

Errors in Categorical Data Analysis, third edition

My sincere thanks to anyone who points out errors in this edition. So far, thanks to Pat Altham, Ahmad Hanandeh, Dave Hoaglin, Bernhard Klingenberg, Scott Linderman, Rachel Melamed, Keramat Nourijelyani, Bayzidur Rahman, Tom Wehrly, and special thanks (for many corrections) to Michael Vock.

All printings so far contain the following errors:

p. 57: In line 9, $(80 + 75 + 29)$ should be $(304 + 75 + 172)$, and in line 11, $(80 + 29)$ should be $(304 + 172)$. (I forgot to update the values from those used in the example in the 2nd edition.) In the displayed equations near the bottom of the page, c and d should be subscripts of the Π symbols.

p. 80: In the displayed formula on line 13, there should not be a minus sign after the] bracket and before the $<$ sign.

p. 92: The reference to (3.10) in the middle of the page is supposed to say (See Note 3.10).

p. 97: In Section 3.6.3, it should say that the log relative risk (not the log odds ratio) has the Laplace distribution.

p. 106: In Table 3.12, except for the first cell, all the residuals have the incorrect sign.

p. 112, Exercise 3.47: The total MSE expression given is based on n times the expected difference, so it has a positive limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Without the n multiple, the total MSE is actually the expression shown divided by n .

p. 127: On the third line after the second displayed equation “ $k = \gamma$ fixed” should be $k = 1/\gamma$ fixed.

p. 182: In the displayed equation in the middle of the page, the square root sign should not extend over the g .

p. 259: For the MCMC analysis reported in the third paragraph with the prior $\sigma = 10$ the Monte Carlo error for the neovascularization effect was 0.01, not 0.001 as reported in the text. When I ran the process for 10,000,000 iterations, I got a posterior mean of 9.12 (rather than 8.93) with $SD = 5.10$ and posterior interval (2.1, 21.3).

p. 268: In the exponent of e in the numerator of equation (7.9), s_1 should be t .

The final line should be

$$\lambda(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = \lambda \sum_i \sum_j \{\log[(\pi_{ij}\pi_{i+1,j+1})/(\pi_{i+1,j}\pi_{i,j+1})]\}^2$$

- p. 316: The reference to Section 6.4.2 should be to Section 6.4.5.
- p. 329, Table 8.14: The count of 7 for black males who are unsure should be 17.
- p. 339, second paragraph: The section numbers here should all have 8 replaced by 9. (This chapter was Chapter 8 in the 2nd edition, and these numbers were not updated in the new Chapter 9.)
- p. 389: At the start of the middle paragraph, $\hat{\pi}_{ij} = \hat{\pi}_{ij}/n$ should be $\hat{\pi}_{ij} = \hat{\mu}_{ij}/n$.
- p. 392: In Section 10.4.7, the scores (1, 2, 3, 4) on line 5 should be (1, 2, 4, 5), as had been used in the middle paragraph on p. 390. So, the interpretation in the final sentence of this subsection about common odds ratios for adjacent columns actually applies to columns (1, 2) and (3, 4) but not to columns (2, 3) for which the implied log odds ratio is twice as high.
- p. 397: The points in Figure 10.3 are slightly misplaced.
- p. 428, equation (11.21): β_a should be β_b .
- p. 438: In Table 11.12, the results in the Toronto row should be
5-4 5-4 3-6 ... 6-3.
As a result, in the discussion of the model on that page, the correct results are $G^2 = 17.69$, $\hat{\alpha} = 0.0917$ ($SE = 0.1515$), estimated probability $e^{0.0917}/[1 + e^{0.0917}] = 0.523$ of winning, estimated team effects $\hat{\beta}_1 = 0.455$, $\hat{\beta}_2 = 0.500$, $\hat{\beta}_3 = 0.637$, $\hat{\beta}_4 = 0.229$, estimated probability of a Boston win is 0.511 at Boston and 0.466 at New York, change in deviance = 5.84 ($P = 0.32$).
- p. 473: In the first sentence (second line) of Section 12.4, Y_2, Y_2 should be Y_2, Y_3 .
- p. 567: The least-squares fit of the linear probability model should be reported as $\hat{\pi} = -1.236 + 0.0811x - 0.1042c$.
- pp. 598-599: The references in the text to equations (16.20) and (16.21) should be to (16.19) and (16.20).
- p. 606: The references in the second paragraph to equation (16.28) should be to equation (16.27).
- p. 608: The reference on line 4 to equation (16.28) should be to equation (16.27) and the reference on line 6 to equation (16.29) should be to equation (16.28).
- p. 621: The reference in Exercise 16.33 to equation (16.28) should be to equation (16.27).
- p. 645: The Altham 2010 reference should have R. Hankin as co-author.