



## Corrigendum

Corrigendum to “Fracture behaviour of MOD restorations reinforced by various fibre reinforced techniques – An in vitro study” [J. Mech. Behav. Biomed. Mater. 98 (2019) 348–356]

Tekla Sáry<sup>a</sup>, Sufyan Garoushi<sup>b</sup>, Gábor Braunitzer<sup>c</sup>, David Alleman<sup>d</sup>, András Volom<sup>a</sup>, Márk Fráter<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Operative and Esthetic Dentistry, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary

<sup>b</sup> Department of Biomaterials Science and Turku Clinical Biomaterials Center -TCBC, Institute of Dentistry, University of Turku, Turku, Finland

<sup>c</sup> DicomLAB Dental Ltd., Szeged, Hungary

<sup>d</sup> The Alleman Center for Biomimetic Dentistry, Utah, USA

The authors regret that the figures in Table 2 got mixed up after adjusting the order of the tested groups. This mistake is only present in Table 2., and does not affect the discussion or the conclusions drawn.

Please find attached the corrected [Table 2](#) in order to aid the interpretation of our results.

The authors would like to apologise for any inconvenience caused.

**Table 2**

Significance matrix from the post-hoc pairwise comparisons (Tukey's HSD). The conventions are the same as in Table 1. Empty cells indicate lack of significance.

|                 | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 | Group 5 | Group 6 | Group 7 | Group 8 | Group 9 | Group 10 | Group 11 | Group 12 |
|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|
| <b>Group 1</b>  | –       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |          | 0.000    | 0.033    |
| <b>Group 2</b>  |         | –       | 0.041   |         |         |         |         |         |         |          | 0.005    |          |
| <b>Group 3</b>  |         | 0.041   | –       |         | 0.001   | 0.000   | 0.009   | 0.000   | 0.000   | 0.002    | 0.000    | 0.000    |
| <b>Group 4</b>  |         |         |         | –       |         | 0.0023  |         | 0.049   | 0.007   |          | 0.000    | 0.000    |
| <b>Group 5</b>  |         |         | 0.001   |         | –       |         |         |         |         |          |          |          |
| <b>Group 6</b>  |         |         |         | 0.000   | 0.023   |         | –       |         |         |          |          |          |
| <b>Group 7</b>  |         |         |         |         | 0.009   |         |         | –       |         |          |          | 0.026    |
| <b>Group 8</b>  |         |         |         |         |         | 0.000   | 0.049   |         |         |          |          |          |
| <b>Group 9</b>  |         |         |         |         |         | 0.000   | 0.007   |         |         |          |          |          |
| <b>Group 10</b> |         |         |         |         |         | 0.002   |         |         |         |          |          |          |
| <b>Group 11</b> | 0.000   | 0.005   | 0.000   | 0.000   |         |         | 0.026   |         |         |          |          |          |
| <b>Group 12</b> | 0.033   |         | 0.000   | 0.000   |         |         |         |         |         |          |          | –        |

DOI of original article: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmbbm.2019.07.006>.

\* Corresponding author. Department of Operative and Esthetic Dentistry Faculty of Dentistry, University of Szeged, Tisza Lajos Krt. 64-66, H-6720, Szeged, Hungary.

E-mail address: [meddentist.fm@gmail.com](mailto:meddentist.fm@gmail.com) (M. Fráter).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmbbm.2019.103505>

1751-6161/© 2019 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.