



Corrigendum: Bioassay-Guided Interpretation of Antimicrobial Compounds in Kumu, a TCM Preparation From *Picrasma quassioides*' Stem via UHPLC-Orbitrap-Ion Trap Mass Spectrometer Combined With Fragmentation and Retention Time Calculation

Haibo Hu^{1,2*}, Changling Hu³, Jinnian Peng², Alokesh Kumar Ghosh¹, Ajmal Khan¹, Dan Sun^{1,4} and Walter Luyten^{1*}

OPEN ACCESS

Edited and reviewed by:

Mukhlesur Rahman,
University of East London,
United Kingdom

*Correspondence:

Haibo Hu
haibo.hu@kuleuven.be
Walter Luyten
walter.luyten@kuleuven.be

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Ethnopharmacology,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Pharmacology

Received: 15 March 2022

Accepted: 29 March 2022

Published: 25 April 2022

Citation:

Hu H, Hu C, Peng J, Ghosh AK,
Khan A, Sun D and Luyten W (2022)
Corrigendum: Bioassay-Guided
Interpretation of Antimicrobial
Compounds in Kumu, a TCM
Preparation From *Picrasma
quassioides*' Stem via UHPLC-
Orbitrap-Ion Trap Mass Spectrometer
Combined With Fragmentation and
Retention Time Calculation.
Front. Pharmacol. 13:897243.
doi: 10.3389/fphar.2022.897243

¹Department of Biology, Animal Physiology and Neurobiology Section, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium, ²National Engineering Research Center for Modernization of Traditional Chinese Medicine—Hakka Medical Resources Branch, School of Pharmacy, Gannan Medical University, Ganzhou, China, ³Laboratory for Functional Foods and Human Health, Center for Excellence in Postharvest Technologies, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, North Carolina Research Campus, Kannapolis, NC, United States, ⁴College of Life Sciences, NanKai University, Tianjin, China

Keywords: *Picrasma quassioides*, kumu, beta-carboline, orbitrap elite, MS fragmenter, fragmentation prediction

A Corrigendum on

Bioassay-Guided Interpretation of Antimicrobial Compounds in Kumu, a TCM Preparation From *Picrasma quassioides*' Stem via UHPLC-Orbitrap-Ion Trap Mass Spectrometer Combined With Fragmentation and Retention Time Calculation

by Hu, H., Hu, C., Peng, J., Ghosh, A. K., Khan, A., Sun, D. and Luyten, W. (2021). *Front. Pharmacol.* 12:761751. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2021.761751

In the original article, there was a mistake in **Table 3** as published. The IC₅₀, and MBC calculations of positive controls were unintentionally incorrect when generated by software Graphpad, and may make people confused about their high IC₅₀ values in the original manuscript. Hence, the tests of these compounds were repeated twice again to confirm these results. The corrected **Table 3** 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.

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.

Copyright © 2022 Hu, Hu, Peng, Ghosh, Khan, Sun and Luyten. 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) and the copyright owner(s) 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.

TABLE 3 | Antimicrobial activity ($\mu\text{g/ml}$) of three β -carbolines.

Microbials	Methylnigakinone (2)		Nigakinone (10)		β -Carboline-1-carboxylic acid (25)		Positive control ^a	
	IC50	MBC	IC50	MBC	IC50	MBC	IC ₅₀	MBC
<i>S. aureus</i>	205.70	>500	55.35	>125	47.70	>125	0.28	>125
<i>S. epidermidis</i>	NT	NT	69.18	>125	50.88	>125	0.49	125
<i>M. luteus</i>	137.10	>250	87.29	>250	33.99	64	2.63	>64
<i>L. innocua</i>	NT	NT	35.04	>250	117.80	>125	0.59	>125
<i>E. faecalis</i>	109.00	>500	50.07	>125	70.66	>125	9.44 ^b	125 ^b
<i>B. cereus</i>	102.40	>250	38.75	>250	30.48	>125	0.02	>125
<i>E. coli</i>	NT	NT	NT	NT	19.17	>125	0.02	<3.91
<i>P. aeruginosa</i>	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	0.02	7.81
<i>S. sonnei</i>	NT	NT	NT	NT	14.81	>125	0.02	31.25
<i>S. flexneri</i>	194.80	>250	29.99	>250	3.96	125	0.02	<3.91
<i>A. baumannii</i>	NT	NT	NT	NT	30.28	>125	0.17	15.62
<i>E. aerogenes</i>	NT	NT	NT	NT	93.65	>125	0.04	>125
<i>B. diminuta</i>	NT	NT	10.46	>64	4.50	64	2.26	>64
<i>A. hydrophila</i>	NT	NT	68.64	>64	10.03	64	<0.01	0.02
<i>S. enterica</i> subsp. <i>enterica</i>	NT	NT	490.12	>500	19.34	>64	0.01	2.00
<i>C. parapsilosis</i>	236.00	>500	201.50	>500	NT	NT	0.13 ^c	12.56 ^c
<i>C. albicans</i>	356.90	>500	493.80	>500	NT	NT	0.01 ^c	12.56 ^c
<i>C. auris</i>	32.82	>125	31.91	>125	NT	NT	0.10 ^c	>50 ^c
<i>C. glabrata</i>	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	0.12 ^c	>12.56 ^c
<i>S. cerevisiae</i>	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	0.44 ^c	>50 ^c

^aPositive control: Ciprofloxacin.^bChloramphenicol.^cMiconazole.