Correction: Pessaries in multiple pregnancy as a prevention of preterm birth: the ProTwin Trial
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The initial sample size calculation in our protocol [1] was based on the expected proportion of ‘bad neonatal outcome’ in the intervention group (3.9%) and control group (7.2%) and accounts for the fact that the outcomes in children from multiple pregnancies are non-independent using an intra class correlation of 0.6. As the intervention is performed on the mother, analysis should be done on the maternal level. This adjustment was made during recruitment and approved by the medical ethics committee. The sample size is calculated based on the primary outcome ‘bad neonatal outcome’. In the control group, ‘bad neonatal outcome’ is expected in 7.2% of the children (1.8% * 77% +5.4% * 35% + 7.2% * 12% + 35.6% * 8% +50% * .5% = 7.2%). In this calculation, the first rate represents the probability that a patient delivers at that gestational age, whereas the second rate represents the probability of ‘bad neonatal outcome’ at that particular gestational age. In case of treatment, ‘bad neonatal outcome’ is then expected in 3.9% of the children (0.9% * 77% + 2.7% *35% + 3.6% * 12% + 17.8% * 8% + 75% * .5% = 3.9%). On the mother level this corresponds to an expected ‘bad neonatal outcome’ in at least one of two children of 12.4% in the control group and 6.7% in case of treatment. Using a two-sided test with an alpha of 0.05 and a power of 0.80 we need 400 women in the control group and 400 in the intervention group.

* Medical Ethics Committee, Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, the Netherlands (ref. No. MEC 09/107).

Author details
1Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Onze Lieve Vrouwe Gasthuis Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands 2Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Academic Medical Centre Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands 3Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Academic Hospital Maastricht, Maastricht, the Netherlands 4Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Academic Hospital Utrecht, Utrecht, the Netherlands 5Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, VU Medical Center Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands 6Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Academic Hospital Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands 7Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Erasmus Medical Center Rotterdam, Rotterdam, the Netherlands 8Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University Medical Center St Radboud Nijmegen, Nijmegen, the Netherlands 9Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Isala Hospital, Zwolle, the Netherlands 10Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, VU Medical Center Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands 11Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

Received: 5 April 2012 Accepted: 23 May 2012 Published: 23 May 2012

References

doi:10.1186/1471-2393-12-37

Submit your next manuscript to BioMed Central and take full advantage of:
- Convenient online submission
- Thorough peer review
- No space constraints or color figure charges
- Immediate publication on acceptance
- Inclusion in PubMed, CAS, Scopus and Google Scholar
- Research which is freely available for redistribution

Submit your manuscript at www.biomedcentral.com/submit