



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

DOI: 10.1039/c8pp90034e  
rsc.li/pps

## 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>

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

<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