

CORRIGENDUM

Enrichment of DNRA bacteria in a continuous culture

Eveline M van den Berg, Udo van Dongen, Ben Abbas and Mark CM van Loosdrecht

The ISME Journal (2015) 9, 2749; doi:10.1038/ismej.2015.195

Correction to: *The ISME Journal* (2015) 9, 2153–2161; doi:10.1038/ismej.2015.26; published online 24 April 2015

Since the publication of this paper, the author has noticed an error in the third paragraph of Materials and Methods (under ‘Chemostat reactor operation’). It should read as follows (changes are underlined):

The culture media was autoclaved before use and sparged with a small flow of nitrogen gas while connected to the chemostat. Medium A contained per liter (day 0–271): 14.7 mmol KH_2PO_4 , 0.8 mmol $\text{MgSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 1.0 mmol NaOH , 10 mg yeast extract, 4 ml trace element solution (Vishniac and Santer, 1957), with only 2.2 g $\text{ZnSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$, and NaNO_3 and NH_4Cl . The concentration of NaNO_3 was 13.3 mM (day 0 until 39), or 11.8 mM (from day 39). NH_4Cl

concentrations were 0.5 mM (day 26–68), 0.7 mM (day 1–26, 68–82 and 94–122), 1.5 mM (day 82–94 and 122–186) and finally omitted (from day 186). Medium B contained, per liter, initially 5.5 mM $\text{NaCH}_3\text{COO} \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$; this was gradually increased to 8.8 mM (day 26 until 39), 10.3 mM (day 39 until 47), 12.5 mM (day 47 until 122), 16.2 mM (day 133 until 140) or 19.8 mM (day 122–271).

The changed numbers are double of what was written in the manuscript. The initial numbers did not correspond to the medium concentrations, but the concentrations in the influent (while referred to as medium concentrations). The influent was a combined flow of equal amount of both media, hence, a dilution factor of 2.

The author would like to apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused.