

Video Article

Erratum: EPA Method 1615. Measurement of Enterovirus and Norovirus Occurrence in Water by Culture and RT-qPCR. II. Total Culturable Virus Assay

URL: <https://www.jove.com/video/5845>

DOI: [doi:10.3791/5845](https://doi.org/10.3791/5845)

Keywords:

Date Published: 7/3/2017

Citation: Erratum: EPA Method 1615. Measurement of Enterovirus and Norovirus Occurrence in Water by Culture and RT-qPCR. II. Total Culturable Virus Assay. *J. Vis. Exp.* (), e5845, doi:10.3791/5845 (2017).

Abstract

A correction was made to: [EPA Method 1615. Measurement of Enterovirus and Norovirus Occurrence in Water by Culture and RT-qPCR. II. Total Culturable Virus Assay](#). The values for Reagent Grade Water shown in Figure 2 were changed from a mean value of 111% with a standard error of 8% to a mean value of 82% with a standard error of 26%.

The penultimate sentence of the last paragraph of the Representative Results section was changed from:

These controls performed similarly with a mean recovery of 111% and a coefficient of variation of 100% (Figure 2),

to:

These controls had a mean recovery of 82% and a coefficient of variation of 110% (Figure 2).

The third sentence of the fourth paragraph of the Discussion section was changed from:

The mean recovery from the LFB samples of 111% with a coefficient of variation (CV) of 100% also met the method performance acceptance criteria even though they are higher than that observed for PE samples during the ICR,

to:

The mean recovery from the LFB samples of 82% with a coefficient of variation (CV) of 110% also met the method performance acceptance criteria even though they are higher than that observed for PE samples during the ICR.

Protocol

A correction was made to: [EPA Method 1615. Measurement of Enterovirus and Norovirus Occurrence in Water by Culture and RT-qPCR. II. Total Culturable Virus Assay](#). The values for Reagent Grade Water shown in Figure 2 were changed from a mean value of 111% with a standard error of 8% to a mean value of 82% with a standard error of 26%.

The penultimate sentence of the last paragraph of the Representative Results section was changed from:

These controls performed similarly with a mean recovery of 111% and a coefficient of variation of 100% (Figure 2),

to:

These controls had a mean recovery of 82% and a coefficient of variation of 110% (Figure 2).

The third sentence of the fourth paragraph of the Discussion section was changed from:

The mean recovery from the LFB samples of 111% with a coefficient of variation (CV) of 100% also met the method performance acceptance criteria even though they are higher than that observed for PE samples during the ICR,

to:

The mean recovery from the LFB samples of 82% with a coefficient of variation (CV) of 110% also met the method performance acceptance criteria even though they are higher than that observed for PE samples during the ICR.

Disclosures

No conflicts of interest declared.