



Correction to: A History of Child and Adolescent Treatment Through a Distillation Lens: Looking Back to Move Forward

Kelsie H. Okamura, PhD

Trina E. Orimoto, PhD

Brad J. Nakamura, PhD

Bree Chang, BA

Bruce F. Chorpita, PhD

Rinad S. Beidas, PhD

**Correction to: *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research* 2020; 47:70–85
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11414-019-09659-3>**

On page 73, authors added clarification to the criteria applied for counting practice elements that would eliminate an apparent discrepancy in the methods section of the manuscript. Specifically, the following text:

Only PEs that occurred in 10% or more of treatment protocols were used, consistent with previous distillation methodological studies.^{20,21} This cutoff was chosen to eliminate less frequently occurring PEs which may have inflated the total number of PEs within a given problem area over time.

Should be replaced with:

We display PEs that occurred in 10% or more of treatment protocols in cross-sectional analyses in Table 1, consistent with previous distillation methodological studies.^{21,22} This convention was chosen

The online version of the original article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11414-019-09659-3>

Address correspondence to Kelsie H. Okamura, PhD, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA.

Email: Skcarpen@usf.edu.

Kelsie H. Okamura, PhD, State of Hawai'i Child and Adolescent Mental Health Division, Honolulu, HI, USA.

Rinad S. Beidas, PhD, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA.

Trina E. Orimoto, PhD, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI, USA.

Brad J. Nakamura, PhD, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI, USA.

Bree Chang, BA, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI, USA.

Bruce F. Chorpita, PhD, University of California, Los Angeles, Box 951563, Los Angeles, CA, USA.

Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research, 2020. 156–157. © 2020 National Council for Behavioral Health.
DOI 10.1007/s11414-020-09740-2

here because the efficiency of elements in representing the evidence base can be underrepresented when there is a large number of infrequently occurring practices. In other words, Table 1 shows the total protocols but only the “common” practice elements in the evidence base. To provide a complementary view that is more conservative regarding the efficiency of practice elements, the longitudinal analyses represented in the figures did not apply this 10% cutoff.

Additionally, on page 77, the discussion sentence that reads “Specifically, PEs that were present in 10% or more of treatment protocol meeting the study criteria were used, which may have been inadvertently influenced by the duration and amount of studies within a problem area” should be followed with this additional clarification sentence “Furthermore, the number of PEs that were present in 10% or more of treatment protocols in these two problem areas should be interpreted with caution because of the relatively small number of protocols overall.”

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