










<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-30354-z>

OPEN

Retraction Note: The Arabidopsis NOT4A E3 ligase promotes PGR3 expression and regulates chloroplast translation

Mark Bailey , Aiste Ivanauskaitė , Julia Grimmer, Oluwatunmise Akintewe, Adrienne C. Payne, Rory Osborne, Anne-Marie Labandera, Ross D. Etherington , Marjaana Rantala , Sacha Baginsky , Paula Mulo  & Daniel J. Gibbs 

Retraction to: *Nature Communications* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-20506-4>, published online 11 January 2021.

In this Article, we reported that NOT4A ubiquitin-ligase was required for proper expression of PROTON GRADIENT REGULATION 3 (PGR3), chloroplast ribosome biogenesis, chloroplast protein translation and photosynthesis. However, it was since brought to our attention (by Hannes Ruwe and Christian Schmitz-Linneweber of Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin and Alice Barkan and Rosalind Williams-Carrier of the University of Oregon) that the Arabidopsis *not4a* T-DNA insertion line (*not4a*; GABI_134E03) used in the paper carries an additional mutation affecting the broader *PGR3* locus. We have independently confirmed the presence of a *PGR3* deletion in the genetic material used during the study. As a result, we can no longer unequivocally conclude that the reported *not4a* phenotypes can be attributed to loss of NOT4A rather than PGR3. For reasons that are currently unclear, the *PGR3* deletion was heterozygous in the *not4a* complementation lines (*N4A-G1* and *N4A-G3*) and as such, these lines do not serve as adequate controls. We consistently observe cosegregation of the *pgr3* deletion with the T-DNA insertion in *NOT4A*, despite being located on different chromosomes. While the basis for this apparent genetic linkage is currently unclear, this likely explains why the *pgr3* deletion was retained despite backcrossing the *not4a* insertion allele to the Col-0 wild type background as described in the Article. We thank Ruwe and colleagues for bringing the issues to our attention and we sincerely apologise for inadvertently misleading readers of the Article. All authors agree with retraction of the Article.

Published online: 20 May 2022



Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2022