LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear Sir:

I am delighted at the independent verification of my thesis in *Astin Bulletin*, **9**, 213, that the gamma distribution generally produces results nearer the truth of $F(x, t)$ than the so-called NP2, when both approximations are fitted by means of the first three moments of F.

In his contribution to the Astin Colloquium in Washington, D. C., T. Pentikäinen has reproduced 15 of the 24 comparisons I made in the first three and the fifth sets shown in my table thus obtaining 11 in favour of the gamma (a slight improvement over my 16 in 24!). He has added $48 - 15 = 33$ new results showing, in his table, that in 11 of them the gamma is superior to NP2 and that there is supposedly equality in 14 results. However, using Pentikäinen's own tabular values of $1 - F(x,t)$, 10 of the 14 "equalities" turn out to favour gamma and only three have the same value to the number of decimals shown.

Summarizing these results we have:

	Number of comparisons	Number in favour of gamma
Pentikäinen (Astin Colloquium):		
Taken from Seal	15	11
New	33	$11 + 10 + 1\frac{1}{2}$ (half of 3)
Seal (*Astin Bull.*):		
Not used in Pentikäinen's extraction	9	5
Remainder (*viz.* fourth, sixth and seventh sets)	14	11
Total	71	$49\frac{1}{2}$

Several lines and groups of lines in this table produce a ratio of close to 70 % in favour of gamma.

Yours very truly,

HILARY L. SEAL

AUGUST 1977

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0515036100006450 Published online by Cambridge University Press