

## Erratum

The figures were mislabeled in the article “Grading lumber with acoustic-based technologies Part 1: Modeling acoustic (stress) wave behavior in clear wood and lumber” by Christopher Adam Senalik, F. J. N. Franca, R. D. Seale, Robert J. Rosss, and R. Shmulsky in the October 2020 issue (52(4)), pp. 380-389. We apologize to the authors for this error. Here are the correct labels for the article.

Figure 1. Unrestrained prismatic bar.

Figure 2. Free body diagram of differential element  $dx$ .

Figure 3. Construction of specimens.

Figure 4. Experimental test setup recording time-domain signal.

Figure 5. (a). Theoretical longitudinal vibration of a prismatic bar, generated using physical and mechanical property data for loblolly pine and Eq 18. Time domain with nine harmonics of the fundamental frequency. (b). Frequency-domain analysis showing the relative magnitude of each harmonic.

Figure 6. Comparison of MOE and fundamental frequencies from acoustic wave measurement and static testing. (a) Dynamic MOE vs tension MOE. (b) Fundamental frequencies predicted by the model given in Eq 18 vs those taken from acoustic signals during testing.

Figure 7. Time- and frequency-domain plots of a high- and low-elastic modulus specimen. The dashed vertical lines in the frequency-domain plots are the average fundamental frequency of 1030 Hz (Coefficient of Variation (COV)) 0.2%) for all 103 specimens, and the first two harmonics at 2060 Hz and 3090 Hz. (a and c) are the time- and frequency-domain plots of defect free specimen 74 with MOE of 11.6 GPA, respectively. (b and d) are the time- and frequency-domain plots of specimen 62 with MOE of 20.2 GPA, respectively.

Figure 8. This figure was correctly labeled.