

Sometimes things go wrong. We are all imperfect humans, trying best we can to live up to the ideals of scientific methodology. It even happens that published material contains errors, especially with the pressure to publish many papers fast that all researchers experience today.

In my opinion, you are not a bad scientist just because you are wrong every now and then. On the contrary, constantly evaluating your standpoint and changing your mind now and then, especially in relation to new arguments and studies, is to me a sign of being a good scientist.

However, I also believe that one has a responsibility to let other people know any errors that have been found in existing published material. Hence the creation of this erratum. This document will be updated continuously and available at my webpage. If a paper would be found to contain serious flaws on important content it will of course be fully retracted from the journal instead of just listing errors here.

Whether I include an entry in this erratum or not depends on how severe the error is and if it is beyond doubt that it is an error. It also matters if I am first or corresponding author compared to just being a coauthor.

Surface plasmon resonance methodology for monitoring polymerization kinetics and morphology changes of brushes - evaluated with poly(N-isopropylacrylamide) (Applied Surface Science 2017)

- The text and legend says that equation 1 was used for the fitting in figure 1b. This is misleading since equation 1 does not have an explicit time dependence. One can assume d grows linearly as a first step to determine the saturation value or use equation 3. Both give the same $S\Delta n$ product of 10 degrees. However, as described one must do a more careful analysis when determining $d(t)$ as well as the parameters α and β .
- The scheme in the supplementary material misses an arrow pointing backwards representing the regeneration step when ascorbic acid changes the oxidation state of the Cu complex.

Sensing applications based on plasmonic nanopores: The hole story (Analyst 2015)

- In the introduction I mention that “there appears to be review from the last 5 years or so” but I completely missed the review by C. Escobedo in Lab on a Chip 2013. Sorry about that! However, I think the two reviews complement each other well since his paper focuses much on fabrication and flow-through.

Plasmonic nanopores in metal-insulator-metal films (Advanced Optical Materials 2014)

- During the time of writing this manuscript, we discovered that the literature data we have used for the permittivity of Au (Etchegoin et al. J.Chem.Phys. 2006) is “incorrect”, i.e. there is an erratum published for that paper because the values it states are actually NOT the best fit to the data by Johnson & Christy. In principle this problem applies also to the paper in ACS Nano 2012. The effect is quite small overall, but the differences in calculation results are noticeable, at least for the predicted absolute resonance wavelengths (10 - 30 nm). However, the corrected values have no significant effect on the calculated resonance *shifts* (~1%). Further, judging from the overall variations in literature data for Au permittivity it is actually far from obvious that the “correct” values (those that do fit J&C data the best) are more suitable for describing our particular Au films. In fact, J&C are known to have the most extreme values e.g. for the Drude damping of Au (see discussion in Nano Letters 2011 and my book).
- The equations for the electric field components in the SI have some errors: The second row is meant to be for the E_x component (not E_z). Also, the index j for k_x should be removed (k_x is universal for all layers, which is the point of the surface wave).

Plasmonic Biosensors (IOS Press 2012)

- Equation 5.14 should have the terms in the denominator switched (sign inversion).
- Equation 6.5 should not have the square root of n_m (just n_m^3).
- Equation 6.22 should have k_0 instead of k .
- Section 7.4 discusses the two surface plasmon modes in metal films of finite thickness. It incorrectly gives the message that the bonding mode is what is important for plasmonic biosensors. This is not true since, strictly speaking, it is the antibonding mode which is excited in regular SPR sensors operating in total internal reflection. (The bonding mode is excited mainly by grating coupling mechanisms since it has a dispersion that does not coincide with any of the photon lines for the semi-infinite dielectrics.)

- Equation 8.5 has the integer counter j on the wrong side.
- Figure 13.5 and related discussion has some errors since the modes are identified wrongly. The antibonding mode is, of course, at higher energy and shorter wavelength.

Optical properties of nanohole arrays in metal-dielectric double films prepared by mask-on-metal colloidal lithography (ACS Nano 2012)

- In the supporting information it is mentioned that the blueshift after RIE etching is “relatively small” (9 nm) considering the inhomogenous field and the large contrast in RI (from 2.24 to 1). The explanation is claimed to be that the holes only represent ~10% of the surface area, so the effective change in RI is still low. However, careful calculations show that the expected shift is still almost 50 nm. The data presented in the supporting information was actually a statistical anomaly. Further tests have shown that the blueshift is indeed typically ~50 nm. The uncertainty in the data is likely associated with the overall poor reproducibility of RIE processes.

Nanoplasmonic sensing of metal–halide complex formation and the electric double layer capacitor (Nanoscale 2012)

- Equation 5 has a misleading look. The k^3 term should be divided by 6π and the k^2 term with $2\pi D$.

Electrochemical crystallization of plasmonic nanostructures (Nano Letters 2011)

- As people have pointed out, the title is somewhat misleading since the paper is not about “crystallization” of gold induced by electrochemistry. The metal is of course already present and undergoes a grain growth process, which means that “recrystallization” is a better term. Although this is obvious when one reads the paper, just looking at the title can lead to misunderstandings.
- It is mentioned that “The immediate peak shifts observed in response to switching between high and low potential are attributed to the capacitive charging of the metal...” However, in later work (Nanoscale 2012) we showed that the charging effect on the spectrum is actually small and that chemical interactions with ions likely dominate the optical response, even at low potentials.
- Reference 34 should have the year 2010.

Nanoplasmonic biosensing with focus on short-range ordered nanoholes in thin metal films (review) (Biointerphases 2008)

- References 98 and 99 refer to the same article.

Generic surface modification strategy for sensing applications based on Au/SiO₂ nanostructures (Biointerphases 2007)

- The caption of figure 3 says that the system was rinsed with 3 mL “butter”. This would have been an interesting experiment indeed, but I am quite sure that it was in fact a buffer solution that was used for rinsing even if I did not perform that experiment.

Localized surface plasmon resonance sensing of lipid-membrane-mediated biorecognition events (Journal of the American Chemical Society 2005)

- The surface functionalization strategy in this paper (biotinylated BSA) most likely does not prevent vesicle adsorption on Au as well as suggested, especially in the presence of Ca²⁺ (as was observed in

later QCM-D experiments). Other coating such as PEG are better for this purpose as shown in later work (Advanced Materials 2008). The reason that vesicles still only are visible on SiO₂ inside the holes when using AFM could be that the tip moves them away when scanning in contact mode, while the walls of the holes makes the vesicles stay there when imaged. This means that the conclusion on the sensitivity enhancement for SiO₂ compared to Au is a bit shaky, quantitatively speaking. Later work (Bionterphases 2007) with better surface chemistry is probably more reliable.