

Speech outcome in children born with cleft lip and palate treated with one-stage palate repair: aspects of function and environment

Errata	Jill Nyberg			
Page	Column/ Paragraph	Line	Error	Corrected
Back of the Title page & Abstract page	ISBN		987-91-7676-407-7	978-91-7676-407-7
3	1	4	physical	physiological
8	1.4.4	2	SLPs	speech and language pathologists (SLPs)
8	1.4.5	8	varied	various
10	1.4.6	1 from the bottom	session	sessions
11	1.4.7	2	otitis	otitis
11	1.5.1	1	A listeners	A listener's
16	3.1	5	1997	1987
16	Table 1a	1	Distribution of participants and number of exclusions in the four studies for the different cleft groups..	Distribution of participants and number of exclusions for the different cleft groups..
17	Table 1b	2	techiques	techniques
17	3.1.1	9	19%	27%
30	Figure 9 and Figure 10	add text		The graphs represent the percentage of children with different cleft types, judged to have moderately to severe deviation/incompetence or frequently or almost/always occurring speech errors (scale value 3-4)
30	Figure 10		6%	10%
30	Figure 10		28%	18%
31	4.1.2	4	most common articulatory error was glottal articulation in both the UCLP and the CPO group (study II and III)	most common articulatory error was glottal articulation in the CPO group (study I) and retracted oral articulation in the UCLP group (study II) (Figure 11).
31	4.1.2	8	(Figure 11)	<i>Should be deleted</i>

Errata	Jill Nyberg			
Page	Column/Paragraph	Line	Error	Corrected
Study I, page 96	Column 2 paragraph 5 and 6	16 13 8 from the bottom	correlate to correlate	compare between compare
Study I, page 99	1	2 from the bottom	correlated	compared related to MIT and MITmr
Study I, page 99	2	9 from the bottom	correlated to the cleft extent	and the differences tested
Study I, page 100	1	5 from the bottom	after	at
Study I, page 100	1	4 from the bottom 3 from the bottom	correlation cleft type and	difference the
Study I, page 100	2	8	The speech quality of children who later underwent	The speech quality of children who underwent
Study I, page 100	2	10	in correlating	comparing
Study II, page 1662	Abstract, Methods	4	Forty-two children	Thirty children
Study II, page 1664	Column 2	2	52%	46%
Study II, page 1665	Column 2, paragraph 4	4	(10%)	(18%)
Study III, page 2	Abstract, Results	2	Approximately 10%	5 - 10%
Study III, page 2	Abstract, Results	2	only marginal	marginal but statistically significant
Study III, page 6	Surgical procedure	1	Eighty-six	Eighty-eight
Study III, page 8-9	Speech assessment	Last sentence from the bottom	The speech variables were rated at both 5 and 10 years of age on 5-point ordinal scales	<i>The sentence should be deleted</i>
Study III, page 10	Excluded samples at 5 and 10 years of age	Line 2 from the bottom	31	30
Study III, page 11	Hypernasality, weak pressure consonants...	Line 3 from the bottom	49	27
Study III, page 15	Results at 10 years	Line 2 from the bottom	None	None of the
Study IV, page 516	Column 1 (authors)	11 from the bottom	June 2013	June 2015