



Manuscript: Radial-probe EBUS for the diagnosis of peripheral pulmonary lesions.

Publication: J Bras Pneumol. 2016;42(4):248-53.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1806-3756201500000079>

On page 251 of the original publication, left column, second paragraph, lines 14 to 18, where it is written

“Malignant nodules were found in 14 (51.8%) of the 27 cases, with a predominance of non-small cell lung cancer. The radial-probe EBUS results were positive in 10 (71.4%) of those 14 malignant nodules.”

it should read

“Tumors were found in 14 (51.8%) of the 27 nodules, with a predominance of non-small cell lung cancer. The radial-probe EBUS results were positive in 10 (71.4%) of those 14 tumoral nodules (Table 2).”

On page 251 of the original publication, Table 1 should be disregarded. The correct table should read

Table 1. Characteristics of the lesions in the patients submitted to radial-probe EBUS (N = 51).

Characteristic	Case	Pulmonary lesion	
		Nodule	Mass
All lesions			
N (%)	51 (100.0)	37 (72.5)	14 (27.5)
Size (cm), mean ± SD	2.5 ± 1.3	1.9 ± 0.7	4.1 ± 0.9
Sensitivity, n (%)	34 (66.7)	23 (62.2)	11 (78.6)
Lesions visible by radial-probe EBUS			
N (%)	39 (76.5)	27 (69.2)	12 (30.8)
Size (cm), mean ± SD	2.6 ± 1.2	1.9 ± 0.7	3.9 ± 0.9
Sensitivity, n (%)	31 (79.5)	20 (74.1)	11 (91.7)
Lesions not visible by radial-probe EBUS			
N (%)	12 (23.5)	10 (83.3)	2 (16.7)
Size (cm), mean ± SD	1.6 ± 1.1	1.3 ± 0.6	3.7 ± 0.7
Sensitivity, n (%)	3 (25.0)	3 (30.0)	0 (0.0)

On page 252 of the original publication, Table 2 should be disregarded. The correct table should read

Table 2. Final diagnoses of the lesions that were visible by radial-probe EBUS and and diagnostic yield.^a

Diagnosis	Pulmonary lesions			
	Nodules		Lung masses	
	Cases	Diagnostic yield	Cases	Diagnostic yield
Non-small cell lung cancer	10 (37.0)	7 (70.0)	8 (66.7)	7 (87.5)
Small cell lung cancer	2 (7.4)	2 (100.0)	1 (8.3)	1 (100.0)
Adenoid cystic carcinoma	1 (3.7)	1 (100.0)		
Hamartoma	1 (3.7)	0 (0.0)		
Metastatic breast cancer			1 (8.3)	1 (100.0)
Tuberculosis or fungal infection	4 (14.8)	2 (50.0)		
Inflammatory disease	3 (11.1)	2 (66.7)	2 (16.7)	2 (100.0)
Nonspecific benign disease	6 (22.2)	6 (100.0)		
Total	27 (100.0)	20 (74.1)	12 (100.0)	11 (91.7)
Tumors	14 (51.8)	10 (71.4)	10 (83.3)	9 (90.0)

^aValues expressed in n (%).

On page 252 of the original publication, left column, second paragraph, lines 16 to 18, where it is written

“The sensitivity of the procedure tripled for lesions that were visible by radial-probe EBUS compared to those that were not visible (73% vs. 25%).”

it should read

“The sensitivity of the procedure tripled for lesions that were visible by radial-probe EBUS compared to those that were not visible (79.5% vs. 25.0%).”

On page 252 of the original publication, right column, third paragraph, lines 1 to 8, where it is written

“The differential diagnosis between malignancy and infectious disease is important in Brazil. In the present study, we identified non-neoplastic disease in

13 (48.1%) of the 27 pulmonary nodules that were visible by radial-probe EBUS and in 2 (16.7%) of the 12 pulmonary masses that were visible by radial-probe EBUS, the final diagnoses including fungal infections and tuberculosis.”

it should read

“The differential diagnosis between malignancy and infectious disease is important in Brazil. In the present study, we identified inflammatory/infectious disease in 13 (48.1%) of the 27 pulmonary nodules that were visible by radial-probe EBUS and in 2 (16.7%) of the 12 pulmonary masses that were visible by radial-probe EBUS, the final diagnoses including fungal infections and tuberculosis.”