EJNMMI Physics

CORRECTION Open Access

Correction to: Influence of dosimetry method on bone lesion absorbed dose estimates in PSMA therapy: application to mCRPC patients receiving Lu-177-PSMA-I&T

Julia Brosch-Lenz[1*], Carlos Uribe[2,3], Astrid Gosewisch[1], Lena Kaiser[1], Andrei Todica[1], Harun Ilhan[1], Franz Josef Gildehaus[1], Peter Bartenstein[1], Arman Rahmim[2,3,4], Anna Celler[3], Sibylle Ziegler[1] and Guido Böning[1]

The original article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1186/s40658-021-00369-4.

* Correspondence: Julia.BroschLenz@med.uni-muenchen.de
[1]Department of Nuclear Medicine, University Hospital, LMU Munich, Marchioninistrasse 15, 81377 Munich, Germany
Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

Correction to: EJNMMI Phys 8, 26 (2021)
https://doi.org/10.1186/s40658-021-00369-4

Following publication of the original article [1], it was reported that due to a typesetting error some text was mistakenly introduced in the "MC method: Patient-specific Monte Carlo (MC) absorbed dose simulation" and "Comparison of dosimetry methods" sub-sections.

The erroneous text is highlighted in bold in the below passages and has been removed in the original article.

In the "MC method: Patient-specific Monte Carlo (MC) absorbed dose simulation" the affected sentence was:

A CT scan of a Gammex tissue characterization phantom (Gammex 467; Gammex Inc., Middleton, WI) using the same imaging parameters from the patient scans was **perfMC method: Patient-specificormed**, which confirmed the HU-to-density relationship of our CT device with that implemented in GATE. GATE converts HU-to-density values with internal tables based on Schneider et al. [22].

The corrected sentence reads:

A CT scan of a Gammex tissue characterization phantom (Gammex 467; Gammex Inc., Middleton, WI) using the same imaging parameters from the patient scans was performed, which confirmed the HU-to-density relationship of our CT device with that implemented in GATE. GATE converts HU-to-density values with internal tables based on Schneider et al. [22].

In the "Comparison of dosimetry methods" sub-section the affected sentence was:

The additional density **wePatient example showing the transversal slice ofighting** of $VSV^{soft}_{weighted}$ and $VSV^{soft+bone}_{weighted}$, led to an overall smaller range of percentage differences than the associated method without weighting.

The corrected sentence reads:

The additional density weighting of $VSV^{soft}_{weighted}$ and $VSV^{soft+bone}_{weighted}$, led to an overall smaller range of percentage differences than the associated method without weighting.

The original article has been updated.

Author details
[1]Department of Nuclear Medicine, University Hospital, LMU Munich, Marchioninistrasse 15, 81377 Munich, Germany. [2]PET Functional Imaging, BC Cancer, 600 West 10th Avenue, Vancouver, BC V5Z 4E6, Canada. [3]Department of Radiology, University of British Columbia, 2775 Laurel Street, Vancouver, BC V5Z 1M9, Canada. [4]Department of Integrative Oncology, BC Cancer Research Centre, 675 West 10th Avenue, Vancouver, BC V5Z 1L3, Canada.

Published online: 13 April 2021

Reference

1. Brosch-Lenz J, Uribe C, Gosewisch A, et al. Influence of dosimetry method on bone lesion absorbed dose estimates in PSMA therapy: application to mCRPC patients receiving Lu-177-PSMA-I&T. EJNMMI Phys. 2021;8:26 https://doi.org/10.1186/s40658-021-00369-4.