European Radiology (2019) 29:7076–7077
https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-019-06271-z

CORRECTION

Correction to: Point estimate and reference normality interval of MRI-derived myocardial extracellular volume in healthy subjects: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Francesco Sardanelli[1,2] · Simone Schiaffino[1] · Moreno Zanardo[3] · Francesco Secchi[1] · Paola Maria Cannaò[1] · Federico Ambrogi[4] · Giovanni Di Leo[1]

Published online: 5 July 2019

Correction to: European Radiology
https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-019-06185-w

The original version of this article, published on 02 May 2019, unfortunately contained a mistake. The following correction has therefore been made in the original: The presentation of Fig. 2 was incorrect. The corrected figure is given below.

The online version of the original article can be found at https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-019-06185-w

✉ Moreno Zanardo
moreno.zanardo@unimi.it

[1] Radiology Unit, IRCCS Policlinico San Donato, via Morandi 30, 20097 San Donato Milanese, Milan, Italy

[2] Department of Biomedical Sciences for Health, Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Morandi 30, 20097 San Donato Milanese, Milan, Italy

[3] Integrative Biomedical Research, Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Mangiagalli 31, 20133 Milan, Italy

[4] Department of Clinical Sciences and Community Health, Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Vanzetti 5, 20133 Milan, Italy



Model	Study name	Mean	Lower limit	Upper limit
	Mordi 2017	0,270	0,254	0,286
	Storz 2017	0,246	0,242	0,250
	Wang 2017	0,269	0,264	0,274
	Youn 2017	0,258	0,248	0,268
	Altabella 2016	0,245	0,228	0,262
	Boentert 2016	0,254	0,242	0,266
	Bulluck 2016	0,264	0,255	0,273
	Hanneman 2016	0,270	0,251	0,289
	Lee 2016	0,263	0,256	0,270
	Luetkens 2016 (1a)	0,277	0,261	0,293
	Luetkens 2016 (1b)	0,253	0,241	0,265
	Luetkens 2016 (2a)	0,265	0,250	0,280
	Luetkens 2016 (2b)	0,261	0,249	0,273
	Mayr 2016	0,250	0,243	0,257
	Mori 2016	0,262	0,250	0,274
	Olivieri 2016 (a)	0,252	0,235	0,269
	Olivieri 2016 (b)	0,207	0,195	0,219
	Schmacht 2016	0,264	0,250	0,278
	Soslow 2016	0,240	0,234	0,246
	Weingartner 2016 (a)	0,260	0,249	0,271
	Weingartner 2016 (b)	0,202	0,193	0,211
	Weingartner 2016 (c)	0,213	0,202	0,224
	Zhao 2016	0,251	0,242	0,260
	aus dem Siepen 2015	0,230	0,222	0,238
	Banypersad 2015	0,250	0,245	0,255
	Barison 2015 (1)	0,280	0,255	0,305
	Barison 2015 (2)	0,250	0,230	0,270
	Edwards 2015 (1)	0,250	0,238	0,262
	Edwards 2015 (2)	0,250	0,238	0,262
	Ertel 2015	0,260	0,256	0,264
	Hong 2015	0,256	0,241	0,271
	Kuruvilla 2015	0,260	0,247	0,273
	Mehta 2015	0,271	0,259	0,283
	Ntusi 2015	0,279	0,275	0,283
	Singh 2015	0,251	0,243	0,259
	Barison 2014	0,260	0,249	0,271
	Brower 2014	0,260	0,250	0,270
	Chin 2014	0,260	0,253	0,267
	Dabir 2014 (a)	0,250	0,237	0,263
	Dabir 2014 (b)	0,260	0,246	0,274
	Edwards 2014	0,250	0,243	0,257
	Florian 2014	0,240	0,230	0,250
	Luetkens 2014	0,236	0,224	0,248
	Neilan 2014	0,270	0,253	0,287
	Radunski 2014	0,250	0,244	0,256
	Thuny 2014	0,268	0,259	0,277
	Brooks 2013	0,268	0,254	0,282
	Neilan 2013 (1)	0,280	0,270	0,290
	Neilan 2013 (2)	0,280	0,270	0,290
	Puntmann 2013 (1)	0,260	0,239	0,281
	Puntmann 2013 (2)	0,270	0,266	0,274
	Salerno 2013	0,285	0,272	0,298
	Shah 2013	0,264	0,259	0,269
	Thompson 2013	0,222	0,209	0,235
	Fontana 2012	0,270	0,262	0,278
	Kawel 2012 (a)	0,270	0,258	0,282
	Kawel 2012 (b)	0,280	0,268	0,292
	Kawel 2012 (c)	0,280	0,268	0,292
	Kellman 2012	0,254	0,248	0,260
	Mongeon 2012	0,240	0,227	0,253
	Sado 2012	0,253	0,245	0,261
	Ugander 2012	0,270	0,262	0,278
	Broberg 2010	0,248	0,238	0,258
	Jerosch-Herold 2008	0,240	0,220	0,260
Random		0,256	0,252	0,260

Fig. 2 Forest plot of the 56 analyzed studies, for a total of 64 independent study parts. Heterogeneity among studies was very high ($I^2 = 92\%$). The last row shows the pooled extracellular volume obtained using the random effects model