Meta-Analysis of Randomized and Controlled Treatment Trials for Achalasia

Lan Wang · You-Ming Li · Lan Li

Published online: 18 June 2009
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2009

Erratum to: Dig Dis Sci
DOI 10.1007/s10620-008-0637-8

The article was published with several citation errors in Table 1. The corrected Table 1 appears below.

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s10620-008-0637-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10620-008-0637-8).

L. Wang · Y.-M. Li (✉) · L. Li
Department of Gastroenterology, The First Affiliated Hospital,
Medical College, Zhejiang University, No.79 Qingchun Road,
Hangzhou 310003, People's Republic of China
e-mail: zlym@zju.edu.cn

Table 1 Characteristics of 16 studies included in our meta-analysis of different treatment methods for achalasia

The mode of comparison	Reference	Sample size, mode of treatment	Age, mean (range), year	Sex (% male)	Duration of symptoms, mean (range), month	Symptom scores		Median follow-up mean (range), month
						Before	After	
Non-sugery methods: differences treatment methods compared with pneumatic dilation								
	Coccia et al. [14]	16 PD	49.5 (18–82)	56.25	49 (6–96)	NA		21 (12–36)
		14 nifedipine	51 (17–83)	57.14	48 (6–84)	NA		
	Vaezi et al. [15]	24 BoTx	57 (44–69)	41.47	NA	11 (9–13)	2 (0–2.5)	NA
		24 PD	56 (37 –70)	29.17	NA	10 (9–12)	3 (0–6)	
	Annese et al. [16]	8 PD	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
		8 BoTx			NA			
	Ghoshal et al. [17]	10 PD	34.3 ± 9.0	50	42.6 ± 49.2	NA	NA	36.0 ± 12.8
		7 BoTx	42.4 ± 22.3	71.43	107 ± 102	NA	NA	34.3 ± 16.8
	Mikaeli et al. [18]	20 BoTx	59.8 ± 11.5 ^a	40	6.9 ± 6.2	8.6 ± 2.2 ^a	2.2 ± 0.2	12
		20 PD	50.1 ± 8.9	52.6	5.9 ± 7.7	8.3 ± 2.2	1.2 ± 0.2	
	Bansal et al. [19]	18 PD	51.8 ± 3.4	66.67	33.6 ± 10.2	6.0 ± 0.5	1.6 ± 0.7	13 (3–23)
		16 BoTx	49.8 ± 3.7	43.75	23.4 ± 5.1	5.8 ± 0.5	1.9 ± 0.6	
	Mikaeli et al. [20]	27 PD	30 (24–45)	46.15	NA	8 (6–10)	NA	12
		27 PD + BoTx	38 (26–49)	61.54	NA	9 (6–10)		
Endoscopic myotomy: different treatment methods compared with laparoscopic myotomy								
	Zaninotto et al. [21]	40 BoTx	55 (19–73)	55	18 (2–240)	17 (8–22)	2.04	23 (12–34)
		40 LM	48 (18–71)	55	24 (2–240)	18 (6–22)	3.24	
	Zaninotto et al. [22]	20 LM	47 (20–66)	60	24 (2–20)	17 (9–22)	NA	17 (12–34)
		17 BoTx	40 (19–73)	64.71	26 (3–240)	17 (12–22)		
	Suárez et al. [23]	14 LM	39.5 (17–70)	42.76	17.5 (2–48)	12 (0–19)	NA	NA
		16 PD	43.2 (16–71)	37.5	22.7 (2–60)	8.5 (3–18)		
	Kostic et al. [24]	26 PD	45 ± 18 (20–78)	50	18 (2–120)	NA	NA	12
		25 LM	43 ± 14 (17–66)	44	20 (8–106)			
	Patti et al. [25]	35 TM	45 (11–96)	57.14	NA	NA	NA	28
		133 LM + Dor						23
Others								
	Pasricha et al. [26]	11 BoTx	57 (19–72)	45.45	36 (9–364)	7.1 ± 1.2 ^a	1.6 ± 2.2 ^a	9 (7–16)
		10 Placebo	54 (22–74)	60	47 (8–120)	5.9 ± 1.6	5.4 ± 2.0	
	Yi et al. [27]	21 FGBD	39 (21–72)	47.62	NA	NA	NA	NA
		37 PD	22 (9–77)	51.35	NA			
	Mearin et al. [28]	17 PD	52 (5)	52.94	49 (9)	NA	NA	12
		24 MD	50 (2)	66.67	48 (8)	NA	NA	
	Csendes et al. [29]	39 PD	40.2 (16–73)	41.1	58 (24–144)	NA	NA	18 (24–44)
		40 EC	42.7 (15–80)	47.62	62 (26–156)	NA	NA	
	Richards et al. [30]	21 Heller	50 (24–76)	47.62	NA	9 (5–10)	NA	
		22 Heller + Dor	50 (22–73)	54.55	NA	8 (5–10)		

NA no analysis, PD pneumatic dilatation, BoTx botulinum toxin injection, LM laparoscopic myotomy, Heller Heller myotomy, Heller + Dor Heller myotomy with Dor fundoplication, TM thorascopic myotomy, FGBD fluoroscopically guided balloon dilation, MD metallic dilation, EC esophagectomy

^a Mean ± standard deviation (SD)