

AusDiab study

Re: "Overweight and obesity in Australia: the 1999–2000 Australian Diabetes, Obesity and Lifestyle Study (AusDiab)", by Adrian J Cameron, Timothy A Welborn, Paul Z Zimmet et al in the 5 May 2003 issue of the Journal (*Med J Aust* 2003; 178: 427–432).

In Boxes 3 and 4 (pages 429 and 430), the row headings for the weekly income categories should have been the lowest (rather than the highest) income group. These sections of Boxes 3 and 4, as they should have appeared, are shown below.

This reversal affected our interpretation of the results of the study. In the Results section (page 431), we stated that "Increasing income increased the risk of obesity in women. Although no such association was significant for men, both the BMI and

waist circumference data suggested that middle-income men tended to be more obese than the lowest income group."

This should have read: "Increasing income decreased the risk of obesity in women. Although no such association was significant for men, both the BMI and waist circumference data suggested that middle-income men tended to be more obese than the highest income group."

In the Discussion section (page 432), we stated that "In men, minor trends for middle-income groups to be more obese and the least affluent to be thin were observed, although these were not significant. Women, by contrast, showed a strong positive graded association between income and obesity."

This should have read: "In men, minor trends for middle-income groups to be more obese

and the most affluent to be thin were observed, although these were not significant. Women, by contrast, showed a strong negative graded association between income and obesity."

The association between obesity and income was not a major outcome of the study, with the results focusing on the prevalence of obesity and the association of obesity with physical activity and television viewing time. □

Bone and joint supplement

Re: "Bone and Joint Disorders: Prevention and Control", the Supplement to the 1 March 2004 issue of the Journal (*Med J Aust* 2004; 180 (5 Suppl): S1–S40). Three errors have been noted.

Firstly, on page S2, the funding for the Supplement was incorrectly attributed to the Department of Health and Ageing alone, and the text should have read: "The Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing sponsored the summit — Bone and Joint Decade Approach, Canberra November 15, 2002. Merck Sharp & Dohme, the Department of Health and Ageing and the Australian Rheumatology Association funded the publication of this Supplement. The views expressed in this Supplement are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the funding organisations."

Secondly, there is incorrect reference numbering in the article "Can we reduce disease burden from osteoarthritis? An evidence-based priority-setting model", by Segal L, Day SE, Chapman AB and Osborne RH. In the section on primary prevention, on page S14, the reference numbers should have read 1,8–10,12, and not 1,12–9.

Finally, in the article "The Australian Orthopaedic Association National Joint Replacement Registry", by Graves SE, Davidson D, Ingerson L, et al, the details for one author were omitted from the authors' address box on page S31. These details are as follows: Heather J McElroy, BSc(Hons), GradDipApplStat, Statistician, Data Management and Analysis Centre, Department of Public Health and General Practice, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA. □

3: Association between obesity (measured using body mass index [BMI]* [*n*=4996] and waist circumference* [*n*=4984]) and potential risk factors among Australian men [weekly income section only]

	Body mass index		Waist circumference	
	<i>n</i>	Adjusted odds ratio† (95% CI)	<i>n</i>	Adjusted odds ratio† (95% CI)
Weekly income (\$)				
0–199	502	1.00	502	1.00
200–399	1541	1.18 (0.80–1.74)	1533	1.30 (0.93–1.81)
400–599	1162	1.12 (0.78–1.60)	1157	1.29 (0.91–1.82)
600–799	1133	1.07 (0.77–1.50)	1134	1.23 (0.84–1.80)
800–1499	571	1.06 (0.70–1.62)	573	0.97 (0.69–1.36)
1500+	37	0.68 (0.22–2.07)	36	0.51 (0.17–1.54)

*Obesity defined as BMI ≥ 30 kg/m², or waist circumference ≥ 102 cm.

† Model adjusted for age and all other risk factors in the table.

4: Association between obesity (measured using body mass index [BMI]* [*n*=6071] and waist circumference* [*n*=6075]) and each of the potential risk factors among Australian women [weekly income section only]

	Body mass index		Waist circumference	
	<i>n</i>	Adjusted odds ratio† (95% CI)	<i>n</i>	Adjusted odds ratio† (95% CI)
Weekly income (\$)				
0–199	1034	1.00	1034	1.00
200–399	2046	0.85 (0.67–1.08)	2046	0.93 (0.74–1.19)
400–599	1270	0.87 (0.66–1.15)	1274	0.79 (0.62–1.02)
600–799	1064	0.57 (0.40–0.82)‡	1062	0.62 (0.46–0.83)‡
800–1499	499	0.67 (0.48–0.93)‡	501	0.59 (0.37–0.94)‡
1500+	20	0.63 (0.19–2.11)	20	0.46 (0.13–1.65)

*Obesity defined as BMI ≥ 30 kg/m², or waist circumference ≥ 88 cm.

† Model adjusted for age and all other risk factors in the table.

‡ Significantly different from reference ($P < 0.05$).