

34. Huda W, Ogden KM, Khorasani MR. Effect of dose metrics and radiation risk models when optimizing CT x-ray tube voltage. *Phys Med Biol.* 2008;53:4719–4732.
35. Gkanatsios NA, Huda W, Peters KR. Effect of radiographic techniques (kVp and mAs) on image quality and patient doses in digital subtraction angiography. *Med Phys.* 2002;29:1643–1650.
36. Huda W, Ogden KM. Optimizing abdominal CT dose and image quality with respect to x-ray tube voltage. *Proc SPIE.* 2004;5368:499–507.
37. Shrimpton PC, Wall BF, Yoshizumi TT, Hurwitz LM, Goodman PC. Effective dose and dose-length product in CT. *Radiology.* 2009;250:604–605.
38. Brenner DJ, Hall EJ. Computed tomography: an increasing source of radiation exposure. *N Engl J Med.* 2007;357:2277–2284.
39. Cristy M, Eckerman KF. *Specific Absorbed Fractions of Energy at Various Ages from Internal Photon Sources.* Oak Ridge, TN: Oak Ridge National Laboratory; 1987.
40. Chawla S, Federman N, Nagata K, et al. Estimated cumulative radiation dose from PET/CT in pediatric patients with malignancies: a 5-year retrospective review [abstract]. *Pediatr Radiol.* 2008;38(suppl):S339.
41. McGeoghegan D, Binks K, Gillies M, Jones S, Whaley S. The non-cancer mortality experience of male workers at British Nuclear Fuels plc, 1946–2005. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2008;37:506–518.

### Errata

In the article “<sup>11</sup>C-Dihydrotetrabenazine PET of the Pancreas in Subjects with Long-Standing Type 1 Diabetes and in Healthy Controls,” by Goland et al. (*J Nucl Med.* 2009;50:382–389), the name of one of the acknowledged individuals, Arthur Mikhno, was misspelled. The authors regret the error.

A methodologic error appeared in the article “Highly Efficient In Vivo Agonist-Induced Internalization of sst<sub>2</sub> Receptors in Somatostatin Target Tissues,” by Waser et al. (*J Nucl Med.* 2009;50:936–941). In the second section of the “Materials and Methods,” the sentence “Both primary antibodies were applied in a 1:1,000 dilution.” should have read “Both R2-88 and SS-800 were applied in a 1:1,000 dilution, whereas a 1:100 dilution was necessary for UMB-1.” The authors regret the error.

In the article “Influence of Trigger PSA and PSA Kinetics on <sup>11</sup>C-Choline PET/CT Detection Rate in Patients with Biochemical Relapse After Radical Prostatectomy,” by Castellucci et al. (*J Nucl Med.* 2009;50:1394–1400), the legend of Figure 5 describes the illustrated patient as being 1 y old instead of the correct age, 71 y. We regret the error.