Pergamon

European Journal of Cancer Vol. 32A, No. 1, pp. 185–186, 1996

Printed in Great Britain
0959–8049/96 $15.00+0.00

Corrections

The publisher apologises for these errors which occurred in the *European Journal of Cancer*, Volume 31A, Nos. 13/14. The corrections are as follows:

1. The transcript ratios in Table 1 on p. 2273 were incorrectly printed. The correct table is shown below:

Table 1. Mean alternate transcript ratios in normal kidney/Wilms' tumour pairs

Transcript ratio	Normal kidney	Wilms' tumour	*P* value
−/+ 51 bp(− KTS)	0.63 ± 0.07	1.12 ± 0.13	<0.001
−/+ 51 bp(+ KTS)	0.64 ± 0.05	1.12 ± 0.13	<0.001
−/+ KTS	1.57 ± 0.15	1.56 ± 0.24	N.S.

Figures are average values and their 95% confidence interval for the ratio of −51 bp *WT1* transcripts to +51 bp *WT1* transcripts both with (+ KTS) and without (− KTS) the 9 bp exon 9 splice, in normal kidney and paired tumour tissue in 10 samples. Values for the ratio of transcripts with and without the KTS splice in exon 9 are also shown. When the 51 bp exon 5 ratios were compared between the tumour and normal tissue samples, a statistically significant ratio increase was observed in the tumour population when the Students *t*-test was applied to the data. Splicing in exon 9 was, however, essentially unchanged. N.S., non-significant.

Also, in the same paper, the legend to Figure 6 on p. 2275 should have read:

Figure 6. Southern blot analysis of the region of the *WT1* gene flanking the first alternative splice site. Genomic DNA was digested with restriction enzymes *Bgl*II and *Sac*1 and hybridised with a PCR generated fragment of the *WT1* cDNA encompassing exons 4, 5 and 6. (a) *Bgl*II restriction enzyme digest of two WT and NK DNA samples. (b) *Sac*1 restriction enzyme digest of two WT and NK DNA samples. The sizes of the restriction fragments and associated exons are indicated. The tables below the figure show the relative densitometric intensities of bands generated in normal kidney/Wilms' tumour pairs expressed as a percentage of the total densitometric units within each sample. Although some differences in relative band intensities were noted between individual samples the differences within each sample pair, between normal kidney and adjacent tumour tissue, were not significant.

2. The legend to Figure 1 on p. 2316 should have read:

Figure 1. The modulating capacity of 0.1 μM BIBW22BS (▨), 0.1 μM dipyridamole (▩), 1.0 μM BIBW22BS (□) or 1.0 μM dipyridamole (■) on the antiproliferative effects of 5-fluorouracil (5FU), methotrexate (MTX) or gemcitabine (dFdC) in various human cancer cell lines. The results are means ± S.D. from at least three separate experiments and are expressed as a potentiation or an inhibition factor based on the relation between the IC_{50} of cells treated with drug alone and the IC_{50} of cells treated with drug and modulator.

3. The top horizontal axis in Figure 3a on p. 2366 was not labelled. The correct Figure is shown below.

(a) The effect of CB1954 and/or GCV treatment on 3T3-NTR.TK1 cells