



Corrections

Erratum to Training of Upper Respiratory Endoscopy in the Horse Using Preserved Head and Neck

Fawzy A. Elnady¹, Eldessouky Sheta², Ashour K. Khalifa³ and Hamdy Rizk¹

¹Department of Anatomy and Embryology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Cairo University, Giza, Egypt; ²Department of Surgery, Anesthesiology and Radiology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Cairo University, Giza, Egypt; ³Ministry of Interior, Equine Department of Police General Security, Tripoli, Libya

In this manuscript which appeared in ALTEX (2015), 32(4), 384-387, <http://dx.doi.org/10.14573/altex.1505111> the last paragraph on page 384 under the heading *Specimen preparation* should read:

Conventional plastination uses formalin for tissue fixation, acetone or alcohol for dehydration, various types of silicone polymer for impregnation (e.g. from BIODUR[®], Germany), and gas, light, or heat, depending on the polymer used, for curing. The Elnady Technique also involves fixation and dehydration, but employs a new non-silicone viscous polymer for impregnation, and follows a different curing process. In our preservation method, all processes run at room temperature.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.14573/altex.1512121>

Corrigendum to Performance of the BG1Luc ER TA Method in a qHTS Format

Patricia Ceger¹, David Allen¹, Ruili Huang², Menghang Xia² and Warren Casey³

¹Integrated Laboratory Systems, Inc., Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, USA; ²National Chemical Genomics Center, National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, National Institutes of Health, Rockville, Maryland, USA;

³National Toxicology Program Interagency Center for the Evaluation of Alternative Toxicological Methods, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, USA

In this manuscript which appeared in ALTEX (2015), 32(4), 287-296, <http://dx.doi.org/10.14573/altex.1505121> the legend of Figure 1 should read:

Fig. 1: Linear regression analysis of BG1 manual and qHTS EC₅₀/AC₅₀ values

A linear regression analysis was conducted of EC₅₀/AC₅₀ values for 33 substances that tested positive in the BG1 manual and HTS methods. A list of the chemicals used to create Figure 1 is included in Table 2. The slope of the linear regression is 0.83 with r² of 0.78.

Further, the first sentences of Section 5.3 should be:

3.5 Quantitative EC₅₀/AC₅₀ comparison

We also evaluated the quantitative differences in EC₅₀/AC₅₀ values for the 33 positive substances in both the BG1 manual and qHTS methods (Fig. 1). The slope of the linear regression presented in Figure 1 is 0.83 with an r² of 0.78, indicating that, while qualitative classifications were identical for these substances, there were some quantitative differences on a per-chemical basis.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.14573/altex.1512041>