

## CORRECTION

[View Article Online](#)

[View Journal](#) | [View Issue](#)



Cite this: *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2018, **17**, 1964

## Correction: Are current guidelines for sun protection optimal for health? Exploring the evidence

Robyn M. Lucas,<sup>\*a</sup> Rachel E. Neale,<sup>b</sup> Sasha Madronich<sup>c</sup> and Richard L. McKenzie<sup>d</sup>

DOI: 10.1039/c8pp90034e

[rsc.li/pps](http://rsc.li/pps)

Correction for 'Are current guidelines for sun protection optimal for health? Exploring the evidence' by Robyn M. Lucas *et al.*, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2018, DOI: 10.1039/c7pp00374a.

The authors would like to draw the reader's attention to an error in the caption to Fig. 2, where UVI > 10 should read UVI > 6, as per the text on the figure. The caption should read: "Frequency distribution of UVA (y-axis, normalised to unity in each case) for the case where UVI is less than 3 (red), and for the case where UVI is greater than 6 (blue). The data used are the same as shown in Fig. 1 (*i.e.*, daytime scans only). In nearly 5–10% of cases, the UVA for UVI < 3 is greater than that for UVI > 6". The in-text reference to Fig. 2 should also be UVI > 6, rather than >10.

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

<sup>a</sup>National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, Research School of Population Health, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

E-mail: [robyn.lucas@anu.edu.au](mailto:robyn.lucas@anu.edu.au)

<sup>b</sup>QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Brisbane, Australia

<sup>c</sup>National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado, USA

<sup>d</sup>National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research, NIWA Lauder, Central Otago, New Zealand

