



Corrigendum: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Prevalence of Congenital Myopathy

Kun Huang^{1,2}, Fang-Fang Bi^{1*} and Huan Yang^{1*}

¹ Department of Neurology, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, China, ² Institute of Molecular Precision Medicine and Hunan Key Laboratory of Molecular Precision Medicine, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, China

Keywords: prevalence, congenital myopathy, nemaline myopathy, core myopathy, centronuclear myopathy, congenital fiber-type disproportion myopathy

A Corrigendum on

A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Prevalence of Congenital Myopathy

by Huang, K., Bi, F.-F., and Yang, H. (2021). *Front. Neurol.* 12:761636. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2021.761636

OPEN ACCESS

Approved by:

Frontiers Editorial Office,
Frontiers Media SA, Switzerland

*Correspondence:

Fang-Fang Bi
fangfangbi@csu.edu.cn
Huan Yang
yangh69@126.com

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Neuroepidemiology,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Neurology

Received: 19 January 2022

Accepted: 19 January 2022

Published: 14 February 2022

Citation:

Huang K, Bi F-F and Yang H (2022)
Corrigendum: A Systematic Review
and Meta-Analysis of the Prevalence
of Congenital Myopathy.
Front. Neurol. 13:857959.
doi: 10.3389/fneur.2022.857959

In the original article, there was an error. In the Abstract there was a mistake in the statement of the results of the pooled prevalence of congenital myopathy in the all-age population. Instead of “The pooled prevalence of congenital myopathy in the all-age population was 1.50 (95% CI, 0.93–2.06) per 100,000, while the prevalence in the child population was 2.73 (95% CI, 1.34–4.12) per 100,000”, it should be “The pooled prevalence of congenital myopathy in the all-age population was 1.62 (95% CI, 1.13–2.11) per 100,000, while the prevalence in the child population was 2.76 (95% CI, 1.34–4.18) per 100,000.”

A correction has been made to *Abstract, Results, Paragraph 1:*

Results: A total of 11 studies were included in the systematic review and meta-analysis. Of the 11 studies included, 10 (90.9%) were considered medium-quality, one (9.1%) was considered low-quality, and no study was assessed as having a high overall quality. The pooled prevalence of congenital myopathy in the all-age population was 1.62 (95% CI, 1.13–2.11) per 100,000, while the prevalence in the child population was 2.76 (95% CI, 1.34–4.18) per 100,000. In the pediatric population, the prevalence among males was 2.92 (95% CI, –1.70 to 7.55) per 100,000, while the prevalence among females was 2.47 (95% CI, –1.67 to 6.61) per 100,000. The prevalence estimates of the all-age population per 100,000 were 0.20 (95% CI 0.10–0.35) for nemaline myopathy, 0.37 (95% CI 0.21–0.53) for core myopathy, 0.08 (95% CI –0.01 to 0.18) for centronuclear myopathy, 0.23 (95% CI 0.04–0.42) for congenital fiber-type disproportion myopathy, and 0.34 (95% CI, 0.24–0.44) for unspecified congenital myopathies. In addition, the prevalence estimates of the pediatric population per 100,000 were 0.22 (95% CI 0.03–0.40) for nemaline myopathy, 0.46 (95% CI 0.03–0.90) for core myopathy, 0.44 (95% CI 0.03–0.84) for centronuclear myopathy, 0.25 (95% CI –0.05 to 0.54) for congenital fiber-type disproportion myopathy, and 2.63 (95% CI 1.64–3.62) for unspecified congenital myopathies.

In the original article, there was a mistake in **Table 1** as published. The number of cases in the reference Norwood et al. should be 41, not 18. The corrected **Table 1** appears below.

The authors apologize for these errors and state that they do not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.

TABLE 1 | Characteristics of the included studies on congenital myopathy prevalence.

