

## Errata Corrige

Correction to Goldberg & Mann, The Research Assessment Exercise in England & Wales. *Epidemiologia e Psichiatria Sociale* 15.02.2006, pp 104-108.

*Unfortunately, three paragraphs on page 107 were reprinted, while the three paragraphs that should have appeared on the right hand column were omitted. The omitted paragraphs were dealing with “Responses”, and should have appeared after the first paragraphs on this section:*

“Many staff complained that the rules favour studies that might appear in top American science journals, failing that general medical or psychiatry journals. Researchers in subspecialty areas are disadvantaged. While being sympathetic, our advice could be to go non-British journals where possible.

We found prioritisation a problem almost universally. This might be prioritising research output in the varied life of a university academic. To these people, we had to set targets - including making an agreement that they would clear some time even through study leave to do some writing. Prioritisation of which work to do was also a problem. Getting on with what was chronologi-

cally next seemed a mindset, which needed to be changed to getting on with the data that might have the best out put. We were able to help here, by pointing out any weaknesses in the data that were proposing to work on, and the strengths of the data we felt they should prioritise. In many cases we attempted to help by offering to read any drafts and help shape the paper for the individual.

For those having to do further analyses, we went over the necessary steps hoping to identify blocks that would prevent the work proceeding - for example statistical advice, data cleaning and entry. We identified possible solutions using personnel in the department.”