

## Erratum to: Biofield Therapies: Helpful or Full of Hype? A Best Evidence Synthesis

Shamini Jain • Paul J. Mills

Published online: 7 December 2010  
© International Society of Behavioral Medicine 2010

**Erratum to: Int.J. Behav. Med.**  
**DOI 10.1007/s12529-009-9062-4**

The original version of this article, which published in volume 17, issue 1 (Spring 2010), contained some errors in the text and online supplementary tables. The errors in the text are:

- 1) In the “Results” section, under the subheading “Hospitalized and Postoperative Patients,” the second sentence should read: “Five studies (four high quality and one low quality, using...” as opposed to
- 2) In the “Results” section, under the subheading “Best Evidence Synthesis”, the first line of the second paragraph should read: “All 66 studies (separated by population/ailment studied) are presented in Tables 4a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h as electronic supplementary material.” (as opposed to “All 67 studies...”).
- 3) In the “Results” section, within the first paragraph of the second column on page 13, the sentence should read “It should be noted that of 66 studies...”, as opposed to “It should be noted that of 67 studies”.

---

The online version of the original article can be found under <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12529-009-9062-4>.

---

S. Jain (✉)  
Samueli Institute,  
Alexandria, VA, USA  
e-mail: [sjain@ucsd.edu](mailto:sjain@ucsd.edu)

S. Jain  
e-mail: [sjain@samueliinsitutute.org](mailto:sjain@samueliinsitutute.org)

P. J. Mills  
Department of Psychiatry, University of California,  
San Diego, USA

P. J. Mills  
Symptom Control Group, Moores Comprehensive Cancer Center,  
University of California,  
San Diego, USA

Study Reference	Patient Population (N, gender, ethnicity)	Intervention(s) (duration, design)	Biomarkers/functional measures examined	Psych and other outcome variables	Results	Study +/-	Comments
Aghabati, Mohammadi, Esmail (2009)	90 hospitalized female cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy (mean age=41; ethnicity not reported)	B/w/n Ss design TT (n=30)  Mock TT (n=30) Control (standard care) (n=30)  TT and mock TT administered for 30 min in the morning for 5 days, during patients' hospitalization and receiving of chemotherapy	None	VAS for acute pain Rhoten Fatigue Scale (VAS-based)	TT group had significantly reduced pain and fatigue scores over the	+ placebo and standard care controls  + adequate sample size + assessed for covariates between groups	Only one TT practitioner used, experience unclear

The errors in the online supplementary tables are:

1) Table 4b (Cancer Studies) is missing a study, which should be placed after Smith et al., and before Olsen et al. Specific verbiage and format follows:

(Please note that the table currently linked to Table 4d for dementia patients is actually the CORRECT table for 4b; that is, this table is for cancer patients and includes the Aghabati et al. study placed correctly in the table).

2) Table 4d (Dementia studies) is incorrectly linked to another table (see above). The table for 4d should be as indicated on the following page:

3) Table 4g (Student Populations) includes a study by Woods & Dimond, 2002 on Alzheimer's patients and should not appear in this table.

Table 4d. Biofield studies conducted with dementia patients, in order of total quality ratings (highest to lowest). Problematic studies marked with an asterisk (\*). (*TT* = *Therapeutic Touch*)

Study Reference	Patient Population (N, gender, ethnicity)	Intervention(s) (duration, design)	Biomarkers/functional measures examined	Psych and other outcome variables	Results	Study +/-	Comments
(Woods et al., 2005)	57 Moderate to severe patients with dementia, mean age=41, female = 46, male=11, 56 Caucasian, 1 Asian	B/w/n Ss design  TT (n=19)  mimic TT (n=19)  no-treatment control (n=19)	None	Modified Agitated Behavior Rating Scale (MABRS) – 6 subscales  6 observers blinded to condition conducted evaluations using above questionnaires	Group difference on percent change for overall behavioral symptoms of dementia; TT group showed significant reductions in vocalization and manual manipulation subscales compared to control group  No significant difference mimic TT and control or TT groups on MABRS	+ placebo control  + control group  + good design to maintain blindness of 3condition both for participant and staff  + reliable/valid measure	Well-delineated efforts to maintain blinding of patients and staff

(continued)

Study Reference	Patient Population (N, gender, ethnicity)	Intervention(s) (duration, design)	Biomarkers/functional measures examined	Psych and other outcome variables	Results	Study +/-	Comments
		TT administered with contact on neck and shoulders; 2×/day for 3 days, length of session 5–7 min. 3 TT practitioners, with 5–8 years experience; 3 research assistants blinded to study purpose conducted mimic TT.				+ tested for inter-rater reliability of MABRS	
(Simington & Laing, 1993)*	105 institutionalized elderly (34 male, 71 female; all Caucasian; mean age=75)	B/w/n Ss design  TT (in form of back rub, given by TT practitioner) (n=34)  Back rub (given by nurse practitioner, who attempted not to administer TT) (n=37)  Back rub (given by registered nurse who was not practicing TT) (n=34)  3-minute sessions, 2× daily for 2 weeks	None	State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI)	TT group showed significantly lower mean STAI score than back rub by non-TT practitioner  No significant difference between TT group and group who received back rub by TT practitioner; no significant difference between back rub by TT practitioner and back rub by non-TT practitioner	+ alpha control for multiple comparisons in subscales  - only one outcome measure used + placebo and control groups  - suboptimal statistical analysis	TT administered “in the form of a back rub” for very short duration (3 min)  Rated problematic due to no report of means and SD, as well as improper analysis ( <i>t</i> -test on mean STAI posttest score, instead of between-groups repeated-measures ANOVA)
(Woods & Dimond, 2002)	10 resident special care patients with AD; male=3, female=7; mean age = 79, all Caucasian	W/in Ss design  TT for 5–7 min, 2× day for 3 days	salivary & urine morning cortisol	agitated behavior overall and subscales (ABRS, trained nursing student rated)	Sig decrease in overall agitated behavior and vocalization, pacing subscales  No sig change in cortisol over entire duration of tx	+ assessed interrater reliability, good quality control  + observers were blinded to study purpose  + control for diurnal variation of cortisol  - small sample size (but assessed over 6 timepoints) - no control group	authors report on repeated measures analysis for 6 timepoints  salivary and urine cortisol changes from baseline to initial treatment suggest some initial intervention effect

(continued)

Study Reference	Patient Population (N, gender, ethnicity)	Intervention(s) (duration, design)	Biomarkers/functional measures examined	Psych and other outcome variables	Results	Study +/-	Comments
Crawford, Leaver, & Mahoney (2007)*	24 patients with Alzheimer's disease (age range 60–80; females=16, males= 8; 11 Native American, 13 Caucasian)	B/w/n Ss design  Reiki ( <i>n</i> =12)  Control ( <i>n</i> =12)  Sessions were 30 min in duration, once a week for 4 weeks  Reiki administered by 2 Reiki Masters	None	Annotated Mini- Mental State Exami- nation (AMMSE)  Revised Memory and Behavior Problems Checklist (RMBPC)	Significant pre-post differences between groups on RMBPC total score, but not AMMSE  Individual items analyzed for each measure; AMMSE showed no differences between groups for any item; RMBPC showed significant differences in 8 of 24 questions	+ control group  +assessment of baseline differences on demographic variables  - no alpha control or multiple (individual item) comparisons	Brief report; noted problematic because no means or standard deviations reported