

Fission-Fusion Dynamics, Behavioral Flexibility, and Inhibitory Control in Primates

Federica Amici, Filippo Aureli,* and Josep Call*

(Current Biology 18, 1415–1419; September 23, 2008)

Upon review of archived materials, the authors have identified several errors in the above article, as follows:

In the Experimental Procedures section “Data Scoring” (p. 1418), the sentence “All trials were videotaped, scored live, and later checked against the videotapes” should have read “59% of the 4,706 administered trials were videotaped. All trials were scored live and later checked against the videotapes when available.”

In the Supplemental Experimental Procedures, the definition of the dependent variable (i.e. the choice made by the subject in the cognitive tasks) was inaccurate for the A-not-B, middle-cup, and delay-of-gratification tasks. In particular, we considered that the subject made a choice in those tasks when she touched, pointed to, or reached for (and if no such response occurred, when she approached or looked at) one of the options, and not only when the subject touched or tried to reach for one of the options, as was mistakenly reported in the article.

In the Supplemental Experimental Procedures section “Subjects,” the sentence “In those cases in which the subject was reluctant to be isolated, another individual was present and the trial was only started and completed when there was no interference by the other individual” should have read “In those cases in which the subject was reluctant to be isolated, another individual was present and the trial was only started when there was no interference by the other individual.”

In order to confirm that the original (and inaccurate) definition of the dependent variable did not affect the results of our study, we recalculated interobserver reliability using the revised definition. An independent observer coded 20% of the video-recorded trials for each of these tasks, and interobserver reliability was excellent (Cohen’s $k = 0.813$ in the A-not-B task, $k = 1$ in the middle-cup task, and $k = 0.912$ in the delay-of-gratification task). Thus, we remain confident that the reported results accurately reflect what the primates were doing when tested. The authors apologize for these errors and any confusion that may have resulted.

*Correspondence: f.aureli@ljmu.ac.uk (F.A.), call@eva.mpg.de (J.C.)

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2013.06.020>
