



Corrigendum: Effects of Whole Body Electrostimulation Associated With Body Weight Training on Functional Capacity and Body Composition in Inactive Older People

Alexandre Lopes Evangelista¹, Angelica Castilho Alonso², Raphael M. Ritti-Dias³, Bruna Massaroto Barros³, Cleison Rodrigues de Souza¹, Tiago Volpi Braz⁴, Danilo Sales Bocalini¹ and Julia Maria D'andréa Greve^{5*}

¹ Laboratório de Fisiologia e Bioquímica Experimental, Centro de Educação Física e Esporte, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória, Brazil, ² Programa de Mestrado Ciências do Envelhecimento, Universidade São Judas Tadeu, São Paulo, Brazil, ³ Programa de Pós-graduação em ciências da reabilitação, Universidade Nove de Julho, São Paulo, Brazil, ⁴ Laboratório de Avaliação do Movimento Humano, Universidade Metodista de Piracicaba, Piracicaba, Brazil, ⁵ Departamento de Ortopedia e Traumatologia, Universidade de São Paulo Faculdade de Medicina, São Paulo, Brazil

OPEN ACCESS

Keywords: older adults, electrostimulation, physical function, body composition, functional fitness

Edited and reviewed by:

Beat Knechtle,
Universitätsklinikum
Zürich, Switzerland

*Correspondence:

Julia Maria D'andréa Greve
jgreve@usp.br

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Exercise Physiology,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Physiology

Received: 13 April 2021

Accepted: 19 April 2021

Published: 20 May 2021

Citation:

Evangelista AL, Alonso AC, Ritti-Dias RM, Barros BM, Souza CRd, Braz TV, Bocalini DS and Greve JMD (2021) Corrigendum: Effects of Whole Body Electrostimulation Associated With Body Weight Training on Functional Capacity and Body Composition in Inactive Older People. *Front. Physiol.* 12:694855. doi: 10.3389/fphys.2021.694855

A Corrigendum on

Effects of Whole Body Electrostimulation Associated With Body Weight Training on Functional Capacity and Body Composition in Inactive Older People

by Evangelista, A. L., Alonso, A. C., Ritti-Dias, R. M., Barros, B. M., Souza, C. R. d., Braz, T. V., et al. (2021). *Front. Physiol.* 12:638936. doi: 10.3389/fphys.2021.638936

In the original article, there was a mistake in the legend for **Table 2** as published. The incorrect legend reads as “**** ST+EMS= strength training combined with electrical muscle stimulation.” The correct legend should read as “BW+WB-EMS: body weight associated with whole body electrostimulation****.” The correct legend appears below.

In the original article, there was a mistake in **Table 2**. The lean mass signs \dagger need to be removed, since there was no statistical difference between pre *versus* post. The corrected **Table 2** appears below.

In the original article, there was an error in the first paragraph of the **Results** section. It currently reads as “No differences were found in baseline parameters for any outcome parameters. As presented in **Table 2**, the values of sitting-rising test, arm curl, 6-min walk test, and handgrip strength were different from the pre-intervention value and the control group. However, the values in the stationary march test, and back scratch test, left and right side, were different only for the control group. No differences were found in the 8 feet up-and-go test.”

The paragraph should read as “As presented in **Table 2**, significant differences were found in baseline parameters between the control group and the BW+WB-EMS group for the stationary march test and the Back scratch test. The values of sitting-rising test, arm curl, 6-min walk test, and handgrip strength were different from the pre-intervention value and the control group. However,

TABLE 2 | Alterations on body composition and functional fitness after 6 weeks of strength training combined with electrical muscle stimulation.

