

CORRECTION

Open Access



Correction: Comparing methylation levels assayed in GC-rich regions with current and emerging methods

Dominic Guanzon^{1,3}, Jason P. Ross¹, Chenkai Ma¹, Oliver Berry² and Yi Jin Liew^{1,2*}

Correction: *BMC Genomics* 25, 741 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-024-10605-7>

Following publication of the original article several errors were reported in Table 1.

In the “EPIC” column of the row “Turnaround time (from DNA extracts)” the value was given as ‘2 days’ but should be ‘3 days’.

In the “ONT” column for the row “Relative costs (per sample)” the values were given as:

\$\$ (for ONT Cas9)

\$ (for whole genome)

The correct values are:

\$\$ (for ONT Cas9)

\$\$\$\$ (for whole genome)

The updated Table 1 with the corrected values in bold is given in this Correction article and the original article has been updated.

The online version of the original article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-024-10605-7>.

*Correspondence:

Yi Jin Liew

yijin.liew@csiro.au

¹CSIRO Health & Biosecurity, Westmead, NSW, Australia

²Environomics Future Science Platform, CSIRO, Crawley, WA, Australia

³Translational Extracellular Vesicles in Obstetrics and Gynae-Oncology Group, Faculty of Medicine, University of Queensland Centre for Clinical Research, The University of Queensland, Queensland, Australia



© Crown 2024. **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 licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence 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 licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

Table 1 Picking the right tool for the job

Criteria	EM-seq	WGBS	EPIC	ONT
Flexibility in DNA conversion	NEB-only	Any bisulphite conversion kit		N/A
Flexibility in library construction	NEB-only	More options	Illumina-only	ONT-only
Flexibility in sequencing	Illumina-only	Depends on library type	Illumina-only	ONT-only
Experimental complexity	Well-established protocols which can be performed by trained scientists.			Protocols actively being developed and slightly more complex.
Data analysis complexity	Robust and mature packages/pipelines available			Pipelines are still in flux
Turnaround time (from DNA extracts)	2–4 days		3 days	1–2 days (data is streamed)
Relative costs (per sample)	\$\$	\$\$\$	\$	\$\$ (for ONT Cas9) \$\$\$\$ (for whole genome)
Strengths	Cheaper than WGBS. Coverage more evenly distributed across genome. Data quality better from GC-rich loci than WGBS.	Easier to compare against publicly available data (most are WGBS/RRBS). Bisulphite conversion (without library building) cheaper than enzymatic conversion, better suited for translation into amplicon-based assays.	Very cost effective for getting a subset of methylated and biologically relevant positions across more samples. Ideal for model organisms.	Almost unbiased coverage regardless of context. Quickest turnaround time. Least affected by GC-context biases.
Weaknesses	Increased laboratory time than WGBS. Comparisons against existing data should consider readout divergences at GC-rich loci.	Coverage and methylation readouts biases very pronounced at GC-rich loci.	Not very practical for non-model organisms. Custom panels possible but less cost effective and less reliable.	Higher inputs required. Methylation data from whole genome possible, but more costly. Methylation calls are not binary, unlike bulk of existing data. Higher complexity in sequencing and in analysis.

Practical considerations involved in all four methods, as well as their relative strengths and weaknesses

Published online: 03 September 2024

Publisher's note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.