The number of new users of ERT increased steadily until the publication of the HERS study, after which it began to decrease. However, the decline in the number of new users accelerated in the third quarter of 2002, with the number of new users in this quarter being significantly less than that predicted by the model (P = .02).

Comment. In the 2 quarters following the publication of the WHI study, we found a large decline in both the prevalence of ERT use among elderly women and in the number of incident users of ERT.

Although our study was limited to women older than 65 years, our data include all elderly women in Ontario. This limitation is also balanced by the fact that women aged 65 years or older are postmenopausal and thus unlikely to be taking ERT for symptom relief. Unfortunately, we were unable to determine whether the decline in use of ERT was physician- or patient-initiated. Nonetheless, we found that a well-publicized large clinical study may be associated with changes in medication prescription and use.
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CORRECTIONS

Incorrect Footnote Symbols: In the Scientific Review and Clinical Applications article entitled “Interventions to Enhance Patient Adherence to Medication Prescriptions: Scientific Review” published in the December 11, 2002, issue of THE JOURNAL (2002;288:2868-2879), 3 tables contained footnote symbol errors. On page 2871, in Table 2, the asterisk (*) following “Adherence Outcome” should be deleted. There should be an asterisk (*) following “Urine measurements” in the “Adherence Outcome” column. On page 2873, in Table 3 in the “Adherence Outcome” column for the human immunodeficiency virus disorder, the section mark ($) following “Structured interview with pill count” should be a parallel mark (.). On page 2874, in Table 4, the dagger (†) footnote should read “P<.05” and the double dagger (‡) footnote should read “Not significant at P=.05 level.” Also, in the second row in the “Clinical Outcome” column, the dagger (†) following “Social dysfunction” should be a section mark ($).

Incorrect Wording: In the Review article entitled “Recent Trends in Disability and Functioning Among Older Adults in the United States: A Systematic Review” published in the December 25, 2002, issue of THE JOURNAL, there was incorrect wording. On page 3140, in the middle column, the sentence that read “The study had 2 flaws for assessing national trends: it drew on a select sample and changed how it administered the survey (from in-person to over the telephone) and made extensive question changes” should have read “The study [based on Framingham data] had 3 flaws for assessing trends: it drew on select samples, provided only 2 measurement points, and had changes in the field work (Table 2).”