



# Erratum: Occurrence and Risk Factors of Dog Bites in Northern Indigenous Communities: A Scoping Review

Frontiers Production Office\*

Frontiers Media SA, Lausanne, Switzerland

**Keywords:** scoping review, dog bites, epidemiology, indigenous, northern communities

## An Erratum on

### Occurrence and Risk Factors of Dog Bites in Northern Indigenous Communities: A Scoping Review

by Daigle, L., Delesalle, L., Ravel, A., Ford, B., and Aenishaenslin, C. (2022). *Front. Vet. Sci.* 9:777640. doi: 10.3389/fvets.2022.777640

## OPEN ACCESS

### Approved by:

Frontiers Editorial Office,  
Frontiers Media SA, Switzerland

### \*Correspondence:

Frontiers Production Office  
production.office@frontiersin.org

### Specialty section:

This article was submitted to  
Veterinary Epidemiology and  
Economics,  
a section of the journal  
Frontiers in Veterinary Science

**Received:** 20 June 2022

**Accepted:** 20 June 2022

**Published:** 18 July 2022

### Citation:

Frontiers Production Office (2022)  
Erratum: Occurrence and Risk Factors  
of Dog Bites in Northern Indigenous  
Communities: A Scoping Review.  
*Front. Vet. Sci.* 9:971946.  
doi: 10.3389/fvets.2022.971946

Due to a production error, the references were incorrectly numbered in Table 4 and in one paragraph.

A correction has been made to the section **Results**, subsection “*Characteristics of Sources of Evidence*,” paragraph one:

“The first article included was published in 2007 (35), but most studies (6/8) were published between 2010 and 2019 (Table 1). The northern Indigenous communities included or mentioned were Inuit from Nunavik, Canada (3/8) (7, 11, 20), Sahtu from Northwest Territories, Canada (1/8) (34), Cree and Assiniboine from Saskatchewan, Canada (2/8) (36, 37), and unspecified Natives from Alaska, USA (2/8) (10, 35). One of the United States studies (10) also compared dog bite injuries among children from non-Nordic (American Indian) and Nordic (Alaska Native) Indigenous communities and mentioned the Navajo and other American Indian communities from the USA as well. We found no publications from Eurasia.”

A correction has been made to **Table 4**. The corrected table appears below.

The publisher apologizes for this mistake. The original version of this article has been updated.

Copyright © 2022 Frontiers Production Office. 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.

**TABLE 4** | Dog bite risk factors identified by the studies included in the scoping review (some studies may have been classified in more than one categories).

Risk factors	Study design			Reported as hypothesis or cited from literature
	Qualitative design	Quantitative design		
	Evidence of importance by qualitative methods	Statistically significant association with the occurrence of bites	Suggesting a possible association without having proven it	
<b>Individual human factors</b>				
Age (children)	(11)	0	(10, 11, 34–36)	(7)
Gender (male)	0	(10), [11*]	(11, 34, 35)	(36)
Behavior toward dog (conflictual/provoked)	(7, 11, 37)	0	(11, 34, 35), [36*]	0
Sociocultural characteristics (ethnicity)	(36)	(35)	(7, 10, 11)	0
<b>Dog factors</b>				
Breeds/size	0	0	(35)	0
Function/role	(11)	0	(35)	0
Gender and reproductive status	0	0	0	(36)
Ownership or presence of a keeper	0	0	(35)	(37)
Number (lone dogs)	0	0	0	0
<b>Structural and environmental factors</b>				
Lack of veterinary service or animal control resources	(11, 36)	0	(10)	(7, 11, 34, 37)
Geographic remoteness	0	0	0	(34, 36)
Lack of legislative interventions	(7, 11)	0	(10)	(7, 36, 37)
Density of dogs in the community (overpopulation)	0	0	(10)	(7, 11, 34)
Free roaming	(7, 11), [7, 37*]	0	[35*]	(7, 37)
Seasonality (temporal variations)	(11)	(11)	(36)	0

[\*] Contradictory result.