

## Correction

# Correction to: Intervention characteristics associated with a reduction in fear of falling among community-dwelling older people. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of RCTs

This is a correction to: Marlot Kruisbrink, MSc, Kim Delbaere, PhD, Gertrudis I J M Kempen, PhD, Rik Crutzen, PhD, Ton Ambergen, PhD, Kei-Long Cheung, PhD, Denise Kendrick, DM, Steve Iliffe, FRCGP, G A Rixt Zijlstra, PhD, Intervention Characteristics Associated With a Reduction in Fear of Falling Among Community-Dwelling Older People: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials, *The Gerontologist*, Volume 61, Issue 6, September 2021, Pages e269–e282, <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnaa021>

In this study, a meta-regression was performed with the standardized mean difference (SMD) as the dependent variable. The regression coefficient (B) represents the difference in the SMD between interventions with and without a certain intervention characteristic. Unfortunately, the abstract and results section mentions “SMD” several times, instead of “B” for regression coefficient. Due to this error, readers may misinterpret the methodology and the findings.

All instances in the abstract which mention “SMD:” should be “B:”. In the meta-regression section of the results, all instances which mention “SMD” between the parentheses, should be “B”. In addition, in the meta-regression section the following errors occurred:

- “Only holistic exercise (i.e., tai chi, yoga, vinyasa, or Pilates) yielded a significant association with the SMD of  $-0.823$  (95% CI:  $-1.255$ ;  $-0.392$ ,  $p < .001$ ).” Should be “Only holistic exercise (i.e., tai chi, yoga, vinyasa, or Pilates) yielded a significant association with *the* SMD. *B* was  $-0.823$  (95% CI:  $-1.255$ ;  $-0.392$ ,  $p < .001$ ).”
- “Delivery in a community setting was significantly associated with a SMD of  $-0.528$  (95% CI:  $-0.894$ ;  $-0.161$ ,  $p = .006$ ; Table 1)...” Should be “Delivery in a community setting was significantly associated with *the* SMD. *B* was  $-0.528$  (95% CI:  $-0.894$ ;  $-0.161$ ,  $p = .006$ ; Table 1)...”
- “However, supervision by a tai chi instructor was significantly associated with a SMD of  $-1.047$  (95% CI:  $-1.598$ ;  $-0.496$ ,  $p < .001$ ),...” Should be “However, supervision by a tai chi instructor was significantly associated with *the* SMD. *B* was  $-1.047$  (95% CI:  $-1.598$ ;  $-0.496$ ,  $p < .001$ )...”

These details have been corrected only in this correction notice to preserve the published version of record.