Erratum

The Barrow Ruptured Aneurysm Trial: 3-year results

Clinical article

To the Editor: We appreciate the publication of our paper entitled “The Barrow Ruptured Aneurysm Trial: 3-year results. Clinical article” (J Neurosurg 119:146–157, 2013).

Recently a Letter to the Editor from Dr. Daniel J. Denis1 alerted us to 2 errors in our paper.

1. In the Methods section of the Abstract, we originally stated:

Of the 170 patients who had been originally assigned to coiling, 64 (38%) crossed over to clipping, whereas 4 (2%) of 179 patients assigned to surgery crossed over to clipping.

The last word of this sentence should have been “coiling,” and thus the corrected sentence is

Of the 170 patients who had been originally assigned to coiling, 64 (38%) crossed over to clipping, whereas 4 (2%) of 179 patients assigned to surgery crossed over to coiling.

2. In the legend to Table 2, we initially stated:

* Coil-coil compared to coil-clip at 3 years: p = 0.007. Coil-clip compared to clip-clip at 3 years: p = 0.26. Coil-coil compared to clip-clip at 3 years: p = 0.0.

The last p value is incorrect; it should have been 0.04.

The corrected legend entry is thus

* Coil-coil compared to coil-clip at 3 years: p = 0.007. Coil-clip compared to clip-clip at 3 years: p = 0.26. Coil-coil compared to clip-clip at 3 years: p = 0.04.

We have bolded the words that have been corrected.

We apologize to the editor and readers for our errors, and we thank Dr. Denis for pointing them out. We are pleased to have the opportunity to make these corrections. The errors were corrected online as of November 29, 2013.
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TABLE 2: Patients with mRS scores > 2 based on actual treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Point</th>
<th>Available for Analysis</th>
<th>Coil-Coil (124/199) mRS &gt;2</th>
<th>Coil-Clip (75/199) mRS &gt;2</th>
<th>Clip-Clip (205/209) mRS &gt;2</th>
<th>Clip-Coil (4/209) mRS &gt;2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time of treatment</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discharge</td>
<td>72/124 58.1</td>
<td>55/74 74.3</td>
<td>144/204 70.6</td>
<td>3/4 75.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 mos</td>
<td>18/108 16.7</td>
<td>22/63 34.9</td>
<td>59/167 35.3</td>
<td>3/3 100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>20/109 18.4</td>
<td>22/65 33.9</td>
<td>61/180 33.9</td>
<td>3/4 75.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 yrs*</td>
<td>24/106 22.6</td>
<td>27/64 42.2</td>
<td>60/175 34.3</td>
<td>4/4 100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 yrs–CF†</td>
<td>24/111 21.6</td>
<td>27/64 42.2</td>
<td>60/184 32.6</td>
<td>4/4 100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Coil-coil compared to coil-clip at 3 years: p = 0.007. Coil-clip compared to clip-clip at 3 years: p = 0.26. Coil-coil compared to clip-clip at 3 years: p = 0.04.
† Includes patients seen at 1 year but not at 3 years.
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