

Erratum

In the published manuscript, Effects of breed, sex, and halothane genotype on fatty acid composition of pork longissimus muscle (J. Anim. Sci. 2007, 85:583–591), the numbers in the body of the table had the decimal place incorrect, and also had incorrect fatty acid designations in footnotes 6 and 8. The correct table is provided below.

Table 2. Effects of breeds from the National Barrow Show Sire Progeny Test Program on fatty acid composition, total lipid content, and fatty acid indices of LM¹

Item	Breed							
	Duroc	Chester White	Berkshire	Poland China	Spotted	Yorkshire	Landrace	Hampshire
Fatty acid ²								
14:0	1.46 ± 0.02a	1.39 ± 0.03 ^{a,b}	1.38 ± 0.03 ^b	1.25 ± 0.03 ^c	1.21 ± 0.03 ^c	1.24 ± 0.02 ^c	1.20 ± 0.03 ^c	1.18 ± 0.03 ^c
16:0	26.01 ± 0.13 ^a	25.19 ± 0.17 ^b	26.01 ± 0.15 ^a	24.76 ± 0.18 ^{b,c}	24.52 ± 0.15 ^{c,d}	24.62 ± 0.11 ^c	24.53 ± 0.16 ^{c,d}	24.27 ± 0.15 ^d
16:1 <i>n</i> -7	4.03 ± 0.05 ^b	4.08 ± 0.07 ^b	4.38 ± 0.06 ^a	4.11 ± 0.07 ^b	4.05 ± 0.06 ^b	3.76 ± 0.05 ^c	3.80 ± 0.06 ^c	4.14 ± 0.06 ^b
18:0	13.04 ± 0.09 ^a	12.14 ± 0.13 ^{c,d}	12.29 ± 0.11 ^{b,c,d}	11.98 ± 0.13 ^{d,e}	11.69 ± 0.12 ^e	12.47 ± 0.09 ^b	12.40 ± 0.12 ^{b,c}	11.70 ± 0.11 ^e
18:1 <i>n</i> -9	45.86 ± 0.23 ^c	46.41 ± 0.32 ^{b,c}	44.85 ± 0.28 ^d	47.48 ± 0.34 ^a	46.97 ± 0.29 ^{a,b}	44.81 ± 0.21 ^e	44.91 ± 0.31 ^e	44.87 ± 0.28 ^e
18:2 <i>n</i> -6	7.85 ± 0.20 ^e	8.65 ± 0.27 ^{c,d}	8.76 ± 0.23 ^{c,d}	8.38 ± 0.28 ^{d,e}	9.19 ± 0.24 ^c	10.30 ± 0.18 ^b	10.23 ± 0.26 ^b	11.07 ± 0.24 ^a
20:4 <i>n</i> -6	1.76 ± 0.08 ^d	2.13 ± 0.11 ^{b,c}	2.34 ± 0.09 ^b	2.03 ± 0.11 ^{c,d}	2.36 ± 0.10 ^b	2.80 ± 0.07 ^a	2.93 ± 0.10 ^a	2.77 ± 0.09 ^a
Total SFA	40.50 ± 0.17 ^a	38.73 ± 0.23 ^{c,d}	39.68 ± 0.20 ^b	37.99 ± 0.25 ^{e,f}	37.42 ± 0.21 ^{f,g}	38.33 ± 0.16 ^{d,e}	38.13 ± 0.22 ^{d,e}	37.16 ± 0.21 ^g
Total MUFA	49.89 ± 0.25 ^{c,d}	50.48 ± 0.34 ^{b,c}	49.22 ± 0.29 ^{d,e}	51.60 ± 0.36 ^a	51.02 ± 0.31 ^{a,b}	48.57 ± 0.23 ^e	48.70 ± 0.33 ^e	49.00 ± 0.30 ^e
Total PUFA	9.61 ± 0.27 ^e	10.79 ± 0.36 ^{c,d}	11.10 ± 0.32 ^{c,d}	10.41 ± 0.38 ^{d,e}	11.55 ± 0.33 ^c	13.10 ± 0.25 ^b	13.16 ± 0.35 ^a	13.84 ± 0.32 ^a
Total lipids ³	3.73 ± 0.09 ^a	2.76 ± 0.12 ^c	3.05 ± 0.10 ^b	2.84 ± 0.13 ^{b,c}	2.67 ± 0.11 ^c	2.06 ± 0.08 ^d	2.17 ± 0.12 ^d	2.23 ± 0.11 ^d
P:S ⁴	0.24 ± 0.01 ^e	0.28 ± 0.01 ^d	0.28 ± 0.01 ^d	0.28 ± 0.01 ^d	0.31 ± 0.01 ^c	0.35 ± 0.01 ^b	0.35 ± 0.01 ^b	0.37 ± 0.01 ^a
AI ⁵	0.54 ± 0.02 ^a	0.50 ± 0.02 ^c	0.52 ± 0.02 ^b	0.48 ± 0.02 ^d	0.47 ± 0.02 ^{d,e}	0.48 ± 0.01 ^d	0.47 ± 0.02 ^d	0.46 ± 0.02 ^e
Δ ⁹ -desaturase (16) index ⁶	13.42 ± 0.14 ^c	13.93 ± 0.19 ^b	14.43 ± 0.16 ^a	14.24 ± 0.20 ^{a,b}	14.18 ± 0.17 ^{a,b}	13.26 ± 0.13 ^c	13.36 ± 0.18 ^c	14.57 ± 0.16 ^a
Δ ⁹ -desaturase (18) index ⁷	77.85 ± 0.18 ^d	79.24 ± 0.24 ^b	78.49 ± 0.21 ^c	79.84 ± 0.25 ^{a,b}	80.05 ± 0.22 ^a	78.24 ± 0.16 ^{c,d}	78.33 ± 0.23 ^{c,d}	79.29 ± 0.21 ^b
Δ ⁹ -desaturase (16+18) index ⁸	56.08 ± 0.18 ^e	57.46 ± 0.25 ^{b,c}	56.22 ± 0.22 ^{d,e}	58.42 ± 0.26 ^a	58.45 ± 0.23 ^a	56.69 ± 0.17 ^d	56.83 ± 0.24 ^{c,d}	57.61 ± 0.22 ^b
Thioesterase index ⁹	18.47 ± 0.35 ^c	18.63 ± 0.48 ^c	19.35 ± 0.41 ^{b,c}	20.18 ± 0.50 ^{a,b}	21.00 ± 0.43 ^a	20.89 ± 0.32 ^a	21.29 ± 0.46 ^a	21.07 ± 0.42 ^a
Elongase index ¹⁰	0.50 ± 0.004 ^a	0.48 ± 0.006 ^b	0.48 ± 0.005 ^b	0.49 ± 0.006 ^b	0.48 ± 0.005 ^b	0.51 ± 0.004 ^a	0.51 ± 0.005 ^a	0.49 ± 0.005 ^b

