EDITOR'S ENDNOTES

José Ángel Cid (Universidad de Jaén, Jaén, Spain) and Rodrigo López Pouso (Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, Spain) submitted the following addendum to their January 2009 article "Does Lipschitz with Respect to x Imply Uniqueness for the Differential Equation $y' = f(x, y)$?"

The main result in our paper is Theorem 2.1. Its most striking consequence is Theorem 3.1, a uniqueness result for first-order ordinary differential equations with nonlinearities which satisfy a Lipschitz condition with respect to the independent variable. An earlier specific proof of our Theorem 3.1 was given in [1] in 1999, as we already acknowledged in the concluding remarks of our paper.

We have recently found out that Theorem 3.1 is a particular case of an even older theorem stated and proved by Stettner and Nowak in 1989 (see [2] and take $d_x = 0$ and $d_t = 1$ in the main result). Stettner and Nowak's paper is written in German, a language which, unfortunately, we do no know, and probably we simply overlooked it when consulting bibliographic databases. Anyway, we were not aware of the result in [2] until Cid attended Nowak's lecture at the 8th AIMS Conference on Dynamical Systems, Differential Equations, and Applications (Dresden, Germany, May 25–28, 2010).

Finally, it is worthy of remark that uniqueness results deduced by means of Theorem 2.1 have, in general, nothing to do with Lipschitz conditions (e.g., Theorem 4.1), thus going beyond the scopes of the results in [1, 2].

REFERENCES

1. C. Mortici, On the solvability of the Cauchy problem, *Nieuw Arch. Wiskd. IV. Ser.* **17** (1999) 21–23.
2. H. Stettner and C. Nowak, Eine verallgemeinerte Lipschitzbedingung als Eindeutigkeitskriterium bei gewöhnlichen Differentialgleichungen [A generalized Lipschitz condition as criterion of uniqueness in ordinary differential equations], *Math. Nachr.* **141** (1989) 33–35.

John Mount (Win-Vector LLC, San Francisco) sent in these comments about an article in the May 2010 issue:

Concerning the survey article "The Evolution of Markov Chain Monte Carlo Methods" by Matthew Richey: I understand that even in a long survey some things must be left out. But, I am disappointed that the references to Diaconis, Jerrum, and Sinclair were not followed further to refer to the works of Dyer, Frieze, and Kannan in correctly applying MCMCM to hard optimization problems (such as estimating volume) or to Propp and Wilson's work on designing exact stopping times. The computer science view of MCMCM is an interesting complement to the statistical and physics treatments.

Matthew Richey responds:

Mount's list of names is a great addition to the discussion. The rationale for leaving these individuals out of the paper had more to do with trying to control the length than any comment on their importance in the big picture.