



# Corrigendum: Iron Availability Influences Silicon Isotope Fractionation in Two Southern Ocean Diatoms (*Proboscia inermis* and *Eucampia antarctica*) and a Coastal Diatom (*Thalassiosira pseudonana*)

### Scott Meyerink<sup>1\*</sup>, Michael J. Ellwood<sup>1\*</sup>, William A. Maher<sup>2</sup> and Robert Strzepek<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research School of Earth Sciences, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia, <sup>2</sup> Ecochemistry Laboratory, Institute for Applied Ecology, University of Canberra, Canberra, ACT, Australia

Keywords: silicon isotopes, Southern Ocean, diatom, isotope fractionation, iron

### A corrigendum on

**Iron Availability Influences Silicon Isotope Fractionation in Two Southern Ocean Diatoms** (*Proboscia inermis* and *Eucampia antarctica*) and a Coastal Diatom (*Thalassiosira pseudonana*) by Meyerink, S., Ellwood, M. J., Maher, W. A., and Strzepek, R. (2017). Front. Mar. Sci. 4:217. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2017.00217

## OPEN ACCESS

#### Edited and reviewed by:

Brivaela Moriceau, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), France

#### \*Correspondence:

Scott Meyerink scott.meyerink@anu.edu.au Michael J. Ellwood michael.ellwood@anu.edu.au

#### Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Marine Biogeochemistry, a section of the journal Frontiers in Marine Science

Received: 16 August 2017 Accepted: 17 August 2017 Published: 30 August 2017

#### Citation:

Meyerink S, Ellwood MJ, Maher WA and Strzepek R (2017) Corrigendum: Iron Availability Influences Silicon Isotope Fractionation in Two Southern Ocean Diatoms (Proboscia inermis and Eucampia antarctica) and a Coastal Diatom (Thalassiosira pseudonana). Front. Mar. Sci. 4:280. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2017.00280 In the original article, there was a mistake in **Table 1** as published. It seems that during the transcription of the data into **Table 1** an error occurred whereby three values from a different experiment were inadvertently added to the average silicon isotope data for iron-limited *Eucampia* antarctica experiment (*Eucampia antarctica* 4.4 nmol  $L^{-1}$  Fe; 40 nmol  $L^{-1}$  DFB). The corrected **Table 1** appears below. Note that the dataset used to generate Figure 2 was not in error. The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way.

In the original article, the error in **Table 1** was translated through to a silicon isotope value quoted in the Abstract and the Results section of this manuscript. In the Abstract and in the Results section titled "Effects of Fe-Availability on Si Isotope Fractionation" the value of  $-1.57 \pm 0.50\%$  (n = 11) is in error as result of the error in **Table 1**. The correct value should be  $-1.82 \pm 0.36\%$  (n = 8).

A correction has been made to the Abstract and the following paragraph in the Results section titled "Effects of Fe-Availability on Si Isotope Fractionation":

Abstract: The fractionation of silicon (Si) isotopes was measured in two Southern Ocean diatoms (*Proboscia inermis* and *Eucampia antarctica*) and a coastal diatom (*Thalassiosira pseudonana*) that were grown under varying iron (Fe) concentrations. Varying Fe concentrations had no effect on the Si isotope enrichment factor ( $\varepsilon$ ) in *T. pseudonana*, whilst *E. antarctica* and *P. inermis* exhibited significant variations in the value of  $\varepsilon$  between Fe-replete and Fe-limited conditions. Mean  $\varepsilon$  values in *P. inermis* and *E. antarctica* decreased from ( $\pm 1$  SD)  $-1.11 \pm 0.15\%$  and  $-1.42 \pm 0.41\%$  (respectively) under Fe-replete conditions, to  $-1.38 \pm 0.27\%$  and  $-1.82 \pm 0.36\%$  (respectively) under Fe-limiting conditions. These variations likely arise from adaptations in diatoms arising from the nutrient status of their environment. *T. pseudonana* is a coastal clone typically accustomed to low Si but high Fe conditions whereas *E. antarctica* and *P. inermis* are typically accustomed to

onana
nai
5
ą
ğ
õ
g
Sil
9.
SS
a la
ha
F
p
ਯ
'n
ğ.
ct
đ
1t
4
ja.
ž
a
9
щ
, v
ji.
ЦE
ij,
m,
<sup>S</sup>
SO
Ą
2
F
Q
, S
ъ
e
.⊑
ē
×
Ð
5
Ĩţ
ĉ
<u>e</u> .
G
Ę,
Φ
8
Ĕ
<u>.</u>
ïŌ
0
Ĕ
Ē
Б
Ę.
Ę
sults
lesults
Results
nd Results
and Results
is and Results
ons and Results
ations and Results
ntrations and Results
entrations and Results
ncentrations and Results
oncentrations and Results
concentrations and Results
Fe concentrations and Results
s, Fe concentrations and Results
tes, Fe concentrations and Results:
ates, Fe concentrations and Results
h rates, Fe concentrations and Results
wth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
owth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
s, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
ons, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
tions, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
ditions, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
onditions, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
conditions, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
re conditions, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
ture conditions, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
ulture conditions, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
Culture conditions, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
1   Culture conditions, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
E1   Culture conditions, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
iLE 1   Culture conditions, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results
ABLE 1   Culture conditions, growth rates, Fe concentrations and Results

