

CORRECTION

Open Access



Correction: Association of risk perception and transport mode choice during the temporary closure of a major inner-city road bridge: results of a cross-sectional study

Pascal Kemmerer¹, Benedikt Brach¹, Thomas Kubiak², Susanne Singer¹ and Emilio A. L. Gianicolo^{1,3*}

Correction: European Transport Research Review 15, 34 (2023)

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12544-023-00608-y>

Following publication of the original article [1], the authors reported errors in the Table 2, Table 4 and Table 6.

Table 2 has been corrected from:

Main mode of transport	Before the bridge closure		During the bridge closure	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Car	364	54	270	40
Public transport	198	29	232	34
Cycling	75	11	85	12
Walking	24	4	44	7
Route not traveled	17	3	48	7
Total	679	100	679	100

Note. Due to rounding, percentages sometimes do not sum to 100%

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12544-023-00608-y>.

*Correspondence:

Emilio A. L. Gianicolo
emilio.gianicolo@uni-mainz.de

¹ Institute of Medical Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Informatics (IMBEI), University Medical Center, Obere Zahlbacher Str. 69, 55131 Mainz, Germany

² Health Psychology, Institute of Psychology, Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz, Germany

³ Institute of Clinical Physiology, National Research Council, Lecce, Italy



© The Author(s) 2024. **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/>.

To:

Main mode of transport	Before the bridge closure		During the bridge closure	
	n	%	n	%
Car	364	54	270	40
Public transport	198	29	232	34
Cycling	75	11	85	12
Walking	24	4	44	7
Route not traveled	17	3	48	7
Total	679	100	679	100

Table 4 has been updated from:

Bridge use frequency	Group of mode choice						Total	
	Car		Alternative		Switch		n	%
	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Before the closure								
Regular	169	164	199	171	65	184	433	169
Occasional	096	136	182	129	13	116	191	131
Total	266	100	281	100	78	100	625	100
During the closure								
Regular	059	122	153	155	40	152	253	140
Occasional	207	178	128	145	38	148	372	160
Total	266	100	281	100	78	100	625	100

Notes. Regular = at least once a week. Occasional = less than once a week. Due to multiple imputation, frequencies are rounded. Therefore, certain frequencies do not cumulate to the correct size of some subsamples

To:

Bridge use frequency	Group of mode choice						Total	
	Car		Alternative		Switch		n	%
	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Before the closure								
Regular	169	64	199	71	65	84	433	69
Occasional	96	36	82	29	13	16	191	31
Total	266	100	281	100	78	100	625	100
During the closure								
Regular	59	22	153	55	40	52	253	40
Occasional	207	78	128	45	38	48	372	60
Total	266	100	281	100	78	100	625	100

Notes. Regular = at least once a week. Occasional = less than once a week. Due to multiple imputation, frequencies are rounded. Therefore, certain frequencies do not cumulate to the correct size of some subsamples

Table 6 has been updated from:

	OR	95% CI		p	B	SE
		Lower	Upper			
Alternative group						
Car group (reference)	1.00					
Attitude (car use)	0.65	0.49	0.87	.003	-0.43	0.14
Attitude (alternative use)	0.93	0.63	1.39	.732	-0.07	0.20
Subjective norm (car use)	0.74	0.57	0.97	.027	-0.30	0.13
Subjective norm (alternative use)	1.45	0.99	2.13	.055	0.37	0.19
Ln PBC (car use)	0.60	0.33	1.10	.097	-0.51	0.31
Ln PBC (alternative use)	3.94	1.91	8.13	<.001	1.37	0.37
Gender						
Male	0.58	0.29	1.13	.106	-0.55	0.34
Female (reference)	1.00					
Age						
18 – 34 years	0.48	0.17	1.34	.159	-0.74	0.53
35 – 64 years	0.65	0.25	1.70	.378	-0.43	0.49
≥ 65 years (reference)	1.00					
Education						
Low	1.74	0.30	10.04	.532	0.55	0.88
Middle	1.98	0.90	4.35	.087	0.69	0.40
High (reference)	1.00					
Equalized income						
< 1,000 EUR	3.30	1.00	10.89	.050	1.19	0.61
1,000 – 2,499 EUR	1.01	0.48	2.13	.976	0.01	0.38
≥ 2,500 EUR (reference)	1.00					
Health-related risk perception	1.17	0.78	1.76	.436	0.16	0.21
Switch group						
Car group (reference)	1.00					
Attitude (car use)	0.86	0.63	1.17	.334	-0.15	0.16
Attitude (alternative use)	0.92	0.61	1.39	.690	-0.08	0.21
Subjective norm (car use)	1.10	0.82	1.47	.537	0.09	0.15
Subjective norm (alternative use)	1.30	0.90	1.89	.162	0.26	0.19
Ln PBC (car use)	0.56	0.29	1.08	.083	-0.57	0.33
Ln PBC (alternative use)	1.52	0.79	2.92	.206	0.42	0.33
Gender (ref: female)						
Male	0.50	0.25	1.02	.056	-0.69	0.36
Female (reference)	1.00					
Age (ref: ≥ 65 years)						
18-34 years	0.12	0.04	0.37	<.001	-2.16	0.60
35-64 years	0.63	0.26	1.53	.309	-0.46	0.45
≥ 65 years (reference)	1.00					
Education (ref: high)						
Low	0.34	0.03	3.86	.386	-1.07	1.23
Middle	1.17	0.55	2.49	.683	0.16	0.38
High (reference)	1.00					
Equalized income						
< 1,000 EUR	2.11	0.47	9.50	.331	0.75	0.77
1,000 EUR – 2,499 EUR	1.14	0.53	2.48	.740	0.13	0.40
≥ 2,500 EUR (reference)	1.00					
Health-related risk perception	1.76	1.14	2.71	.010	0.56	0.22

