Correction.

THE GRAPHICAL EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF SIMPLE AND MULTIPLE SLOPE-RATIO ASSAYS

BY PAMELA M. CLARKE and ZENA D. HOSKING.

This Journal, 1953, **5**, 586.

Page 588, legend to Fig. 1, last line. *For* CC′ *read* BB′.

Pages 592 and 593. *For v read v.*

Page 593, last line. *For* $t_2 = t\sqrt{n(k-1)(2k+1)/k2d_n}$ *read*

$$t_2 = t\sqrt{n(k-1)(2k+1)/k/2d_n}$$

Page 594, first paragraph. *Read:*

For a multiple assay, the corresponding test for "intersections" may be made using a range test described by Cox[7]. When there is a common zero dose the range of the values of H should not be greater than $t_3 r$ where $t_3 = d_v F_{\nu_1,\nu_2}\sqrt{nk(k-1)(2k+1)/2/(vk+1)d_n}$. F is found from variance ratio tables with ν_1 and ν_2 degrees of freedom, where $\nu_1 = \nu_v$ and $\nu_2 = (vk+1)\nu_n$, using the values of ν given in Table V. When there is no common zero dose, $t_3 = d_v F_{\nu_1,\nu_2}\sqrt{n(k-1)(2k+1)/2k/vd_n}$, $\nu_1 = \nu_v$ and $\nu_2 = vk\nu_n$.

Page 594, second paragraph. *For v read v.*

Correction.

A COMPARISON OF PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL METHODS WITH BIOLOGICAL ASSAY OF VITAMIN A

BY T. K. MURRAY AND J. A. CAMPBELL.

This Journal, 1953, **5**, 596.

Page 597, the last two sentences of the first paragraph should read:—

"Unpublished results of a similar comparison conducted by an informal committee of the U.S.P.[11] indicated that the Morton and Stubbs correction procedure gave a conservative estimate of biological potency. There was, however, no indication of over-correction to the extent reported by Melnick *et al.*"

Page 599, Table I, column 5, "Potency of Concentrates" the figure 15,900 should read 159,000, and in column 6 "Confidence Limits of Concentrates" the figure 16,100 should read 161,000.