may be related to increasing scrutiny of inpatient claims by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. In the future, it will be important to systematically collect data on hospital-based care delivered under observation status and determine its impact on cost and outcomes.
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Figure. Schematic Representation of Call Script

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>Hi. I am calling to see if I can get emergency contraception today. (N = 943)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not available today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Call ended (n = 184)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th>If I am 17 years old, is that okay? (n = 759)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caller considered unable to access emergency contraception and call ended (n = 145)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 3</th>
<th>My friends said there is an age rule regarding over-the-counter access. Do you know what it is? (n = 814)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If in step 2 the caller was told that she was unable to access emergency contraception based on her age, that answer was considered to be misinformation regarding over-the-counter access. The understood age to dispense emergency contraception over-the-counter was not obtained in this situation due to concern that if callers asked this question, it would be perceived by the pharmacy staff as an attempt to obtain information to guarantee access when they presented in person to the pharmacy.

Table. Outcomes Examined Based on Census Block Group Median Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Poverty Level Income Group, No. (%)</th>
<th>Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤200%</td>
<td>&gt;200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338 (78.2)</td>
<td>398 (82.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.98 (0.77-1.45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to obtain based on age</td>
<td>80 (23.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct age given for over-the-counter dispensing</td>
<td>169 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 (14.6)</td>
<td>250 (82.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.93 (1.53-2.43)</td>
<td>0.59 (0.46-0.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eleven addresses were not able to be geocoded and 16 addresses had median household income of $0 and were excluded.
Indicates the reference group.
Adjusted for pharmacy chain status, with city used as a clustering variable.

See also p 365.
poverty level was considered low-income. We compared outcome measures across low-income vs non–low-income neighborhoods using logistic regression models, clustering by city, and adjusting for whether the pharmacy was independent or a chain. To exclude the possibility of differential findings between pharmacy chains, we repeated the analyses adjusting for pharmacy chain (eg, CVS/pharmacy, Walgreens) as a fixed effect. The Boston University Medical Center institutional review board deemed this study to be non–human subjects research.

Results. Of 943 commercial pharmacies, 687 (72.9%) were chains (≥4 locations); 432 (47%) were located in low-income neighborhoods; and 916 addresses (97%) were successfully linked with census data and included in the analysis. Missing census information was distributed evenly across cities. The average cost of emergency contraception without insurance was $45 (range, $15-$65).

The availability of emergency contraception did not differ based on neighborhood income (TABLE). However, in 19% (n = 138) of calls, the adolescent was told she could not obtain emergency contraception under any circumstance. This misinformation occurred more often (23.7% vs 14.6%) among pharmacies in low-income neighborhoods (adjusted odds ratio [AOR], 1.93; 95% CI, 1.53-2.43). When callers queried the age threshold for over-the-counter access, they were given the correct age less often by pharmacies in low-income neighborhoods (50.0% vs 62.8%; AOR, 0.59 [95% CI, 0.45-0.79]). In all but 11 calls, the incorrect age was stated as erroneously too high, potentially restricting access. Adjusting analyses for pharmacy chain as a fixed effect yielded virtually identical results.

Comment. Although we found approximately 80% same-day availability of emergency contraception in US metropolitan areas, misinformation regarding access was common—particularly in low-income neighborhoods. Although our design did not permit us to determine why disparities in access to emergency contraception exist, possible explanations include differences in pharmacy staffing or training, frequency of requests for information, or organizational cultures around customer service. Our study assessed only telephone calling and not in-person visits. Limitations notwithstanding, the finding that misinformation regarding emergency contraception access is more common in low-income neighborhoods, which have higher teen pregnancy rates, suggests that targeted education for consumers and pharmacy staff may be necessary.
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CORRECTIONS

Table Error: In the Original Contribution “Association of BRCA1 and BRCA2 Mutations With Survival, Chemotherapy Sensitivity, and Gene Mutator Phenotype in Patients With Ovarian Cancer,” published in the October 12, 2011, issue of JAMA (2011;306[14]:1557-1565), an incorrect proportion was listed in Table 1. In the column describing BRCA1 mutation cases, the number (%) of those with residual tumor size of less than 1 cm should be 15 (50). This article was corrected online. An accompanying letter to the editor appears in this issue of JAMA.

Errors in Text, Table Legend, and End Matter: In the Original Contribution “Sleep Disorders, Health, and Safety in Police Officers” by Rajaratnam et al, published in the December 21, 2012, issue of JAMA (2011;306[23]:2567-2578), incorrect language was used in several places in the text, in the footnotes in Tables 3 through 5, in the row stubs in Tables 3 and 4, and in a column head of Table 2, in the Financial Disclosures, and in the first 2 references. Some individuals were inadvertently missing from the Additional Contributions. This article was corrected online.

Error in Editorial: In the Editorial entitled “Onward,” published in the June 22/29, 2011, issue of JAMA (2011;305[24]:2575-2576), the first sentence of the second paragraph should have read, “Considering the history of the previous 14 JAMA editors, all of whom had left their offices by firing, resignation, or retirement at times not necessarily of their choosing.” with this supporting reference: Riley RW. A century of editors. JAMA. 1983;250[2]:230-235. This article was corrected online.