Corrigendum to "Iron complexes of [2+2] and [6+6] Schiff-base macrocycles derived from 2,2′-oxydianiline and their applications" [Inorg. Chem. Commun. 139 (2022) 109376]

Kuiyuan Wang,[a] *Kai Chen,*[b] *Jiajun Cai,*[c] *and Carl Redshaw* [a*]

[a] Department of Chemistry, University of Hull, Hull, HU6 7RX, U.K.

[b] Collaborative Innovation Center of Atmospheric Environment and Equipment Technology, Jiangsu Key Laboratory of Atmospheric Environment Monitoring and Pollution Control, School of Environmental Science and Engineering, Nanjing University of Information Science & Technology, Nanjing 210044, P. R. China.

[c] MIIT Key Laboratory of Critical Materials Technology for New Energy Conversion and Storage School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering State Key Lab of Urban Water Resource and Environment, Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin 150001, P. R. China.

The authors regret that an error was made in the analysis of the crystal structure of **3**, which has the formula $[Fe_2(L^2H_4)][FeBr_3OFeBr_3]_2{\cdot}8MeCN$ rather than $[Fe_2(L^2H_2)][FeBr_3OFeBr_3]{\cdot}4MeCN$. The revised CIF has been updated and deposited with the CSD, and an updated version of the supplementary information file is provided.

The elemental analysis has been recalculated on the basis of the new formula ($C_{142}H_{118}N_{20}O_{14}Br_{12}Fe_6$, C 47.08%, H 3.28%, N 7.74%; found: C 46.88%, H, 3.15%, N 7.48%). The original analytical data suggest the sample prepared for elemental analysis was of the [2+2] type likely due to insufficient reflux. We additionally provide a new mass spectrum (see revised SI).

The authors apologise for these errors and any consequent inconvenience to authors and readers.