Correction to: Further Validation of the Test of Memory Malinger (TOMM) Trial 1 Performance Validity Index: Examination of False Positives and Convergent Validity

Troy A. Webber¹ · K. Chase Bailey^{1,2} · W. Alexander Alverson¹ · Edan A. Critchfield¹ · Kathleen M. Bain¹ · Johanna M. Messerly¹ · Justin J. F. O'Rourke¹ · Joshua W. Kirton¹ · Chrystal Fullen^{1,3} · Janice C. Marceaux^{1,4} · Jason R. Soble^{1,5}

Published online: 27 November 2018
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2018

Correction to: Psychological Injury and Law (2018) 11(4):325–335
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12207-018-9335-9>

Correction of mistake in the original version of this paper, “Further Validation of the Test of Memory Malinger (TOMM) Trial 1 Performance Validity Index: Examination of False Positives and Convergent Validity”, the sentence “As indicated in Table 7, TOMM T1 ≤ 40 exhibited sensitivity of .86 and specificity of .85, though TOMM T1 ≤ 43 exhibited the best combination of sensitivity (.81) and specificity (.91) in our sample.” in the Results section should read “As indicated in Table 7, TOMM T1 ≤ 40 exhibited sensitivity of .85 and specificity of .86, though TOMM T1 ≤ 36 exhibited the

best combination of sensitivity (.79) and specificity (.90) in our sample.”.

In the Discussion section, the sentence “Based on standards in neuropsychology performance validity testing suggesting that sensitivity $\geq .40$ and specificity $\geq .90$ represent adequate classification accuracy (Boone, 2012), ROC curve analyses suggested TOMM T1 ≤ 42 had the best combination of sensitivity (.81) and specificity (.91) in our sample, while TOMM T1 ≤ 40 exhibited sensitivity of .86 and specificity of .85.” should read “Based on standards in neuropsychology

The online version of the original article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12207-018-9335-9>

✉ Troy A. Webber
webbertr@gmail.com

- ¹ Psychology Service, South Texas Veterans Health Care System (116B), 7400 Merton Minter Blvd., San Antonio, TX 78229, USA
- ² University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX, USA
- ³ Our Lady of the Lake University, San Antonio, TX, USA
- ⁴ Department of Neurology, University of Texas Health Science Center, San Antonio, TX, USA
- ⁵ Departments of Psychiatry and Neurology, University of Illinois College of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA

performance validity testing suggesting that sensitivity $\geq .40$ and specificity $\geq .90$ represent adequate classification accuracy (Boone, 2012), ROC curve analyses suggested TOMM T1 ≤ 36 had the best combination of sensitivity (.79) and specificity (.90) in our sample, while TOMM T1 ≤ 40 exhibited sensitivity of .85 and specificity of .86”.

The corrected Table 7 is given below.

Table 7 Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve Analysis for TOMM T1

TOMM T1 Raw Score	Specificity	Sensitivity
24	1.0	.24
25	.99	.27
26	.99	.33
27	.99	.36
28	.99	.39
29	.99	.45
30	.98	.48
31	.98	.54
32	.97	.64
33	.95	.64
34	.95	.76
35	.93	.79
36	.90	.79
38	.89	.79
39	.88	.82
40	.86	.85
41	.85	.85
42	.83	.85
43	.81	.91
44	.78	.91
45	.75	.97
46	.69	.97
47	.66	.97
48	.52	.97
49	.36	.97
50	.23	1.0

Note: TOMM T1 = Test of Memory Malinger Trial 1. Criterion group used ≥ 2 criterion PVT failures as indicating noncredible, and ≤ 1 criterion PVT failures indicating valid. Bold denotes the score with the optimal sensitivity and specificity values

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