Erratum to: Comparison of Technical and Clinical Outcome of Transjugular Portosystemic Shunt Placement Between a Bare Metal Stent and a PTFE-Stentgraft Device

J. Lauermann¹ · A. Potthoff² · M. Mc Cavert³ · S. Marquardt¹ · B. Vaske⁴ ·
H. Rosenthal¹ · T. von Hahn² · F. Wacker¹ · B. C. Meyer¹ · Thomas Rodt¹

Published online: 10 December 2015

© Springer Science+Business Media New York and the Cardiovascular and Interventional Radiological Society of Europe (CIRSE) 2015

Erratum to: *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* DOI 10.1007/s00270-015-1209-x

In the above-mentioned manuscript, relative frequencies have been falsely determined as cumulative probabilities in some cases. Corrections are in bold.

Page 4, Technical Follow-up

Overall primary patency rate was 89 % [occlusion ($n = 10$) and stenosis requiring revision ($n = 8$)/163...]. Probability of 14 days primary patency was **87.5 %** (group 1) and **100 %** (group 2).

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s00270-015-1209-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00270-015-1209-x).

✉ Thomas Rodt
rodt.thomas@mh-hannover.de

J. Lauermann
jostlauermann@gmail.com

¹ Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology, Hannover Medical School, Carl-Neuberg-Str. 1, 30625 Hannover, Germany

² Department of Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Endocrinology, Hannover Medical School, Hannover, Germany

³ Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology, Beaumont Hospital, Dublin, Ireland

⁴ Institute of Biometry, Hannover Medical School, Hannover, Germany

Page 5, Clinical Progress

Kaplan–Meier analysis of overall survival yielded 1-year survival rate of **84 %**. One-year survival rates were **79.2 %** (group 1) and **86.8 %** (group 2). Subgroup analysis for Child–Pugh class yielded 1-year survival rates of **100 %** (A), **85.8 %** (B) and **66.8 %** (C). Liver capsule perforation was associated with significantly lower probability of 1-year survival (**38.1** vs. **86.4 %**; $p < 0.001$). The small number of variceal embolizations did not allow valid analysis... (**83 %** against **89 %**).

Page 6, Table 3:

The probabilities of primary patency and survival given above are also updated in Table 3.

Table 3 Technical and clinical outcome depending on TIPS device

Characteristics	Group 1	Group 2	<i>p</i> value
Primary patency rate	86.3 %	91.6 %	
Secondary patency rate	90 %	85.7 %	
Number of TIPS revisions	16	15	
Patients with need of TIPS revision	14	11	
Revisions during first year after TIPS	13	11	
Revisions to maintain TIPS patency	12	8	
Probability of primary patency (Kaplan–Meier analysis)			
After 14 days	87.5 %	100 %	0.004
After 6 months	87.5 %	95.0 %	0.047
After 1 year	76.7 %	87.8 %	0.057
After 2 years	63.7 %	82.9 %	0.037
Probability of 1-year survival (Kaplan–Meier analysis)	79.2 %	86.8 %	0.295
Causes of death during first year	11 (13.75 %)	7 (8.4 %)	
HE after TIPS	11 (13.75 %)	16 (19.3 %)	
Patients with at least one revision due to HE	4 (5 %)	4 (4.8 %)	