RSC Sustainability



CORRECTION

View Article Online
View Journal | View Issue



Cite this: RSC Sustainability, 2025, 3,

Correction: Carbon removal efficiency and energy requirement of engineered carbon removal technologies

Daniel L. Sanchez,*abc Peter Psarras,ad Hannah K. Murnenb and Barclay Rogersb

DOI: 10.1039/d5su90013a

rsc.li/rscsus

Correction for 'Carbon removal efficiency and energy requirement of engineered carbon removal technologies' by Daniel L. Sanchez et al., RSC Sustain., 2025, https://doi.org/10.1039/d4su00552j.

The authors regret that there was an error in the caption of Fig. 2 in the original article. The original caption suggested that all data points on the scatter plot were taken from the baseline figures as reported in Fig. 3 when the points labelled "DAC" were taken from the "sensitivity scenario" numbers.

Fig. 2 is given again here with the corrected caption:




Fig. 2 Scatter plot of energy use and carbon efficiency for each technology's most likely embodiment. Ideal CDR technologies have low energy use and high carbon removal efficiency.

Additionally, there was also an error in ref. 10, the details of which were the same as ref. 7. The correct details for ref. 7 and 10 are given here as ref. 1 and 2, respectively.

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

References

- 1 D. W. Keith and J. S. Rhodes, Bury, burn or both: a two-for-one deal on biomass carbon and energy, Clim. Change, 2002, 54, 375.
- 2 D. W. Keith, G. Holmes, D. S. Angelo and K. Heidel, A process for capturing CO₂ from the atmosphere, Joule, 2018, 2(8), 1573–1594.

[&]quot;Carbon Direct, USA. E-mail: sanchezd@berkeley.edu

^bGraphyte, USA

^cUniversity of California-Berkeley, USA

^dUniversity of Pennsylvania, USA