



Corrigendum: Effectiveness of Improved Use of Chewing Gum During Capsule Endoscopy in Decreasing Gastric Transit Time: A Prospective Randomized Controlled Study

Liang Huang^{1†}, Yue Hu^{1†}, Fang Chen², Shan Liu¹ and Bin Lu^{1*}

¹ First Affiliated Hospital, Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou, China, ² Department of Gastroenterology, Hangzhou Red Cross Hospital, Hangzhou, China

Keywords: small bowel capsule endoscopy, chewing gum, gastric transit time, small bowel transit time, gastroscopy intervention

OPEN ACCESS

Approved by:

Frontiers Editorial Office,
Frontiers Media SA, Switzerland

*Correspondence:

Bin Lu
drivbin@163.com

[†]These authors have contributed
equally to this work

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Gastroenterology,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Medicine

Received: 30 October 2021

Accepted: 29 December 2021

Published: 24 January 2022

Citation:

Huang L, Hu Y, Chen F, Liu S and Lu B
(2022) Corrigendum: Effectiveness of
Improved Use of Chewing Gum
During Capsule Endoscopy in
Decreasing Gastric Transit Time: A
Prospective Randomized Controlled
Study. *Front. Med.* 8:805642.
doi: 10.3389/fmed.2021.805642

A Corrigendum on

Effectiveness of Improved Use of Chewing Gum During Capsule Endoscopy in Decreasing Gastric Transit Time: A Prospective Randomized Controlled Study

by Huang, L., Hu, Y., Chen, F., Liu, S., and Lu, B. (2021). *Front. Med.* 8:605393.
doi: 10.3389/fmed.2021.605393

In the original article, there was an error. “19.0 min” should be “29.0 min” in the **Abstract**.

A correction has been made to **Abstract, Results**, Paragraph One:

Results: GTT was shorter in the chewing gum group (29.0 min, interquartile range: 17.0–52.0 min) than in the control group [42.5 min (23.25–60 min); $P = 0.01$].

In the original article, there was an error. “DY (66.02 vs. 59.80%, $P = 0.359$)” should be “DY (67.96 vs. 59.80%, $P = 0.224$)” in **Abstract**.

A correction has been made to **Abstract, Results**, Paragraph One:

CR (95.15 vs. 89.22%, $P = 0.114$) and DY (67.96 vs. 59.80%, $P = 0.224$) did not differ between the groups.


In the original article, there was an error. “ $P = 0.359$ ” should be “ $P = 0.224$ ” in the **Results** section.

A correction has been made to **Results, Outcomes**, Paragraph Two:


The DY and CR also did not significantly differ between the chewing gum and control groups ($P = 0.224$ and $P = 0.114$, respectively).

In the original article, there was a mistake in **Figures 2, 3** as published. The order of **Figures 2, 3** are reversed. The corrected **Figures 2, 3** appears below.

The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.



Publisher’s Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.



Copyright © 2022 Huang, Hu, Chen, Liu and Lu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.