



Corrigendum: Prediction of EGFR Mutation Status Based on ¹⁸F-FDG PET/CT Imaging Using Deep Learning-Based Model in Lung Adenocarcinoma

Guotao Yin^{1†}, Ziyang Wang^{1†}, Yingchao Song^{2†}, Xiaofeng Li¹, Yiwen Chen¹, Lei Zhu¹, Qian Su¹, Dong Dai^{1*} and Wengui Xu^{1*}

¹ Department of Molecular Imaging and Nuclear Medicine, Tianjin Medical University Cancer Institute and Hospital, National Clinical Research Center for Cancer, Tianjin Key Laboratory of Cancer Prevention and Therapy, Tianjin's Clinical Research Center for China, Tianjin, China, ² School of Medical Imaging and Tianjin Key Laboratory of Functional Imaging, Tianjin Medical University, Tianjin, China

OPEN ACCESS

Edited and reviewed by:

Pasquale Pisapia,
University of Naples Federico II, Italy

*Correspondence:

Dong Dai
tjdaidong@163.com
Wengui Xu
wenguixy@yeah.net

[†]These authors have contributed
equally to this work and
share first authorship

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Thoracic Oncology,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Oncology

Received: 26 July 2021

Accepted: 27 July 2021

Published: 07 September 2021

Citation:

Yin G, Wang Z, Song Y, Li X,
Chen Y, Zhu L, Su Q, Dai D
and Xu W (2021) Corrigendum:
Prediction of EGFR Mutation Status
Based on ¹⁸F-FDG PET/CT Imaging
Using Deep Learning-Based
Model in Lung Adenocarcinoma.
Front. Oncol. 11:747316.
doi: 10.3389/fonc.2021.747316

Keywords: adenocarcinoma of lung, fluorodeoxyglucose F18, positron emission tomography computed tomography, deep learning, epidermal growth factor receptor

A Corrigendum on

Prediction of EGFR Mutation Status Based on ¹⁸F-FDG PET/CT Imaging Using Deep Learning-Based Model in Lung Adenocarcinoma

By Yin G, Wang Z, Song Y, Li X, Chen Y, Zhu L, Su Q, Dai D and Xu W (2021). *Front. Oncol.* 11:709137. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2021.709137

In the original article, there was a mistake in **Table 2** as published. The clinical model was changed in the process of revising the manuscript. Due to our negligence, the AUC, sensitivity, and specificity of the clinical model for the training dataset were not correctly revised. The corrected **Table 2** appears below.

The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Copyright © 2021 Yin, Wang, Song, Li, Chen, Zhu, Su, Dai and Xu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

TABLE 2 | Predictive performance of different models in the training dataset.

	AUC (95% CI)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Accuracy (%)
Stack _{PET-CT}	0.86 (0.80-0.91)	71.75	84.38	75.25
SE _{CT}	0.74 (0.67-0.80)	82.35	53.12	67.17
SE _{PET}	0.75 (0.69-0.81)	86.25	56.25	72.22
Clinical model	0.63 (0.55-0.69)	50.98	71.88	60.10

The bold values represented the highest one of the evaluation indices.