

## Corrigendum

# Corrigendum to: Older People's Nonphysical Contacts and Depression During the COVID-19 Lockdown

**Bruno Arpino, PhD,<sup>1,\*</sup> Marta Pasqualini, PhD,<sup>2</sup> Valeria Bordone, PhD,<sup>3</sup> and Aida Solé-Auró, PhD<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Statistics, Computer Science, Applications, University of Florence, Firenze, Italy. <sup>2</sup>Department of Political and Social Sciences, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain. <sup>3</sup>Department of Sociology, University of Vienna, Austria.

\*Address correspondence to: Bruno Arpino, PhD, Department of Statistics, Computer Science, Applications, University of Florence, Viale Morgagni, 59, 50134 Firenze, Italy. E-mail: [bruno.arpino@unifi.it](mailto:bruno.arpino@unifi.it)

In "Older People's Nonphysical Contacts and Depression During the COVID-19 Lockdown," DOI: 10.1093/geront/gnaa144, several errors were noted and listed in this corrigendum.

There was a typo in Table 1 with regard to the descriptive statistics for "Living with at least one coresident", in which the category "No" should have been "Yes".

In addition, the values of the AMEs reported in Table 4 for the interactions have been corrected since numbers reported were not referring to the reference category of each model. Consequently, numbers cited in the following texts have been replaced with 15 (not 10) and 25 (not 6), respectively: "Indeed, among individuals aged 70+, those who did not change their non-intergenerational

contacts during the lockdown reduced their probability of increased perceived depressive feelings of about 15 percentage points compared with those who decreased the frequency of such contacts." "For example, unchanged frequency of intergenerational contacts reduced the probability of increased perceived depressive feelings as compared to decreased frequency of contacts both in Spain and Italy, but the effect was about 25 percentage points larger in Spain ( $p < .1$ )"

It should be noted that the interpretation of results is not affected because it was based on the beta coefficients and not on the AMEs, the former being perfectly correct.

These errors have now been corrected.