



Correction to: Incidental intracranial meningiomas: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prognostic factors and outcomes

Abdurrahman I. Islim^{1,2,3} · Midhun Mohan^{2,3} · Richard D. C. Moon^{2,3} · Nisaharan Srikandarajah^{1,3} · Samantha J. Mills⁴ · Andrew R. Brodbelt³ · Michael D. Jenkinson^{1,3}

Published online: 31 July 2019
© The Author(s) 2019

Correction to:
Journal of Neuro-Oncology (2019) 142:211–221
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11060-019-03104-3>

Issues with data analysis have recently been highlighted by a reader of our article. These have been addressed with changes to Tables 2 and 4, as shown below, and Online Resources 5–7. T2 and peritumoral signal are no longer prognostic factors on simple pooled (Online Resource 5) and IPD (Table 4) analyses respectively. In Table 5, the number of patients which informed the outcomes symptom development and intervention were 575 and 947 respectively; 69 developed symptoms (pooled proportion %8.4 [95% CI 2.8–16.7], $I^2 = 88.9\%$). These included motor and cognitive deficits ($n = 1$). We apologise to the readership of the Journal of Neuro-Oncology for these errors and thank the reader for helping us identify them.

Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Abdurrahman I. Islim, Midhun Mohan and Richard D. C. Moon contributed equally to the manuscript.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11060-019-03104-3>.

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11060-019-03237-5>) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

✉ Abdurrahman I. Islim
a.islim@liv.ac.uk

- ¹ Institute of Translational Medicine, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK
- ² Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK
- ³ Department of Neurosurgery, The Walton Centre NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK
- ⁴ Department of Neuroradiology, The Walton Centre NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK

Table 2 Baseline clinical and radiological characteristics

No. of studies informing characteristic	No. of valid cases informing characteristic (%)	Characteristics	Total	Surgery	SRS	Active monitoring	P
18	2050	N. of patients (%)	2050	560 (27.3)	450 (22.0)	1040 (50.7)	
13	803 (39.2)	Mean age, years (SD)	63.1 (6.9)	61.5 (4.7)	54.9 (NR) ^b	64 (6.9)	<0.001
17	1948 (95.0)	Sex, N (%)					0.539
		Female	1549	369 (23.8)	363 (23.4)	817 (52.7)	
		Male	399	89 (22.3)	87 (21.8)	223 (55.9)	
16	1495 (72.9)	Location, N (%) ^a					<0.001
		Non-skull base	1024	277 (27.1)	235 (22.9)	512 (50.0)	
		Convexity	431	126	86	219	
		Parafalcine	245	61	71	113	
		Parasagittal	151	42	36	73	
		Tentorial	62	12	28	22	
		Intraventricular	26	4	12	10	
		Skull base	471	106 (22.5)	154 (32.7)	211 (44.8)	
		Anterior midline	112	22	43	47	
		Sphenoid wing	98	25	11	62	
		Posterior fossa - lateral and posterior	52	23	12	17	
		Posterior fossa - midline	138	17	87	34	
15	888 (43.3)	Mean diameter, cm (SD)	2.14 (0.61)	2.11 (0.42)	1.73 (NR) ^b	2.19 (0.66)	<0.001
10	615 (30.0)	Calcification, N (%)					0.177
		No	394	64 (16.2)	NR	330 (83.8)	
		Yes	221	27 (12.2)	NR	194 (87.8)	
5	298 (14.5)	Tumor signal intensity, N (%)					0.237
		Hyperintense	120	40 (33.3)	NR	80 (66.6)	
		Iso/hypointense	178	48 (27.0)	NR	130 (73.0)	
12	1107 (54.0)	Peritumoral edema, N (%)					
		Yes	144	47 (32.6)	24 (16.7)	73 (50.7)	
		No	963	145 (15.1)	365 (37.9)	453 (47.0)	

NR not reported, SRS stereotactic radiosurgery

^aOne study which dichotomized location into supratentorial and infratentorial was excluded [15]

^bAvailable in one study which did not report SD [25]

Table 4 Growth dynamics and symptom development during active monitoring stratified by baseline characteristics

Factor		Mean/median AGR (cm ³ / year)	P	Mean/median RGR (%/year)	P	Symptom develop- ment, yes/total (%)	OR (95% CI)	MLR P ^a
Location	Non-skull base	7.97/0.68	0.747	70.2/17.0	0.405	12/60 (20.0)		0.116
	Skull base	5.82/2.93		28.1/17.2		5/25 (20.0)		
Diameter	≥ 3.0 cm	19.7/5.91	0.004	114/24.7	0.091	15/27 (55.5)	12.16 (5.56–18.78)	< 0.001
	< 3.0 cm	1.56/0.46		31.4/12.7		2/58 (3.45)		
Calcification	No	19.0/19.0	NA	141/141	NA	1/1 (100)		
	Yes	NR		NR		NR		
Tumor signal intensity	Hyperintense	NR	NA	NR	NA	NR		
	Iso/hypointense	NR		NR		NR		
Peritumoral edema	Yes	NR	NA	NR	NA	NR		
	No	2.32/0.62		19.7/13.2		1/29 (3.45)		

AGR absolute growth rate, RGR relative growth rate, MLR multi-level regression, NA not applicable, NR not reported

^aPerformed to 50 iterations