New Mortality Experience. $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{MF}}, \& c$. -(continued).

| Age. | Unadjusted. |  | Adjusted. |  |  | Probability of Dying in a Year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Numberliving. | Decrement. | Numberliving. | Decrement. | Expectation | Partial Experience Adjusted. | Total Experlence Adjusted. |
| 77 | 19687 | 2113 | 19728 | 2257 | 5.811 | -11441 | -11322 |
| 78 | 17574 | 2302 | 17471 | 2131 | $5 \cdot 497$ | -12197 | $\cdot 12110$ |
| 79 | 15272 | 2017 | 15340 | 2001 | $5 \cdot 191$ | -13044 | -12938 |
| 80 | 13255 | 1776 | 13339 | 1863 | $4 \cdot 895$ | -13966 | -13868 |
| 81 | 11479 | 1762 | 11476 | 1710 | $4 \cdot 609$ | ${ }^{1} 14901$ | -14907 |
| 82 | 9717 | 1432 | 9766 | 1568 | $4 \cdot 328$ | $\cdot 16055$ | $\cdot 16068$ |
| 83 | 8285 | 1536 | 8198 | 1426 | $4 \cdot 060$ | -17394 | $\cdot 17426$ |
| 84 | 6749 | 1214 | 6772 | 1270 | 3810 | -18753 | -18857 |
| 85 | 5535 | 1211 | 5502 | 1115 | 3574 | -20265 | -20267 |
| 86 | 4324 | 952 | 4387 | 955 | 3355 | $\cdot 21768$ | $\cdot 21732$ |
| 87 | 3372 | 751 | 3432 | 805 | $3 \cdot 150$ | $\cdot 23455$ | $\cdot 23248$ |
| 88 | 2621 | 691 | 2627 | 651 | $2 \cdot 962$ | $\cdot 24781$ | '24581 |
| 89 | 1930 | 454 | 1976 | 520 | $2 \cdot 773$ | $\cdot 26316$ | ${ }^{2} 5923$ |
| 90 | 1476 | 394 | 1456 | 411 | $2 \cdot 585$ | $\cdot 28228$ | $\cdot 27778$ |
| 91 | 1082 | 309 | 1045 | 319 | $2 \cdot 405$ | -30526 | -29708 |
| 92 | 773 | 304 | 726 | 233 | $2 \cdot 242$ | $\cdot 32093$ | '31069 |
| 93 | 469 | 235 | 493 | 168 | 2.066 | $\cdot 34077$ | -33029 |
| 94 | 234 | 0 | 325 | 124 | 1-875 | $\cdot 38154$ | $\cdot 35694$ |
| 95 | 234 | 26 | 201 | 79 | 1.724 | $\cdot 38806$ | $\cdot 36441$ |
| 96 | 208 | 130 | 122 | 48 | 1-516 | -39837 | $\cdot 37334$ |
| 97 | 78 | 39 | 74 | 36 | $1 \cdot 207$ | $\cdot 48648$ | $\cdot 46809$ |
| 98 | 39 | 0 | 38 | 26 | $\cdot 815$ | -68420 | -65999 |
| 99 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 | $\cdot 500$ | $1 \cdot 00000$ | $1 \cdot 00000$ |
| 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |

## ON HERR LAZARUS'S PAPER ON THE THEORY OF PROBABILITIES.

To the Editor of the Journal of the Institute of Actuaries.
Sir,--In the July number of the Journal you inserted a letter from me, having for its object the elucidation of a passage in Herr Lazarus's paper "On some problems in the Theory of Probabilities." I have since received a very courteous communication from Herr Lazarus in reference to the subject of my letter; and I beg to send you the substance of that communication out of fairness to Herr Lazarns, at the same time feeling confident that it will greatly interest some of your readers.

He says, in explanation of the passage upon which my remarks were based, "The simplest way to find the sum $\Omega_{0}+\Omega_{1}+\Omega_{2}$ would be to extend " one of the equations (28) or (29), so as to include $\Omega_{0}$. I think it is self" evident from (28) that

$$
\because \Omega_{0}+\Omega_{1}=\frac{\int_{0}^{p} x^{m-1}(1-x)^{n} d x}{\int_{0}^{1} x^{m-1}(1-x)^{n} d x}-\frac{\int_{0}^{p} x^{m+z}(1-x)^{n-z-1} d x}{\int_{0}^{1} x^{m+z}(1-x)^{n-z-1} d x}
$$

$"$ and as by $(29) \Omega_{2}=\frac{\int_{0}^{p} x^{m-z-1}(1-x)^{n+z} d x}{\int_{0}^{1} x^{m-z-1}(1-x)^{n+z} d x}-\frac{\int_{0}^{p} x^{m-1}(1-x)^{n} d x}{\int_{0}^{1} x^{m-1}(1-x)^{n} d x}$;
" it follows directly by mere addition that

$$
" \Omega_{0}+\Omega_{1}+\Omega_{2}=\frac{\int_{0}^{p} x^{m-z-1}(1-x)^{n+z} d x}{\int_{0}^{1} x^{m-z-1}(1-x)^{n+z} d x}-\frac{\int_{0}^{p} x^{m+z}(1-x)^{n-z-1} d x}{\int_{0}^{1} x^{n+z}(1-x)^{n-z-1} d x}
$$

" and from this equation I derive
$" \Omega_{0}+\Omega_{1}+\Omega_{2}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{0}^{k_{2}} \varepsilon^{-t^{2}} d t+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{0}^{k_{3}} \varepsilon^{-t^{2}} d t+\frac{\mathrm{B}_{2}}{\mathrm{~A}_{2} \sqrt{\pi}}=\varepsilon^{-k_{2}^{2}}-\frac{\mathrm{B}_{3}}{\mathrm{~A}_{3} \sqrt{\pi}} \varepsilon^{-k_{3}^{2}}$.
With regard to the signs of the first two terms in this expression, Herr Lazarus says, "On page 246, at the bottom, we found the inequalities

$$
" m<p(\mu+1), \quad m>p(\mu+1)-1
$$

" It follows that

$$
" \frac{m}{\mu+1}<p, \quad \frac{m+1}{\mu+1}>p ;
$$

" and in consequence thereof,
" $\frac{m+z}{\mu-1}>p$, the + sign of the first term is fixed;
" $\frac{m-z-1}{\mu-1}<p$, the $+\operatorname{sign}$ of the second term is fixed."
There is thus, then, no necessity for the double sign which I prefixed to these terms. At the same time I think it would have been as well had this step in the demonstration been inserted in Herr Lazarus's paper.

Herr Lazarus kindly points out a misprint in my letter. In the expression for $\Omega_{0}+\Omega_{1}+\Omega_{2}$, on page 454 , the factor $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}$ has been omitted from the first two terms.

> I am, Sir,
> Your obedient servant,

Dec. 1, 1870,
WILLIAM SUTTON.
18, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

