

Corrigendum to: The Clinical and Economic Burden of Norovirus Gastroenteritis in the United States

Sarah M. Bartsch, Kelly J. O'Shea, and Bruce Y. Lee

Public Health Informatics, Computational, and Operations Research, City University of New York, New York City, New York, USA

In “The Clinical and Economic Burden of Norovirus Gastroenteritis in the United States” by Bartsch et al. [J Infect Dis 2020 Dec 1;222(11):1910–1919], the authors reported an error in Figure 1 of their Supplementary Appendix. Specifically, the black boxes at the end of the model flow diagram included at the very bottom of the figure, describing the costs accrued during

the course of the model. The figure shows ‘lifetime productivity losses’ accruing for those that do not die (following the “Does the person die?” -> “no” pathway), rather than for those that do (“does the person die?” -> “yes” pathway), where it should be. The supplementary data has been replaced with a corrected version and is available online. The authors regret this error.

Corrigendum to: SARS-CoV-2 Serologic Assays in Control and Unknown Populations Demonstrate the Necessity of Virus Neutralization Testing

Jennifer A. Rathe,^{1,2} Emily A. Hemann,¹ Julie Eggenberger,¹ Zhaoqi Li,³ Megan L. Knoll,¹ Caleb Stokes,^{1,2} Tien-Ying Hsiang,¹ Jason Netland,¹ Kennedy K. Takehara,¹ Marion Pepper,¹ and Michael Gale Jr¹

¹Department of Immunology, Center for Innate Immunity and Immune Disease, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA, ²Department of Pediatric Infectious Disease, Seattle Children's Hospital/University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA, and ³Department of Statistics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA⁴

In “SARS-CoV-2 Serologic Assays in Control and Unknown Populations Demonstrate the Necessity of Virus Neutralization Testing” by Rathe et al. [J Infect Dis 2020; jiaa797], the advance online publication contained an error in Table 1, Figure 4B, and Figure 5 in which “sensitivity” and “specificity” labels

were accidentally interchanged. The error was introduced when the labels were transferred from statistics software output to a master data file. The statistics remain the same and are correct. The corrected table and figures are provided below, and are correct in the printed version. The authors regret the error.

Original Table 1:

	Specificity, % (95% CI)	Sensitivity, % (95% CI)	PPV, % (95% CI)	NPV, % (95% CI)
RBD IgG	87 (62–98)	100 (89–100)	100 (77–100)	94 (80–99)
RBD IgM	73 (48–89)	97 (83–100)	92 (65–100)	88 (73–95)
Spike IgG	67 (42–85)	97 (83–100)	91 (62–100)	85 (70–94)
Spike IgM	60 (36–80)	97 (83–100)	90 (60–100)	83 (67–92)
Spike IgG1	71 (45–88)	100 (87–100)	100 (72–100)	88 (73–95)
Spike IgG3	93 (70–100)	97 (83–100)	93 (70–100)	97 (83–100)
Spike IgA	67 (42–85)	100 (89–100)	100 (72–100)	86 (71–94)
NP IgG	93 (70–100)	97 (83–100)	93 (70–100)	97 (83–100)

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; ELISA, enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay; IgA, immunoglobulin A; IgG, immunoglobulin G; IgM, immunoglobulin M; NP, nucleocapsid protein; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive predictive value; RBD, receptor binding domain.

Corrected Table 1:

Platforms	Sensitivity, % (95% CI)	Specificity, % (95% CI)	PPV, % (95% CI)	NPV, % (95% CI)
RBD IgG	87 (62–98)	100 (89–100)	100 (77–100)	94 (80–99)
RBD IgM	73 (48–89)	97 (83–100)	92 (65–100)	88 (73–95)
Spike IgG	67 (42–85)	97 (83–100)	91 (62–100)	85 (70–94)
Spike IgM	60 (36–80)	97 (83–100)	90 (60–100)	83 (67–92)
Spike IgG1	71 (45–88)	100 (87–100)	100 (72–100)	88 (73–95)
Spike IgG3	93 (70–100)	97 (83–100)	93 (70–100)	97 (83–100)
Spike IgA	67 (42–85)	100 (89–100)	100 (72–100)	86 (71–94)
NP IgG	93 (70–100)	97 (83–100)	93 (70–100)	97 (83–100)

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; ELISA, enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay; IgA, immunoglobulin A; IgG, immunoglobulin G; IgM, immunoglobulin M; NP, nucleocapsid protein; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive predictive value; RBD, receptor binding domain.

