

# Correction to “A Topologically Valid Definition of Depth for Functional Data” by Alicia Nieto-Reyes and Heather Battey

We are grateful to Irène Gijbels and Stanislav Nagy for drawing our attention to some regrettable substantive errors in our paper, which appears in *Statistical Science* **31** 61–79, 2016. With apologies, we present the correct forms below.

1. In Definition 3.1 and in the definitions of band depth and modified band depth on page 68 (lines 15-16, 27-28 and 34)  $\alpha$  should be replaced by  $\alpha(v)$ .
2. The last two lines of Definition 3.1 should be replaced by  $U : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}$  with  $U(v) := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{E}} x(v)$  and  $L : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}$  with  $L(v) := \inf_{x \in \mathcal{E}} x(v)$  when  $\max(|U(v)|, |L(v)|) < \infty$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ .
3. In Definition 3.2:
  - under P-3., after “exists” should appear “with  $D(z, P) = D(z', P)$  implying  $d(z, z') = 0$ ”.
  - Equation (3.1) has to be substituted by  $\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{F}_x : d(x, y) < \delta} D(y, P) \leq D(x, P) + \epsilon$ , where  $\mathfrak{F}_x := \left\{ y \in \mathfrak{F} : d(y, x) < d(y, \theta) \text{ or } \max\{d(y, \theta), d(y, x)\} < d(x, \theta) \right\}$  for  $\theta = \operatorname{argsup}_{x \in \mathfrak{F}} D(x, P)$ .
  - In P-5.,  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{F}, P)$  is substituted by  $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{F}, P) \setminus 0$  and the interval of definition of  $\delta$  by  $[\inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}} d(L(v), U(v)), d(L, U)) \cap (0, \infty)$ .
4. Lemma 4.3 is false. Consequently, there is a cross in the corresponding position in Table 2.  
*Conter-example:* Let  $(\mathfrak{F}, d) = (\mathbb{H}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{L}_2})$  and  $P$  a discrete distribution on  $\mathfrak{F}$  with support  $\{X_1, X_2, X_3\}$  such that  $P(X_1) = P(X_3) = 1/4$  and  $P(X_2) = 1/2$  and  $d(X_1, X_2) = d(X_2, X_3) = d(X_1, X_3)/2$ . Let  $x \in \mathfrak{F}$  such that  $d(x, X - 1) = d(x, X_2) = d(X_1, X_2)/2$ , then, there always exist a  $h$  such that  $D_h(x, P) < \min(D_h(X_1, P), D_h(X_2, P))$ . This is due to  $D_h(x, P) = \mathbb{E}[\exp(-(x/h)^2/2)/(h\sqrt{2\pi})]$ .

**Acknowledgement:** We thank Peter Green for much valued constructive criticism.