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The reduction in the rate of conflict should read 15% (95% CI 5.7–23.7%) and containment 23.2% (95% CI 9.9–35.5%) in the abstract and Section 2.1. Table 1 row 8 for PCC containment, risk of events – n/N should read 0.58 (938/1607) experimental, and 0.50 (802/1609) control. In Table 2, the confidence intervals for physical health should read −3.702 to −0.003, and the corresponding intervals stated in Section 2.3 should read “The control group staff showed a 1.85 point (95% CI: −0.003, −3.704) greater improvement in physical health than the Safewards intervention”

The authors would like to apologise for any inconvenience caused.