Errata

On Coppock (2019), *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 6(1)

This note lists two corrections to "Avoiding Post-Treatment Bias in Audit Experiments," published in the *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 6(1), 1-4, doi 10.1017/XPS.2018.9. Both are misstated numbers in the reanalysis paragraph on page 3, and **neither changes a conclusion of the paper.** In each case the published figure is the correct value truncated rather than rounded at the last digit it prints. Table 2, which carries the same reanalysis, is right in every cell it prints, and the argument the note makes about post-treatment conditioning is unaffected.

Every number in a corrected sentence below is computed from the deposited replication archive (10.7910/DVN/6NVI9C) at the time this document is rendered, including the numbers that were not wrong. The code and output supporting each correction are at github.com/active-maintenance-aec/coppock_2019b.

Every quantity on the percentage-point scale is stated to one decimal place, and bold marks the corrections. A corrected sentence therefore differs from the published one in more places than it is wrong: the article states the redefined-outcome estimate in whole points, and setting a whole number to one decimal is not a correction. Only what is bold has changed. Where a fuller value matters it is given in the note beneath the entry.

1. The Always-Responder estimate disagrees with Table 2

> Under the unverifiable assumption that both pair members would also have responded if the treatment assignment had been switched, I estimate the ATE among this subgroup to be **−5.5** points (SE = 2.5 points).

Corrected:

> Under the unverifiable assumption that both pair members would also have responded if the treatment assignment had been switched, I estimate the ATE among this subgroup to be **−5.6** points (SE = 2.5 points).

Table 2 prints −0.056 for the same estimate, which is −5.6 points. The estimate is −5.563 points, so the table rounds and the sentence truncates, and the article disagrees with itself about the number a reader would quote. The standard error is 2.482 points and is correct as published.

2. The standard error on the redefined outcome

> Finally, using the redefined outcome, I estimate the ATE to be a 6 point decrease in friendliness (SE = **1.7** points).

Corrected:

> Finally, using the redefined outcome, I estimate the ATE to be a 6.1 point decrease in friendliness (SE = **1.8** points).

Table 2 prints no standard errors, so this figure appears in the article only here. The standard error is 1.756 points, which rounds to 1.8; the sentence truncates it, as the sentence before it does. The point estimate is a decrease of 6.100 points, which is correct at the whole-point precision the article states; it is restated above at one decimal, unbolded, and has not changed.