
The article entitled “Systematic Review and Metaanalysis Comparing the Bias and Accuracy of the Modification of Diet in Renal Disease and Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration Equations in Community-Based Populations,” by Emily C. McFadden, Jennifer A. Hirst, Jan Y. Verbakel, Julie H. McLellan, F.D. Richard Hobbs, Richard J. Stevens, Chris A. O’Callaghan, and Daniel S. Lasserson (Clin Chem 2018;64:475–85), published in the March 2018 issue of *Clinical Chemistry*, contains errors.

In the Results section, under “Difference in Bias between CKD-EPI and MDRD Equations for eGFR” (page 479), the penultimate sentence of the paragraph should read, “Bias in the CKD-EPI equation was on average lower than mGFR by 2.8 mL/min/1.73 m² (95% CI, -0.4 to 6.0) with variation between studies (I^2 99.0; $P < 0.0001$) (Fig. 3).” Figure 3 is correct and unchanged. In the Discussion (page 479), the opening sentence should read, “In populations relevant to primary care, we found that both the MDRD and CKD-EPI equations underestimated GFR, though the estimate for CKD-EPI was not significantly different from mGFR. Estimates from CKD-EPI were slightly more accurate than those from MDRD.” In view of these changes, the abstract conclusion should read “Both equations may underestimate mGFR, but CKD-EPI gave more accurate estimates of GFR.”

The authors regret the errors.

DOI: 10.1093/clinchem/hvab083