References	Country/region	Age (years)	Data source	Diagnostic criteria	Prevalence date	Population size	Number of cases	Prevalence per 100,000 (95% CI)	Overall score ^d
Amburgey et al. (21)	United States (Michigan)	<18	Hospital/clinic chart review, administrative database	Clinical history with at least 1 additional supporting study (biopsy, genetic testing, or first-degree relative)	2010	1,211,100	46	3.80 (2.93, 4.66)	Medium
Chung et al. (22)	Southern China (Hong Kong)	<19	Hospital/clinic chart review, administrative database	European Neuromuscular Center (23), World Federation of Neurology Research Committee (24) ^a	2001.06.30	1,335,469	45	3.22 (2.43, 4.01)	Medium
Darin and Tulinius (25)	Western Sweden	<16	Mailed survey, hospital/clinic chart review, administrative databases	Muscle and Nerve (26) ^b	1995.01.01	359,676	18	5.01 (3.37, 6.64)	Medium
Hughes et al. (27)	Northern Ireland	All	Hospital/clinic chart review, administrative database, relatives.	European Neuromuscular Center (23), World Federation of Neurology Research Committee (24) ^a	1994.06.30	1,573,282	57	3.62 (2.87, 4.37)	Medium
Lefter et al. (28)	Ireland	>18	Hospital/clinic chart review, administrative database	Table e-1 at Neurology.org (28)	2013.12.31	3,439,565	33	0.96 (0.65, 1.27)	Medium
Norwood et al. (29)	Northern England	All	Hospital/clinic chart review, administrative database	European Neuromuscular Center (23), Monogenic neuromuscular disorders (30) ^c	2007.08.01	2,990,000	41	0.60 (0.33, 0.87)	Medium
Pagola-Lorz et al. (31)	Northern Spain (Navarre)	All	Hospital/clinic chart review, administrative database	Monogenic neuromuscular disorders (32), undiagnosed genetic muscle disease (33) ^c	2016	640,647	8	1.25 (0.44, 2.06)	Medium
Santos et al. (34)	Portugal	<15	NM	Details are not available	2001	1,656,602	27	1.63 (1.07, 2.19)	Low
Tangsrud and Halvorsen (35)	Southern Norway	<18	Mailed survey, hospital/clinic chart review	System proposed by Dubowitz (36) ^b	1983.01.01	573,762	3	0.52 (–0.05, 1.10)	Medium
Theadom et al. (37)	New Zealand	All	Hospital/clinic chart review, administrative database	Details are not available	2014.04.01	4,242,048	60	1.41 (1.08, 1.75)	Medium
Witting et al. (38)	Denmark	>5	Mailed survey, hospital/clinic chart review, administrative database	Highly dependent on histological findings	NM	5,400,000	82	1.52 (1.22, 1.82)	Medium

CI, confidence interval; NM, not mentioned.

^aDiagnosis based on characteristic histochemical abnormalities.

^bHighly dependent on histological findings.

^cGenetic confirmation or clinical phenotype + characteristic histological findings.

^dQuality of study reporting assessment; details are shown in Supplementary Material 2.

