

Erratum to: Genetic Influences on Four Measures of Executive Functions and Their Covariation with General Cognitive Ability: The Older Australian Twins Study

Teresa Lee · Miriam A. Mosing · Julie D. Henry · Julian N. Trollor ·
David Ames · Nicholas G. Martin · Margaret J. Wright ·
Perminder S. Sachdev · OATS Research Team

Published online: 20 March 2012
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2012

Erratum to: Behav Genet DOI 10.1007/s10519-012-9526-1

In the published paper, there are errors in the tables. The corrections are as follows. In Table 2, “WorkMem” should be printed in the same row along with the other three EF

variables, as shown in the revised table below. In Table 5, the E3 path for “Flexibility” should read 0.09 (–0.05, 0.23). In Table 6, the A2 paths for “WorkMem” and “Flexibility” were both significant and should be asterisked; the E4 path for “Flexibility” should read –0.02 (–0.16, 0.13).

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s10519-012-9526-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-012-9526-1).

T. Lee · J. N. Trollor · P. S. Sachdev · OATS Research Team
Brain and Aging Research Program, School of Psychiatry,
Faculty of Medicine, University of New South Wales, Sydney,
Australia

T. Lee (✉) · P. S. Sachdev
Neuropsychiatric Institute, Euroa Centre, Prince of Wales
Hospital, Randwick, NSW, Australia
e-mail: teresa.lee@unsw.edu.au

M. A. Mosing · N. G. Martin · M. J. Wright
Genetic Epidemiology Unit, Queensland Institute of Medical
Research, Brisbane, Australia

M. A. Mosing · J. D. Henry · N. G. Martin · M. J. Wright
School of Psychology, University of Queensland, Brisbane,
Australia

J. N. Trollor
Department of Developmental Disability Neuropsychiatry,
School of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, University of New
South Wales, Sydney, Australia

D. Ames
National Aging Research Institute, University of Melbourne,
Melbourne, Australia

D. Ames
Department of Psychiatry, University of Melbourne, Melbourne,
Australia

Table 2 Maximum likelihood estimation of twin correlations and phenotypic correlations between the four executive function variables and general cognitive ability (GCA), corrected for age and sex with 95% confidence intervals in parentheses

N (individuals)	Twin correlations		Phenotypic correlations			
	MZ (186–254)	DZ (154–218)	WorkMem	Fluency	Inhibition	Flexibility
GCA	0.74 (0.64; 0.81)	0.29 (0.08; 0.46)	0.38 (0.29; 0.46)	0.26 (0.16; 0.30)	0.31 (0.20; 0.41)	0.26 (0.16; 0.35)
WorkMem	0.59 (0.46; 0.69)	0.28 (0.10; 0.45)		0.27 (0.18; 0.36)	0.13 (0.12; 0.24)	0.15 (0.06; 0.24)
Fluency	0.66 (0.55; 0.75)	0.13 (–0.07; 0.32)			0.06 (–0.06; 0.18)	0.06 (–0.04; 0.16)
Inhibition	0.29 (0.08; 0.47)	0.10 (–0.16; 0.34)				0.15 (0.04; 0.25)
Flexibility	0.31 (0.13; 0.47)	0.22 (0.01; 0.47)				

MZ monozygotic twin, DZ dizygotic twin, *WorkMem* digit span backward, *Fluency* controlled oral word association test, *Inhibition* Stroop3/1 ratio score, *Flexibility* TMTB/A ratio score

Table 5 Cholesky AE decomposition showing genetic (A) and environmental (E) influences on the relationship between GCA, WorkMem, fluency, inhibition, and flexibility

	GCA	WorkMem	Fluency	Inhibition	Flexibility
A paths					
A1	0.86 (0.80, 0.90)*	0.40 (0.28, 0.50)*	0.29 (0.16, 0.42)*	0.31 (0.16, 0.44)*	0.27 (0.14, 0.39)*
A2		0.66 (0.56, 0.74)*	0.17 (0.01, 0.32)*	0.07 (–0.11, 0.25)	0.18 (0.03, 0.34)*
A3			0.73 (0.64, 0.80)*	–0.06 (–0.23, 0.12)	–0.13 (–0.29, 0.03)
A4				0.45 (0.17, 0.45)*	0.08 (–0.25, 0.42)
A5					0.43 (–0.59, 0.59)
E paths					
E1	0.52 (0.45, 0.60)*	0.08 (–0.03, 0.20)	0.01 (–0.10, 0.13)	0.09 (–0.06, 0.25)	0.04 (–0.10, 0.19)
E2		0.63 (0.56, 0.72)*	0.08 (–0.03, 0.18)	–0.08 (–0.23, 0.08)	–0.12 (–0.26, 0.01)
E3			0.59 (0.51, 0.68)*	0.01 (–0.16, 0.17)	0.09 (–0.05, 0.23)
E4				0.82 (0.72, 0.93)*	0 (–0.16, 0.14)
E5					0.81 (0.73, 0.90)*

* Significant paths ($p < 0.05$)

Table 6 Best fitting Cholesky decomposition showing genetic (A) and environmental (E) influences on the relationship between NART-IQ, WorkMem, fluency, inhibition, and flexibility

	NART-IQ	WorkMem	Fluency	Inhibition	Flexibility
A paths					
A1	0.90 (0.86, 0.92)*	0.44 (0.34, 0.53)*	0.32 (0.20, 0.43)*	0.39 (0.26, 0.50)*	0.20 (0.08, 0.31)*
A2		–0.64 (–0.71, –0.54)*	–0.15 (–0.29, 0.0)	–0.03 (–0.21, 0.14)	–0.23 (–0.39, –0.07)*
A3			0.73 (0.65, 0.79)*	–0.06 (–0.22, 0.11)	–0.10 (–0.25, 0.05)
A4				0.41 (0.05, 0.57)*	0.16 (–0.18, 0.55)
A5					0.44 (–0.60, 0.60)
E paths					
E1	0.44 (0.38, 0.51)*	0.05 (–0.05, 0.17)	0.11 (0, 0.22)	0.04 (–0.13, 0.21)	0.08 (–0.06, 0.22)
E2		0.63 (0.56, 0.71)*	0.06 (–0.04, 0.16)	–0.09 (–0.24, 0.07)	–0.13 (–0.26, 0)
E3			0.57 (0.50, 0.66)*	–0.02 (–0.18, 0.15)	0.06 (–0.08, 0.20)
E4				0.82 (0.72, 0.92)*	–0.02 (–0.16, 0.13)
E5					0.80 (0.72, 0.89)*

* Significant paths ($p < 0.05$)