Erratum: "Meat and Fat Intake as Risk Factors for Pancreatic Cancer: The Multiethnic Cohort Study" by Nöthlings et al. [J Natl Cancer Inst 2005;97:1458–65 (Issue 19)]. Because of an oversight in how the analysis dataset for the Anderson Gill Cox regression model was set up, some cases were counted as multiple events. As a result, incorrect relative risks, 95% confidence intervals, and *P* values were calculated. On page 1458, abstract, first sentence of Results section, "68% increased risk" should read "66% increased risk" and "relative risk = 1.68, 95% confidence interval = 1.35 to 2.07, $P_{trend}<.01$" should read "relative risk = 1.66, 95% confidence interval = 1.20 to 2.30, $P_{trend} = .07$." Thus, whereas the relative risk changed minimally, the P_{trend} lost statistical significance. In line 23 of the abstract, "50% increases in risk" should read "48% and 42% increases in risk, respectively." In line 25 of the abstract, "(both $P_{trend}<.01$)" should read "($P_{trend}<.01$ and .03, respectively)." On page 1461, first column, first full paragraph, line 10, "almost 70% higher" should read "over 65% higher." On page 1462, second column, the second sentence of the first full paragraph should read "There was no statistically significant association between nitrosamine intake and pancreatic cancer risk (relative risk = 1.22, 95% confidence interval = 0.89 to 1.69 for the fifth versus the first quintile, $P_{trend} = .20$)." In addition, incorrect data were presented in Table 2 "Relative risks (with 95% confidence intervals) of exocrine pancreatic cancer across quintiles of daily intake of meat, dairy products, and eggs in the Multiethnic Cohort Study, $n = 190\,545$" on page 1461 and Table 3 "Relative risks (with 95% confidence intervals) of exocrine pancreatic cancer across quintiles of daily intake of total fat, saturated fat, and cholesterol intake in the Multiethnic Cohort Study, $n = 190\,545$" on page 1462. The corrected tables are available in the electronic version of the Journal (http://jncicancerspectrum.oxfordjournals.org/jnci/content/vol98/issue11/). Although a few relative risks and *P* values for trend have lost statistical significance in the corrected analysis, the error does not alter the authors' overall conclusions. The authors regret the error.

DOI: 10.1093/jnci/djj238