

- locus in response of adult *Drosophila melanogaster* to environmental alcohol. *Nature* 255:148–149
- Gibson JB (1970) Enzyme flexibility in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Nature* 227:959–960
- Hutner SH, Kaplan HM, Enzman EV (1937) Chemicals attracting *Drosophila*. *American Naturalist* 71:575–581
- Kreitman M (1980) Assessment of variation within electromorphs of alcohol dehydrogenase in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* in press
- McDonald J, Anderson S, Tilton R (1980) Analysis of winery populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*. In preparation
- McKenzie JA (1974) The distribution of vineyard populations of *Drosophila melanogaster* and *D. simulans* during vintage and non-vintage periods. *Oecologia (Berl)* 15:1–16
- McKenzie JA, Parsons PA (1972) Alcohol tolerance: An ecological parameter in the relative success of *Drosophila melanogaster* and *Drosophila simulans*. *Oecologia (Berl)* 10:373–388
- McKenzie JA, Parsons PA (1974) Microdifferentiation in a natural population of *Drosophila melanogaster* to alcohol in the environment. *Genetics* 77:385–394
- Rasmuson B, Wilson LR, Rasmuson M, Zeppenauer E (1966) Effects of heterozygosity on alcohol dehydrogenase activity in *Drosophila*. *Hereditas* 56:313–316
- Thorpe WH (1939) Further studies on pre-imaginal olfactory conditioning in insects. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, London (B)* 127:424–433

Received May 20, 1980

## Erratum

In the article entitled, “The Analysis of Contact Sampling Data” by P. deJong, L.W. Aarssen and R. Turkington, published in volume 45, 1980, pp. 322–324, there are four numbers (1), (2), (3), (4) in the text which do not refer to the respectively numbered equations. These were designated in the galley proof to represent the location for insertion of four statements before publication, but the numbers instead of the statements were printed. The statements that were to appear are as follows:

At (1), in the last paragraph of the introduction, insert: The basic difference from looking at association in quadrat sampling is that with contact sampling, only two species can be present in any one sample.

At (2), in the left column on p. 323, insert: In general, there will be serious overestimation of the expected number of joint occurrences.

At (3), in the final paragraph of the paper, insert: ... and may raise difficulties in some vegetation types when being forced in the field to decide where one individual ends and another starts.

At (4), in the final paragraph of the paper, insert: There is no reason to presume any ecological distinction between these ordered pairs in view of the contact sampling scheme.

## Erratum

In the article, “Influence of Litterbags on Growth of Fungal Vegetative Structures,” by T.V. St. John, published in Volume 46, No. 1, 1980, pp 130–132, the sentence beginning on the sixth line of the results section (p. 131) should read: “The mean numbers of structures in each treatment were no litter bag: 5.3, coarse mesh: 2.7, fine mesh: 2.5.”