

## Corrections

**Correction in Article by Cano et al. “Spanish Pacemaker Registry. 14th Official Report of the Spanish Society of Cardiology Working Group on Cardiac Pacing (2016)”, *Rev Esp Cardiol.* 2017;70:1083–1097**



**Corrección en el artículo de Cano et al. «Registro Español de Marcapasos. XIV Informe Oficial de la Sección de Estimulación Cardíaca de la Sociedad Española de Cardiología (2016)», *Rev Esp Cardiol.* 2017;70:1083–1097**

In the article by Cano et al. titled “Spanish Pacemaker Registry. 14th Official Report of the Spanish Society of Cardiology Working Group on Cardiac Pacing (2016)”, the authors would like to report the following errors.

The last sentence of the **Conclusions** section in the abstract, where it says “Age and sex directly influenced pacing mode selection, which could be improved in around 32% of patients”, it should say “Age and sex directly influenced pacing mode selection, which could be improved in around 22.3% of patients”.

In the sub-section **Remote Monitoring/Follow-up**, where it says “In 2016, there was a significant increase in the use of remote monitoring, involving 4373 pacemakers (11.5% of all implanted pacemakers) and 781 CRT-P devices (65% of all CRT-P devices)”, it should say “In 2016, there was a significant increase in the use of remote monitoring, involving 3895 pacemakers (10.2% of all implanted pacemakers) and 299 CRT-P devices (24.4% of all CRT-P devices)”.

In the sub-section **Pacing Modes**, where it says “Taking into account the electrocardiographic diagnosis prior to implantation, with only 7.4% of implants being performed in patients with permanent atrial tachyarrhythmia, an estimated 32% of the patients who received single-chamber ventricular pacing”, it should say “Taking into account the electrocardiographic diagnosis prior to implantation, with only 17% of implants being performed in patients with permanent atrial tachyarrhythmia, an estimated 22.3% of the patients who received single-chamber ventricular pacing”

In the **Discussion** section, where it says “from 5% to 20% in conventional pacemakers and from 15.9% to 65% in CRT-P devices, it should say, “from 5% to 10.2% in conventional pacemakers and from 15.9% to 24.2% in CRT-P devices.

These corrections were made to the electronic version of the article on 20 March 2018.

---

SEE RELATED CONTENT:

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rec.2017.08.017>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rec.2018.01.017>  
1885-5857/