OPEN

Author Correction: Effect of two (short-term) storage methods on load to failure testing of murine bone tissue

Thomas M. Tiefenboeck , Stephan Payr, Olga Bajenov, Thomas Koch, Micha Komjati & Kambiz Sarahrudi

Correction to: *Scientific Reports* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-42476-4>, published online 11 April 2019

The original version of this Article contained errors.

In the Abstract,

“The comparison of the mean load to failure of all 3 groups (group 1: $28.7 \text{ N} \pm 6.1 \text{ N}$, group 2: $23.8 \text{ N} \pm 3.8 \text{ N}$ and group 3: $23.7 \text{ N} \pm 5.7 \text{ N}$) did not reveal a significant difference.”

now reads:

“The comparison of the mean load to failure of all 3 groups (group 1: $28.7 \text{ N} \pm 6.4 \text{ N}$, group 2: $23.7 \text{ N} \pm 6.0 \text{ N}$ and group 3: $24.0 \text{ N} \pm 3.9 \text{ N}$) did not reveal a significant difference.”

In Table 1,

“Stiffness in N/mm^2 ”.

now reads:

“Stiffness in N/mm ”

Furthermore, in column “Strength in N/mm^2 ”, row r7,

“-27.1”

now reads:

“27.1”

Additionally Table 1 contained errors in the values in columns Stiffness in N/mm , Strength in N/mm^2 , Cross sectional area in mm^2 . The original Table 1 appears below.

Published: 16 June 2020

Nr. Group	Stiffness in N/mm ²	Strength in N/mm ²	Cross sectional area in mm ²	Load to failure in N
Freezing (n = 12)				
1	44.6	16.8	1.23	20.6
2	36.8	16.6	1.21	20
3	44.8	21.0	1.91	40.2
4	39.0	15.4	1.63	25
5	52.8	12.7	1.89	23.9
6	27.1	16.2	1.74	28.2
7	19.8	−27.1	1.13	30.6
8	23.5	15.1	1.67	25.2
9	28.3	19.1	1.43	27.4
10	27.2	12.6	2.57	32.3
11	42.6	18.3	1.79	32.7
12	63.4	20.9	1.84	38.5
Native Bone (n = 9)				
13	49.6	11.3	2.52	28.4
14	44.3	10.4	1.52	15.8
15	29.3	10.6	2.01	21.4
16	39.7	12.0	2.66	18.1
17	32.0	23.1	1.33	30.7
18	48.2	12.1	2.69	17.2
19	24.9	13.3	1.72	22.8
20	38.4	18.7	1.41	26.3
21	46.3	13.9	2.32	32.2
Paraformaldehyde (n = 8)				
22	23.7	21.9	1.43	31.4
23	37.5	15.1	1.79	27
24	35.3	11.0	1.67	23.2
25	43.2	12.3	2.22	24.4
26	22.2	11.9	1.50	18.4
27	41.0	14.8	1.86	22.1
28	26.2	10.6	1.47	21.8
29	23.7	21.9	2.27	24

Table 1. Detailed overview of stiffness, strength, cross sectional area and load to failure of tested bone. N – Newton, Nr – Number.

As a result of this, in the Results section,

“The mean cross sectional area of ROI (fracture region) was 1.81 mm² (median; 1.74 mm² range; 1.13 to 2.69 mm² STD 0.44 mm²). There was no significant difference between mean stiffness (freezing 37.5 N/mm² vs. native 39.2 N/mm² vs. 32.7 N/mm² paraformaldehyde) and strength (freezing 17.6 N/mm² vs. native 14.3 N/mm² vs. 13.94 N/mm² paraformaldehyde). A detailed overview is presented in Table 1.”

now reads:

“The mean cross sectional area of ROI (fracture region) was 1.72 mm² (median; 1.67 mm² range; 1.13 to 2.57 mm² STD 0.38 mm²). There was no significant difference between mean stiffness (freezing 37.5 N/mm vs. native 39.2 N/mm vs. 32.7 N/mm paraformaldehyde) and strength (freezing 17.6 N/mm² vs. native 13.9 N/mm² vs. 13.9 N/mm² paraformaldehyde). A detailed overview is presented in Table 1.”

And,

“No significant difference in the load to failure values between the three groups was found ($p = 0.113$). The mean load to failure in group 1 was 28.7 ± 6.1 N (median; 27.8 N; range 20 to 40.2 N) compared to 23.8 ± 3.8 N (median; 23.1 N; range; 18.4 to 31.4 N) in group 2. The mean load to failure in group 3 was 23.7 ± 5.7 N (median; 22.8; range 15.8 to 32.2 N).”

now reads:

“No significant difference in the load to failure values between the three groups was found ($p = 0.113$). The mean load to failure in group 1 was 28.7 ± 6.4 N (median; 27.8 N; range 20 to 40.2 N) compared to 23.7 ± 6.0 N (median; 22.8 N; range; 15.8 to 32.2 N) in group 2. The mean load to failure in group 3 was 24.0 ± 3.9 N (median; 23.6; range 18.4 to 31.4 N).”

These errors have now been corrected in the PDF and HTML versions of the Article.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2020