



## Correction to: The natural course of pT2 prostate cancer with positive surgical margin: predicting biochemical recurrence

A. Karl<sup>1</sup> · A. Buchner<sup>1</sup> · C. Tympner<sup>2</sup> · T. Kirchner<sup>2</sup> · U. Ganswindt<sup>3</sup> · C. Belka<sup>3</sup> · R. Ganzer<sup>4</sup> · M. Burger<sup>4</sup> · F. Eder<sup>5</sup> · F. Hofstädter<sup>5</sup> · D. Schilling<sup>6</sup> · K. Sievert<sup>6</sup> · A. Stenzl<sup>6</sup> · M. Scharpf<sup>7</sup> · F. Fend<sup>7</sup> · F.vom Dorp<sup>8</sup> · H. Rübber<sup>8</sup> · K. Schmid<sup>9</sup> · D. Porres-Knoblauch<sup>10</sup> · A. Heidenreich<sup>10</sup> · B. Hangarter<sup>11</sup> · R. Knuchel-Clarke<sup>11</sup> · M. Rogenhofer<sup>12</sup> · B. Wullich<sup>12</sup> · A. Hartmann<sup>13</sup> · E. Comploj<sup>14</sup> · A. Pycha<sup>14</sup> · E. Hanspeter<sup>15</sup> · D. Pehrke<sup>16</sup> · G. Sauter<sup>17</sup> · M. Graefen<sup>16</sup> · C. Stief<sup>1</sup> · A. Haese<sup>16</sup>

Published online: 19 February 2020  
© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2020

**Correction to: World J Urol (2015) 33:973–979**  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-015-1510-y>

The authors recognized an error regarding the content of Tables 2 and 3 in the original publication of the above article. The correct Tables 2 and 3 are given below.

As a result, the second paragraph of the Results section should read as given below:

In univariate analysis, multiple parameters such as perineural infiltration and Gleason at positive margin were significantly associated with BCR (Table 2).

Accordingly, the *p* value in the reference to Table 3 in the Results section has to be changed: (Table 3, *p* < 0.001) instead of (Table 3, *p* = 0.003). Therefore, the first sentence

in the fourth paragraph of the Results section should read as given below:

In multivariate analysis, GS of the regular prostatectomy specimen was the only statistically significant parameter for pT2R1 prostate cancer (Table 3, *p* < 0.001).

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-015-1510-y>.

✉ A. Karl  
alexander.karl@barmherzige-muenchen.de

<sup>1</sup> Department of Urology, Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Marchioninstr. 15, 81377 Munich, Germany

<sup>2</sup> Department of Pathology, Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich, Germany

<sup>3</sup> Department of Radiation Oncology, Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich, Germany

<sup>4</sup> Department of Urology, University Regensburg, Regensburg, Germany

<sup>5</sup> Department of Pathology, University Regensburg, Regensburg, Germany

<sup>6</sup> Department of Urology, University Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

<sup>7</sup> Department of Pathology, University Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

<sup>8</sup> Department of Urology, University Essen, Essen, Germany

<sup>9</sup> Department of Pathology, University Essen, Essen, Germany

<sup>10</sup> Department of Urology, University RWTH Aachen, Aachen, Germany

<sup>11</sup> Department of Pathology, University RWTH Aachen, Aachen, Germany

<sup>12</sup> Department of Urology, Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen, Germany

<sup>13</sup> Department of Pathology, Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen, Germany

<sup>14</sup> Department of Urology, Zentralkrankenhaus Bozen, Bozen, Italy

<sup>15</sup> Department of Pathology, Zentralkrankenhaus Bozen, Bozen, Italy

<sup>16</sup> Martini-Klinik am UKE, University Clinic Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

<sup>17</sup> Department of Pathology, UKE, Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

**Table 2** Univariate Cox regression analysis of potential prognostic parameters for biochemical recurrence

Variable	Hazard ratio	95% Confidence interval	<i>p</i> value
Prostate volume*	0.99	0.98–1.00	0.016
Tumor percentage*	1.00	0.98–1.01	0.817
Maximum positive margin*	1.02	0.98–1.06	0.420
Age*	1.00	0.98–1.02	0.892
PSA preoperative *	1.00	1.00–1.01	0.450
Nerve sparing surgery	1.11	0.69–1.81	0.664
Pelvic lymph node dissection performed	1.50	1.16–1.94	0.002
Pathological Gleason Score			<0.001
Gleason 3 + 4 = 7a vs. Gleason 6	1.84	1.38–2.47	<0.001
Gleason 4 + 3 = 7b vs. Gleason 6	3.80	2.43–5.94	<0.001
Gleason 8–10 vs. Gleason 6	7.18	3.94–13.07	<0.001
Perineural infiltration	1.83	1.11–3.00	0.017
L-Status	2.03	1.03–4.02	0.041
V-Status	4.73	1.45–15.42	0.010
Gleason Grade at positive margin (Gl. 4/5 vs. Gl. ≤3)	1.94	1.26–2.99	0.003
Bilateral vs. unilateral tumor	1.34	1.00–1.81	0.051

Parameters marked with asterisk (\*) were used as continuous variables; Gleason score was analyzed in four categories (6/7a/7b/8–10) using score 6 as reference

**Table 3** Multivariate Cox regression analysis of potential prognostic parameters for biochemical recurrence

Variable	Hazard ratio	95% Confidence interval	<i>p</i> value
Pelvic lymph node dissection performed	1.11	0.70–1.76	0.652
Pathological Gleason Score			<0.001
Gleason 3 + 4 = 7a vs. Gleason 6	1.50	0.92–2.46	0.106
Gleason 4 + 3 = 7b vs. Gleason 6	2.72	1.42–5.23	0.003
Gleason 8–10 vs. Gleason 6	4.77	2.15–10.58	<0.001
Gleason Grade at positive margin (Gl. 4/5 vs. Gl. ≤3)	1.23	0.75–2.01	0.415

Parameters with  $p < 0.01$  in univariate analysis were included. Parameters marked with asterisk (\*) were used as continuous variables; Gleason score was analyzed in four categories (6/7a/7b/8–10) using score 6 as reference