

CORRECTION

Correction: Prostate cancer and podcasts: an analysis and assessment of the quality of information about prostate cancer available on podcasts

Colin Scott , Peter Campbell, Amy Nemirovsky, Stacy Loeb  and Rena Malik

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Limited 2023

Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases (2024) 27:355–356; <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41391-023-00721-y>

Correction to: *Prostate Cancer and Prostatic Diseases* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41391-023-00694-y>, published online 25 July 2023

There are typos in the “Results”, please find the corrected text below:

Results

Overall, 52% of podcasts were low-moderate quality. 35% had poor understandability, and 65% had poor actionability. Of the podcasts analyzed, 45% explicitly discussed shared decision making between physicians and patients, 12% contained moderate to high misinformation, and 7% had commercial bias (Table 1). 62% of the podcasts were targeted toward patients or the general public. Of these: 63% were rated as low-moderate quality, 9% had poor understandability, 50% had poor actionability, 45% discussed shared decision making, 16% contained moderate to high misinformation, and 10% had commercial bias (Table 1). When compared to podcasts targeted to medical professionals, a significantly greater number were rated as low-moderate quality

(63% vs. 34%; $p \leq 0.01$), while a smaller percent had poor understandability (9% vs. 76%; $p \leq 0.01$) and poor actionability (50% vs. 89%; $p \leq 0.01$). 21% of podcasts contained any amount of misinformation (low, moderate, or high).

43 podcasts discussed prostate cancer treatments, and of these, 63% discussed alternative treatments (surgery vs. radiation vs. active surveillance), and 63% discussed impacts on quality of life.

Regarding the creators and narrators: 28% were doctors, 20% were health and wellness channels, 12% were foundation/advocacy groups, 11% were medical education, 4% were patients, and 25% were “other.”

There were 5 podcasts with at least 1000 reviews on Apple podcasts. Of these, 4 were rated as low-moderate quality, 1 had poor understandability, 3 had poor actionability, and 1 contained moderate to high misinformation.

There are also typos in Table 1. Please find the correct table below:

Table 1. Analysis of prostate cancer content on podcasts.

	All podcasts (n = 100)	Podcasts targeted to general public (n = 62)	Podcasts targeted to medical professionals (n = 38)	p value
Poor quality (DISCERN ≤ 3), n (%)	52 (52)	39 (63)	13 (34)	<0.01
Poor understandability (PEMAT < 75%), n (%)	35 (35)	6 (9)	29 (76)	<0.01
Poor actionability (PEMAT < 75%), n (%)	65 (65)	31 (50)	34 (89)	<0.01
Shared decision making discussed, n (%)	45 (45)	28 (45)	17 (45)	0.97
Misinformation, n (%)	12 (12)	10 (16)	2 (5)	0.11
Commercial bias, n (%)	7 (7)	6 (10)	1 (3)	0.18

Bolded text indicates statistically significant *p*-values.