ERRATUM

Erratum to: Difficulties in deciding whether to ablate patients with putatively “low–intermediate-risk” differentiated thyroid carcinoma: do guidelines mainly apply in the centres that produce them? Results of a retrospective, two-centre quality assurance study

Savvas Frangos¹ · Ioannis P. Iakovou² · Robert J. Marlowe³ · Nicolaos Eftychiou¹ ·
Loukia Patsali¹ · Anna Vanezi¹ · Androulla Savva¹ · Vassilis Mpalaris² ·
Evanthia I. Giannoula²

Published online: 2 November 2015
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2015

**Erratum to: European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and
Molecular Imaging**
DOI 10.1007/s00259-015-3124-4

The original version of this article contained a mistake in the reference citation found in Table 5. Instead of ATA 2006, it should have been ATA 2009.

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00259-015-3124-4>.

✉ Savvas Frangos
savvas.frangos@gmail.com

¹ Department of Nuclear Medicine, Bank of Cyprus Oncology Centre, 32 Acropoleos Avenue, Strovolos, Nicosia 2006, Cyprus

² Department of Nuclear Medicine, Aristotle University, Papageorgiou Hospital, 56403 Thessaloniki, Greece

³ Spencer-Fontayne Corporation, 33 Bentley Avenue, Jersey City, NJ 07304-1901, USA

Table 5 Classification of the study population in relation to the indications for thyroid remnant ablation according to selected DTC clinical guidelines/consensus statements

Category/criterion	EANM 2008 [13]	NCCN Version 2 2014 [15]	ATA 2009 [11]
Definite ablation candidates (“indication”)	70.5 % (237)	19.6 % (66)	32.7 % (110)
Probable ablation candidates (“recommendation”)	10.1 % (34)	54.8 % (184)	28.6 % (96)
Possible (“selective”) ablation candidates (“no indication”)	19.3 % (65)	25.6 % (86)	38.7 % (130)

The data presented are percentages (number) of patients in relation to the entire cohort *ATA* American Thyroid Association, *EANM* European Association of Nuclear Medicine, *NCCN* National Comprehensive Cancer Network