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After the publication of the article [1], it was brought to our attention that some of the data in Table 2 were incorrect. Please find a correct and updated version of Table 2 in the erratum. Following this Fig. 1 has also been updated; the correct version of Fig. 1 is given in this erratum.

Also, during the calculation of specific glucose uptake rate, the authors mistakenly used the unit mmol/L as mmol, and therefore it caused some errors in the calculations of production rate (Table 2) and ATP regeneration rate (Section “Flux balance analysis”—[1]) which need to be corrected. The corrected ATP regeneration rates are 0.02 and 0.38 mmol\textsubscript{ATP}/(gCDW h) for [Co(bipy)\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{3+/2+}] or [Fe(CN)\textsubscript{6}\textsuperscript{3−/4−}] as electron acceptors while poising the anode at +0.697 V vs SHE.

Also, during the calculation of specific glucose uptake rate, the authors mistakenly used the unit mmol/L as mmol, and therefore it caused some errors in the calculations of production rate (Table 2) and ATP regeneration rate (Section “Flux balance analysis”—[1]) which need to be corrected. The corrected ATP regeneration rates are 0.02 and 0.38 mmol\textsubscript{ATP}/(gCDW h) for [Co(bipy)\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{3+/2+}] or [Fe(CN)\textsubscript{6}\textsuperscript{3−/4−}] as electron acceptors while poising the anode at +0.697 V vs SHE.

**Table 2** Key process parameters of anaerobic glucose conversion of *P. putida* F1 in the anode compartment of a BES using [Co(bipy)\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{3+/2+}] or [Fe(CN)\textsubscript{6}\textsuperscript{3−/4−}] as electron acceptors while poising the anode at +0.697 V vs SHE

|                  | [Co(bipy)\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{3+/2+}] | [Fe(CN)\textsubscript{6}\textsuperscript{3−/4−}] |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Carbon balance (%) | 99.6                                             | 97.6                                          |
| Coulombic efficiency (%) | 98.5                                           | 93.3                                          |
| Yields (mol\textsubscript{product}/mol\textsubscript{glucose}) |                               |                                                |
| \textsubscript{2}KGA | 0.90 ± 0.03                                      | 0.90 ± 0.02                                   |
| \textsubscript{acetic acid} | 0.073 ± 0.008                                   | 0.144 ± 0.012                                 |
| \textsubscript{gluconic acid} | 0.31 ± 0.06                                     | 0.09 ± 0.03                                   |
| \textsubscript{electrons} | 0.25 ± 0.03                                     | 0.09 ± 0.04                                   |
| Yields (mol\textsubscript{product}/mol\textsubscript{glucose}) |                               |                                                |
| \textsubscript{glucose} | 3.94 ± 0.11                                      | 3.88 ± 0.07                                   |
| \textsubscript{acetic acid} | 0.019 ± 0.003                                   | 0.051 ± 0.010                                 |
| \textsubscript{2}KGA | 0.23 ± 0.04                                      | 0.32 ± 0.06                                   |
| \textsubscript{gluconic acid} | 0.08 ± 0.02                                     | 0.03 ± 0.01                                   |
| \textsubscript{electrons} | −0.06 ± 0.01                                     | −0.03 ± 0.02                                  |
| Rates (mmol/(gCDW h)) | 1.02 ± 0.18                                     | 1.37 ± 0.26                                   |

Data are fitted with linear regression using datasets from ten ([Fe(CN)\textsubscript{6}\textsuperscript{3−/4−}]) and four ([Co(bipy)\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{3+/2+}] biological replicates with a total of 79 and 36 samples, respectively (compare Additional file 1: Fig. S3). Carbon balance is calculated from the fitted rates considering carbon content of molecules and assuming equimolar CO\textsubscript{2} production when making acetate from glucose. Gluconic acid is a product in the first 100 h and serves as a substrate thereafter, hence 2 yields and rates are given.
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Fig. 1 Change of biomass (triangles, a), pH (squares, b) and electron production (circles, b) in the anode compartment of a BES reactor of *P. putida* F1 with K$_3$[Fe(CN)$_6$] as electron acceptor in control (black symbols) and closed circuit with the anode potential poised at +0.697 V (white symbols). Data have been averaged from ten (closed circuit) and three (control) biological replicates with a total of 79 and 30 samples, respectively. Means and standard deviations (X and Y error bars) are given (average sample size $n = 7$ (closed circuit); exact sample size $n = 3$ (control)).

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:10.1186/s13068-016-0452-y.
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