Errata

On Murphy, Coppock, Hill, and Vavreck (2026), *Political Communication*

This note lists corrections and three unresolved items in "Do Emotional Ads Persuade? Evidence from Real-Time Campaign Advertising Experiments," published in *Political Communication*, doi 10.1080/10584609.2026.2726266. Page numbers are the journal's. **No slope in Figures 2, 3, or 4 becomes distinguishable from zero under any correction here, so the article's central null is unchanged.**

1. Sanders favorability is rescaled twice

Published, app. Section E:

> The estimated slope of 0.034 indicates that an ad achieving the maximum rating of 1 relative to the minimum rating of 0 would be 3.4 points higher.

Corrected:

> The estimated slope of **0.044** indicates that an ad achieving the maximum rating of 1 relative to the minimum rating of 0 would be **4.4** points higher.

`clean_exps.R` applies `(favorBS_rev - 1)/4` twice, so Sanders favorability runs from -0.25 to 0 where the other candidates run from 0 to 1, and the 12 favorability estimates for the two pro-Sanders ads are a quarter of their size. The slope stays significant. The same rows enter Figure 2, where 0.014 (0.017) becomes 0.008 (0.034) and 0.008 (0.014) becomes 0.026 (0.025), and Figure 3, where -0.004 (0.013) becomes -0.012 (0.021). Tables C.1, C.6, C.11, and E.17 hold the same rows, and refitting them changes 102 of their 152 printed coefficients and standard errors, in the 5 columns that include the Sanders ads. Stars move on 10 coefficients. On the index coefficient the moves are C.6 Dem (PD), 0.052* to 0.021, E.17 Ind (PD), 0.223 to 0.507*, and E.17 All (2), 0.036 to 0.050*. No Figure 2 or 3 slope becomes distinguishable from zero. Both accuracy scripts repeat the same line, and there a CATE's scale can change which ad wins a matchup. Rerunning them without the line changes 12 of the 56 favorability and vote choice statistics behind Figures E.11 and E.12, all on favorability. In Figure E.11 the overall estimate, 0.508 becomes 0.502, and the Democrats' estimate, 0.578 becomes 0.564. In Figure E.12 the overall estimate, 0.489 becomes 0.444, and the Democrats' estimate, 0.733 becomes 0.667. Both Democrats' intervals exclude 0.50

as published and contain it once corrected. The overall individual intervals still contain 0.50, so the appendix's conclusion that individuals are no better than random guessing stands.

2. The two-advertisement sample

Published, app. Section E.1:

> Our design allows us to analyze individual accuracy by subsetting our sample to individuals who viewed two advertisements (n = 5,070)

Corrected:

> Our design allows us to analyze individual accuracy by subsetting our sample to individuals who viewed two advertisements (n = **5,077**)

The deposit's `exps.rds` assigns 5,077 respondents to the two-ad arm, one row each, and the analysis frame `observed_pairwise_frame.rds` holds all of them. Of these, 5,015 enter the favorability comparison because they rated both ads. No column of that arm has 5,070 non-missing values, so the source of the printed count is unknown.

3. Turnout and issue estimates take the sign of the ad's valence

Published, p. 11, Figure 4, the label in each panel; the data are also in app. Tables C.3 to C.5, C.8 to C.10, and C.13 to C.15:

> Target Issue Support, Negative Index: **0.052 (0.059)**. Turnout Intentions, Negative Index: **-0.017 (0.021)**. Target Issue Support, Positive Index: **-0.039 (0.041)**. Turnout Intentions, Positive Index: **0.064 (0.035)**.

Corrected:

> Target Issue Support, Negative Index: **0.018 (0.072)**. Turnout Intentions, Negative Index: **0.017 (0.021)**. Target Issue Support, Positive Index: **-0.053 (0.042)**. Turnout Intentions, Positive Index: **-0.052 (0.028)**.

