

## CORRIGENDUM

## Corrigendum to “Effectiveness of oral *versus* intravenous tranexamic acid in primary total hip and knee arthroplasty: a randomised, non-inferiority trial” (*Br J Anaesth* 2023; 130: 234–241)

Christopher J. DeFrancesco<sup>1</sup>, Julia F. Reichel<sup>2</sup>, Ejiro Gbaje<sup>2</sup>, Marko Popovic<sup>2</sup>, Carrie Freeman<sup>2</sup>, Marisa Wong<sup>2</sup>, Danya DeMeo<sup>2</sup>, Jiabin Liu<sup>2,3</sup>, Alejandro Gonzalez Della Valle<sup>1</sup>, Amar Ranawat<sup>1</sup>, Michael Cross<sup>4</sup>, Peter K. Sculco<sup>1</sup>, Stephen Haskins<sup>2,3</sup>, David Kim<sup>2,3</sup>, Daniel Maalouf<sup>2,3</sup>, Meghan Kirksey<sup>2,3</sup>, Kethy Jules-Elysee<sup>2,3</sup>, Ellen M. Soffin<sup>2,3</sup>, Kanupriya Kumar<sup>2,3</sup>, Jonathan Beathe<sup>2,3</sup>, Mark Figgie<sup>1</sup>, Allan Inglis Jr. <sup>1</sup>, Sean Garvin<sup>2,3</sup>, Michael Alexiades<sup>1</sup>, Kathryn DelPizzo<sup>2,3</sup>, Linda A. Russell<sup>5</sup>, Alexandra Sideris<sup>2</sup>, Jawad Saleh<sup>6</sup>, Haoyan Zhong<sup>2</sup> and Stavros G. Memtsoudis<sup>2,3,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY, USA, <sup>2</sup>Department of Anesthesiology, Critical Care & Pain Management, Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY, USA, <sup>3</sup>Department of Anesthesiology, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY, USA, <sup>4</sup>OrthoIndy Hospital, Indianapolis, IN, USA, <sup>5</sup>Department of Rheumatology, Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY, USA and <sup>6</sup>Pharmacy Department, Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY, USA

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: [memtsoudiss@hss.edu](mailto:memtsoudiss@hss.edu)

DOI of original article: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2022.11.003>.

In reviewing the final data for the study, three minor discrepancies were noted. First, Table 2 should show that 94 subjects were retained for the IV TXA/TKA subgroup (instead of 96). Second, Table 1 should show that 1 subject was missing an ASA physical status assignment in the IV TXA/TKA subgroup. Lastly, we note that the analysis followed a “modified intention-to-treat” model rather than a true “intention-to-treat” model, as a small number of subjects who self-withdrew from the study after randomisation

were removed from the analysis entirely. This was done because the subjects who withdrew were uniformly treated with typical non-study i.v. dosing algorithms, which had the potential to bias the data toward showing non-inferiority for oral TXA if these subjects had been included.

The authors note that none of the statistical testing or other findings are impacted by these changes, and apologize for the inconvenience.