Erratum for Toh et al. (Enhancing the cardiovascular protective effects of a healthy dietary pattern with wolfberry (*Lycium barbarum*): A randomized controlled trial). Am J Clin Nutr; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqab062>.

Error in author Jiong-Wei Wang affiliation.

Original: Department of Physiology, **Faculty of Science**, National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore

Correction: Department of Physiology, **Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine**, National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore

The authors apologize for this error.

Address correspondence to Dr. JEK (e-mail: fstkje@nus.edu.sg).

doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqab192>

Corrigendum to Chen *et al.* Plasma glycerophospholipid profile, erythrocyte n—3 PUFAs, and metabolic syndrome incidence: a prospective study in Chinese men and women. Am J Clin Nutr; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqab050>.

When this paper was first published, it contained a sentence that read “Address correspondence to XL (e-mail: xlin@sibs.ac.cn).” This should have read: “Address correspondence to LS (e-mail: sunliang@sibs.ac.cn), XL (e-mail: xlin@sibs.ac.cn), or RZ (zr@sibs.ac.cn)”

This has been corrected online.

Address correspondence to SC (e-mail: chenshuangshuang2017@sibs.ac.cn).

doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqab216>

Erratum to: Cesarean delivery and metabolic risk factors in young adults: a Brazilian birth cohort study. Am J Clin Nutr 2015;102: 295–301.

In the original article, in **Table 3** the standardized Beta coefficient was presented, instead of the non-standard Beta coefficient, so the

TABLE 3 Regression coefficients for metabolic variables in young adults in the Ribeirão Preto birth cohort (São Paulo, Brazil) born by cesarean delivery compared with vaginal delivery

Variable	All individuals	P [n]		B (95% CI)	
		Crude	Adjusted	Crude	Adjusted ²
Total cholesterol, mg/dL	167.9 (166.4, 169.5) ³	0.154 [2037]	0.230 [1997]	2.471 (−0.926, 5.868)	2.145 (−1.360, 5.650)
HDL cholesterol, mg/dL	48.3 (47.7, 48.8) ³	0.722 [2037]	0.206 [1997]	−0.219 (−1.421, 0.984)	−0.748 (−1.910, 0.413)
LDL cholesterol, mg/dL	96.1 (94.8, 97.4) ⁴	0.107 [2029]	0.094 [1989]	0.010 (−0.002, 0.023)	0.007 (−0.002, 0.024)
Triglycerides, mg/dL	82.6 (80.7, 84.4) ⁴	0.381 [2037]	0.468 [1997]	0.009 (−0.012, 0.030)	0.008 (−0.014, 0.030)
Glucose, mg/dL	83.2 (82.8, 83.7) ⁴	0.154 [2043]	0.143 [2002]	0.004 (−0.001, 0.009)	0.004 (−0.001, 0.009)
Insulin, mg/dL	5.3 (5.1, 5.5) ⁴	0.918 [2022]	0.857 [1982]	0.002 (−0.030, 0.033)	0.003 (−0.030, 0.036)
HOMA-IR	1.1 (1.0, 1.1) ⁴	0.749 [2022]	0.689 [1982]	0.005 (−0.028, 0.039)	0.007 (−0.027, 0.041)
QUICKI ⁵	0.4 (0.4, 0.4) ⁴	0.987 [2022]	0.900 [1982]	−0.000 (−0.006, 0.006)	0.000 (−0.006, 0.005)
BMI, kg/m ²	23.9 (23.7, 24.1) ⁴	< 0.001 [2056]	0.001 [2015]	0.018 (0.010, 0.025)	0.020 (0.013, 0.028)

¹ P values were obtained by testing if the coefficient was zero in linear regression models.

² Model was adjusted for maternal schooling at birth, maternal age at childbirth, maternal smoking during pregnancy, birth weight, sex, and parity, variables identified as a minimum adjustment set in a directed acyclic graph.

³ Geometric mean; 95% CI in parentheses.

⁴ Arithmetic mean; 95% CI in parentheses.

⁵ QUICKI, quantitative insulin-sensitivity check index.

“B” is not part of the confidence interval for the BMI values (and the others’ outcomes). There were, therefore, inaccuracies in the table.

These details have been corrected only in this erratum to preserve the published version of record.

Address correspondence to JB (e-mail: Juliana.Bernardi@yahoo.com.br).

doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqab128>