



Corrigendum

Corrigendum to “Parenting very preterm infants and stress in Neonatal Intensive Care Units” (Early Hum. Dev. 101 (2016) 3–9)



Inês Baía^{a,b,1}, Mariana Amorim^{a,c,1}, Susana Silva^a, Michelle Kelly-Irving^{d,e}, Cláudia de Freitas^{a,f}, Elisabete Alves^{a,*}

^a ISPUP-EPIUnit, Universidade do Porto, Rua das Taipas, no. 135, 4050-600 Porto, Portugal

^b Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade do Porto, Rua Doutor Plácido da Costa, 4200-450 Porto, Portugal

^c Global Public Health Doctoral Programme, Instituto de Saúde Pública, Universidade do Porto, Portugal

^d INSERM UM1027, F-3100 Toulouse, France

^e Université Toulouse III Paul Sabatier, UM1027, F-3100 Toulouse, France

^f Centre for Research and Studies in Sociology (CIES), University Institute of Lisbon, Portugal

The authors regret to inform that they detect minor errors on the manuscript and they would like to correct them, if possible. These alterations have no implications for the results interpretation or the discussion of the paper.

The proportion of participation reported on Abstract (page 3) and on Methods section (page 4) should be 96.8% instead of 98.6%.

On Table 1 (page 5) the proportion should be 68.3% instead of 69.3% regarding caesarean mode of delivery, among mothers.

The *p* value 0.026 instead of 0.023 for the comparison of the scores of the subscale “change in parental role” according to multiple pregnancies on Results section (page 5) and on Table 3 (page 6).

The *p* value should be 0.316 instead of 0.312 for the comparison of the scores of the subscale “sights and sounds” according to household monthly income on Table 3 (page 6).

The *p* value should be 0.882 instead of 0.881 for the comparison of the scores of the subscale “baby looks and behaves” according to educational level on Table 3 (page 6).

The *p* value should be 0.112 instead of 0.115 for the comparison of the scores of the subscale “change in parental roles” according to extremely low birth weight delivery on Table 3 (page 6).

The *p* value should be 0.680 instead of 0.623 for the comparison of the scores of the subscale “overall stress” according to mode of delivery on Table 3 (page 6).

In Table 4, the mean value for the subscale “overall stress” should be 3 and not 4 for both vaginal/instrumental and caesarean mode of delivery.

The authors would like to apologise for any inconvenience caused.

DOI of original article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2016.04.001>

* Corresponding author at: ISPUP-EPIUnit, Universidade do Porto, Rua das Taipas, no. 135, 4050-600 Porto, Portugal.

¹ Equal contributing authors.

E-mail address: elisabete.alves@ispup.up.pt (E. Alves).