


Corrections

p 460: The decimal in “4.0” is not clearly obvious in the body of Figure 4.

p 462: Column one, third paragraph, line 24: “50 pg” should read “50 ng.”

p 580: Authors’ corrections for this paper were received too late. The following corrections are needed. Abstract, last sentence: substitute “volatile profiles” for “these volatiles”; p 581, fourth paragraph, line 4: “0.5%” should read “0.2%”; column two, first line, “as a point” should read “or, equivalently, as points”; four lines further down, “X” should read “W”; three lines further down, remove hyphens from “sign of the dot”; in Table 1, p 582, remove “2-t-butylphenol” from bottom right.

p 787: Boehringer Mannheim Corp. no longer supports the Award mentioned in column one. Boehringer Mannheim Diagnostics (formerly Hycel) supports the Award mentioned in column two.

p 884: The authors of the abstract on this page (Ash) and that on p 885 (Ferrone) are interchanged.

p 1041: The abstract numbered 084 here was printed again elsewhere. Abstract 084 should read:


We compared the determination of total cholesterol (TC) and HDLCH in serum by the Du Pont aca and Dow methods, using specimens from 114 patients. Measurement of HDLCH by these two methods is based on separation of non-HDLCH by precipitation, followed by enzymic determination of HDLCH in the supernate. The ratio (R) TC to HDLCH was calculated for each specimen. The following linear regression equations were obtained using the statistical analysis system:

\[
\text{TCH: } aca = 1.20 \text{ Dow} - 6 \text{ mg/dL}
\]

\[
\text{HDLCH: } aca = 1.10 \text{ Dow} - 0.4 \text{ mg/dL}
\]

\[
R: aca = 0.98 \text{ Dow} - 0.0
\]

A comparison of the results using the paired-sample Student's t-test showed that the aca result for TCH and HDLCH was significantly (p < 0.0001) greater than the Dow result. No significant difference was found between the calculated ratios.

Three control sera were analyzed in duplicate during three months period to estimate precision. The results are the following (mg/dL ± SD):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Method} & \text{Control 1} & \text{Control 2} & \text{Control 3} \\
aca & 22 & 20.9 ± 2.0 & 28.1 ± 3.8 & 35.6 ± 2.5 \\
Dow & 22 & 22.8 ± 2.1 & 37.9 ± 3.7 & 32.2 ± 2.5 \\
\end{array}
\]

Bilirubin (up to 10.7 mg/dL), hemoglobin (up to 200 mg/dL), and slight lipidemic (triglycerides up to 500 mg/dL) did not alter the HDLCH result with the aca system. Thus there is a systematic bias between the aca and Dow methods for determination of TCH and HDLCH, but they compare favorably with respect to precision.

p 1045: The author of abstract no. 105 is V. B. Kambli (Norwalk Hospital, Norwalk, CT 06856).

p 1190: Under Materials and Methods, line 7: change “μmol” to “mmol” in both mentions.

p 1389: Column two, line 3: “Table 1” should read “Table 2.” Table 2, not originally supplied, should have read as follows.

Table 2. Statistical Comparison of Urinary Protein Studies in Three Histopathologically Distinct Groups of Children with Nephrotic Syndrome a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protein study</th>
<th>H-test b</th>
<th>U-test c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC vs FGS</td>
<td>FGS vs MPQN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinary excretion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albumin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferrin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IgG</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α\text{2}-Macroglobulin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinary clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albumin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferrin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IgG</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α\text{2}-Macroglobulin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(clearance of IgG/transferrin)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a + indicates significance, - indicates no significance at a “p” level of 0.05. 
b H-test is derived by the Kruskal–Wallis method (8). This test compares all of the patients. c U-test is derived by the Mann–Whitney method (8). This test compares the groups for differences.

p 1472: Column one, fifth full paragraph down: the word “restricted” should read “unrestricted.”