British Journal of Nutrition (2015), **113**, 865–866
doi:10.1017/S0007114515000598

British Journal of Nutrition

CORRIGENDUM

Resistant starch and arabinoxylan augment SCFA absorption, but affect postprandial glucose and insulin responses differently – CORRIGENDUM

Anne Krog Ingerslev, Peter Kappel Theil, Mette Skou Hedemann, Helle Nygaard Lærke and Knud Erik Bach Knudsen

(First published online 16 February 2015)

doi:10.1017/S0007114513004066, Published by Cambridge University Press, February 2014.

The *P* value for the diet effect on net portal glucose flux (NPF) (Table 4) in the paper by Ingerslev *et al.*[1] was incorrect. It should read: The NPF of glucose were 258 mmol/h on the WSD, 203 mmol/h on the RSD and 242 mmol/h on the AXD (SEM 21), and the corresponding *P* values were $P_{Diet} = 0{\cdot}20$, $P_{Time} < 0{\cdot}001$ and $P_{Diet \times Time} < 0{\cdot}001$, respectively.

Table 4. Net portal flux of metabolites from 0 to 5 h after the first daily meal*
(Least-squares (LS) means with their standard errors or 95 % confidence intervals)

	WSD		RSD		AXD			*P*		
	LS means	95 % CI	LS means	95 % CI	LS means	95 % CI	SEM	Diet	Time	Diet × time
Portal blood flow (litres/min)†	2·77		2·15		2·87		0·29	NS‡	<0·001	NS
Net portal flux (mmol/h)										
Glucose	258		203		242		21	0·20	<0·001	<0·001
Insulin flux (nmol/h)§	9·0[a,b]	3·6, 15·7	10·5[a]	4·8, 17·5	4·6[b]	0·01,10·2	–	0·09	0·04	NS
C-peptide (nmol/h)§	7·9	4·6, 11·4	6·6	3·4, 10·0	5·5	2·4, 8·8	–	NS	<0·001	NS
GLP-1 (nmol/h)§	1·6	1·2, 2·0	1·8	1·4, 2·2	1·9	1·4, 2·3	–	NS	<0·001	NS
GIP (nmol/h)§	4·4	2·1, 6·9	2·8	0·5, 5·2	3·3	1·1, 5·7	–	NS	0·12	NS
SCFA	37[a]		66[b]		102[c]		9·3	<0·001	0·009	0·006
Acetate	24[a]		40[b]		62[c]		6·1	<0·001	0·006	0·01
Propionate	8·2[a]		17[b]		25[c]		2·6	0·001	0·03	0·002
Butyrate	2·8[a]		5·7[a]		10·2[b]		1·0	0·001	0·02	0·04
Valerate	1·7[a]		2·4[b]		2·5[b]		0·4	0·05	<0·001	0·001
Caproate	0·05[a]		0·68[b]		0·59[b]		0·15	0·03	0·005	0·03
BCFA	1·3[a]		1·6[a]		2·8[b]		0·26	<0·001	NS	0·08
Isobutyrate	0·6[a]		0·7[a]		1·2[b]		0·11	<0·001	NS	0·09
Isovalerate	0·7[a]		0·9[a]		1·5[b]		0·15	<0·001	0·08	0·07
Hepatic extraction (%)										
Glucose	8		5		9		4·2	NS	<0·001	NS
Insulin	27		44		44		11	NS	NS	NS
Total SCFA	57		50		63		9·2	NS	0·03	NS
Acetate	44[a,b]		29[b]		49[a]		12	0·03	NS	NS
Propionate	94		93		95		1·4	NS	NS	NS
Butyrate	83		79		83		4·6	NS	<0·001	NS

WSD, Western-style diet; RSD, resistant starch-enriched diet; AXD, arabinoxylan-enriched diet; GLP-1, glucagon-like peptide 1; GIP, glucose-dependent insulinotropic peptide; BCFA, branched-chain fatty acids.
[a,b,c] Mean values within a row with unlike superscript letters are significantly different ($P < 0{\cdot}05$).
* Mean plasma concentrations were determined in pigs fed either WSD, RSD or AXD.
† Mean values for portal blood flow are determined based on initial blood flow measurements.
‡ $P > 0{\cdot}1$.
§ Since data were logarithmically transformed before data analysis, SEM is not the correct measure of variance. Instead, 95 % CI are given.

In the abstract, the first sentence describing the results (page 1564, line 7) should be: 'The NPF of insulin was lower ($P=0{\cdot}04$) in AXD-fed pigs (4·6 nmol/h) compared with RSD-fed pigs (10·5 nmol/h), despite similar glucose absorption among diets (203–258 mmol/h, $P_{Diet} = 0{\cdot}20$). A prolonged and a lower peak NPF of glucose was observed in RSD-fed pigs ($P_{Diet \times Time} < 0{\cdot}001$) compared with the WSD- and AXD-fed pigs.'

In the Results section, first paragraph (page 1570, line 9), the sentence should be: 'Substituting wheat flour with potato and high-amylose maize starches or rye flakes and enzyme-treated wheat bran did not affect the NPF of glucose ($P=0{\cdot}20$). However, RSD-fed pigs showed a significant diet × time interaction ($P<0{\cdot}001$); RSD-fed pigs had a lower peak NPF of glucose (approximately 300 mmol/h) between 45 and 120 min after feeding.'

The authors apologise for this error.

Reference

1. Ingerslev AK, Theil PK, Hedemann MS, *et al.* (2014) Resistant starch and arabinoxylan augment SCFA absorption, but affect postprandial glucose and insulin responses differently. *Br J Nutr* **111**, 1564–1576. Published by Cambridge University Press, February 2014, doi:10.1017/S0007114513004066.