Information Aggregation and Strategic Abstention in Large Laboratory Elections: Corrigendum[*]

Marco Battaglini[†] Rebecca Morton[‡] Thomas Palfrey[§]

May 6, 2008

There are some numerical errors in column 5 of Table 2 of "Information Aggregation and Strategic Abstention in Large Laboratory Elections" (this issue, pp. xx-yy). These arose in the process of coding the data for statistical analysis. The corrected table is given below.

Table 2 - Mean Efficiency by Treatment

Treatment	State	Cases	Actual	Predicted
$\pi - \frac{1}{2}, m = 0$	State A	11	1	1
	State B	9	1	1
$\pi = \frac{1}{2}, m = 6$	State A	14	1	0.98
	State B	6	0.83	0.99
$\pi = \frac{1}{2}, m = 12$	State A	15	1	0.93
	State B	5	0.50	0.98
$\pi = \frac{5}{9}, m = 0$	State A	14	1	1
	State B	6	0.92	1
$\pi = \frac{5}{9}, m = 6$	State A	7	1	0.99
	State B	13	0.92	0.98
$\pi = \frac{5}{9}, m = 12$	State A	9	1	0.84
	State B	11	0.55	0.98

The discussion in the first paragraph of section III.B (p. zz) was based on those incorrectly computed numbers. With the corrected numbers here, the main conclusion from Table 2 – that efficiency as measured by the percentage of correct decisions declines with the number of partisans (m) – still holds, but only in State B. In State B we observe efficiencies of 97%, 89%, and 53% for the $m = 0, 6, 12$ treatments, respectively, with no differences across the two π treatments. State A efficiencies are all 100%.

[*]We are grateful to Howard Margolis for bringing this to our attention.

[†]Department of Economics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544. Email: mbattagl@princeton.edu

[‡]Department of Politics, NYU, New York, NY 10012. Email: rebecca.morton@nyu.edu.

[§]Division of the Humanities and Social Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Mail Code 228-77, Pasadena, CA 91125. Email: trp@hss.caltech.edu.