

---

## **Correction: Bonsai trees in your head: How the Pavlovian system sculpts goal-directed choices by pruning decision trees**

Quentin JM Huys<sup>1,2,3,†,\*</sup>, Neir Eshel<sup>4,5,\*</sup>, Elizabeth O’Nions<sup>4</sup>, Luke Sheridan<sup>4</sup>, Peter Dayan<sup>1</sup> and Jonathan P Roiser<sup>4</sup>

**1** Gatsby Computational Neuroscience Unit, UCL, London, UK

**2** Wellcome Trust Centre for Neuroimaging, Institute of Neurology, UCL, London, UK

**3** Guy’s and St. Thomas’ NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

**4** UCL Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, London, UK

**5** currently at: Harvard Medical School, Harvard University, Boston, MA, USA

† Corresponding author: qhuys@cantab.net

\* These authors contributed equally.

**NB: Original author affiliations shown.**

Page 6: The sentence “The inferred reinforcement sensitivities from model ‘Pruning & Loss’ are shown in Figure 5B” should read “The inferred reinforcement sensitivities from model ‘Loss’ are shown in Figure 5B”.

Figure 5B: The title of this figure reads “Best loss model inferred sensitivities” but should read “Loss only model inferred sensitivities”.

Discussion, end of fourth paragraph says: “To the extent to which loss aversion can be described as an inflexible, reactive, response to an aversive stimulus, it may represent a third instance of Pavlovian responses to losses interfering with goal-directed decisions in this task [27].” However, loss aversion is not observed after accounting for pruning. This should hence be clarified by adding the sentence: “However, in this sample loss aversion was no longer evident when pruning was taken into account, i.e. pruning could explain away loss aversion, but loss aversion did not explain away pruning.”.

All other findings and all key conclusions remain unaltered.