CORRECTION



Correction to: Comparative testis structure and function in three representative mice strains

Carolina Felipe Alves de Oliveira¹ · Nathalia de Lima e Martins Lara¹ · Bárbara Ramalho Ladeira Cardoso¹ · Luiz Renato de França¹ · Gleide Fernandes de Avelar¹

Published online: 2 January 2021 © Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2020

Erratum to: Cell and Tissue Research https://doi.org/10.1007/s00441-020-03239-0

The authors regret that in our published paper entitled "Comparative testis structure and function in three representative mice strains." Cell and Tissue Research, 2020 Jul 14; the Tables 1, 3 and 4 as well as Fig. 2 are presenting some inaccurate information.

Specifically, the data referring to seminiferous tubules diameter and cell counts need to be corrected. However, as detailed in the "Material and Methods" section, these data are used for calculating quantitative testicular parameters, such as the total length of seminiferous tubule per testis and per testis gram; cell ratios; Sertoli cell efficiency and numbers; and daily sperm production per testis and per gram of testis. Although imperative, the replacement of the absolute values of each of these cited parameters, in overall, did not change the comparative observations and the biological context of our results. Therefore, the error does not affect the interpretation of the results or the scientific conclusions of the article in any way.

The authors would like to apologize for any inconvenience made by this mistake.

Therefore, in our article we make the following corrigendum in the text:

- 1. Replacement of Tables 1, 3 and 4 showing the correct values for tubular diameter, total length of seminiferous tubule per testis and per testis gram and cell counts and ratios.
- 2. Replacement of Fig. 2 with the correct values for Sertoli cell efficiency and numbers and daily sperm production per testis and per gram of testis. Consequently, the sub-title must be corrected as follows (for the changes, see underlined text):

As a consequence of the tables and figure alterations, the text has the following changes (for the changes, see underlined text).

- 3. Page 6, Results, Biometric data and testis morphometry, Line 18:
- 4. Page 6, Results, Cell counts and daily sperm production, Line 2:
- 5. Page 6, Results, Cell counts and daily sperm production, Line 6:
- 6. Page 6, Results, Cell counts and daily sperm production, Line 10:
- 7. Page 10, Discussion, paragraph 3, Line 5:
- 8. Page 10, Discussion, paragraph 3, Line 10:
- 9. Page 10, Discussion, paragraph 4, Line 1:
- 10. Page 10, Discussion, paragraph 4, Line 6:

The original article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1007/s00441-020-03239-0.

Gleide Fernandes de Avelar gleideav@yahoo.com.br

¹ Laboratory of Cellular Biology Department of Morphology, Institute of Biological Sciences, Federal University of Minas Gerais, MG, Belo Horizonte, Brazil Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard tojurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Table 1Biometric and
morphometric data in
three different mice strains
 $(mean \pm SEM)$

| | C57BL/6 | Swiss | BALB/c | |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Body weight (g) | 25 ± 0.6^{a} | 39 ± 0.5^{b} | 27 ± 0.4^{a} | |
| Testis weight (mg) | 91.5 ± 1.8^{a} | 111.3 ± 3.2^{b} | 105 ± 1.6^{b} | |
| Gonadosomatic index (%) | 0.73 ± 0.01^{a} | $0.57\pm0.02^{\rm b}$ | $0.79 \pm 0.01^{\circ}$ | |
| Epididymis weight (mg) | 41.8 ± 2^{a} | 54.2 ± 2.2^{b} | 41.2 ± 2.6^{a} | |
| Seminal vesicle weight (mg) | 217 ± 13^{a} | 430 ± 20^{b} | $292 \pm 19^{\circ}$ | |
| Anogenital index | 4.5 ± 0.07^{a} | 3.6 ± 0.14^{b} | 4.2 ± 0.13^{a} | |
| Volumetric density (%) | | | | |
| Seminiferous tubules | 93.3 ± 0.5^{a} | 91.1 ± 0.7^{b} | 92.1 ± 0.4^{ab} | |
| Tunica propria | 2.77 ± 0.1^{a} | 3.15 ± 0.1^{b} | 2.97 ± 0.1^{ab} | |
| Seminiferous epithelium | 81.5 ± 0.6^{a} | 77.5 ± 0.5^{b} | 79.7 ± 0.7^{ab} | |
| Lumen | 9.0 ± 0.5 | 10.4 ± 0.5 | 9.4 ± 0.7 | |
| Intertubular compartment | 6.5 ± 0.4^{a} | 8.9 ± 0.7^{b} | 7.9 ± 0.4^{ab} | |
| Leydig cell | 3.7 ± 0.2^{a} | 5.3 ± 0.4^{b} | 3.95 ± 0.4^{ab} | |
| Blood vessels | 2.1 ± 0.2 | 2.4 ± 0.1 | 2.6 ± 0.3 | |
| Lymphatic space | 0.5 ± 0.1^{a} | 1.1 ± 0.3^{ab} | 0.9 ± 0.1^{b} | |
| Macrophages | 0.96 ± 0.03^{a} | 1.10 ± 0.09^{ab} | $1.17\pm0.05^{\rm b}$ | |
| Tubular diameter (µm) | 216 ± 2^a | 228 ± 2^{b} | 210 ± 3^{a} | |
| Seminiferous epithelium height (µm) | 78.9 ± 0.9 | 77.3 ± 1.2 | 75.8 ± 0.5 | |
| Total length of seminiferous tubule per testis (m) | 2.4 ± 0.1 | 2.4 ± 0.1 | 2.6 ± 0.1 | |
| Length of seminiferous tubule per testis gram (m) | 26.5 ± 0.8^a | $22.5 \pm 1.0^{\rm b}$ | $26.6\pm0.8^{\rm a}$ | |

