

7. Penninck D, Smyers B, Webster CRL, et al. Diagnostic value of ultrasonography in differentiating enteritis from intestinal neoplasia in dogs. *Vet Radiol Ultrasound* 2003;44:570–575.
8. Rudolf H, Van Schaik G, O'Brien RT, et al. Ultrasonographic evaluation of the thickness of the small intestinal wall in dogs with inflammatory bowel disease. *J Small Anim Pract* 2005;46:322–326.
9. Penninck D, Nyland T, Fisher PE, et al. Ultrasonography of the normal canine gastrointestinal tract. *Vet Radiol Ultrasound* 1989;30:272–276.
10. Goutal-Landry CM, Mansell J, Ryan KA, et al. Effect of endoscopic forceps on quality of duodenal mucosal biopsy in healthy dogs. *J Vet Intern Med* 2013;27:456–461.



### **Correction: Power of treatment success definitions when the Canine Brief Pain Inventory is used to evaluate carprofen treatment for the control of pain and inflammation in dogs with osteoarthritis**

In the report “Power of treatment success definitions when the Canine Brief Pain Inventory is used to evaluate carprofen treatment for the control of pain and inflammation in dogs with osteoarthritis” (*Am J Vet Res* 2013;74:1467–1473), the abbreviations for pain interference score (PIS) and pain severity score (PSS) were inadvertently switched in 2 places. In the Conclusions and Clinical Relevance section of the abstract, the following sentence is incorrect:

The CBPI had robust statistical power to evaluate the treatment effect of carprofen in dogs with osteoarthritis when protocol success criteria were predefined as a reduction  $\geq 1$  in PIS and  $\geq 2$  in PSS.

The sentence should have read as follows:

The CBPI had robust statistical power to evaluate the treatment effect of carprofen in dogs with osteoarthritis when protocol success criteria were predefined as a reduction  $\geq 1$  in PSS and  $\geq 2$  in PIS.

In the 8th paragraph of the Discussion section on page 1472, the following sentence contained a similar error:

In addition, defining success with more stringent criteria (decrease  $\geq 1$  in PIS and  $\geq 2$  in PSS) resulted in treatment being classified as a success in fewer dogs overall, but a substantially smaller *P* value (*P* = 0.013) was found.

The sentence should have read:

In addition, defining success with more stringent criteria (decrease  $\geq 1$  in PSS and  $\geq 2$  in PIS) resulted in treatment being classified as a success in fewer dogs overall, but a substantially smaller *P* value (*P* = 0.013) was found.