



Erratum

Erratum. A Randomized Controlled Trial of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Adherence and Depression (CBT-AD) in Patients With Uncontrolled Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:625–633

DOI: 10.2337/dc16-er06

Steven A. Safren, Jeffrey S. Gonzalez, Deborah J. Wexler, Christina Psaros, Linda M. Delahanty, Aaron J. Blashill, Aleksandra I. Margolina, and Enrico Cagliero

In the RESULTS section of the article cited above, the sentence “For medication adherence, a significant main effect for study arm indicated that the CBT-AD arm maintained 24.3 percentage points higher medication adherence than the ETAU arm during the follow-up period (95% CI –38.2 to –10.3, $P = 0.001$) (Table 3)” should have read, “For medication adherence, a significant main effect for study arm indicated that the CBT-AD arm maintained 16.3 percentage points higher medication adherence than the ETAU arm during the follow-up period (95% CI –26.1 to –6.5, $P = 0.001$) (Table 3).” The sentence “For adherence to glucose monitoring goals, a significant main effect for study arm indicated that the CBT-AD arm maintained 16.9 percentage points better glucose monitoring adherence than the ETAU arm during the follow-up period (95% CI –33.3 to –0.5, $P = 0.043$)” should have read, “For adherence to glucose monitoring goals, a significant main effect for study arm indicated that the CBT-AD arm maintained 22.3 percentage points better glucose monitoring adherence than the ETAU arm during the follow-up period (95% CI –36.1 to –8.6, $P = 0.002$).”

Accordingly, these changes also affect the abstract where the sentence “Analyses of 4-, 8-, and 12-month follow-up time points indicated that CBT-AD maintained 24.3 percentage points higher medication adherence (95% CI –38.2 to –10.3, $P = 0.001$); 16.9 percentage points greater SMBG adherence (95% CI –33.3 to –0.5, $P = 0.043$). . .” should have read, “Analyses of 4-, 8-, and 12-month follow-up time points indicated that CBT-AD maintained 16.3 percentage points higher medication adherence (95% CI –26.1 to –6.5, $P = 0.001$); 22.3 percentage points greater SMBG adherence (95% CI –36.1 to –8.6, $P = 0.002$). . .”

In Table 3, the P value for condition for glucose monitoring should now read $P = 0.002$ instead of $P = 0.043$. (Note that the P value for medication adherence remains the same in Table 3 and does not need to be changed.)

In addition, the abstract states that the intervention group had “6.44 points lower depression scores on the Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale” and the text on page 628 states “6.22” points. The abstract is correct, and the text should state “6.44.”

These errors do not affect the conclusion of the study. The online version reflects these changes.