scientific reports

Check for updates

OPEN

Author Correction: A framework for rigorous evaluation of human performance in human and machine learning comparison studies

Published online: 07 July 2022

Hannah P. Cowley, Mandy Natter, Karla Gray-Roncal, Rebecca E. Rhodes, Erik C. Johnson, Nathan Drenkow, Timothy M. Shead, Frances S. Chance, Brock Wester & William Gray-Roncal

Correction to: *Scientific Reports* https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-08078-3, published online 31 March 2022

The original version of this Article contained errors, where Reference 7 was incorrectly cited and omitted. As a result, in the Introduction,

"In some cases, when algorithm performance is compared against that of human participants, researchers make exciting claims that the ML algorithm exceeds human performance (e.g.,[7])."

now reads:

"In some cases, when algorithm performance is compared against that of human participants, researchers make exciting claims that the ML algorithm exceeds human performance."

"For example, they may not report how many human participants were tested or the level of expertise that the human performers have in completing the task (e.g.,[7])."

now reads:

"For example, they may not report how many human participants were tested or the level of expertise that the human performers have in completing the task (e.g.,[8,9])."

"These researchers employed many of the practices we advocate for in this work, including a recruiting large human participant pool, completion of relevant ethical reviews, and matching of trials across evaluation groups."

now reads:

"These researchers employed many of the practices we advocate in this work, including a recruiting large human participant pool, completion of relevant ethical reviews, and matching of trials across evaluation groups. These are not the only examples of well-executed and well-reported comparisons between human and algorithm performance; for example, Buetti-Dinh et al. (2009) provide information about the human subject pool under study and justification for the sample subject pool[22]."

The original Article has been corrected.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

© The Author(s) 2022