Correction: Addressing challenges in the removal of unbound dye from passively labelled extracellular vesicles
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Correction for ‘Addressing challenges in the removal of unbound dye from passively labelled extracellular vesicles’ by Kaisa Rautaniemi et al., Nanoscale Adv., 2022, DOI: 10.1039/d1na00755f.

The authors regret that an incorrect version of Table 3 was included in the original article. The correct version is given here:

| Dye      | Method | 110k EVs | 20k EVs |
|----------|--------|----------|---------|
|          |        | $R_{EV}$ (%) | $R_{dye}$ (%) | $E_{RP}$ a,b | $R_{EV}$ (%) | $R_{dye}$ (%) | $E_{RP}$ a,b |
| DHPE-OG  | UCG    | 43.0 ± 2.8† | 44.6 ± 4.2 | 1.0 | 52.9 ± 7.5† | 39.6 ± 3.3 | 1.3 |
| Ptx-OG   | UCG    | 12.2 ± 1.6† | 8.7 ± 1.4  | 1.4 | 8.2 ± 0.9  | 9.3 ± 5.0  | 0.9 |
| BP       | UCG    | 10.3 ± 0.4† | 67.8 ± 11.5| 0.2‡ | 6.5 ± 3.3  | 41.3 ± 38.4| 0.2‡ |
|          | SEC    | 3.8 ± 1.6   | 2.9 ± 1.3  | 1.3 | 3.7 ± 0.9  | 1.3 ± 0.3  | 2.8† |
|          | UF     | 3.6 ± 4.8   | 16.6 ± 1.3 | 0.5‡ | <1†       | 7.0 ± 0.8  | —   |
|          | UCG    | 12.8 ± 10.3†| 6.2 ± 0.9  | 0.7‡ | 2.3 ± 1.0† | 1.3 ± 3.8  | 0.5‡ |
| BPC12    | UC     | 12.5 ± 6.8† | 35.5 ± 37.6| 0.4‡ | 5.9 ± 6.2  | 17.2 ± 15.3| 0.3‡ |
|          | UF     | 3.9 ± 2.8   | 7.9 ± 3.4  | 0.5‡ | 8.4 ± 11.2 | 9.5 ± 15.4 | 0.9‡ |
| DiO      | UCG    | n.d.       | n.d.       | —   | n.d.       | n.d.       | —   |
|          | SEC    | 1.1 ± 0.2†  | n.d.       | —   | <1†        | n.d.       | —   |
|          | AEC    | 10 ± 12.3†  | 2.2 ± 2.0  | 4.6† | 6.4 ± 0.3  | 1.8 ± 0.3  | 3.5† |

† – acceptably high; ‡ – unacceptably low; all other values are acceptable with caution. a,$E_{RP} > 1$ indicates successful separation of the labelled EVs from the unbound dye: the greater $E_{RP}$, the better separation; conversely, $E_{RP} < 1$ indicates unsuccessful removal of the dye.

The Royal Society of Chemistry apologises for these errors and any consequent inconvenience to authors and readers.