CSIRO PUBLISHING

CORRIGENDUM
https://doi.org/10.1071/RD21234_CO

Reproduction, Fertility and Development

Corrigendum to: Effects of mobile phone use on semen parameters: a cross-sectional study of 1634 men in China

Shanshan Zhang, Fengyi Mo, Yali Chang, Shufang Wu, Qing Ma, Fan Jin and Lanfeng Xing

Reproduction, Fertility and Development, 2022, **34**(9), 669–678.
doi: 10.1071/RD21234

The authors of the above-mentioned paper regret to inform readers that there was an error in the daily phone call duration. The correct daily phone call duration was <0.5 h/day, 0.5–2 h/day and >2 h/day.

In the 'Questionnaire' section on page 671, the text should appear as below (with corrected text in bold):

The subjects were divided into different groups according to the daily habits of mobile phone usage, such as daily duration of mobile phone use (<2 h per day (h/day), 2–4 h/day, 4–6 h/day and >6 h/day), daily phone call duration (<0.5 h/day, **0.5**–2 h/day and >2 h/day), use of earphones while talking on the mobile phone (never, occasionally and always) and the location where the mobile phone was carried (bag, coat pocket, rear trouser pocket and front pants pocket).

In the 'Influence of daily duration of phone calls on semen parameters' section on page 672, the text should appear as below (with corrected text in bold):

Bonferroni pairwise comparison showed significant differences in the percentage of progressively motile spermatozoa ($P = 0.005$ and $P = 0.027$ for >2 h vs <0.5 h and >2 h vs **0.5**–2 h) and the percentage of rapid progressive motile spermatozoa ($P = 0.004$ and $P = 0.012$ for >2 h vs <0.5 h and >2 h vs **0.5**–2 h) between different groups of daily durations of phone calls.

Table 3 should appear as below:

Table 3. Comparison of sperm parameters according to the cumulative daily call duration.

Variable	<0.5 h *n* = 1106	0.5–2 h *n* = 439	>2 h *n* = 89	*P*-value *n* = 1634
Age (years)	31.24 ± 3.57[a]	31.92 ± 3.44[a]	31.67 ± 3.64	0.003
BMI (kg/m^2)	23.25 ± 3.04[a]	23.86 ± 2.97[a]	23.84 ± 2.85	0.001
DFI (%)	15.86 ± 9.64	16.56 ± 9.96	17.49 ± 10.44	0.487
Normal forms of morphology (%)	3.22 ± 1.84	3.21 ± 1.84	2.78 ± 1.64	0.178
Volume (mL)	3.57 ± 1.41	3.59 ± 1.52	3.49 ± 1.45	0.823
Concentration (10^6 per mL)	69.12 ± 44.23	72.37 ± 42.86	67.41 ± 47.06	0.365
Total sperm number (10^6 per ejaculate)	236.73 ± 171.74	245.40 ± 158.47	221.35 ± 147.51	0.406
All progressive motility (%)	40.97 ± 14.72[c]	40.33 ± 15.51[b]	35.76 ± 15.74[cb]	0.007
Rapidly progressive (%)	21.49 ± 11.37[c]	21.25 ± 11.85[b]	17.41 ± 11.24[cb]	0.006
Slowly progressive (%)	19.47 ± 6.92	19.15 ± 7.52	18.47 ± 7.89	0.362
Total motility (%)	52.52 ± 17.24[c]	52.24 ± 18.27	47.71 ± 18.99[a]	0.046

Note: analysis of variance was used to explore differences among different groups. $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant. Values with the letter a differ significantly between the group of <0.5 h and the group of **0.5**–2 h within rows ($P < 0.05$); values with the letter b differ significantly between the group of **0.5**–2 h and the group of >2 h within rows ($P < 0.05$); values with the letter c differ significantly between the group of <0.5 h and the group of >2 h within rows ($P < 0.05$).
BMI, body mass index; DFI, DNA fragmentation index; *n*, number of subjects.

We apologise for the error and any confusion this may have caused.

Zhang S *et al.* (2022) *Reproduction, Fertility and Development*, **34**(18), 1145.
doi:10.1071/RD21234_CO

© 2022 The Author(s) (or their employer(s)). Published by CSIRO Publishing. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND).

OPEN ACCESS

Downloaded from connectsci.au/rd/article-pdf/34/18/1145/3194451/rd21234_co.pdf by guest on 11 October 2026