Fe <sup>/</sup> ol L <sup>-1</sup> )	Number of replicate cultures	μ (d <sup>-1</sup> )	PFD (μ <i>E</i> m <sup>−2</sup> s <sup>−1</sup> )	2	δ <sup>30</sup> Si <sub>NBS28</sub> (per mil)	f	σ	Fractionation factor (ε, ‰)	٩
,369	0	$0.35 \pm 0.02$	60	0	$-0.55 \pm 0.16$	$0.97 \pm 0.06$	$0.9989 \pm 0.0002$	$-1.11 \pm 0.15$	
0.09	2	$0.09 \pm 0.02$	60	Ŋ	$-0.6 \pm 0.23$	$0.68 \pm 0.06$	$0.9986 \pm 0.0003$	$-1.38 \pm 0.27$	0.08
,369	4	$0.32 \pm 0.02$	50	12	$-0.65 \pm 0.33$	$0.7 \pm 0.02$	$0.9986 \pm 0.0004$	$-1.42 \pm 0.41$	
0.2	4	$0.07 \pm 0.01$	50	œ	$-1.04 \pm 0.32$	$0.72 \pm 0.07$	$0.9982 \pm 0.0004$	$-1.82 \pm 0.36$	0.04
418	-	1.52*	133	ო	$0.09 \pm 0.08$	0.60	$0.9994 \pm 0.0001$	$-0.59 \pm 0.11$	
208	-	1.48*	133	ო	$0.13 \pm 0.37$	0.65	$0.9995 \pm 0.0005$	$-0.51 \pm 0.46$	0.8
67	-	0.85*	133	ო	$0.13 \pm 0.08$	0.67	$0.9995 \pm 0.0001$	$-0.51 \pm 0.1$	0.39
25	2	$0.72 \pm 0.01$	133	9	$-0.07 \pm 0.08$	$0.87 \pm 0.01$	$0.9993 \pm 0.0001$	$-0.65 \pm 0.08$	0.42
				9	$0.54 \pm 0.13$				
				ო	$0.53 \pm 0.02$				
				0	$0.54 \pm 0.11$				
Fe-replete. I	Because there was no differe	nce in $\varepsilon$ betwee	in replicate cultures,	the valu	e for $\varepsilon$ is the mean	of all cultures ±	1 SD. Fractionation fa	ctors were calculate	d from
	e' IL-1) 369 369 369 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37	e' Number of replicate ol L-1) cultures 369 3 369 3 369 4 3.2 4 1 18 1 18 1 37 1 37 1 37 2 35 36 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38	e'         Number of replicate         μ (d <sup>-1</sup> )           iL-1)         cultures         μ (d <sup>-1</sup> )           369         3         0.35 ± 0.02           369         2         0.09 ± 0.02           369         4         0.32 ± 0.02           369         1         1.52*           369         1         1.52*           369         1         0.07 ± 0.01           37         1         0.35 ± 0.02           37         2         0.07 ± 0.01           37         2         0.72 ± 0.01	e'         Number of replicate $\mu$ (d <sup>-1</sup> ) $PED$ i.L-1,         cuttures $\mu$ (d <sup>-1</sup> ) $PED$ 36.1         38.2         38.2 $0.35 \pm 0.02$ $60$ 36.3         3 $0.35 \pm 0.02$ $60$ $60$ 36.9         2 $0.09 \pm 0.02$ $60$ $60$ 36.9         4 $0.32 \pm 0.02$ $60$ 37         4 $0.07 \pm 0.01$ $50$ 37         1 $1.52^{*}$ $133$ 37         1 $0.85^{*}$ $133$ 37         2 $0.72 \pm 0.01$ $133$ 37         2 $0.72 \pm 0.01$ $133$	$e^{-}$ Number of replicate $\mu$ (d <sup>-1</sup> ) $FFD$ $n$ $IL^{-1}$ cultures $\mu$ (d <sup>-1</sup> ) $(\mu E m^{-2} s^{-1})$ $n$ $369$ $3$ $0.35 \pm 0.02$ $60$ $9$ $369$ $2$ $0.09 \pm 0.02$ $60$ $9$ $369$ $2$ $0.09 \pm 0.02$ $60$ $7$ $369$ $4$ $0.32 \pm 0.02$ $60$ $8$ $369$ $4$ $0.07 \pm 0.01$ $50$ $8$ $369$ $1$ $1.52^*$ $133$ $3$ $37$ $1$ $0.05 \pm 0.01$ $50$ $8$ $37$ $1$ $1.48^*$ $133$ $3$ $37$ $1$ $0.85^*$ $133$ $6$ $35$ $2$ $0.72 \pm 0.01$ $133$ $6$ $35$ $2$ $0.72 \pm 0.01$ $133$ $3$	e'         Number of replicate $\mu$ (d <sup>-1</sup> )         PFD $n$ $^{30}$ Sivesas           i.l1,         cultures $(\mu \in m^{-2} s^{-1})$ $(\mu \in m^{-2} s^{-1})$ $n$ $^{30}$ Sivesas           369         3         0.35 ± 0.02         60         9 $-0.55 \pm 0.16$ 369         3         0.35 ± 0.02         60         9 $-0.66 \pm 0.23$ 369         4         0.09 ± 0.02         60         12 $-0.66 \pm 0.23$ 369         4         0.32 ± 0.01         50         12 $-0.66 \pm 0.23$ 369         4         0.07 \pm 0.01         50         8 $-1.04 \pm 0.32$ 37         1         1.52*         133         3         0.13 \pm 0.08           37         1         1.48*         133         3         0.13 \pm 0.08           37         1         0.85*         133         3         0.13 \pm 0.03           37         1         0.365*         0.36         0.54 \pm 0.13           37         133         3         0.54 \pm 0.13           37         0.72 \pm 0.01         133         0.54 \pm 0.13           38         0.72 \pm 0.01 <td>e<sup>-</sup>         Number of replicate         μ (d<sup>-1</sup>)         refD         n         s<sup>30</sup>SiNBSS         f           ol L-1,         cultures         μ (d<sup>-1</sup>)         (μ f m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>)         m         s<sup>30</sup>SiNBSS         f           SiL         38         3         0.35 ± 0.02         60         9         -0.65 ± 0.16         0.97 ± 0.06           38         3         0.35 ± 0.02         60         5         -0.66 ± 0.23         0.68 ± 0.06           38         2         0.09 ± 0.02         60         5         -0.66 ± 0.23         0.68 ± 0.06           38         4         0.32 ± 0.02         60         7         -0.66 ± 0.23         0.74 ± 0.02           38         4         0.32 ± 0.01         50         8         -1.04 ± 0.32         0.72 ± 0.07           