Published in final edited form as:

Soc Sci Med. 2019 February ; 223: 117–120. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.01.030.

Corrigendum to “Perceived social support in African American breast cancer patients: Predictors and effects” [*Soc. Sci. Med.* 192 (2017) 134–142]

Tess Thompson^{a,*}, Maria Pérez^b, Matthew Kreuter^a, Julie Margenthaler^b, Graham Colditz^b, and Donna B. Jeffe^b

^aHealth Communication Research Laboratory, Brown School of Social Work, Washington University in St. Louis, United States

^bWashington University School of Medicine, Washington University in St. Louis, United States

The authors regret several errors in this manuscript. It should be noted that our main findings and conclusions have not changed.

A participant who was randomized to the intervention group was mistakenly excluded from analysis, and thus the total sample should be 228, not 227. This patient dropped out after completing the baseline survey without receiving the intervention. In addition, vital status was misclassified for two participants. (Most models excluded participants who had died.) This means one participant was included in the analyses who should have been excluded, and one was excluded who should have been included.

After these errors were corrected, we reran the multiple imputation and analyses using the corrected data from the 228 people who completed the first interview. Although the main findings and conclusions did not change, and parameter estimates that were previously significant remained significant, there were slight shifts in many of the numbers in the text and tables. In addition, patients’ receipt of chemotherapy was no longer included in one exploratory model described only in the text, because that variable was no longer significant at $p < 0.10$ when the multiple imputation was rerun. Several small errors were also found and corrected.

Changes to the text are detailed in the first table below. Corrected versions of Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3 from the manuscript are also provided.

The authors would like to apologise for any inconvenience caused. Corrections made to article text (changed text highlighted in bold).

*Corresponding author. Washington University in St. Louis, One Brookings Drive, Campus Box 1196, St. Louis, MO, 63130, United States., tessthompson@wustl.edu (T. Thompson).

Section, page	Original text	Corrected text
Abstract, p. 134	... 227 newly diagnosed African American women ...	... 228 newly diagnosed African American women ...
Methods, p. 135	... 227 African American women newly diagnosed with breast cancer who were randomly assigned to two arms: 107 in the intervention arm ...	... 228 African American women newly diagnosed with breast cancer who were randomly assigned to two arms: 108 in the intervention arm ...
Methods, p. 135	Of 371 eligible patients invited to participate, the study team enrolled 227(61.1%).	Of 369 eligible patients invited to participate, the study team enrolled 228 (61.8%) .
Methods, p. 137	... the significance of model parameters was identical ...	the significance of estimates of model parameters was identical ...
Methods, p. 137	... with a sample size of 218 for the growth curve models.	... with a sample size of 219 for the growth curve models.
Results, p. 137	At baseline, 28.2% of participants were married/partnered. Mean age was 56.0 ($SD = 10.0$), and the majority of participants reported annual household income below \$25,000. Most patients had early-stage cancer and were treated with breast-conserving therapy. Most patients (99.0%) were treated at Siteman Cancer Center. All but three patients received either breast-conserving surgery or mastectomy. Mean MOS-SSS score at baseline was 81.9 ($SD = 19.8$).	At baseline, 28.1% of participants were married/partnered. Mean age was 55.9 ($SD = 10.0$), and the majority of participants reported annual household income below \$25,000. Most patients had early-stage cancer and were treated with breast-conserving therapy. Most patients (98.7%) were treated at Siteman Cancer Center. All but three patients received either breast-conserving surgery or mastectomy. Mean MOS-SSS score at baseline was 82.0 ($SD = 19.8$).
Results, p. 137	This model demonstrated excellent fit ($\chi^2(10) = 13.84$, RMSEA = 0.04, TLI = 0.99, SRMR = 0.06). The mean intercept of social support was significantly different from zero (mean intercept = 81.79, $p < 0.001$), but the mean slope was not significantly different from zero, indicating no significant change in average levels of social support over time for the sample as a whole (mean slope = -0.073 , $p = 0.835$).	This model demonstrated excellent fit ($\chi^2(10) = \mathbf{11.68}$, RMSEA = 0.02 , TLI = 1.00 , SRMR = 0.06). The mean intercept of social support was significantly different from zero (mean intercept = 81.93 , $p < 0.001$), but the mean slope was not significantly different from zero, indicating no significant change in average levels of social support over time for the sample as a whole (mean slope = -0.156 , $p = \mathbf{0.653}$).
Results, p. 138	This model demonstrated good fit ($\chi^2(58) = 80.45$, RMSEA = 0.04, TLI = 0.95, SRMR = 0.03) ...	This model demonstrated good fit ($\chi^2(58) = \mathbf{77.71}$, RMSEA = 0.04, TLI = 0.95, SRMR = 0.02) ...
Results, p. 138	... variables retained included marital status, spirituality, depressive symptoms, education, and receipt of chemotherapy ...	... variables retained included marital status, spirituality, depressive symptoms, and education ...
Results, p. 138	Being married/partnered (standardized coefficient = 0.33, $p = 0.042$) and reporting higher levels of spirituality (standardized coefficient = 0.31, $p = 0.002$) were associated with higher estimated initial levels of social support, and more severe depressive symptoms were associated with lower initial levels of social support (standardized coefficient = 0.33, $p < 0.001$).	Being married/partnered (standardized coefficient = 0.33, $p = \mathbf{0.033}$) and reporting higher levels of spirituality (standardized coefficient = 0.30 , $p = \mathbf{0.001}$) were associated with higher estimated initial levels of social support, and more severe depressive symptoms were associated with lower initial levels of social support (standardized coefficient = -0.34 , $p < 0.001$).
Results, p. 138	... general health at Time 5 (standardized coefficient for intercept = 0.21, slope = 0.26, each $p < 0.05$).	... general health at Time 5 (standardized coefficient for intercept = 0.21, slope = 0.25 , each $p < 0.05$).
Results, p. 138	... depressive symptoms at Time 5 (standardized coefficient for intercept = -0.20 , slope = -0.40 , each $p < 0.05$).	... depressive symptoms at Time 5 (standardized coefficient for intercept = -0.20 , slope = -0.39 , each $p < 0.05$).
Results, pp. 138–139	... which was attenuated (standardized coefficient = -0.16 , $p = 0.069$). However, the model with baseline covariates added showed relatively poor fit ($\chi^2(58) = 346.38$; RMSEA = 0.09, TLI = 0.73, SRMR = 0.09) ...	... which was attenuated (standardized coefficient = -0.16 , $p = \mathbf{0.052}$). However, the model with baseline covariates added showed relatively poor fit ($\chi^2(\mathbf{121}) = \mathbf{348.71}$; RMSEA = 0.09, TLI = 0.73, SRMR = 0.09) ...

