Corrigendum: Hidden figures: Revisiting doping prevalence estimates previously reported for two major international sport events in the context of further empirical evidence and the extant literature

Andrea Petróczi[1,2,3]*, Maarten Cruyff[4], Olivier de Hon[5], Dominic Sagoe[6] and Martial Saugy[7]

[1]School of Life Sciences, Pharmacy and Chemistry, Faculty of Health, Science, Social Care and Education, Kingston University, London, United Kingdom, [2]Department of Movement Sciences, Faculty of Movement and Rehabilitation Sciences, Katholieke Universiteit (KU) Leuven, Leuven, Belgium, [3]Willibald Gebhardt Research Institute, University of Münster, Münster, Germany, [4]Faculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands, [5]Doping Authority Netherlands, Capelle aan den IJssel, Netherlands, [6]Department of Psychosocial Science, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway, [7]Research and Expertise in anti-Doping Sciences (REDs), Institute of Sport Sciences, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

KEYWORDS

athlete, performance enhancement, doping, randomised response technique, prevalence, single sample count, prohibited substance, elite sport

Corrigendum on

Hidden figures: Revisiting doping prevalence estimates previously reported for two major international sport events in the context of further empirical evidence and the extant literature

By Petróczi A, Cruy M, de Hon O, Sagoe D and Saugy M (2022) Front. Sports Act. Living 4:1017329. doi: 10.3389/fspor.2022.1017329

Correction to Table/Figure

In the published article, there was an error in table 4 as published. There was an error in the estimated % of admitted doping (d) for H2: 0.3031 ± 0.0800 was erroneously listed for both the estimated % of admitted doping (d) and for the estimated % of noncompliance (nc). The correct value for the estimated % of admitted doping (d) is 0 and the value of the estimated % of noncompliance (nc) remains 0.3031 ± 0.0800. The corrected Table 4 and its caption Estimated use of prohibited performance enhancing substances and/or methods at WCA (12-month prevalence) appear below.

TABLE 4 Estimated use of prohibited performance enhancing substances and/or methods at WCA (12-month prevalence).

H	Model fit			Estimated % of admitted doping (d)	Estimated % of noncompliance (nc) p = 1.1E-16
	Log-likelihood	AIC	BIC		
H0	−1854.0342	3708.07	3708.07		
H1	−1853.9311	3709.86	3714.95	0.0132 ± 0.0576	0
H2	−1819.0675	3642.14	3652.32	0	0.3031 ± 0.0800
H3	−1819.5104	3643.02	3653.21	0.0132 ± 0.0576	0.0699 ± 0.0201
H4	**−1799.2650**	**3602.53**	**3612.72**	**0.2124 ± 0.0873**	**0.3190 ± 0.0562**
H5	−1853.9311	3711.86	3722.05	0.0132 ± 0.0576	0

In Figure 3: Comparison of doping prevalence estimates for WCA and PAG between the two survey formats, and with literature evidence. Data extracted from Table 1 using the most relevant figure (i.e., elite level and current/last season/past 12 months) when multiple estimates are reported. In the figure legend 'ABP Blood doping WAC 2021' should read as 'ABP Blood doping WCA 2011'.

Incorrect Supplementary Material

In the published article, there was an error in Supplementary Material 2: Detailed prevalence and noncompliance estimations, Table 2.1: Detailed prevalence and noncompliance estimations for WAC and PAG, 2011. Incorrect values were reported for 'Estimation'. The correct material statement appears below.

Model			WAC doping use	PAG doping use	PAG nutritional supplement use
Estimation	*d*	Lowest	0.1251	0.0290	0.0103
		Highest	0.2997	0.1836	0.1611
		Midpoint of multiplied Cis	0.2124	0.1063	0.0857
	CI (d)		0.0872	0.0773	0.0754
	nc	Lowest	0.2628	0.0927	0.0531
		Highest	0.3752	0.1043	0.1755
		Midpoint of multiplied Cis	0.3190	0.0985	0.1143
	CI (nc)		0.0562	0.0058	0.0612
D	*d*nc*	Lowest	0.03287628	0.00268714	0.00054693
		Highest	0.11244744	0.019156824	0.02827305
		Midpoint of multiplied Cis	0.07266186	0.010921982	0.01440999
	d (1-nc)*	Lowest	0.07816248	0.02597414	0.00849235
		Highest	0.22093884	0.166587624	0.15254559
		Midpoint of multiplied Cis	0.14955066	0.096280882	0.08051897
NC	*(1-d)*nc*	Lowest	0.18403884	0.075647624	0.04454559
		Highest	0.32826248	0.101314104	0.17369235
		Midpoint of multiplied CIs	0.25615066	0.088480882	0.10911897
	(1-d) (1-nc)*	Lowest	0.43754744	0.731216824	0.69167305
		Highest	0.64497628	0.881027140	0.93714693
		Midpoint of multiplied CIs	0.54126186	0.806121982	0.81440999

The authors apologize for these error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.