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