frontiers in Genetics

ERRATUM
published: 07 December 2020
doi: 10.3389/fgene.2020.628196

# Erratum: Infrared Spectrometry as a High-Throughput Phenotyping Technology to Predict Complex Traits in Livestock Systems

*Frontiers Production Office**

*Frontiers Media SA, Lausanne, Switzerland*

OPEN ACCESS

***Approved by:***
*Frontiers Editorial Office, Frontiers Media SA, Switzerland*

***Correspondence:**
*Frontiers Production Office*
*production.office@frontiersin.org*

***Specialty section:***
*This article was submitted to Livestock Genomics, a section of the journal Frontiers in Genetics*

***Received:*** *11 November 2020*
***Accepted:*** *11 November 2020*
***Published:*** *07 December 2020*

***Citation:***
*Frontiers Production Office (2020) Erratum: Infrared Spectrometry as a High-Throughput Phenotyping Technology to Predict Complex Traits in Livestock Systems. Front. Genet. 11:628196. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2020.628196*

**Keywords: beef cattle, dairy cattle, near-infrared, novel phenotypes, mid-infrared, spectral information**

**An Erratum on**

**Infrared Spectrometry as a High-Throughput Phenotyping Technology to Predict Complex Traits in Livestock Systems**
*by Bresolin, T., and Dórea, J. R. R. (2020). Front. Genet. 11:923. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2020.00923*

Due to a production error, an incorrect reference citation "Vanlierde et al. (2016)" was inserted in Table 5. It should be "Visentin et al. (2016)." The corrected **Table 5** appears below.

The publisher apologizes for this mistake. The original article has been updated.

## REFERENCES

Visentin, G., Penasa, M., Gottardo, P., Cassandro, M., and De Marchi, M. (2016). Predictive ability of mid-infrared spectroscopy for major mineral com-position and coagulation traits of bovine milk by using the uninformative variable selection algorithm. *J. Dairy Sci.* 99, 8137–8145. doi: 10.3168/jds.2016-11053

**TABLE 5 |** Number of samples (N) and coefficient of determination in the validation set for mineral contents using partial least square methodology.

| References | N | Breed | Validation* | Ca | K | Mg | Na | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Soyeurt et al. (2009) | 92 | Multibreed | LOOCV | 0.87 | 0.36 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.85 |
| Gottardo et al. (2015) | 208 | – | 10-F CV[b] | 0.55 | – | – | – | – |
| Toffanin et al. (2015) | 208 | Holstein | LOOCV | 0.53[c] | – | – | – | 0.70[c] |
| Bonfatti et al. (2016) | 689 | Simental | 10-F CV | 0.48 | 0.41 | 0.46 | – | 0.43 |
| Visentin et al. (2016) | 923 | Multibreed | R-Tr/Te[b] | 0.67 | 0.69 | 0.65 | 0.40 | 0.68 |
| Malacarne et al. (2018)[a] | 153 | Holstein | Tr/Te[b] | 0.25 | 0.34 | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.53 |
| Franzoi et al. (2019)[b] | 93 | Holstein | CV | 0.79 | 0.55 | 0.68 | 0.75 | 0.87 |
| Fleming et al. (2019) | 986 | Multibreed | 10- FCV | 0.25 | – | – | – | – |

*[a]Bulk milk samples. [b]Backward interval partial least squares (BiPLS), number of folds (n-F) in the cross-validation, leave-one-out cross-validation (LOOCV), train and test cross-validation defined by splitting the data set randomly (R-Tr/Te), external or independent validation. [c]Correlation coefficient (r) transformed to coefficient of determination (R2). *The validation strategy defined as "CV" was assigned for the reviewed paper that did not completely describe the validation method adopted or the authors defined that cross-validation was employed.*