`estimate_all_cates.R` multiplies every outcome by -1 for an anti ad, which suits candidate favorability and vote choice. It also flips turnout, so an anti ad that raises turnout plots as lowering it, in 90 of 102 estimates. For issues the deposit's `ad_id_to_base_by_hand.csv` carries a `direction` column that no script reads, and it disagrees with the sign used in 63 of 102 estimates. The corrected labels refit the same CATEs with no flip on turnout and with `direction` on issues (`maintained/corrected_slopes.R`). This correction counts a rise in turnout intentions as a rise whichever candidate the ad attacks, although an ad might be meant to demobilize. All four slopes remain indistinguishable from zero, so the sentence on p. 10 that the slopes of all four meta-regression lines are close to zero and not statistically significant stands. The appendix tables were not refit, and their turnout and issue columns carry the published signs.

4. Note 5 on the primary ads

Published, p. 12, note 5:

> Primary ads are coded as support for the sponsor's party. In our sample, nearly all the primary ads were positive in tone.

Table D.16 codes 7 of the 18 ads fielded in the primary period as positive. The anti-Trump ads "Scam", "Plain Wrong", and "Quotes" came from Republican sponsors and are plotted as pro-Democratic. We cannot tell which set of ads the note means, so this item corrects nothing.

5. Three attack ads are coded positive

Published, p. 5; app. Table D.16:

> If an ad's purpose was to attack an opponent, we code it as negative in tone, regardless of the colors or sounds it uses

Table D.16 codes the anti-Trump ads "America's Bullies", "Example", and "Families" as positive. Recoding the three as negative moves Figure 3: -0.004 (0.013) becomes 0.005 (0.010) on favorability, and -0.023 (0.024) becomes -0.014 (0.018) on vote choice. Neither is distinguishable from zero. Either the rule or the three codes could be the one intended, so this item corrects nothing.

6. Whose favorability

Published, p. 7:

> Here, we report the ads' effects on its sponsor's favorability among all respondents who were randomly assigned to see the ad.

Corrected:

> Here, we report **each ad's effect on the favorability of the candidate it promotes or attacks** among all respondents who were randomly assigned to see the ad.

`estimate_all_cates.R` measures an anti-Clinton ad on Clinton's favorability, as the same paragraph's example says.

7. The border item

Published, p. 10:

> The set of issues we asked about included whether to build a wall on the Mexican border

Corrected:

> The set of issues we asked about included whether to build a **fence along** the Mexican border

The deposit's `bases_df.xlsx` gives the item as a fence.

8. The note under Figure E.10

Published, app. Figure E.10:

> Red points correspond to an ad's average emotion index score and CATE among Republican respondents

Corrected:

> Red points correspond to an ad's average **rating** index score and CATE among Republican respondents

The figure's horizontal axis is the rating index.

9. Two ads named Sacrifice

Published, p. 4; app. Table D.16:

> we measured the effects of 48 unique political advertisements on more than 28,000 individuals

Table D.16 lists ads 60 and 99 under the same title, valence, and tone. The deposit gives them the same sponsor and fields both in the wave of September 5, 2016, with 331 subjects each. Nothing in the deposit shows whether these are two cuts or one spot. If they are one spot, the unique count is 47 and the 58 total treatments are 57. This item corrects nothing.

10. The estimator is weighted

Published, p. 7:

> We estimate conditional average treatment effects (CATEs) on candidate favorability and vote choice for each experiment using ordinary least squares regression (OLS) with robust standard errors.

Corrected:

> We estimate conditional average treatment effects (CATEs) on candidate favorability and vote choice for each experiment using **survey-weighted** ordinary least squares regression (OLS) with robust standard errors.

`estimate_all_cates.R` passes the deposit's `weights` to `lm_robust`. Neither the article nor its appendix mentions weights.

11. A dropped word

Published, app. Section E.1:

> Republicans correctly predict "Dem v. " favorability CATEs 33.3% of the time

Corrected:

> Republicans correctly predict "Dem v. **Rep**" favorability CATEs 33.3% of the time

12. A missing construction

Published, app. Section E:

> Figure E.10 displays the relationship subjects' subjective ratings with effectiveness.

Corrected:

> Figure E.10 displays the relationship **between** subjects' subjective ratings **and** effectiveness.

13. Spelling and number

Published, app. Sections A, D, and E:

> the emotion index components and the indicies. / the intended emotional valence of each add. / But before they provided a responses, they were reminded

Corrected:

> the emotion index components and the **indices**. / the intended emotional valence of each **ad**. / But before they provided a **response**, they were reminded