

In the manuscript “Relationship between contrast-induced nephropathy and long-term mortality after percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with chronic coronary total occlusion”, DOI: 10.1590/1806-9282.20220283, published in the Rev Assoc Med Bras. 2022;68(8):1078-1083, on page 1078, the Results section of Summary:

Where it reads:

RESULTS: Mean age of patients with incidence of contrast-induced nephropathy was 66.7 ± 11.8 , and 23.8% of them were comprised by female. We found a significantly higher mortality in long-term follow-up in the patient group with contrast-induced nephropathy (42.9 vs. 57.1%, $p < 0.001$). According to Kaplan-Meier analysis performed additionally, survival during follow-up was significantly shorter in this group and, in logistic regression analysis, it was an independent predictor of mortality (OR 11.78; 95%CI 3.38–40.9).

It should read:

RESULTS: Mean age of patients with incidence of contrast-induced nephropathy was 66.7 ± 11.8 , and 23.8% of them were comprised by female. We found a significantly higher mortality in long-term follow-up in the patient group with contrast-induced nephropathy (42.9 vs. 57.1%, $p \leq 0.001$). According to Kaplan-Meier analysis performed additionally, survival during follow-up was significantly shorter in this group and, in logistic regression analysis, it was an independent predictor of mortality (OR 3.02; 95%CI 1.41–6.45, $p = 0.004$).

