

**Correction to the article “Profiles on Adolescent Internet Addiction: A Taxonomy with Latent Profiling Analysis”,
Published on Acta Med Port 2022 Sep;35(9):644-651.**

**Errata ao artigo “Perfis na Dependência de Internet em Adolescentes: Análise Taxonómica de Perfis Latentes”,
Publicado em Acta Med Port 2022 Sep;35(9):644-651.**

On page 646, Section ‘RESULTS’,

On paragraph ‘Model estimation and selection’,

Line 3, where it reads (in red):

Firstly, we examined fit statistics (Table 5), namely the Akaike Information criterion (AIC) (...)

It should read (in blue):

Firstly, we examined fit statistics (Table 3), namely the Akaike Information criterion (AIC) (...)

Line 9, where it reads (in red):

(...) (LRT = 57.33, $p < 0.0001$, see Table 5) (...)

It should read (in blue):

(...) (LRT = 57.33, $p < 0.0001$, see Table 3) (...)

On paragraph ‘Classification accuracy of the model’,

Line 1, where it reads (in red):

The probabilities of correct classification of observations are shown in the main diagonal of Table 6, (...)

It should read (in blue):

The probabilities of correct classification of observations are shown in the main diagonal of Table 4, (...)

Line 7, where it reads (in red):

The classification accuracy of the testing subsample was 96%, as shown in Table 7.

It should read (in blue):

The classification accuracy of the testing subsample was 96%, as shown in Table 5.

On page 647,

Chapter Description of profiles, 2nd paragraph, **line 4, where it reads (in red):**

This group scores negatively (less than 2.5, below the green, dotted bottom line) in all dimensions (Table 3), (...)

It should read (in blue):

This group scores negatively (less than 2.5, below the green, dotted bottom line) in all dimensions (Table 6), (...)

On page 648,

Line 6, where it reads (in red):

(...) equal parental control rates or absence thereof (Table 4).

It should read (in blue):

(...)equal parental control rates or absence thereof (Table 7).

2nd paragraph, **line 9, where it reads (in red):**

(...) compared with other profiles, are noteworthy (Table 4).

It should read (in blue):

(...) compared with other profiles, are noteworthy (Table 7).

3rd paragraph, **line 7, where it reads (in red):**

Here we also highlight users with the least difficulty in making friends (Table 4).

It should read (in blue):

Here we also highlight users with the least difficulty in making friends (Table 7).

4th paragraph, **line 10, where it reads (in red):**

(...) and lower parental control rate stood out compared with the other profiles (Table 4).

It should read (in blue):

(...) and lower parental control rate stood out compared with the other profiles (Table 7).

As a result of these corrections, the **Tables 3 to 7** are reordered as follows (original order in **red**, correct order in **blue**):

Table 3 – Means and standard deviations of Profiles and ANOVA tests

Profile	SAL	EXU	NGW	ANT	LOC	NSL	IAT
P1	1.85 (0.52)	1.91 (0.48)	1.88 (0.63)	2.19 (0.75)	2.46 (0.69)	1.44 (0.71)	1.96 (0.31)
P2	1.12 (0.22)	1.2 (0.23)	1.07 (0.16)	1.19 (0.32)	1.19 (0.26)	0.84 (0.45)	1.1 (0.13)
P3	1.44 (0.34)	1.56 (0.33)	1.22 (0.27)	1.84 (0.54)	1.50 (0.40)	1.37 (0.67)	1.49 (0.19)
P4	2.83 (0.81)	2.71 (0.81)	2.33 (0.95)	3.03 (1.11)	2.97 (0.99)	2.12 (1.18)	2.66 (0.33)
F	575.888	448.338	265.143	266.323	432.916	118.867	442.392
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Standard deviations in parenthesis.

