



Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.



## Corrigenda

## Corrigendum to ‘Risk perception and resource scarcity in food procurement during the early outbreak of COVID-19’ [Public Health 195 (2021) 152–157]



Y. Wang <sup>a</sup>, X. Chen <sup>b, c, \*</sup>, Y. Yang <sup>d</sup>, Y. Cui <sup>b</sup>, R. Xu <sup>c, e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Marketing and Management, State University of New York at Oswego, Oswego, NY, 13126, USA

<sup>b</sup> Department of Geography, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, 06269, USA

<sup>c</sup> Institute for Collaboration on Health, Intervention, and Policy (InCHIP), USA

<sup>d</sup> Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, 19122, USA

<sup>e</sup> Department of Allied Health Sciences, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, 06269, USA

The authors regret the following errors in the originally published version:

1. In Table 1, for the ‘food security status’, the ‘Secure - secure’ category should be ‘391, 16.37%.’

Here is the updated Table 1:

**Table 1**  
Demographics of survey participants.

| Variable  | Subgroup               | N (Percentage)         |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|
| Gender  | Male                   | 1,359 (56.9%)          |
|   | Non-male               | 1,029 (43.1%)          |
| Age   | 18–24                  | 156 (6.53%)            |
|   | 25–34                  | 1,039 (43.51%)         |
|   | 35–44                  | 595 (24.92%)           |
|   | 45–54                  | 365 (15.28%)           |
|   | 55–64                  | 177 (7.41%)            |
|   | 65 and above           | 56 (2.35%)             |
| Ethnicity   | Caucasian              | 1,692 (70.85%)         |
|   | African American       | 342 (14.32%)           |
|   | Latino                 | 129 (5.40%)            |
|   | Asian                  | 160 (6.70%)            |
|   | Native American        | 37 (1.55%)             |
|   | Other                  | 28 (1.17%)             |
|   | Educational attainment | Finished middle school |
| Finished high school                              |                        | 201 (8.42%)            |
| Some college                                      |                        | 398 (16.67%)           |
| Completed 2-year college                          |                        | 220 (9.21%)            |
| Completed 4-year college                          |                        | 1,278 (53.52%)         |
| Attended graduate school                          |                        | 283 (11.85%)           |
| Employment  |                        | Employed for wages     |
|   | Not employed for wages | 390 (16.33%)           |
| Food security status (before-during the pandemic) | Secure–secure          | 391 (16.37%)           |
|   | Secure-insecure        | 438 (18.34%)           |
|   | Insecure–secure        | 24 (1.01%)             |
|   | Insecure–insecure      | 1,535 (64.28%)         |

2. In Line 148, it is currently written as ‘Table 3 reveals the relationships among the behavioral changes: the **increase** in in-store safety perception ...’

It should be ‘Line 148: Table 3 reveals the relationships among the behavioural changes: the decrease in in-store safety perception ...’

Here is the updated paragraph:

Table 3 reveals the relationships among the behavioural changes: the decrease in in-store safety perception was associated with both the decrease in shopping frequency ( $\beta = .18, P < .01$ ) and the increase in food expenditure ( $\beta = -7.00, P < .01$ ). Also, people’s food security status during the pandemic further impacted the relationship between shopping frequency and food expenditure, as shown by the interaction term ( $\beta = -22.68, P < .01$ ). This result indicates that the mediation effects on food procurement differ among people in different food security statuses.

The authors would like to apologise for any inconvenience caused.

DOI of original article: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2021.04.020>.

\* Corresponding author. Department of Geography, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, 06269, USA.

E-mail address: [xiang.chen@uconn.edu](mailto:xiang.chen@uconn.edu) (X. Chen).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2021.11.008>

0033-3506/Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of The Royal Society for Public Health.