



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Susan Loveall,
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, United States

*CORRESPONDENCE
Silje Hokstad
✉ silje.hokstad@inn.no

RECEIVED 30 May 2024
ACCEPTED 17 June 2024
PUBLISHED 03 July 2024

CITATION
Hokstad S and Næss K-AB (2024)
Corrigendum: Stuttering in individuals with
Down syndrome: a systematic review of
earlier research. *Front. Psychol.* 15:1440913.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1440913

COPYRIGHT
© 2024 Hokstad and Næss. 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: Stuttering in individuals with Down syndrome: a systematic review of earlier research

Silje Hokstad^{1,2*} and Kari-Anne B. Næss¹

¹Department of Education, Lillehammer, Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences, Lillehammer, Norway, ²Department of Special Needs Education, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

KEYWORDS

Down syndrome, stuttering, speech, disfluency, stuttering assessment, systematic review

A corrigendum on

Stuttering in individuals with Down syndrome: a systematic review of earlier research

by Hokstad, S., and Næss, K.-A. B. (2023). *Front. Psychol.* 14:1176743.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1176743

In the published article, there was an error in [Table 4](#). The study by Rabensteiner (1975) was missing in the table. The corrected [Table 4](#), “Measurement approaches,” and its caption 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 4 Measurement approaches.

Study	Assessor(s)			
	Assessor(s)	Clinical judgment, parental judgment, self-report, or other	Speaking situation as described in study	Speech sample (audio/video, duration and number of utterances, words, or syllables), written sources, real-time observation (duration and/or number of utterances, words, or syllables), or own experience
Devenny and Silverman (1990)	SLPs	Clinical judgment	Conversation about work and recreation	Speech sample (video, 10 min, first 150 words)
Eggers and van Eerdenbrugh (2018)	Authors	Clinical judgment	Play session with toy or book adapted to age and interests	Speech sample (audio, 15 min, 50 utterances ¹)
Gottsleben (1955)	Author and SLPs	Clinical judgment	NR	Written sources
Hokstad et al. (2022)	Researchers	Clinical judgment	Picture book dialogue and story-retelling	Speech sample (audio, unknown duration/number of utterances/words/syllables)
Keane (1970)	1 = SLP 2 = SLPs and other (clinical experience with stutterers)	Clinical judgment	1 and 2 = Interviews about daily life and interests	1 = Real-time observation (ca. 10 min), 2 = Speech sample (video, mean duration 10 min)
Kumin (1994)	Parent	Parental judgment	NR	Real-time observation (NR)
Martyn et al. (1969)	SLPs and students	Clinical judgment	Conversation, interview or reading sample adapted to the level of intellectual disability	Real-time observation (NR)
Preus (1972)	1) NR 2) Other (personnel day institutions) 3) NR	Clinical judgment	1) Spontaneous speech evoked by means of conversation pictures 2) Daily interaction 3) NR	1) Speech sample (audio, mean duration 9.47 min, min/max = 3.5–28 min, minimum 200 words) 2) real-time observation (NR) 3) NR
Rabensteiner (1975)	Other (two observers)	Clinical judgment	Test situation	Real-time observation
Rohovsky (1965)	10 grad. students (speech and hearing science)	Clinical judgment	Story retelling	Speech sample (audio, 30 s)
Salihovic et al. (2012)	SLPs	Clinical judgment	Spontaneous speech elicited through pictures	1 and 2 = Speech sample (audio, minimum 200 syllables) 3 = real-time observation (minimum 200 syllables)
Schieve et al. (2009)	Adult family member (usually parent)	Parental judgment	NR	Real-time observation (NR)
Schlanger and Gottsleben (1957)	Authors/researchers	Clinical judgment	NR	Written sources
Stansfield (1990)	1 = Other (nursing or ATC staff) 2 and 3 = SLP and students	1 = Other (paid caregivers) 2 and 3 = Clinical judgment	1 = NR 2 = Informal interaction 3 = Assessment situation	1 = Real-time observation (NR) 2 = Real-time observation (5 min) 3 = Speech sample (audio, 30 min)

In cases where assessments have been conducted in several stages each stage is numbered, SLP, speech and language pathologist; min, minutes; NR, not reported. ¹When 50 utterances were not available the maximum number of utterances was used. In cases in which assessments have been conducted in several stages, each stage is numbered, SLP, speech and language pathologist; ATC staff, adult training center staff; min, minutes; NR, not reported; grad., graduate.