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, Keramat Nourijelyani, Bayzidur Rahman, Michael Vock, and Tom Wehrly.

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. 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 $n \to \infty$. 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 neovasculation 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. 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. 428, equation (11.21): β_a should be β_b.

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.