Erratum to: Encephalopathy and death in infants with abusive head trauma is due to hypoxic-ischemic injury following local brain trauma to vital brainstem centers

Jakob Matschke · Andreas Büttner ·
Markus Bergmann · Christian Hagel · Klaus Püschel ·
Markus Glatzel

Published online: 20 September 2014
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2014

Erratum to: Int J Legal Med
DOI 10.1007/s00414-014-1060-7

Unfortunately, in the original version of this article initially published, in the results part under the heading “Case–control analysis of 20 AHT-victims with instant death with 20 SIDS victims” it was reported that:

“Logistic regression run separately for these two parameters adjusted for age, sex, and brain weight as possible confounding factors showed a significant effect for APP-positive

axons in the brainstem (odds ratio [OR]=3.5; 95 % confidence interval [CI]=1.3 to 9.2; $p=0.010$) in the cerebellar peduncles (OR=1.3; 95 % CI=1.1 to 1.7; $p=0.012$; see Table 2 with complete original data in the online resource 3). Instead, this sentence should read:

“Logistic regression run separately for these two parameters adjusted for age, sex, and brain weight as possible confounding factors showed a significant effect for APP-positive axons in the brainstem (odds ratio [OR]=3.1; 95 % confidence interval [CI]=1.2 to 7.7; $p=0.015$) in the cerebellar

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00414-014-1060-7>.

J. Matschke (✉)
Forensic Neuropathology Unit, University Medical Centre,
Hamburg-Eppendorf, 20246 Hamburg, Germany
e-mail: matschke@uke.de

J. Matschke · C. Hagel · M. Glatzel
Institute of Neuropathology, University Medical Centre,
Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

A. Büttner
Institute of Legal Medicine, Medical Faculty, University of Rostock,
Rostock, Germany

M. Bergmann
Institute of Clinical Neuropathology, Klinikum Bremen-Mitte,
Bremen, Germany

K. Püschel
Institute of Legal Medicine, University Medical Centre,
Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

peduncles (OR=1.5; 95 % CI=0.9 to 2.6; $p=0.136$; see Table 2 with complete original data in the online resource 3).

In addition, parts “c” and “d” in Figure 2 were identical. The correct Figure 2 is given here.

We regret this error; consequences for any of the results drawn in this study did not occur.