ERRATUM

Erratum to: The prognostic ability of the STarT Back Tool was affected by episode duration

Lars Morso¹ · Alice Kongsted^{2,3} · Lise Hestbaek^{2,3} · Peter Kent³

Received: 19 April 2016 / Revised: 19 April 2016 / Accepted: 19 April 2016 / Published online: 9 May 2016
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2016

Erratum to: Eur Spine J (2016) 25:936–944
DOI 10.1007/s00586-015-3915-0

Unfortunately, there is a mistake in the published version of Table 1. In the last row of the table, the numbers corresponding to the proportion of people in the STarT Back Tool risk subgroups High Risk and Low Risk had been swapped. When these numbers are correctly swapped back, they then correspond with the numbers presented in lines 10–20 of the results section. This misleading error was only in the table layout and did not affect the results or the conclusions of the paper.

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s00586-015-3915-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-015-3915-0).

✉ Lars Morso
lars.morsoe@rsyd.dk

¹ Centre for Quality, Region of Southern Denmark, P.V. Tuxensvej 5, 5500 Middelfart, Denmark

² Nordic Institute of Chiropractic and Clinical Biomechanics, Odense, Denmark

³ Department of Sports Science and Clinical Biomechanics, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark

Table 1 Baseline characteristics of included cohorts

	Chiropractic cohort (<i>n</i> = 416)	GP cohort (<i>n</i> = 244)	Physiotherapy cohort (<i>n</i> = 200)	Spine centre cohort (<i>n</i> = 960)	Test for differences between cohorts ^c
Age in years					
Mean (SD ^a)	42.9 (11.8)	46.1 (11.4)	50.5 (16.3)	52.0 (14.1)	Chiro < GP < others
Female, proportion	187 (45.0 %)	130 (53.3 %)	115 (57.5 %)	521 (54.3 %)	Chiro < others
Duration in weeks					
0–2 weeks	252 (62.1 %)	83 (38.1 %)	44 (22.8 %)	15 (1.6 %)	All differ from each other
2–4 weeks	48 (11.8 %)	26 (11.9 %)	33 (17.1 %)	34 (3.7 %)	
4–12 weeks	46 (11.3 %)	33 (15.1 %)	42 (21.8 %)	137 (14.7 %)	
>12 weeks	60 (14.8 %)	76 (34.9 %)	74 (38.3 %)	746 (80.0 %)	
Previous low back pain episodes					
Previous episodes	331 (81.5 %)	190 (86.4 %)	152 (79.2 %)	778 (81.8 %)	No differences
Pain intensity ^b (0–10 scale) ^c					
Low back pain, mean (SD ^a)	6.7 (1.9)	7.0 (2.0)	5.2 (2.2)	5.7 (2.4)	Physio < spine centre < others
Leg pain, mean (SD ^a)	2.6 (2.8)	3.9 (3.3)	3.1 (2.8)	4.6 (2.8)	All different from each other
Activity limitation ^d (0–100 scale) ^c					
Mean (SD ^a)	51.0 (24.1)	58.6 (23.7)	55.4 (23.8)	59.5 (22.7)	Chiro < GP and spine centre
STarT Back Tool risk subgroup					
Low-risk	215 (51.7 %)	93 (35.1 %)	65 (32.5 %)	273 (28.0 %)	All differ from each other, except GP and physio
Medium-risk	160 (38.5 %)	96 (36.2 %)	85 (42.5 %)	312 (32.0 %)	
High-risk	41 (9.9 %)	76 (28.7 %)	50 (25.0 %)	389 (40.0 %)	

^a Standard deviation^b Numeric rating scale (0–10)^c High scores are worse^d Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire^e Tests for differences between subgroups were ANOVA with Scheffe post hoc comparisons or Kruskal–Wallis procedures, depending on data type and distribution (*p* < 0.05)