Fire Technology, 58, 3291–3296, 2022
© 2022 The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature
Manufactured in The United States
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10694-022-01264-9

Correction to: Burning Behavior Analysis in Meso and Large-Scale Oil Slick Fires With and Without Waves Using Outdoor Gas Emission Sampling (OGES) System

*Hsin-Hsiu Ho**, *Fire Protection Engineering, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, 100 Institute Road, Worcester, MA 01609, USA*
Kemal S. Arsava, Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory (CRREL), US Army Corps of Engineers, 72 Lyme Rd, Hanover, NH 03755, USA
Ali S. Rangwala, Fire Protection Engineering, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, 100 Institute Road, Worcester, MA 01609, USA

Published online: 22 May 2022

Correction to: Fire Technology
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10694-022-01234-1

In the PDF of this article, the labelling to the table 3, 4, 5, 6 and equation 1 in the article is incorrect and should have been the following information. The original article PDF has now been corrected.

Table 3

The labels in this table are all over the place and are not properly aligned with the appropriate columns.

*Correspondence should be addressed to: Hsin-Hsiu Ho, E-mail: hho@wpi.edu

Table 3
Summary of Combustion Product Concentrations Measured at 2.8 m Above Pool Surface

Fuel	Initial thickness (cm)	Wave number	Regression rate (mm/min)	Peak/Avg produced CO_2 (vol %)	Peak/Avg produced CO	Soot^ (g)			Peak/Avg consumed O_2 (vol%)	Burn time (min)	Burn efficiency (%)
HOOPS	8			4.637/1.415	0.460/0.098	7.500/2.081	0.01	1.54		30.0	57
HOOPS*	8	Wave 1		4.540/1.817	0.475/0.118	7.834/2.946	0.10	1.86		42.0	95
HOOPS	8	Wave 2		2.798/1.137	0.299/0.054	5.331/1.685	0.01	1.45		54.0	97
Bunker	1			1.943/0.705	0.106/0.035	2.797/1.107		1.25		5.5	74
Bunker	1	Wave 3		1.122/0.405	0.053/0.019	1.523/0.653	0.02	1.72		6.0	86

*Rainy day
^ Fine particle filter in Fig. 1

Corrected Table 3

Table 3

Summary of combustion product concentrations measured at 2.8 m above pool surface

Fuel	Initial thickness (cm)	Wave number	Peak/Avg produced CO_2 (vol%)	Peak/Avg produced CO (vol%)	Peak/Avg consumed O_2 (vol%)	Soot^ (g)	Regression rate (mm/min)	Burn time (min)	Burn efficiency (%)
HOOPS	8		4.637/1.415	0.460/0.098	7.500/2.081	0.01	1.54	30.0	57
HOOPS*	8	Wave 1	4.540/1.817	0.475/0.118	7.834/2.946	0.10	1.86	42.0	95
HOOPS	8	Wave 2	2.798/1.137	0.299/0.054	5.331/1.685	0.01	1.45	54.0	97
Bunker	1		1.943/0.705	0.106/0.035	2.797/1.107		1.25	5.5	74
Bunker	1	Wave 3	1.122/0.405	0.053/0.019	1.523/0.653	0.02	1.72	6.0	86

*Rainy day

^ Fine particle filter in Fig. 1

Table 4

The labels such as Initial thickness, Wave number, and Peak/Avg produced CO2 are all taking up multiple rows, which makes it aesthetically unpleasing to read.

Table 4
Summary of Combustion Product Concentrations Measured by OGES Crane

Fuel	Initial thickness (cm)	Wave number	Peak/Avg produced CO_2 (vol%)	Peak/Avg produced CO (ppm)	Peak/Avg consumed O_2 (vol%)	Soot^ (g)	Regression rate (mm/min)	Burn time (min)	Burn efficiency (%)
HOOPSa	8		0.247/	33/	0.117/	0.01	1.54	30.0	57
HOOPSa*	8	Wave 1	0.858/0.455	105/34	0.292/	0.10	1.86	42.0	95
HOOPSb	8	Wave 2	2.197/0.651	224/50		0.01	1.45	54.0	97
Bunkerb	1		1.860/0.490	113/49			1.25	5.5	74
Bunkerb	1	Wave 3	2.146/0.659	1420/460		0.02	1.72	6.0	86

