Erratum: "Neural coding and psychophysical discrimination" [R. Duncan Luce and David M. Green, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 56, 1554–1564 (1974)]

R. Duncan Luce

School of Social Sciences, University of California, Irvine, California 92664

David M. Green

Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
(Received 19 February 1975)

Subject Classification: 10.90; 65.35, 65.75.

An error in our conclusions has been pointed out to us by S. Colburn. In Eqs. 23 and 26 we show that, for large p, Δf grows as $f^{1/2}$ and f in the counting and timing models, respectively. (The exponent in Eq. 26 should be $1/2$, not $-1/2$.) However, for moderate p, such as that corresponding to signals 50 dB SL as in Fig. 4, p grows approximately as $1/f$ (see Eq. 17). Thus, in the timing model, Δf grows approximately as $f^{1/2}$. So the existing frequency data do not discriminate between the models, although very high intensity data should. Thus, the conclusion favoring the counting model in discrimination experiments rests on its prediction that $\Delta I/I$ decreases with I, as the data appear to, whereas the timing model predicts $\Delta I/I$ increases with I. However, as shown in Green and Luce (1974), assuming that J, the number of channels, grows approximately as $I^{0.1}$ causes the timing model to predict $\Delta I/I$ decreases with I. The dependence of J on I and f is critical in these models, see Sec. IV in the original paper.

Green, D. M., and Luce, R. D. (1974). "Counting and timing mechanisms in auditory discrimination and reaction time," in *Contemporary developments in mathematical psychology*, D. H. Krantz, R. C. Atkinson, R. D. Luce, and P. Suppes, Eds. (Freeman, San Francisco), Vol. II, pp. 372–415.

Erratum: "Response of ribbed panels to reverberant acoustic fields" [G. Maidanik, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 34, 809–826 (1962)]

G. Maidanik

Naval Ship Research and Development Center, Bethesda, Maryland 20084
(Received 1 March 1975)

Subject Classification: 10.90; 20.60, 20.30; 40.35; 50.55.

Since the publication of the titled paper the author has become aware of two errors; they appeared obvious enough not to warrant a formal publication of a correction. Recently a book published in Russia quoted directly from the paper.[1] (The quotation is slightly modified but not in essentials.) The quotation includes one of these errors. Prompted by this event, and to prevent further proliferation of these errors, it has been decided to issue a formal correction; *luchshe pozno chem nekakgda*—better late than never.

Equation (2.27) is valid for the inequality

$$k_p/k_a,\ k_{px}/k_a,\ k_{py}/k_a \gg 1\ ,$$

and not the opposite inequality as stated in the paper.

In Eq. (2.39a) the expression

$$(\lambda_a\lambda_b/A_p)\,g_1(f/f_p)$$

should be replaced by

$$(\lambda_a\lambda_b/A_p)\,(2f/f_p)\,g_1(f/f_p)\ .$$

To those who were either inconvenienced or misled or both by these errors, the author wishes to express his apologies.

[1] L. S. Boroditskii and V. M. Spiridinov, *Reduction of Structural Noise in Ship Compartments* ("Ship Building" Publishing House, Leningrad, 1974).