

# UCLA

## UCLA Previously Published Works

### Title

Erratum: Author Correction: Impact of remote patient monitoring on clinical outcomes: an updated meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials.

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/76r0282n>

### Authors

Noah, Benjamin  
Keller, Michelle  
Mosadeghi, Sasan  
et al.

### Publication Date

2018

### DOI

10.1038/s41746-018-0027-3

### Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

## AUTHOR CORRECTION OPEN

## Author Correction: Impact of remote patient monitoring on clinical outcomes: an updated meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Benjamin Noah<sup>1,2</sup>, Michelle S. Keller<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Sasan Mosadeghi<sup>4</sup>, Libby Stein<sup>1,2</sup>, Sunny Johl<sup>1,2</sup>, Sean Delshad<sup>1,2</sup>, Vartan C. Tashjian<sup>1,2,5</sup>, Daniel Lew<sup>1,2,5</sup>, James T. Kwan<sup>1,2</sup>, Alma Jusufagic<sup>1,2,3</sup> and Brennan M. R. Spiegel<sup>1,2,3,5,6</sup>


npj Digital Medicine (2018)1:17; doi:10.1038/s41746-018-0027-3

**Correction to:** npj Digital Medicine 1:2; <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-017-0002-4>, published online 15 January 2018


The original version of this Review Article contained calculation errors within the abstract:

“Body mass index (−0.96; 95% CI: −2.30, 0.37)” has been corrected to “Body mass index (−0.73; 95% CI: −1.84, 0.38)”, “BMI I<sup>2</sup> statistic 92% (95% Confidence Interval: [82%, 96%])” was corrected to “BMI I<sup>2</sup> statistic 92% (95% Confidence Interval: [83%, 96%])”, “body fat percentage (0.19; −1.2,1.57)” has been corrected to “body fat percentage (−0.11; −1.56, 1.34)”, I<sup>2</sup> statistic 85% (95% [56%, 95%])” was corrected to “body fat I<sup>2</sup> statistic 86% (95% [59%, 95%])”, and “diastolic blood pressure (−0.74; −2.34, 0.86)” has been corrected to “diastolic blood pressure (−0.99; −2.73, 0.74)”, “diastolic blood pressure I<sup>2</sup> statistic 28% (95% [0%, 73%])” has been changed to “diastolic blood pressure I<sup>2</sup> statistic 44% (95% [0%, 81%])”. These corrections have been repeated in the results section and Figs. 2, 5 and 7.

These errors have now been corrected in the HTML and PDF versions of this Article.


 **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as 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. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2018




**Fig. 2** Point estimates of the mean difference for each study (green squares) and the corresponding 95% Confidence Intervals (horizontal black lines) are shown, with the size of the green square representing the relative weight of the study. The black diamond represents the overall pooled estimate, with the tips of the diamond representing the 95% Confidence Intervals

<sup>1</sup>Division of Health Services Research, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA, USA; <sup>2</sup>Cedars-Sinai Center for Outcomes Research and Education (CS-CORE), Los Angeles, CA, USA; <sup>3</sup>Department of Health Policy and Management, UCLA Fielding School of Public Health, Los Angeles, CA, USA; <sup>4</sup>Department of Medicine, University of Arizona, College of Medicine Tucson, Tucson, AZ, USA; <sup>5</sup>Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA, USA and <sup>6</sup>American Journal of Gastroenterology, Bethesda, USA  
Correspondence: Brennan M. R. Spiegel (Brennan.Spiegel@cshs.org)



**Fig. 5** Point estimates of the mean difference for each study (green squares) and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (horizontal lines) are shown, with the size of the green square representing the relative weight of the study. The black diamond represents the overall pooled estimate, with the tips of the diamond representing the 95% Confidence Intervals



**Fig. 7** Point estimates of the mean difference for each study (green squares) and the corresponding 95% Confidence Intervals (horizontal lines) are shown, with the size of the green square representing the relative weight of the study. The black diamond represents the overall pooled estimate, with the tips of the diamond representing the 95% Confidence Intervals