Notes. B = regression coefficient, SE = standard error, CI = confidence interval, OR = odds ratio, Ln = natural logarithm, PBC = perceived behavioral control. R² = .37 (Nagelkerke). Model $\chi^2(28) = 105.94, p < .001$

To:

Published online: 15 May 2024

	OR	95% CI		p	B	SE
		Lower	Upper			
Alternative group						
Car group (reference)						
Attitude (car use)	1.00					
Attitude (alternative use)	0.65	0.49	0.87	.003	-0.43	0.14
Subjective norm (car use)	0.93	0.63	1.39	.732	-0.07	0.20
Subjective norm (alternative use)	0.74	0.57	0.97	.027	-0.30	0.13
Ln PBC (car use)	1.45	0.99	2.13	.055	0.37	0.19
Ln PBC (alternative use)	0.60	0.33	1.10	.097	-0.51	0.31
Gender						
Male	3.94	1.91	8.13	<.001	1.37	0.37
Female (reference)	1.00					
Age						
18 – 34 years	0.58	0.29	1.13	.106	-0.55	0.34
35 – 64 years	1.00					
≥ 65 years (reference)	1.00					
Education						
Low	0.48	0.17	1.34	.159	-0.74	0.53
Middle	0.65	0.25	1.70	.378	-0.43	0.49
High (reference)	1.00					
Equivalized income						
< 1,000 EUR	1.74	0.30	10.04	.532	0.55	0.88
1,000 – 2,499 EUR	1.98	0.90	4.35	.087	0.69	0.40
≥ 2,500 EUR (reference)	1.00					
Health-related risk perception	1.17	0.78	1.76	.436	0.16	0.21
Switch group						
Car group (reference)						
Attitude (car use)	1.00					
Attitude (alternative use)	0.86	0.63	1.17	.334	-0.15	0.16
Subjective norm (car use)	0.92	0.61	1.39	.690	-0.08	0.21
Subjective norm (alternative use)	1.10	0.82	1.47	.537	0.09	0.15
Ln PBC (car use)	1.30	0.90	1.89	.162	0.26	0.19
Ln PBC (alternative use)	0.56	0.29	1.08	.083	-0.57	0.33
Gender						
Male	1.52	0.79	2.92	.206	0.42	0.33
Female (reference)	1.00					
Age						
18-34 years	0.50	0.25	1.02	.056	-0.69	0.36
35-64 years	1.00					
≥ 65 years (reference)	1.00					
Education						
Low	0.12	0.04	0.37	<.001	-2.16	0.60
Middle	0.63	0.26	1.53	.309	-0.46	0.45
High (reference)	1.00					
Equivalized income						
< 1,000 EUR	0.34	0.03	3.86	.386	-1.07	1.23
1,000 EUR – 2,499 EUR	1.17	0.55	2.49	.683	0.16	0.38
≥ 2,500 EUR (reference)	1.00					
Health-related risk perception	2.11	0.47	9.50	.331	0.75	0.77
	1.14	0.53	2.48	.740	0.13	0.40
	1.00					
	1.76	1.14	2.71	.010	0.56	0.22

Reference

1. Kemmerer, P, Brach, B, Kubiak, T., et al. (2023). Association of risk perception and transport mode choice during the temporary closure of a major inner-city road bridge: Results of a cross-sectional study. *European Transport Research Review*, 15, 34. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12544-023-00608-y>

Notes. B = regression coefficient, SE = standard error, CI = confidence interval, OR = odds ratio, Ln = natural logarithm, PBC = perceived behavioral control. $R^2 = .37$ (Nagelkerke). Model $\chi^2(28) = 105.94, p < .001$

The original article [1] has been updated.