Author Correction: Covidization of research: what are the risks?

Madhukar Pai

Correction to: *Nature Medicine* https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-1015-0, published online 27 July 2020.

In the version of this article initially published, the second sentence of the eighth paragraph failed to include the attribution for that text. The correct attribution is as follows: "As described by Ballantyne and Dunning (https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/which-experts-should-you-listen-to-during-the-pandemic/#:~:text=In%20philosophy%2C%20this%20phenomenon%20has,where%20they%20lack%20crucial%20competence), by indulging in 'epistemic trespassing', wherein well-intentioned scientists with real expertise in one field intrude into another...." The error has been corrected in the HTML and PDF versions of the article.

Author Correction: A stochastic agent-based model of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in France

Nicolas Hoertel, Martin Blachier, Carlos Blanco, Mark Olfson, Marc Massetti, Marina Sánchez Rico, Frédéric Limosin and Henri Leleu

Correction to: *Nature Medicine* https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-1001-6, published online 14 July 2020.

In the version of this article initially published, two values in the final two sentences of the first paragraph of the 'Interventions' subsection of the Methods section ("...risk of transmission would be decreased by 53% if all individuals were wearing masks....both measures would reduce risk multiplicatively by 67%...") were incorrect. The correct text is as follows: "...risk of transmission would be decreased by 47% if all individuals were wearing masks....both measures would reduce risk multiplicatively by 63%...". Also, four values in the 'Efficacy of masks' section of Supplementary Table 3 (top group, "If efficacy is fixed at 79% (instead of 53% in the main analysis)"; second group, "If efficacy is fixed at 36% (instead of 53% in the main analysis)") were incorrect. The correct values are as follows: "If efficacy is fixed at 64% (instead of 47% in the main analysis)" (top group); and "If efficacy is fixed at 21% (instead of 47% in the main analysis)" (second group). Finally, three values in the first sentence of the legend to Extended Data Fig. 4 ("...at 36% **a**, **c**, **e**, and 79% **b**, **d**, **f**, instead of 53%...") were incorrect. The correct values are as follows: "...at 21% **a**, **c**, **e**, and 64% **b**, **d**, **f**, instead of 47%...". The errors have been corrected in the HTML and PDF versions of the article.