

CORRECTION

## Correction: Acetyl-L-carnitine in the Treatment of Peripheral Neuropathic Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials

Sheyu Li, Qianrui Li, Yun Li, Ling Li, Haoming Tian, Xin Sun

In Figs 2, 3, and 4, a trial named "Onofrj, 1995" should not be included. Please see the corrected figures here.



## 

**Citation:** Li S, Li Q, Li Y, Li L, Tian H, Sun X (2015) Correction: Acetyl-L-carnitine in the Treatment of Peripheral Neuropathic Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. PLoS ONE 10(6): e0129991. doi:10.1371/journal. pone.0129991

Published: June 12, 2015

**Copyright:** © 2015 Wynd et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the <u>Creative Commons Attribution License</u>, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.



	ALC			Control				Mean Difference	Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl		
De Grandis, 2002	-1.93	2.09	95	-0.35	1.1	104	40.3%	-1.58 [-2.05, -1.11]	+		
Sima, UC, 2005	-2.53	2.875	70	-0.972	3.112	48	16.0%	-1.56 [-2.67, -0.45]			
Sima, UCE, 2005	-2.175	3.458	58	-1.451	2.749	61	15.6%	-0.72 [-1.85, 0.40]			
Youle, 2007	-1.32	1.84	43	-0.61	1.55	44	28.0%	-0.71 [-1.43, 0.01]			
Total (95% CI)			266			257	100.0%	-1.20 [-1.72, -0.68]	◆		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 5.18, df = 3 (P = 0.16); I <sup>2</sup> = 42% -4 -2 0 2 4   Test for overall effect: Z = 4.54 (P < 0.00001)											

**Fig 2.** Overall Meta-analysis on the VAS Scores. Patients receiving ALC showed significantly more reduction in VAS scores than those receiving placebo. The values presented referred to the change of VAS scores from baseline. VAS = Visual Analogue Scale; ALC = acetyl-l-carnitine; UCE = U.S.-CanadianEuropean Study; UC = U.S.-Canadian Study; SD = standard deviation; CI = confidence interval.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129991.g001

	ALC			С	ontrol		Mean Difference	Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		
2.2.1 Diabetes										
De Grandis, 2002	-1.93	2.09	95	-0.35	1.1	104	-1.58 [-2.05, -1.11]			
Sima, UC, 2005	-2.53	2.875	70	-0.972	3.112	48	-1.56 [-2.67, -0.45]			
Sima, UCE, 2005	-2.175	3.458	58	-1.451	2.749	61	-0.72 [-1.85, 0.40]			
Subtotal (95% CI)			223			213	-1.47 [-1.87, -1.06]	•		
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1	1.92, df=	= 2 (P =	0.38);1	²=0%						
Test for overall effect: .	Z = 7.11	(P < 0.0	00001)							
2.2.2 Non-diabetes										
Youle, 2007	-1.32	1.84	43	-0.61	1.55	44	-0.71 [-1.43, 0.01]			
Subtotal (95% CI)			43			44	-0.71 [-1.43, 0.01]	$\bullet$		
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable									
Test for overall effect:	Z=1.94	(P = 0.0	)5)							
Total (95% CI)			266			257	-1.28 [-1.64, -0.93]	◆		
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =										
Test for overall effect: 1	Z=7.15	(P < 0.0	-4 -2 U 2 4 Favours ALC Favours control							
Test for subaroup diffe	erences:	Favours ALC Favours control								

**Fig 3.** Subgroup-analysis on the VAS Scores of the Diabetic and Non-diabetic Patients. Subgroup-analysis was performed by subdividing RCTs according to whether the peripheral neuropathy diagnosed in patients was diabetic or non-diabetic. Taking ALC decreased VAS scores significantly in diabetic patients. VAS = Visual Analogue Scale; ALC = acetyl-l-carnitine; UCE = U.S.-Canadian-European Study; UC = U.S.-Canadian Study; SD = standard deviation; CI = confidence interval.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129991.g002



	ALC			Control				Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
2.3.1 Intramuscular									
De Grandis, 2002	-1.93	2.09	95	-0.35	1.1	104	40.3%	-1.58 [-2.05, -1.11]	-
Youle, 2007	-1.32	1.84	43	-0.61	1.55	44	28.0%	-0.71 [-1.43, 0.01]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			138			148	68.3%	-1.19 [-2.04, -0.34]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.28; Chi	i <sup>z</sup> = 3.98	6, df = 1	(P = 0.0	05); I <sup>2</sup> = 1	75%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.75 (	(P = 0.0	06)						
2.3.2 Oral									
Sima, UC, 2005	-2.53	2.875	70	-0.972	3.112	48	16.0%	-1.56 [-2.67, -0.45]	
Sima, UCE, 2005	-2.175	3.458	58	-1.451	2.749	61	15.6%	-0.72 [-1.85, 0.40]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			128			109	31.7%	-1.15 [-1.96, -0.33]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	0.02; Chi	i <sup>2</sup> = 1.07	7, df = 1	(P = 0.3	30); I <sup>2</sup> =	7%			
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.75 (	(P = 0.0)	06)						
Total (95% CI)			266			257	100.0%	-1.20 [-1.72, -0.68]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	0.12; Chi	i <sup>2</sup> = 5.18	3, df = 3	8 (P = 0.1	16); I <sup>2</sup> =	42%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.54 (	(P < 0.0	0001)						Favours ALC Favours control
Test for subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.00, df = 1 (P = 0.95), l <sup>2</sup> = 0%									

**Fig 4.** Subgroup-analysis on the VAS Scores by Subdividing RCTs according to the Route of Administration. Oral administration of ALC decreased VAS scores significantly. VAS = Visual Analogue Scale; ALC = acetyl-l-carnitine; UCE = U.S.-Canadian-European Study; UC = U.S.-Canadian Study; SD = standard deviation; CI = confidence interval.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129991.g003

## Reference

 Li S, Li Q, Li Y, Li L, Tian H, Sun X (2015) Acetyl-L-Carnitine in the Treatment of Peripheral Neuropathic Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. PLoS ONE 10(3): e0119479. doi: <u>10.1371/journal.pone.0119479</u>