

CORRIGENDA

In the article by A. MANICHAIKUL, J. Y. MOON, Š. SEN, B. S. YANDELL, and K. W. BROMAN (*GENETICS* **181**: 1077–1086) entitled “A Model Selection Approach for the Identification of Quantitative Trait Loci in Experimental Crosses, Allowing Epistasis,” on page 1082, the values of T_i^H and T_i^L are switched.

The published information states:

The LOD penalties of $T_m = 3.58$, $T_i^H = 2.81$, and $T_i^L = 4.41$ were obtained as 95% thresholds of the appropriate \log_{10} -likelihood-ratio statistics, estimated via 10,000 simulation replicates under the null hypothesis of no QTL.

The corrected sentence should read:

The LOD penalties of $T_m = 3.58$, $T_i^H = 4.41$, and $T_i^L = 2.81$ were obtained as 95% thresholds of the appropriate \log_{10} -likelihood-ratio statistics, estimated via 10,000 simulation replicates under the null hypothesis of no QTL.

DOI: 10.1534/genetics.109.112912

In the article by A. S. WILKINS (*GENETICS* **183**: 773–777) entitled “Charles Darwin: Genius or Plodder?,” on page 775, the word “explained” in line 33 of column 2 should be corrected to read “unexplained.”

The published information states:

The connection between “negative capability” and the nature of Darwin’s creative processes has, not surprisingly, been remarked upon previously (LEVINE 1988). In modern terms, what Darwin was doing was keeping all of the explained facts and questions in his unconscious mind, ready to be drawn upon.

The corrected sentence should read:

The connection between “negative capability” and the nature of Darwin’s creative processes has, not surprisingly, been remarked upon previously (LEVINE 1988). In modern terms, what Darwin was doing was keeping all of the unexplained facts and questions in his unconscious mind, ready to be drawn upon.

DOI: 10.1534/genetics.109.113225