

# SCIENTIFIC REPORTS

OPEN

## Corrigendum: Towards automatic pulmonary nodule management in lung cancer screening with deep learning

F. Ciompi, K. Chung, S. J. van Riel, A. A. A. Setio, P. K. Gerke, C. Jacobs, E. T. Scholten, C. Schaefer-Prokop, M. M. W. Wille, A. Marchianò, U. Pastorino, M. Prokop & B. van Ginneken

*Scientific Reports* 7:46479; doi: 10.1038/srep46479; published online 19 April 2017; updated on 07 September 2017

This Article contains errors. The legend of Table 3 is incorrect.

**'Nodule classification performance in terms of accuracy and F-measure per nodule type.** Results for each pair of human observer  $O_i$  vs.  $O_j$  and for observers versus the computer on the  $test_{OBS}$  dataset (167 nodules) are reported. Averages of measures across observers and across computer-observers are also indicated. The additional class "not a nodule" is added to observers since they could exclude nodules during the observer study. The performance of the system on the  $test_{ALL}$  set (639 nodules) is also reported. In this case, annotations from DLCST radiologists (O4) are considered as the reference standard'.

should read:

**'Nodule classification performance in terms of accuracy and F-measure per nodule type.** Results for each pair of human observer  $O_i$  vs.  $O_j$  and for observers versus the computer on the  $test_{OBS}$  dataset (167 nodules) are reported. Averages of measures across observers and across computer-observers are also indicated. The additional class "not a nodule" is added to observers since they could exclude nodules during the observer study'.

Additionally, the title of Table 4 is incomplete.

'Comparison of classification performance in terms of accuracy and F-measure when the considered methods are: (1) features based on pixel intensity of patches and linear SVM classifier, (2) features learned from raw nodule patches using the unsupervised learning approach proposed in ref. 34 and linear SVM classifier, (3) the proposed deep learning approach using ConvNets working at 1, 2 and 3 scales'.

should read:

'Comparison of classification performance on the  $test_{ALL}$  set (639 nodules) in terms of accuracy and F-measure when the considered methods are: (1) features based on pixel intensity of patches and linear SVM classifier, (2) features learned from raw nodule patches using the unsupervised learning approach proposed in ref. 34 and linear SVM classifier, (3) the proposed deep learning approach using ConvNets working at 1, 2 and 3 scales. In these experiments, annotations from DLCST radiologists (O4) are considered as the reference standard'.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in the credit line; if the material is not included under the Creative Commons license, users will need to obtain permission from the license holder to reproduce the material. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

© The Author(s) 2017