Correction to: Wastewater treatment of food industries through constructed wetland: a review

S. Sehar¹

Published online: 14 September 2020
© Islamic Azad University (IAU) 2020

Correction to: International Journal of Environmental Science and Technology (2019) 16:6453–6472
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13762-019-02472-7>

There is a change in the authorship of the article since the original publication. A request from Dr. Nasser was received to remove his name from the authorship as he may not fully meet the authorship criteria. The authorship change has been approved by both authors. The correct authorship is mentioned above. Additionally, some minor corrections in Table 1 were made. The corrected table is given.

The following citation should be removed from the reference list.

Maltais-Landry G, Chazarenc F, Comeau Y, Troesch S, Brisson J (2007) Effects of artificial aeration, macrophyte species, and loading rate on removal efficiency in constructed wetland mesocosms treating fish farm wastewater. *J Environ Eng Sci* 6:409–414

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13762-019-02472-7>.

✉ S. Sehar
shamaseher@yahoo.com

¹ School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences,
The University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052,
Australia

Table 1 Application of various types of constructed wetland for food industry wastewater treatment

Type of wastewater (WW)	Location	Removal performance (%)					Hydraulic loading rate (m ³ /day)	Hydraulic retention time (days)	References	
		COD	BOD ₅	TSS	NO ₃ -N	NH ₄ -N				TP
Free water surface (FWS)										
Dairy WW	Canada	–	99	95	–	94	91	1000 l/day	15	Smith et al. (2006)
Potato farm WW	Canada	–	96	99	–	–	90	–	0.3 months	Bosak et al. (2016)
Sugar factory WW	Kenya	–	–	76	–	36	29	77 mm/day	–	Bojevcska and Tonderski (2007)
Dairy WW	Ireland	–	95.8	–	–	95.2	69.6	3.6–18.5	4	Dunne et al. (2005)
Aquaculture WW	China	–	–	73.2	43.8	14.3	13.1	–	–	Mahmood et al. (2016)
Aquaculture WW	Germany	31	–	67–72	–	–	41–53	1.46–4.37	0.5	Schulz et al. (2004)
Constructed wetlands with horizontal sub-surface flow (HF)										
Dairy WW	Italy	92.5	93.7	90.8	–	–	60.6	6.3	–	Mantovi et al. (2003)
Trout farm effluent	Germany	67.2	88.7	90.1	–9.7	82.9	40	0.9 l/s	–	Sindilariu et al. (2007)
Dairy WW	Canada	95.8	–	–	–	95.2	69.6	250	4	Vander Zaag et al. (2008)
Dairy WW	Italy	–	92	–	–	17	40	–	–	Gorra et al. (2014)
Winery WW	Spain	54.4	61.3	73.4	–	–	–	25.5 mm/day	–	De la Varga et al. (2013)
Dairy WW	Australia	–	66	95	–	–	–	–	–	Idris et al. (2012)
Constructed wetlands with vertical sub-surface flow (VF)										
Livestock WW	China	–	81.3	77.1	66.6	61.7	48.9	0.4	–	He et al. (2006)
Aquaculture WW	China	–	70.5	81.9	68	61.5	20	–	–	Li et al. (2007)
Oil-rich farm WW	USA	94	96	97	–	–	73	–	5	Travis et al. (2012)
Aquaculture WW	Canada	56	53	39	–	–	58	1 cm/day	–	Snow et al. (2010)
Piggery and dairy WW	Japan	91–96	94–98	84–97	–	40–85	71–90	1 cm/day	–	Zhang et al. (2016)
Winery WW	Spain	71.6	67.5	87	–	–	57.6	17.6	–	Serrano et al. (2011)
Livestock WW	China	62.4	–	86.5	–	95	80	0.125	–	Zhu et al. (2012)
Dairy WW	Canada	–	–	–	82	–	58	–	–	Kantawanichkul and Somprasert (2005)
Cheese factory WW	Italy	80.4	80.3	80.3	81.7	39.1	–	0.05 m/day	5	Comino et al. (2011)
Hybrid constructed wetlands (HCW)										
Milking parlour WW	Japan	88	89	98	–	–	76	4.5	–	Sharma et al. (2010)
Vinegar production WW	Slovenia	67	66	–	83	–	62	20	15	Justin et al. (2009)
Pig farm WW	Mexico	86.3	–	64.5	–	85	77.9	–	10	Mora-Orozco et al. (2018)
Pig farm WW	Italy	79	–	–	53	63	61	–	0.5	Borin et al. (2013)