



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Valentina Sclafani,
University of Lincoln, United Kingdom

*CORRESPONDENCE
Terry Tin-Yau Wong
✉ terrytyw@hku.hk

RECEIVED 11 September 2025
ACCEPTED 16 September 2025
PUBLISHED 06 October 2025

CITATION
Wong TT-Y, Tang JW-Y, Choi PP-K and Leung TS-C (2025) Correction: Identification of preschoolers with special educational needs: comparing the discriminative validity of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaires (SDQ) and the Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA) across different informants in Hong Kong.
Front. Psychol. 16:1703161.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1703161

COPYRIGHT
© 2025 Wong, Tang, Choi and Leung. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](#). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Correction: Identification of preschoolers with special educational needs: comparing the discriminative validity of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaires (SDQ) and the Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA) across different informants in Hong Kong

Terry Tin-Yau Wong^{1*}, Jacqueline Wai-Yan Tang^{1,2}, Pokky Poi-Ki Choi^{1,2} and Terence Siu-Chung Leung¹

¹Department of Psychology, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong SAR, China, ²Caritas Rehabilitation Service, Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

KEYWORDS

SDQ, ASEBA, preschool, behavioral and emotional problems, mental health

A Correction on

Identification of preschoolers with special educational needs: comparing the discriminative validity of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaires (SDQ) and the Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA) across different informants in Hong Kong

by Wong, T. T.-Y., Tang, J. W.-Y., Choi, P. P.-K., and Leung, T. S.-C. (2025). *Front. Psychol.* 16:1623690. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1623690

There was a mistake in [Table 6](#) as published. The T score column was missing. The corrected [Table 6](#) appears below.

The original version of this article has been updated.

TABLE 6 Cutoff scores for SDQ-T total difficulties score.

Age	Percentile	Raw score	T score	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	Overall acc.
3	90th percentile	≥19	64	0.32	0.87	0.35	0.85	0.77
	85th percentile	≥16	59	0.47	0.85	0.41	0.88	0.78
	Suggested	≥13	54	0.68	0.69	0.33	0.91	0.69
4	90th percentile	≥20	64	0.33	0.90	0.33	0.90	0.82
	85th percentile	≥18	61	0.47	0.83	0.30	0.91	0.78
	Suggested	≥14	55	0.80	0.73	0.32	0.96	0.74
5	90th percentile	≥17	65	0.20	0.90	0.40	0.76	0.72
	85th percentile	≥13	58	0.43	0.81	0.45	0.80	0.72
	Suggested	≥11	54	0.73	0.72	0.48	0.89	0.72

Publisher’s note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.