CrossMark
click for updatesCite this: *RSC Adv.*, 2016, 6, 115365

DOI: 10.1039/c6ra90127a

www.rsc.org/advances

Correction: Plant metabolomics driven chemical and biological comparison of the root bark of *Dictamnus dasycarpus* and *Dictamnus angustifolius*

Mengying Lv,^{ab} Yuan Tian,^{ab} Zunjian Zhang,^{ab} Jingyu Liang,^c Fengguo Xu^{*ab} and Jianbo Sun^{*c}Correction for 'Plant metabolomics driven chemical and biological comparison of the root bark of *Dictamnus dasycarpus* and *Dictamnus angustifolius*' by Mengying Lv et al., *RSC Adv.*, 2015, 5, 15700–15708.

The authors regret that incorrect data were supplied for Fig. 2 and 5. The correct figures are presented below. This correction does not alter the discussion or conclusions presented in this *RSC Advances* paper.

Fig. 2 Scores plot of PCA (A) and OPLS-DA (B) based on data after pretreatment with statistical parameters as follows: (A) $R^2X = 0.798$, $Q^2 = 0.652$; (B) $R^2X = 0.757$, $R^2Y = 0.994$, $Q^2 = 0.989$.

^aKey Laboratory of Drug Quality Control and Pharmacovigilance (Ministry of Education), China Pharmaceutical University, Nanjing 210009, China. E-mail: fengguoxu@gmail.com; Fax: +86 25 8327 1021; Tel: +86 25 8327 1021

^bState Key Laboratory of Natural Medicine, China Pharmaceutical University, Nanjing 210009, China

^cDepartment of Natural Medicinal Chemistry, China Pharmaceutical University, Nanjing 210009, China. E-mail: sjbcpu@gmail.com; Fax: +86 25 8327 1415; Tel: +86 25 8327 1415

Fig. 5 PCA analysis based on 16 identified chemical markers was performed to assess the discriminative ability of the identified chemical markers. (A) Scores plot of PCA based on a 20 (samples) $\times$ 16 (chemical markers) dataset. (B) The bi-plot shows the correlation between the samples (yellow boxes and blue triangles) and the chemical markers (green dots). The closer the samples are to the chemical markers, the stronger is the correlation. Samples situated near the chemical markers are high in these markers and are low in markers situated opposite.

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