

CORRECTION

Open Access



Publisher Correction: Double-counting of populations in evidence synthesis in public health: a call for awareness and future methodological development

Humaira Hussein¹, Clareece R. Nevill¹, Anna Mefen¹, Keith R. Abrams^{1,2}, Sylwia Bujkiewicz¹, Alex J. Sutton¹ and Laura J. Gray^{1*}

Publisher Correction: BMC Public Health 22, 1827 (2022)
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-14213-6>

In the original publication of this article [1]: Box 1 was omitted during the publication process. Box 1 has been included in this correction article, the original article has been updated.

Box 1 Suggested approaches to include real-world data in evidence synthesis

Identify potential overlapping populations by extracting data on:

- Where the data is from:
 - Database or registry used
 - Hospital (and if possible specific department(s) data is from)
 - Geographical area(s)
- Time period of study

- Population characteristics (e.g., age range, background interventions or particular subgroup considered).

Options to minimise impact of double-counting of individuals/populations:

- Consider using a method of analysis which accounts for double-counting
- Contact authors to clarify aspects of the studies that are unclear
- Include all studies if double-counting cannot be fully determined
- Analyse studies at different time-points
- Preference of peer-reviewed studies
- Retain only one of any identified set of studies in which overlap is suspect by some rational criteria. For example, retain the:
 - Largest study (i.e., study with the most participants)
 - Most recent study
 - Most complete data

Authors could utilise an alternative study if the selected study does not have data for a particular outcome being analysed

- Obtain individual patient data

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-14213-6>.

*Correspondence: Ig48@leicester.ac.uk

¹Department of Health Sciences, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH, UK

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s) 2022. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

- Always conduct sensitivity analysis to assess robustness of results.

NOTE: The authors are not recommending these approaches rather highlighting possible options; further work is required to understand the implications of these methods.

Reporting on approaches taken:

- Provide rationale for studies included in the evidence synthesis
- Discuss potential double-counting of data between studies
- Implications of double-counting and method used to account for it regarding interpretation of results.

Author details

¹Department of Health Sciences, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH, UK. ²Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK.

Published online: 08 December 2022

Reference

1. Hussein H, et al. Double-counting of populations in evidence synthesis in public health: a call for awareness and future methodological development. *BMC Public Health*. 2022;22:1827. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-14213-6>.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

