

# Journal of Biomedical Optics

[SPIEDigitalLibrary.org/jbo](http://SPIEDigitalLibrary.org/jbo)

## **Errata: Tri-modal confocal mosaics detect residual invasive squamous cell carcinoma in Mohs surgical excisions**

Dan Gareau  
Anna Bar  
Nicholas Snaveley  
Ken Lee  
Nathaniel Chen  
Neil Swanson  
Eric Simpson  
Steve Jacques

# Errata: Tri-modal confocal mosaics detect residual invasive squamous cell carcinoma in Mohs surgical excisions

Dan Gareau,<sup>a,b</sup> Anna Bar,<sup>a</sup> Nicholas Snaveley,<sup>a</sup> Ken Lee,<sup>a</sup> Nathaniel Chen,<sup>b</sup> Neil Swanson,<sup>a</sup> Eric Simpson,<sup>a</sup> and Steve Jacques<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Oregon Health & Science University, Department of Dermatology, CH16D, 3303 SW Bond Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97239

<sup>b</sup>Oregon Health & Science University, Department of Biomedical Engineering, CH16D, 3303 SW Bond Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97239

[DOI: [10.1117/1.JBO.19.2.029801](https://doi.org/10.1117/1.JBO.19.2.029801)]

This article [*J. Biomed. Opt.* **17**(6), 066018 (2012)] was originally published online on 6 June 2012 with errors Table 2 on p. 4. The corrected table is reprinted below.

**Table 2** Clinical review result.

Confocal screening result			↓	↓
			Negative	Positive
	Reviewer #1, Bar			
	→	Positive	0	50
	→	Negative	23	2
	Reviewer #2, Snaveley			
	→	Positive	0	50
	→	Negative	22	3

In addition, the text discussing this table contained errors in the specificity percentage values for the reviewed results. The final paragraph of Sec. 5 has been corrected to read:

Table 2 shows the results of the clinical review. The two reviewers (Bar and Snaveley) evaluated all the confocal submosaics correctly except for two and three false positives, respectively. The calculated diagnostic value from Table 2 is 100% for sensitivity, and 92% and 88% for specificity for Bar and Snaveley, respectively.

This article was corrected online on 14 February 2014.