

Erratum to: QTL mapping of carrot resistance to leaf blight with connected populations: stability across years and consequences for breeding

V. Le Clerc¹ · S. Marques¹ · A. Suel¹ · S. Huet¹ · L. Hamama¹ · L. Voisine¹ · E. Auperpin¹ · M. Jourdan¹ · L. Barrot² · R. Prieur³ · M. Briard¹

Published online: 18 May 2016
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2016

Erratum to: Theor Appl Genet (2015) 128:2177–2187
DOI 10.1007/s00122-015-2576-z

Unfortunately, the last column data of Table 2 of the above mentioned article was incorrectly published in the original version. The complete corrected Table 2 is given in the following page.

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s00122-015-2576-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-015-2576-z).

✉ V. Le Clerc
valerie.leclerc@agrocampus-ouest.fr

¹ Agrocampus-Ouest, UMR 1345 Institut de Recherche en Horticulture et Semences, SFR 4207 QUASAV, 42 rue Georges Morel, 49071 Beaucouze Cedex, France

² VILMORIN, Centre de recherche La Costière, 30210 Ledenon, France

³ HMCLAUSE, 1 Chemin du Moulin des Ronzières, 49800 La Bohalle, France

Table 2 QTLs detected in single or connected populations in Les Landes

Scoring year	Population	Code of the QTL ^a	1.5 LOD support interval (cM) ^b	Position (cM)	R^2 (%)	Global R^2 (%)	F test	Additive effect of allele		
								H1	K3	I2
2011	PC2	1	0–22.4	11.5	16.8	37.7	6.2	0.23		–0.23
		4–1	11.3–31.4	23.9	16.9		6.2	–0.23		0.23
		8–1	8–59.6	27.3	15.9		5.8	0.20		–0.20
	PC3	6–1	50.7–67.6	56.2	28.9	52.8	8.2	0.27	–0.27	
		8–1	35.5–39.1	37.7	43.8		13.3	0.34	–0.34	
		9–1	18.9–66.5	29.8	13.6		3.9	0.18	–0.18	
	PC2 and PC3 connected	1	0–20.5	10	19.2	52.5	10.4	0.29	0.07	–0.36
		2	34.1–49	49	6.6		3.3	0.11	0.06	–0.17
		4–1	10.5–27.4	14.8	12.6		6.6	–0.21	–0.00	0.21
		5	1.6–114.8	28.9	4.8		2.4	0.12	0.34	–0.46
		6–1	50.2–66.1	57	16.0		8.5	0.07	–0.38	0.31
		8–1	31.8–38.1	35.1	27		15.4	0.32	–0.30	–0.02
		9–1	29.4–51.7	40.2	8.7		4.5	0.19	–0.23	0.04
2014	PC2	1	10.5–24.1	17.2	34.8	52.7	12.4	0.45		–0.45
		4–1	10.5–39.6	18.3	18		6.1	–0.28		0.28
		8–2?	2.7–58.8	11	11		3.8	0.20		–0.20
		9–2	36.5–68.4	52	12.1		4.2	0.21		–0.21
	PC3	4–2	29.4–41.3	36.1	16.6	51.7	4.4	–0.20	0.20	
		6–1	44.2–67.6	60.1	14		3.7	0.18	–0.18	
		6–2	0–15.9	0.7	14		3.8	0.15	–0.15	
		8–1?	26.1–62.9	47	24		6.4	0.24	–0.24	
		9–2	49.7–65	59.4	18		4.8	0.20	–0.20	
	PC2 and PC3 connected	1	9.3–24.6	20	23.1	43	12.5	0.38	0.28	–0.66
		4–1	14.4–51	19.5	14		7.2	–0.30	–0.01	0.31
		4–2 ^c	15.2–39.6	34.5	10.6		5.5	–0.31	0.15	0.16
		8–1	23.7–54.9	30	10.8		5.4	0.25	–0.20	–0.05
		8–2?	2–52.5	5.7	10.2		5.2	0.28	0.01	–0.29
	9–2	51.3–69.7	61.7	11.5		5.8	0.27	–0.17	–0.1	

R^2 and global R^2 are the phenotypic part of the variation explained, respectively by one or all the QTLs detected at one scoring date

^a Correspond to the number of the linkage group followed by a number when more than two QTLs were identified on the same linkage group

[?] Is added when affiliation is uncertain

^b LOD confidence intervals and positions correspond to the ones on consensus map

^c QTLs in italic were not taken into account in the calcul of global R^2 . QTLs identified with choice of manual cofactors