

Corrigenda

In situ and laboratory stress–strain relationships. M. Kabbaj, F. Tavenas and S. Leroueil (1988). *Géotechnique* 38, No. 1, 83–100.

On page 92, in Fig. 12(a) and (b), the symbols in the key for MSL_p and in situ stress–strain curves have been transposed. Fig. 12 is shown here in its correct form.




Fig. 12. Stress–strain curves obtained in the laboratory and observed in situ at Berthierville: (a) sublayer 4–5 (3.0–3.9 m); (b) sublayer 5–6 (3.9–4.8 m)

Discussion on Reliability model on progressive slope failure. R.N. Chowdhury, W.H. Tang and I. Sidi (1988). *Géotechnique*, 38, No. 4, 641–644.

The following amendments should be noted.

On page 642, equation (8) should read $\text{var} \{c_r\} = \beta \cdot c_p$ which results in the same model described by equation (24) of page 645.

The origin of Fig. 2(b) should be zero, not c_r .

On page 643 the second line above equation (14) should read ‘the event that $R_2 > R_1$.’

Equation (15) should read $(c_p)_L < [S_{o,d+L} - (c_p)_d \times d]/L$.

In the second line above equation (18), the word ‘unexpected’ should read ‘expected’.

Equation (18) should read

$$E(c_{req}) = E \left[\frac{1}{L_i} \int_{L_i} \tau(x) dx \right] \\ = \frac{1}{L_i} \int_{L_i} \bar{\tau}(x) dx$$

The first sentence of the last paragraph on page 643 should read ‘As L_i tends to zero, equation (18) will approach the limit of mean shear stress $\bar{\tau}(x)$ at a point.’