

## Corrigendum

**Cite this article:** Villemain O, Malekzadeh-Milani S, Sitefane F, Mostefa-Kara M, Boudjemline Y (2019). Radiation exposure in transcatheter patent ductus arteriosus closure: time to tune? – CORRIGENDUM. *Cardiology in the Young* **29**: 1006–1007. doi: [10.1017/S1047951118000744](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1047951118000744)

First published online: 9 July 2018

# Radiation exposure in transcatheter patent ductus arteriosus closure: time to tune? – CORRIGENDUM

---

Olivier Villemain, Sophie Malekzadeh-Milani, Fidelio Sitefane, Meriem Mostefa-Kara and Younes Boudjemline

---

doi: [10.1017/S1047951117002839](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1047951117002839), Published by Cambridge University Press, 19 January 2018.

The authors apologise for some major errors in Table 1 in their published article.

In Table 1, the paper from R.W. Harbron and colleagues is missquoted (ref 18). DAP provided in the Table were approximated based on supplementary data provided in their publication.

The Table should have mentioned that but the legend somehow disappeared.

The corrected Table is given below.

## Reference

Villemain O, Malekzadeh-Milani S, Sitefane F, Mostefa-Kara M, Boudjemline Y. Radiation exposure in transcatheter patent ductus arteriosus closure: time to tune? *Cardiol Young*. Published by Cambridge University Press, 19 January 2018. doi: [10.1017/S1047951117002839](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1047951117002839).

**Table 1.** Studies included in the dose review

Study (reference) :	Country	Study period	Publication date	Number of patients	Frame per second	II or FDP	DAP median [Q1-Q3], Gy.cm <sup>2</sup>	FT median [Q1-Q3], min	Air Kerma [Q1-Q3], mGy
Al Haj(14)	Saudi Arabia	2000–2002	2008	41	15	II	23.21	19.7	NA
Borik(15)	Canada	2007–2014	2015	266	7.5, 15	FDP	2.54 [0.380–181]	8 [3–92]	47 [7–2019]
El Sayed(16)	Egypt	NA	2012	18	15	II	10	10.8	300
Ghelani(3)	USA	2009–2013	2014	548	10, 15, 30	NA	7 [?–16]	12 [?–17]	109 [?–175]
Glatz(17)	USA	2009–2013	2014	92	10–15	FDP	3.52 [2.29–7.09]	11 [9–16]	83 [51–139]
Harbron(18)*	UK	1994–2013 2007–2010 2008–2013 2008–2013	2015	1276 64 319 152	10–30	Both	NA H1: 0.65(0.52–1.26) H2: 3.17(2.37–4.83) H3: 1.12(0.65–2.22)	NA 6.53 6.25 7.8	NA NA NA NA
Kobayashi(19)	USA	2008–2013	2014	750	NA	Both	NA	10 [?–15]	NA
Smith(20)	UK	2005–2009	2012	140	7.5–15	FDP	1.52 [0.78–2.52]	6 [4, 9]	NA
Song(21)	China	NA	2015	20	15–30	FDP	6.47 [1.29–90.01]	5.67 [2.1–33]	42 [20–250]
Ubeda(22)	Chile	NA	2012	137	10	II	2	11.2	NA
Ubeda(23)	Chile	2011–2013	2015	126	10	II	1.4	13	NA
Verghese(24)	USA	2005–2009	2012	61	NA	FDP	8 [5.58–14.30]	17	240 [139–321]
Yakoumakis(25)	Greece	NA	2013	16	12.5	II	9.5 [7.8–11.2]	9.8	
Our study	France	2012–2015	2018	269	15	Both	1.24 [0.69–2.55]	2.8 [2–4]	28 [17–56]
Our study	France	2015–2016	2018	55	7.5	FDP	0.44 [0.24–0.61]	2.5 [1.6–3.4]	10 [6–22]

\*this paper presents data from 3 different hospitals during a long period of time. Median DAP values for the entire population are not available. We present here for better understanding data derived from the three hospitals in the last area where radiation exposure was the lowest.