

## ERRATUM

---

The following is a correction for an error that occurred in the *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, Vol. 7, No. 6. The error occurred in the article titled “Sensitivity and specificity of standardized neurocognitive testing immediately following sports concussion,” pp. 693–702, by Barr and McCrea. On page 696, under the subheading “Test-Retest Reliability and Reliable Change Cut-off Scores”, the confidence interval in the third sentence should read “–2.21, +2.59”, rather than “±2.59”. The text under the subheading should have appeared as:

### **Test–Retest Reliability and Reliable Change Cut-off Scores**

Test–retest indices for the control group are included in Table 1. The level of test–retest reliability was only moderate, though statistically significant ( $r = .55$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Computation of a reliable change score at the 90% CI resulted in a value of  $\pm 2.38$ . After adding the mean change score from this group, as suggested by others (Chelune et al., 1993), the adjusted score would be  $-2.21, 2.59$ . Rounded to the nearest test score, this would indicate that an increase or decrease of 3 points with repeat testing on the SAC would represent a statistically reliable and clinically significant change in performance. Intervals based on 80% and 70% confidence intervals would be  $\pm 2.08$  and  $\pm 1.71$  respectively. The distribution of observed change scores, with sensitivity and specificity values, for the concussion and control groups is included in Table 2.

Cambridge University Press and the authors regret the inconvenience that these inadvertent errors may have caused.