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This is joint work with Xia Hua. Consider the simple linear regression model $Y_{j}=a+b x_{j}+\varepsilon_{j}$ where $x_{1}<x_{2}<\cdots<x_{n}$ are non-random design points, $Y_{j}$ are also observed, the "errors" $\varepsilon_{j}$ are unobserved i.i.d. $N\left(0, \sigma^{2}\right), n \geq 2$, and $\sigma^{2}$ is unknown. It's well known that $a$ and $b$ can be uniquely estimated by least squares or equivalently by maximum likelihood, giving $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{b}$. We then observe the residuals $r_{j}=Y_{j}-\hat{a}-\hat{b} x_{j}$. For numbers $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}$ which may be either $\varepsilon_{1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{n}$ or $r_{1}, \ldots, r_{n}$, say that there is a turning point at $j=2, \ldots, n-1$ if $\left(s_{j-1}-s_{j}\right)\left(s_{j+1}-s_{j}\right)>$ 0 , or a convexity point if $\left(s_{j}-s_{j-1}\right) /\left(x_{j}-x_{j-1}\right)<\left(s_{j+1}-s_{j}\right) /\left(x_{j+1}-x_{j}\right)$. There is a convexity point in the errors at $j$ if and only if there is one in the residuals. That is not true for turning points but it becomes approximately true for large $n$. Thus the indicators $t_{j}$ of having a turning point at $j$ are weakly dependent. The indicators $c_{j}$ of having a convexity point at $j$ in the errors and thus in the residuals are 2 -dependent. Suppose for simplicity that the spacings $x_{j}-x_{j-1}$ are all equal. The variables $X_{j}=c_{2 j}+c_{2 j+1}-1$ are 1 -dependent and symmetric. The talk will focus on the distribution of the total number of convexity points.