SAL: Saliency; EXU: Excessive Use; NGW: Neglect Work; ANT: Anticipation; LOC: Lack of Control; NSL: Neglect Social Life; IAT: Internet Addiction test

Table 3 – Model fit for the different profile solutions

Solution	AIC	BIC	ICL	LRT	BLRT
Two profiles	23612	23834	24691	362.59	0.000
Three profiles	23275	23570	24364	145.18	0.000
Four profiles	23156	23523	24323	57.33	0.000
Five profiles	23211	23564	24487	123.10	0.000
Six profiles	23027	23539	24884	69.87	0.000
Seven profiles	22983	23567	25024	55.7	0.000

AIC: Akaike Information criterion; BIC: Bayesian Information criterion; ICL: integrated completed likelihood; LRT: Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test; BLRT: bootstrap likelihood ratio test; VVE model: ellipsoidal, variable volume, variable shape, equal orientation bootstrap with 5000 replications

Table 4 – Profiles' description and chi-squared tests

Variable	n	%	Profile 1	Profile 2	Profile 3	Profile 4
Gender*						
Female	1019	53%	54%	59%	52%	49%
Male	891	47%	46%	40%	47%	50%
With health issues						
No	1443	76%	75%	81%	75%	76%
Yes	454	24%	25%	18%	24%	23%
Sleeps well						
No	171	9%	10%	7%	7%	9%
Yes	1706	90%	90%	92%	93%	90%
Practices sports						
No	873	46%	45%	44%	46%	48%
Yes	1035	54%	55%	54%	54%	51%
Hard to make friends†						
No	1627	85%	85%	88%	89%	82%
Yes	276	15%	15%	11%	10%	17%
Parents control Internet*						
No	961	50%	50%	44%	46%	58%
Yes	943	50%	50%	54%	53%	41%

*: $p < 0.01$; †: $p < 0.05$; ‡: $p < 0.1$

Table 4 – Average latent profile probabilities for most likely profile membership (row) by latent profile (column)

Profile	1	2	3	4
1	0.997	0.000	0.000	0.003
2	0.000	1	0.000	0.000
3	0.107	0.000	0.893	0.000
4	0.077	0.000	0.009	0.915

Table 5 – Model fit for the different profile solutions

Solution	AIC	BIC	ICL	LRT	BLRT
Two profiles	23612	23834	24691	362.59	0.000
Three profiles	23275	23570	24364	145.18	0.000
Four profiles	23156	23523	24323	57.33	0.000
Five profiles	23211	23564	24487	123.10	0.000
Six profiles	23027	23539	24884	69.87	0.000
Seven profiles	22983	23567	25024	55.7	0.000

AIC: Akaike Information criterion; BIC: Bayesian Information criterion; ICL: integrated completed likelihood; LRT: Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test; BLRT: bootstrap likelihood ratio test; VVE model: ellipsoidal, variable volume, variable shape, equal orientation bootstrap with 5000 replications

Table 5 – Results of the supervised classification

Profile	Predicted in training (n = 1340)				Predicted in testing (n = 575)			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1.	704	0	2	0	290	0	0	1
2.	0	109	3	0	0	55	0	0
3.	17	0	225	0	12	0	100	0
4.	16	0	1	263	9	0	1	107

Main diagonals contain correct classifications.

Classification error in the training set is 2.9% and 4.0% in the testing set.

Table 6 – Average latent profile probabilities for most likely profile membership (row) by latent profile (column)

Profile	1	2	3	4
1	0.997	0.000	0.000	0.003
2	0.000	1	0.000	0.000
3	0.107	0.000	0.893	0.000
4	0.077	0.000	0.009	0.915

Table 6 – Means and standard deviations of Profiles and ANOVA tests

Profile	SAL	EXU	NGW	ANT	LOC	NSL	IAT
P1	1.85 (0.52)	1.91 (0.48)	1.88 (0.63)	2.19 (0.75)	2.46 (0.69)	1.44 (0.71)	1.96 (0.31)
P2	1.12 (0.22)	1.2 (0.23)	1.07 (0.16)	1.19 (0.32)	1.19 (0.26)	0.84 (0.45)	1.1 (0.13)
P3	1.44 (0.34)	1.56 (0.33)	1.22 (0.27)	1.84 (0.54)	1.50 (0.40)	1.37 (0.67)	1.49 (0.19)
P4	2.83 (0.81)	2.71 (0.81)	2.33 (0.95)	3.03 (1.11)	2.97 (0.99)	2.12 (1.18)	2.66 (0.33)
F	575.888	448.338	265.143	266.323	432.916	118.867	442.392
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Standard deviations in parenthesis.