38         1         1         1.52*         133         3         0.13 ± 0.37         0.65           38         1         133         3         0.13 ± 0.37         0.65         0.65           38         1         133         3         0.13 ± 0.37         0.65         0.65           38         0.13 ± 0.02         0.54 ± 0.13         3         0.54 ± 0.13         0.65</td> <td>e<sup>4</sup>         Number of replicate old under all under         <math>\mu</math> (d<sup>-1</sup>)         PFD (<math>\mu</math> m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>)         <math>n</math> <math>3^{30}</math>SiNessa (per mi)         <math>r</math> <math>\alpha</math>           36)         3         0.35 ± 0.02         60         9         <math>-0.55 \pm 0.16</math>         0.3989 ± 0.0002         389         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.0004         0.388 ± 0.006         0.3985 ± 0.006<td>e<sup>4</sup>         Number of replicate         <math>\mu (d^{-1})</math>         PFD (<math>\mu \in m^{-2} s^{-1}</math>)         <math>n</math>         S<sup>30</sup> Shassa (per mi)         <math>f</math> <math>\alpha</math>         Fractionation factor (s, %)           31 L-1         autures         <math>\mu (d^{-1})</math> <math>(\mu \in m^{-2} s^{-1})</math> <math>\mu (d^{-1})</math> <math>(\mu \in m^{-2} s^{-1})</math> <math>(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2} s^{-1})</math> <math>(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2} s^{-2})</math> <math>(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2} s^{-2})</math> <math>(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2} s^{-2})</math> <math>(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2})</math></td></td>	e <sup>-</sup> Number of replicate         μ (d <sup>-1</sup> )         refD         n         s <sup>30</sup> SiNBSS         f           ol L-1,         cultures         μ (d <sup>-1</sup> )         (μ f m <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> )         m         s <sup>30</sup> SiNBSS         f           SiL         38         3         0.35 ± 0.02         60         9         -0.65 ± 0.16         0.97 ± 0.06           38         3         0.35 ± 0.02         60         5         -0.66 ± 0.23         0.68 ± 0.06           38         2         0.09 ± 0.02         60         5         -0.66 ± 0.23         0.68 ± 0.06           38         4         0.32 ± 0.02         60         7         -0.66 ± 0.23         0.74 ± 0.02           38         4         0.32 ± 0.01         50         8         -1.04 ± 0.32         0.72 ± 0.07           38         1         1         1.52*         133         3         0.13 ± 0.37         0.65           38         1         133         3         0.13 ± 0.37         0.65         0.65           38         1         133         3         0.13 ± 0.37         0.65         0.65           38         0.13 ± 0.02         0.54 ± 0.13         3         0.54 ± 0.13         0.65	e <sup>4</sup> Number of replicate old under all under $\mu$ (d <sup>-1</sup> )         PFD ( $\mu$ m <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> ) $n$ $3^{30}$ SiNessa (per mi) $r$ $\alpha$ 36)         3         0.35 ± 0.02         60         9 $-0.55 \pm 0.16$ 0.3989 ± 0.0002         389         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.006         0.388 ± 0.0004         0.388 ± 0.006         0.3985 ± 0.006 <td>e<sup>4</sup>         Number of replicate         <math>\mu (d^{-1})</math>         PFD (<math>\mu \in m^{-2} s^{-1}</math>)         <math>n</math>         S<sup>30</sup> Shassa (per mi)         <math>f</math> <math>\alpha</math>         Fractionation factor (s, %)           31 L-1         autures         <math>\mu (d^{-1})</math> <math>(\mu \in m^{-2} s^{-1})</math> <math>\mu (d^{-1})</math> <math>(\mu \in m^{-2} s^{-1})</math> <math>(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2} s^{-1})</math> <math>(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2} s^{-2})</math> <math>(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2} s^{-2})</math> <math>(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2} s^{-2})</math> <math>(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2})</math></td>	e <sup>4</sup> Number of replicate $\mu (d^{-1})$ PFD ( $\mu \in m^{-2} s^{-1}$ ) $n$ S <sup>30</sup> Shassa (per mi) $f$ $\alpha$ Fractionation factor (s, %)           31 L-1         autures $\mu (d^{-1})$ $(\mu \in m^{-2} s^{-1})$ $\mu (d^{-1})$ $(\mu \in m^{-2} s^{-1})$ $(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2} s^{-1})$ $(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2} s^{-2})$ $(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2} s^{-2})$ $(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2} s^{-2})$ $(\mu = m^{-2} s^{-2})$

