



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Roberto Cannataro,
University of Calabria, Italy

*CORRESPONDENCE

Mario Albaladejo-Saura
✉ mdalbaladejosaura@ucam.edu
Raquel Vaquero-Cristóbal
✉ raquel.vaquero@um.es

RECEIVED 29 August 2024

ACCEPTED 26 September 2024

PUBLISHED 21 October 2024

CITATION

Mecherques-Carini M, Albaladejo-Saura M, Vaquero-Cristóbal R, Baglietto N and Esparza-Ros F (2024) Corrigendum: Validity and agreement between dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry, anthropometry and bioelectrical impedance in the estimation of fat mass in young adults. *Front. Nutr.* 11:1488063. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2024.1488063

COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Mecherques-Carini, Albaladejo-Saura, Vaquero-Cristóbal, Baglietto and Esparza-Ros. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). 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.

Corrigendum: Validity and agreement between dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry, anthropometry and bioelectrical impedance in the estimation of fat mass in young adults

Malek Mecherques-Carini¹, Mario Albaladejo-Saura^{1*}, Raquel Vaquero-Cristóbal^{2*}, Nicolás Baglietto¹ and Francisco Esparza-Ros¹

¹International Kinanthropometry Chair, UCAM Universidad Católica San Antonio de Murcia, Murcia, Spain, ²Department of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences, Faculty of Sport Sciences, University of Murcia, San Javier, Spain

KEYWORDS

body composition, fat mass, anthropometry, bioelectrical impedance analysis, dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry

A Corrigendum on

Validity and agreement between dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry, anthropometry and bioelectrical impedance in the estimation of fat mass in young adults

by Mecherques-Carini, M., Albaladejo-Saura, M., Vaquero-Cristóbal, R., Baglietto, N., and Esparza-Ros, F. (2024). *Front. Nutr.* 11:1421950. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2024.1421950

In the published article, there was an error in **Material and methods**, *Design*, paragraph 1. The following sentence was erroneously added “The statistical power of the study was calculated for the sample indicated for the physical activity and AMD variables.”

The paragraph previously read as:

“The present research followed a descriptive, cross-sectional design. The sample recruitment was non-probabilistic by convenience. The calculation used to establish the minimum sample size was performed with Rstudio 3.15.0 software (Rstudio Inc., Boston, MA, United States). The significance level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$. The standard deviation (SD) for the total sample was set based on previous studies on the variables of fat mass percentage (SD = 5.19) (8). This methodology for sample size calculation has been used in previous research (42). Thus, the minimum sample size was 265 subjects, assuming an error (d) of 0.62% for fat mass percentage and for a 99% confidence interval (CI). Considering that acceptable statistical power is greater than 0.80 (43). The statistical power of the study was calculated for the sample indicated for the physical activity and AMD variables. The calculated statistical power was 0.96, which is high.”

The corrected paragraph should read as:

“The present research followed a descriptive, cross-sectional design. The sample recruitment was non-probabilistic by convenience. The calculation used to establish the minimum sample size was performed with Rstudio 3.15.0 software (Rstudio Inc., Boston, MA, United States). The significance level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$. The standard deviation (SD) for the total sample was set based on previous studies on the variables of fat mass percentage (SD = 5.19) (8). This methodology for sample size calculation has been used in previous research (42). Thus, the minimum sample size was 265 subjects, assuming an error (d) of 0.62% for fat mass percentage and for a 99% confidence interval (CI). Considering that acceptable statistical power is greater than 0.80 (43). The calculated statistical power was 0.96, which is high.”

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.