^{a-g}Values in the same row with different subscripts differ at $P < 0.05$.

¹Values are expressed as least squares means ± SE.

²Fatty acid values are g/100 g of total lipids.

³Total lipids are g/100 g of muscle.

⁴The ratio of total PUFA to total SFA.

⁵Index of atherogenicity, calculated as $(4 \times 14:0 + 16:0)/(\Sigma\text{MUFA} + \Sigma\text{PUFA})$.

⁶Calculated as $100 \times [16:1n-7/(16:1n-7 + 16:0)]$.

⁷Calculated as $100 \times [18:1n-9/(18:1n-9 + 18:0)]$.

⁸Calculated as $100 \times [(16:1n-7 + 18:1n-9)/(16:1n-7 + 16:0 + 18:1n-9 + 18:0)]$.

⁹Calculated as 16:0/14:0.

¹⁰Calculated as 18:0/16:0.

Additional corrections to the manuscript include the following (indicated in **bold**):

On pg. 585, the sentence should read “Breed was a significant source of variation for both the thioesterase and elongase indices (**Table 2**).”;

On pg. 588, the sentence should read “The indices of Δ⁹-desaturase, thioesterase, and elongase did not differ between the 2 sex groups (**$P > 0.05$**), indicating similar enzyme activities in barrows and gilts.”;

On pg. 589, the sentence should read “Consequently, the total SFA and MUFA concentrations and IA were greater ($P < 0.05$ and $P < 0.01$, respectively) in NN pigs, whereas the total PUFA concentration and P:S ration were **greater** ($P < 0.01$) in Nn pigs.”; and

In Table 3, footnote 6 should read “Calculated as $100 \times [16:1n-7/(16:1n-7 + 16:0)]$.” and footnote 8 should read “Calculated as $100 \times [16:1n-7 + 18:1n-9/(16:1n-7 + 16:0 + 18:1n-9 + 18:0)]$.”