Correction to: Characteristics of bone metabolism markers during the healing of osteoporotic versus nonosteoporotic metaphyseal long bone fractures: a matched pair analysis

L. Kolios¹ · M. Hitzler² · A. Moghaddam² · C. Takur² · H. Schmidt-Gayk³ · B. Höner⁴ · M. Lehnhardt¹ · P. Grützner² · C. Wölfl²

Published online: 20 May 2020

© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2020

Correction to: Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg (2012) 38:457–462
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00068-012-0190-1>

The original version of this article unfortunately contained a mistake. The presentation of Table 1 was incorrect. The corrected table (Table 1) is given below.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00068-012-0190-1>.

✉ L. Kolios
leilakolios@freenet.de; lkolios@bgu-ludwigshafen.de

¹ Department for Hand, Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Burn Care Centre, Clinic for Plastic Surgery of the University of Heidelberg, BG Trauma Center Ludwigshafen, Ludwig-Guttmann-Str. 13, 67071 Ludwigshafen, Germany

² Department for Traumatology and Orthopaedic Surgery, BG Trauma Center Ludwigshafen, Ludwig-Guttmann-Str. 13, 67071 Ludwigshafen, Germany

³ Clinical Laboratory Limbach, Im Breitspiel 15, 69126 Heidelberg, Germany

⁴ Department of Social and Legal Sciences, SRH University Heidelberg, Ludwig-Guttmann-Str. 6, 69123 Heidelberg, Germany

Table 1 Table of matched pairs of patients

Patient no.	Sex	Age (years)	Fracture localization	Fracture type	Osteosynthesis	Osteoporosis
1	Female	57	Distal radius fracture	A	Plate	Healthy
1	Female	59	Distal radius fracture	A	Plate	Diseased
2	Female	62	Distal radius fracture	A	Plate	Healthy
2	Female	61	Distal radius fracture	A	Plate	Diseased
3	Female	57	Distal radius fracture	A	Plate	Healthy
3	Female	57	Distal radius fracture	A	Plate	Diseased
4	Female	63	Distal radius fracture	A	Plate	Healthy
4	Female	67	Distal radius fracture	A	Plate	Diseased
5	Female	66	Distal radius fracture	A	Plate	Healthy
5	Female	68	Distal radius fracture	A	Plate	Diseased
6	Female	65	Distal radius fracture	A	Plate	Healthy
6	Female	64	Distal radius fracture	A	Plate	Diseased
7	Female	56	Distal radius fracture	B	Plate	Healthy
7	Female	69	Distal radius fracture	B	Plate	Diseased
8	Female	60	Proximal humeral fractures	A	Plate	Healthy
8	Female	59	Proximal humeral fractures	A	Plate	Diseased
9	Female	68	Proximal humeral fractures	C	Plate	Healthy
9	Female	71	Proximal humeral fractures	C	Plate	Diseased
10	Female	74	Proximal humeral fractures	C	Plate	Healthy
10	Female	78	Proximal humeral fractures	C	Plate	Diseased
11	Male	72	Femoral neck fractures	A	Screws	Healthy
11	Male	75	Femoral neck fractures	A	Screws	Diseased
12	Male	64	Femoral neck fractures	A	DHS	Healthy
12	Male	68	Femoral neck fractures	A	DHS	Diseased
13	Female	59	Intertrochanteric fracture	B	DHS	Healthy
13	Female	63	Intertrochanteric fracture	B	DHS	Diseased
14	Female	66	Intertrochanteric fracture	C	IFN	Healthy
14	Female	70	Intertrochanteric fracture	C	IFN	Diseased
15	Male	64	Intertrochanteric fracture	B	IFN	Healthy
15	Male	68	Intertrochanteric fracture	B	IFN	Diseased

The matching criteria were age (± 5 years), sex (male, female), fracture localization (proximal humerus, distal radius, proximal femur), fracture type (according to AO classification; A-, B-, or C-type fractures), and operation method (plate, intramedullary nail)