

Erratum

Erratum to “Salt effects in capillary electrophoresis. I. Dependence of electrophoretic mobilities upon the hydrodynamic radius”

[J. Chromatogr. A, 786 (1997) 171–180]<sup>1</sup>

Reginald F. Cross\*, Jing Cao

*School of Chemical Sciences, Swinburne University of Technology, John Street, Hawthorn, Vic. 3122, Australia*

Received 12 February 1998

*Keywords:* Salt effects; Electrophoretic mobility; Hydrodynamic radius; Sulfonamides; Peptides

---

Table 1, line 1, last column, the electrophoretic mobility ( $\mu_{ep}$ ) of  $SQ \cdot H_2O$  should be  $-21.60 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ V}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ . Also in Table 1, the relative mobilities calculated from  $Z/r^2$  for SIOX and SMI should be inverted.

It has been pointed out [1] that the equations given (p. 175, right side) for the correlations between  $\mu_{ep}$  and ( $Z/r$  and  $Z/r^2$ ) are not consistent with the data in Table 1 and thus the plots (solid lines, Figs. 1 and 2) are also in error. The corrected eqs. and correlation coefficients ( $R$ ) in the 174 mM sodium phosphate buffer are:

$$\mu_{ep}/10^{-5} = -11.22 + 52.22 Z/r: \quad R = 0.752$$

$$\mu_{ep}/10^{-5} = -5.244 + 265.9 Z/r^2: \quad R = 0.912$$

And in the case of the  $Z/r^3$  regression (p. 177, right side, top paragraph):

$$\mu_{ep}/10^{-5} = -4.413 + 1008 Z/r^3: \quad R = 0.974$$

Again, the regression plots and correlation coefficients at the other three buffer concentrations have the same relativities.

## References

- [1] R.M. Smith, personal communication.

---

\*Corresponding author.

<sup>1</sup>PII of original article: S0021-9673(97)00547-5.