Correction to: Phosphorus Use Efficiency in Permanent Pastures in Andisols

Erika Vistoso¹ · Sergio Iraira¹ · Patricio Sandaña²

Published online: 3 September 2021

© Sociedad Chilena de la Ciencia del Suelo 2021

Correction to: Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s42729-021-00526-9>

Equation 5 and Fig. 2 as they appeared in this article as originally published stood in need of correction.

The correct Eq. 5 and Fig. 2 are provided below.
The original article has been updated.

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{P available} = ((\text{Olsen - P (mg kg}^{-1}\text{)}) * (10000 \times \text{depth} \times \text{BD}) + \text{P application rate} \\ (\text{kg P ha}^{-1}) \quad \quad \quad ((0.14 (\text{mg kg}^{-1})) \quad \quad \quad (1000000) \quad \quad \quad (\text{kg P ha}^{-1}) \end{array} \quad (5)$$

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42729-021-00526-9>.

✉ Erika Vistoso
evistoso@inia.cl

¹ Instituto de Investigaciones Agropecuarias, INIA Remehue, Ruta 5 Sur km 8 Norte, Osorno, Chile

² Institute of Plant Production and Protection, Universidad Austral de Chile, Campus Isla Teja, Valdivia, Chile

Fig. 2 Cumulative P utilization efficiency (PUTE) (a, b, c), P uptake efficiency (PUPE) (d, e, f) and P use efficiency (PUE) (g, h, i) in year 1, 2 and total in experiments 1 (left panels), 2 (middle panels) and 3 (right panels). With the exception of PUTE in c, PUTE, PUPE and PUE were averaged across P sources (phosphate rock (PR) and tri-

ple superphosphate (TSP)) according to ANOVA results (Table 1). In c, PUTE was disaggregated according to the significant Source x P rate interaction from ANOVA. Period: September 2013–October 2014 ($\pm$ standard error, $n=3$). Different letters indicate differences between P rates (within each year) obtained with the Fischer T test ($p=0.05$)