

## Erratum to: Exposure to household painting and floor treatments, and parental occupational paint exposure and risk of childhood brain tumors: results from an Australian case–control study

Kathryn R. Greenop · Susan Peters · Lin Fritschi · Deborah C. Glass ·  
Lesley J. Ashton · Helen D. Bailey · Rodney J. Scott · John Daubenton ·  
Nicholas H. de Klerk · Bruce K. Armstrong · Elizabeth Milne

Published online: 20 June 2014  
© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2014

### Erratum to: *Cancer Causes Control* (2014) 25:283–291 DOI 10.1007/s10552-013-0330-x

After publication, it was noted by the authors that the dataset used for the analyses of occupational exposures in this study accidentally used incomplete occupational histories for 94 control fathers and 104 control mothers recruited in 2006, and these control parents were all treated as unexposed to occupational painting.

Results in Tables 1–5 were unaffected by this error as they concerned household rather than occupational paint exposure. The conclusions regarding the association with household exposure to paint and floor treatments are consequently unaffected.

---

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s10552-013-0330-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10552-013-0330-x).

---

K. R. Greenop · H. D. Bailey · N. H. de Klerk · E. Milne (✉)  
Telethon Institute for Child Health Research, Centre for Child  
Health Research, University of Western Australia,  
PO Box 855, Perth, WA 6872, Australia  
e-mail: lizm@ichr.uwa.edu.au

S. Peters · L. Fritschi  
Western Australian Institute for Medical Research, University of  
Western Australia, Perth, WA, Australia

D. C. Glass  
Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, Monash  
University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

L. J. Ashton  
School of Women and Children's Health, University of New  
South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia

H. D. Bailey  
Section of Environment and Radiation, International Agency for  
Research on Cancer, Lyon, France

However, for occupational exposure, 15 control fathers and 1 control mother were mistakenly classified as being unexposed when they should have been classified as exposed (any time before the child's birth). The analyses presented in Table 6 in the published article were rerun using the complete dataset to ensure correct exposure assignment (5 case fathers and 4 control fathers were additionally excluded from the revised occupational analysis due to genuinely missing data). The updated Table 6 is presented in this erratum.

In the original publication, the authors commented in the results section that the ORs for paternal occupational exposure to paints were slightly elevated but lacked precision, and in the conclusion remarked that there was “little evidence that exposure to paints at home, or parental exposure at work, was associated with risk of CBT.” The

R. J. Scott  
School of Biomedical Sciences and Pharmacy, Faculty of  
Health, University of Newcastle, Newcastle, NSW, Australia

R. J. Scott  
Hunter Medical Research Institute, John Hunter Hospital,  
Newcastle, NSW, Australia

R. J. Scott  
Hunter Area Pathology Service, HNEHealth, Newcastle, NSW,  
Australia

J. Daubenton  
Division of Women's, Adolescent and Children's Services  
(WACS), Royal Hobart Hospital, Hobart, TAS, Australia

B. K. Armstrong  
Sydney School of Public Health, University of Sydney, Sydney,  
NSW, Australia

**Table 6** Fathers' occupational exposure to the application of paint and risk of CBT

	<i>n</i> cases/ controls	OR <sup>a</sup>	95 % CI
No exposure before the child's birth	187/642	1.00	Referent
Any exposure before the child's birth	54/153	1.23	0.85, 1.78
Any exposure in the "conception year" <sup>b,c</sup>	18/52	1.26	0.70, 2.27

<sup>a</sup> ORs adjusted for matching variables (child's age, sex, state of residence), paternal education, year of diagnosis/recruitment, paternal occupational exposure to diesel exhausts in the 2 years prior to birth

<sup>b</sup> "Conception year" relates to the 2 years before the birth year

<sup>c</sup> Reference level is no occupational painting before the child's birth

revised ORs for paternal occupational exposure to paints are only slightly different from those previously published so these statements are still correct. There were still too few occupationally exposed mothers to analyse (2 cases/6 controls).

The sentence in the abstract concerning fathers' occupational exposure should now read:

"The OR for the association between CBT and paternal occupational exposure to paint any time before the pregnancy was 1.23 (95 % CI 0.85, 1.78), which is consistent with the results of other studies."

The authors offer their sincere apologies for any confusion that they may have caused.