Correction: Receiving, or ‘Adopting’, Donated Embryos to Have Children: Parents Narrate and Draw Kinship Boundaries
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The authors wish to make the following corrections to this paper published in Genealogy (Tasker et al., 2018), reflecting regrettable misrepresentation of one research participant’s experience.

(1) In Table 1, page 6, it states that participant Anne was still trying for an IVF pregnancy with her husband and the same information is stated in the text below the table; however, this is not the case. The statement on page 15 that “Anne also still desired to have genetically related children with her husband and they were on yet another IVF cycle using their own gametes when Anne was interviewed” is similarly incorrect.

(2) On page 13, it states that Anne, along with two other participants, “could not ignore the presence of the donors in their lives”. This statement is inaccurate with respect to Anne.

(3) On page 13/14, Anne is represented as not liking the open-contact relationship with the donor couple; however, this is a misrepresentation. On the contrary, Anne had initially expressed some concerns but as she learned more about the process she realized that open donation is in the best interests of children. Furthermore, her family and the donor family have gradually and mutually evolved to more frequent and open contact as the years passed. The worries she discusses were thus “initial” rather than being current.

(4) On page 14 in the discussion of Anne’s family map, the statement that Anne included the donor family in her family map despite her reservations is inaccurate.

(5) In the same paragraph on page 14, there is a quote from Anne presented in parenthesis which is inaccurate.

(6) Anne’s engagement with Christianity is misrepresented. It is more accurate to say that she felt less invested in (versus isolated and on the margins of) “the wider Christian values ‘family’ concept as fostered by the embryo adoption agency”.
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