Original Figure 4:

A

	RBD IgG	RBD IgM	Spike IgG	Spike IgM	Spike IgG1	Spike IgG3	Spike IgA	NP IgG	PRNT
R²	0.90		0.90			0.45		0.52	N/A
PRNT % Agreement	94%	63%	94%	31%	50%	94%	75%	88%	N/A
Misidentified PRNTs (MI)	2	7	5	12	8	1	4	2	N/A
Unknowns									
1			MI						
2			MI						
3	MI	MI		MI	MI		MI	MI	
4		MI		MI	MI				
5									
6									
7		MI	MI	MI	MI	MI	MI	MI	
8	MI		MI						
9					MI				
10		MI	MI	MI					
11		MI		MI	MI				
12				MI					
13				MI					
14		MI		MI	MI				
15				MI	MI		MI		
16					MI				
17									
19		MI		MI			MI		
18				MI					
20				MI					

B

	RBD IgG	Spike IgG3	NP IgG	PRNT
Specificity	87% (62–98%)	93% (70–100%)	93% (70–100%)	100% (80–100%)
Sensitivity	100% (89–100%)	97% (83–100%)	97% (83–100%)	100% (70–100%)
Positive predictive value (PPV)	100% (77–100%)	93% (70–100%)	93% (70–100%)	100% (80–100%)
Negative predictive value (NPV)	94% (80–99%)	97% (83–100%)	97% (83–100%)	100% (70–100%)
R²	0.90	0.45	0.52	
PRNT % Agreement - Unknowns	94%	94%	88%	N/A
PRNT % Agreement - Controls	92%	92%	92%	N/A
PRNT % Agreement - Total	84%	84%	82%	N/A
Misidentified PRNTs (MI)	2	1	2	N/A
Unknowns				
1				
2				
3	MI		MI	
4				
5				
6				
7		MI	MI	
8	MI			
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
19				
18				
20				

Corrected Figure 4:

A

	RBD IgG	RBD IgM	Spike IgG	Spike IgM	Spike IgG1	Spike IgG3	Spike IgA	NP IgG	PRNT
R²	0.90		0.90			0.45		0.52	N/A
PRNT % Agreement	94%	63%	94%	31%	50%	94%	75%	88%	N/A
Misidentified PRNTs (MI)	2	7	5	12	8	1	4	2	N/A
Unknowns									
1			MI						
2			MI						
3	MI	MI		MI	MI		MI	MI	
4		MI		MI	MI				
5									
6									
7		MI	MI	MI	MI	MI	MI	MI	
8	MI		MI						
9					MI				
10		MI	MI	MI					
11		MI		MI	MI				
12				MI					
13				MI					
14		MI		MI	MI				
15				MI	MI		MI		
16					MI				
17									
19		MI		MI			MI		
18				MI					
20				MI					

B

	RBD IgG	Spike IgG3	NP IgG	PRNT
Sensitivity	87% (62-98%)	93% (70-100%)	93% (70-100%)	100% (80-100%)
Specificity	100% (89-100%)	97% (83-100%)	97% (83-100%)	100% (70-100%)
Positive predictive value (PPV)	100% (77-100%)	93% (70-100%)	93% (70-100%)	100% (80-100%)
Negative predictive value (NPV)	94% (80-99%)	97% (83-100%)	97% (83-100%)	100% (70-100%)
R²	0.90	0.45	0.52	
PRNT % Agreement - Unknowns	94%	94%	88%	N/A
PRNT % Agreement - Controls	92%	92%	92%	N/A
PRNT % Agreement - Total	84%	84%	82%	N/A
Misidentified PRNTs (MI)	2	1	2	N/A
Unknowns				
1				
2				
3	MI		MI	
4				
5				
6				
7		MI	MI	
8	MI			
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
19				
18				
20				

Original Figure 5:

	PRNT	Spike IgG3	RBD IgG --> Spike IgG	RBD IgG --> Spike IgG3	RBD IgG --> NP IgG	Spike IgG3 --> NP IgG
Specificity	100%	93%	67%	87%	87%	87%
Sensitivity	100%	97%	97%	97%	97%	93%
PRNT % Agreement - Unknowns	100%	94%	88%	88%	88%	88%
PRNT % Agreement - Controls	100%	92%	75%	83%	83%	83%
PRNT % Agreement - Total	100%	84%	73%	77%	80%	77%
Misidentified PRNTs (MI)	N/A	1	3	2	2	2
Unknowns						
1						
2						
3			MI	MI	MI	MI
4						
5						
6						
7		MI	MI	MI	MI	MI
8			MI			
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
19						
18						
20						

Corrected Figure 5:

	PRNT	Spike IgG3	RBD IgG --> Spike IgG	RBD IgG --> Spike IgG3	RBD IgG --> NP IgG	Spike IgG3 --> NP IgG
Sensitivity	100%	93%	67%	87%	87%	87%
Specificity	100%	97%	97%	97%	97%	93%
PRNT % Agreement - Unknowns	100%	94%	88%	88%	88%	88%
PRNT % Agreement - Controls	100%	92%	75%	83%	88%	83%
PRNT % Agreement - Total	100%	84%	73%	77%	80%	77%
Misidentified PRNTs (MI)	N/A	1	3	2	2	2
Unknowns						
1						
2						
3			MI	MI	MI	MI
4						
5						
6						
7		MI	MI	MI	MI	MI
8			MI			
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
19						
18						
20						