CORRECTIONS

Author Corrections

The March 1, 2012, article by Walker et al, entitled “Recurrence and Survival After Random Assignment to Laparoscopy Versus Laparotomy for Comprehensive Surgical Staging of Uterine Cancer: Gynecologic Oncology Group LAP2 Study” (J Clin Oncol 30:695-700, 2012), contained errors.

In the Discussion section, references 18 and 19 were cited in the second-to-last sentence of the first paragraph, whereas it should have been references 19 and 20, as follows: “There is controversy worldwide regarding the survival benefit of comprehensive staging.^{19,20}”

Also in the Discussion section, references 20 and 21 were cited in the last two sentences of the third paragraph, whereas it should have been references 21 and 22, as follows:

“Two other major prospective clinical trials in the Netherlands and Australia evaluating minimally invasive treatment of endometrial cancer should not be compared to this trial because of their exclusion of nonendometrioid cell types and the comprehensive staging requirement for all of the participants in this trial.^{21,22} These laparoscopic surgery trials included only

endometrioid histology and required only hysterectomy and bilateral salpingoophorectomy,²¹ and the LACE (Laparoscopic Approach to Cancer of the Endometrium) trial in Australia excluded nonendometrioid cell types, did not require lymphadenectomy (only recommended this), and did not mandate conversion to laparotomy for completion of staging.²²”

In the References section, reference 21 should have been given as: 21. Mourits MJE, Bijen CB, Arts HJ, et al: Safety of laparoscopy versus laparotomy in early-stage endometrial cancer: A randomised trial. *Lancet Oncol* 11:763-771, 2010

In addition, reference 21 should have been given as reference 22, as follows: 22. Janda M, Gebiski V, Brand A, et al. Quality of life after total laparoscopic hysterectomy versus total abdominal hysterectomy for stage I endometrial cancer (LACE): A randomised trial. *Lancet Oncol* 11:772-780, 2010.

The online version has been corrected in departure from the print. The authors apologize for the mistakes.

DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2012.43.3417; published May 1, 2012

The March 10, 2012, article by Salit et al, entitled “Dose-Adjusted EPOCH-Rituximab Combined With Fludarabine Provides an Effective Bridge to Reduced-Intensity Allogeneic Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation in Patients With Lymphoid Malignancies” (J Clin Oncol 30:830-836, 2012), contained errors.

In the Patients and Methods section, under Chemotherapy and Dose Adjustments, the dosages for etoposide and doxorubicin were incorrectly given in the third sentence of the first paragraph as 60 mg/m² and 40 mg/m², respectively. The dosages should have been given as 50 mg/m²/day and 10 mg/m²/day, respectively, as follows:

“In the final iteration, DA-EPOCH-F consisted of fludarabine (25 mg/m²/day intravenously [IV], days 1 through 4), oral prednisone (60 mg/m²/day, days 1 through 5), and cyclophosphamide (750 mg/m² IV, day 5 only); **etoposide (50 mg/m²/day, days 1 through 4 as a 24-hour continuous IV infusion), doxorubicin (10 mg/m²/day, days 1 through 4 as a 24-hour continuous IV infusion), and vincristine (0.4 mg/m²/day, days 1 through 4 as a 24-hour continuous IV infusion; Table 1).**”

The online version has been corrected in departure from the print. The authors apologize for the mistakes.

DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2012.43.3425; published May 1, 2012