



## Correction to: Diagnostic accuracy of eFAST in the trauma patient: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Stuart Netherton<sup>1</sup> · Velimir Milenkovic<sup>2</sup> · Mark Taylor<sup>1</sup> · Philip J. Davis<sup>1</sup>

Published online: 10 November 2021

© Canadian Association of Emergency Physicians (CAEP)/ Association Canadienne de Médecine d'Urgence (ACMU) 2021

**Correction to: CJEM (2019) 21(6):727–738**  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/cem.2019.381>

In the original article, the authors erroneously reported data from Boulanger et al. from their 2001 manuscript (reference 20 in original manuscript). Due to a transcription error they quoted a sensitivity of 0.33 (95% CI 0.01–0.91) and a specificity of 1.00 (95% CI 0.89–1.00), which gave a +LR of 24.00 and a –LR of 0.67. The correct value for sensitivity is 1.00 (95% CI 0.025–1.00) and the specificity is 0.94 (95% CI 0.79–0.99). This then gives a corresponding +LR of 10.2 (95% CI 2.43–42.9) and a –LR of 0.27 (95% CI 0.02–2.98). The pooled sensitivity for all included studies examining PCE is 0.92 (95% CI 0.88–0.95) and the pooled specificity is 0.94 (95% CI 0.92–0.95). Pooled +LR is 30.84

(95% CI 0.96–993.5) and the pooled –LR is 0.09 (95% CI 0.03–0.36). Including these corrected values does not change the overall interpretation of the data.

---

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43678-021-00226-4>.

---

✉ Stuart Netherton  
stuartnetherton@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK, Canada

<sup>2</sup> Department of Surgery, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK, Canada