SAL: Saliency; EXU: Excessive Use; NGW: Neglect Work; ANT: Anticipation; LOC: Lack of Control; NSL: Neglect Social Life; IAT: Internet Addiction test

Table 7 – Results of the supervised classification

Profile	Predicted in training (n = 1340)				Predicted in testing (n = 575)			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1.	704	0	2	0	290	0	0	1
2.	0	109	3	0	0	55	0	0
3.	17	0	225	0	12	0	100	0
4.	16	0	1	263	9	0	1	107

Main diagonals contain correct classifications.

Classification error in the training set is 2.9% and 4.0% in the testing set.

Table 7 – Profiles' description and chi-squared tests

Variable	n	%	Profile 1	Profile 2	Profile 3	Profile 4
Gender*						
Female	1019	53%	54%	59%	52%	49%
Male	891	47%	46%	40%	47%	50%
With health issues						
No	1443	76%	75%	81%	75%	76%
Yes	454	24%	25%	18%	24%	23%
Sleeps well						
No	171	9%	10%	7%	7%	9%
Yes	1706	90%	90%	92%	93%	90%
Practices sports						
No	873	46%	45%	44%	46%	48%
Yes	1035	54%	55%	54%	54%	51%
Hard to make friends†						
No	1627	85%	85%	88%	89%	82%
Yes	276	15%	15%	11%	10%	17%
Parents control Internet*						
No	961	50%	50%	44%	46%	58%
Yes	943	50%	50%	54%	53%	41%

*: $p < 0.01$; †: $p < 0.05$; ‡: $p < 0.1$

Article published with errors:

<https://www.actamedicaportuguesa.com/revista/index.php/amp/article/view/17047>

Na página 646, Secção 'RESULTS',
No parágrafo 'Model estimation and selection',

Linha 3, onde se lê (assinalado a vermelho):

Firstly, we examined fit statistics (Table 5), namely the Akaike Information criterion (AIC) (...)

Deve ler-se (assinalado a azul):

Firstly, we examined fit statistics (Table 3), namely the Akaike Information criterion (AIC) (...)

Linha 9, onde se lê (assinalado a vermelho):

(...) (LRT = 57.33, $p < 0.0001$, see Table 5) (...)

Deve ler-se (assinalado a azul):

(...) (LRT = 57.33, $p < 0.0001$, see Table 3) (...)

No parágrafo 'Classification accuracy of the model',

Linha 1, onde se lê (assinalado a vermelho):

The probabilities of correct classification of observations are shown in the main diagonal of Table 6, (...)

Deve ler-se (assinalado a azul):

The probabilities of correct classification of observations are shown in the main diagonal of Table 4, (...)

Linha 7, onde se lê (assinalado a vermelho):

The classification accuracy of the testing subsample was 96%, as shown in Table 7.

Deve ler-se (assinalado a azul):

The classification accuracy of the testing subsample was 96%, as shown in Table 5.

Na página 647,

No capítulo Description of profiles, 2º parágrafo, **linha 4, onde se lê (assinalado a vermelho):**

This group scores negatively (less than 2.5, below the green, dotted bottom line) in all dimensions (Table 3), (...)

Deve ler-se (assinalado a azul):

This group scores negatively (less than 2.5, below the green, dotted bottom line) in all dimensions (Table 6), (...)

Na página 648,

Linha 6, onde se lê (assinalado a vermelho):

(...) equal parental control rates or absence thereof (Table 4).

Deve ler-se (assinalado a azul):

(...)equal parental control rates or absence thereof (Table 7).

2º parágrafo, **linha 9, onde se lê (assinalado a vermelho):**

(...) compared with other profiles, are noteworthy (Table 4).

Deve ler-se (assinalado a azul):

(...) compared with other profiles, are noteworthy (Table 7).