6 utation since as a university in the meriod of the original offer information are system one database when are exercise the ference of an exercise of the ference of an exercise of the ference of an exercise of a system of a s High Si, High nitrate low Fe conditions. Growth induced variations in silicic acid  $(Si(OH)_4)$  uptake arising from Felimitation is the likely mechanism leading to Si-isotope variability in *E. antarctica* and *P. inermis*. The multiplicative effects of species diversity and resource limitation (e.g., Fe) on Si-isotope fractionation in diatoms can potentially alter the Si-isotope composition of diatom opal in diatomaceous sediments and sea surface Si(OH)<sub>4</sub>. This work highlights the need for further in vitro studies into intracellular mechanisms involved in Si(OH)<sub>4</sub> uptake, and the associated pathways for Si-isotope fractionation in diatoms.

Effects of Fe-Availability on Si Isotope Fractionation: Mean values for  $\varepsilon$  varied between the Fe-replete and Fe-limited conditions for the two Southern Ocean diatoms (Table 2). While there was some variability in the values of  $\varepsilon$  for *E. antarctica*, there was a significant difference in  $\varepsilon$  (p = 0.04) between Fe-replete and Fe-limited conditions, with mean  $\varepsilon$  values being more negative for Fe-limited cultures (Fe-limited,  $\varepsilon = -1.82 \pm 0.36\%$ ; Fe-replete,  $\varepsilon = -1.40 \pm 0.41\%$ )

(Table 1). Mean  $\varepsilon$  values were also more negative for *P. inermis* cultured under Fe-limited conditions (Fe-limited,  $\varepsilon = -1.38 \pm 0.27\%$ ; Fe-replete,  $\varepsilon = -1.11 \pm 0.15\%$ ). Both Fe-replete and Fe-limited datasets for *P. inermis* exhibited a significant difference at the 90% confidence interval (p = 0.08), and removing outliers from both Fe-replete and Fe-limited data sets for *P. inermis* makes the difference more significant (p = 0.04).

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

**Conflict of Interest Statement:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2017 Meyerink, Ellwood, Maher and Strzepek. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.