Scand J Work Environ Health 2012;38(6):604

<https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.3326>

Issue date: 01 Nov 2012

Re: Young AE, Wasiak R, Webster BS, Shayne RGF. Urban-rural differences in work disability after an occupational injury. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2008;34(2):158-164. doi:10.5271/sjweh.1217

by [Young AE](#), [Wasiak R](#), [Webster BS](#), [Shayne RGF](#)

Affiliation: Center for Disability Research, Liberty Mutual Research Institute for Safety, United States.
amandae.young@libertymutual.com

See also the article: [2008;34\(2\):158-164](#)

Refers to the following text of the Journal: [2008;34\(2\):158-164](#)

Key terms: [amendment and correction](#); [disability](#); [occupational injury](#); [work disability](#)

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](#).

Re: Young AE, Wasiak R, Webster BS, Shayne RGF. Urban–rural differences in work disability after an occupational injury. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2008;34(2):158–164. doi:10.5271/sjweh.1217

Thanks to the eyes of a keen reader, some inconsistency between the Wald Statistic P-values and the confidence intervals presented in Table 3 was observed. Specifically, it was noted that in our original Table 3, the age category 36–35 versus >35 years had a P-value of 0.778, but that the odds ratio (OR) 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were 0.79–0.96. In addition, for the State comparison New York versus Texas, the P-value was 0.001, but the OR 95% CI were 0.99–1.39.

Looking back over the analysis, we realized that, for categorical variables with more than two levels, SAS requires a reference category be defined in the syntax. This was not included in original analysis. This omission influenced the calculation of the Wald Statistic and associated P-values, but had no impact on the OR, 95% CI, or other previously reported statistics. We have prepared this addendum to Table 3 with updated Wald and P-values for independent variables with more than two levels (ie, age, industry and State) and note that the change to values does not require any change to the body of the document or the conclusions drawn.

Thank you to the reader who point out this inconsistency and to the editors of SJWEH for giving us the opportunity to publish this addendum.

Amanda E Young, PhD
Center for Disability Research,
Liberty Mutual Research Institute for Safety, United States.
[E-mail: amandae.young@libertymutual.com]

Revised Table 3. Results of multiple logistic regression analysis conducted to determine if rurality was related to whether or not a person was away from the workplace for a week or more when the effect of confounders was taken into consideration (N=11 307). [OR=odds ratio; 95% CI=95% confidence interval]

Variable	Wald Test (χ^2)	P-value	OR	95% CI
Age category (<25 versus >35)	4.93	<0.001	0.74	0.65–0.83
Age category (26–35 versus >35)	7.80	0.002	0.87	0.79–0.96
Gender (female = 1)	10.29	0.001	1.18	1.07–1.30
Body part (nondigit = 1)	1080.37	<0.001	4.44	4.06–4.85
Occupation (blue-collar = 1)	177.40	<0.001	1.95	1.77–2.16
Industry a (1 versus 4)	58.56	<0.001	0.55	0.47–0.64
Industry a (2 versus 4)	9.50	0.002	0.79	0.68–0.92
Industry a (3 versus 4)	7.65	0.006	1.25	1.07–1.47
Percent rural (more rural = 1)	10.39	0.001	0.86	0.79–0.94
State (California versus Texas)	22.75	<0.001	1.42	1.23–1.64
State (Florida versus Texas)	26.51	<0.001	0.65	0.56–0.77
State (Illinois versus Texas)	9.11	0.003	1.26	1.08–1.46
State (Indiana versus Texas)	24.56	<0.001	0.63	0.53–0.76
State (Michigan versus Texas)	5.72	0.017	0.80	0.66–0.96
State (New York versus Texas)	3.15	0.076	1.17	0.99–1.38
State (Oregon versus Texas)	0.54	0.463	0.93	0.78–1.11
State (Pennsylvania versus Texas)	1.68	0.195	0.90	0.76–1.06

^a 1 = manufacturing; 2 = wholesale and retail trades, services, public administration and finances; 3 = transport; 4 = agriculture, mining and construction.