

**Correction.** In the article, "Control of oscillating glycolysis of yeast by stochastic, periodic, and steady source of substrate: A model and experimental study," by Arnold Boiteux, Albert Goldbeter, and Benno Hess, which appeared in the October issue of *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* 72, 3829-3833, the authors have requested the following changes. On page 3830, in the legend of Fig. 1, the sinusoidal expression for parameter  $\sigma_1$  should read  $\sigma_1 = [0.5 + 0.25 \sin(2\pi t/T')]$   $\text{sec}^{-1}$ . Also on page 3830, line 4 of the left-hand column, constant  $K_{Rj}$  should read  $K_R$ .

On page 3832, in Table 2, the entries for "Sustained oscillations: Period" should read, for both Model and Experiment: "Of the order of min; decreases by a factor  $\leq 10$  as  $v_1$  increases." Also in Table 2, footnote<sup>c</sup> should read: "Obtained for a K system ( $\theta = 1$ ) in the middle of the oscillatory domain, for  $\sigma_1 = 0.7 \text{ sec}^{-1}$ ."

**Correction.** In the article "Conversion of *Bacillus subtilis* RNA Polymerase Activity *In Vitro* by a Protein Induced by Phage SP01", by J. J. Duffy, R. L. Petrussek, and E. P. Geiduschek, which appeared in the June, 1975, issue of the *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* 72, 2366-2370, the authors have requested that the following corrections be made.

On page 2368, right-hand column, second paragraph, the sentence beginning on line twenty-six should have read: "The substantially different competition of *in vivo* 28-min RNA suggests that the two RNA preparations contain substantially different proportions of the *m* (8, 9) subclass of middle transcripts." rather than "... proportions of the *m*<sub>2</sub>l (8, 9) subclass of ...".

On page 2369, left-hand column, the sentence beginning on line 20 of the *Discussion* should have read: "For example, Fig. 4 suggests some difference in the *in vitro* syntheses of the *m* subclass of middle SP01 transcripts ..." rather than "...syntheses of the *m*<sub>2</sub>l subclass of ...".

The authors wish to state that the above conclusion was, however, in error. Reanalysis of the RNA made *in vitro* on native SP01 DNA by *B. subtilis* RNA polymerase core—P<sup>28</sup> complex and by the B-P polymerase showed that by these criteria, the two RNA samples were indistinguishable and particularly that they were indistinguishable in their content of SP01 middle transcripts.

#### Authors' Statement on Polypeptide Splicing

In October 1973 a paper by us entitled "In Vivo Splicing of Protein: One Continuous Polypeptide from Two Independently Functioning Operons" (1) appeared in this journal. In it we claimed that some *Escherichia coli* heterodiploids with complementing  $z^-$  nonsense mutations made active  $\beta$ -galactosidase which contained wild-type size protomeric molecules rather than the expected termination and reinitiation polypeptides.

A key factor in the validity of these results is a correct analysis of the genotypes of the diploid strains involved. Recent investigations in our laboratory have revealed that this analysis was wrong and led to the assignment of incorrect genotypes to putative splicing diploids. Attempts to reproduce the results on splicing have been completely negative. It has been shown that most of the  $z^-$  alleles referred to in the paper as splicing do not complement at any significant level. Because of this we must retract the assertion that there is experimental evidence for splicing between complementing mutants in the *z* gene of the *lac* operon of *E. coli*.

B. N. Apte  
David Zipser  
Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory  
Cold Spring Harbor, New York 11724

1. Apte, B. N. & Zipser, D. (1973) *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* 70, 2969-2973.