

Correction

Silva, Patrícia V.; Van Gestel, Cornelis A.M.; Verweij, Rudo A.; Papadiamantis, Anastasios G.; Gonçalves, Sandra F.; Lynch, Iseult; Loureiro, Susana

DOI:

[10.1039/d1en90031e](https://doi.org/10.1039/d1en90031e)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution (CC BY)

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Silva, PV, Van Gestel, CAM, Verweij, RA, Papadiamantis, AG, Gonçalves, SF, Lynch, I & Loureiro, S 2021, 'Correction: Toxicokinetics of pristine and aged silver nanoparticles in: *Physa acuta* (*Environmental Science: Nano* (2020) 7 (3849-3868) DOI: 10.1039/D0EN00946F)', *Environmental Science: Nano*, vol. 8, no. 8, pp. 2396-2397. <https://doi.org/10.1039/d1en90031e>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.



Cite this: *Environ. Sci.: Nano*, 2021, **8**, 2396

DOI: 10.1039/d1en90031e

rsc.li/es-nano

Correction: Toxicokinetics of pristine and aged silver nanoparticles in *Physa acuta*

Patrícia V. Silva,^{*a} Cornelis A. M. van Gestel,^b Rudo A. Verweij,^b
Anastasios G. Papadimitrakopoulos,^{cd} Sandra F. Gonçalves,^a
Iseult Lynch^c and Susana Loureiro^a

Correction for ‘Toxicokinetics of pristine and aged silver nanoparticles in *Physa acuta*’ by Patrícia V. Silva *et al.*, *Environ. Sci.: Nano*, 2020, **7**, 3849–3868, DOI: 10.1039/D0EN00946F.

An error in the units used for Ag sediment concentration ($\mu\text{g Ag kg}^{-1}$ instead of mg Ag kg^{-1}) in eqn (3) and (4) resulted in the units for sediment uptake being wrongly presented as $\text{g}_{\text{sediment}} \text{g}_{\text{organism}}^{-1}$ per day rather than $\text{kg}_{\text{sediment}} \text{g}_{\text{organism}}^{-1}$ per day in the original Table 2. Correcting these units changes the interpretation of the data slightly, as such high uptake rate constants suggest that the Ag concentrations in the sediment were probably too low to explain uptake, and thus uptake through water was probably more important. The modelling using model 2 was redone, leading to different values of k_w , although the values for k_s , k_2 or SF reported in the original Table 2 were not affected. With these new calculations, the units for k_s were maintained as $\text{g}_{\text{sediment}} \text{g}_{\text{organism}}^{-1}$ per day. The unit for Ag sediment concentrations used in model 4 (eqn (7) and (8)) was also $\mu\text{g Ag kg}^{-1}$, so the unit of k_1 was wrongly presented as $\text{g}_{\text{sediment}} \text{g}_{\text{organism}}^{-1}$ per day in the original Table 2 but is changed now to $\text{kg}_{\text{sediment}} \text{g}_{\text{organism}}^{-1}$ per day. The new values and corrected units are shown in the revised Table 2 below.

The new k_w (uptake from water) values are highest for the exposures to $\text{Ag}_2\text{S-NPs}$ ($3.15 \text{ L}_{\text{water}} \text{g}_{\text{organism}}^{-1}$ per day) and 60 nm Ag-NPs ($2.19 \text{ L}_{\text{water}} \text{g}_{\text{organism}}^{-1}$ per day), followed by AgNO_3 ($1.88 \text{ L}_{\text{water}} \text{g}_{\text{organism}}^{-1}$ per day). The new k_w values, however, did change our conclusion regarding the contribution of uptake from water and sediment to the total Ag uptake, and thus the values in the original Table 3 are incorrect and should not be considered anymore. Redoing the estimate showed that, at the low sediment concentrations in the water-spiked test, for all Ag forms nearly 100% of the Ag measured in the animals was from the water, with less than 0.1% coming from the sediment. The new values are shown in the revised Table 3 below.

These new calculations particularly affected the conclusion of sediment being a more important uptake route for $\text{Ag}_2\text{S-NPs}$ by the snails, which is no longer valid. It should also be noted that the units of k_1 for sediment as a single exposure route (model 4) changed, with $\text{Ag}_2\text{S-NPs}$ and AgNO_3 presenting the highest k_1 values ($1.88 \text{ kg}_{\text{sediment}} \text{g}_{\text{organism}}^{-1}$ per day and $2.05 \text{ kg}_{\text{sediment}} \text{g}_{\text{organism}}^{-1}$ per day, respectively). These k_1 values considering sediment as the only exposure route are much higher than the ones obtained in the test with Ag-spiked sediment, due to the fact that uptake was mainly from water because of the very low sediment concentrations in this test with spiked water and clean sediment. As explained above, uptake from water is the dominant process.

In the Abstract, the sentence ‘‘When considering the double exposure route, which provides a more realistic contamination scenario, water was the main route, except for $\text{Ag}_2\text{S-NPs}$, for which sediment was more important’’ should be replaced with ‘‘When considering the double exposure route, which provides a more realistic contamination scenario, water was the main route’’.

