Author Correction: Using Bayes factor hypothesis testing in neuroscience to establish evidence of absence

Christian Keyzers , Valeria Gazzola and Eric-Jan Wagenmakers

Correction to: *Nature Neuroscience* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-020-0660-4>, published online 29 June 2020.

In the version of this article initially published, a number of small errors occurred throughout the text, and several figures were out of order.

Figure 6 should have been Figure 3; Figure 3 should have been Figure 4; Figures 4 and 5 should have been Figs. 5 and 6. Figure citations throughout the text have been updated to reflect this.

In the legend for Fig. 1b, the sentence beginning, “When an effect is present...” the last phrase should read “misses ($BF_{+0} < 1/3$, red bars and red percentages) are rare ($\mu = 0.5$) or absent ($\mu = 1.2$ or 2).”

In Fig. 3a, the key for the graph on the right should have read, “Max BF_{+0} : 0.99 at $r = 0.0$; Wide prior: $BF_{+0} = 4.5$; Ultrawide prior: $BF_{+0} = 6.1$; User prior: $BF_{+0} = 8.4$.” In the legend for Fig. 3a, the second-to-last sentence should read, “As can be seen, there is extreme evidence for H_1 in ShockObs, across all but the smallest priors (i.e., the gray, green and cyan dots all have $BF_{+0} > 160$), and there is moderate evidence for H_0 for all but the smallest priors for CS (most $BF_{+0} > 4.5$).” In Fig. 3c, eight instances of BF_{-0} and BF_{0-} should have been BF_{+0} and BF_{0+} , respectively.

In the paragraph beginning “The Bayesian approach...” the second sentence before the end of the paragraph should have read “If $BF \approx 1$ we have absence of evidence.”

In the paragraph beginning “Fig. 6 applies this logic...”, the sentences beginning “Selecting ‘Compare to...” should have read “Selecting ‘Compare to best model’, as we did in Fig. 6, shows the models with the best model on top, and all other BF_{10} values can be read as describing how likely that model is compared to the best model. If one selects ‘Compare to null model’, the null model is shown first, and all other BF_{10} values express likelihood relative to that null model.”

In the paragraph beginning, “Selecting the option ‘Prior...” the first sentence should have referred to dotted and blue lines.

The errors have been corrected in the PDF and HTML versions of this article.

Published online: 6 October 2020

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-020-00710-7>

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature America, Inc. 2020