CORRECTION

Correction to: Evaluation of properties and specific energy consumption of spinifex-derived lignocellulose fibers produced using different mechanical processes

Katarzyna Kępa · Céline M. Chaléat · Nasim Amiralian ·
Warren Batchelor · Lisbeth Grøndahl · Darren J. Martin

Published online: 4 February 2020
© Springer Nature B.V. 2020

Correction to:

Cellulose (2019) 26:6555–6569

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10570-019-02567-x>

Due to an equipment error, the values for the energy consumption of samples which were subjected to the milling process (presented in Table 2) are incorrect in the original publication. The value for sample M-20 is 20.2 kWh/kg and for sample M-40 is 33.2 kWh/kg.

Those corrections will respectively affect values for other “dual processed” samples, which have been extruded and then milled, i.e., X-M samples, as the energy of these is the sum of energies for combined extrusion and milling processes. Finally, as a conclusion for this aspect of the publication, it should be

The original article can be found online at
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10570-019-02567-x>.

K. Kępa · C. M. Chaléat · N. Amiralian · L. Grøndahl ·
D. J. Martin (✉)
Australian Institute for Bioengineering and
Nanotechnology, The University of Queensland, Building
75, Corner of College and Cooper Road, Brisbane,
QLD 4072, Australia
e-mail: darren.martin@uq.edu.au

W. Batchelor
Department of Chemical Engineering, Bioresource
Processing Research Institute of Australia, Monash
University, Melbourne, VIC 3800, Australia

L. Grøndahl
School of Chemistry and Molecular Biosciences, The
University of Queensland, Building 68, Cooper Road,
Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia

Table 2 Mechanical and physical properties and energy consumption of handsheets produced with different processing methods

Sample	Tensile Index (Nm g ⁻¹)	Strain at Break (%)	Tensile Strength (MPa)	Density (g cm ⁻³)	Porosity (%)	Sample thickness (μm)	Crystallinity Index (%)	Energy Consumption (kWh kg ⁻¹) ^d
H	84 ± 10	3.1 ± 0.7	84 ± 10	1.00 ± 0.02 ^b	31 ± 2 ^b	85 ± 3	72 ^a	43.3
X-1	32 ± 4 ^c	1.8 ± 0.4 ^c	25 ± 3 ^c	0.75 ± 0.05 ^b	48 ± 4 ^b	116 ± 9	74 ^a	0.6
X-3	40 ± 2	2.1 ± 0.3	32 ± 2	0.82 ± 0.05 ^b	44 ± 3 ^b	107 ± 5	74 ^a	1.3
X-6	40 ± 3	1.8 ± 0.4	36 ± 3	0.91 ± 0.05 ^c	38 ± 4 ^c	92 ± 5	72 ^a	2.9
X-10	46 ± 8	2.0 ± 0.2	40 ± 7	0.88 ± 0.06 ^c	40 ± 4 ^c	94 ± 7	73 ^a	5.0
X-3-M-20	77 ± 7	3.2 ± 0.8	83 ± 8	1.09 ± 0.05 ^c	25 ± 4 ^c	79 ± 4	72 ^a	21.5
X-6-M-20	81 ± 5	3.5 ± 0.6	90 ± 6	1.11 ± 0.06 ^c	24 ± 4 ^c	85 ± 6	70 ^a	23.1
X-10-M-20	79 ± 5	3.3 ± 0.5	85 ± 5	1.08 ± 0.05 ^c	26 ± 3 ^c	88 ± 3	71 ^a	25.2
M-20	80 ± 4	3.0 ± 0.3	80 ± 4	1.0 ± 0.1 ^c	31 ± 7 ^c	99 ± 11	71 ^a	20.2 ^a
M-40	82 ± 4	2.8 ± 0.5	87 ± 4	1.07 ± 0.09 ^c	26 ± 6 ^c	80 ± 7	68 ^a	33.2 ^a

Number of replicates for value, $n = a:2$, $b:5$; $c:9$, $n = 10$ otherwise

^d Value calculated based on a single experiment

noted that the milling process is less energy intensive compared to high-pressure homogenization.

The correct version of Table 2 is provided in this article.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.