Erratum to: Understanding of and reasoning about object–object relationships in long-tailed macaques?

Christian Schloegl · Michael R. Waldmann ·
Julia Fischer

Published online: 18 October 2013
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2013

Erratum to: Anim Cogn (2013) 16:493–507 DOI 10.1007/s10071-012-0591-x

A re-inspection of the data of Experiment 2 (“reducing the computational demands—flat board versus cup”) revealed that for two subjects, one trial, each in the control condition A in which the reward was hidden underneath of one of two cups, had been coded erroneously as incorrect choices; the two subjects had indeed selected the baited object in both trials. We re-calculated the repeated-measures ANOVA, which we had reported as a test of subjects’ performances in the four different conditions. The corrected results demonstrate, as before, that performance differed between conditions ($F_{3,21} = 6.778$, $P = 0.002$; previously: $F_{3,21} = 7.143$, $P = 0.002$). With one exception, the post hoc comparisons yielded equivalent results [even though the P values changed slightly (see below)]. The only qualitative change was found in the comparison between condition C (one board and one cup, with the food underneath the board) and the control condition A (two

cups). Whereas we had originally reported a significant difference between these conditions ($P = 0.035$), this contrast now marginally fails to reach significance ($P = 0.051$).

The corrected P values for the other post hoc comparisons are as follows:

Condition B (two boards) versus Condition A (two cups): $P = 0.006$ (previously: $P = 0.004$).

Condition B versus Condition C (one board and one cup, reward underneath the board): $P = 0.492$ (previously: $P = 0.494$).

Condition B versus Condition D (one board and one cup, food underneath the cup): $P = 0.012$ (unchanged).

Condition C versus Condition D: $P = 0.082$ (previously: $P = 0.083$).

Condition D versus Condition A: $P = 0.724$ (previously: $P = 0.604$).

Furthermore, we had compared the performance within each condition against the hypothetical chance level of 50 %. For the corrected data set of the control condition A, this comparison is now: paired t test: $t = -1.214$, $df = 7$, $P = 0.264$ (previously: $t = -1.57$, $P = 0.16$).

Moreover, we had reported that the performance over the course of the six blocks (all conditions combined) did not change. Our new analysis confirms this finding (Pearson correlation: $r = -0.266$, $P = 0.611$; previously: $r = -0.204$, $P = 0.698$).

Lastly, for each condition, we had compared the performance in the first three blocks with the performance in the last three blocks. We repeated this analysis for the control condition A with unchanged results (paired t test: $N = 8$, $df = 7$, $t = 0$, $P > 0.999$).

We apologize for this error. In our view, the conclusions drawn from the data are still valid.

The corrected Fig. 3 is presented below.

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s10071-012-0591-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-012-0591-x).

C. Schloegl (✉) · J. Fischer
Cognitive Ethology Laboratory, German Primate Center
Göttingen, Kellnerweg 4, 37077 Göttingen, Germany
e-mail: cschloegl@dpz.eu

C. Schloegl · M. R. Waldmann · J. Fischer
Courant Research Centre “Evolution of Social Behaviour”,
Georg-August-University Göttingen, Kellnerweg 6,
37077 Göttingen, Germany

M. R. Waldmann
Department of Psychology, Georg-August-University Göttingen,
Gößlerstrasse 14, 37073 Göttingen, Germany

Fig. 3 Performance of the monkeys in Experiment 2. Capital letters below the *x*-axis denote the conditions. The objects used per condition are shown below the *x*-axis. The illustration shows the objects after the hiding of the reward. For conditions *B–D*, the top object is rewarded, and the lower object is not rewarded. In the control condition *A*, each object was rewarded in 50 % of the trials. Boxplots show median, 25th and 75th quartile, whiskers show 10th and 90th percentiles, and dots represent outliers. The solid horizontal line represents the 50 % chance level, and the vertical dotted line separates control and test conditions. Boxes marked with small letters above the *x*-axis differ significantly from each other, based on a repeated-measure ANOVA with post hoc Holm-Sidak tests. Asterisk shows significant deviation from chance according to a one-sample *t* test