

Erratum

Is everyone Bayes? On the testable implications of Bayesian Fundamentalism – Erratum

Maarten Speekenbrink and David R. Shanks

doi:10.1017/S0140525X11000409, Published by Cambridge University Press, 30 August 2011

On page 213 of the commentary by Speekenbrink and Shanks (2011) on the target article by Jones & Love, there are some equations in which the operators are missing. The sentence that reads:

For example, suppose the sequence of rewards is S_1 and the sequence of responses is S_8 . The first response $x_1 = 1$ implies that $v_1 + v_2 + v_3 + v_4 v_5 v_6 v_7 v_8$; the second response $x_2 = 1$ implies that $v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4$; the third response $x_3 = 1$ implies that $v_1 v_2$. One choice of values consistent with this is v_j .

should read as follows:

For example, suppose the sequence of rewards is S_1 and the sequence of responses is S_8 . The first response $x_1 = 1$ implies that $v_1 + v_2 + v_3 + v_4 < v_5 + v_6 + v_7 + v_8$; the second response $x_2 = 1$ implies that $v_1 + v_2 < v_3 + v_4$; the third response $x_3 = 1$ implies that $v_1 < v_2$. One choice of values consistent with this is $v_j = j$.

We regret the error.

Reference

Speekenbrink, M. & Shanks, D. R. (2011) Is everyone Bayes? On the testable implications of Bayesian Fundamentalism. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 34(4):213–14.