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On page 213 of the commentary by Speekenbrink and Shanks (2011) on the target article by Jones & Love, there are some equations in which the operators are missing. The sentence that reads:

For example, suppose the sequence of rewards is \( S_1 \) and the sequence of responses is \( S_8 \). The first response \( x_1 = 1 \) implies that \( v_1 + v_2 + v_3 + v_4 + v_5 + v_6 + v_7 + v_8 \); the second response \( x_2 = 1 \) implies that \( v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 \); the third response \( x_3 = 1 \) implies that \( v_1, v_2 \). One choice of values consistent with this is \( v_j \).

should read as follows:

For example, suppose the sequence of rewards is \( S_1 \) and the sequence of responses is \( S_8 \). The first response \( x_1 = 1 \) implies that \( v_1 + v_2 + v_3 + v_4 < v_5 + v_6 + v_7 + v_8 \); the second response \( x_2 = 1 \) implies that \( v_1 + v_2 < v_3 + v_4 \); the third response \( x_3 = 1 \) implies that \( v_1 < v_2 \). One choice of values consistent with this is \( v_j = j \).

We regret the error.
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