3º parágrafo, **linha 7, onde se lê (assinalado a vermelho):**

Here we also highlight users with the least difficulty in making friends (Table 4).

Deve ler-se (assinalado a azul):

Here we also highlight users with the least difficulty in making friends (Table 7).

4º parágrafo, **linha 10, onde se lê (assinalado a vermelho):**

(...) and lower parental control rate stood out compared with the other profiles (Table 4).

Deve ler-se (assinalado a azul):

(...) and lower parental control rate stood out compared with the other profiles (Table 7).

Resultado destas correções, as Tabelas 3 a 7 são reordenadas da seguinte forma (ordem original assinalada a **vermelho**, ordem correcta a **azul**):

Table 3 – Means and standard deviations of Profiles and ANOVA tests

Profile	SAL	EXU	NGW	ANT	LOC	NSL	IAT
P1	1.85 (0.52)	1.91 (0.48)	1.88 (0.63)	2.19 (0.75)	2.46 (0.69)	1.44 (0.71)	1.96 (0.31)
P2	1.12 (0.22)	1.2 (0.23)	1.07 (0.16)	1.19 (0.32)	1.19 (0.26)	0.84 (0.45)	1.1 (0.13)
P3	1.44 (0.34)	1.56 (0.33)	1.22 (0.27)	1.84 (0.54)	1.50 (0.40)	1.37 (0.67)	1.49 (0.19)
P4	2.83 (0.81)	2.71 (0.81)	2.33 (0.95)	3.03 (1.11)	2.97 (0.99)	2.12 (1.18)	2.66 (0.33)
F	575.888	448.338	265.143	266.323	432.916	118.867	442.392
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Standard deviations in parenthesis.

SAL: Saliency; EXU: Excessive Use; NGW: Neglect Work; ANT: Anticipation; LOC: Lack of Control; NSL: Neglect Social Life; IAT: Internet Addiction test

Table 3 – Model fit for the different profile solutions

Solution	AIC	BIC	ICL	LRT	BLRT
Two profiles	23612	23834	24691	362.59	0.000
Three profiles	23275	23570	24364	145.18	0.000
Four profiles	23156	23523	24323	57.33	0.000
Five profiles	23211	23564	24487	123.10	0.000
Six profiles	23027	23539	24884	69.87	0.000
Seven profiles	22983	23567	25024	55.7	0.000

AIC: Akaike Information criterion; BIC: Bayesian Information criterion; ICL: integrated completed likelihood; LRT: Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test; BLRT: bootstrap likelihood ratio test; VVE model: ellipsoidal, variable volume, variable shape, equal orientation bootstrap with 5000 replications

Table 4 – Profiles' description and chi-squared tests

Variable	n	%	Profile 1	Profile 2	Profile 3	Profile 4
Gender*						
Female	1019	53%	54%	59%	52%	49%
Male	891	47%	46%	40%	47%	50%
With health issues						
No	1443	76%	75%	81%	75%	76%
Yes	454	24%	25%	18%	24%	23%
Sleeps well						
No	171	9%	10%	7%	7%	9%
Yes	1706	90%	90%	92%	93%	90%
Practices sports						
No	873	46%	45%	44%	46%	48%
Yes	1035	54%	55%	54%	54%	51%
Hard to make friends†						
No	1627	85%	85%	88%	89%	82%
Yes	276	15%	15%	11%	10%	17%
Parents control Internet*						
No	961	50%	50%	44%	46%	58%
Yes	943	50%	50%	54%	53%	41%

*: $p < 0.01$; †: $p < 0.05$; ‡: $p < 0.1$

Table 4 – Average latent profile probabilities for most likely profile membership (row) by latent profile (column)

Profile	1	2	3	4
1	0.997	0.000	0.000	0.003
2	0.000	1	0.000	0.000
3	0.107	0.000	0.893	0.000
4	0.077	0.000	0.009	0.915

