ERRATUM

Erratum to: The reliability of retro-cues determines the fate of noncued visual working memory representations

Eren Günseli¹ • Dirk van Moorselaar¹ • Martijn Meeter¹ • Christian N. L. Olivers¹

Published online: 30 July 2015
© Psychonomic Society, Inc. 2015

Erratum to: Psychon Bull Rev DOI 10.3758/s13423-014-0796-x

We made two errors in the Introduction of our article Günseli, van Moorselaar, Meeter, and Olivers (2015). Neither of these affects our arguments, hypotheses, results or conclusions in our view, but may lead to a misconception of earlier work.

1. The validity ratios of two studies were erroneously swapped. We reported a validity ratio of 50% for Landman, Spekreijse, and Lamme (2003) and 66.6% for Rerko and Oberauer (2013), where we intended 66.6% for Landman et al. (2003) and 50% for Rerko and Oberauer (2013).
2. For the study of Matsukura, Luck, and Vecera (2007), we reported a validity ratio of 75%, but this was based on an inconsistency in our calculations. A more consistent calculation yields 73.3% instead.

Note that we calculated the reliability of a particular cue type as the ratio of the number of valid cues over the number of valid plus invalid cues of that cue type. Not all studies we

quoted explicitly reported this ratio, as it was not directly relevant to their research question. In supplementary information available from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Eren_Gunseli we explain our calculations in detail in order to avoid future misunderstanding.

References

- Günseli, E., van Moorselaar, D., Meeter, M., & Olivers, C. N. (2015). The reliability of retro-cues determines the fate of noncued visual working memory representations. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*. doi:10.3758/s13423-014-0796-x
- Landman, R., Spekreijse, H., & Lamme, V. A. (2003). Large capacity storage of integrated objects before change blindness. *Vision research*, 43(2), 149–164.
- Matsukura, M., Luck, S. J., & Vecera, S. P. (2007). Attention effects during visual short-term memory maintenance: Protection or prioritization? *Perception and Psychophysics*, 69(8), 1422–1434.
- Rerko, L., & Oberauer, K. (2013). Focused, unfocused, and defocused information in working memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 39(4), 1075–1096. doi:10.1037/a0031172

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13423-014-0796-x>.

✉ Eren Günseli
gunseli.eren@gmail.com

¹ Department of Cognitive Psychology, VU University, Van der Boechorststraat 1, 1081 BT Amsterdam, The Netherlands