

OPEN

Author Correction: Phonological network fluency identifies phonological restructuring through mental search

Karl David Neergaard , Jin Luo & Chu-Ren Huang

Correction to: *Scientific Reports* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-52433-w>, published online 05 November 2019

The HTML and PDF versions of this Article contained a typographical error in the spelling of the author Chu-Ren Huang, which was incorrectly given as Chu -Ren Huang.

In addition, the original version of this Article contained errors in the Abstract.

“Post exclusion, 95 native-language Mandarin speakers produced as many items that differed by a single lexical tone as possible within one minute.”

now reads:

“Post exclusion, 95 native-language Mandarin speakers produced as many items that differed by a single segment or lexical tone as possible within one minute.”

Lastly, the original article contains errors in the Methods section under the subheading ‘Fluency’.

“We introduce ‘weighted edit’ (WE), shown in Fig. 1b. WE states that a given word’s value to the final fluency score decreases as edit distance between itself and the auditory stimuli increases. Fluency weightings differed according to the number of units for each of the stimuli and production, such that weightings were the proportion of the number of edit distances possible prior to two items sharing no similarity. For instance, for four-unit stimuli that received five-unit responses, edit 1 garnered 1 point (e.g., wai4/uar⁵¹⁵¹/→ shuai4/ɕuar⁵¹⁵¹/), edit 2 = 0.75 (e.g., wai4/uar⁵¹⁵¹/→ shuan4/ɕuan⁵¹⁵¹/), edit 3 = 0.50 (e.g., wai4/uar⁵¹⁵¹/→ xiang4/ɕian⁵¹⁵¹/), edit 4 = 0.25 (e.g., wai4/uar⁵¹⁵¹/→ xiang3/ɕian²¹⁴/), and edit 5 = 0 (e.g., wai4/uar⁵¹⁵¹/→ xiong3/ɕion²¹⁴/). Similarly, for three-unit stimuli that received two-unit responses, edit 1 = 1 (e.g., du2/tu³⁵³⁵/→ wu2/u³⁵³⁵/), edit 2 = 0.50 (e.g., tu2/tu³⁵³⁵/→ wu4/u⁵¹⁵¹/), edit 3 = 0 (e.g., tu2/tu³⁵³⁵/→ yi4/i⁵¹⁵¹/), edits 4 and 5 also received 0 points due to not being possible combinations.”

now reads:

“We introduce ‘weighted edit’ (WE), shown in Fig. 1b. WE states that a given word’s value to the final fluency score decreases as edit distance between itself and the auditory stimuli increases. Fluency weightings differed according to the number of units for each of the stimuli and production, such that weightings were the proportion of the number of edit distances possible prior to two items sharing no similarity. For instance, for four-unit stimuli that received five-unit responses, edit 1 garnered 1 point (e.g., wai4/uar⁵¹/→ shuai4/ɕuar⁵¹/), edit 2 = 0.75 (e.g., wai4/uar⁵¹/→ shuan4/ɕuan⁵¹/), edit 3 = 0.50 (e.g., wai4/uar⁵¹/→ xiang4/ɕian⁵¹/), edit 4 = 0.25 (e.g., wai4/uar⁵¹/→ xiang3/ɕian²¹⁴/), and edit 5 = 0 (e.g., wai4/uar⁵¹/→ xiong3/ɕion²¹⁴/). Similarly, for three-unit stimuli that received two-unit responses, edit 1 = 1 (e.g., du2/tu³⁵/→ wu2/u³⁵/), edit 2 = 0.50 (e.g., tu2/tu³⁵/→ wu4/u⁵¹/), edit 3 = 0 (e.g., tu2/tu³⁵/→ yi4/i⁵¹/), edits 4 and 5 also received 0 points due to not being possible combinations.”

These errors have now been corrected in the PDF and HTML versions of the published Article.

Published online: 14 January 2020



Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2020