

Corrigendum: Clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of first-line chemotherapy for adult patients with locally advanced or metastatic non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review and economic evaluation

T Brown,¹ G Pilkington,¹ A Bagust,¹ A Boland,¹
J Oyee,¹ C Tudur Smith,² M Blundell,¹ M Lai,¹
C Martin Saborido,¹ J Greenhalgh,¹ Y Dundar¹
and R Dickson^{1*}

¹Liverpool Reviews and Implementation Group (LRiG), Institute of Psychology, Health and Society, Department of Health Services Research, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

²Department of Biostatistics, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

*Corresponding author

Corrigendum issued May 2015

Corrigendum DOI: 10.3310/hta17310-c201505

Original DOI: 10.3310/hta17310

The original report should be referenced as follows:

Brown T, Pilkington G, Bagust A, Boland A, Oyee J, Tudur Smith C, *et al.* Corrigendum: Clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of first-line chemotherapy for adult patients with locally advanced or metastatic non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technol Assess* 2014;**17**(31). Corrigendum in *Health Technol Assess* 2015;**17**(31):281–282.

Health Technology Assessment is indexed and abstracted in *Index Medicus/MEDLINE*, *Excerpta Medica/EMBASE*, *Science Citation Index Expanded (SciSearch®)* and *Current Contents®/Clinical Medicine*.

Corrigendum notice

Clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of first-line chemotherapy for adult patients with locally advanced or metastatic non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review and economic evaluation

T Brown, G Pilkington, A Bagust, A Boland, J Oyee, C Tudur Smith, M Blundell, M Lai, C Martin Saborido, J Greenhalgh, Y Dundar and R Dickson

This paper¹ is corrected as follows:

Appendix 22: Table 96 is replaced with the following text:

Table 96 has been removed as it includes incorrect hazard ratios caused by a reversal of the hazard ratio calculations. However, this does not impact on any of the clinical or economic results reported.

Chapter 3, under the heading 'Survival risk at year 1 and year 2 post randomisation': The following text is removed:

Analyses for 1-year survival show no evidence to suggest any difference in survival between the third-generation chemotherapy treatments except for PEM + PLAT compared with GEM + PLAT that demonstrated significant evidence of 1-year survival advantage for PEM over GEM.

Reference

1. Brown T, Pilkington G, Bagust A, Boland A, Oyee J, Tudur Smith C, *et al.* Clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of first-line chemotherapy for adult patients with locally advanced or metastatic non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technol Assess* 2013;**17**(31).