Corrections

Correction: Pérez and Merchant, "The Synaptic Properties of Cells Define the Hallmarks of Interval Timing in a Recurrent Neural Network"

In the article "The Synaptic Properties of Cells Define the Hallmarks of Interval Timing in a Recurrent Neural Network" by Oswaldo Pérez and Hugo Merchant, which appeared on pages 4186–4199 of the April 25, 2018 issue, an incorrect acknowledgment was listed. The authors apologize for the oversight. The corrected acknowledgment is as follows: "This work was supported by Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología Grants 236836 and 196, and Programa de Apoyo a Proyectos de Investigación e Innovación Tecnológica Grant IN202317, Secretaria de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación to H.M. We thank Victor de Lafuente, Warren Meck, Fernando Peña, and Dobromir Dotov for their fruitful comments on earlier versions of the paper, Luis Prado and Raul Paulín for their technical assistance. Oswaldo Pérez is a doctoral student from Programa de Doctorado en Ciencias Biomédicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) and received fellowship 204516 from CONACYT." This correction does not affect the conclusions of the paper. The acknowledgments have been corrected on the online PDF version.

DOI:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1689-18.2018

Correction: Stalnaker et al., "Cholinergic Interneurons Use Orbitofrontal Input to Track Beliefs about Current State"

In regards to the article, "Cholinergic Interneurons Use Orbitofrontal Input to Track Beliefs about Current State" by Thomas A. Stalnaker, Ben Berg, Navkiran Aujla, and Geoffrey Schoenbaum, which appeared on pages 6242–6257 of the June 8, 2016 issue, the authors discovered a bug in the MATLAB code that calculated the mean coefficient of variation (CV2) index for each neuron in the population. This index was used to identify putative cholinergic interneurons (CINs) as those with mean CV2 < 0.80. The bug artificially lowered the mean CV2 by averaging a spurious -999 into the list of CV2 values for each pair of interspike intervals for each neuron. This only had a substantial effect on the small minority of neurons with a very low number of spikes (very low firing rates), which were therefore inaccurately identified as putative CINs. Upon finding this error, we recalculated the CV2 with corrected code and reanalyzed the resulting revised lists of CINs. The re-analyses showed qualitatively similar results to those reported in the original paper, including statistical significance.

Because the distribution of mean CV2 indices of putative medium spiny neurons (MSNs; defined by waveform and firing rate characteristics) were slightly shifted upward in the corrected dataset, we were also able to better distinguish putative CINs from putative MSNs. Therefore we identified a slightly higher CV2 criterion for putative identification of CINs (<0.85), which still distinguished putative CINs from putative MSNs statistically and was still consistent with published data on confirmed CINs. When we reanalyzed the data using this revised criterion, we also found similar results to the original paper, again including statistical significance. The revised figures in this corrigendum are parallel to the figures in the original paper except that they use the corrected CV2 values and the revised putative CIN lists using the 0.85 criterion (Figs. 1–12). These revised lists excluded 30 of the 109 total CINs analyzed in the original paper (average baseline firing rate of these 30 neurons $= 0.8$ spikes/s, average corrected CV2 $= 1.08$). The original figure legends are also remade, with n values and statistical values changed to reflect the re-analyses. The authors apologize for this error but reaffirm that the description and interpretation of the data reported in the article are not affected.