

## Correction

Graber JM, Stayner LT, Conroy LM, *et al.* Respiratory-related mortality among U.S. coalminers; results after 37-years of follow-up. *Occup Environ Med* 2014;71:30–9. This article included some errors, they are listed below:

- ▶ In Abstract, in the sentence which begins “Mortality from COPD was significantly elevated among ever smokers and former smokers...”, the word ‘ever’ should be ‘never’. The sentence correctly reads: “Mortality from COPD was significantly elevated among never smokers and former smokers...”. And the upper limits of the confidence intervals for the hazard ratio for average cohort exposure to respirable silica associated with mortality from pneumoconiosis and COPD were incorrectly reported as 1.33 and 1.52 respectively. The correct confidence limits are shown on table 3 and are HR=1.33, 95% CI 0.94 to 1.90 for mortality from pneumoconiosis and HR=1.04, 95% CI 0.96 to 1.14 for mortality from COPD.
- ▶ In Results, Lung Cancer, in the first sentence of the second paragraph "model" is misspelled as "morel".
- ▶ In table 4, the confidence interval from the dual exposure model for the hazard ratio (0.99) for the cumulative exposure to respirable silica should be 0.84 to 1.18. Also the number of lung cancer deaths in the title should be 568. Please find the corrected part of table 4 below.
- ▶ In Discussion, the last sentence of the first full paragraph should read: “In our study the effect of silica exposure was weakened when we controlled for coal mine dust (HR=1.04; 95% CI 0.96 to 1.14)”.

**Table 4** HRs for mortality due to lung cancer mortality (568 deaths) estimated in Cox proportional hazards models controlling for age at study entry, race and year of birth, and other covariates as listed

Variables	Single-exposure models		Dual-exposure model			
	B coeff.	HR (95% CI)	B coeff.	HR* (95% CI)	B coeff.	HR (95% CI)
Cumulative exposures (mg/m <sup>3</sup> -years)						
Coal mine dust (log)*,†	0.1271	1.70 (1.02 to 2.83)			0.1290	1.71 (1.03 to 2.85)
Respirable silicat			0.0191	1.05 (0.90 to 1.23)	–0.0028	0.99 (0.84 to 1.18)

Please refer to the original article for full table 4.



CrossMark

*Occup Environ Med* 2014;71:738. doi:10.1136/oemed-2013-101597corr1



## Correction

*Occup Environ Med* 2014 71: 738  
doi: 10.1136/oemed-2013-101597corr1

---

Updated information and services can be found at:  
<http://oem.bmj.com/content/71/10/738>

---

*These include:*

### **Email alerting service**

Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article. Sign up in the box at the top right corner of the online article.

---

### **Notes**

---

To request permissions go to:  
<http://group.bmj.com/group/rights-licensing/permissions>

To order reprints go to:  
<http://journals.bmj.com/cgi/reprintform>

To subscribe to BMJ go to:  
<http://group.bmj.com/subscribe/>