south of air route A90 and abeam of PAWES at 1406, when the sphere was dissipating) and Presley's observations (air route A90; behind McDade and approaching the intersection designated SABES) allows us to estimate the size and distance of the halo.

Our conclusion is that original estimated positions were in error. Additional data, primarily from Van den Berg, place the event between the Kurils and Sakhalin. The altitude of the center of the halo at the maximum observed size is estimated to have been greater than 200 miles, and the diameter of the halo is estimated to have been at least 380 miles. It seems unlikely that a ground-based explosion could produce this kind of an effect. It is surprising to us that no official data have been provided by government agencies and that such a significant observation from a region of demonstrated military sensitivity was, and still remains, a mystery. In retrospect, we believe that erroneous assumptions regarding the presumed location of the mystery cloud may have contributed to the early dismissal of a hypothesis that now deserves intense examination. The 10 April 1984 issue of the *Anchorage Daily News* reported (*2*) that the Soviet Union had informed Japanese officials that missile testing would begin on 9 April in an area west of the Kamchatka Peninsula. The 12 April 1984 issue of that newspaper reported (*3*) that "a Japanese aviation official confirmed Wednesday the Soviet Union had scheduled missile tests in the northern Pacific, but not on the day or in the area where the mysterious cloud burst was sighted."

DANIEL L. MCKENNA
Department of Meteorology, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI 96822
DANIEL A. WALKER
Hawaii Institute of Geophysics, University of Hawaii at Manoa

REFERENCES

1. H. Eggen, *Aarde Kosmos* 5, 292 (1985).
2. L. Campbell, *Anchorage Daily News*, 10 April 1984, p. A1.
3. M. Kuramitsu, *ibid.*, 12 April 1984, p. A1.

Erratum: The Research News article "How unusual are unusual events?" by Roger Lewin (26 Sept., p. 1385) cited the statement "Given a 5% probability of an unusual event in a 1-year study, one should expect a 35% probability of such an event in a 7-year study." The expected correct probability for a 7-year study would be 30.17%.

Erratum: In the article by Jane Menken *et al.* "Age and infertility" (26 Sept., p. 1389), the first sentence under the sidehead *"Diagnosis of infertility by failure to conceive within a year"* (p. 1390, column two, paragraph two) should have read: "The historical evidence indicates that the proportion of women who were sterile increased rather slowly and almost linearly from the 20's until the early 40's.