PLOS ONE

CORRECTION

Correction: Rotating hinge knee versus constrained condylar knee in revision total knee arthroplasty: A meta-analysis

Jung-Ro Yoon, Ji-Young Cheong, Jung-Taek Im, Phil-Sun Park, Jae-Ok Park, Young-Soo Shin

In Table 2, the information presented was incorrectly duplicated within the table. Please view the correct Table 2 here.

Citation: Yoon J-R, Cheong J-Y, Im J-T, Park P-S, Park J-O, Shin Y-S (2019) Correction: Rotating hinge knee versus constrained condylar knee in revision total knee arthroplasty: A meta-analysis. PLoS ONE 14(4): e0216004. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216004

Published: April 18, 2019

Table 2. Sensitivity analysis.

Study	Parameter	Before exclusion	After exclusion	Statistical significance
Farfalli et al. [9] (2013)	ROM	MD = 4.77, 95% CI = -0.40 to 9.93, Z = 1.81, P = 0.07	MD = 4.86, 95% CI = -0.72 to 10.45, Z = 1.71, P = 0.09	No difference
	CR	OR = 1.28, 95% CI = 0.66,2.49, Z = 0.74, P = 0.46	OR = 1.12, 95% CI = 0.67,1.85, Z = 0.42, P = 0.67	No difference
	SR	OR = 0.77, 95% CI = 0.45,1.30, Z = 0.98, P = 0.33	OR = 0.61, 95% CI = 0.30,1.25, Z = 1.36, P = 0.18	No difference

ROM, range of motion; CR, complication rate; SR, survival rate; MD, mean difference; CI, confidence interval; OR, odd ratio

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216004.t001

Reference

1. Yoon J-R, Cheong J-Y, Im J-T, Park P-S, Park J-O, Shin Y-S (2019) Rotating hinge knee versus constrained condylar knee in revision total knee arthroplasty: A meta-analysis. PLoS ONE 14(3): e0214279. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0214279 PMID: 30908538