



## Corrigendum

http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1516-4446-2021-0030

We hereby inform that a correction is needed in the article titled "Positive psychology interventions to improve well-being and symptoms in people on the schizophrenia spectrum: a systematic review and meta-analysis" (http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1590/1516-4446-2020-1164), by Pina et al., published in the Brazilian Journal of Psychiatry in December 2020 in ahead of print mode. The data from Shrank et al. 2015 (ref. 19 in the article) were mistakenly included in the metanalysis with values reported as mean and standard error (SE), rather than the correct mean and standard deviation (SD). Updating the values from SE to SD resulted in considerably reduced pooled effect sizes compared to the original metanalysis. Nonetheless, as discussed in the review, the results still favor positive psychology interventions for people in the schizophrenia spectrum, albeit by a very slight margin. Below we reproduce the revised, correct versions of the forest plots shown in Figures 2 and 3.

Study or	Experimental			Control				Std. mean difference	Std. mean difference					
subgroup	Mean SD		Total	Mean	Mean SD		Weight	IV, Random, 95%CI	IV, Random, 95%CI					
Schrank 2015	3.36	0.66	43	3.24	0.64	41	25.8%	0.18 [-0.25, 0.61]						
Favrod 2019	23.03	5.45	40	21.78	6.06	40	25.7%	0.21 [-0.22, 0.65]						
Kim 2017	90.11	16.15	28	77.28	16.08	29	25.0%	0.79 [0.24, 1.33]				_		
Kang 2018	93.9	11.84	30	67.47	6.84	30	23.6%	2.70 [1.99, 3.41]					_	
Total (95%CI)			141			140	100.0%	0.93 [-0.01, 1.87]			<b>4</b>			
Heterogeneity: Ta Test for overall e		′		df = 3 (p	< 0.000	001); I <sup>2</sup> =	= 93%		-4	-2	0	2	4	
										Favors [co	ntrol] Favo	rs [interve	ntion1	

Figure 2 Forest plot and extent of the effects of primary outcomes on well-being and quality of life. 95%CI = 95% confidence interval; df = degrees of freedom; IV = inverse variance; SD = standard deviation.

Study or subgroup	Experimental			Control				Std. mean difference	Std. mean difference				
	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95%CI		IV, Ranc	om, 95%C	I	
Schrank 2015	3.36	0.66	43	3.24	0.64	41	36.6%	0.18 [-0.25, 0.61]					
Favrod 2019	23.03	5.45	40	21.78	6.06	40	35.6%	0.21 [-0.22, 0.65]					
Kim 2017	90.11	16.15	28	77.28	16.08	29	27.8%	0.79 [0.24, 1.33]				-	
Kang 2018	93.9	11.84	30	67.47	6.84	30	0.0%	2.70 [1.99, 3.41]					
Total (95%CI)			111			110	100.0%	0.36 [0.01, 0.71]			•		
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.04$ ; $Chi^2 = 3.44$ , $df = 2$ (p < 0.18); $I^2 = 42\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.01$ (p = 0.04)								-4	-2	0	2	4	
		\(\frac{1}{2}\)	- /							Favors [co	ntrol] Favor	s [interve	ntion]

Figure 3 Forest plot of sensitivity analysis excluding Kang et al.<sup>22</sup> 95%CI = 95% confidence interval; df = degrees of freedom; IV = inverse variance; SD = standard deviation.