Correction

This is a correction to: Damiano Ognissanti, Moa Andresen Bergström, Elvar Theodorsson, Anders Larsson, Gunnar Nordin, Ola Hammarsten, Estimating Analytical Errors of Glomerular Filtration Rate Measurement, *Clinical Chemistry*, Volume 68, Issue 9, September 2022, Pages 1211–1218, https://doi.org/10.1093/clinchem/hvac098

In this the originally published manuscript, percentages reported in Figure 4 and in the Results section are incorrect.

In the Results section of the Abstract, the sentence, "Theoretical GFR uncertainty could be lowered 2.6-fold if individually optimized time points for sampling had been used in our 731 clearance measurements." should read, "Theoretical GFR uncertainty could be lowered 3.2-fold if individually optimized time points for sampling had been used in our 731 clearance measurements."

In the Results section of the paper, the following: "If the theoretically optimal time points from Table 1 had been used, the CV_{GFR} could on average have been lowered 2.6-fold in all patients, 3.8-fold in patients with a GFR ≤60 mL/min/1.73 m^2, and 6.2-fold in patients with a GFR <40 mL/min/1.73 m^2. In simulations, where patient eGFR was used to optimize sampling times from Table 1, as suggested in online Supplemental Fig. 4, the median CV_{GFR} would have decreased from 17% to 4% (Fig. 4B)."

should read: "If the theoretically optimal time points from Table 1 had been used, the CV_{GFR} could on average have been lowered 3.2-fold in all patients, 3.9-fold in patients with a GFR ≤60 mL/min/1.73 m^2, and 5.0-fold in patients with a GFR <40 mL/min/1.73 m^2. In simulations, where patient eGFR was used to optimize sampling times from Table 1, as suggested in online Supplemental Fig. 4, the median CV_{GFR} would have decreased from 3.7% to 1.5% (Fig. 4B)."

In Figure 4, the y axes should read "0, 20, 40" instead of "0%, 50%, 100%, 150%".

The article has been corrected online. The authors regret the errors.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clinchem/hvac162