



Cite this: *J. Anal. At. Spectrom.*, 2026, 41, 801

## Correction: Cadmium isotopes analysis of environmental samples with high organic matter by dry ashing method under wet plasma conditions

Xian Wu,<sup>ab</sup> Zeyu Wang,<sup>ac</sup> Guangyi Sun,<sup>\*a</sup> Yu Lin,<sup>ab</sup> Xuewu Fu,<sup>\*a</sup> Yang Tang<sup>a</sup> and Xinbin Feng<sup>ab</sup>

DOI: 10.1039/d5ja90064f

rsc.li/jaas

Correction for 'Cadmium isotopes analysis of environmental samples with high organic matter by dry ashing method under wet plasma conditions' by Xian Wu *et al.*, *J. Anal. At. Spectrom.*, 2024, 39, 2298–2308, <https://doi.org/10.1039/D4JA00083H>.

The headings of Table 3 were previously misaligned. The first two  $\delta^{114}\text{Cd}$  values were incorrectly placed under “Dry ashing”, and the third  $\delta^{114}\text{Cd}$  value is placed under “High-pressure bomb”, which does not reflect the intended structure of the table. This misalignment obscures the correct interpretation of the analytical results. The updated Table 3 with the correct heading alignment is found below.

<sup>a</sup>State Key Laboratory of Environmental Geochemistry, Institute of Geochemistry, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Guiyang 550081, China. E-mail: fuxuewu@mail.gyig.ac.cn; sunguangyi@mail.gyig.ac.cn

<sup>b</sup>University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

<sup>c</sup>College of Eco-Environmental Engineering, Guizhou Minzu University, Guiyang, Guizhou 550025, China



**Table 3** The information of environmental standard samples under dry ashing method and high-pressure bomb method in this study and the literature

Sample name	Dry ashing						High-pressure bomb			Reference			
	Cd ( $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ )	Weighing sample (g)	LOI (%) (mean $\pm$ 2 SD)	Recovery (%) (mean $\pm$ 2 SD)	$\delta^{114}\text{Cd}$ (‰)	2 SD	$\delta^{114}\text{Cd}$ (‰)	2 SD	$n$	$\delta^{114}\text{Cd}$ (‰)	2 SD		
NIST SRM 2711a	54.1 $\pm$ 0.5	0.2670–0.5261	6.08 $\pm$ 0.38	91.6 $\pm$ 1.4	0.524	0.086	2	0.543	0.060	38	0.58	0.08	Li <i>et al.</i> (2018) <sup>39</sup>
											0.551	0.051	Liu <i>et al.</i> (2019) <sup>27</sup>
											0.532	0.038	Tan <i>et al.</i> (2020) <sup>28</sup>
											0.550	0.046	Dong <i>et al.</i> (2022) <sup>31</sup>
GSS-4 (GBW07404)	0.35 $\pm$ 0.08	0.5235–0.5245	9.48 $\pm$ 0.35	106.1 $\pm$ 4.5	−0.317	0.082	2	−0.286	0.035	4	0.557	0.032	Lu <i>et al.</i> (2021) <sup>55</sup>
											0.62	0.03	Peng <i>et al.</i> (2021) <sup>40</sup>
											−0.308	0.016	Tan <i>et al.</i> (2020) <sup>28</sup>
											−0.303	0.044	Dong <i>et al.</i> (2022) <sup>31</sup>
GSS-5 (GBW07405)	0.45 $\pm$ 0.09	0.3506–0.3531	5.67 $\pm$ 0.60	105.9 $\pm$ 5.5	−0.481	0.043	3				−0.23	0.09	Peng <i>et al.</i> (2021) <sup>40</sup>
											−0.314	0.040	Chang <i>et al.</i> (2023) <sup>41</sup>
											−0.694	0.010	Tan <i>et al.</i> (2020) <sup>28</sup>
											−0.558	0.046	Dong <i>et al.</i> (2022) <sup>31</sup>
GSD-11 (GBW07311)	2.3 $\pm$ 0.2	0.4579–0.4597	1.85 $\pm$ 0.07	94.4 $\pm$ 3.2	−0.305	0.064	2	−0.281	0.059	33	−0.54	0.06	Peng <i>et al.</i> (2021) <sup>40</sup>
											−0.304	0.054	Pallavicini <i>et al.</i> (2014) <sup>30</sup>
											−0.274	0.037	Tan <i>et al.</i> (2020) <sup>28</sup>
											−0.320	0.067	Dong <i>et al.</i> (2022) <sup>31</sup>
GSD-12 (GBW07312)	4.0 $\pm$ 0.3	0.4975–0.5847	2.36 $\pm$ 0.59	108.0 $\pm$ 0.7	−0.049	0.063	2	−0.067	0.056	21	−0.34	0.06	Peng <i>et al.</i> (2021) <sup>40</sup>
											−0.04	0.06	Li <i>et al.</i> (2018) <sup>39</sup>
											−0.071	0.060	Tan <i>et al.</i> (2020) <sup>28</sup>
											−0.041	0.03	Dong <i>et al.</i> (2022) <sup>31</sup>
BCR-482	0.50 $\pm$ 0.02 <sup>a</sup>	0.6480–1.6714	97.61 $\pm$ 0.09	93.1 $\pm$ 6.27	−0.176	0.073	4	−0.188	0.028	7	−0.10	0.06	Peng <i>et al.</i> (2021) <sup>40</sup>
											−0.039	0.104	Lu <i>et al.</i> (2021) <sup>55</sup>
											−0.123	0.035	Chang <i>et al.</i> (2023) <sup>41</sup>
											−0.170	0.030	Borovička <i>et al.</i> (2021) <sup>56</sup>
GSB-16 (GBW10025)	0.37 $\pm$ 0.03	0.3330–0.4054	90.57 $\pm$ 0.25	107.9 $\pm$ 0.8	−0.026	0.058	3	0.030	0.054	2	−0.069	0.059	Lu <i>et al.</i> (2021) <sup>55</sup>
											−0.611	0.069	Lu <i>et al.</i> (2021) <sup>55</sup>
GSB-29 (GBW10051)	1.00 $\pm$ 0.02	0.3462–0.4065	92.98 $\pm$ 2.22	102.2 $\pm$ 8.5	−0.613	0.056	3	−0.689	0.038	3	−0.611	0.069	Lu <i>et al.</i> (2021) <sup>55</sup>
											−0.611	0.069	Lu <i>et al.</i> (2021) <sup>55</sup>
NIST SRM 1632d	0.08 $\pm$ 0.01	1.2377–1.3885	92.82 $\pm$ 0.21	94.5 $\pm$ 23.0	−0.309	0.041	2	−0.264	0.058	2			

<sup>a</sup> This value is obtained from long-term observations in this study and is consistent with Kłos *et al.* (2012).<sup>57</sup>



## Correction

Minor formatting updates to the chemical reaction eqn (S1–S3) presented in the supplementary information have also been incorporated.

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

