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The authors would like to make the following correction to their article:

To verify the effect of excitation wavelength on the emission properties of the rGO–CeO$_2$ nanocomposite, the photoluminescence (PL) spectra of the sample were recorded again using an optical filter. The recorded spectra are presented below in Fig. 9(b). It should be noted that the units stated in the legend of Fig. 9(b) are corrected to nm.

One can find that there is no peak shift in the rGO–CeO$_2$ nanocomposite towards the red region from 442 nm to 500 nm when the excitation wavelength is changed from 220 nm to 250 nm, as indicated in the published article. Thus, the emission peaks observed at 461, 483 and 500 nm for the rGO–CeO$_2$ nanocomposite when excited by 230, 240 and 250 nm wavelengths are an artefact due to second order transmission.

Fig. 9  
(a) PL emission spectra of GO, rGO, CeO$_2$ and rGO–CeO$_2$ nanocomposite excited using an excitation wavelength of 220 nm. (b) Emission spectra of rGO–CeO$_2$ nanocomposite obtained for different excitation wavelengths using an optical filter. The bands at 444 nm in (a) and 442 nm in (b) are the 2nd order artefact and not the properties of the synthesized materials.
As such, the rGC–CeO₂ nanocomposite does not exhibit excitation-dependent tunable luminescence as reported in the published article. The changes do not affect the reported photocatalytic activity of the rGC–CeO₂ nanocomposite.

The Royal Society of Chemistry apologises for these errors and any consequent inconvenience to authors and readers.