

CORRECTION

Correction: Does artificial nutrition improve outcome of critical illness?

Miet Schetz*, Michael Paul Casaer and Greet Van den Berghe

See related viewpoint by Schetz *et al.*, <http://ccforum.com/content/17/1/302>

Correction

After publication of their article [1], the authors noticed two errors in their viewpoint.

On page 4 under the subheading “Recent randomized controlled trials”, the text currently reads “However, both ICU and hospital stays were shorter in the tight-calorie group, clearly introducing the statistical problem of informative censoring/competing risk that we discussed earlier.” The ICU and hospital stays are in fact longer in the tight-calorie group, and this statement should therefore read “However, both ICU and hospital stays were longer in the tight-calorie group, clearly introducing the statistical problem of informative censoring/competing risk that we discussed earlier.”

On page 5 also under the subheading “Recent randomized controlled trials”, the text currently reads “The EN

amount did not differ between groups and reached $\pm 50\%$ of target at day 7.” In fact, the EN amount reached $\pm 20\%$ of target at day 7, and this statement should therefore read “The EN amount did not differ between groups and reached $\pm 20\%$ of target at day 7.”

Competing interests

The authors have no competing interests.

Published: 18 February 2013

Reference

1. Schetz M, Casaer MP, Van den Berghe: Does artificial nutrition improve outcome of critical illness? *Critical Care* 2013, **17**:302.

doi:10.1186/cc12509

Cite this article as: Schetz M, *et al.*: Correction: Does artificial nutrition improve outcome of critical illness? *Critical Care* 2013, **17**:413.

*Correspondence: marie.schetz@uzleuven.be
Department of Intensive Care Medicine, University Hospitals Leuven, Herestraat 49,
B3000 Leuven, Belgium