



OPEN ACCESS

APPROVED BY
Yukiori Goto,
Kyoto University, Japan

*CORRESPONDENCE
Lucy J. Troup
✉ Lucy.Troup@uws.ac.uk

RECEIVED 10 January 2024
ACCEPTED 23 January 2024
PUBLISHED 13 February 2024

CITATION
Ciesluk B, Erridge S, Sodergren MH and
Troup LJ (2024) Corrigendum: Cannabis use
in the UK: a quantitative comparison of
individual differences in medical and
recreational cannabis users.
Front. Psychol. 15:1368554.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1368554

COPYRIGHT
© 2024 Ciesluk, Erridge, Sodergren and
Troup. 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.

Corrigendum: Cannabis use in the UK: a quantitative comparison of individual differences in medical and recreational cannabis users

Beata Ciesluk¹, Simon Erridge^{2,3}, Mikael H. Sodergren^{2,3,4} and Lucy J. Troup^{1*}

¹Division of Psychology, School of Education and Social Sciences, University of the West of Scotland, Paisley, United Kingdom, ²Medical Cannabis Research Group, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom, ³Sapphire Medical Clinics, London, United Kingdom, ⁴Curaleaf International, London, United Kingdom

KEYWORDS

cannabis, cannabinoid, medical cannabis, recreational drug use, anxiety, depression

A corrigendum on

Cannabis use in the UK: a quantitative comparison of individual differences in medical and recreational cannabis users

by Ciesluk, B., Erridge, S., Sodergren, M. H., and Troup, L. J. (2024). *Front. Psychol.* 14:1279123. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1279123

In the published article, there were errors in the figure numbering and captions.

Figure 2 should be re-numbered to be Figure 5, and the caption should be changed to “Differences in mean scores on motive subscales between RCU and MCU”.

Figure 3 should be re-numbered to be Figure 2, with the caption “Differences in percentage frequency of self-reported current psychological diagnoses between RCU and MCU.”

Figure 4 should be re-numbered to be Figure 3, with the caption “Differences in mean score on mental health measures between RCU and MCU.”

Figure 5 should be re-numbered to be Figure 4, with the caption “Total sample mean scores on motives subscales.”

Additionally, in the published article, there were errors in the in-text figure citations.

Where Figure 3 has been cited in the text of Section 3.1.4 Current psychological diagnoses, this should instead be “Figure 2”. The corrected sentence is below.

“No differences between the two groups in substance use-related disorders and other psychological disorders were found ($p > 0.050$) (see Figure 2; Table 1).”

Where Figure 4 has been cited in the text of Section 3.2 Mental health, this should instead be “Figure 3”. The corrected sentence is below.

“This interaction is illustrated in Figure 3.”

Where Figure 4 has been cited in Section 3.3 Motives, this should instead be “Figure 5”. The corrected sentence is below.

“Using the Greenhouse–Geisser correction, there was a significant main effect of motives [$F_{(7.74,1230.57)} = 119.314, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.32$], with *Enjoyment* ($M = 11.08$,

$SD = 3.55$), *Low Risk* ($M = 10.34$, $SD = 3.92$), and *Sleep* ($M = 9.66$, $SD = 4.14$) motives having the highest overall scores and *Conformity* ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 1.0$) and *Alcohol* ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 2.03$) motives having the lowest overall scores regardless of group (Table 4; Figure 5)."

Where Figure 5 has been cited in the text of Section 3.2 Mental health, this should instead be "Figure 3". The corrected sentence is below.

"As observed in Figure 3, RCUs scored lower on all the mental health measures except from *State Anxiety* scores ($p < 0.001$)."

Additionally, in Section 3.1.3 Substance use, instead of "(see Figure 2; Table 1)", only Table 1 should be cited here. A correction has been made to **Section 3 Results**, "3.1.3 Substance use". The corrected paragraph is shown below.

"Considering substance use prior to completing the survey, there were only significant differences for cannabis use ($p = 0.006$) (see Table 1), with MCUs presenting a higher frequency of cannabis use 24 h prior to taking the survey ($n = 71$; 88.75%) than RCUs ($n = 53$; 66.25%; $p < 0.001$) and 8 h prior to completing the survey ($n = 49$; 61.25%; $p = 0.006$) than RCUs ($n = 32$; 40%; $p = 0.006$). There were no significant differences in caffeine, alcohol, and tobacco use between the two groups ($p > 0.050$)."

Lastly, in Section 3.3 *Motives*, Figure 4 and Figure 5 should be cited along with Table 4 and Table 5, respectively. Corrections have been made to **Section 3 Results**, "3.3 *Motives*", Paragraphs 1 and 2. The corrected paragraphs are shown below.

"The differences in motives for cannabis use between RCUs and MCUs were assessed by the CMMQ, which has

12 subscales (*Enjoyment, Conformity, Coping, Experimentation, Boredom, Alcohol, Celebration, Altered Perception, Social Anxiety, Low Risk, Sleep, and Availability*). Descriptive statistics for each subscale and group scores are displayed in Table 4 and Figure 4."

"The differences in motives between MCUs and RCUs were analyzed using a mixed-design (2×12) ANOVA (see Table 5; Figure 5) with within-subject factors of motives subscales (*Enjoyment, Conformity, Coping, Experimentation, Boredom, Alcohol, Celebration, Altered Perception, Social Anxiety, Low Risk, Sleep, and Availability*) and between-subject factors of cannabis user group (RCUs and MCUs). Mauchly's test of sphericity indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated [$\chi^2_{(65)} = 0.084$, $p < 0.001$]; therefore, degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse–Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\epsilon = 0.70$)."

The authors apologize for these errors and state that they do 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.