also be true for the lower value of the slope of the sulfate curve calculated from mean values (Table 2).

The last evaluated parameter of the tested method was the assessment of the repeatability (Table 4). Relative standard deviations obtained for the ITP method were 1.7 for nitrate and 5.9% for sulfate.

Conclusions

Results of nitrate and sulfate determinations in plant samples by means of capillary isotachopheresis were compared with those obtained in an International Plant-Analytical Exchange (IPE). They show good precision, accuracy and repeatability in the range of two orders of the natural occurrence of both analytes.

Acknowledgement. The authors wish to express their gratitude to Dr. V.J.G. Houba from Wageningen Agricultural University for his kind

permission to use the nitrate and sulfate IPE-results 1992, and to Mrs. I. Matusinska for her help in preparing the manuscript.

References

1. Matejovič I, Bieliková M (1988) Collection Czechoslovak Chem Commun 53:3067–3071.
2. Houba VJG, van der Lee JJ, Novozamsky I (1991) *Analisis* 19:145–149
3. Houba VJG, Uittenbogaard J, Pellen PJ (1992) International Plant-Analytical Exchange (IPE) Report 1992. Department of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition, Wageningen Agricultural University, Wageningen
4. van Montfort MAJ (1992) Statistical Remarks on Round Robin Data of IPE & ISE. Technical Note 92-02. Department of Mathematics, Wageningen Agricultural University, Wageningen
5. Miller JC, Miller JN (1986) *Statistics for Analytical Chemistry*. Wiley, New York Chichester Brisbane Toronto

Fresenius J Anal Chem (1994) 349:562 – © Springer Verlag 1994

Erratum

Polymer based RIFS sensing: an approach to the indirect measurement of organic pollutants in water

G. Kraus, A. Brecht, V. Vasic, G. Gauglitz

Institute for Physical and Theoretical Chemistry,
University of Tübingen, Auf der Morgenstelle 8,
D-72076 Tübingen, Germany

Published in Fresenius J Anal Chem (1994) 348:598–601

Due to a typing error during preparation of the manuscript, the values for the concentrations were given ng/ml instead of $\mu\text{g/ml}$ and the sensitivity specified in ml/ng instead of ml/ μg . In particular, the concentration range for the calibration should be 77.2 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ to 1.2 mg/ml, and the corresponding limit of detection 12 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ (*Results and discussion*). The concentration values compiled in Table 1 and Table 2 should be in $\mu\text{g/ml}$. The corresponding sensitivity values compiled in Table 2 should be in ml/ μg .