Phenotypic plasticity and experimental evolution

T. Garland, Jr and S. A. Kelly

doi:10.1242/jeb.022673

There were two errors published in *J. Exp. Biol.* 209, 2344-2361.

First, on p. 2355 in the first complete paragraph of the section entitled '*Plasticity of exercise-related traits*', the authors stated:

If we imagine further that S and C mice housed without wheels showed no difference (or at least values similar to those of C mice housed with wheels), then the S mice seem to be more responsive to wheel exposure, i.e. they are more plastic.

The sentence should have read:

If we imagine further that S and C mice housed without wheels showed values similar to those of C mice housed with wheels, then the S mice seem to be more responsive to wheel exposure, i.e. they are more plastic.

Second, on pp. 2355–2356, beginning in column 2 of p. 2355, the authors stated:

For hematocrit in females, Table 2 shows that the ln likelihood of the nested ANCOVA model without wheel running (–75.7) is larger (less negative, in this case) than for the model with wheel running (–83.7). As the latter model contains one additional parameter (estimating the effect of wheel running), twice the difference in ln likelihoods (16.0, in this case) can be compared with a χ^2 distribution with one degree of freedom, for which the critical value for P=0.05 is 3.841. Therefore, the model with wheel running as an additional covariate yields a significantly worse fit to the data, and we conclude that the difference in hematocrit between S and C mice when housed with wheel access is not best explained as a simple function of the greater running by S mice.

The paragraph should have read:

For hematocrit in females, Table 2 shows that the ln likelihood of the nested ANCOVA model without wheel running is –78.1 whereas for the model with wheel running it is –77.9. As the latter model contains one additional parameter (estimating the effect of wheel running), twice the difference in ln likelihoods (0.3 in this case) can be compared with a χ^2 distribution with one degree of freedom, for which the critical value for P=0.05 is 3.841. Therefore, the model with wheel running as an additional covariate does not fit the data significantly better, and we conclude that the difference in hematocrit between S and C mice when housed with wheel access is not best explained as a simple function of the greater running by S mice.

We apologise to the authors and readers for these errors but do not believe that they compromise the overall results and conclusions of the paper.