Familial nasopharyngeal carcinoma in Hong Kong: epidemiology and implication in screening

Wai Tong Ng · Cheuk Wai Choi · Michael C. H. Lee ·
Siu Hong Chan · Tsz Kok Yau · Anne W. M. Lee

Published online: 10 May 2009
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2009

Erratum to: *Familial Cancer* (2009) 8:103–108 DOI 10.1007/s10689-008-9213-9

Unfortunately the article published in the journal *Familial Cancer* (2009) 8:103–108 has following three corrections.

Due to a data transfer mistake for one patient, the authors regret that the following changes to be made.

The correct version of the eighth sentence in the abstract section must read as:

There were also more stage I–II patients in group 1 (38 vs 23%, $P < 0.01$).

Instead of

There were also more stage I–II patients in group 1 (37 vs. 23%, $P < 0.01$).

The correct version of the second sentence in the second paragraph of the Result section must read as:

Furthermore, more patients in group 1 presented in early stages than group 2, with 38% in group 1 presenting at stage I–II (stage I: 6.4%, stage II: 31.2%), compared to 23% (stage I: 0.6%, stage II: 22.2%) in group 2 ($P < 0.01$).

Instead of

Furthermore, more patients in group 1 presented in early stages than group 2, with 37% in group 1 presenting at stage I–II (stage I: 6.4%, stage II: 30.4%), compared to 23% (stage I: 0.6%, stage II: 22.2%) in group 2 ($P < 0.01$).

In Table 1, the second column under the “Screen detected (Group 1a)” is changed.

Please see the revised table shown below:

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s10689-008-9213-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10689-008-9213-9).

W. T. Ng (✉) · C. W. Choi · S. H. Chan ·
T. K. Yau · A. W. M. Lee
Department of Clinical Oncology, Pamela Youde Nethersole
Eastern Hospital, 3 Lok Man Road, Chai Wan, Hong Kong
e-mail: ngwt1@ha.org.hk

M. C. H. Lee
Department of Medical Physics, Pamela Youde Nethersole
Eastern Hospital, 3 Lok Man Road, Chai Wan, Hong Kong

Table 1 Patient characteristics

	Group 1 (with family history)		Group 2 (No family history)	<i>P</i> -value (Group 1 vs. Group 2)	<i>P</i> -value (Group 1b vs. Group 2)
	Screen detected (Group 1a)	Symptomatic cases (Group 1b)			
Age	41.8	48.7	50.3	0.044 ^b	0.293
Sex (male vs. female)	41.2 vs. 58.8%	66.7 vs. 33.3%	74.8 vs. 25.2%	0.005 ^b	0.065
Duration of presenting symptoms (month)	Not applicable	4.74	5.30	–	0.882
T stage				0.039 ^b	0.427
T1	8 (47.1%)	2 (1.9%)	36 (3.3%)		
T2	5 (29.4%)	55 (50.9%)	451 (41.9%)		
T3	3 (17.6%)	26 (24.1%)	290 (26.9%)		
T4	1 (5.9%)	20 (18.5%)	251 (23.3%)		
Unknown ^a		5 (4.6%)	49 (4.5%)		
N stage				0.049 ^b	0.271
N0	7 (41.2%)	17 (15.7%)	132 (12.3%)		
N1	6 (35.3%)	40 (37.0%)	317 (29.4%)		
N2	4 (23.5%)	31 (28.7%)	395 (36.7%)		
N3	0 (0.0%)	15 (13.9%)	184 (17.1%)		
Unknown ^a		5 (4.6%)	49 (4.5%)		
M1 stage	0 (0.0%)	5 (4.6%)	49 (4.5%)	0.779	0.970
Group stage				<0.001	0.008
Early stage (I/II)	10 (58.8%)	37 (34.3%)	246 (22.8%)		
Advanced stage (III/IV)	7 (41.2%)	71 (65.7%)	831 (77.2%)		

^a Not assessed by imaging because of metastatic disease (i.e. IVC disease)

^b Changed from significant to non-significant when compared with symptomatic cases only