Different letters indicate significant differences (p < 0.05) among groups

Table 3 Cell counts and ratios per seminiferous tubule cross sections at stage VII of the seminiferous epithelium cycle, in three different mice strains (mean \pm SEM)

| | C57BL/6 | Swiss | BALB/c |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Sertoli cell nucleoli | 6.5 ± 0.2^{ab} | 6.9 ± 0.2^{a} | 6.0 ± 0.2^{b} |
| Spermatogonia | 0.9 ± 0.1^{a} | 1.7 ± 0.1^{b} | 1.5 ± 0.1^{b} |
| Pre-leptotene spermatocytes | 25.5 ± 0.8^a | $28.2\pm0.7^{\rm b}$ | 30.1 ± 0.6^{b} |
| Pachytene spermatocytes | 25.3 ± 0.7^a | 28 ± 0.8^{b} | 26.7 ± 0.7^{ab} |
| Round spermatids | 68 ± 2.9^{a} | 78 ± 2.4^{b} | 63 ± 1.8^{a} |
| Meiotic index | 2.7 ± 0.1^{a} | 2.8 ± 0.1^{a} | 2.3 ± 0.1^{b} |
| | | | |

Different letters indicate significant differences (p < 0.05) among groups

 Table 4
 Comparative data related to biometry, testis stereology and spermatogenesis in mice strains already investigated

| Parameters | C57BL/6 ^a | Swiss ^b | BALB/c ^c | C3H ^d | ICR ^e | NMRI ^f | Parkes ^g | CF-1 ^h |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Body weight (g) | 25 | 39 | 27 | 25 | 37 | 25-31 | 33 | 35 |
| Testis weight (mg) | 92 | 111 | 105 | 78 | 125 | 140 | 100 | 120 |
| Gonadosomatic Index (%) | 0.73 | 0.57 | 0.79 | 0.61 | 0.68 | 1.04 | 0.60 | 0.69 |
| Seminiferous tubules (%) | 93.3 | 91.1 | 92.1 | | 92.5 | | | |
| Leydig cell (%) | 3.7 | 5.3 | 3.9 | | 3.9 | | | |
| Tubular diameter (µm) | 216 | 228 | 210 | | 202 | 211-217 | 200 | 199 |
| Sertoli cells per gram of testis ($\times 10^6$) | 43 | 39 | 40 | | | | | |
| Sertoli cells per testis ($\times 10^6$) | 3.9 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.1 | | | | |
| Sertoli cell efficiency | 10.5 | 11.5 | 10.5 | | | | | |
| Pre-meiotic phase ^h (%) | 23.8 | 24 | 23.1 | 28.5-33 | 24.8 | | | |
| Meiotic phase ⁱ (%) | 9.1 | 11.3 | 11.2 | 10-10.5 | 10.1 | | | |
| Post-meiotic phase ^j (%) | 67.1 | 64.7 | 65.7 | 57-61 | 65.1 | | | |
| Meiotic index ^k | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.3 | | | 2.1 | | |
| Spermatogenic cycle length (days) | 8.7 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 8.6 | | | | |
| Spermatogenesis total duration (days) | 39.2 | 39.6 | 40.1 | 38.7 | | | | |
| DSP^{l} per gram of testis (×10 ⁶) | 52 | 50 | 47 | | | | | 29 |
| DSP ¹ per testis ($\times 10^6$) | 4.7 | 5.4 | 4.6 | | | | | |

^aPresent paper

^bPresent paper

^cPresent paper

^dOakberg, 1956; Clermont & Trott, 1969; Allan et al., 2004

^eAvelar et al., 2000; Korejo et al., 2016

^fJafari et al., 2017; Khorsandi & Oroojan et al., 2018, Fisher et al., 2019

^gJoshi & Singh, 201

^hCagen et al., 1999; Obregon et al., 2007

^hCombined stages frequencies after spermiation and prior to methaphase

ⁱMeiotic division I through meiosis I

^jCombined stages frequencies after completion of meiosis until spermiation

^kMeasured as the number of round spermatids produced per pachytene primary spermatocyte (presumptive germ cell loss in parenthesis) ¹DSP=daily sperm production Fig. 2 Sertoli cell and sperm production parameters in the three mice strains investigated (a-e). As it can be noted, the only statistical difference observed was on daily sperm production per testis (e), which was significantly increased in Swiss mice (*) in comparison to the C57BL/6. T test was performed to compare differences between C57BL/6 and Swiss strains (p < 0.05) due to Gaussian distribution in these groups"

