**Errata**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Corrected Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>p.32</td>
<td>The number of quite sure in Paper II – intervention group reads 31 - it should read <strong>35</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | Table 10 | p.39 | The legend reads: Odds ratios of degree of suspicion of pneumonia...  
It should read: Odds ratios of **any** degree of suspicion of pneumonia... |
| 3 | Paper I Table 1, p 4 in article: | | The symbol > should be ≥  
The variable “Age ≥65 years” is missing. The variable resulted in a **p-value of 0.25** and unadjusted/adjusted OR of **1.6 (0.71-3.7)** and **1.3 (0.41-4.1)** respectively.  
The lower confidence interval for OR in crude analyses of current smoker reads 0.9. It should read **0.09**.  
The multiple logistic regression of gender resulted in a p-value of 0.28, OR 0.52 (0.16-1.7). |
| 4 | Paper III Table 1, p 6 in manuscript: | | In the columns ‘Number of patients’ and ‘Data Missing’, the figures within brackets represent proportions (%) |
| 5 | Paper IV in article | | In the part Comparison with existing literature, p 7, third paragraph, it reads:  
“...one study by van Vugt et al showed that low values does not exclude radiographic pneumonia, whereas a study by Lagerström et al suggested that CRP testing can help to exclude pneumonia”  
It should read:  
“...one study by **Lagerström et al** showed that low values does not exclude radiographic pneumonia, whereas a study by **van Vugt et al** suggested that CRP testing can help to exclude pneumonia” |