TABLE ERRATA

494.—T. S. SHAO, T. C. CHEN & R. M. FRANK, "Tables of zeros and Gaussian weights of certain associated Laguerre polynomials and the related generalized Hermite polynomials," *Math. Comp.*, v. 18, 1964, pp. 598–616.

Recomputation of most of the tables occupying pp. 599–608 of this paper and subsequent collation whenever possible with those of Stroud & Secrest [1] have revealed a systematic relative error in all the weights computed by Shao et al., amounting to -4.7×10^{-23}, nearly. This pervasive error appears to have been generated by an inaccurate value of $\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})$.

No errors were found in the tabulated zeros of the polynomials.

B. DANLOY

Département d'informatique
Université de Montréal
Montréal 101, Québec, Canada

1. A. H. STROUD & D. SECREST, *Gaussian Quadrature Formulas*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1966, pp. 217–251, 277–286.

495.—HAROLD T. DAVIS, *Tables of the Higher Mathematical Functions*, Volume I, The Principia Press, Bloomington, Indiana, 1933.

In Table 11, p. 354, the tabulated values of $\Psi(x)$ corresponding to $x = .01, .24, .50, .52, .80$, and $.88$ should each be decreased by a unit in the last place.

The following comparable corrections are required in Table 12, pp. 366–367. The values of $\Psi(z + 1)$ should be increased by a unit in the last place for $z = .26, .27, .36, .47, .48, .50, .51, .52$, and $.99$; and the tabular values of that function should be decreased by a unit in the last place for $z = .01, .06, .07, .08, .09, .10, .12, .18, .19, .21, .22, .31, .38, .45, .57, .60, .61, .62, .64, .65, .66, .68, .72, .74, .76, .78, .79, .80, .81, .82, .83, .84, .88, .89, .90, .92, .94$, and $.95$.

More serious terminal-digit errors noted in $\Psi(z + 1)$ in Table 12 are as follows:

z	*for*	*read*	*z*	*for*	*read*
.11	248	259	.67	607	604
.17	299	297	.69	012	017
.34	946	948	.70	948	957
.56	189	187	.71	789	794
.58	439	437	.73	792	790
.59	042	040	.77	795	793
.63	383	381	.93	793	791

The entry for $z = .11$ was previously corrected from 248 to 260 in the *FMRC Index* [1]. The relevant digits found in the present calculation were 2593772. This

result was obtained by the power series on p. 280 and independently by Gauss's formula on p. 286.

ROBERT S. SPIRA

Department of Mathematics
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

1. A. FLETCHER, J. C. P. MILLER, L. ROSENHEAD & L. J. COMRIE, *An Index of Mathematical Tables*. Vol. II, 2nd ed., Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1962, p. 817. MR **26** #365b.

EDITORIAL NOTE. These same errors occur also in the revised edition, retitled *Tables of the Mathematical Functions*, and published by the Principia Press of Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas, 1963. (For additional errata see *Math. Comp.*, v. 19, 1965, pp. 696–698, RMT **131**.)

496.—BURTON D. FRIED & SAMUEL D. CONTE, *The Plasma Dispersion Function: The Hilbert Transform of the Gaussian*, Academic Press, New York, 1961.

Several typographical errors in this book have been previously announced in a review in this journal (*Math. Comp.*, v. 17, 1963, pp. 94–95). With reference to the error announced therein relative to the sign of a_{n+1} in the second equation on p. 6, the following detailed clarification seems to be required. If a_{n+1} is defined as positive, then the continued fraction is correctly written, but the signs of a_1 and a_{n+1} in the recurrence relations should be negative. On the other hand, if a_{n+1} is defined as $-n(2n-1)/2$, then the recurrence relations read correctly, but the numerators in the continued fraction are incorrectly written as $-a_{n+1}$ and $-a_{n+2}$.

Additional errors, not noted in the review, are as follows:

p. 2, last equation: on the right side, *for* $Z(x+iy)$, *read* $Z^*(x+iy)$.

p. 6, sixth equation: *for* A_n, *read* B_n.

p. 6, last equation: *for* $Z(\zeta^*)$, *read* $Z^*(\zeta^*)$.

HENRY E. FETTIS

Applied Mathematics Laboratory
Aerospace Research Laboratories
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433

497.—P. POULET, "Table des nombres composés vérifiant le théorème de Fermat pour le module 2 jusqu'à 100.000.000," *Sphinx*, v. 8, 1938, pp. 42–52.

In Table Errata 485, *Math. Comp.*, v. 25, 1971, p. 944, the last entry under "Insert" should read

N	p
*99036001	3001.

That is because this $N = 61 \cdot 541 \cdot 3001$, and therefore is a Carmichael number.

J. D. SWIFT

Department of Mathematics
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024