CORRECTION

The results of our recent paper, "Topography of Nucleic Acid Helices in Solution. I. The Nonidentity of Polyadenylic–Polyuridylic and Polyinosinic–Polycytidylic Acid Helices" (Edmond J. Gabbay, *Biochemistry*, Vol. 5, September 1966, p 3036), concerning the stabilization of nucleic acid helices by diquaternary ammonium salts, I, $R_1R_2R_3N^+(CH_2)_nN^+R_1R_2R_3 \cdot 2X^-$, are somewhat misleading. We assumed that Mahler's statement [H. R. Mahler and B. D. Mehrotra (1963), *Biochim. Biophys. Acta 68*, 211; (1964), *Biochim. Biophys. Acta 91*, 78] that the simple diamines, II, $NH_2(CH_2)_nNH_2$, exist in the diprotonated form at neutral pH is correct. However, we have found that the pK_1 of ethylenediamine, **1**, is 6.88, and hence at pH 7.0 more than 50% of **1** exists in the monoprotonated form. For this reason the melting temperature of rA–rU and rI–rC in the presence of the dihydrobromide salts of II were reinvestigated at a lower pH. Fortunately, the results shown below indicate that maximum stabilization still occurs at $n = 3$ for rA–rU and rI–rC helices. The arguments and conclusions drawn in the original paper remain accurate.

TABLE: Variation of ΔT_m of rA–rU and rI–rC with 2×10^{-3} M II, $H_3N^+(CH_2)_nNH_3 \cdot 2Br^-$, in 0.10 M Sodium Phosphate Buffer at pH 6.15[a] (0.10 M with respect to Na^+).

n	rA–rU[b]	rI–rC[c]
2	6.2	7.5
3	8.2	9.0
4	7.2	6.4

[a] At this pH, ethylenediamine exists in the diprotonated form to the extent of 90%, whereas the other diamines are 100% diprotonated. [b] T_m of blank is $56.0 \pm 0.2°$. [c] T_m of blank is $59.0 \pm 0.3°$.

EDMOND J. GABBAY