

CORRECTION

Correction: Frankenstein, thematic analysis and generative artificial intelligence: Quality appraisal methods and considerations for qualitative research

Tanisha Jowsey, Peta Stapleton, Shawna Campbell, Alexandra Davidson, Cher McGillivray, Isabella Maugeri, Megan Lee, Justin Keogh


S1 Table, S2 Table and S1 Fig are incorrect. Please view the correct [S1 Table](#), [S2 Table](#) and [S1 Fig](#) below.

Supporting information

S1 Table. Reported quotes by human researchers and genAI (Copilot).
(PDF)

S2 Table. Thematic analysis: Human compared with GenAI Copilot thematic analysis.
(PDF)

S1 Fig. Human compared with Copilot accuracy of participant/document quotes.
(PDF)



Reference

1. Jowsey T, Stapleton P, Campbell S, Davidson A, McGillivray C, Maugeri I, et al. Frankenstein, thematic analysis and generative artificial intelligence: Quality appraisal methods and considerations for qualitative research. PLoS One. 2025;20(9):e0330217. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0330217> PMID: [40911617](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40911617/)

OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Jowsey T, Stapleton P, Campbell S, Davidson A, McGillivray C, Maugeri I, et al. (2025) Correction: Frankenstein, thematic analysis and generative artificial intelligence: Quality appraisal methods and considerations for qualitative research. PLoS One 20(11): e0337734. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0337734>

Published: November 25, 2025

Copyright: © 2025 Jowsey et al. 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 author and source are credited.