research groups agree that *Aco1* and *Ireb2* have redundant functions in the IRP-IRE regulatory hierarchy.

We assert that the increased anemia⁴ and neuromuscular compromise of Aco1+/-*Ireb2*^{-/-} mice compared with *Ireb2*^{-/-} mice (Fig. 1a) indicates that there is an IRP dosage effect, which is characteristic of duplicated regulatory genes¹⁰. If the neurodegeneration symptoms were due to an off-site effect of the neo cassette and were not attributable to loss of Ireb2 itself, loss of Aco1 would not worsen neurodegeneration, as Aco1 is located on chromosome 4. whereas Ireb2 is located on chromosome 9, and neighboring genes that could be adversely affected by targeting in Aco1+/-*Ireb2*^{-/-} animals should differ completely. Thus, Galy et al. have not performed a critical experiment that would allow full assessment of neurodegeneration in mice with compromised IRP function: they

need to generate and follow the phenotype of large cohorts of $Ireb2^{-/-}$ and $Aco1^{+/-}$ $Ireb2^{-/-}$ mice over time, as we have done. Notably, expression of the Psma4 gene on chromosome 9 is unchanged in our $Ireb2^{-/-}$ mice (S.C., unpublished data).

Despite their assertion that *Ireb2*^{-/-} mice lack 'symptomatic neurodegeneration', the results of Galy et al. are essentially confirmatory—they report compromise of neuromuscular function on rotarod, accelerod and self-grooming and conclude that their *Ireb2*^{-/-} mice have a mild clinical phenotype at 14 months of age. They assert that their mice do not have 'severe neurodegeneration', and we agree that the term 'severe' is not appropriate to describe Ireb2^{-/-} mice at 14 months of age; we did not use this terminology to describe the phenotype of *Ireb2*^{-/-} mice in our previous publications^{1,5}, and we do not believe that qualitative distinctions are useful.

Manik C Ghosh, Hayden Ollivierre-Wilson, Sharon Cooperman & Tracey A Rouault

Cell Biology and Metabolism Branch, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, US National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA. e-mail: trou@helix.nih.gov

- LaVaute, T. et al. Nat. Genet. 27, 209–214 (2001).
- Meyron-Holtz, E.G. et al. EMBO J. 23, 386–395 (2004).
- Meyron-Holtz, E.G., Ghosh, M.C. & Rouault, T.A. Science 306, 2087–2090 (2004).
- Cooperman, S.S. et al. Blood 106, 1084–1091 (2005).
- Smith, S.R. et al. Ann. NY Acad. Sci. 1012, 65–83 (2004).
- Galy, B., Ferring, D. & Hentze, M.W. Genesis 43, 181–188 (2005).
- 7. Galy, B. et al. Blood 106, 2580-2589 (2005).
- 8. Crawley, J.N. Brain Res. 835, 18-26 (1999).
- Smith, S.R., Ghosh, M.C., Ollivierre-Wilson, H., Hang Tong, W. & Rouault, T.A. Blood Cells Mol. Dis. 36, 283–287 (2006).
- Kondrashov, F.A. & Koonin, E.V. *Trends Genet.* 20, 287–290 (2004).

Genetic testing: care, consent and liability

To the Editor:

The review of the text *Genetic Testing: Care, Consent and Liability* by Kathy Hudson (*Nat. Genet.* **38**, 603; 2006) referred to an apparent error concerning the case of Breyne V. Hudson on page 116. The publishers of the text, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., have now acknowledged that this was the result of a "significant printing error" and have issued an Erratum.

The sentences in question read, as finally

printed in the book, "The woman proceeded to have an abortion. The following day, the physician telephoned the woman, admitted that he had been mistaken and said that the baby actually had Trisomy 21 (Downs Syndrome), a condition that could not cause retardation but could result in developmental delays in learning, speech, and motor skills." The Erratum states, "Somehow, during the final stages of the production process at John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,

the reference to '47,XXX' was replaced with the phrases 'Trisomy 21 (Downs Syndrome)'. The Publisher regrets this error and wishes to take full responsibility for it, as it was clear that the Editors had indeed approved the correct reference to 47,XXX."

Neil F Sharpe

Genetic Testing Research Group, Hamilton, Ontario L8R 3B7, Canada. e-mail: natgensoc@gmail.com

