

Erratum to “Evaluation of a Suspended Personal Radiation Protection System vs. Conventional Apron and Shields in Clinical Interventional Procedures” [Open Journal of Radiology 3 (2013) 143-151]

Chet R. Rees

Baylor Scott and White Health, Dallas, USA

Email: chet.rees@bswhealth.org

How to cite this paper: Rees, C.R. (2017) Erratum to “Evaluation of a Suspended Personal Radiation Protection System vs. Conventional Apron and Shields in Clinical Interventional Procedures” [Open Journal of Radiology 3 (2013) 143-151]. *Open Journal of Radiology*, 7, 249-249. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojrad.2017.74027>

Received: May 16, 2013

Accepted: June 16, 2013

Published: June 23, 2013

Copyright © 2017 by author and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

The original online version of this article (C. Savage, T. Seale IV, C. Shaw, B. Angela, D. Marichal and C. Rees, “Evaluation of a Suspended Personal Radiation Protection System vs. Conventional Apron and Shields in Clinical Interventional Procedures,” *Open Journal of Radiology*, 3, 143-151.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojrad.2013.33024>) was mistaken of the total isolates number in **Table 2**. The authors wish to correct the errors to: **Table 2**. Other study parameters “Gycm” should be changed to “cGycm” All of the decimal points (“.”) should be changed to commas (“,”). For example, “47.486” should be “47,486”.

Table 2. Other study parameters.

	Dosimeter Type	Procedures (N)	Operators (N)	Minutes Fluoroscopy	Patient DAP (cGy cm ²)	
					DAP Fluoroscopy	DAP Total
Phase I	OSL badges	67				
	Zgrav	32	3	307	47,486 [*]	267,801
	LAS	35	3	307	50,561 ^{**}	318,839
Phase II	EDD-30					
	Eye	50				
	Zgrav	28	2	329	103,884	281,364
	LAS	22	3	122	47,734	222,364
	Wrist	21				
	Zgrav	15	2	186	83,316	414,680
	LAS	7	2	40	22,083	131,520

^{*}Data available for last 13 cases, 112 minutes of fluoroscopy. ^{**}Data available for last 14 cases, 132 minutes fluoroscopy.