

ERRATUM

Open Access



Erratum to: What value is the CINAHL database when searching for systematic reviews of qualitative studies?

Kath Wright^{1*}, Su Golder² and Kate Lewis-Light¹

Erratum

After publication of [1] it came to the authors' attention that three percentage (%) symbols were missed upon publication of their manuscript. The incorrect statement present in the Abstract and Results is "The median number of unique studies was 9.09; while the range had a lowest value of 5.0 to the highest value of 33.0". The correct statement is "The median % of unique studies was 9.09%; while the range had a lowest value of 5.0% to the highest value of 33.0%". This has been updated in the original article.

Author details

¹Centre for Reviews & Dissemination, University of York, York, UK

²Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK

Published online: 20 November 2015

References

1. Wright K, Golder S, Lewis-Light K. What value is the CINAHL database when searching for systematic reviews of qualitative studies? *Systematic Reviews*. 2015;4:104.

Submit your next manuscript to BioMed Central and take full advantage of:

- Convenient online submission
- Thorough peer review
- No space constraints or color figure charges
- Immediate publication on acceptance
- Inclusion in PubMed, CAS, Scopus and Google Scholar
- Research which is freely available for redistribution

Submit your manuscript at
www.biomedcentral.com/submit



* Correspondence: kath.wright@york.ac.uk

¹Centre for Reviews & Dissemination, University of York, York, UK