



Cite this: *Biomater. Sci.*, 2020, **8**, 2040

Correction: Opposite responses of normal hepatocytes and hepatocellular carcinoma cells to substrate viscoelasticity

Kalpna Mandal,^{*a} Ze Gong,^b Alexis Rylander,^a Vivek B. Shenoy^b and Paul A. Janmey^{*a}

DOI: 10.1039/d0bm90022b

rsc.li/biomaterials-science

Correction for 'Opposite responses of normal hepatocytes and hepatocellular carcinoma cells to substrate viscoelasticity' by Kalpna Mandal *et al.*, *Biomater. Sci.*, 2020, **8**, 1316–1328.

After publication, the authors found an error in Fig. 5(b and c) in the main paper. The corrected Fig. 5 is shown below.




Fig. 5 Model explains the viscoelastic regulation results for different cells. (A) Schematic of motor clutch model for a cell spreading on an elastic or viscoelastic substrate (collagen I coated only on elastic PAA components). Myosin motors pull the actin bundle towards the cell center at a retrograde flow velocity V_f . Clutches connect the actin bundle to the substrate based on the reaction rates r_{on} and r_{off} and resist the retrograde flow. The spreading speed V_s is the difference between polymerization speed V_p and retrograde flow V_f . The viscoelastic substrate is represented as a generalized Maxwell model with two relaxation timescales ($\tau_{s1} = \frac{\eta_1}{k_{a1}}$, $\tau_{s2} = \frac{\eta_2}{k_{a2}}$). (B–C) Spreading speed V_s of PHH cells (B) and Huh7 cells (C) on elastic (black) and viscoelastic (orange) substrates. Error bars represent the standard deviation ($N = 10$ simulations).

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

^aInstitute for Medicine and Engineering, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 19104, USA. E-mail: mandalk@penntmedicine.upenn.edu, janmey@penntmedicine.upenn.edu

^bDepartment of Mechanical Engineering and Applied Mechanics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 19104, USA

