CORRECTION

Check for updates

Correction: Addressing challenges in the removal of unbound dye from passively labelled extracellular vesicles

Kaisa Rautaniemi,[a] Jacopo Zini,[b] Emilia Löfman,[a] Heikki Saari,[bc] Iida Haapalehto,[a] Johanna Laukka,[a] Sami Vesamäki,[a] Alexander Efimov,[a] Marjo Yliperttula,[b] Timo Laaksonen,[ab] Elina Vuorimaa-Laukkanen[a] and Ekaterina S. Lisitsyna*[a]

Correction for 'Addressing challenges in the removal of unbound dye from passively labelled extracellular vesicles' by Kaisa Rautaniemi *et al.*, *Nanoscale Adv.*, 2022, DOI: 10.1039/d1na00755f.

The authors regret that an incorrect version of Table 3 was included in the original article. The correct version is given here:

Table 3 EV recoveries R_{EV}, dye recoveries in the EV fractions R_{dye}, and relative purification efficiencies E_{rp} for the labelled and purified EVs. The removal of unbound dye was studied with ultracentrifugation (UC), ultracentrifugation with density gradient without ultrafiltration (UCG), ultrafiltration (UF), size-exclusion chromatography (SEC), and anion exchange chromatography (AEC). The individual values for each replicate are presented in ESI Table S2

		110k EVs			20k EVs		
Dye	Method	$R_{EV}{}^{a}$ (%)	R_{dye} (%)	$E_{rp}{}^{a,b}$	$R_{EV}{}^{a}$ (%)	R_{dye} (%)	$E_{rp}{}^{a,b}$
DHPE-OG	UCG	43.0 ± 2.8†	44.6 ± 4.2	1.0	52.9 ± 7.5†	39.6 ± 3.3	1.3
	SEC	12.2 ± 1.6†	8.7 ± 1.4	1.4	8.2 ± 0.9	9.3 ± 5.0	0.9
Ptx-OG	UCG	10.3 ± 0.4†	67.8 ± 11.5	0.2‡	6.5 ± 3.3	41.3 ± 38.4	0.2‡
	SEC	3.8 ± 1.6	2.9 ± 1.3	1.3	3.7 ± 0.9	1.3 ± 0.3	2.8†
BP	UC	7.6 ± 4.8	16.6 ± 1.3	0.5‡	<1 ‡	7.0 ± 0.8	—
	UF	1.2 ± 0.7‡	1.8 ± 0.9	0.7‡	2.3 ± 1.0‡	4.8 ± 3.8	0.5‡
	UCG	78.6 ± 10.3†	6.2 ± 0.9	12.7†	54.0 ± 6.0†	15.5 ± 4.8	3.5†
BPC12	UC	12.5 ± 6.8†	35.5 ± 37.6	0.4‡	5.9 ± 6.2	17.2 ± 15.3	0.3‡
	UF	3.9 ± 2.8	7.9 ± 3.4	0.5‡	8.4 ± 11.2	9,5 ± 15,4	0.9‡
DiO	UCG	n.d.	n.d.	—	n.d.	n.d	—
	SEC	1.1 ± 0.2‡	n.d.	—	<1‡	n.d	—
	AEC	10.1 ± 12.3†	2.2 ± 2.0	4.6†	6.4 ± 0.3	1.8 ± 0.3	3.5†

^{a} † – acceptably high; ‡ – unacceptably low; all other values are acceptable with caution. ^{b} E_{rp} > 1 indicates successful separation of the labelled EVs from the unbound dye: the greater E_{rp}, the better separation; conversely, E_{rp} < 1 indicates unsuccessful removal of the dye.

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

^{a}Chemistry and Advanced Materials, Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences, Tampere University, Korkeakoulunkatu 8, 33720 Tampere, Finland. E-mail: ekaterina.lisitsyna@tuni.fi

^{b}Drug Research Program, Division of Pharmaceutical Biosciences, Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Helsinki, Viikinkaari 5, 00790 Helsinki, Finland

^{c}Finnish Red Cross Blood Services, Kivihaantie 7, 00310 Helsinki, Finland