2. Like in Figure 3, Figure 4 in Ougrin (2011) presents exactly the same serious error. If we take the effect sizes (and SEs) reported in Ougrin’s Figure 4 as standardized mean differences (and their SEs), then the correct forest plot should be:
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Additional minor errors in Ougrin’s (2011) article

1. On page 4 in Ougrin (2011), second column, fifth paragraph, reporting the results of the meta-analysis for PD in short-term outcomes, an $I^2 = 68\%$ is reported (last line in the paragraph). However, in Figure 5, an $I^2 = 62\%$ is reported. This data should be corrected.

2. On page 4 in Ougrin (2011), second column, last paragraph, reporting the results of the meta-analysis for PD in long-term outcomes, an $I^2 = 24\%$ is reported (last line in the paragraph). However, in Figure 6, an $I^2 = 69\%$ is reported. In addition, Ougrin says that a fixed-effects model was applied when, actually, he applied a random-effects one.

3. Figures 1 and 2 in Ougrin (2011) report meta-analyses for comparing CT vs. E in OCD, taking the mean difference as the effect size. Ougrin selected the (unstandardized) mean difference because all of the studies on OCD reported as the main outcome the Y-BOCS scores. On page 3, second column and second paragraph, Ougrin explains that the Y-BOCS takes values from 0 to 40. Thus, the maximum and minimum mean differences between CT and E will be -40 and +40. As a consequence, the forest plots showed in Figures 1 and 2 should have -40 and +40 as the limits for the effect size scale, and not from -100 to +100. This change will help to make clearer these two forest plots.

In summary, I have some suggestions for the E&B corrections and some additional suggestions to further correct the Ougrin’s (2011) article. If E&B were been exhaustive in their review of the Ougrin’s paper, then my additional corrections should be also detected by them. If the E&B correction note is published, then it should be completed with those I have detected.