



Erratum to: CDOM fluorescence as a proxy of DOC concentration in natural waters: a comparison of four contrasting tropical systems

Emma Rochelle Newall, F. D. Hulot, Jean-Louis Janeau, A. Merroune

► To cite this version:

Emma Rochelle Newall, F. D. Hulot, Jean-Louis Janeau, A. Merroune. Erratum to: CDOM fluorescence as a proxy of DOC concentration in natural waters: a comparison of four contrasting tropical systems. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 2014, 186 (5), pp.3303 - 3304. 10.1007/s10661-014-3665-1 . hal-02633861

HAL Id: hal-02633861

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02633861>

Submitted on 27 May 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Erratum to: CDOM fluorescence as a proxy of DOC concentration in natural waters: a comparison of four contrasting tropical systems

E. Rochelle-Newall · F. D. Hulot · J. L. Janeau ·
A. Merroune

Published online: 13 February 2014
© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2014

Erratum to: Environ Monit Assess
DOI 10.1007/s10661-013-3401-2

The original version of this article unfortunately contained a mistake. There were transcription errors in the row for “Soil leachate (2010)”. The range under the column “Absorption ($a_{(355)} \text{ m}^{-1}$)” should read 0.18–70.8, and the slope under the column “Absorption versus fluorescence” should read 9.78.

The errors do not change the conclusion of the article. Below is the corrected table.

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10661-013-3401-2>.

E. Rochelle-Newall · J. L. Janeau · A. Merroune
IRD-Bioemco, UMR 7618, c/o Soils and Fertilisers Research
Institute (SFRI), Dong NgacTu Liem District
Hanoi, Vietnam

E. Rochelle-Newall (✉)
IRD-Bioemco, UMR 7618,
UPMC-CNRS-INRA-ENS-IRD-AgroParisTech-Université
Paris-Est Ecole Normale Supérieure, 46 rue d’Ulm,
75005 Paris, France
e-mail: emma.rochelle-newall@ird.fr

F. D. Hulot
Ecologie, Systématique et Evolution, UMR 8079,
Univ. Paris-Sud, Orsay, France

Table 2 Regressions of absorption versus fluorescence and DOC versus fluorescence for each sample site

	Absorption ($a_{(355)} \text{ m}^{-1}$)	Fluorescence (NFIU)	DOC ($\mu\text{M C}$)	Absorption versus fluorescence			DOC versus fluorescence		
	Range (min–max)			Intercept	Slope	r^2	Intercept	Slope	r^2
Bach Dang estuary (July 2008)	nd	5.1–40.2	91.0–144.2	nd	nd	nd	–43.2	0.51	0.75
Bach Dang estuary (April 2009)	0.27–2.24	2.0–33.2	90.8–158.9	–0.36	1.76	0.93	–7.6	0.18	0.16
Bach Dang estuary (November 2011)	nd	1.7–22.2	86.4–175.5	nd	nd	nd	–20.7	0.26	0.74
Freshwater lens, New Caledonia (2007–2008)	2.57–60.9	70.7–1308	298–4,277	47.8	22.2	0.99	248.5	0.15	0.34
Zimbabwe (2010)	4.28–37.0	43.8–252.2	339.2–2,550.9	35.9	5.7	0.66	28.6	0.08	0.70
Soil leachate (2010)	0.18–70.8	0.3–620.4	65.22–5,190.6	49.7	9.78	0.88	12.5	0.12	0.98

Values in italics are those not significant at the $p=0.05$ level

nd not determined