OPEN ACCESS

Check for updates

Cite this as: *BMJ* 2020;370:m3095<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m3095>

Published: 05 August 2020

Comparison of dietary macronutrient patterns of 14 popular named dietary programmes for weight and cardiovascular risk factor reduction in adults: systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomised trials

In the paper by Ge and colleagues (*BMJ* 2020;369:m696, doi:, published 1 April 2020), one trial was incorrectly categorised, which affected the estimates for macronutrient diet patterns and weight loss at six months. Further, based on the included Mediterranean diets, the fat content of the moderate macronutrient diets had more variability than reflected in table 1. These issues do not affect the overall conclusions of the review, and the changes to the calculations are minor.

The incorrect categorisation specifically affects the following:

- In the abstract, the low fat estimate for weight loss at six months' follow-up should read 4.40 kg rather than 4.37 kg.
- In table 1, the second footnote regarding the Rosemary Conley diet no longer applies.
- In table 1, to better reflect the variability in macronutrient content of Mediterranean style diets, the percent fat content should read "21 to ≤40" rather than "21 to ≤30" for moderate macronutrient diets.
- In figure 3, some of the point estimates and 95% credible intervals for the macronutrient diet analysis (eg, low fat, low carbohydrate) for weight loss at six months' follow-up changed slightly, but none more than 0.5 kg.