

CORRIGENDUM

Neurocognitive and Self-efficacy Benefits of Cognitive Remediation in Schizophrenia: A Randomized Controlled Trial – Corrigendum

Shayden D. Bryce, Susan L. Rossell, Stuart J. Lee, Richard J. Lawrence, Eric J. Tan, Sean P. Carruthers and Jennie L. Ponsford
 doi: 10.1017/S1355617717001369. Published online by Cambridge University Press on 21 January 2018.

In the article by Bryce et al. (2018) incorrect standard deviations were used when calculating the reliable change indices presented in this article. While the correct standard deviation (SD) was used in calculating the Matrics Consensus Cognitive Battery (MCCB) composite reliable change value, an error was made in using cognitive domain SDs from an incorrect domain (i.e., speed SD used for attention domain, etc.) for the domain reliable change values. The article also contains two minor manual entry errors for two participants' end cognition score.

The authors have rechecked the data and re-run all analyses using the corrected data. The interpretation of the data does not change. This remains correct. The incorrect and correct text are as follows:

Page 549, Abstract, line 8 under Results: “Favoring CR ($p = .028$)” should read “Favoring CR ($p = .027$)”

Page 549, Abstract, line 9 under Results: “End-group, 17 (77%)” should read “End-group 13 (59.1%)”

Page 554, under Results:

Para 1, line 3: “group x time interaction ($p = .028$)” should read “group x time interaction ($p = .027$)”

Para 2, line 2: “both end of group ($p = .008$)” should read “both end of group ($p = .005$)”

Para 2, line 5: “3-month follow-up ($p = .20$)” should read “3-month follow-up ($p = .43$)”

Page 554, under Results, Rates of Reliable Cognitive Improvement and Effect Size:

Table 2. Results of linear mixed-effect analyses on primary and secondary outcomes among CR and CG completers

Variable		Baseline <i>M (SE)</i>	End-group <i>M (SE)</i>	Three-months follow up <i>M (SE)</i>	Group x Time <i>p</i>	Group <i>p</i>	Time <i>p</i>
<i>Primary Outcome</i>							
Global MCCB					.027*	.77	< .001*
	CR	30.82 (2.37)	34.91 (2.37)	36.99 (2.46)			
	CG	32.52 (2.43)	32.91 (2.44)	34.39 (2.46)			
<i>Secondary Outcomes</i>							
ILSS					.69	.43	.11
	CR	.711 (.030)	.727 (.024)	.730 (.027)			
	CG	.723 (.030)	.755 (.025)	.771 (.026)			
RSES					.59	.11	.028 *
	CR	98.14 (4.60)	109.77 (5.06)	110.02 (4.86)			
	CG	110.95 (4.71)	119.18 (5.23)	116.15 (4.74)			
EUROHIS-QOL					.75	.98	.21
	CR	26.96 (1.05)	28.32 (1.08)	27.27 (1.20)			
	CG	26.57 (1.08)	28.00 (1.10)	27.85 (1.16)			
PANSS					.71	.37	.48
	CR	61.82 (3.20)	60.96 (3.20)	60.93 (3.57)			
	CG	60.29 (3.28)	57.66 (3.33)	55.35 (3.45)			

Note. N = 43.

* $p < .05$.

CR = Cognitive remediation; CG = computer games; EUROHIS-QOL = European Health Interview Survey – Quality of Life; ILSS-SR = Independent Living Skills Survey – Self-Report; MCCB = Matrics Consensus Cognitive Battery; M = mean; PANSS = Positive and Negative Symptom Scale; RSES = Revised Self-Efficacy Scale; SE = standard error.

Table 3. Comparison of reliable improvements and effect sizes in MCCB domains between CR and CG completers

MCCB domain		Baseline	End-group	Reliably improved		d_z
		$M (SD)$		n	%	
Processing speed	CR	37.45 (10.01)	41.00 (10.56)	4	18	0.54
	CG	40.45 (9.31)	40.55 (9.68)	0	0	0.02
Attention	CR	35.55 (12.21)	41.23 (10.44)	7	32	0.49
	CG	40.95 (13.02)	40.45 (12.70)	2	10	0.05
Working memory	CR	39.18 (11.33)	42.91 (11.16)	2	9	0.63
	CG	37.70 (9.10)	39.80 (10.22)	1	5	0.31
Verbal learning	CR	35.36 (8.43)	35.55 (9.37)	4	18	0.02
	CG	40.15 (9.02)	35.05 (7.86)	0	0	0.54
Visual learning	CR	36.27 (14.51)	43.14 (13.46)	1	5	1.00
	CG	33.40 (12.21)	37.85 (10.92)	0	0	0.60
Reasoning and problem solving	CR	43.55 (10.20)	39.36 (6.25)	0	0	0.58
	CG	40.15 (5.88)	40.05 (8.10)	2	10	0.02
Social cognition	CR	39.09 (12.78)	41.36 (14.07)	0	0	0.28
	CG	43.95 (11.01)	44.75 (12.79)	1	5	0.10
Global composite	CR	30.82 (11.65)	34.91 (11.72)	6	27	0.73
	CG	33.25 (10.45)	33.55 (10.12)	2	10	0.06
Improved in at least one domain	CR	-	-	13	59	-
	CG	-	-	6	30	-

Note. Reliable improvement based on a reliable change index of + 1.65 (i.e. 90% confidence level).

Percentage improved reported to the nearest whole number.

Reliable change index and Cohen's d effect size estimated using the per-protocol completer sample (i.e. CR = 22; CG = 20).

CR = Cognitive remediation; CG = computer games; d^2 = Cohen's d ; MCCB = Matrices Consensus Cognitive Battery; M = mean;

SD = standard deviation.

Para 1, line 1: "As shown in Table 3, *five CR completers (22.73%)*" should read "As shown in Table 3, *six CR completers (27.27%)*".

Para 1, line 6: "moderate effect overall ($d_z = 0.68$)" should read "moderate effect overall ($d_z = 0.73$)"

Para 1, lines 7–9: "Seventeen CR (77.27%) and nine CG (42.86%) completers improved reliably in at least one MCCB cognitive domain" should read "Thirteen CR (59.1%) and six CG (30.0%) completers improved reliably in at least one MCCB cognitive domain".

Page 555, under Discussion:

Para 2, line 7: "In addition, *three-quarters*" should read "in addition, *approximately 60% (59.1%)*".

Para 2, line 9: "following CR (c.f., $\leq 50\%$ in CG)" should read "following CR (c.f., 30% in CG)"

The corrected Tables 2 and 3 are as follows:

REFERENCE

- Bryce, S.D., Rossell, S.L., Lee, S.J., Lawrence, R.J., Tan, E.J., Carruthers, S.P., & Ponsford, J.L. (2018). Neurocognitive and self-efficacy benefits of cognitive remediation in schizophrenia: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 24(6), 549–562. doi: doi.org/10.1017/S1355617717001369