ERRATUM

Open Access

CrossMark

Erratum to: A Monte Carlo simulation study comparing linear regression, beta regression, variable-dispersion beta regression and fractional logit regression at recovering average difference measures in a two sample design

Christopher Meaney* and Rahim Moineddin

Erratum

After publication of the original article [1], the authors noticed an error in Fig. 1. The legend included in the original sub-plot of Fig. 1 was labelled "phi = 500 ($p = 25$, q = 475)"; however, the figure title suggested phi = 1000.

An updated version of Fig. 1 is published in this erratum, where the legend has been updated to "phi = 1000 ($p = 50$, q = 950)" to be consistent with the figure title.

Published online: 09 November 2016

* Correspondence: christopher.meaney@utoronto.ca
Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, 500 University Avenue, Toronto M5G1V7, ON, Canada

Fig. 1 Various forms of the beta density for varying shape parameters {p,q}. Top left panel: We fix the mean equal to 0.5 and plot the resulting beta densities for varying dispersion parameters. Top right panel: We fix the mean equal to 0.05 and plot the resulting beta densities for varying dispersion parameters. Bottom left panel: We fix the dispersion parameter equal to 100 and plot the resulting beta densities for varying mean parameters. Bottom right panel: We fix the dispersion parameter equal to 5 and plot the resulting beta densities for varying mean parameters

Reference

1. Meaney C, Moineddin R. A Monte Carlo simulation study comparing linear regression, beta regression, variable-dispersion beta regression and fractional logit regression at recovering average difference measures in a two sample design. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2014;14:14. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-14-14.