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Corrections and clarifications
Three journals raise doubts on validity of Canadian studies
Three errors crept into this news article by Caroline White (10 January, p 67). In the sixth paragraph we inadvertently referred to datasets in two papers being the same, instead of two sets of patients being the same. In the following paragraph, we referred to the number of digits remembered by patients as part of a memory test. The numbers given in the submitted paper refer to scores, however, so cannot be reliably converted into digits. The relevant sentence should therefore read: “One was the implausibly high score relating to the number of digits remembered by the participants.” Lastly, Dr Jack Strawbridge is director of faculty relations (not labour relations) at Memorial University.

Clinical arithmetic
A missing “t” in the author’s email address may have prevented you from writing to Colin Currie about his editorial in the Christmas issue (BMJ 2003;327:1418-9; doi:10.1136/bmj.327.7429.1418). We slipped up here, although we can’t work out what went wrong in our process, as we did mean to add the “t”. The correct email address is drcolintcurrie@hotmail.com.

Of Struldbrugs, sugar, and gatekeepers: a tale of our times
A crucial word change phoned to us by the author somehow did not find its way into the published version of this article by David Kerr in the Christmas issue (BMJ 2003;327:1451-3). The “standfirst” (the bit of editorial text that sits under the title to tempt you to read the article) should have read: “Socially isolated, depressed old patients most often end up on the diabetes wards after someone notices their blood sugar is high [not “low”] and all other specialists have lost interest.”