frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology

CORRECTION
published: 08 December 2021
doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2021.813442

Corrigendum: Evaluation of the SARS-CoV-2 Inactivation Efficacy Associated With Buffers From Three Kits Used on High-Throughput RNA Extraction Platforms

*Ruth E. Thom, Lin S. Eastaugh, Lyn M. O'Brien, David O. Ulaeto, James S. Findlay, Sophie J. Smither, Amanda L. Phelps, Helen L. Stapleton, Karleigh A. Hamblin and Simon A. Weller**

CBR Division, Dstl Porton Down, Salisbury, United Kingdom

OPEN ACCESS

Edited and reviewed by:
Max Maurin,
Université Grenoble Alpes, France

***Correspondence:**
Simon A. Weller
sweller@dstl.gov.uk

Specialty section:
This article was submitted to Clinical Microbiology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology

Received: *11 November 2021*
Accepted: *23 November 2021*
Published: *08 December 2021*

Citation:
Thom RE, Eastaugh LS, O'Brien LM, Ulaeto DO, Findlay JS, Smither SJ, Phelps AL, Stapleton HL, Hamblin KA and Weller SA (2021) Corrigendum: Evaluation of the SARS-CoV-2 Inactivation Efficacy Associated With Buffers From Three Kits Used on High-Throughput RNA Extraction Platforms. Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol. 11:813442. doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2021.813442

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, high throughput, PCR, biosafety, laboratory-acquired infection, clinical diagnosis

A Corrigendum on

Evaluation of the SARS-CoV-2 Inactivation Efficacy Associated With Buffers From Three Kits Used on High-Throughput RNA Extraction Platforms

By Thom RE, Eastaugh LS, O'Brien LM, Ulaeto DO, Findlay JS, Smither SJ, Phelps AL, Stapleton HL, Hamblin KA and Weller SA (2021). Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol. 11:716436. doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2021.716436

In the original article, there was a mistake in **Table 1***: Protocols tested for assessing inactivation using lysis buffers* as published. During the publication process the components for each of the three kits tested in this study (as stated in the 'Reagents' and 'Active virucidal components' columns), were unclearly formatted. The corrected **Table 1***: Protocols tested for assessing inactivation using lysis buffers* appears below.

The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.

TABLE 1 | Protocols tested for assessing inactivation using lysis buffers.

Manufacturer, RNA extraction kit, Platform	Reagents (volume/sample)	Active virucidal components*	Reagent: Sample ratio
Qiagen, QIAamp 96 Virus QIAcube HT Kit (Cat #: 57731), Qiagen Qiacube HT. *(Referred to here as Qiagen protocol)*	ACL buffer (190 µl) ATL buffer (100 µl) Proteinase K (20 µl) Carrier RNA (5 µl) MS2 (10 µl)	GITC 30 - <50% 1 - <3% SDS	1.6: 1
ThermoFisher, MagMax Pathogen RNA/DNA kit (Cat #: 4462359), Kingfisher Flex. *(Referred to here as MagMax Protocol 1)*	Lysis binding buffer (350 µl) Isopropanol (300 µl) Carrier RNA (2 µl) Water (100 µl) MS2 (10 µl)	GITC 55-80% <0.001% Acrylamide Zwittergent 100% 2-propanol	3.8: 1
ThermoFisher, MagMax viral/pathogen nucleic acid isolation kit (Cat #: A48310), Kingfisher Flex. *(Referred to here as MagMax Protocol 2)*	Lysis binding buffer (265 µl) Proteinase K (5 µl) †Water (Magnetic beads) (10 µl) MS2 (10 µl)	GITC 55-80% <0.001% Acrylamide Zwittergent	1.4: 1

**As identified directly from components, manufacturer information, or inferred from the associated MSDS.*
†Water was used to replace the magnetic beads as the washing steps described below would not remove the beads and the beads interfered the read-out of the TCID-$_{50}$ assay.
GITC, Guanidinium thiocyanate; SDS, Sodium dodecyl sulphate.