frontiers | Frontiers in Nutrition

TYPE Correction
PUBLISHED 23 August 2024
DOI 10.3389/fnut.2024.1469028



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
R. Pandiselvam,
Central Plantation Crops Research Institute (ICAR), India

*CORRESPONDENCE
Moo-hyeog Im
✉ imh0119@daegu.ac.kr

RECEIVED 23 July 2024
ACCEPTED 07 August 2024
PUBLISHED 23 August 2024

CITATION
Park M, Kim H, Kim M and Im M-h (2024) Corrigendum: Reduction in residual cyantraniliprole levels in spinach after various washing and blanching methods.
*Front. Nutr.* 11:1469028.
doi: 10.3389/fnut.2024.1469028



# Corrigendum: Reduction in residual cyantraniliprole levels in spinach after various washing and blanching methods

Minsoo Park, Hyeonjun Kim, Myungheon Kim and Moo-hyeog Im*

Department of Food Engineering, Daegu University, Gyenogsan, South Korea

KEYWORDS

**cyantraniliprole, washing, blanching, pesticide residue, spinach**

A Corrigendum on
Reduction in residual cyantraniliprole levels in spinach after various washing and blanching methods

by Park, M., Kim, H., Kim, M., and Im, M.-h. (2022). *Front. Nutr.* 9:948671. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2022.948671

In the published article, there was an error in "Table 1. Recovery of cyantraniliprole in spinach" as published. The figure listed in the column LOQ read as 0.030. The corrected figure should read as 0.003. The corrected Table and its caption appear below.

In the published article, there was an error in **Materials and methods**, "*UHPLC-MS/MS analysis*." The incorrect text reads as "MRM transitions were used as follows. The precursor ion m/z 473 and product ion m/z 284 were used for quantitative analysis, and the precursor ion m/z 442 and product ion m/z 177 m/z were used for qualitative analysis." This should be written as "MRM transitions were used as follows. The precursor ion was 473 m/z. Three product ions with good sensitivity were selected as qualitative and quantitative ions. Product ion 284 m/z was used for quantitative analysis, and the product ion m/z 442 and 177 m/z were used for qualitative analysis."

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.

## Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

10.3389/fnut.2024.1469028

TABLE 1 Recovery of cyantraniliprole in spinach.

| Compound | Fortification (mg/kg) | Recovery ± SD[a] (%) | CV[b] (%) | LOQ[c] (mg/kg) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cyantraniliprole | 0.003 | 97.61 ± 4.51 | 4.62 | 0.003 |
| | 0.03 | 96.76 ± 1.17 | 1.21 | |
| | 0.15 | 109.37 ± 1.83 | 1.67 | |

[a]Standard deviation.
[b]Coefficient of variation.
[c]Limit of quantitation.