Erratum

Erratum to “Development and Validation of a LC/MS/MS Method for the Determination of Duloxetine in Human Plasma and Its Application to Pharmacokinetic Study”

**D. Chandrapal Reddy,^{1,2} A. T. Bapuji,¹ V. Suryanarayana Rao,³ V. Himabindu,²
D. Rama Raju,¹ Syed Syedba,¹ and H. L. V. Ravikiran¹**

¹ Department of Clinical Pharmacology, APL Research Centre, Hyderabad 500090, India

² Institute of Science and Technology, Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Kukatpally, Hyderabad 500085, India

³ Department of Chemistry, Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Anantapur 515 055, India

Correspondence should be addressed to D. Chandrapal Reddy; dcpreddy007@yahoo.co.in

Received 3 July 2012; Accepted 25 September 2012

Copyright © 2013 D. Chandrapal Reddy et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The typo error happened in Table 2 has now been modified as mentioned below.

TABLE 2: Absolute matrix effect, relative recovery, and process efficiency for duloxetine.

Analyte ISTD	A ^a (%CV)	B ^b (%CV)	C ^c (%CV)	Matrix effect (%ME) ^d	Recovery (%RE) ^e	Process efficiency (%PE) ^f
STD 1						
Duloxetine	170 (4.86)	160 (3.75)	136 (4.32)	94.23	85.40	80.47
Fluoxetine	106783 (2.34)	96545 (2.99)	81421 (1.32)	90.41	84.34	76.25
STD 3						
Duloxetine	708 (3.23)	739 (4.13)	575 (1.22)	104.38	77.77	81.18
Fluoxetine	104735 (1.31)	108227 (1.56)	81902 (1.80)	103.33	75.68	78.20
STD 5						
Duloxetine	57893 (1.74)	57170 (1.69)	45749 (0.96)	98.75	80.02	79.02
Fluoxetine	100839 (1.94)	98731 (1.65)	82613 (0.68)	97.91	83.67	81.93
STD 6						
Duloxetine	174918 (1.09)	172409 (1.24)	138067 (1.01)	98.57	80.08	78.93
Fluoxetine	95399 (1.53)	94770 (1.56)	76090 (1.07)	99.34	80.29	79.76
STD 8						
Duloxetine	349836 (1.09)	344817 (1.24)	269986 (6.06)	98.57	78.30	77.18
Fluoxetine	85599 (1.61)	87554 (2.23)	71346 (0.67)	102.28	81.49	83.35

^a Mean area response of six replicate samples prepared in mobile phase (neat samples).^b Mean area response of six replicate samples prepared by spiking in postextracted blank.^c Mean area response of six replicate samples prepared by spiking in plasma before extraction.^d % Matrix effect: postextracted mean response/aqueous neat mean response $\times$ 100.^e % Recovery: extracted mean response/postextracted mean response $\times$ 100.^f % Process efficiency: extracted mean response/aqueous mean response $\times$ 100.