

CORRECTION

Correction to: Left Atrial Volume, Cardiorespiratory Fitness, and Diastolic Function in Healthy Individuals: The HUNT Study, Norway

In the article by Letnes, et al, “Left Atrial Volume, Cardiorespiratory Fitness, and Diastolic Function in Healthy Individuals: The HUNT Study, Norway” which published online January 28, 2020 and appeared on the February 4, 2020 issue of the Journal (*J Am Heart Assoc.* 2020;9:e014682. DOI: 10.1161/JAHA.119.014682.), corrections were needed.

The authors were made aware that the previously published formula used to scale peak oxygen uptake to age and sex was incorrect for women. The regression equation “ $VO_{2peak}=55.6-(0.328 \cdot AGE)$ ”, has been corrected to “ $VO_{2peak}=51.6-(0.328 \cdot AGE)$ ”. Thus, peak oxygen uptake as percentage of predicted is underestimated by 9%. This underestimation of peak oxygen uptake as percentage of predicted is similar for all women and does not influence any of the authors’ main findings or conclusions, but it influences some of the details of the results reported throughout the paper.

The authors have reanalyzed all of the data and have provided a bulleted list of the errors:

- Abstract
 - In the Methods and Results section, “(β [95% CI] 0.11 [0.06–0.16] and 0.18 [0.09–0.28], respectively)” should read “(β [95% CI] 0.18 [0.09–0.28] and 0.10 [0.05–0.15], respectively)”.
- On page 4, under Statistical Analyses, the regression equation for women “women: $VO_{2peak}=55.6-0.328$ ” should read: “women: $VO_{2peak}=51.6-0.328$ ”.
- In Table 1, for women, the correct $VO_{2\%pred}$ is mean (SD) 92 (16) instead of 83 (14).
- Results
 - On page 5, in the first paragraph of the Results section, “ VO_{2peak} was 10% lower than predicted by age and sex” should read “ VO_{2peak} was 5% lower than predicted by age and sex”.
 - In Figure 2, each data point for women is shifted $\approx 9\%$ percentage points down (to the left) compared to the correct value, and the text in the figure should read: “ $y=0.10x+23.1, P<0.0001, R^2 0.06$ ” instead of “ $y=0.11x+22.7, P<0.0001, R^2 0.083$ ”.
 - In Table 3, univariate model; β (95% CI) for $VO_{2\%pred}$ should read “0.10 (0.05–0.15)” and R^2 should read “0.06” instead of “0.11 (0.06–0.16)” and “0.08”.
 - In Table 3, age- and sex-adjusted model; β (95% CI) for $VO_{2\%pred}$ should read “0.08 (0.03–0.13)” instead of “0.09 (0.04–0.14)”.
 - In Figure 3B, minor changes were needed to the prediction diagram.
 - On page 5, under “Diastolic Function”, the sentence “Septal e’ showed a positive association” should read “Septal e’ showed a borderline positive association”.

-
- Discussion
 - On page 7, in the “CRF, Diastolic Function, and LA Size” section:
 - “However, the mean $VO_{2\%pred}$ of the study population was 10% lower than expected by age and sex” should read “However, the mean $VO_{2\%pred}$ of the study population was 5% lower than expected by age and sex”.
 - “In fact, only 16% of women” should read “In fact, only 26% of women”.
 - Supplemental Material
 - In “Supplemental Methods and Results” in the “Restricted cubic splines model” “(AIC 1499.7 versus AIC 1502.3, respectively)” should read “(AIC 1502.2 versus AIC 1504.9, respectively)”.
 - Supplemental Table S2: for all analyses with “ $VO_{2\%pred}$ as independent variable” most estimates showed small changes with no changes to conclusions. Only change of notice is the age- and sex-adjusted *P* value for the association to Septal *e'* (*P* value changed from 0.047 to 0.051).
 - Supplemental Figure S1, S2, S3, S4 required very minor changes.

The corrections have been made to the current online version of the article, which is available here: <https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/JAHA.119.014682>