Erratum

In the last issue of Journal of Aquatic Plant Management, 52#1, January 2014, in the article "Response of invasive floating plants and nontarget emergent plants to foliar applications of imazamox and penoxsulam by Christopher R. Mudge and M. D. Netherland, page 4, the following table appeared incorrectly. Below is the corrected version. The revised table will be added to the original article when this manuscript is published online.

Table 2. Days to 10% or greater visual injury of floating target and emergent non-target aquatic plant species treated with foliar herbicide and herbicide COMBINATION TREATMENTS.

Treatment	Floating target plants		Emergent nontarget plants				
	Waterhyacinth	Waterlettuce	Lanceleaf arrowhead	Jointed spikerush	Gulfcoast spikerush	California bulrush	Softstem bulrush
I + S ^{a,b}	10°	7	14	_	_	_	_
I + C + S	4	3	7	14	_	_	_
$I + E^{d} + S$	N/A	N/A	7	14	14	_	14
I + F + S	4	2	7	_	_	7	7
I + 2 S	7	7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
P + S	10	7	7	_	_	_	_
P + C + S	4	3	7	14	_	14	14
$P + E^{d} + S$	N/A	N/A	7	14	14	14	14
P + F + S	4	2	7	14	_	7	7
P + 2 S	7	7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2,4-D + S	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	3
2,4-D + D + S	N/A	N/A	1	1	1	1	1

^a Abbreviations: I, imazamox; P, penoxsulam; C, carfentrazone; E, endothall; F, flumioxazin; S, surfactant; D, diquat.

 $^{^{\}rm b} \ Herbicide \ (ga.i.ha^{-1}) \ and \ surfactant \ application \ rates; I, 70.1; P, 35.0; C, 16.6; E, 37.1; F, 17.9; S, 1.0\% \ v/v; 2 \ Surf, 1\% \ plus \ 0.5\% \ v/v; 2,4-D, 2130.6 \ (alone) \ and \ 1065.3 \ (combination \ v/v) \ (alone) \ and \ 1065.3 \ (blue \ v/v) \ (alone) \ and \ (alone) \ (al$

c Injury indicates number of days until injury was ≥10%; N/A indicates that the herbicide was not applied to the given plant species; — indicates that plant injury never exceed 10%. d Endothall and 2,4-D were applied as g a.e. ha^{-1} .