In the Conclusions, the section: ‘‘When accounting for double exposure via both water and sediment, water was likely to be the main route. Interestingly, the simulated aged Ag-NP form ($\text{Ag}_2\text{S-NPs}$) revealed analogous kinetics in experiments that considered sediment as exposure route, which points to a higher influence of the sediment for $\text{Ag}_2\text{S-NPs}$. This was also supported by the higher contribution to Ag uptake from sediment determined for $\text{Ag}_2\text{S-NP}$. Moreover, $\text{Ag}_2\text{S-NPs}$ were not only highly available to snails but were also easily depurated’’ should be replaced with: ‘‘When accounting for double exposure *via* both water and sediment, water was the main route for all Ag forms tested. Moreover, $\text{Ag}_2\text{S-NPs}$ were not only highly available to snails but were also easily depurated’’.

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

^a Department of Biology & CESAM, University of Aveiro, Campus Universitário de Santiago, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal. E-mail: pverissimo@ua.pt

^b Department of Ecological Science, Faculty of Science, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands

^c School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK

^d NovaMechanics Ltd., 1065, Nicosia, Cyprus



Table 2 Toxicokinetic parameters for 3–8 nm, 50 nm and 60 nm Ag-NPs, Ag₂S-NPs and AgNO₃ in *Physa acuta* exposed to water spiked at a nominal concentration of 10 µg Ag L⁻¹, in the Ag-spiked water and clean sediment test. k_1 is the uptake rate constant, k_2 the elimination rate constant, k_w the uptake rate constant from water, k_s the uptake rate constant from sediment, k_g the growth rate constant and SF the stored fraction. 95% confidence intervals (CI) are given in brackets. Different letters within a column indicate statistically significant differences ($X^2_{(d)} > 3.84$; $p < 0.05$)

Exposure route	Ag form	k_w (L _{water} ⁻¹ g _{organism} ⁻¹ per day)	k_s (g _{sediment} ⁻¹ g _{organism} ⁻¹ per day)	k_1 (L _{water} g _{organism} ⁻¹ per day; kg _{sediment} g _{organism} ⁻¹ per day)	k_2 (day ⁻¹)	SF	k_g (day ⁻¹)
Water and sediment (model 2)	3–8 nm	0.88(n.d.)	0.25(n.d.)		0.05(−0.02–0.12) A	0(−0.61–0.61)	−0.02
	50 nm	1.11(n.d.)	0.30(n.d.)		0.65(−0.51–1.80) A, B, C	0.13(−0.03–0.28)	−0.01
	60 nm	2.19(n.d.)	0.50(n.d.)		0(−0.03–0.03) B	0.01(−0.33–0.35)	0
	Ag ₂ S-NPs	3.15(n.d.)	1.91(n.d.)		0.74(0.02–1.46) C	0.001(−0.02–0.02)	0
	AgNO ₃	1.88(n.d.)	0.40(n.d.)		0.16(−0.45–0.78) A, B	0.33(0.13–0.53)	−0.01
Water (model 3)	3–8 nm			0.88(0.35–1.40) A	0.05(−0.02–0.11) A	0(−0.57–0.57)	
	50 nm			1.11(0.27–1.95) A	0.65(−0.22–1.51) A, B, C	0.13(0.04–0.21)	
	60 nm			2.19(0.79–3.36) B, C	0(−0.03–0.02) B	0.01(−0.32–0.32)	
	Ag ₂ S-NPs			3.16(1.36–4.95) B	0.74(0.12–1.36) C	0.001(−0.02–0.02)	
	AgNO ₃			1.88(0.59–3.17) C	0.16(−0.41–0.73) A, B	0.33(0.14–0.53)	
Sediment (model 4)	3–8 nm			0.42(0.28–0.56) A	0.18(−0.17–0.52) A	0(−5.24–5.24)	
	50 nm			0.61(−0.62–1.83) A, B	1.76(−3.27–6.80) A, B	0.19(−0.17–0.56)	
	60 nm			0.64(0.30–0.99) A, B	0.16(n.d.)	1(−4.10–6.10)	
	Ag ₂ S-NPs			1.88(−6.14–9.91) B, C	2.68(−9.86–15.2) B	0(−0.06–0.06)	
	AgNO ₃			2.05(−1.52–5.61) C	2.18(−3.65–8.00) B	0.27(−0.18–0.72)	

(n.d.) not possible to determine 95% confidence intervals.

Table 3 The relative contribution of uptake from water (APW) and sediment to the total uptake of Ag in *Physa acuta* exposed to 3–8 nm, 50 nm and 60 nm Ag-NPs, Ag₂S-NPs and AgNO₃, in the Ag-spiked water and clean sediment test

Ag form	% uptake from water	% uptake from sediment
3–8 nm	99.96	0.036
50 nm	99.96	0.037
60 nm	99.96	0.038
Ag ₂ S-NPs	99.93	0.075
AgNO ₃	99.96	0.039

