FEDER, P. I. (1967). On the likelihood ratio statistic with applications to broken line regression. Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. Statist., Stanford Univ.

HINKLEY, D. V. (1969). Inference about the intersection in two-phase regression. *Biometrika* **56** 495–504.

KNOWLES, M. D. and SIEGMUND, D. O. (1989). On Hotelling's approach to testing for a nonlinear parameter in regression. *Internat. Statist. Rev.* **57** 205–220.

LEADBETTER, M. R. (1972). Point processes generated by level crossings. *Stochastic Point Processes.* Wiley, New York.

MCKAY, M. D., CONOVER, W. J. and BECKMAN, R. J. (1979). A comparison of three methods for selecting values of input variables in the analysis of output from a computer code. *Technometrics* **21** 239–245.

OWEN, A. B. (1990). A central limit theorem for Latin hypercube sampling. Technical report, Dept. Statist., Stanford Univ.

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305

LARRY L. SCHUMAKER

Vanderbilt University

Clearly the fitting of functions of more than two variables is an important problem, and it is nice to see that statisticians are willing to tackle it. Mathematicians have tended to concentrate on the bivariate case (perhaps because even there, much remains to be done). The recently published bibliography [5] provides a fairly up-to-date list of what approximation theorists have been doing. Some of this work does deal with the many variable case. In particular, the papers [1], [2], [3], [4] and [11] deal with adaptive fitting of piecewise polynomials, much in the spirit of the paper under discussion. These papers also deal with the problem of giving error bounds.

Approximation theorists have also recently been interested in the problem of approximating multivariate functions by sums of univariate functions. In this connection I would like to cite [6], [7] (see also the bibliography [5]). Other references can be found in the book [6].

Next, a few comments on the paper under discussion. I am a bit puzzled by the assertion in Section 2.4.2 and later in Section 3.2 that lack of smoothness of the approximating functions limits the accuracy of the approximation. Generally it is true that lack of smoothness of the function to be approximated limits accuracy, while for the approximating functions it is the degree of the polynomials used which is critical. Similarly, I do not understand the discussion of end effects in Section 3.7. The classical natural splines perform badly near the boundaries precisely because they smoothly match linear functions there; i.e., they are constrained at the endpoints in the wrong way. The author uses a basis of piecewise linear functions which are smoothed out to be C^1. If one does not need C^1 functions, it seems it would be better to simply use linear splines to begin with. As far as I know, the approximation properties of