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Corrigendum notice

Nutritional Evaluation and Optimisation in Neonates (NEON) trial of amino acid regimen and intravenous lipid composition in preterm parenteral nutrition: a randomised double-blind controlled trial

Sabita Uthaya, Xinxue Liu, Daphne Babalis, Caroline Dore, Jane Warwick, Jimmy Bell, Louise Thomas, Deborah Ashby, Giuliana Durighel, Ash Ederies, Monica Yanez-Lopez and Neena Modi

This paper\textsuperscript{1} is corrected as follows:

During the uploading of data for submission to the EudraCT results database, a discrepancy was identified. It was noted that the number of deaths per group was not consistent with the number in the final report and trial publication. This discrepancy was found to relate to two randomisation numbers. During the trial, the randomisation database had been held separately from the trial database, with manual transcription of randomisation numbers from the randomisation database to the trial database. Two randomisation numbers had been entered incorrectly into the trial database and, although this was documented at the time, the correction had not been made in the analysis data set. The two infants in question received the correct treatment in accordance with their allocation, but were analysed according to the wrong treatment group. Following the identification of this error, all analyses were repeated. It was confirmed that this error had a negligible impact on the study results. Furthermore, the two infants in question had not been included in the primary and secondary outcome analyses, as one had died and the other had withdrawn prior to the primary end-point assessment, so the key study outcomes remain unchanged. The only changes to the results are in the number of serious adverse events and minor changes to the data in demographics tables mostly affecting decimal points and the CONSORT diagram. Our interpretation of the study results remains unchanged.

Table 18: Information in this table has been updated.

Figure 2: Information in this figure has been updated.
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