

Errata and Clarifications

Wickens, T. D.: *Elementary Signal Detection Theory* Oxford University Press: 2002

The following list contains the errors and corrections I have identified. Please notify me at twickens@socrates.berkeley.edu if you find any others. In the list below, paragraphs that start on a page are numbered ¶1, ¶2, etc., and ¶0 refers to a paragraph that continues from the previous page. Lines are numbered ℓ1, ℓ2, etc. Negative line numbers count up from the bottom of the page or paragraph. Material that needs to be corrected is underlined in quotations.

Page Location	Correction	193 Prb. 10.4	Should read “Find the decision...”. [The curious text here is an index tag that misfired. It should have produced an entry on p. 260 under <i>likelihood-ratio observer</i> .
iii	My current affiliation is the University of California, <u>Berkeley</u> .	209 1.3 ff.	An incorrect value for the number of old items identified as OLD propagates through the example. “As there were <u>45</u> + 21 = <u>66</u> OLD responses to the 120 items, an estimate of the probability of saying OLD is $p = \frac{66}{120} = \underline{0.55}$, corresponding to a criterion set at $\hat{\lambda} = -Z(p) = \underline{-0.126}$.” The numerical portions of the three displayed calculations below should be $\frac{0.55 \times 0.45}{60} = 0.004125$, $\frac{2 \times 0.004125}{(0.396)^2} = 0.05266$, and $\frac{1.06 - 0}{\sqrt{0.05266}} = 4.62$. The conclusion to the example does not change.
vii ¶3, ℓ–1	My current web page is socrates.berkeley.edu/~twickens .		
ix ℓ12	My current email address is twickens@socrates.berkeley.edu .		
12 ¶0, ℓ1–2	“In other <u>versions</u> .”		
23 ℓ17	“ $\hat{\lambda}$ must be 0.915 units below \hat{d}' . <u>Rounding to two places</u> .”		
43 ¶1, ℓ3–4	“and of constant λ_{center} (right).”		
61 Fig. 4.1	The axis labels z_H and z_F on the Gaussian plot are exchanged.		
61 ℓ4	“which implies that $\sigma_s^2 > \sigma_n^2$.”		
65 Eq. 4.3	Because x_0 is negative, the formula based on it should include a minus sign: $d_a = \dots = \frac{-\sqrt{2}x_0y_0}{\sqrt{x_0^2 + y_0^2}}$.	210 ℓ4	The hit rate for Session 2 should be 0.550 (as in Example 2.2), not 0.055.
68 Eq. 4.7	Same as above correction: $\Phi\left(\frac{-x_0y_0}{\sqrt{x_0^2 + y_0^2}}\right)$.	224 Prb. 11.9	The text should read “in Problem 11.6 was repeated <u>on a total of eight days</u> .” To be consistent with the other entries and with Problem 11.6, the data for Day 1 should read 127, 23, 48, and 102 for observer <i>A</i> and, 125, 25, 34, and 116 for observer <i>B</i> . Finally, changing the C.R. entry for observer <i>A</i> on day 6 to 137 makes number of trials identical to those for the other observations.
82 Prb. 4.4	The frequency of misses in the <i>Balanced</i> table should be 78 instead of 88, so that the row frequencies sum to 200 as they do in the other tables.	257 ¶1, ℓ3	“...listed in the <u>reference</u> section”.
87 ¶2, ℓ5	“The inadequacy of the <u>equal-variance</u> model ...”.	235 Eq. A.34	The final term in both parts of the equation should have the coefficient 2: $\text{var}(W) = a^2 \text{var}(X) + b^2 \text{var}(Y) + \underline{2ab} \text{cov}(X, Y) = a^2 \sigma_X^2 + b^2 \sigma_Y^2 + \underline{2ab} \sigma_X \sigma_Y$.
92 Prb. .5.2c	“Summarize <u>the</u> subject’s recognition performance...”.	244 ¶1, ℓ8	$Q_{\Sigma}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{1 - \rho^2} \left[\frac{x_1^2}{\sigma_1^2} - 2\rho \frac{x_1 x_2}{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} + \frac{x_2^2}{\sigma_2^2} \right]$. Note the change in sign of the middle term.
100 Fig. 6.3	The labels “Say FIRST” and “Say SECOND” are reversed.	244 Note 4	$C_{\Sigma} = [(2\pi)^d \Sigma]^{-1/2}$. Alternatively, replace $ \Sigma $ by $\sqrt{ \Sigma }$ in existing equation.
162 Eq. 9.17	The equation above the numbered line should have a subscript <i>s</i> on σ . Also, the final plus signs should be minuses: $\left[\log \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} - \log \sigma_s - \dots \right] - \left[\log \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} - \frac{1}{2} x^2 \right]$ The final equation is correct.		
170 Prb. 9.5b	“base a decision on the quantity $y = (\mu_n + \mu_s)x^2 - \underline{2\mu_n \mu_s}x$.”		
177 ¶1, ℓ8	The inequality is reversed. It should read “lies in the regions where $f_s(\mathbf{x}) < f_n(\mathbf{x})$.”		
178 Eq. 10.3	The denominator of the third term in the equation should have a square root: $\frac{\sum \mu_i^2 - 0}{\sqrt{\sum \mu_i^2}}$.		
193 Prb. 10.1	Assume that the observers in make their choices without preference for a YES or NO response when the original signal intensities were set.		

I would like to thank Drs. Yasuharu Okamoto and John R. Vokey for pointing out several of these errors.

5 October 2004