Errata

In the October 1998 issue of the *Journal,* there were two table errors in the article "Prenatal Screening for Cystic Fibrosis Carriers: An Economic Evaluation," by Rowley et al. (63:1160–1174). In the last row of table 5, the difference in the marginal cost per QALY should be "$8,290." Also, table 9, which compares the marginal cost per QALY for selected preventive measures, may be misleading, since the authors of the references cited used two different methods of calculation. The values for antepartum Rh immunization, T_4 thyroid screening, phenylketonuria screening, and school tuberculin screening were derived simply by dividing the program costs incurred by the number of those *not* screened. This latter methodology is the preferred method, since it makes a comparison, often with existing practice; however, since it often entails high costs for the unscreened group, it may yield a cost-effectiveness ratio that is more favorable to screening. The *Journal* regrets these errors.

In the September 1999 issue of the *Journal,* an error appeared in the article "Combined Use of Biallelic and Microsatellite Y-Chromosome Polymorphisms to Infer Affinities among African Populations," by Scozzari et al. (65:829–846). In Appendix B (table B1), one of the haplotypes was omitted. The missing haplotype, "1B 22 22 21 21," was observed at a frequency of 1.8% in the Moroccan sample ($n = 56$) only. The *Journal* regrets the error.

Three errors appeared in the December 1999 issue of the *Journal,* in the article entitled "Long Homozygous Chromosomal Segments in Reference Families from the Centre d'Étude du Polymorphisme Humain," by Broman and Weber (65:1493–1500). First, in table 1, the heading that appears over the "Autologous" and "Not Autologous" column heads should read "Probability Given That Segment Is." Second, in the next-to-the-last row of the "Chromosome (Markers)" stub column in table 3, the chromosome number in front of markers "D18S4550–GATA51E05" should be "18." Third, a supplemental table listing significant homozygous segments for all individuals in the eight CEPH families was inadvertently omitted from the electronic version of this article; mention of this supplemental table appeared in lines 9 and 10 of the right-hand column of page 1496. This supplemental table has now been added to the electronic version of the article. The *Journal* regrets these errors.