Preventive Medicine Reports 8 (2017) 303–305

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Preventive Medicine Reports

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/pmedr

Corrigendum

Corrigendum to "Impact of a brief intervention on cervical health literacy: A waitlist control study with jailed women" [Prev. Med. Rep. 6 (2017) 314–321]

Megha Ramaswamy[a,*], Jaehoon Lee[b], Joi Wickliffe[a], Molly Allison[a], Amanda Emerson[c], Patricia J. Kelly[c]

[a] Preventive Medicine and Public Health, University of Kansas School of Medicine, Kansas City, KS, United States
[b] College of Education, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, United States
[c] School of Nursing, University of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, United States

The authors regret an error in their original reporting of sample size, and thus the results.

In the published paper, we conducted an analysis with 188 participants. The correct number should be 182. Four of the 188 women should have not been included in the analysis because they were duplicate participants (had done a pilot study and the main study that we reported on). One woman completed the study in the wrong group assignment. In addition, one woman completed the post-test four weeks after intervention completion although she should've completed it after one week. Thus, we should've excluded these six women from the analysis.

Corrected Tables 1 and 2 that reflect these changes appear below.

The error also necessitates the following corrections to the text:

Abstract: When controlling for covariates, the intervention group had greater knowledge, less barriers, perceptions of seriousness, susceptibility to disease, and increased self-efficacy for cervical health screening and follow-up, compared to the control group (all $p < 0.05$).

Results: Participants were on average 34 years old (SD = 9.50) (see Table 1). Half were White ($n = 92$, 50.6%), and a third were Black ($n = 53$, 29.1%). < 10% ($n = 17$) of women reported Latina ethnicity. Two-thirds ($n = 115$, 63.2%) had completed high school or more education, but only 18.9% ($n = 34$) were employed full-time prior to incarceration. Less than half of the participants had health insurance ($n = 71$, 39.0%), but most had access to a medical home or usual place of care ($n = 125$, 68.7%). Two-thirds of women ($n = 124$, 68.1%) reported a Pap screening in the past three years. Over half ($n = 95$, 52.2%) had a lifetime abnormal Pap test history, 14.8% ($n = 27$) had ever been diagnosed with HPV, and 13.2% ($n = 24$) had received a cervical cancer diagnosis in the past.

Comparisons of cervical health literacy pre- and post-intervention showed that the intervention group experienced significant changes for seven out of eight domains, including increased knowledge about cervical health ($p < 0.001$, Cohen's d = 0.33), more perceived benefits to screening ($p < 0.01$, d = 0.26), reduced barriers to screening ($p < 0.001$, d = 0.40), reduced perception of seriousness ($p < 0.001$, d = 0.37), reduced susceptibility to disease ($p < 0.01$, d = 0.37), and greater motivation ($p < 0.001$, d = 0.34) and self-efficacy ($p < 0.001$, d = 0.59) for seeking out cervical health screening and follow-up care (see Fig. 3). The control group only improved in terms of motivation for seeking out screening ($p < 0.01$, d = 0.36) at post-test. The changes were significantly different between the groups for knowledge ($p < 0.5$, d = 0.33), reduced barriers ($p < 0.05$, d = 0.32), perception of the disease's seriousness ($p < 0.05$, d = 0.36), susceptibility to disease ($p < 0.05$, d = 0.36), and self-efficacy ($p < 0.05$, d = 0.36).

When controlling for covariates (pre-test cervical health literacy scores, education, health insurance, and access to medical home or usual place of care), the intervention and control groups were significantly different on five outcomes: increased knowledge ($p < 0.05$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.03$); reduced barriers ($p < 0.01$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.05$), perception of seriousness ($p < 0.01$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.05$), susceptibility to disease ($p < 0.05$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.04$), and increased self-efficacy for cervical health screening and follow-up ($p < 0.01$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.05$) (see Table 2).

DOI of original article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2017.04.003
* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: mramaswamy@kumc.edu (M. Ramaswamy).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2017.11.011

Available online 06 December 2017

Table 1
Participant characteristics[a].

	Total (n = 182), mean ± SD or no. (%)	Intervention (n = 108), mean ± SD or no. (%)	Waitlist control (n = 74), mean ± SD or no. (%)	p-Value[b]
Age	33.83 ± 9.50	33.95 ± 9.54	33.66 ± 9.49	0.838
Race				0.315
White	92 (50.6)	50 (46.3)	42 (56.8)	
Black	53 (29.1)	37 (34.3)	16 (21.6)	
Other	33 (18.1)	19 (17.6)	14 (18.9)	
Latina ethnicity	17 (9.3)	9 (8.3)	8 (10.8)	0.700
High school or more	115 (63.2)	69 (63.9)	46 (62.2)	0.671
Homeless or institutionalized	45 (24.7)	25 (23.2)	20 (27.0)	0.531
Employed[c]	61 (33.5)	40 (37.0)	21 (28.4)	0.131
Received public benefits[d]	87 (47.8)	57 (52.8)	30 (40.5)	0.266
Insured	71 (39.0)	41 (38.0)	30 (40.5)	0.815
Has primary care doctor	69 (37.9)	44 (40.7)	25 (33.8)	0.352
Has medical home	125 (68.7)	73 (67.6)	52 (70.3)	0.476
Past month tobacco use	147 (80.8)	83 (76.9)	64 (86.5)	0.218
Hazardous/harmful alcohol use[e]	94 (51.7)	58 (53.7)	36 (48.7)	0.503
Past year drug dependence[f]	112 (61.5)	63 (58.3)	49 (66.2)	0.283
History of exchanging sex	60 (33.0)	33 (30.6)	27 (36.5)	0.668
History of STIs[g]	115 (63.2)	63 (58.3)	52 (70.3)	0.101
Past year IPV[h]	115 (63.2)	65 (60.2)	50 (67.6)	0.282
Child physical or sexual abuse[i]	48 (26.4)	27 (25.0)	21 (28.4)	0.840
Mental health problems[j]	133 (73.1)	76 (70.4)	57 (77.0)	0.320
Lifetime months incarcerated	25.55 ± 47.77	24.50 ± 43.91	27.13 ± 53.31	0.720
Number of pregnancies to term	2.61 ± 2.02	2.74 ± 2.10	2.40 ± 1.89	0.272
Pap screening in past three years	124 (68.1)	74 (68.5)	50 (67.6)	0.619
Abnormal Pap test history	95 (52.2)	48 (44.4)	47 (63.5)	**0.028**
HPV diagnosis	27 (14.8)	13 (12.0)	14 (18.9)	**0.021**
Cervical cancer diagnosis	24 (13.2)	12 (11.1)	12 (16.2)	0.137

