ERRATUM

Interpretation of the causes of instability of flash visual evoked potentials in intraoperative monitoring and proposal of a recording method for reliable functional monitoring of visual evoked potentials using a light-emitting device

An error appeared in the article by Sato (Sato A: Interpretation of the causes of instability of flash visual evoked potentials in intraoperative monitoring and proposal of a recording method for reliable functional monitoring of

visual evoked potentials using a light-emitting device. *J Neurosurg* [epub ahead of print February 19, 2016; DOI: 10.3171/2015.10.JNS151228]).

Figure 5 was incorrect. The correct figure is shown here.

The article has been corrected online as of July 29, 2016.

Atsushi Sato, MD
Ina Central Hospital, Ina, Japan

CORRESPONDING ARTICLE See pp 888–897.

INCLUDE WHEN CITING

Published online July 29, 2016; DOI: 10.3171/2016.7.JNS151228a.
©AANS, 2016

FIG. 5. The *upper graphs* show correlations between the peak latency during the light emission time and each peak latency. The left 3 graphs are data for the off response, and the right 3 graphs are data for the on response. The off response was analyzed by Mann-Whitney tests relative to 800 msec. The on response was analyzed by Mann-Whitney tests relative to 200 msec. The *lower graphs* show correlations between the peak latency and the emission quantity. The off response was analyzed by Wilcoxon signed-rank test relative to 50%. The on response was analyzed by Wilcoxon signed-rank test relative to 100%. ms = msec. *p < 0.0083. **p < 0.025.