ERRATUM

Rich EC, Burke W, Heaton CJ, Haga S, Pinsky L, Short MP, Acheson L. Reconsidering the Family History in Primary Care. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2004; 19:273–280. In Table 3 on page 275 of the above-cited article the authors report the following errors:

In the third column in Table 3, the Positive Predictive Value for a genetic test for FAP that is 99.9% sensitive and 99.9% specific is incorrectly listed as 99.99%; the correct value for the Positive Predictive Value in the third column is 99.9%.

In the last row of Table 3, the “False Reassurance Rate” (which is 1- negative predictive value), is actually reported, in-

stead of the Negative Predictive Value; the False Reassurance Rate seemed to have more intuitive relevance to the issue of risk of FAP following a negative screening test. Table 3 as corrected appears below.

Neither of these errors adversely affects the accuracy of the text.

The authors and publisher apologize for this error. The authors wish to thank Dr Mark Kroese, Specialist Registrar in Public Health Medicine at the Public Health Genetics Unit in Cambridge, UK, for being such a careful reader of our work and bringing the flaws in Table 3 to our attention.

Table 3. Genetic Testing for FAP

	General Population	Affected First Degree Relative	Affected First Degree Relative With Identified Mutation*
Risk for FAP in tested individual	1/8000	1/2	1/2
Test sensitivity, %	95	95	99.9
Test specificity, %	99.9	99.9	99.9
Positive predictive value, %	10.61	99.89	99.9
False Reassurance Rate, %	0.00006	4.77	0.10