

Erratum to: Tensile properties of bamboo in different sizes

Hong Chen^{1,2} · Haitao Cheng² · Ge Wang² · Zixuan Yu² · Sheldon Qiang Shi³

Published online: 5 February 2016
© The Japan Wood Research Society 2016

Erratum to: J Wood Sci (2015) 61(6):552–561 DOI 10.1007/s10086-015-1511-x

After online publication of the paper, some errors were found in the abstract, discussion and conclusion. The following changes should be made in the original publication of the paper.

1. The corrected abstract is given below.

The objective of this study was to investigate the effect of specimen size on the mechanical properties of bamboo. Single bamboo fibers and bamboo fiber bundles obtained from both chemical retting and mechanical retting were tested. The tensile strength of chemically retted single bamboo fiber was 90.3 % higher than that of the mechanically retted fibers. The tensile strength of the chemically retted fiber bundles was over 2.1 times as that of the mechanically retted one, while the tensile modulus was almost 1.4 times. For the chemical retting, the fiber bundles were 65.5 % less in tensile strength compared to the single fiber, 12.3 % less for the tensile modulus, and 9.7 % less for the elongation. For the mechanical retting, the tensile

strength, tensile modulus and elongation of fiber bundles were 68.8, 52.3 and 60.9 % lower than that of the single fibers, respectively. Compared with single bamboo fibers and bamboo fiber bundles, the tensile strength of bamboo strips was reduced by 67.7 and 3.4 %, respectively. The modulus of bamboo strips was 42.7 % less compared to the single bamboo fibers, and 20.3 % higher compared to the bamboo fiber bundles. The mechanical properties of bamboo strips were lower than that of samples made from outer portion of the bamboo, but higher than that of samples made from inner portion of the bamboo.

2. In keywords, “bamboo bundles” should be “bamboo fiber bundles”.
3. Under the last paragraph of “Relationship of tensile properties between bamboo units in different sizes” of the discussion, “3.3 %” should be “3.4 %”.
4. In the conclusion,
 - (a) Line 15: “65.7 %” should be “65.5 %”;
 - (b) Line 26: “3.3 %” should be “3.4 %”;
 - (c) Line 27: “fiber bundles” should be “strips”;
 - (d) Line 28: “16.9 %” should be “20.3 %”.

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s10086-015-1511-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10086-015-1511-x).

✉ Ge Wang
wangge@icbr.ac.cn

- ¹ College of Furniture and Industrial Design, Nanjing Forest University, Nanjing 210037, China
- ² International Center for Bamboo and Rattan, No. 8, Futong Dong Dajie, Wangjing Area, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100102, China
- ³ Mechanical and Energy Engineering, University of North Texas, Denton, TX 76203-1277, USA