Corrigenda and Addenda

Correction: Persuading Patients Using Rhetoric to Improve Artificial Intelligence Adoption: Experimental Study

Glorin Sebastian[1*], MS; Amrita George[2*], PhD; George Jackson Jr[3*], PhD

[1]Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, United States

[2]Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, United States

[3]Capella University, Minneapolis, MN, United States

[*]all authors contributed equally

Corresponding Author:
Amrita George, PhD
Georgia State University
Room 1713
55 Park Place
Atlanta, GA, 30303
United States
Phone: 1 4048344213
Email: ageorge12@gsu.edu

Related Article:
This is a corrected version. See correction statement in: https://www.jmir.org/2023/1/e41430

(J Med Internet Res 2026;28:e114087) doi: 10.2196/114087

The authors of "Persuading Patients Using Rhetoric to Improve Artificial Intelligence Adoption: Experimental Study" [1] miscalculated the *F* statistics and degrees of freedom for our manipulation check, and these were accidentally transposed into the text paragraph discussing our manipulation checks and Table 1.

An update to the manipulation check section has been completed to display the accurate, item-level validation metrics from the raw dataset to maintain the accuracy of the scientific record.

In the originally published manuscript, the Manipulation Check section under the Results read as follows:

> *We assessed whether the manipulation was successful. The participants were asked to rate questions related to the effectiveness of each advertisement. For example, participants were asked to rate "this advertisement was relevant/meaningful/important to me" ("1 strongly disagree...5 strongly agree"; see Table S4 in Multimedia Appendix 1 for the entire list). An ANOVA was conducted and a significant mean difference between the communication strategy conditions indicated that the manipulation was successful (Table 1). Participants in the pathological condition of the treatment group reported scores (mean 3.37, SD 0.90) different from those in the ethos condition (mean 3.52, SD 0.97) and logos condition (mean 3.43, SD 0.89). Thus, the results confirmed the effectiveness of communication strategy manipulation [Multimedia Appendix 1].*

In the corrected manuscript, the Manipulation Check section has been revised to read as follows:

> *We assessed whether the manipulation was successful. The participants were asked to rate questions related to the effectiveness of each advertisement and perceived relevance of the product (see Table S4 in Multimedia Appendix 1). For example, participants were asked to rate "this advertisement was relevant/meaningful/important to me" and "this product is relevant/irrelevant to me" ("1 strongly disagree...5 strongly agree"; see Table S4 in Multimedia Appendix 1 for the entire list). To check the effectiveness of the rhetorical manipulations, a 4-group 1-way ANOVA was conducted. While the overall composite involvement scale did not reach significance, a statistically significant mean difference emerged across the communication strategy conditions for the reverse-scaled relevance item ("This product is irrelevant to me," $F_{3,197}=2.86$; $P=.04$). A significant mean difference between the communication strategy conditions indicated that the manipulation was successful (Table 1).*

In the originally published manuscript, Table 1 appeared as an isolated 3-group mean/SD block with incorrect ANOVA parameters ($F_{1,144}=43.79$; $P<.001$).

XSL•FO
RenderX

Table 1. Mean score and ANOVA results for induced communication strategy (CS) conditions.

Experimental condition and CS type	Sample size, n	Values, mean (SD)	ANOVA
CS			$F_{1,144}$=43.79; P<.001
Pathos	52	3.37 (0.90)	
Logos	48	3.43 (0.89)	
Ethos	50	3.52 (0.97)	

In the corrected manuscript, Table 1 has been updated to present the explicit parameters of the validated product involvement manipulation check (included here as Table 2).

Table 2. Manipulation check analysis across rhetorical conditions (item-level focus).

Manipulation dimension and source of variation	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean square	*F* statistic	*P* value	Finding/interpretation
Product involvement (item: "This product is irrelevant to me"; reverse-scaled)				2.86	.04	Successful manipulation (significant difference across conditions: control, pathos, logos, ethos)
Between groups	15.271	3	5.09			
Within groups (error)	350.649	197	1.78			
Total	365.92	200	—[a]			

[a]Not applicable.

The underlying downstream partial least squares path models published in the study remain completely sound, accurate, and unaffected by this recalculation.

The correction will appear in the online version of the paper on the JMIR Publications website together with the publication of this correction notice. Because this was made after submission to PubMed, PubMed Central, and other full-text repositories, the corrected article has also been resubmitted to those repositories.

Reference

1. Sebastian G, George A, Jackson G. Persuading patients using rhetoric to improve artificial intelligence adoption: experimental study. J Med Internet Res. Mar 13, 2023;25:e41430. [FREE Full text] [doi: 10.2196/41430] [Medline: 36912869]

This is a non–peer-reviewed article. Submitted 10.Oct.2026; accepted 14.Oct.2026; published 20.Nov.2026.

Please cite as:
Sebastian G, George A, Jackson Jr G
Correction: Persuading Patients Using Rhetoric to Improve Artificial Intelligence Adoption: Experimental Study
J Med Internet Res 2026;28:e114087
URL: https://www.jmir.org/2026/1/e114087
doi: 10.2196/114087
PMID:

©Glorin Sebastian, Amrita George, George Jackson Jr. Originally published in the Journal of Medical Internet Research (https://www.jmir.org), 20.Nov.2026. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work, first published in the Journal of Medical Internet Research (ISSN 1438-8871), is properly cited. The complete bibliographic information, a link to the original publication on https://www.jmir.org/, as well as this copyright and license information must be included.

XSL•FO
RenderX