

CORRECTION

Correction: Subjective perceptions of breast cancer treatment experiences in women: a Q methodological approach

Sun Jung Park¹ , Byung Jun Park^{2,*} ¹Department of Nursing, Sahmyook Health University, 02500 Seoul, Republic of Korea²Department of Nursing, Kangwon National University, 25949 Samcheok, Republic of Korea***Correspondence**

apnjun@kangwon.ac.kr (Byung Jun Park)

1. Statement of Impact

The authors wish to correct the errors identified in the previously published version of this article [1]. The authors strictly confirm that these corrections are minor administrative/technical updates and do not affect the primary findings, analysis, results, or conclusions of the study.

2. List of Corrections**1. Location:** Page 1, Abstract (Method), Line 14**Original Text:** (3) analyzing the data using factor analysis via the PQMethod software.**Corrected Text:** (3) analyzing the data using factor analysis via QUANAL software.**Explanation:** QUANAL was utilized as the analytical tool in this study; the previous reference to PQMethod was an error.**2. Location:** Page 3, 2.2.5 Q-sorting process, Line 13**Original Text:** Once they had sorted the cards into these groups, they were instructed to place the cards on a 9-point forced distribution grid as follows: 2 cards each at +4 and -4, 3 cards each at +3 and -3, 4 cards each at +2 and -2, 6 cards each at +1 and -1, and 7 cards at 0 (neutral).**Corrected Text:** Once they had sorted the cards into these groups, they were instructed to place the cards on a 9-point forced distribution grid as follows: 2 cards each at +4 and -4, 3 cards each at +3 and -3, 4 cards each at +2 and -2, 5 cards each at +1 and -1, and 7 cards at 0 (neutral).**Explanation:** In practice, the Q-sorting procedure was correctly conducted using a total of 35 cards. The +1 and -1 piles should each contain 5 cards, rather than the 6 cards erroneously stated due to a typographical error.**3. Location:** Page 3, 2.2.3 P-sample selection, Line 24**Original Text:** Individuals were excluded if they had experienced cancer recurrence or were undergoing current treatment, had been diagnosed with and were receiving treatment for a severe psychiatric disorder, or had other acute or chronic illnesses unrelated to breast cancer, such as cardiovascular disease, respiratory disease, complicated hypertension or diabetes, or chronic renal failure.**Corrected Text:** Individuals were excluded if they had experienced cancer recurrence or were undergoing current treatment, had been diagnosed with and were receiving treat-

ment for a severe psychiatric disorder, or had other acute or chronic illnesses unrelated to breast cancer, such as cardiovascular disease, respiratory disease, severe complications or uncontrolled hypertension or diabetes, or chronic renal failure.

Explanation: The exclusion criterion stating “complicated hypertension or diabetes” was intended to refer to patients with severe complications or uncontrolled conditions. The participants described in Table 4 had stable conditions that were adequately controlled with medication.**4. Location:** Page 5, 2.4 Data analysis, Line 20 & 22**Original Text:** To better understand the characteristics of the three identified types, differences in Z-scores between factors (difference scores) and consensus items across all three types were also examined, using the same Z-score threshold of 1.0.**Corrected Text:** To better understand the characteristics of the four identified types, differences in Z-scores between factors (difference scores) and consensus items across all four types were also examined, using the same Z-score threshold of 1.0.**Explanation:** The final analysis of the study correctly identified four factors. The statement referring to “three factors” in the Data Analysis section (2.4) was a clerical error introduced during the revision process. The Abstract and Results sections correctly reflect the final four-factor solution.**5. Location:** Page 6, Table 4 (title)**Original Text:** P-sample (N = 35)**Corrected Text:** P-sample (N = 40)**Explanation:** The total number of participants included in the final analysis was 40. The notation “N = 35” in the title of Table 4 was a typographical error.**6. Location:** Page 11, Reference**Original Text:** [19] Park YH, Oh HY. Development and evaluation of a community-based multifaceted cognitive training program for the elderly with mild cognitive impairment. Journal of Korean Academy of Community Health Nursing. 2019; 30: 119–129. (In Korean)**Corrected Text:** [19] Kim HK. Agreement between the Q block and the Q tool. Journal of Korean Society for the

Scientific Study of Subjectivity. 2008; 16: 5–16. (In Korean)

Explanation: Reference [19] was inadvertently listed incorrectly during the final bibliography formatting process.

3. Concluding Acknowledgment

The authors sincerely apologize for any inconvenience or confusion that these errors may have caused to the readers of

the journal.

REFERENCES

- [1] Park SJ, Park BJ. Subjective perceptions of breast cancer treatment experiences in women: a Q methodological approach. *European Journal of Gynaecological Oncology*. 2025; 46: 27–37.