Errata

On Galos and Coppock (2023), *Science Advances* 9, eade7979

This note lists five corrections to "Gender composition predicts gender bias: A meta-reanalysis of hiring discrimination audit experiments," published in *Science Advances* 9, eade7979, doi 10.1126/sciadv.ade7979: three misstated numbers, one dropped significance marker, and one cross-reference to a figure that does not exist. **None of them changes a conclusion of the paper.** The gender gradient, the estimates in Tables 1 and 2, and every study-level effect in the supplementary materials are unaffected.

Every number in a corrected sentence below is computed from the deposited replication archive (10.7910/DVN/5MCRNY) 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/galos_coppock_2023.

Bold marks the corrected token in each corrected sentence. Entry 3 corrects a table rather than a sentence, so its change is named in the entry and shown in a reprint of the table, which is otherwise identical to the published one. Percentage-point quantities are given at the precision the article itself uses for them, which in the Results sentence corrected below is two decimal places. Rounding that sentence to one decimal would erase the correction it needs, since the published and corrected figures differ by a hundredth of a point.

1. The record spans six continents, not five

> Since 1983, more than 70 employment audit experiments, carried out in more than 26 countries across **five** continents, have randomized the gender of fictitious applicants to measure the extent of hiring discrimination on the basis of gender.

Corrected:

> Since 1983, more than 70 employment audit experiments, carried out in more than 26 countries across **six** continents, have randomized the gender of fictitious applicants to measure the extent of hiring discrimination on the basis of gender.

The paper's own evidence map, fig. S2.2, is drawn as six continent facets: Africa, Asia, Europe, N. America, Oceania, S. America. Section S2 names Oceania among the regions where the boom in audit experimentation occurred, and the earliest study in the whole record, the Australian one the introduction discusses, is on that continent. The sentence describes the wider literature rather than the 57 studies reanalysed here, but a superset of those studies cannot span fewer continents, so five is too few under any reading.

2. Table S2.1 overstates the occupation counts for two studies

> Gonzalez et al. (89): Spain … **18** occupations
>
> Dahl and Krog (84): Denmark … **24** occupations

Corrected:

> Gonzalez et al. (89): Spain … **17** occupations
>
> Dahl and Krog (84): Denmark … **21** occupations

The article disagrees with itself in these two rows. Figs. S4.37 and S4.32 plot 17 and 21 occupations for the same two studies, and 17 and 21 is what the deposited data hold. The other 55 rows of the column are right. The table is not reprinted here because its N subjects column cannot be regenerated from the deposit, which carries no subject counts.

3. Table 2's Model 2 intercept carries no significance marker

The Model 2 intercept is printed as -3.72 with no marker, at a p-value of 0.00104. Five decimals rather than the three the table's own note uses: at three the p-value reads 0.001, which is the threshold for the third star rather than the second, and the correction would be ambiguous inside the rule it is being compared against. The numerically identical Model 3 intercept, -3.73, does carry its two stars. The estimate and its standard error are right and only the marker is missing, so what is corrected here is the table rather than any sentence.

Table 2, corrected. Meta-regression estimates of the gender gradient by majority/minority status. $^{*}\mathrm{P} < 0.05$, $^{**}\mathrm{P} < 0.01$, and $^{***}\mathrm{P} < 0.001$.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Intercept	−1.55	−3.72**	−3.73**
	(1.31)	(1.13)	(1.14)
Gender gradient	5.70*	9.08***	9.11***
	(2.50)	(2.26)	(2.28)
Majority status			2.19
			(1.74)
Majority × gradient			−3.42
			(3.37)
Sample	Majority status group	Minority status group	Both groups
Tau.squared	6.60	6.28	6.44
Nobs	91	96	187

Note: The only change from the published table is the marker on the Model 2 intercept. Standard errors in parentheses.

4. The article cites a supplementary figure that does not exist

> The PRISMA search process yielded over 70 papers that met our inclusion criteria. Figure S6.**66** is a "PRISMA flow diagram" that illustrates the search strategy and reports the number of records retained at each stage of the process.

Corrected:

> The PRISMA search process yielded over 70 papers that met our inclusion criteria. Figure S6.**63** is a "PRISMA flow diagram" that illustrates the search strategy and reports the number of records retained at each stage of the process.

The supplementary materials list Figs. S1.1 to S6.63 in their front matter, and the PRISMA flow diagram is the last of them. There is no fig. S6.66. The same paragraph cites the evidence map as fig. S.2.2, where the figure itself is numbered S2.2.

5. The difference in the magnitude of the two predicted biases

> The magnitude of these biases is higher in women-dominated occupations than in men-dominated occupations, by a statistically significant **2.10** points (bootstrapped SE: 0.58), perhaps suggesting that pro–status quo forces operate differently across contexts.

Corrected:

> The magnitude of these biases is higher in women-dominated occupations than in men-dominated occupations, by a statistically significant **2.11** points (bootstrapped SE: 0.58), perhaps suggesting that pro–status quo forces operate differently across contexts.

The deposited code and the maintained rewrite both give 2.10547, which rounds to 2.11 at the two decimal places the sentence prints. The published figure is the truncation rather than a different number, and the bootstrapped standard error, 0.5781, is 0.58 as published.