

ERRATUM

to the article ‘Assessment of the GenoType MTBDRplus assay for rifampin and isoniazid resistance detection on sputum samples in Cote d’Ivoire’ by K. N’guessan, J. S. Assi, T. Ouassa, J. M. Ahui-Brou, A. Tehe, M. Keita Sow, A. Guei, J. Kouakou, and M. Dosso in Vol. 4, No. 3, 2014, pp. 166–173 (DOI: 10.1556/EuJMI-D-14-00014).

Authors would like to correct the article as follows:

1. Author affiliation No. 6 correctly reads as:

⁶Programme National de Lutte contre la Tuberculose, Côte d’Ivoire

2. An error was made in *Table 2* on p. 169 in column 4, rows 14–18. Please find below *Table 2* with the proper values:

Table 2. Patterns of GenoType MTBDRplus in comparison to drug susceptibility testing

Number of sputum samples (%)	DST		MTBDRplus assay			Results
	RMP	INH	RMP pattern (<i>rpoB</i>)	INH pattern		
				<i>katG</i>	<i>inhA</i>	
8 (6.7%)	R	R	ΔWT3,4, Mut1 (D516V)	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	ΔWT 2, Mut3B (T8A)	MDR
8 (6.7%)	R	R	ΔWT3,4, Mut1 (D516V)	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	ΔWT 2, Mut3A (T8C)	MDR
5 (4.2%)	R	R	ΔWT3,4, Mut1 (D516V)	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	WT	MDR
1 (0.8%)	R	R	ΔWT2,3,4	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	WT	MDR
1 (0.8%)	R	R	ΔWT2	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	ΔWT 2, Mut3A (T8C)	MDR
4 (3.3%)	R	R	ΔWT7, Mut2B (H526D)	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	WT	MDR
1 (0.8%)	S	R	ΔWT7, Mut2B (H526D)	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	WT	MDR
2 (1.7%)	R	R	ΔWT7, Mut2B (H526D)	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	ΔWT 2, Mut3A (T8C)	MDR
6 (5%)	R	R	ΔWT7, Mut2A (H526Y)	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	WT	MDR
1 (0.8%)	S	S	ΔWT7, Mut2A (H526Y)	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	ΔWT 2, Mut3A (T8C)	MDR
3 (2.5%)	R	R	ΔWT7	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	WT	MDR
11 (9.2%)	R	R	ΔWT7, Mut2A (H526Y)	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	ΔWT 2, Mut3A (T8C)	MDR
2 (1.7%)	R	R	ΔWT7, Mut2A (H526Y)	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	ΔWT 2, Mut3B (T8A)	MDR
4 (3.3%)	R	R	ΔWT8, Mut3 (S531L)	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	WT	MDR
2 (1.7%)	R	R	ΔWT8, Mut3 (S531L)	WT	WT	Rif monoR
1 (0.8%)	S	S	ΔWT8, Mut3 (S531L)	WT	WT	Rif monoR
1 (0.8%)	S	S	ΔWT8, Mut3 (S531L)	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	WT	MDR
2 (1.7%)	R	R	ΔWT8, Mut3 (S531L)	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	WT	MDR

* Corresponding author: K. N’guessan; 01 BP 490 Abidjan 01, Cote d’Ivoire; E-mail: kouassinguessan@pasteur.ci

Table 2. (cont.)

Number of sputum samples (%)	DST		MTBDRplus assay			Results
	RMP	INH	RMP pattern (<i>rpoB</i>)	INH pattern		
				<i>katG</i>	<i>inhA</i>	
11 (9.2%)	S	S	ΔWT8	WT	WT	Rif monoR
3 (2.5%)	R	R	ΔWT8	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	ΔWT 2, Mut3B (T8A)	MDR
1 (0.8%)	R	R	ΔWT8	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	WT	MDR
1 (0.8%)	R	R	ΔWT8	WT	ΔWT 1, Mut1 (C15T)	MDR
27 (22.5%)	S	S	WT	WT	WT	Susceptible
9 (7.5%)	S	R	WT	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	WT	Inh monoR
2 (1.7%)	S	R	WT	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	ΔWT 2, Mut3B (T8A)	Inh monoR
2 (1.7%)	S	R	WT	WT	WT	Susceptible
1 (0.8%)	S	R	WT	ΔWT, Mut1 (S315T)	ΔWT 2, Mut3A (T8C)	Inh monoR

Δ: Absence of hybridization signal with wild-type probes; WT: wild-type; Mut: mutation; DST: drug susceptibility testing; RMP: rifampin; INH: isoniazid; R: resistant; S: susceptible; MDR: multidrug-resistant; Rif monoR: rifampin mono-resistant; Inh monoR: isoniazid mono-resistant

3. *Table 3* on p. 170 was erroneously given with a dividing line, the corrected *Table 3* can be found below:

Table 3. Performance of MTBDRplus compared to drug susceptibility testing

	Drug susceptibility testing		Performances
Rifampin	64	15	Sensitivity: 100% (75.6–100%) Specificity: 73.2% (61.3–84%) PPV: 81% (72–90%)
	0	41	NPV: 100% (69–100%)
Isoniazid	75	2	Sensitivity: 95% (90–99%) Specificity: 95.1% (88.5–100%)
	4	39	PPV: 97.4% (94–100%) NPV: 90.7% (82–99%)

PPV: positive predictive value; NPV: negative predictive value