[a]Crane
[b]Zip line
*Rainy day
^Fine particle filter in Fig. 1

Correct Table 4

Table 4

Summary of combustion product concentrations measured by OGES Crane

Fuel	Initial thickness (cm)	Wave number	Peak/Avg produced CO_2 (vol%)	Peak/Avg produced CO (ppm)	Peak/Avg consumed O_2 (vol%)	Soot^ (g)	Regression rate (mm/min)	Burn time (min)	Burn efficiency (%)
HOOPS[a]	8		0.247/	33/	0.117/	0.01	1.54	30.0	57
HOOPS[a*]	8	Wave 1	0.858/0.455	105/34	0.292/	0.10	1.86	42.0	95
HOOPS[b]	8	Wave 2	2.197/0.651	224/50		0.01	1.45	54.0	97
Bunker[b]	1		1.860/0.490	113/49			1.25	5.5	74
Bunker[b]	1	Wave 3	2.146/0.659	1420/460		0.02	1.72	6.0	86

* Rainy day

^ Fine particle filter in Fig. 1

[a] Crane

[b] Zip line

Table 5

The terms are presented incorrectly. The division sign is missing, and the dot is not above the Q. $2/5/zQ^{\cdot}$.

Error

Table 5

Summary of Mass Flow Rate Correlations for a Buoyant Diffusion Flame from McCaffrey [14]

Regime	$zQ^{\cdot 2/5}$ ($m/kW^{2/5}$)	Correlation
Continuous flame	< 0.08	$m/Q^{\cdot} = 0.111(z/Q^{\cdot 2/5})^{0.566}$
Intermittent	0.08–0.20	$m/Q^{\cdot} = 0.026(z/Q^{\cdot 2/5})^{0.909}$
Plume	> 0.20	$m/Q^{\cdot} = 0.124(z/Q^{\cdot 2/5})^{1.895}$

Correct

Regime	$z/\dot{Q}^{2/5}$ (m/kW$^{2/5}$)	Correlation
Continuous flame	< 0.08	$\dot{m}/\dot{Q} = 0.011(z/\dot{Q}^{2/5})^{0.566}$
Intermittent	0.08 – 0.20	$\dot{m}/\dot{Q} = 0.026(z/\dot{Q}^{2/5})^{0.909}$
Plume	> 0.20	$\dot{m}/\dot{Q} = 0.124(z/\dot{Q}^{2/5})^{1.895}$

Table 6

Similar to Table 5, the terms are presented incorrectly. The division sign is missing, and the dot is not above the Q. Additionally, the units for the values under k are presented incorrectly. The s is appearing after the parentheses. There are multiplication signs appearing after the parentheses, and the superscript over m and kW are reversed in the last row. Please see the Correct portion for the proper units and values. $2/5/zQ^{\cdot}$.

Error

Table 6
Summary of Centerline Constants for a Buoyant Diffusion Flame from McCaffrey [14]

Regime	k	η	$zQ^{\cdot 2/5}$ (m/kW$^{2/5}$)	C
Continuous flame	6.8 (m$^{1/2}$/)s	1/2	< 0.08	0.9
Intermittent	1.9 (m/kW$^{1/5}$ s).	0	0.08–0.20	0.9
Plume	1.1 (m$^{1/3}$/kW$^{4/3}$ s).	-1/3	> 0.20	0.9

Correct

Regime	k	η	$z/\dot{Q}^{2/5}$ (m/kW$^{2/5}$)	C
Continuous flame	6.8 (m$^{1/2}$/s)	1/2	< 0.08	0.9
Intermittent	1.9 (m/kW$^{1/5}\cdot$s)	0	0.08 – 0.20	0.9
Plume	1.1 (m$^{4/3}$/kW$^{1/3}\cdot$s)	-1/3	> 0.20	0.9

Eqn. (1)
The 2 in CO2 should be subscript, like CO_2.

Error

$$MCE = \frac{CO2}{CO2 + CO} \tag{1}$$

Correct (2 should be subscript)

$$MCE = \frac{CO_2}{CO_2 + CO} \tag{1}$$

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