frontiers | Frontiers in Plant Science

TYPE Correction
PUBLISHED 10 October 2025
DOI 10.3389/fpls.2025.1701163

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Anna N Stepanova,
North Carolina State University, United States

*CORRESPONDENCE
Ep Heuvelink
ep.heuvelink@wur.nl

RECEIVED 08 September 2025
ACCEPTED 18 September 2025
PUBLISHED 10 October 2025

CITATION
Vincenzi E, Moehn A, Katsadas E, Karbor S, de Beer E, Millenaar F, Marcelis LFM and Heuvelink E (2025) Correction: Dose-response of tomato fruit yield to far-red fraction in supplementary lighting. *Front. Plant Sci.* 16:1701163. doi: 10.3389/fpls.2025.1701163

Correction: Dose-response of tomato fruit yield to far-red fraction in supplementary lighting

Elena Vincenzi[1], Aron Moehn[1], Emmanouil Katsadas[1], Sana Karbor[1], Esther de Beer[2], Frank Millenaar[3], Leo F.M. Marcelis[1] and Ep Heuvelink[1]*

[1]Horticulture and Product Physiology, Department of Plant Science, Wageningen University and Research, Wageningen, Netherlands, [2]Signify Netherlands B.V., Eindhoven, Netherlands, [3]BASF–Nunhems, Nunhem, Netherlands

KEYWORDS

tomato, far-red light, radiation use efficiency, electricity use efficiency, fruit quality, vertical light distribution, photosynthesis, yield component analysis

A Correction on

Dose-response of tomato fruit yield to far-red fraction in supplementary lighting

By Vincenzi E, Moehn A, Katsadas E, Karbor S, de Beer E, Millenaar F, Marcelis LFM and Heuvelink E (2025). *Front. Plant Sci.* 16:1618171. doi: 10.3389/fpls.2025.1618171

In the published article, there was an error in **Figure 3** as published. **Figure 3B** depicted the effects of FR fraction in supplementary light on the fraction of dry matter partitioned to fruits instead of leaf photosynthesis rate. The corrected **Figure 3** and its caption appear below.

The original article has been updated.

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.

10.3389/fpls.2025.1701163



FIGURE 3
Effects of FR fraction in supplementary light on plant dry weight after 20 weeks of cultivation, 140–143 DAT **(A)**, leaf photosynthesis rate measured between 128 and 134 DAT **(B)**, fraction of PAR **(C, D)**, and FR **(E, F)** light remaining at different canopy depths for cv. Foundation and cv. Trevine. A trendline is depicted to show a significant quadratic relationship between plant dry weight and FR fraction ($p < 0.1$, averaged over both cultivars), and letters denote significant differences between treatments, as determined by Fisher's protected LSD test. Each data point represents the average of two experimental units ± SEM, where the value per experimental unit is the average of five **(B)** or six **(A)** plants or the average of two experimental units **(C-F)**. FR, far-red light; DAT, days after transplant.