



OPEN

Author Correction: Alexithymia traits outweigh autism traits in the explanation of depression in adults with autism

Carola Bloch , Lana Burghof, Fritz-Georg Lehnhardt, Kai Vogeley & Christine Falter-Wagner

Correction to: *Scientific Reports* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-81696-5>, published online 26 January 2021

The original version of this Article contained errors, that affected the descriptive statistics. Inferential statistics remained unaffected.

In Table 1, the Cohen's d values were incorrectly given. The correct and incorrect values appear below.

Incorrect:

	d
Age	0.057
IQ	-0.212
PIQ	-0.107
VIQ	-0.314

Correct:

	d
Age	0.027
IQ	-0.230
PIQ	-0.117
VIQ	-0.326

As a result, in the Method section, under the subheading 'Statistical procedures',

"The samples differed significantly in IQ scores, with higher scores in the ASD+ sample ($t(398) = -2.055, p < 0.05, d = -0.212$), driven by higher scores in VIQ ($t(398) = -2.942, p < 0.05, d = -0.314$)."

now reads:

"The samples differed significantly in IQ scores, with higher scores in the ASD+ sample ($t(398) = -2.055, p < 0.05, d = -0.230$), driven by higher scores in VIQ ($t(398) = -2.942, p < 0.05, d = -0.326$)."

In the Results section,

"The ASD+ sample did not significantly differ from the ASD- sample in any TAS-20 subdomains, DIF ($t(398) = 1.698, p = 0.090, d = 0.186$), DDF ($t(398) = -0.555, p = 0.579, d = -0.061$), and EOT ($t(398) = 0.488, p = 0.626, d = 0.053$). The groups did not differ significantly in their levels of AQ ($t(398) = -1.693, p = 0.091, d = -0.185$) and BDI ($t(398) = 1.579, p = 0.115, d = 0.173$)."

Published online: 17 September 2021

now reads:

“The ASD+ sample did not significantly differ from the ASD– sample in any TAS-20 subdomains, DIF ($t(398) = 1.698, p = 0.090, d = 0.183$), DDF ($t(398) = -0.555, p = 0.579, d = -0.060$), and EOT ($t(398) = 0.488, p = 0.626, d = 0.054$). The groups did not differ significantly in their levels of AQ ($t(398) = -1.693, p = 0.091, d = -0.187$) and BDI ($t(398) = 1.579, p = 0.115, d = 0.172$).”

Furthermore, in Table 2, the BDI values for the Variables “AQ” sample “ASD–”, “EOT” sample “ASD+”, and “EOT” sample “ASD–” were incorrect. Additionally, the AQ values for the Variables “DDF” sample “ASD–”, “EOT” sample “ASD+”, and “EOT” sample “ASD–” were incorrect. The correct and incorrect values appear below.

Incorrect:

Variable	Sample	BDI	AQ
AQ	ASD+	0.25 (0.000)	–
	ASD–	0.20 (0.033)	
DDF	ASD+	0.26 (0.000)	0.47 (0.000)
	ASD–	–0.01 (0.877)	0.40 (0.000)
EOT	ASD+	–0.03 (0.650)	–0.01 (0.827)
	ASD–	0.05 (0.551)	0.00 (0.952)

Correct:

Variable	Sample	BDI	AQ
AQ	ASD+	0.25 (0.000)	–
	ASD–	0.12 (0.189)	
DDF	ASD+	0.26 (0.000)	0.47 (0.000)
	ASD–	–0.01 (0.877)	0.47 (0.000)
EOT	ASD+	–0.03 (0.643)	0.00 (0.985)
	ASD–	0.06 (0.551)	0.02 (0.830)

As a result, in the Results section,

“Regarding correlations with depressive symptoms in the ASD+ sample, BDI scores significantly increased with AQ ($r = 0.25, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.13, 0.35]$), DIF ($r = 0.41, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.31, 0.51]$), and DDF ($r = 0.26, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.15, 0.37]$), but not with EOT ($r = -0.03, p = 0.650, 95\% CI [-0.14, 0.09]$). In the ASD– sample, BDI significantly increased with AQ ($r = 0.20, p < 0.05, 95\% CI [0.02, 0.36]$), and with DIF ($r = 0.25, p < 0.05, 95\% CI [0.08, 0.41]$), but not with DDF ($r = -0.01, p < 0.877, 95\% CI [-0.19, 0.16]$) or EOT ($r = 0.05, p = 0.551, 95\% CI [-0.13, 0.23]$). Considering correlations of autism and alexithymia traits in the ASD+ sample, DIF significantly increased with AQ ($r = 0.52, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.42, 0.60]$) and DDF ($r = 0.47, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.37, 0.56]$). Similarly, AQ significantly increased with DIF ($r = 0.44, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.28, 0.58]$) and DDF ($r = 0.40, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.24, 0.54]$) in the ASD– sample. EOT was not correlated with AQ in either sample (ASD+: $r = -0.01, p = 0.827, 95\% CI [-0.12, 0.10]$ /ASD–: $r = 0.00, p = 0.952, 95\% CI [-0.18, 0.18]$).”

now reads:

“Regarding correlations with depressive symptoms in the ASD+ sample, BDI scores significantly increased with AQ ($r = 0.25, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.13, 0.35]$), DIF ($r = 0.41, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.31, 0.51]$), and DDF ($r = 0.26, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.15, 0.37]$), but not with EOT ($r = -0.03, p = 0.643, 95\% CI [-0.14, 0.09]$). In the ASD– sample, BDI significantly increased with DIF ($r = 0.25, p < 0.05, 95\% CI [0.08, 0.41]$), but not with AQ ($r = 0.12, p = 0.189, 95\% CI [-0.06, 0.29]$), DDF ($r = -0.01, p < 0.877, 95\% CI [-0.19, 0.16]$) or EOT ($r = 0.06, p = 0.551, 95\% CI [-0.13, 0.23]$). Considering correlations of autism and alexithymia traits in the ASD+ sample, DIF significantly increased with AQ ($r = 0.52, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.43, 0.60]$) and DDF ($r = 0.47, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.38, 0.56]$). Similarly, AQ significantly increased with DIF ($r = 0.44, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.28, 0.57]$) and DDF ($r = 0.47, p < 0.001, 95\% CI [0.32, 0.60]$) in the ASD– sample. EOT was not correlated with AQ in either sample (ASD+: $r = 0.00, p = 0.985, 95\% CI [-0.12, 0.12]$ /ASD–: $r = 0.02, p = 0.830, 95\% CI [-0.16, 0.20]$).”

The original Article has been corrected.



Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2021