Journal of the Economic Science Association (2019) 5:95–96
https://doi.org/10.1007/s40881-019-00073-1

CORRECTION

Correction to: Do people exploit risk–reward structures to simplify information processing in risky choice?

Christina Leuker[1] · Thorsten Pachur[1] · Ralph Hertwig[1] · Timothy J. Pleskac[1,2]

Published online: 1 August 2019
© The Author(s) 2019

Correction to: Journal of the Economic Science Association https://doi.org/10.1007/s40881-019-00068-y

In the original publication of the article, the author's correction was missed in Table 1. The original article has been corrected and the correct Table 1 is given below.

The original article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1007/s40881-019-00068-y.

✉ Christina Leuker
leuker@mpib-berlin.mpg.de

[1] Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany

[2] University of Kansas Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany

https://doi.org/10.1007/s40881-019-00073-1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1 Overview of regression models for processing and choice. Reference group set for environment: "uncorrelated". Models included a random effect for "participant." Coefficients are the mean and the 95% credible intervals of the posterior distributions. Credible differences in bold

Regression	Condition (Within-participant)	
	Best	Fast
Choice: Higher EV (1)		
(Intercept)	0.61 [0.43, 0.79]	0.14 [– 0.01, 0.29]
EV difference	**0.13 [0.12, 0.14]**	**0.06 [0.05, 0.07]**
Environment (Negative)	**– 0.35 [– 0.60, – 0.11]**	**– 0.23 [– 0.42, – 0.03]**
Environment (Positive)	**– 0.30 [– 0.54, – 0.05]**	– 0.18 [– 0.38, 0.01]
Processing: RTs (2)		
(Intercept)	4.03 [3.50, 4.57]	1.01 [0.95, 1.06]
EV difference	**– 0.02 [– 0.03, – 0.14]**	0.00 [0.00, 0.00]
Environment (Negative)	**– 1.10 [– 1.86, – 0.34]**	– 0.04 [– 0.11, 0.03]
Environment (Positive)	– 0.63 [– 1.38, 0.13]	– 0.02 [– 0.10, 0.05]
Processing: AOIs (3)		
(Intercept)	3.18 [2.94, 3.41]	2.09 [1.82, 2.36]
EV difference	0.00 [0.00, 0.00]	0.00 [0.00, 0.00]
Environment (Negative)	– 0.20 [– 0.53, 0.13]	– 0.03 [– 0.42, 0.36]
Environment (Positive)	0.07 [– 0.26, 0.39]	0.21 [– 0.18, 0.59]
Processing: Within-gamble transitions (4)		
(Intercept)	1.74 [1.38, 2.10]	0.41 [0.31, 0.53]
EV difference	**– 0.01 [– 0.02, – 0.01]**	0.00 [0.00, 0.00]
Environment (Negative)	– 0.30 [– 0.79, 0.26]	– 0.05 [– 0.21, 0.10]
Environment (Positive)	– 0.09 [– 0.59, 0.41]	0.05 [– 0.11, 0.20]
Processing: Gaze to payoff (5)		
(Intercept)	0.51 [0.47, 0.56]	0.57 [0.50, 0.63]
EV difference	0.00 [0.00, 0.00]	0.00 [0.00, 0.00]
Environment (Negative)	**0.09 [0.02, 0.16]**	**0.10 [0.01, 0.19]**
Environment (Positive)	**0.09 [0.02, 0.15]**	**0.11 [0.02, 0.21]**
Choice: Higher EV pred. from process data (6)		
(Intercept)	0.41 [0.11, 0.72]	– 0.51 [– 0.78, – 0.24]
EV difference	**0.13 [0.12, 0.15]**	**0.06 [0.05, 0.07]**
Response time	– 0.03 [– 0.06, 0.00]	**0.47 [0.25, 0.69]**
AOIs inspected	**0.13 [0.06, 0.21]**	0.08 [0.00, 0.16]
Transitions (within)	0.01 [– 0.05, 0.06]	0.08 [– 0.04, 0.21]
Environment (Negative)	**– 0.35 [– 0.60, – 0.11]**	**– 0.20 [– 0.36, – 0.03]**
Environment (Positive)	**– 0.30 [– 0.55, – 0.05]**	– 0.14 [– 0.31, 0.03]

Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s40881-019-00073-1 Published online by Cambridge University Press