

## Erratum to: Highly efficient *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation of banana cv. Rasthali (AAB) via sonication and vacuum infiltration

Kondeti Subramanyam · Koon Subramanyam ·  
K. V. Sailaja · M. Srinivasulu · K. Lakshmidēvi

Published online: 21 January 2011  
© Springer-Verlag 2011

**Erratum to: Plant Cell Rep**  
**DOI 10.1007/s00299-010-0996-4**

In the original version of the article, some of the significance values were accidentally omitted in the fifth column of Table 3. The correct version of the table is given in the following page.

---

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s00299-010-0996-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00299-010-0996-4).

---

Kondeti Subramanyam · K. V. Sailaja · K. Lakshmidēvi (✉)  
Department of Biochemistry, Sri Krishnadevaraya University,  
Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh 515055, India  
e-mail: [prasamshika1@gmail.com](mailto:prasamshika1@gmail.com)

Koon Subramanyam  
Department of Biotechnology, Sreenidhi Institute of Science and  
Technology (Autonomous), Jawaharlal Nehru Technological  
University, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh 501301, India

M. Srinivasulu  
Department of Microbiology, Sri Krishnadevaraya University,  
Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh 515055, India

**Table 3** Effect of sonication and vacuum infiltration on the number of GUS positive shoots after 3 days of co-cultivation with *Agrobacterium* strain EHA105 harboring pCAMBIA1301 plasmid in co-cultivation medium supplemented with 50  $\mu$ M acetosyringone

Sonication (min)	Vacuum treatment (min)	No. of suckers infected <sup>A</sup>	No. of suckers formed shoots <sup>B</sup> (%)	Total no. of shoots <sup>C</sup>	No. of GUS positive shoots <sup>D</sup>	Percentage of GUS positive shoots <sup>E</sup>
0	–	10	8 (80)	136.0 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>a</sup>	39.1 $\pm$ 0.4 <sup>b</sup>	28.6 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>e</sup>
2	–	10	8 (80)	130.8 $\pm$ 0.3 <sup>b</sup>	40.4 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	30.8 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>cd</sup>
4	–	10	8 (80)	125.0 $\pm$ 0.4 <sup>c</sup>	39.1 $\pm$ 0.4 <sup>b</sup>	31.2 $\pm$ 0.3 <sup>c</sup>
6	–	10	7 (70)	91.8 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>d</sup>	32.1 $\pm$ 0.4 <sup>c</sup>	34.9 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>a</sup>
8	–	10	7 (70)	88.1 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>c</sup>	29.3 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>d</sup>	33.3 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>b</sup>
10	–	10	5 (50)	72.1 $\pm$ 0.3 <sup>f</sup>	21.2 $\pm$ 0.1 <sup>e</sup>	29.3 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>d</sup>
–	0	10	8 (80)	135.9 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	39.0 $\pm$ 0.3 <sup>b</sup>	28.6 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>e</sup>
–	2	10	8 (80)	132.3 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>b</sup>	41.4 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	31.2 $\pm$ 0.1 <sup>cd</sup>
–	4	10	7 (70)	110.9 $\pm$ 0.3 <sup>c</sup>	35.4 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>c</sup>	31.9 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>c</sup>
–	6	10	7 (70)	95.1 $\pm$ 0.3 <sup>d</sup>	34.1 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>d</sup>	35.8 $\pm$ 0.3 <sup>a</sup>
–	8	10	6 (60)	68.1 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>c</sup>	23.3 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>e</sup>	34.1 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>b</sup>
–	10	10	5 (50)	52.2 $\pm$ 0.3 <sup>f</sup>	16.1 $\pm$ 0.3 <sup>f</sup>	30.8 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>d</sup>
2	2	10	7 (70)	113.4 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>a</sup>	36.1 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>a</sup>	31.8 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>e</sup>
4	4	10	7 (70)	101.0 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>b</sup>	34.1 $\pm$ 0.4 <sup>b</sup>	33.7 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>c</sup>
6	6	10	5 (50)	61.1 $\pm$ 0.4 <sup>c</sup>	24.1 $\pm$ 0.4 <sup>c</sup>	39.4 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>a</sup>
8	8	10	5 (50)	58.2 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>d</sup>	21.3 $\pm$ 0.3 <sup>d</sup>	36.5 $\pm$ 0.4 <sup>b</sup>
10	10	10	3 (30)	28.3 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>e</sup>	9.2 $\pm$ 0.4 <sup>e</sup>	32.6 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>d</sup>

Mean values ( $\pm$ standard errors) with different superscript letters (a, b, c, d, e and f) indicate significant different ( $P < 0.05$ )

<sup>A</sup> Number of *Agrobacterium* infected banana suckers

<sup>B</sup> Number of suckers responded to shoot induction after *Agrobacterium* infection, % (responded percentage), B/A  $\times$  100

<sup>C</sup> Total number of shoots formed from the suckers after *Agrobacterium* infection

<sup>D</sup> Number of GUS positive shoots identified after GUS assay

<sup>E</sup> Percentage of Gus positive shoots: D/C  $\times$  100. Mean values of three independent experiments  $\pm$  standard errors