Journal of Cleaner Production 314 (2021) 128253

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Cleaner Production

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jclepro

Corrigendum to "Can we not mitigate climate change using seaweed based biostimulant: A case study with sugarcane cultivation in India" [J. Clean. Prod. 204 (2018) 992–1003]

Ishwar Singh [a,b], K.G. Vijay Anand [c], Sushil Solomon [a], Sudhir Kumar Shukla [a], Ramakant Rai [a], Sudhakar T. Zodape [c], Arup Ghosh [c,*]

[a] ICAR- Indian Institute of Sugarcane Research, Lucknow, 226 002, India
[b] ICAR- National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, 110012, India
[c] Agronomy and Biofertilizer Group, Biotechnology and Phycology Division, CSIR-Central Salt & Marine Chemicals Research Institute, Bhavnagar, 364002, Gujarat, India

The authors regret misreading of the unit during calculation wherein kg CO_2 equivalents ha^{-1} $2y^{-1}$ was by mistake construed as kg CO_2 equivalents (Mg cane production)$^{-1}$. This led to erroneous representation at some places in the text which are as follows:

In Abstract; text of section 3.5: Environmental benefits of seaweed extract (SWE) use; Conclusion section and in Highlights:

The savings in climate change (CC) impact category envisaged on account of use of seaweed extract at 5% KSWE was mentioned as 260 kg CO_2 equivalents (Mg cane production)$^{-1}$ in the text which should be actually read as 260 kg CO_2 equivalents ha^{-1} $2y^{-1}$. The actual savings in CC due to SWE application per ton of cane production would be 2.06 kg CO_2 equivalents (Mg cane production)$^{-1}$.

In the text of section 3.5: Environmental benefits of seaweed extract (SWE) use:

The savings envisaged for 50% RRF + SWE treatment in CC impact category was mentioned as 1234 kg CO_2 equivalents (Mg cane production)$^{-1}$ which should be actually read as 1234 kg CO_2 equivalents ha^{-1} $2y^{-1}$. The actual savings in CC due to SWE application per ton of cane production would be 11.65 kg CO_2 equivalents (Mg cane production)$^{-1}$.

The gains in water depletion which was represented as $21m^3$ (Mg cane production)$^{-1}$ should be instead read as 21 m^3 ha^{-1} $2y^{-1}$. The actual water saving per ton of cane production would be 0.17 m^3.

In the last paragraph of the Discussion section, error in estimation of impacts gains in CC and water depletion per Mg of cane production in the 5% KSWE treatment led to errors in extrapolation for 10% of total cane production.

Thus, translation of gains which was given as ca.9.3 million Mg of CO_2 equivalents would be 0.073 million Mg of CO_2 equivalents.

Similarly for water depletion, the overall savings would be 5.99 million m^3 instead of 1.12 billion cubic meters.

We confirm that there is no discrepancy in the data of tables or figures owing the above mistake.

The authors would like to apologise for any inconvenience caused.

DOI of original article: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.070.
* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: arupghosh@csmcri.res.in (A. Ghosh).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128253

Available online 10 July 2021