ERRATUM

Erratum to: Marital histories, marital support, and bone density: findings from the Midlife in the United States Study

D. Miller-Martinez · T. Seeman · A. S. Karlamangla ·
G. A. Greendale · N. Binkley · C. J. Crandall

Erratum to: Osteoporos Int
DOI 10.1007/s00198-013-2602-4

An error in standardization of effect sizes for the marital history variable was discovered. The corrected effect sizes are slightly different from those given in the first sentence of the Results paragraph of the Abstract and in the third paragraph of the Results section in the main text, and the corrected passages are provided here.

D. Miller-Martinez · T. Seeman · A. S. Karlamangla ·
G. A. Greendale
Division of Geriatrics, David Geffen School of Medicine at
University of California, Los Angeles, 10945 Le Conte Avenue,
Suite 2339, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1687, USA

D. Miller-Martinez
e-mail: danamill@ucla.edu

T. Seeman
e-mail: tseeman@mednet.ucla.edu

A. S. Karlamangla
e-mail: akarlamangla@mednet.ucla.edu

G. A. Greendale
e-mail: ggreenda@mednet.ucla.edu

N. Binkley
University of Wisconsin-Madison Osteoporosis Clinical Center and
Research Program, Madison, WI, USA
e-mail: nbinkley@wisc.edu

C. J. Crandall (✉)
Division of General Internal Medicine and Health Services Research,
David Geffen School of Medicine at University of California, Los
Angeles, 911 Broxton Ave, 1st Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90024, USA
e-mail: ccrandall@mednet.ucla.edu

Abstract
Results Compared to stably married men, men who were currently divorced, widowed, or separated, men who were currently married but previously divorced, widowed, or separated, and never married men had 0.34 (95 % CI: 0.01, 0.67), 0.38 (95 % CI: 0.09, 0.68), and 0.53 (95 % CI: 0.22, 0.84) standard deviations lower lumbar spine BMD, respectively.

Results (third paragraph)
Those who had never married had 0.28 SD lower BMD at the lumbar spine (95 % CI: −0.51 to −0.04), and those who are currently divorced, widowed, separated had 0.25 SD lower lumbar spine BMD (95 % CI: −0.45, −0.05) compared with participants who were currently married and never divorced, widowed, or separated (Table 2: Model 2). There was marginal evidence that the association between never married and lower BMD differed by gender ($p=0.08$); thus, we ran stratified models. The gender-stratified models demonstrated that among men, those who were never married, and those currently married/ previously divorced, widowed, separated had lower lumbar spine BMD (0.53 SD lower BMD, 95 % CI: −0.84 to −0.22, and 0.38 SD lower BMD, 95 % CI: −0.68 to −0.09, respectively), but this was not the case among women (Table 2: Model 2).

Table 2 Table 2 Effect size and 95 % confidence interval for adjusted associations of various aspects of marital status and lumbar spine BMD. Effect sizes expressed in multiples of the BMD standard deviation (SD)

	Full sample	Men	Women
Model 1: Marital status[a]			
Currently married[b]	0.19* (0.03, 0.35)	0.29* (0.04, 0.53)	0.12 (−0.09, 0.32)
Model 2: Marital history[a]			
Married: previously divorced, widowed, or separated[c]	−0.20* (−0.40, −0.002)	−0.38* (−0.68, −0.09)	−0.10 (−0.36, 0.16)
Currently divorced, widowed, or separated[c]	−0.25* (−0.45, −0.05)	−0.34* (−0.67, −0.01)	−0.18 (−0.43, 0.07)
Never married[c]	−0.28* (−0.51, −0.04)	−0.53** (−0.84, −0.22)	−0.09 (−0.42, 0.23)
Model 3: Early marriage[a,d]			
Per year of marriage prior to age 25	−0.03~ (−0.07, 0.00)	−0.07* (−0.13, −0.002)	−0.02 (−0.06, 0.03)
Model 4: Marital quality[a,d,e]			
Average spouse support (per unit increase in Likert scale)	0.19* (0.01, 0.37)	0.12 (−0.20, 0.44)	0.35** (0.10, 0.59)

[a] All models adjusted for age, gender, race, education, financial advantage, clinic site, body weight, menopause transition stage, smoking status, physical activity, and use of serotonin reuptake inhibitors

[b] Currently married (regardless of previous divorce of separation) versus everyone else

[c] Reference group = currently married: never divorced, widowed, or separated

[d] Among those ever married

[e] Includes additional control variables formarital history, and support from other sources. Due to missing data regarding support, n's for these models are: 388 (full sample), 202 (males), 186 (females)

~ $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** < 0.01