

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Jan Baptist Vermorken,
University of Antwerp, Belgium

*CORRESPONDENCE

Dan Li

Iidanludan@163.com

Yue Xie

Ying Wang

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work

RECEIVED 29 May 2025 ACCEPTED 08 August 2025 PUBLISHED 20 August 2025

CITATION

Yang L-N, Song Y-R, Zhang H, Tu H-L, Lu M-Y, Liu D-Q, Sui J-D, Li D, Xie Y and Wang Y (2025) Correction: Monocyte count combined with GTVnx is an independent prognostic factor in non-metastatic nasopharyngeal carcinoma receiving radiotherapy. *Front. Oncol.* 15:1637309. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2025.1637309

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Yang, Song, Zhang, Tu, Lu, Liu, Sui, Li, Xie and Wang. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Correction: Monocyte count combined with GTVnx is an independent prognostic factor in non-metastatic nasopharyngeal carcinoma receiving radiotherapy

Li-Na Yang[†], Yun-Rui Song[†], Huan Zhang[†], Hong-Lei Tu, Ming-Yue Lu, De-Qing Liu, Jiang-Dong Sui, Dan Li^{*}, Yue Xie^{*} and Ying Wang^{*}

Radiation Oncology Center, Chongqing University Cancer Hospital, School of Medicine, Chongqing University, Chongqing, China

KEYWORDS

peripheral blood monocyte count, GTVnx, nasopharyngeal carcinoma, radiotherapy, overall survival

A Correction on

Monocyte count combined with GTVnx is an independent prognostic factor in non-metastatic nasopharyngeal carcinoma receiving radiotherapy

By Yang L-N, Song Y-R, Zhang H, Tu H-L, Lu M-Y, Liu D-Q, Sui J-D, Li D, Xie Y and Wang Y (2025) Front. Oncol. 15:1541212. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2025.1541212

In the published article, there was an error in the legend for **Figure 3** as published. Risk classification should be low, medium and high risk rather than no risk, low risk and high risk. The corrected legend appears below.

The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.

Yang et al. 10.3389/fonc.2025.1637309

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated

organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

