Correction to: Effects of funding mechanisms on participation in multilateral environmental agreements

Steffen Mohrenberg¹ · Vally Koubi¹ · Thomas Bernauer¹

Published online: 12 November 2019
© Springer Nature B.V. 2019

Correction to: Int Environ Agreements (2019) 19:1–18
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-018-9423-z>

In the original publication of the article, there were few mistakes in the text, tables and figure. The corrected text has been presented with this correction.

On page 11, Table 1, (a) in the row starting with entry “fund”, second column, “0.42* (0.05)” should read as “0.40* (0.05)”; (b) in the row starting with entry “Constant”, third column, “–3.44* (0.2S)” should read as “–3.44* (0.28)”. The correct version of Table 1 is given here.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-018-9423-z>.

✉ Vally Koubi
koubi@ir.gess.ethz.ch

¹ ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

Table 1 Main results, logit regression with robust standard errors clustered by country

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
fund	0.40* (0.05)	0.42* (0.05)		
fund_contribution mandatory all			– 1.56* (0.32)	
fund_contribution mandatory some			0.85* (0.24)	
fund_contribution voluntary			1.07* (0.10)	
fund_usage few benefit				0.94* (0.08)
fund_usage all benefit				0.14* (0.06)
subject_energy	0.24* (0.09)	0.24* (0.09)	– 2.39* (0.51)	0.24* (0.09)
subject_freshwater	– 0.31* (0.12)	– 0.31* (0.12)		– 0.41* (0.11)
subject_habitat	0.62* (0.07)	0.62* (0.07)	– 15.62* (0.56)	0.67* (0.07)
subject_nature	0.35* (0.06)	0.34* (0.06)	1.29* (0.32)	0.32* (0.06)
subject_ocean	– 0.62* (0.06)	– 0.61* (0.06)	– 0.72* (0.13)	– 0.63* (0.07)
subject_pollution	0.88* (0.07)	0.87* (0.07)	1.86* (0.42)	0.90* (0.07)
subject_species	0.11* (0.05)	0.11* (0.05)	0.63* (0.21)	0.11* (0.05)
subject_weapons	0.06 (0.11)	0.05 (0.12)	1.29* (0.31)	0.17 (0.11)
obligations	– 0.21* (0.05)	– 0.21* (0.05)	– 2.18* (0.37)	– 0.26* (0.04)
mon_and_enf	0.39* (0.03)	0.38* (0.03)	– 0.65* (0.23)	0.34* (0.04)
dispute_settlement	0.52* (0.05)	0.51* (0.05)	1.34* (0.20)	0.44* (0.05)
public_good_global	– 0.37* (0.06)	– 0.37* (0.05)	– 0.17 (0.20)	– 0.42* (0.05)
public_good_mixed	– 0.61* (0.06)	– 0.61* (0.06)		– 0.62* (0.06)
trade_openness	0.05 (0.06)	0.05 (0.06)	0.08 (0.07)	0.05 (0.06)
igo_membership_count	0.02* (0.004)	0.02* (0.004)	0.02* (0.01)	0.02* (0.004)
polity	0.03* (0.01)	0.03* (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.03* (0.01)
gdppc	0.13* (0.04)	0.16* (0.04)	0.05 (0.06)	0.13* (0.04)
gdppc_squared	– 0.05* (0.02)	– 0.05* (0.02)	– 0.07* (0.03)	– 0.05* (0.02)
gdp	0.04 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)	0.01 (0.05)	0.04 (0.04)
legislative_approval	0.10 (0.11)	0.10 (0.11)	0.14 (0.13)	0.10 (0.11)
ratification_global	0.05* (0.002)	0.05* (0.002)	0.04* (0.003)	0.05* (0.002)
ratification_in_region	0.02* (0.002)	0.02* (0.002)	0.002 (0.002)	0.02* (0.002)
t1	– 0.25* (0.02)	– 0.25* (0.02)	– 0.30* (0.04)	– 0.25* (0.02)
t2	0.01* (0.001)	0.01* (0.001)	0.01* (0.001)	0.01* (0.001)
t3	– 0.0001* (0.0000)	– 0.0001* (0.0000)	0.0001* (0.0000)	– 0.0001* (0.0000)
fund:gdppc		– 0.13* (0.04)		
Constant	– 3.45* (0.29)	– 3.44* (0.28)	– 0.96 (0.75)	– 3.27* (0.29)
Treaties	178	178	26	178
Countries	154	154	154	154
Years	62	62	59	62
Observations	612,429	612,429	73,293	612,429
Log likelihood	– 25,271.16	– 25,260.64	– 4669.38	– 25,207.26

Reference categories: fund and fund usage: no fund; fund contribution: unspecified

* $p < 0.05$

On page 12, Para “Finally, we estimated...”, the sentence beginning, “If only some members...” should read “If all members benefit from a fund, the average ratification probability is higher if contributions are voluntary compared to mandatory for all members (expected probability difference of about 0.027). If, however, only some members benefit from a fund, voluntary contributions are, on average, also associated with a higher ratification probability than mandatory contributions for all members, yet the difference of about 0.006 is not statistically significant.”

On page 13, Figures 2(a) and 2(b) are identical. The correct version of Fig. 2(a) is given below:

Fig. 2 Simulated differences in the probability of treaty ratification when input variables of model 1 (a), 4 (b), or 3 (c) are, one by one, changed from a low to a high value, i.e., from 0 to 1 for dummy variables and from the 10th to the 90th percentile for the other variables. Time variables are set to the year 1960, the public good variables indicate that no public good is addressed, and the remaining variables are held constant at their median. Each confidence interval summarizes 20,000 simulations (median, 2.5th and 97.5th quantiles)

On page 15, Table 2 published with minor typos. The corrected Table 2 is provided in this correction.

Table 2 Interaction effects of contributions and benefits, logit regression with robust standard errors clustered by country

fund_included: mandatory contributions for all—all benefit	– 0.17* (0.08)
fund_included: mandatory contributions for all—few benefit	1.02* (0.45)
fund included: remaining combinations	0.56* (0.07)
fund_included: voluntary contributions only—all benefit	0.53* (0.20)
fund included: voluntary contributions only—few benefit	1.10* (0.08)
subject_energy	0.18* (0.09)
subject_freshwater	– 0.36* (0.11)
subject_habitat	0.59* (0.07)
subject_nature	0.34* (0.06)
subject_ocean	– 0.68* (0.06)
subject pollution	0.85* (0.07)
subject_species	0.10* (0.04)
subject_weapons	0.03 (0.11)
obligations	– 0.25* (0.04)
mon_and_enf	0.31* (0.04)
dispute_settlement	0.49* (0.05)
public_good_global	– 0.41* (0.06)
public_good_mixed	– 0.64* (0.06)
trade openness	0.05 (0.06)
igo_membership_count	0.02* (0.004)
polity	0.03* (0.01)
gdppc	0.13* (0.04)
gdpp c_squared	– 0.05* (0.02)
edD	0.04 (0.04)
legislative_approval	0.10 (0.11)
ratification_global	0.05* (0.002)
ratification_in_region	0.02* (0.002)
tl	– 0.25* (0.02)
t2	0.01* (0.001)
t3	– 0.0001* (0.0000)
Constant	– 3.25* (0.29)
Treaties	178
Countries	154
Years	62
Observations	612,429
Log likelihood	– 25,186.13

Reference categories: fund included, no fund. Remaining combinations: fund contribution: unspecified or mandatory for some; fund usage: all or few

* $p < 0.05$

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.