

Table II. Comparative Recovery of NC-2983 from Samples of Field-Treated Soil by Two Different Analytical Procedures

Sample	ppm Recovered		
	MeOH/HCl method ^a	MeOH/HCl method ^b	Modified method ^{c,d}
1	1.22	1.16	1.10
2	0.91	0.89	0.92
3	1.73	1.84	1.96
4	2.10	1.94	2.01
5	1.78	1.91	2.04
6	3.66	3.84	3.66
7	4.14	4.40	4.33
8	3.83	3.68	3.89
9	0.92	0.98	0.92
10	0.94	0.91	0.87
11	1.66	1.83	2.00
12	2.67	2.50	2.46
13	4.07	3.93	3.75
14	4.24	3.88	3.76

^a Analyzed by the Fisons Agrochemical Division, Chesterford Park, England, using methanol:HCl extraction procedure. ^b Analyzed by the Pesticide Research Laboratory, Pennsylvania State University, using methanol:HCl extraction procedure. ^c Analyzed by the Pesticide Research Laboratory, Pennsylvania State University, using modified methylene chloride:isopropyl alcohol extraction procedure. ^d $t_{0.05} = 2.160$.

deterioration of the column and contamination of the detector, since these extracts were subjected to a minimum of cleanup. For this reason, if a large number of samples are to be analyzed, 1/20,000th of the final soil extract (equivalent to 1 mg of soil) is the maximum amount which can be injected repetitively into the glc column with loss of efficiency.

The recovery of NC-2983 from control soil samples which had been fortified with various amounts of the chemical, from 0.5 to 4.0 ppm, ranged from 88 to 108% (Table I). The average recovery value for 57 fortified samples was 97%.

Figure 1 is a tracing of the glc recorder response of 1.0 μ l of a benzene solution, diluted 50,000 \times , and fortified with 0.25 ng/ μ l of dieldrin as an internal standard, of the residue extracted from 20 g of field soil containing 0.80 ppm of NC-2983. Gas chromatograms of numerous control samples of

untreated soil did not show any significant peaks (peak heights less than 0.5 cm) which interfered with that of NC-2983.

The effectiveness of this modified procedure was determined by comparing the results obtained with it to those obtained in our and another laboratory using the more lengthy methanol extraction procedure on split samples from field-treated plots. An analysis of the data in Table II by the Student's t-distribution test revealed no significant difference at the 5% level for the 14 samples analyzed by the two different methods, thus demonstrating that this modified method is as efficient as the more exhaustive methanolic method for the analysis of NC-2983 residues in soil. This modified method, therefore, can be used effectively to analyze field samples of soil for residues of NC-2983 because it overcomes the limitations of emulsion formation often experienced in the original method as proposed by Crofts and Whiteoak (1969). It is comparable in sensitivity and reliability to the more entailed methanolic procedure and has the added advantage that it is considerably faster and simpler to conduct.

LITERATURE CITED

- Asquith, D., *J. Econ. Entomol.* **61**, 1044 (1968).
 Crofts, M., Whiteoak, R. J., Chesterford Park Research Station, Nr. Saffron Walden, Essex, England, private communication, 1969.
 Fisons Ltd., Chesterford Park Research Station, Nr. Saffron Walden, Essex, England, unpublished data, 1968.
 Saggars, D. T., Clark, M. L., *Nature* **215**, 275 (1967).

Charles D. Ercegovich*
 Sujit Witkonton
 Kathryn B. Steen

Pesticide Research Laboratory and
 Department of Entomology
 The Pennsylvania State University
 University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Received for review October 13, 1971. Accepted November 29, 1971. Authorized for publication of October 6, 1971, as paper No. 4074 in the journal series of the Pennsylvania Agricultural Experiment Station. This work was supported in part by a grant from the Fisons Corporation, Agricultural Chemicals Division, Bedford, Mass. We thank C. H. Cronin, Myron Crofts, and R. J. Whiteoak for their technical assistance and cooperation.

Correction

EVALUATION OF THE PROTEIN QUALITY OF MILLED RICES DIFFERING IN PROTEIN CONTENT

In this article by Ricardo Bressani, Luiz G. Elias, and Bienvenido O. Juliano [*J. Agr. Food Chem.* **19**(5), 1028 (1971)], the title incorrectly appeared as "Evaluation of the Protein Quality and Milled Rices Differing in Protein Content."