Parameters	Pre	Post	Δ%	MD [95%CI]	Time	Time*Group
					p-value	p-value
BODY COMPOSITION						
Body mass (kg)						
Control	69.9 ± 11.7	67.6 ± 11.9	0.5	2.3 [−1.2 to 2.8]	= 0.402	= 0.507
BW+WB-EMS	76.2 ± 16.2	76.2 ± 16.9	−0.6	−0.1 [2.2 to 5.4]	= 0.504	
Fat body (%)						
Control	31.8 ± 12.2	31.8 ± 12.7	−0.1	0.1 [−0.7 to 0.9]	= 0.672	= 0.534
BW+WB-EMS	34.6 ± 6.6	35.0 ± 7.1	1.0	0.4 [−0.5 to 2.5]	= 0.388	
Lean mass (kg)						
Control	45.7 ± 8.6	45.6 ± 8.2	−0.2	−0.1 [−0.4 to 0.2]	= 0.409	= 0.438
BW+WB-EMS	49.4 ± 12.1	50.0 ± 11.1	1.1	0.6 [−0.3 to 1.5]	= 0.327	
FUNCTIONAL FITNESS						
Sitting-rising test (reps)						
Control	11.8 ± 4.9	12.0 ± 2.7	1.7	0.2 [−0.1 to 0.5]	= 0.192	= 0.024
BW+WB-EMS	10.2 ± 3.3	13.8 ± 5.0 [†]	35.3	2.6 [1.3 to 3.9]	= 0.022	
Arm curl (reps)						
Control	14.3 ± 3.2	14.5 ± 2.9	1.4	0.2 [−0.8 to 1.2]	= 0.289	= 0.012
BW+WB-EMS	16.6 ± 3.9	19.9 ± 6.1 [†]	19.9	3.3 [0.9 to 5.7]	= 0.007	
Stationary march test (reps)						
Control	36.8 ± 11.4	37.4 ± 9.2	1.6	0.8 [−0.4 to 2.0]	= 0.289	= 0.045
BW+WB-EMS	51.2 ± 23.8 [#]	52.5 ± 19.0 [#]	2.5	1.3 [0.1 to 2.5]	= 0.183	
Back scratch test-left (cm)						
Control	19.0 ± 16.1	18.5 ± 15.2	−2.7	−0.5 [−2.1 to 1.1]	= 0.128	= 0.023
BW+WB-EMS	9.1 ± 11.1 [#]	9.5 ± 8.3 [#]	4.4	0.4 [−0.7 to 1.5]	= 0.107	
Back scratch test-right (cm)						
Control	16.4 ± 13.9	15.0 ± 12.5	−8.4	−1.4 [−3.6 to 0.8]	= 0.338	= 0.042
BW+WB-EMS	7.0 ± 8.5 [#]	5.1 ± 7.0 [#]	−27.1	−1.9 [−3.9 to 0.1]	= 0.256	
8 feet up-and-go (s)						
Control	10.5 ± 3.3	9.4 ± 3.0	−10.7	−1.1 [−3.6 to 1.4]	= 0.202	= 0.132
BW+WB-EMS	8.6 ± 3.0	7.2 ± 2.4	−16.8	−1.4 [−2.9 to 0.1]	= 0.159	
6-Min walk test (m)						
Control	355 ± 104	372 ± 92	4.8	17 [2 to 42]	= 0.307	= 0.008
BW+WB-EMS	401 ± 96	527 ± 127 [†]	31.3	126 [98 to 154]	= 0.001	
Handgrip strength (kgf)						
Control	28.0 ± 7.0	27.7 ± 6.7	−1.1	−0.3 [−1.8 to 1.2]	= 0.303	= 0.022
BW+WB-EMS	30.1 ± 10.7	32.2 ± 10.8 [†]	7.0	1.1 [0.2 to 2.0]	= 0.004	

Values expressed in mean ± standard deviation. BW+WB-EMS = body weight combined with electrical muscle stimulation; MD[95% IC] = mean difference and 95% confidence interval.

[†] Significantly greater than the corresponding pre-intervention value ($p < 0.05$).

[#] Significantly greater than the control group ($p < 0.05$).

the values in the stationary march test, and back scratch test, left and right side, were different only for the control group. No differences were found in the 8 feet up-and-go test.”

The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.

Copyright © 2021 Evangelista, Alonso, Ritti-Dias, Barros, Souza, Braz, Bocalini and Greve. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.