CORRECTION Open Access



Correction: Characteristics of 'mega' peer-reviewers

Danielle B. Rice^{1,2}, Ba' Pham³, Justin Presseau^{4,5,6}, Andrea C. Tricco^{7,8,9} and David Moher^{1,4,5*}

Correction to: Res Integr Peer Rev 7, 1 (2022) https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-022-00121-1

Following publication of the original article [1], the authors identified an error in the 'Results', both in the Abstract and in the main text: it incorrectly stated that 'a greater proportion of mega peer reviews were male (92%) as compared to the control reviewers (70% male),' instead of 74% vs 58% as listed in the table.

In addition, 'Web of Science' needed to be changed to 'Clarivate' in the main text and the 'Acknowledgements' section.

The original article [1] has been corrected.

Author details

¹Centre for Journalology, Clinical Epidemiology Program, The Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada. ²Department of Psychology, Faculty of Science, McGill University, Montreal, Canada. ³Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. ⁴Clinical Epidemiology Program, The Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada. ⁵Faculty of Medicine, School of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada. ⁶Faculty of Social Sciences, School of Psychology, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada. ⁷Knowledge Translation Program, Unity Health Toronto, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, Canada. ⁸Epidemiology Division and Institute for Health Policy, Management, and Evaluation, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. ⁹Queen's Collaboration for Health Care Quality Joanna Briggs Institute Centre of Excellence, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada.

The original article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-022-00121-1.

*Correspondence: dmoher@ohri.ca

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



Published online: 13 July 2022

Reference

 Rice, et al. Characteristics of 'mega' peer-reviewers. Res Integr Peer Rev. 2022;7:1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-022-00121-1.

© The Author(s) 2022. **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 Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data

⁵ Faculty of Medicine, School of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada