Erratum: Noise benefit in prepulse inhibition of the acoustic startle reflex

Erik Pålsson · Göran Söderlund · Daniel Klamer ·
Filip Bergquist

Published online: 22 December 2010
© Springer-Verlag 2010

Erratum to: Psychopharmacology
DOI 10.1007/s00213-010-2074-6

The author wishes to apologize for inadvertently providing the wrong image for Fig. 4. Here is the correct image:

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00213-010-2074-6>.

E. Pålsson · D. Klamer
Department of Pharmacology,
Institute of Neuroscience and Physiology, The Sahlgrenska Academy,
University of Gothenburg,
Box 400, 405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden

G. Söderlund
Department of Linguistics, Stockholm University,
106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

F. Bergquist (✉)
Clinical Neuroscience and Rehabilitation,
Institute of Neuroscience and Physiology,
The Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg,
Box 400, 405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
e-mail: filip.bergquist@gu.se

Fig. 4 **a** ASR to a single pulse expressed as digital units (mean±SEM) at different acoustic background noises in 6-OHDA-lesioned Sprague–Dawley rats. Responses are compared with intact Sprague–Dawley rats. Two-way ANOVA did not indicate a significant effect of 6-OHDA lesioning $F(1, 100)=2.157$, $p=0.1575$, but significant effect of noise $F(5, 100)=27.3$ and interaction lesion×noise $F(5, 100)=2.546$, $p=0.0326$. Significant differences in Bonferroni-corrected post hoc t tests indicated by a single asterisk $p<0.05$. **b** PPI of the startle response expressed as percent (mean±SEM) of startle response. Two-way ANOVA indicated a main effect of background noise level, $F(5, 100)=75.34$, $p<0.0001$, but not of lesion treatment $F(1, 100)=0.7398$, $p=0.3999$ or interaction lesion×noise $F(5, 100)=2.035$, $p=0.0801$