J. Stomat. Occ. Med. (2010) 3: 177–178
 DOI 10.1007/s12548-010-0065-1
 Printed in Austria
 © Springer-Verlag 2010

international journal of
**stomatology &
 occlusion medicine**

Erratum to: Relationship between occlusal contact pattern and non-carious cervical lesions among male adults

Y. Hirata, T. Yamamoto, T. Kawagoe, K. Sasaguri, S. Sato

Received October 14, 2009; Accepted January 12, 2010

Erratum to: J. Stomat. Occ. Med. (2010) 3: 10–14
 DOI 10.1007/s12548-010-0039-3
 Printed in Austria
 © Springer-Verlag 2010

In Tables 2–5 and 7, the column and/or line headings were inadvertently reproduced incompletely (the heading “No”, denoting the number of subjects, was missing); the tables should have been printed as follows:

Tab. 2: Distribution of mediotrusive-side contact with age

Age	Mediotrusive-side contact			Total
	No	Unilateral	Bilateral	
30–39	52	31	43	126
40–49	71	38	42	151
50–59	63	23	23	109
Total	186	92	108	386
No Number of subjects; $P = 0.116$ (Chi-square test).				

Tab. 4: Relation between non-carious cervical lesions and mediotrusive-side contact

Mediotrusive-side contact	Without lesions	With lesions	Total
No	90	96	186
Unilateral	35	57	92
Bilateral	36	72	108
Total	161	225	386
No Number of subjects; $P = 0.030$ (Chi-square test).			

Tab. 3: Distribution of laterotrusive-side contact with age

Age	Laterotrusive-side contact				Total
	Incisor-canine areas	Incisor-canine-premolar areas	Incisor-canine-premolar-molar areas	No	
30–39	9	28	88	1	126
40–49	24	29	97	1	151
50–59	10	37	62	0	109
Total	43	94	247	2	386
No Number of subjects; $P = 0.012$ (Chi-square test after excluding the data of 2 subjects without laterotrusive-side contact).					

Tab. 5: Relation between non-carious cervical lesions and laterotrusive-side contact

Laterotrusive-side contact	Without lesions	With lesions	Total
Incisor-canine areas	25	18	43
Incisor-canine-premolar areas	37	57	94
Incisor-canine-premolar-molar areas	99	148	247
No	0	2	2
Total	161	225	386
No Number of subjects; $P = 0.073$ (Chi-square test after excluding the data of 2 subjects without laterotrusive-side contact).			

Correspondence: Tatsuo Yamamoto, Division of Sociological Approach in Dentistry, Department of Dental Sociology, Kanagawa Dental College, 82 Inaoka-cho, Yokosuka, Kanagawa 238-8580, Japan.
 E-mail: yama_tatsu@kdcnet.ac.jp

Tab. 7: Logistic regression analysis of the risk indicators for subjects with or without non-carious cervical lesions as the dependent variables

Indicators	Odd's ratio	95% CI	<i>P</i>
Age			
30–39	1.00		
40–49	2.72	1.64–4.51	<0.001
50–59	3.48	1.98–6.09	<0.001
Mediotrusive-side contact			
No	1.00		
Unilateral	1.60	0.93–2.76	0.090
Bilateral	2.19	1.24–3.86	0.007
Laterotrusive-side contact			
Incisor-canine areas	1.00		
Incisor-canine-premolar areas	2.27	1.06–4.88	0.036
Incisor-canine-premolar-molar areas	1.84	0.90–3.74	0.095
Excluding the data of 2 subjects without laterotrusive-side contact.			