Correction. In the article “Dose-response curves and competing risks” by Peter G. Groer, which appeared in the September 1978 issue of the Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci USA (75, 4087–4091), semi-logarithmic plots were used for the data given in table 1. This manner of plotting has been criticized because on such a plot a linear function of dose has a slope that increases linearly with dose. Such a plot exaggerates sigmoid behavior and conceals linear behavior (this plot was used to permit showing all the data points). A linear plot of part of the same data is shown below (Fig. 1) to correct any misinterpretation. Objection has been raised to the statement in the discussion that the data in figure 3 of the original paper show a sigmoid response; a linear response has been suggested for the data as shown here in Fig. 1. Approximate statistical tests based on the asymptotic distribution of the Kaplan–Meier (K–M) estimates cannot reject a least square line for the data in table 1 of the original paper. But a square response for the dose range 0.0–0.0156 (level 1.0) can also not be rejected, and evidence from earlier work by others and myself (2, 3) on the dose-response curve and the mechanism of osteosarcoma induction for $^{239}$Ra in man and beagle supports a sigmoid response with a tumor incidence rate proportional to $[1 - (1 + kD)e^{-kD}]$ (3) for $^{239}$Pu in beagles (k is the rate of cell killing per rad and D is the radiation dose). I mentioned this evidence (ref. 23 in the paper) but the discussion of this point was not clear in the paper.

There are three uncaught errors on page 4089 of the original paper. In table 1, the mean injected amount for level 0.7 is 0.0103 (not 0.103). In figure 3, the K–M estimate for this level on the abscissa should be encircled, and the correct SD for the 1.0 level is 0.14 (less than originally shown).

Correction. In the article “A gene adjacent to satellite DNA in Drosophila melanogaster” by Marian Carlson and Douglas Brutlag, which appeared in the December 1978 issue of Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA (75, 5898–5902), the authors request the following change. In Fig. 5, on page 5901, “pBR142.1” should read “aDml42.1.”

Correction. In the article “Monovalent antibodies directed to transformation-sensitive membrane components inhibit the process of viral transformation” by C. A. Lingwood, A. Ng, and S. Hakomori, which appeared in the December 1978 issue of Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA (75, 6049–6053), the authors request that the following correction be made. The numbers in Table 3 should be read as $X \times 10^{-2}$ cpm. Therefore, 190 ± 9.5 should be 19,000 ± 950, etc.

Correction. In the article “Unusual resistance to ionizing radiation of the viruses of kuru, Creutzfeldt–Jakob disease, and scrapie” by Clarence J. Gibbs, Jr., D. Carleton Gajdusek, and R. Latarjet, which appeared in the December 1978 issue of Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA (75, 6268–6270), the following errors occurred in the Proceedings editorial office. On page 6270, line 28 of the left-hand column, “49 Gy m$^{-1}$” should read “49 Gy min$^{-1}$.” On the same page, line 7 of the right-hand column, ref. 9 should be ref. 11.
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**FIG. 1.** Dose-response curve for osteosarcomas induced by $^{239}$Pu in beagles (levels 0.0–1.7). X, K–M estimates at 4375 days; O, fractional estimates; @, coincidence of the two estimates. Vertical line shows SD.