REFERENCES

21. Amburgey K, Mcnamara N, Bennett LR, McCormick ME, Acsadi G, Dowling JJ. Prevalence of congenital myopathies in a representative pediatric united states population. *Ann Neurol.* (2011) 70:662–5. doi: 10.1002/ana.22510
22. Chung B, Wong V, Ip P. Prevalence of neuromuscular diseases in Chinese children: a study in southern China. *J Child Neurol.* (2003) 18:217–9. doi: 10.1177/08830738030180030201
23. Dubowitz V. Diagnostic criteria for neuromuscular disorders: Edited by Alan E. H. Emery. Published 1994, European Neuromuscular Centre, Baarn, The Netherlands. ISBN 90 261 0719 6, 72 pp. *Neuromuscular Disord.* (1994) 4:292–3. doi: 10.1016/0960-8966(94)90038-8
24. World Federation of Neurology Research Committee Research Group on Neuromuscular Diseases. *J Neurol Sci.* (1988) 86, 333–360.
25. Darin N, Tulinius M. Neuromuscular disorders in childhood: a descriptive epidemiological study from western Sweden. *Neuromuscul Disord.* (2000) 10:1–9. doi: 10.1016/S0960-8966(99)00055-3
26. Brooke MH, Carroll JE, Ringel SP. Congenital hypotonia revisited. *Muscle Nerve.* (1979) 2:84–100. doi: 10.1002/mus.880020203
27. Hughes MI, Hicks EM, Nevin NC, Patterson VH. The prevalence of inherited neuromuscular disease in Northern Ireland. *Neuromuscul Disord.* (1996) 6:69–73. doi: 10.1016/0960-8966(94)00017-4
28. Lefter S, Hardiman O, Ryan AM. A population-based epidemiologic study of adult neuromuscular disease in the Republic of Ireland. *Neurology.* (2017) 88:304–13. doi: 10.1212/WNL.0000000000003504
29. Norwood FL, Harling C, Chinnery PF, Eagle M, Bushby K, Straub V. Prevalence of genetic muscle disease in Northern England: in-depth analysis of a muscle clinic population. *Brain.* (2009) 132:3175–86. doi: 10.1093/brain/awp236
30. Kaplan JC. Gene table of monogenic neuromuscular disorders (nuclear genome only) Vol 19. No 1 January 2009. *Neuromuscul Disord.* (2009) 19:77–98. doi: 10.1016/j.nmd.2008.11.001
31. Pagola-Lorz I, Vicente E, Ibanez B, Torne L, Elizalde-Beiras I, Garcia-Solaesa V, et al. Epidemiological study and genetic characterization of inherited muscle diseases in a northern Spanish region. *Orphanet J Rare Dis.* (2019) 14:276. doi: 10.1186/s13023-019-1227-x
32. Bonne G, Rivier F, Hamroun D. The 2018 version of the gene table of monogenic neuromuscular disorders (nuclear genome). *Neuromuscul Disord.* (2017) 27:1152–83. doi: 10.1016/j.nmd.2017.10.005
33. Harris E, Laval S, Hudson J, Barresi R, De Waele L, Straub V, et al. Undiagnosed genetic muscle disease in the north of England: an in depth phenotype analysis. *PLoS Curr.* (2013) 5:ecurrents.md.37f840ca67f5e722945ecf755f40487e. doi: 10.1371/currents.md.37f840ca67f5e722945ecf755f40487e
34. Santos MA, Fineza I, Moreno T, Cabral P, Ferreira JC, Silva RL, et al. G.P.7 07 Epidemiology of neuromuscular disorders in Portugal at pediatric age. *Neuromuscular Disord.* (2006) 16:703. doi: 10.1016/j.nmd.2006.05.192
35. Tangsrud SE, Halvorsen S. Child neuromuscular disease in southern Norway. Prevalence, age and distribution of diagnosis with special reference to “non-Duchenne muscular dystrophy”. *Clin Genet.* (1988) 34:145–52. doi: 10.1111/j.1399-0004.1988.tb02854.x
36. Dubowitz V. Muscle disorders in childhood. *Major Probl Clin Pediatr.* (1978) 16:iii–xiii, 1–282.
37. Theadom A, Rodrigues M, Poke G, O’grady G, Love D, Hammond-Tooke G, et al. A Nationwide, population-based prevalence study of genetic muscle disorders. *Neuroepidemiology.* (2019) 52:128–35. doi: 10.1159/000494115
38. Witting N, Werlauff U, Duno M, Vissing J. Phenotypes, genotypes, and prevalence of congenital myopathies older than 5 years in Denmark. *Neurol Genet.* (2017) 3:e140. doi: 10.1212/NXG.0000000000000140

Publisher’s Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Copyright © 2022 Huang, Bi and Yang. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.