

GENERAL COMMENTARY published: 19 May 2015 doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2015.00082

Corrigendum: Brain training with non-action video games enhances aspects of cognition in older adults: a randomized controlled trial

Soledad Ballesteros^{1*}, Antonio Prieto¹, Julia Mayas¹, Pilar Toril¹, Carmen Pita¹, Laura Ponce de León¹, José M. Reales¹ and John Waterworth²

¹ Studies on Aging and Neurodegenerative Diseases Research Group, Department of Basic Psychology II, Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Madrid, Spain, ² Department of Informatics, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

Keywords: attention, cross-modal oddball attention task, cognitive aging, non-action video games, training support

A corrigendum on

Brain training with non-action video games enhances aspects of cognition in older adults: a randomized controlled trial

by Ballesteros, S., Prieto, A., Mayas, J., and Waterworth J. (2014). Front. Aging Neurosci. 6:277. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2014.00277

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Rodrigo Orlando Kuljiš, Zdrav Mozak Limitada, Chile

Reviewed by: Mark Mattson, National Institute on Aging, USA

> *Correspondence: Soledad Ballesteros, mballesteros@psi.uned.es

Received: 22 December 2014 Accepted: 28 April 2015 Published: 19 May 2015

Citation:

Ballesteros S, Prieto A, Mayas J, Toril P, Pita C, Ponce de León L, Reales JM and Waterworth J (2015) Corrigendum: Brain training with non-action video games enhances aspects of cognition in older adults: a randomized controlled trial. Front. Aging Neurosci. 7:82. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2015.00082 We would like to clarify that this article as well as the Mayas and colleagues article (Mayas et al., 2014) originated from the randomized controlled intervention study: clinical trial number: ClinicalTrials.gov NCT02007616. The Mayas et al. (2014) article included the trial number at the end of the Abstract. At the top of this article it said CLINICAL TRIAL ARTICLE but the clinical trial number did not appear due to an involuntary omission, as the trial number was included in the four preliminary versions of the manuscript under revision. We explain that because we would not like to make the reader think that both articles corresponded to results from two different randomized controlled trials. In an intend to avoid misunderstandings, we referred twice in the present publication to the Mayas et al. (2014) paper, the first reference in the Method section and the second in the Discussion. In the Results section, we described briefly the cross-modal oddball attention task and said that, "Results from this task have been reported separately (Mayas et al., 2014)". Figure 3B corresponding to the results of the cross-modal oddball attention task is similar to Figure 2B of Mayas et al. (2014). In the Brain training article, we included a brief description of the oddball task, a summary of the results and Figure 3B to give the reader a whole picture of the outcomes of our intervention study (that included two speed of processing tasks, the executive control WCST, the cross-modal oddball attention task, several tasks to assess visuospatial working memory - Corsi Blocks, the Jigsaw-puzzle task, and the Rev-Osterrieth Complex Figure Test-, Immediate and Delayed Visual Episodic Memory Tests, and the Wellbeing SPF-IL scale) and referred the reader to Mayas et al. (2014) dedicated specifically to the oddball task for more details.

We would like to explain the differences in the samples showed in the Consort diagrams of the two publications. The reason is that the Mayas et al diagram refers only to the cross-modal oddball task designed to assess alertness and distraction while the Frontier's Consort diagram refers to the whole intervention study with all the outcomes mentioned above. One of the participants of the control group was removed due to the large number of errors in the oddball task, but he was included in the other tasks of the study in which reached inclusion criteria. The same occurred in the trained group. The oddball data were analyzed separately by our coauthors and by the time we sent the results only 15 participants (out of 17) completed the post-evaluation (we could not contact a participant and the other was traveling that week). A few days later, these two participants completed the post-evaluation, but we decided not to include them in the Mayas paper.

References

Mayas, J., Parmentier, F. B. R., Andrés, P., and Ballesteros, S. (2014). Plasticity of attentional functions in older adults after non-action video game training. *PLoS ONE* 9:e92269. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0092269

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2015 Ballesteros, Prieto, Mayas, Toril, Pita, Ponce de León, Reales and Waterworth. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.