## **Correction**

J Voigt, M Mosier. A powered bone marrow biopsy system versus manual methods: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised trials. *J Clin Pathol* 2013;66:9 792–796. Figure 5 in this paper was incorrect. It depicted adverse events identified and did not represent the overall trephine length analysis. The correct Figure 5 is shown below.

	Powered bone biopsy			Manual bone biopsy			Mean Difference		Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	
Berenson 2011	13.3	6.6	52	11	5.5	50	22.9%	2.30 [-0.05, 4.65]		•
Bucher 2013	14.6	5.2	30	14.2	5.6	30	20.7%	0.40 [-2.33, 3.13]	-	<del> -</del>
Miller 2011	17	6.8	24	11.1	4.5	24	17.9%	5.90 [2.64, 9.16]		
Reed 2011	15.3	7.3	27	9.8	6.7	27	15.6%	5.50 [1.76, 9.24]		-
Swords 2011	13.1	4.8	25	8.2	3.6	25	22.9%	4.90 [2.55, 7.25]		-
Total (95% CI)	158				156	100.0%	3.65 [1.61, 5.68]		•	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 3.28; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 10.47, df = 4 (P = 0.03); l <sup>2</sup> = 62%										0 10 20
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.51 (P = 0.0005)									-20 -10 Favors manual	

J Clin Pathol 2013;66:1004. doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2013-201605corr1