




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

Christina Leuker<sup>1</sup>  · Thorsten Pachur<sup>1</sup> · Ralph Hertwig<sup>1</sup> · Timothy J. Pleskac<sup>1,2</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany

<sup>2</sup> University of Kansas Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany

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