Notes.

[a] Participant characteristics are presented for the 188 participants whose data were analyzed in the intent-to-treat analysis, which included 112 participants in the intervention group (participants who completed baseline and post-intervention survey) and 76 participants in the waitlist control group (participants who completed baseline and pre-intervention survey).

[b] p-Values < 0.05 for comparisons between groups are boldfaced.

[c] Full-time, part-time, or on and off.

[d] Cash assistance, food stamps, social security, or disability.

[e] Assessed using AUDIT-C, which is scored on a scale of 0–12 (scores of 0 reflect no alcohol use). In women, a score of 3 or more is considered positive for alcohol problems (ref).

[f] Assessed using DSM IV criteria, where If participants answer “yes” to 3 of 6 DSM-IV criteria, they were classified as drug dependent (ref).

[g] Lifetime diagnosis by a clinician of hepatitis B or C, human immunodeficiency virus, syphilis, gonorrhea, chlamydia, trichomoniasis, herpes, or HPV.

[h] Adapted from Verbal HITS scale, where responses dichotomized so that 1 = any IPV in past year, 0 = no IPV in past year (ref).

[I] Adapted from Childhood Experiences of Violence Questionnaire, where responses dichotomized across categories so that 1 = any violence, 0 = no violence (ref).

[j] Lifetime diagnosis by a clinician of depression, anxiety, bipolar disorder, or post-traumatic stress disorder.

Table 2
General linear modeling results.

	DV = KNOWLEDGE (post)				DV = BENEFIT (post)				DV = BARRIERS (post)			DV = SERIOUSNESS (post)	
Parameter	Estimate	*SE*	*t*	*p*	Estimate	*SE*	*t*	*p*	Estimate	*SE*	*p*	Estimate	*SE*
Intercept	2.53	0.33	7.58	0.000	3.27	0.28	11.73	0.000	1.01	0.18	0.000	1.92	0.26
Pre-test score	0.37	0.07	5.36	**0.000**	0.33	0.05	6.08	**0.000**	0.52	0.06	**0.000**	0.42	0.07
High school or more	0.41	0.12	3.33	**0.001**	0.08	0.10	0.79	0.430	0.07	0.08	0.370	− 0.14	0.11
Insured	− 0.05	0.13	− 0.41	0.684	0.00	0.10	− 0.04	0.965	− 0.01	0.08	0.904	0.04	0.11
Has medical home	0.06	0.13	0.42	0.672	0.19	0.11	1.80	0.072	− 0.03	0.08	0.723	− 0.18	0.12
GROUP (intervention)	0.23	0.12	1.97	**0.048**	0.16	0.09	1.67	0.096	− 0.20	0.07	**0.006**	− 0.30	0.10

	DV = SERIOUSNESS (post)		DV = SUSCEPTIBILITY (post)				DV = MOTIVATION (post)			
Parameter	*t*	*p*	Estimate	*SE*	*t*	*p*	Estimate	*SE*	*t*	*p*
Intercept	7.30	0.000	1.52	0.24	6.40	0.000	1.31	0.21	6.20	0.000
Pre-test score	5.98	**0.000**	0.46	0.07	6.77	**0.000**	0.59	0.07	8.83	**0.000**
High school or more	− 1.30	0.192	− 0.05	0.12	− 0.42	0.675	− 0.09	0.12	− 0.73	0.466
Insured	0.34	0.731	− 0.02	0.12	− 0.13	0.898	0.09	0.12	0.74	0.462
Has medical home	− 1.57	0.117	− 0.14	0.13	− 1.11	0.268	0.07	0.13	0.52	0.600
GROUP (intervention)	− 2.89	**0.004**	− 0.26	0.11	− 2.32	**0.020**	0.22	0.12	1.85	0.064

	DV = SELF-EFFICACY (post)				DV = CONFIDENCE (post)			
Parameter	Estimate	*SE*	*t*	*p*	Estimate	*SE*	*t*	*p*
Intercept	1.06	0.17	6.35	0.000	1.22	0.22	5.67	0.000
Pre-test score	0.71	0.05	13.95	**0.000**	0.58	0.06	10.20	**0.000**
High school or more	0.01	0.09	0.11	0.914	0.00	0.12	0.02	0.981
Insured	− 0.09	0.09	− 1.02	0.306	0.08	0.12	0.70	0.484
Has medical home	0.01	0.10	0.14	0.892	− 0.03	0.12	− 0.21	0.836
GROUP (intervention)	0.24	0.08	2.88	**0.004**	0.06	0.11	0.52	0.604

Note. *p*-Values < 0.05 are boldfaced.