Errata

On Coppock (2016), the corrigendum to Coppock (2014), *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 3(2)

This note lists three corrections to the corrigendum to "Information Spillovers: Another Look at Experimental Estimates of Legislator Responsiveness," published in *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 3(2):206–208, doi 10.1017/XPS.2016.8. **None changes the corrigendum's conclusion.** The first moves four upper confidence bounds, and both corrected intervals still include zero; the other two are names.

The corrigendum corrects Coppock (2014), *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 1(2):159–169, doi 10.1017/xps.2014.9, which has an errata note of its own. The data and code behind the corrigendum are deposited at doi 10.7910/DVN/H47CC6, and the maintained analysis that reproduces it is at github.com/active-maintenance-aec/coppock_2014.

The text

1. None of the four upper confidence bounds is the one the data support

Published, pp. 206–207:

> with 95% confidence intervals extending from -0.325 to **-0.025** for the indirect effect and -0.575 to **0.000** for the direct effect. […] The 95% confidence intervals are much wider, at [-0.325, **0.200**] for the indirect effect and [-0.625, **0.175**] for the direct effect

Corrected:

> with 95% confidence intervals extending from -0.325 to **-0.050** for the indirect effect and -0.575 to **-0.025** for the direct effect. […] The 95% confidence intervals are much wider, at [-0.325, **0.175**] for the indirect effect and [-0.625, **0.200 or higher**] for the direct effect

The bounds are read off the p-value surfaces saved in the corrigendum's own archive (doi:10.7910/DVN/H47CC6, fig2.rdata), the original panel for the first pair of intervals and the corrected panel for the second. The function that located them returned the first grid point after each edge of the confidence region, which is the first point inside at the lower edge and the first point outside at the upper edge, so three of the four upper bounds sit one step of 0.025 too high. The fourth, the corrected direct bound, lies at the top of the grid searched: the region runs to 0.2, where the function returns no bound at all, so the printed 0.175 has no origin in the code, and the data place the bound no lower than 0.2. The lower bounds are correct. Corrected, the original intervals still exclude zero and the corrected ones still include it, which is the corrigendum's conclusion.

2. A name in the acknowledgments is misspelled

Published, p. 208:

> I am grateful to Peter M. Aronow, Jake Bowers, and Mark M. **Frederickson**

Corrected:

> I am grateful to Peter M. Aronow, Jake Bowers, and Mark M. **Fredrickson**

The corrigendum's own reference list spells the name correctly, in Bowers, Fredrickson, and Panagopoulos (2013).

3. A reference gives the wrong second author

Published, p. 208, references:

> Butler, D. M., and **David, W. N.** (2011). Can learning constituency opinion affect how legislators vote?

Corrected:

> Butler, D. M., and **Nickerson, D. W.** (2011). Can learning constituency opinion affect how legislators vote?

The second author of the experiment the article reanalyzes is David W. Nickerson, whose given and family names the printed entry reverses. The 2014 article cites the same paper correctly.