

## ERRATUM – Male circumcision and prostate cancer (Table 3)

Cite as: *Can Urol Assoc J* 2021;15(3):E196. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5489/cuaj.7192>

In response to a reader query regarding a recently published paper entitled, “Male circumcision and prostate cancer: A geographical analysis, meta-analysis, and cost analysis,” (Citation: Van Howe RS. *Can Urol Assoc J* 2020;14(7):E334-40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5489/cuaj.6126>), a statistical re-review was conducted and an apparent mislabeling of the column headings in Table 3 was identified. The author revised the table with the correct column headings (below).

Please visit <https://cuaj.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/6126/4513> for a corrected version of the full manuscript. *CUAJ* regrets the oversight and apologizes for any inconvenience.

**Table 3. Meta-analysis of studies assessing the association between male circumcision and prostate cancer considering intact genitalia as a risk factor**

Study	Intact case	Circumcised case	Intact control	Circumcised control	Odds ratio	95% confidence interval
Kaplan	34	19	90	61	1.21	0.63, 2.32
Wynder	143	29	121	21	0.86	0.46, 1.58
Rotkin	52	59	54	57	0.93	0.55, 1.58
Ross – White	81	61	57	85	1.98	1.23, 3.18
Ross – Black	99	43	84	58	1.59	0.97, 2.59
Mandel	124	102	137	103	0.91	0.63, 1.32
Newell	50	44	114	53	0.53	0.31, 0.89
Ewings	123	36	221	104	1.61	1.04, 2.49
Rosenblatt	253	500	215	488	1.15	0.92, 1.43
Madsen	85	1	99	4	3.43	0.38, 31.32
Wright	294	707	254	688	1.03	0.92, 1.37
Spence – White	814	526	790	525	1.03	0.88, 1.20
Spence – Black	81	22	44	31	2.59	1.34, 3.63
Spence – Asian	19	6	50	20	1.05	0.44, 5.01
Spence – other	42	33	59	53	1.14	0.64, 2.06
Nair-Shalliker	389	931	296	712	1.01	0.84, 1.20
Random-effects summary effects OR					1.10	0.96, 1.26

Between-study heterogeneity  $\chi^2_{15}=27.43$ ;  $p=0.03$ ;  $I^2=82.8\%$ .