

understanding of the nature of mental illness. Second, it is critical that mental health evaluators, who provide clinical assessments in legal matters, remain keenly aware of the relevant legal definitions and elements involved in those matters. Providing clinical opinions to the court that overlook relevant legal requirements regarding mental concepts may result in the inadmissibility of the expert evaluator's opinion and, ultimately, may hamper the court's effort toward a just resolution.

Of course, an expert's involvement in a capital punishment matter carries particularly high stakes, where a convicted defendant faces the ultimate

penalty. Given that capital punishment cases are often adjudicated over the course of many years, the evolving nature of medical sciences and diagnostic formulations can pose significant challenges for both the courts and evaluators. Accordingly, it is important that evaluators remain familiar with the advances in diagnostic formulations and assessments to appropriately guide courts in reaching well-reasoned and well-informed decisions. In the case of assessing intellectual disability in capital defendants, the proper evaluation of intellectual and adaptive functioning and the ability to translate those clinical findings into relevant jurisdictional legal standards may make the difference between life and death.

E R R A T U M

In the March 2020 issue of *The Journal* (48:1, pp 143-4), we acknowledged our colleagues who have conducted peer review for *The Journal* during 2016–2019. The individuals listed below should also have been included in that recognition. We offer our sincere apologies to each of our colleagues for this error and affirm our appreciation for their efforts on behalf of *The Journal*.

Jessica Abellard
Kenneth Appelbaum
Renée L. Binder
Stanley Brodsky
Richard L. Frierson
Jeffrey Guina
Steven Simring
Jagannathan Srinivasaraghavan
Anthony Tamburello

DOI:10.29158/JAAPL.200034-20