

14. Ran C, Zhang Z, Hooker J, Moore A. In vivo photoactivation without “light”: use of Cherenkov radiation to overcome the penetration limit of light. *Mol Imaging Biol.* 2012;14:156–162.
15. Kotagiri N, Sudlow GP, Akers WJ, Achilefu S. Breaking the depth dependency of phototherapy with Cherenkov radiation and low-radiance-responsive nanophotosensitizers. *Nat Nanotechnol.* 2015;10:370–379.
16. Kamkaew A, Cheng L, Goel S, et al. Cherenkov radiation induced photodynamic therapy using chlorin e6-loaded hollow mesoporous silica nanoparticles. *ACS Appl Mater Interfaces.* 2016;8:26630–26637.
17. Kavadiya S, Chadha TS, Liu H, Shah VB, Blankenship RE, Biswas P. Directed assembly of the thylakoid membrane on nanostructured TiO₂ for a photo-electrochemical cell. *Nanoscale.* 2016;8:1868–1872.
18. de Carvalho BA, Kavadiya S, Huang S, Niedzwiedzki DM, Biswas P. Highly stable perovskite solar cells fabricated under humid ambient conditions. *IEEE Journal of Photovoltaics.* 2017;7:532–538.
19. Kavadiya S, Niedzwiedzki DM, Huang S, Biswas P. Electrospray-assisted fabrication of moisture-resistant and highly stable perovskite solar cells at ambient conditions. *Advanced Energy Materials.* 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aenm.201700210>. Accessed November 19, 2018.
20. Lin L-Y, Nie Y, Kavadiya S, Soundappan T, Biswas P. N-doped reduced graphene oxide promoted nano TiO₂ as a bifunctional adsorbent/photocatalyst for CO₂ photoreduction: effect of N species. *Chem Eng J.* 2017;316:449–460.
21. Almquist CB, Biswas P. Role of synthesis method and particle size of nanostructured TiO₂ on its photoactivity. *J Catal.* 2002;212:145–156.
22. Namkhang P, An W-J, Wang W-N, Rane KS, Kongkachuichay P, Biswas P. Low temperature synthesis of N-doped TiO₂ nanocatalysts for photodegradation of methyl orange. *J Nanosci Nanotechnol.* 2013;13:2376–2381.
23. Duan D, Liu H, Xu Y, et al. Activating TiO₂ nanoparticles: gallium-68 serves as a high-yield photon emitter for Cherenkov-induced photodynamic therapy. *ACS Appl Mater Interfaces.* 2018;10:5278–5286.
24. Pratt EC, Shaffer TM, Zhang Q, Drain CM, Grimm J. Nanoparticles as multimodal photon transducers of ionizing radiation. *Nat Nanotechnol.* 2018;13:418–426.
25. Zhou Z, Song J, Nie L, Chen X. Reactive oxygen species generating systems meeting challenges of photodynamic cancer therapy. *Chem Soc Rev.* 2016;45:6597–6626.
26. Glaser AK, Zhang R, Gladstone DJ, Pogue BW. Optical dosimetry of radiotherapy beams using Cherenkov radiation: the relationship between light emission and dose. *Phys Med Biol.* 2014;59:3789–3811.
27. Glaser AK, Zhang R, Andreozzi JM, Gladstone DJ, Pogue BW. Cherenkov radiation fluence estimates in tissue for molecular imaging and therapy applications. *Phys Med Biol.* 2015;60:6701.
28. Gill RK, Mitchell GS, Cherry SR. Computed Cherenkov luminescence yields for radionuclides used in biology and medicine. *Phys Med Biol.* 2015;60:4263–4280.
29. Beattie BJ, Thorek DL, Schmidlein CR, Pentlow KS, Humm JL, Hielscher AH. Quantitative modeling of Cherenkov light production efficiency from medical radionuclides. *PLoS One.* 2012;7:e31402.
30. Ouyang Z, Liu B, Yasmin-Karim S, Sajo E, Ngwa W. Nanoparticle-aided external beam radiotherapy leveraging the Čerenkov effect. *Phys Med.* 2016;32:944–947.
31. Almquist CB, Biswas P. A mechanistic approach to modeling the effect of dissolved oxygen in photo-oxidation reactions on titanium dioxide in aqueous systems. *Chem Eng Sci.* 2001;56:3421–3430.
32. Kotagiri N, Laforest R, Achilefu S. Reply to ‘Is Cherenkov luminescence bright enough for photodynamic therapy?’. *Nat Nanotechnol.* 2018;13:354–355.
33. Anderson W, Belcher E. A standard light source of very low intensity based on the Cherenkov effect. *British Journal of Applied Physics.* 1954;5:53–57.
34. National Institute of Standards and Technology. ESTAR stopping-power and range tables for electrons. <https://physics.nist.gov/PhysRefData/Star/Text/ESTAR.html>. Accessed November 19, 2018.
35. Physical Sciences Resource Center. Lund/LBNL nuclear data search. <https://psrc.aapt.org/items/detail.cfm?ID=258>. Accessed November 19, 2018.
36. Villarreal TL, Gómez R, Gonzalez M, Salvador P. A kinetic model for distinguishing between direct and indirect interfacial hole transfer in the heterogeneous photooxidation of dissolved organics on TiO₂ nanoparticle suspensions. *J Phys Chem B.* 2004;108:20278–20290.
37. Gerischer H, Heller A. The role of oxygen in photooxidation of organic molecules on semiconductor particles. *J Phys Chem.* 1991;95:5261–5267.
38. Jiang J, Oberdörster G, Elder A, Gelein R, Mercer P, Biswas P. Does nanoparticle activity depend upon size and crystal phase? *Nanotoxicology.* 2008;2:33–42.
39. Niu G, Chen X. When radionuclides meet nanoparticles. *Nat Nanotechnol.* 2018;13:359–360.

Errata

In the article “¹⁸F-Flortaucipir PET/MRI Correlations in Nonamnesic and Amnesic Variants of Alzheimer Disease,” by Nasrallah et al. (*J Nucl Med.* 2018;59:299–306), grant numbers were inadvertently left out of the Disclosure section. The Disclosure should have included the following: The study was also partially funded by NIH grant numbers P01 AG017586 (PI. Virginia M. Lee), P30-AG010124 (PI. John Q. Trojanowski), and AG054519 (PI. Murray Grossman). The authors regret the error.

In the article “Immediate Postablation ¹⁸F-FDG Injection and Corresponding SUV Are Surrogate Biomarkers of Local Tumor Progression After Thermal Ablation of Colorectal Carcinoma Liver Metastases,” by Cornelis et al. (*J Nucl Med.* 2018;59:1360–1365), values in the SUV_{mean} and SUV_{max} columns of Table 1 were reversed. The corrected table appears below. The authors regret the error.

TABLE 1
Average SUVs of ROIs Before and After Ablation

ROI	SUV _{mean}	SUV _{max}
Including tumors		
Before ablation	2 (0.6)	9.2 (6.2)
After ablation	2.2 (0.6)	4.5 (1.7)
Including liver background only		
Before ablation	2.5 (0.5)	3.8 (1.6)
After ablation	3.2 (0.6)	4 (0.9)