Errata

The Authors wish to make a correction to their article published in JAMDA (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2014.10.014) “The Vegetative State: Prevalence, Misdiagnosis, and Treatment Limitations”.

The following sentences should have read 6 years 2 months); 2 nontrauma for 3 to 12 months, 10 for 1 to 5 years, 5 for 5 to 10 years, and 3 for more than 10 years. One patient had suffered traumatic brain injury at age 18, and was now 43.

Forty-one percent of patients with a reported clinical diagnosis of VS/UWS (39%) showed signs of consciousness: 11 were in MCS+, 4 in MCS−, and 2 were conscious (Table 2).

Table 3 should have read...

The Authors wish to make a correction to their article published in JAMDA (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2018.05.019) “Gait Speed Assessment in Older Adults: A Comparison Among Walk Tests, a Portable Gait Analysis Device and Self-Report”.

The authors have detected some mistakes in the results section. Consequently, some data are incorrect, and Figure 1 should be replaced with the new Figure. Although these errata do not change the direction of the discussion and conclusions, it should be changed so that the correct data is available.

The authors apologize for these errors and for any inconvenience this may cause.

The highest mean gait speed was for the 6-m walk test (1.2 ± 0.20 m/s), followed by the 2.44-m walk test (1.04 ± 0.25 m/s) and the self-report (0.94 ± 0.06 m/s).

The highest correlations were observed between the 2.44-m and the 6-m walk tests and between the 2.44-m walk test and the self-report ($r = 0.496$, $P < .001$, and $r = 0.414$, $P < .001$, respectively). Although lower, the correlations were also moderate between the 6-m walk test and both self-report and the portable gait analysis device ($r = 0.396$, $P < .001$, and $r = 0.322$, $P = .001$, respectively). Likewise, the lowest correlations were observed between the portable gait analysis IDEEA device and both the 2.44-m walk test and the self-report ($r = 0.322$, $P < .001$, and $r = .318$, $P = .001$, respectively).

The Residents’ mean age (standard deviation) was incorrect and should be 77.6 years (13.7), consistent with the main text and Table 1. The authors regret this error.
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