

## Corrections

**ECOLOGY.** For the article “Avian migration phenology and global climate change,” by Peter A. Cotton, which appeared in issue 21, October 14, 2003, of *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* (**100**, 12219–12222;

first published September 30, 2003; 10.1073/pnas.1930548100), the author notes that the entries in the last two columns of Table 1 were printed out of order. The corrected table appears below.

**Table 1. Slopes of linear regressions for 20 species of migrant bird in Oxfordshire (1971 to 2000)**

Species	Arrival date vs. year	Departure date vs. year	Duration vs. year	Arrival date vs. African winter temperature anomaly	Departure date vs. minimum Oxford temperature
Common Cuckoo, <i>Cuculus canorus</i>	−0.51	−0.93	−0.58	0.05	−2.51
Common Swift, <i>Apus apus</i>	−0.30	−0.06	0.20	−6.29	−4.26
European Turtle-Dove, <i>Streptopelia turtur</i>	−0.31	−0.29	−0.35	−1.92	−1.97
Little Ringed Plover, <i>Charadrius dubius</i>	−0.76	−0.81	−0.15	−10.52	−5.88
Eurasian Hobby, <i>Falco subbuteo</i>	−0.04	0.56	0.58	8.37	1.57
Spotted Flycatcher, <i>Muscicapa striata</i>	−0.25	−0.08	0.18	0.45	−2.62
Common Redstart, <i>Phoenicurus phoenicurus</i>	−0.09	0.12	0.07	−0.48	−1.07
Whinchat, <i>Saxicola rubetra</i>	0.07	0.53	0.39	−4.98	4.65
Northern Wheatear, <i>Oenanthe oenanthe</i>	−0.37	0.11	0.58	1.33	0.33
Sand Martin, <i>Riparia riparia</i>	−0.58	−0.38	0.18	−1.47	0.02
Barn Swallow, <i>Hirundo rustica</i>	−0.44	−0.50	0.05	−8.02	−5.56
Northern House-Martin, <i>Delichon urbica</i>	−0.67	−0.65	0.02	−7.10	−4.76
Common Grasshopper-Warbler, <i>Locustella naevia</i>	−0.27	−0.75	−0.58	1.53	−0.06
Sedge Warbler, <i>Acrocephalus schoenobaenus</i>	−0.23	−0.39	−0.27	−6.26	−4.23
Eurasian Reed-Warbler, <i>Acrocephalus scirpaceus</i>	−0.31	−0.46	−0.19	−3.14	−5.27
Willow Warbler, <i>Phylloscopus trochilus</i>	−0.07	−0.34	−0.29	−0.26	−9.55
Garden Warbler, <i>Sylvia borin</i>	−0.03	−0.39	−0.18	−3.24	−0.40
Common Whitethroat, <i>Sylvia communis</i>	−0.23	0.18	0.63	−1.96	−0.78
Lesser Whitethroat, <i>Sylvia curruca</i>	0.02	−0.54	−0.46	2.21	−7.58
Yellow Wagtail, <i>Motacilla flava</i>	0.04	−0.23	−0.28	−0.94	−0.22
Mean	−0.268	−0.266	−0.022	−2.131	−2.506
SE	0.053	0.092	0.084	0.958	0.758
One-sample t test	−5.033	−2.887	−0.267	−2.225	−3.309
Significance (2-tailed)	<0.001	<0.009	>0.05	<0.05	<0.004

Arrival date, departure date and duration of stay in Oxfordshire against year; arrival date in Oxfordshire against African winter temperature anomaly (°C); departure date from Oxfordshire against minimum and maximum Oxford temperature anomaly (°C). A one-sample t test was used to test each mean against the null hypothesis of no effect (a slope of zero).

[www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0400920101](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0400920101)

**POPULATION BIOLOGY.** For the article “Persistent colonization and the spread of antibiotic resistance in nosocomial pathogens: Resistance is a regional problem,” by David L. Smith, Jonathan Dushoff, Eli N. Perencevich, Anthony D. Harris, and Simon A. Levin, which appeared in issue 10, March 9, 2004, of *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* (**101**, 3709–3714; first published February 25, 2004; 10.1073/pnas.0400456101), the authors note that the equation in the ninth line under the subheading “LTCFs” on page 3714 incorrectly read

$$“\dot{x}_{f,h} = \beta_f x_f (1 - x_{e,f}) - \lambda x_{e,f} - \sigma_{e,f} (x_{e,f} - \alpha_{e,j,h} x_{e,h} - \alpha_{e,f,c} x_{e,c}).”$$

It should read

$$“\dot{x}_{e,f} = \beta_f x_f (1 - x_{e,f}) - \lambda x_{e,f} - \sigma_{e,f} (x_{e,f} - \alpha_{e,f,h} x_{e,h} - \alpha_{e,f,c} x_{e,c}).”$$

[www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0401592101](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0401592101)

**APPLIED PHYSICAL SCIENCES, PLANT BIOLOGY.** For the article “Functional analysis of each blue light receptor, cry1, cry2, phot1, and phot2, by using combinatorial multiple mutants in *Arabidopsis*,” by Maki Ohgishi, Kensuke Saji, Kiyotaka Okada, and Tatsuya Sakai, which appeared in issue 8, February 24, 2004, of *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* (**101**, 2223–2228; first published February 17, 2004; 10.1073/pnas.0305984101), the authors note that the article should be classified as “Plant Biology” instead of “Applied Physical Sciences.”

[www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0401218101](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0401218101)