

Erratum

DOI: 10.3766/jaaa.29.1.11

In the February 2016 issue (Vol. 27, No. 2), in the article “On Diagnostic Accuracy in Audiology: Central Site of Lesion and Central Auditory Processing Disorder Studies” by Vermiglio, the author identified errors in the text. The correct text is presented in italics.

Corrections for Table 6 on page 148

- 1) Olsen et al (1975) study, True Positives = *41.7%*.
- 2) Musiek and Pinheiro (1987), False Negatives = *33.3%*, True Positives = *66.7*, False Positives, True Negatives, and Efficiency were *not reported*.
- 3) For the Musiek et al (2011) study, the correct labels for the index test(s), in order, are Dichotic digits, *Competing sentences*, *Frequency patterns* and *Filtered speech*.

Corrections for Table 8 on page 153

- 1) The correct values for the first row are *25.0*, *23.9*, *76.1*, *75.0*, and *75.8*.
- 2) The correct values for the second row are *21.7*, *13.6*, *86.4*, *78.3*, and *82.2*.

Text correction starting with the last sentence on page 146 (continues on page 148)

The true-positive values (sensitivity) range from *41.7%* for the speech recognition in quiet and in noise protocol used in the study by Olsen et al (1975) to 100% for the duration pattern and gaps-in-noise tests used by Bamiou et al (2006). The true-negative values (specificity) range from *72.4%* for the *filtered speech* test from the Musiek et al (2011) study to 100% for dichotic digits test (DDT), frequency pattern, duration pattern, and gaps-in-noise tests used in the study by Bamiou et al (2006) and for the *competing sentences* test in the study by Musiek et al (2011). It should be noted that the number of patients and control participants for the Bamiou et al (2006) study was only eight for each group. The Musiek et al (2011) study on the other hand had 20 participants each in the patient and control groups. Test efficiency (percentage of correct results) ranged from *63.3%* for the *filtered speech* test (Musiek et al, 2011) to 100% for the duration pattern and gaps-in-noise tests used in the study by Bamiou et al (2006).

Text correction, p. 152, right column, starting with the third sentence in the first full paragraph

Table 8 shows that the diagnostic accuracy values of the *psychoacoustic* pattern discrimination test for a lesion of the CANS are not the same as the values for a “central hearing disorder.” For example, the specificity of the index test for lesions of the CANS was *75.0%* and for a “central hearing disorder” the specificity was *78.3%*. The false negatives found for a lesion of the CANS was *23.9%* and *13.6%* for the “central hearing disorder.”