Table 5 – Model fit for the different profile solutions

Solution	AIC	BIC	ICL	LRT	BLRT
Two profiles	23612	23834	24691	362.59	0.000
Three profiles	23275	23570	24364	145.18	0.000
Four profiles	23156	23523	24323	57.33	0.000
Five profiles	23211	23564	24487	123.10	0.000
Six profiles	23027	23539	24884	69.87	0.000
Seven profiles	22983	23567	25024	55.7	0.000

AIC: Akaike information criterion; BIC: Bayesian Information criterion; ICL: integrated completed likelihood; LRT: Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test; BLRT: bootstrap likelihood ratio test; VVE model: ellipsoidal, variable volume, variable shape, equal orientation bootstrap with 5000 replications

Table 5 – Results of the supervised classification

Profile	Predicted in training (n = 1340)				Predicted in testing (n = 575)			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1.	704	0	2	0	290	0	0	1
2.	0	109	3	0	0	55	0	0
3.	17	0	225	0	12	0	100	0
4.	16	0	1	263	9	0	1	107

Main diagonals contain correct classifications.

Classification error in the training set is 2.9% and 4.0% in the testing set.

Table 6 – Average latent profile probabilities for most likely profile membership (row) by latent profile (column)

Profile	1	2	3	4
1	0.997	0.000	0.000	0.003
2	0.000	1	0.000	0.000
3	0.107	0.000	0.893	0.000
4	0.077	0.000	0.009	0.915

Table 6 – Means and standard deviations of Profiles and ANOVA tests

Profile	SAL	EXU	NGW	ANT	LOC	NSL	IAT
P1	1.85 (0.52)	1.91 (0.48)	1.88 (0.63)	2.19 (0.75)	2.46 (0.69)	1.44 (0.71)	1.96 (0.31)
P2	1.12 (0.22)	1.2 (0.23)	1.07 (0.16)	1.19 (0.32)	1.19 (0.26)	0.84 (0.45)	1.1 (0.13)
P3	1.44 (0.34)	1.56 (0.33)	1.22 (0.27)	1.84 (0.54)	1.50 (0.40)	1.37 (0.67)	1.49 (0.19)
P4	2.83 (0.81)	2.71 (0.81)	2.33 (0.95)	3.03 (1.11)	2.97 (0.99)	2.12 (1.18)	2.66 (0.33)
F	575.888	448.338	265.143	266.323	432.916	118.867	442.392
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Standard deviations in parenthesis.

SAL: Saliency; EXU: Excessive Use; NGW: Neglect Work; ANT: Anticipation; LOC: Lack of Control; NSL: Neglect Social Life; IAT: Internet Addiction test

Table 7 – Results of the supervised classification

Profile	Predicted in training (n = 1340)				Predicted in testing (n = 575)			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1.	704	0	2	0	290	0	0	1
2.	0	109	3	0	0	55	0	0
3.	17	0	225	0	12	0	100	0
4.	16	0	1	263	9	0	1	107

Main diagonals contain correct classifications.

Classification error in the training set is 2.9% and 4.0% in the testing set.

Table 7 – Profiles' description and chi-squared tests

Variable	n	%	Profile 1	Profile 2	Profile 3	Profile 4
Gender[†]						
Female	1019	53%	54%	59%	52%	49%
Male	891	47%	46%	40%	47%	50%
With health issues						
No	1443	76%	75%	81%	75%	76%
Yes	454	24%	25%	18%	24%	23%
Sleeps well						
No	171	9%	10%	7%	7%	9%
Yes	1706	90%	90%	92%	93%	90%
Practices sports						
No	873	46%	45%	44%	46%	48%
Yes	1035	54%	55%	54%	54%	51%
Hard to make friends[†]						
No	1627	85%	85%	88%	89%	82%
Yes	276	15%	15%	11%	10%	17%
Parents control Internet[*]						
No	961	50%	50%	44%	46%	58%
Yes	943	50%	50%	54%	53%	41%

*: $p < 0.01$; †: $p < 0.05$; ‡: $p < 0.1$

Artigo publicado com erros:

<https://www.actamedicaportuguesa.com/revista/index.php/amp/article/view/17047>



<https://doi.org/10.20344/amp.18862>