Corrigendum

Since its publication, the authors of King *et al.* (2005) have brought to our attention corrections that need to be made to Table 2 in their paper. The corrected table is printed below.

We apologise to our readers for this mistake.

Table 2 Allometric regressions used to predict tree component biomass of young aspen, paper birch and sugar maple at the Aspen FACE project in Rhinelander, WI, USA

Dependent variable	Intercept (P)	Parameter estimate (P)	MSE	R^2	n
Aspen foliage	1.48984 (<0.0001)	2.70111 (<0.0001)	0.14649	0.892	131
Aspen wood	3.13855 (<0.0001)	2.72444 (<0.0001)	0.02496	0.980	132
Aspen heart root	2.86029 (<0.0001)	1.87143 (<0.0001)	0.04421	0.929	128
Paper birch foliage	1.78036 (<0.0001)	2.38384 (<0.0001)	0.22940	0.836	37
Paper birch wood	3.19439 (<0.0001)	2.50650 (<0.0001)	0.06087	0.955	37
Paper birch heart root	2.48509 (<0.0001)	1.98989 (<0.0001)	0.05909	0.932	37
Sugar maple foliage	2.35586 (<0.0001)	2.29003 (<0.0001)	0.13239	0.906	25
Sugar maple wood	2.93748 (<0.0001)	2.88168 (<0.0001)	0.06722	0.968	25
Sugar maple heart root	3.03418 (<0.0001)	1.79167 (<0.0001)	0.10574	0.883	24

MSE, mean square error.
Models were developed from trees harvested destructively within FACE plots in 2000 and 2002. All models had the form $\log(y) = m \log(x) + b$, where y = biomass component (g) and x = diameter (cm). Baskerville's (1972) adjustment to the antilogarithm was applied when calculating absolute data from the log–log models.

Reference

King JS, Kubiske ME, Pregitzer KS, Hendrey GR, McDonald EP, Giardina CP, Quinn VS, Karnosky DF. 2005. Tropospheric O_3 compromises net primary production in young stands of trembling aspen, paper birch and sugar maple in response to elevated atmospheric CO_2. *New Phytologist* **168**: 623–635.