Table 1

Characteristics of African American women with breast cancer in the Survivor Stories Study ($N = 228$) at baseline.

Variables	% (N) or Mean (SD)
Categorical variables	
Married/partnered	28.1% (64)
Private insurance	45.5% (101)
Working at least part-time	44.3% (101)
Education	
Grades 1–8	2.2% (5)
Grades 9–11	14.0% (32)
High school/GED	30.7% (70)
Some college	32.9% (75)
College degree	20.2% (46)
Household income	
< \$10,000	30.9% (69)
\$10,000–\$24,999	28.3% (63)
\$25,000 – \$49,999	25.6% (57)
\$50,000–\$74,999	7.6% (17)
\$75,000–\$99,999	5.8% (13)
\$100,000	1.8% (4)
Cancer stage	
Early (stages 0/I/IIA)	72.4% (165)
Locally advanced (stage IIB/III)	27.6% (63)
Surgery type	
Breast-conserving surgery	68.9% (155)
Mastectomy	31.1% (70)
Hormone therapy	62.8% (142)
Radiation therapy	77.5% (176)
Chemotherapy	49.3% (112)
Continuous variables	

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Variables	% (N) or Mean (SD)
Age	55.9 (10.0)
MOS-SSS score	82.0 (19.8)
CES-D score	11.8 (11.4)
SBI score	40.5 (5.8)
SF-36 general health perceptions	59.2 (22.3)
Comorbidity	1.0 (1.4)

Note: At baseline, data were missing as follows: insurance (6 participants), income (5), surgery type (3), hormone therapy (2), radiation therapy (1), chemotherapy (1), and SBI score (1). MOS-SSS = Medical Outcomes Study Social Support Survey; CES-D = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale, SBI = Systems of Belief Inventory.

Table 2

Results from Model 2 (conditional growth curve model) of predictors of social support slope and correlates of social support intercept in 219 African American breast cancer patients.

Variables	Estimate	Standardized coefficient
Intercept correlates		
Study arm	2.43	0.15
Married/partnered	5.54 *	0.33 *
Age	-0.06	-0.04
Working	-2.92	-0.18
Education	-0.97	-0.06
Income	0.81	0.06
Insurance	0.61	0.04
Late stage cancer	-4.73	-0.28
Surgery type	0.36	0.02
Radiation therapy	-0.49	-0.03
Chemotherapy	3.91	0.24
Hormone therapy	1.30	0.08
Comorbidity	-0.73	-0.06
Depressive symptoms (CES-D)	-0.50 *	-0.34 *
General health (SF-36)	-0.01	-0.02
Systems of Belief Inventory score	0.86 *	0.30 *
Slope predictors		
Study arm	0.51	0.13
Married/partnered	0.25	0.07
Age	-0.05	-0.12
Working	0.10	0.03
Education	-0.80	-0.21
Income	0.04	0.01
Insurance	1.22	0.32

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Variables	Estimate	Standardized coefficient
Late stage cancer	0.08	0.02
Surgery type	−0.46	−0.12
Radiation therapy	0.46	0.12
Chemotherapy	0.33	0.09
Hormone therapy	0.72	0.19
Comorbidity	−0.24	−0.09
Depressive symptoms (CES-D)	−0.01	−0.04
General health perceptions (SF-36)	0.00	0.01
Systems of Belief Inventory score	0.03	0.05

Note. The partially standardized coefficient is used for categorical variables, and the fully standardized coefficient is used for continuous variables. The estimate for married/partnered was significant ($p = 0.042$) in the model in which patients who died over the course of the study were excluded (presented here); the estimate was nearly significant ($p = 0.058$) in the model that included those participants with imputed data.

* $p < 0.05$.

Table 3

Results from Model 3 using social support intercept and slope estimated across four time points to predict outcomes at two years after baseline in African American breast cancer patients.

Predictors	Estimate	Standardized coefficient
General health perceptions		
Social support intercept	0.29 *	.21 *
Social support slope	1.32 *	.25 *
Study arm	0.67	.02
General health perceptions at baseline (SF-36)	0.59 *	.58 *
Depression		
Social support intercept	-.15 *	-.20 *
Social support slope	-1.07 *	-.39 *
Study arm	-1.19	-.05
Depression (CES-D) at baseline	0.45 *	0.44 *
Fit statistics: $\chi^2(21) = 29.62$, RMSEA = 0.04, TLI = 0.98, SRMR = 0.04		

Note. The partially standardized coefficient is included for categorical variables, and the fully standardized coefficient is included for continuous variables. RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, TLI = Tucker-Lewis incremental fit index, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual.

* $p < 0.05$.