

Correction to “Fluvastatin Synergistically Improves the Antiproliferative Effect of Everolimus on Rat Smooth Muscle Cells by Altering p27^{Kip1}/Cyclin E Expression”

In the above article [Ferri N, Granata A, Pirola C, Torti F, Pfister PJ, Dorent R, and Corsini A (2008) *Mol Pharmacol* **74**:144-153], the IC₅₀ units and values in Table 1 were incorrect because of an error during copyediting. The corrected table appears in its entirety below:

TABLE 1

Inhibitory effect of everolimus alone or in association with fluvastatin on cell proliferation

| Assay | Inhibition (Conc.) for Fluvastatin | IC ₅₀ | | Ratio | Maximal Effect (Conc.) | |
|-------------------------|--|------------------|--------------------------------|-------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | Everolimus | Everolimus + Fluvastatin | | Everolimus | Everolimus + Fluvastatin |
| | | <i>nM</i> | | | | |
| Cell proliferation | −9.2 ± 8.4% (0.5 μM) | 2.5 | 1.0 | 2.5 | −54.9 ± 12.9% (0.5 μM) | −72.4 ± 8.3% (0.5 μM) |
| Thymidine incorporation | −14.2 ± 9.1% (2 μM) | 6.5 | 0.19 | 34.2 | −63.3 ± 4.6% (0.1 μM) | −75.9 ± 2.4% (0.1 μM) |
| Cell cycle (S phase) | 3.2 ± 23.8% (2 μM) | | | | −76.9 ± 3.8% (0.1 μM) | −83.4 ± 1.5% (0.1 μM) |

The online version has been corrected in departure from the print version.

The printer regrets this error and apologizes for any confusion or inconvenience it may have caused.

Correction to “S/c39a14 Gene Encodes ZIP14, A Metal/Bicarbonate Symporter: Similarities to the ZIP8 Transporter”

In the above article [Girijashanker K, He L, Soleimani M, Reed JM, Li H, Liu Z, Wang B, Dalton TP, and Nebert DW (2008) *Mol Pharmacol* **73**:1413-1423], some exponents were incorrectly reported as positive rather than negative. Under *Materials and Methods*, in the *Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction Analysis* section, the first sentence of the second paragraph should read “The range of calibration curves was linear from 10^{−3} to 10^{−7} μg of plasmid (*r* = 0.999 for ZIP14A, 0.998 for ZIPB, and 0.995 for ZIP8).”

The authors regret this error and apologize for any confusion or inconvenience it may have caused.