

Erratum

In the article by Endre et al., entitled ‘Timely diagnosis of acute kidney injury using kinetic eGFR and the creatinine excretion to production ratio, E/eG – Creatinine can be useful’ [Nephron 2016;132:312–316, DOI: 10.1159/000444456], table 1 has a serious mistake. The AUCs are not in agreement with those mentioned in the Results section. The values of E/eG appeared as those of the clinical model and the values of KeGFR appeared as those of E/eG. The correct table should be as follows:

Table 1. Prediction of DGF in recipients of kidneys from deceased kidney donors

Time	AUC (95% CI)					p value
	sCr	eGFR	clinical model	KeGFR	E/eG	
4 h (n = 56)	0.56 (0.41–0.72)	0.50 (0.34–0.65)	0.72 (0.58–0.86)	0.69 (0.56–0.83)	0.87 (0.77–0.96)	0.01
8 h (n = 52)	0.61 (0.45–0.77)	0.52 (0.35–0.68)	0.68 (0.52–0.83)	0.78 (0.64–0.93)	0.89 (0.80–0.98)	0.20
12 h (n = 52)	0.68 (0.53–0.84)	0.67 (0.51–0.82)	0.68 (0.52–0.83)	0.83 (0.69–0.96)	0.94 (0.87–1.00)	0.10

AUCs (with 95% CI) for prediction of delayed graft function using sCr, unadjusted eGFR, the clinical model based on donor and recipient factors, KeGFR, and the creatinine excretion to production ratio (E/eG). p values compare the AUCs of E/eG with KeGFR.