

Correction to A Temporal Comparison of PBDEs, OH-PBDEs, PCBs, and OH-PCBs in the Serum of Second Trimester Pregnant Women Recruited from San Francisco General Hospital, California

Ami R. Zota,* Linda Linderholm, June-Soo Park, Myrto Petreas, Tan Guo, Martin L. Privalsky, R. Thomas Zoeller, and Tracey J. Woodruff

Environ. Sci. Technol. **2013**, *47* (20), 11776–11784; DOI: 10.1021/es402204y.

The following errata were found in the results presentation of the published article. However, none of these errata affect the overall conclusions of the original article. In the original manuscript, there was an error in the formula used to calculate percent difference in environmental chemical concentrations between 2008 and 2009 and 2011 and 2012. In the original manuscript, percent difference in environmental chemicals concentrations by study cohort were estimated as $(1 - (e(\beta))) \times 100\%$ with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) estimated as $(1 - (e(\beta \pm 1.96 \times SE)))$ where β and SE are the estimated regression coefficient and standard error, respectively.

However, the correct way to estimate percent changes by study cohort given our model specification is $(e(\beta) - 1) \times 100\%$ with 95% CIs estimated as $(e(\beta \pm 1.96 \times SE) - 1)$ where β and SE are

the estimated regression coefficient and standard error, respectively. When the beta from multivariate models is positive and/or small these two formulas produce similar results. However, when the effect estimates are large and negative, the percent difference estimates vary between the two different formulas.

The statistical models and the corresponding level of statistical significance were all correctly specified in the original manuscript, as were the least-squares geometric means (LSGMs) in the graphs and tables. When we use the correct formula, it changes the percent difference estimates in Table 3 and Table S2 in the Supporting Information. The revised tables with the correct percent differences are included in this correction.

Table 3. REVISED. Comparison of Chemical Analyte Concentrations between Cohorts Calculated from Multivariate Regression Models Adjusted for Age, Gestational Age, Race/Ethnicity, Parity, And Insurance Status^{a,c}

chemical analyte	n	% difference ^b	2008–2009 LSGM (95% CI)	2011–2012 LSGM (95% CI)	p
PBDEs (ng/g lipid)					
BDE-28	59	−43 (−60, −17)	2.15 (1.49, 3.09)	1.23 (0.85, 1.78)	0.004
BDE-47	59	−44 (−61, −18)	40.3 (27.9, 58.1)	22.7 (15.7, 32.9)	0.003
BDE-99	59	−44 (−61, −17)	9.69 (6.64, 14.2)	5.48 (3.74, 8.02)	0.004
BDE-100	59	−47 (−65, −19)	10.0 (6.60, 15.2)	5.31 (3.48, 8.09)	0.004
BDE-153	59	−25 (−47, 6)	23.0 (16.2, 32.5)	17.2 (12.1, 24.4)	0.10
ΣPBDEs	59	−39 (−56, −15)	90.0 (64.7, 125.2)	54.6 (39.2, 76.2)	0.004
PCBs (ng/g lipid)					
PCB-74	59	−26 (−46, 1)	1.26 (0.92, 1.72)	0.93 (0.68, 1.27)	0.06
PCB-118	59	−10 (−34, 24)	2.04 (1.49, 2.81)	1.85 (1.34, 2.54)	0.53
PCB-138	59	−6 (−31, 29)	2.96 (2.17, 4.05)	2.79 (2.04, 3.82)	0.70
PCB-153	59	−9 (−36, 30)	4.34 (3.05, 6.17)	3.96 (2.78, 5.65)	0.61
PCB-180	59	−42 (−59, −18)	3.83 (2.72, 5.38)	2.23 (1.59, 3.15)	0.003
ΣPCBs	59	−20 (−40, 7)	15.1 (11.3, 20.1)	12.0 (8.98, 16.1)	0.13
OH-PBDEs (ng/mL)					
5-OH-BDE47	58	−83 (−92, −66)	0.042 (0.020, 0.088)	0.007 (0.003, 0.014)	<0.0001
6-OH-BDE47	58	−84 (−91, −71)	0.039 (0.022, 0.070)	0.006 (0.004, 0.011)	<0.0001
ΣOH-PBDEs	58	−86 (−92, −75)	0.099 (0.055, 0.179)	0.014 (0.008, 0.025)	<0.0001
ΣOH-PCBs (ng/mL)	58	−8 (−41, 43)	0.020 (0.013, 0.031)	0.018 (0.012, 0.028)	0.71

^aChemical analyte concentrations were natural log-transformed in multivariate regression models. ^bReference group is 2008–2009 cohort.

^cAbbreviations: CI = confidence intervals; LSGM = least-squares geometric mean.

Published: February 3, 2014

Table S2. REVISED. Results of Sensitivity Analyses: A Comparison of Percent Difference (95% Confidence Intervals) Estimates between Cohorts Calculated from Three Different Multivariate Regression Models^a

chemical analyte	model 1 ^b : (n = 59)	model 2 ^c : (n = 47)	model 3 ^d : (n = 59)
PBDEs			
BDE-28	-43 (-60, -17)	-42 (-61, -12)	-45 (-62, -21)
BDE-47	-44 (-61, -18)	-43 (-62, -13)	-47 (-63, -23)
BDE-99	-44 (-61, -17)	-39 (-60, -7)	-47 (-64, -22)
BDE-100	-47 (-65, -19)	-53 (-70, -26)	-50 (-67, -24)
BDE-153	-25 (-47, 6)	-32 (-55, 3)	-29 (-50, 2)
ΣPBDEs	-39 (-56, -15)	-40 (-59, -13)	-43 (-59, -20)
PCBs			
PCB-74	-26 (-46, 1)	-29 (-51, 4)	-24 (-44, 5)
PCB-118	-10 (-34, 24)	-9 (-36, 30)	-8 (-33, 28)
PCB-138	-6 (-31, 29)	-12 (-39, 25)	-7 (-32, 29)
PCB-153	-9 (-36, 30)	-12 (-40, 28)	-7 (-36, 34)
PCB-180	-42 (-59, -18)	-48 (-64, -24)	-41 (-59, -16)
ΣPCBs	-20 (-40, 7)	-25 (-45, 4)	-19 (-40, 9)
OH-PBDEs			
5-OH-BDE47	-83 (-92, -66)	-79 (-91, -50)	-
6-OH-BDE47	-84 (-91, -71)	-80 (-90, -62)	-
ΣOH-PBDEs	-86 (-92, -75)	-84 (-92, -67)	-
ΣOH-PCBs	-8(-41, 43)	12 (-27, 71)	-

^aChemical analyte concentrations were natural log-transformed in all models, and all models were adjusted for age, gestational age, race/ethnicity, parity, and insurance status. ^bPBDEs and PCBs were modeled as lipid adjusted (ng/g lipid) and OH-PBDEs and OH-PCBs were modeled as wet weights (ng/mL). (These estimates are provided in Table 3 in main text). ^cSmokers were excluded from the analysis. PBDEs and PCBs were modeled as lipid adjusted (ng/g lipid) and OH-PBDEs and OH-PCBs are modeled as wet weights (ng/mL). ^dPBDEs and PCBs were modeled as wet weight concentrations (ng/mL), and lipid content was modeled as a separate covariate.