ERRATUM

Erratum to: Measuring the Severity of Prescribing Errors: A Systematic Review

Sara Garfield · Matthew Reynolds · Liesbeth Dermont · Bryony Dean Franklin

Published online: 30 January 2014

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2014

Erratum to: Drug Saf (2013) 36:1151–1157 DOI 10.1007/s40264-013-0092-0

Page 1153, column 2, section 3.3, paragraph 1, lines 1-5: The following two sentences, which previously read:

"Thirty (75 %) tools were based on potential rather than actual harm. It is of interest that the NCC MERP index [68] was developed to assess actual harm but was subsequently used or adapted to assess potential harm in six studies [48, 50, 51, 54–56]."

should read:

"Twenty nine (72.5 %) were based on potential rather than actual harm. It is of interest that the NCC MERP index [68] was developed to assess actual harm but was subsequently used or adapted to assess potential harm in five studies [50–51, 54–56]."

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:10. 1007/s40264-013-0092-0.

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (doi:10.1007/s40264-014-0135-1) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

S. Garfield (\boxtimes) · M. Reynolds · L. Dermont · B. D. Franklin The Centre for Medication Safety and Service Quality, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, Charing Cross Hospital, Fulham Palace Road, London W6 8RF, UK e-mail: sara.garfield@imperial.nhs.uk

S. Garfield \cdot M. Reynolds \cdot L. Dermont \cdot B. D. Franklin UCL School of Pharmacy, London, UK

Page 1155, column 1, section 3.6, paragraph 1, lines 7–11: The following sentence, which previously read:

"Forrey et al. [48] found that the original NCC MERP index [68] had 74 % alignment and that their adapted version had 81.0–83.9 % alignment when potential harm assessment was compared with actual harm."

should read:

"Forrey et al. [48] found that the original NCC MERP index [68] had 74 % alignment and that their adapted version had 81.0–83.9 % alignment when the severity scores of an expert panel (used as a gold standard) were compared with those of individual raters."