






## Correction to: Refractory full thickness macular hole: current surgical management

Rino Frisina  · Irene Gius  · Luigi Tozzi · Edoardo Midena 


Published online: 25 February 2022

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to The Royal College of Ophthalmologists 2022


Correction to: *Eye*

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41433-020-01330-y>

The original version of this article unfortunately contained a mistake. Figures 3 and 5 were incomplete. The corrected figures are given below. The original article has been corrected.



**Fig. 3** Forest plot from meta-analysis of weighted closure rate of refractory full thickness macular hole (FTMH) for all articles. No significant difference in refractory FTMH closure rate among the 36 articles was detected.



Heterogeneity test  $Q = 196.034, P < 0.0001; I^2 = 84.19\%$  (95%CI 78.62 to 88.30)

Footnotes

BCVA=Best corrected visual acuity. logMAR=logarithm of minimum angle of resolution. SE=standard error. CI= confidence interval

Fig. 5 Forest plot from meta-analysis of best-corrected visual acuity (BCVA) gain among the 32 analysed articles. Significant difference in BCVA gain among the surgical technique subgroups was demonstrated.