

## Erratum to: Do Neighborhood Attributes Moderate the Relationship Between Alcohol Establishment Density and Crime?

Darin J. Erickson · Bradley P. Carlin ·  
Kathleen M. Lenk · Harrison S. Quick ·  
Eileen M. Harwood · Traci L. Toomey

Published online: 18 April 2014  
© Society for Prevention Research 2014

**Erratum to: Prev Sci**  
**DOI 10.1007/s11121-013-0446-y**

The original version of this article unfortunately contained some errors in Tables 2 and 3. In Table 2, the estimate for the association between healthcare services and rape is 0.26. In Tables 2 and 3, three asterisks (indicating significance at  $p < 0.05$ ) were missing and are now added in the following updated tables.

---

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11121-013-0446-y>.

---

D. J. Erickson (✉) · K. M. Lenk · E. M. Harwood · T. L. Toomey  
Division of Epidemiology and Community Health, School of Public  
Health, University of Minnesota, 1300 South Second Street, Suite  
300, Minneapolis, MN 55454, USA  
e-mail: [erick232@umn.edu](mailto:erick232@umn.edu)

B. P. Carlin · H. S. Quick  
Division of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, University of  
Minnesota, A460 Mayo Building, MMC 303, 420 Delaware St. S.E.,  
Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA

**Table 2** Multivariate results (Part 1): Associations between alcohol establishment density and violent crime outcomes, with potential moderating effects

	Assault		Rape		Robbery	
	<i>B</i>	95 % CI	<i>B</i>	95 % CI	<i>B</i>	95 % CI
Alcohol establishment density	0.40*	[0.27, 0.52]	0.24*	[0.09, 0.40]	0.28*	[0.15, 0.42]
Neighborhood demographics						
Population density [pop/ roadway mile]	0.40*	[0.21, 0.59]	0.39*	[0.15, 0.62]	0.52*	[0.34, 0.72]
Socioeconomic/racial index	−0.82*	[−0.98, −0.66]	−0.57*	[−0.78, −0.36]	−0.53*	[−0.75, −0.32]
Total population	0.20*	[0.01, 0.39]	−0.04	[−0.29, 0.21]	0.03	[−0.19, 0.23]
Population aged 15–24	−0.36*	[−0.56, −0.15]	−0.22	[−0.47, 0.03]	−0.33*	[−0.54, −0.13]
Potential moderators						
Non-alcohol food retailers	–	–	–	–	0.27*	[0.08, 0.46]
Healthcare services	–	–	0.26*	[0.05, 0.48]	–	–
Parks in “good” condition	–	–	–	–	−0.16*	[−0.29, −0.02]
Elementary schools	–	–	–	–	–	–
Colleges	0.05	[−0.10, 0.20]	–	–	–	–
Condemned buildings	–	–	–	–	0.26*	[0.04, 0.48]
Interactions						
Alcohol density × Elementary schools	–	–	–	–	–	–
Alcohol density × Colleges	−0.70*	[−1.18, −0.22]	–	–	–	–

*B* unstandardized regression coefficient; CI confidence interval for *B*

– Variable not included in multivariate model because it was not significant in individual moderator model at  $p < .05$ . All variables included in multivariate model were retained, regardless of significance

\*  $p < 0.05$

**Table 3** Multivariate results (Part 2): Associations between alcohol establishment density and non-violent crime outcomes, with potential moderating effects

	Vandalism		Nuisance		DWI		Public Consumption		Underage Possession/ Consumption	
	<i>B</i>	95 % CI	<i>B</i>	95 % CI	<i>B</i>	95 % CI	<i>B</i>	95 % CI	<i>B</i>	95 % CI
Alcohol establishment density	0.28*	[0.19, 0.37]	0.50*	[0.31, 0.69]	0.31	[-0.72, 1.16]	0.83*	[0.49, 1.17]	0.49*	[0.25, 0.72]
Neighborhood demographics										
Population density [pop/ roadway mile]	0.22*	[0.09, 0.35]	0.23	[-0.02, 0.48]	0.10	[-0.11, 0.31]	0.70*	[0.24, 1.21]	-0.01	[-0.39, 0.36]
Socioeconomic/racial index	-0.26*	[-0.40, -0.11]	-0.70*	[-0.90, -0.49]	-0.26*	[-0.44, -0.07]	-0.75*	[-1.19, -0.31]	-0.33	[-0.65, 0.01]
Total population	-0.10	[-0.23, 0.04]	-0.15	[-0.40, 0.11]	-0.02	[-0.23, 0.21]	-0.29	[-0.79, 0.23]	-0.55*	[-0.95, -0.13]
Population aged 15–24	0.11	[-0.02, 0.25]	0.15	[-0.10, 0.39]	0.19	[-0.03, 0.39]	0.09	[-0.42, 0.65]	0.81*	[0.43, 1.16]
Potential moderators										
Non-alcohol food retailers	–		0.32*	[0.09, 0.55]	0.21	[-0.03, 0.44]	0.26	[-0.29, 0.82]	–	
Non-food retailers	–		–		–		0.27	[-0.32, 0.87]	–	
Non-healthcare services	–		–		–		0.23	[-0.41, 0.79]	–	
Healthcare services	–		–		-0.10	[-0.31, 0.11]	–		–	
Parks in “good” condition	-0.07	[-0.16, 0.02]	–		–		–		–	
Elementary schools	–		–		–		–		–	
Colleges	–		0.2	[0.01, 0.39]	-0.01	[-0.19, 0.16]	0.26	[-0.08, 0.64]	–	
Neighborhood quality	–	–	–		-0.04	[-0.20, 0.12]	–		–	
Neighborhood activism	–		–		–		0.60*	[0.23, 0.99]	0.31*	[0.02, 0.60]
Condemned buildings	0.15*	[0.01, 0.30]	–		–		–		–	
Interactions										
Alcohol density × Neighborhood quality	–		–		0.15	[-0.07, 0.41]	–		–	
Alcohol density × Healthcare services	–		–		-0.09	[-0.26, 0.07]	–		–	
Alcohol density × Colleges	–		-0.77*	[-1.38, -0.20]	-0.52	[-1.05, 0.03]	-1.32*	[-2.58, -0.07]	–	

*B* unstandardized regression coefficient; CI confidence interval for *B*

– Variable not included in multivariate model because it was not significant in individual moderator model at  $p < .05$ . All variables included in multivariate model were retained, regardless of significance

\*  $p < 0.05$