



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Gabriele Nibbio,
University of Brescia, Italy

*CORRESPONDENCE
Huijuan He
✉ hhjiabei@hbtcn.edu.cn

RECEIVED 30 November 2023
ACCEPTED 07 December 2023
PUBLISHED 04 January 2024

CITATION
Zhang Y, He H, Yang C, Wang X, Luo J, Xiao J,
Fu B, Chen Y and Ma C (2024) Corrigendum:
Chain mediations of perceived social support
and emotional regulation efficacy between role
stress and compassion fatigue: insights from
the COVID-19 pandemic.
Front. Public Health 11:1346956.
doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2023.1346956

COPYRIGHT
© 2024 Zhang, He, Yang, Wang, Luo, Xiao, Fu,
Chen and Ma. 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: Chain mediations of perceived social support and emotional regulation efficacy between role stress and compassion fatigue: insights from the COVID-19 pandemic

Yuan Zhang¹, Huijuan He^{1*}, Chongming Yang², Xiangrong Wang¹,
Jiang'an Luo¹, Jie Xiao¹, Bei Fu¹, Yiwen Chen¹ and Chenjuan Ma³

¹School of Nursing, Hubei University of Chinese Medicine, Wuhan, Hubei, China, ²College of Family, Home, and Social Sciences, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT, United States, ³NYU Rory Meyers College of Nursing, New York, NY, United States

KEYWORDS

COVID-19, compassion fatigue, emotional regulation efficacy, nurses, perceived social support, role stress

A corrigendum on

[Chain mediations of perceived social support and emotional regulation efficacy between role stress and compassion fatigue: insights from the COVID-19 pandemic](#)

by Zhang, Y., He, H., Yang, C., Wang, X., Luo, J., Xiao, J., Fu, B., Chen, Y., and Ma, C. (2023). *Front. Public Health*. 11:1269594. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2023.1269594

In the published article, there was an error in [Table 1](#). Instead of “tertiary hospital, secondary hospital and community hospital”, it should be “Grade A tertiary hospital, Grade B tertiary hospital, Grade A secondary hospital, Grade B secondary hospital and community hospital.” The corrected [Table 1](#) 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.

TABLE 1 Sociodemographic information and distribution of compassion fatigue (n = 500).

Factors	N(%)	Compassion fatigue M(SD)	t/F	p
Gender				
Male	23 (4.6)	81.65 (11.55)	-0.10	0.92
Female	477 (95.4)	81.88 (10.78)		
Age				
≤25	87 (17.4)	84.01 (11.14)	1.99	0.12
26–35	308 (61.6)	81.18 (10.99)		
36–45	78 (15.6)	81.47 (9.97)		
≥46	27 (5.4)	84.07 (8.92)		
Educational level				
Technical secondary school	7 (1.4)	86.29 (5.56)	3.00	0.03
Junior college	83 (16.6)	80.40 (9.57)		
Undergraduate college	397 (79.4)	81.86 (10.99)		
Postgraduate or above	13 (2.6)	89.31 (11.54)		
Marital status				
Unmarried/single	94 (18.8)	81.90 (10.36)	2.70	0.03
Unmarried with a partner	50 (10.0)	85.82 (12.30)		
Married w/kids	299 (59.8)	81.26 (10.54)		
Married w/o kids	45 (9.0)	80.31 (11.50)		
Divorced/Widowed	12 (2.4)	86.33 (7.66)		
Hospital rank				
Grade A tertiary hospital	303 (60.6)	81.00 (10.91)	3.16	0.01
Grade B tertiary hospital	17 (3.4)	88.06 (13.35)		
Grade A secondary hospital	146 (29.2)	83.27 (9.70)		
Grade B secondary hospital	16 (3.2)	83.25 (12.47)		
Community hospital	18 (3.6)	78.11 (10.85)		
Job title				
Level 1	323 (64.6)	81.51 (11.06)	2.40	0.07
Level 2	153 (30.6)	81.84 (9.84)		
Level 3	20 (4.0)	88.15 (12.56)		
Level 4	4 (0.8)	81.25 (9.88)		
Employment methods				
Contract system	366 (73.2)	81.66 (10.90)	1.89	0.15
Personnel agency	69 (13.8)	80.83 (10.26)		
Formal staffing	65 (13.0)	84.18 (10.63)		

(Continued)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Factors	N(%)	Compassion fatigue M(SD)	t/F	p
Monthly income (RMB)				
<3,000	40 (8.0)	81.28 (12.09)	0.69	0.56
3,001–6,000	247 (49.4)	82.61 (10.41)		
6,001–9,000	152 (30.4)	80.93 (11.06)		
9,001–12,000	42 (8.4)	81.12 (10.05)		
>12,000	19 (3.8)	82.74 (12.67)		
Years of working				
<1	23 (4.6)	85.65 (10.17)	2.39	0.07
1–5	138 (27.6)	82.75 (11.36)		
5–20	295 (59.0)	80.92 (10.63)		
≥20	44 (8.8)	83.57 (9.87)		
Weekly night shift				
0	166 (33.2)	81.26 (10.63)	0.61	0.65
1–3	243 (48.6)	81.85 (10.67)		
≥3	91 (18.2)	83.05 (11.45)		
Sleep time (hour)				
<4	69 (13.8)	85.90 (11.86)	4.30	< 0.01
4–6	308 (61.6)	81.41 (10.21)		
6–8	109 (21.8)	81.17 (11.43)		
≥8	14 (2.8)	77.79 (8.94)		