Erratum to: Comment on “Quantifying the informational value of classification images”: Miscomputation of infoVal metric was a minor issue and is now corrected

Mathias Schmitz¹ · Marine Rougier¹ · Vincent Yzerbyt¹ · Loek Brinkman² · Ron Dotsch²

Published online: 3 March 2020
© The Psychonomic Society, Inc. 2020

Keywords infoVal · Reverse correlation · Classification images · rcicr package · R

Erratum to: Behav Res (2019)
<https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-019-01295-1>

One of the two miscomputations identified in the *infoVal* metric, namely the omission of the k constant, turns out not to be a miscomputation, since the constant was already taken into account by default in the `mad()` function from R (see <https://www.rdocumentation.org/packages/stats/versions/3.6.2/topics/mad>). Therefore, the only miscomputation that remains is the use of the *one norm* instead of the *Euclidean norm*. As can be seen in Table 1 and Fig. 1, the impact of this miscomputation is minor. The computation of *infoVal* has been corrected and can now be computed with the *rcicr* package. All the computations were performed with the data

available in OSF (https://osf.io/fbduk/?view_only=e3c04e549f844facb109200dcba7a0db) from Schmitz et al. (Schmitz, Rougier, & Yzerbyt, 2019).

Reference

Schmitz, M., Rougier, M., & Yzerbyt, V. (2019). *Comment on “Quantifying the informational value of classification images”: A miscomputation of the infoVal metric*. *Behavior Research Methods* <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-019-01295-1>

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

✉ Mathias Schmitz
mathias.schmitz@uclouvain.be

¹ Université catholique de Louvain,
Ottignies-Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

² Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands

Table 1. Proportions of H_0 rejection ($H_0 = CI$ generated by a random process) out of 1,000 simulation runs per level of P [random] for two different critical values (1.96 and 3) and for the “correct” (Euclidean norm) vs. “incorrect” (one norm) computation of the *infoVal* metric

P [random]	<i>infoVal</i> > 1.96		<i>infoVal</i> > 3	
	correct computation	incorrect computation	correct computation	incorrect computation
.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
.125	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
.250	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
.375	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
.500	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
.625	.970	.970	.864	.866
.750	.555	.553	.279	.282
.875	.126	.125	.028	.028
1.000	.041	.041	.005	.005

Fig. 1. Relationship between the *infoVal* metric and the probability of random responses, P [random], as a function of the “correct” (Euclidean norm) vs. “incorrect” (one norm) computation of this metric. The dashed line represents 1.96 units of approximated standard deviation