frontiers | Frontiers in Psychiatry

TYPE Correction
PUBLISHED 07 February 2023
DOI 10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1145593

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Thomas Nilsson,
University of Gothenburg, Sweden

*CORRESPONDENCE
Fritjof von Franqué
✉ f.von-franque@uke.de

SPECIALTY SECTION
This article was submitted to Forensic Psychiatry, a section of the journal Frontiers in Psychiatry

RECEIVED 16 January 2023
ACCEPTED 26 January 2023
PUBLISHED 07 February 2023

CITATION
von Franqué F and Briken P (2023) Corrigendum: Mandated or voluntary treatment of men who committed child sexual abuse: Is there a difference?
Front. Psychiatry 14:1145593.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1145593

Corrigendum: Mandated or voluntary treatment of men who committed child sexual abuse: Is there a difference?

Fritjof von Franqué* and Peer Briken

Institute for Sex Research, Sexual Medicine and Forensic Psychiatry, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

KEYWORDS

prevention, sexual violence, pedophilia, risk, need, responsivity, sexual offense, rehabilitation

A corrigendum on
Mandated or voluntary treatment of men who committed child sexual abuse: Is there a difference?

by von Franqué, F., and Briken, P. (2021). *Front. Psychiatry* 12:708210. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2021.708210

In the published article, there was an error in Table 3 as published. For the non-forensic group, the means and standard deviations were incorrectly reported as 2.55 (0.80) for Understanding and 2.27 (0.83) for Demonstration. The correct Table 3 with the corrected means and standard deviations for Understanding 10.18 (2.67) and Demonstration 8.89 (2.15) and its legend appear 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.

TABLE 3 Mean scores of forensic ($n = 22$) and non-forensic clients ($n = 22$) in TRS-10- items associated with dynamic risk as well as corresponding effect sizes.

TRS-2-Items	Forensic clients		Non-forensic clients		Effect size[a]	
	Understanding	Demonstration	Understanding	Demonstration	Understanding	Demonstration
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	*r*	*r*
Prosocial attitudes	2.55 (0.67)	2.27 (0.70)	2.55 (0.80)	2.27 (0.83)	−0.01	−0.01
Adequate coping skills/styles	2.05 (0.65)	1.68 (0.48)	2.18 (0.66)	1.77 (0.61)	−0.11	−0.06
Adequate intimacy skills	1.95 (0.79)	1.64 (0.65)	1.91 (0.75)	1.73 (0.77)	−0.03	−0.05
Good general self-regulation	2.18 (0.59)	2.09 (0.61)	2.09 (0.68)	1.82 (0.66)	−0.06	−0.21
Good sexual self-regulation	1.77 (0.61)	1.64 (0.58)	1.45 (0.67)	1.27 (0.46)	−0.28	−0.33
Total: functioning on dynamic risk factors	10.50 (2.35)	9.32 (2.19)	10.18 (2.67)	8.89 (2.15)	−0.09	−0.11

Increasing scores reflect normative functioning and therefore are negatively associated with dynamic risk factors. The exact Mann und Whitney U-Test was used for all comparisons between the subsamples. Regarding the total score, the significance level was set at $\alpha < 0.05$. For the analysis of the single items, a Bonferroni corrected $\alpha_{corr} = \alpha/5 = 0.01$ was used. All comparisons were nonsignificant. [a]The effect size r was calculated as **Z** statistic divided by the square root of the sample size ($Z/\sqrt{N}$).

10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1145593