

Page 21, line 2: are important → **is** important

Page 22, line 12: Keratinocytes make a major contribution to the inflammation reaction → [...] to the **inflammatory** reaction

Page 25, line 15: angiogenetic proteins → **angiogenic** proteins

Page 40, line 14: due a lower template-to-solid phase ratio → due **to** a [...]

Page 69, line 17: 30-fold difference between signal changes of both enzymes. Clarification: the signal change of Rgp is 30-fold higher than that of trypsin.

Paper I, abstract, line 11-12: secrete → secretes

Paper I, abstract, line 22: dissociation constants → **affinity** constants

Paper I, figure 1: the polymer film after applying the stamp with added weight is missing

Paper II, page 3: 150 mL of ethylene glycol was used, not 150 m.

Paper II, page 4: to clarify, the resolution of 4 for the FTIR method corresponds to a data point separation of 0.4281 cm^{-1} .

Paper II, page 8: the typical LOD calculation method was written as the simpler version of 3 S/N. This is incorrect and should be the more precise 3.3 S/N instead.

Paper III, page 15, figure 6: the y-axis is labelled as total biomass with units μm^2 . The bar graph shows the surface coverage of the bacteria, and the units are correct.

Paper III, page 30, figure S3-A: the empty square boxes in the legend indicate molar ratio and are supposed to be signified by χ .

Paper IV, page 3, line 16-17: It is written that the designed peptide has increased specificity towards hydrolysis by Rgp compared to other proteins. To clarify, this means that Rgp has a higher tendency to hydrolyse the peptide compared to other proteins.

Page 21, line 2: are important → **is** important

Page 22, line 12: Keratinocytes make a major contribution to the inflammation reaction → [...] to the **inflammatory** reaction

Page 25, line 15: angiogenetic proteins → **angiogenic** proteins

Page 40, line 14: due a lower template-to-solid phase ratio → due **to** a [...]

Page 69, line 17: 30-fold difference between signal changes of both enzymes. Clarification: the signal change of Rgp is 30-fold higher than that of trypsin.

Paper I, abstract, line 11-12: secrete → secretes

Paper I, abstract, line 22: dissociation constants → **affinity** constants

Paper I, figure 1: the polymer film after applying the stamp with added weight is missing

Paper II, page 3: 150 mL of ethylene glycol was used, not 150 m.

Paper II, page 4: to clarify, the resolution of 4 for the FTIR method corresponds to a data point separation of 0.4281 cm^{-1} .

Paper II, page 8: the typical LOD calculation method was written as the simpler version of 3 S/N. This is incorrect and should be the more precise 3.3 S/N instead.

Paper III, page 15, figure 6: the y-axis is labelled as total biomass with units μm^2 . The bar graph shows the surface coverage of the bacteria, and the units are correct.

Paper III, page 30, figure S3-A: the empty square boxes in the legend indicate molar ratio and are supposed to be signified by χ .

Paper IV, page 3, line 16-17: It is written that the designed peptide has increased specificity towards hydrolysis by Rgp compared to other proteins. To clarify, this means that Rgp has a higher tendency to hydrolyse the peptide compared to other proteins.