



## OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY  
Lidia Ghosh,  
RCC Institute of Information Technology, India

\*CORRESPONDENCE  
Xuehe Wang  
✉ wangxuehe@mail.sysu.edu.cn

<sup>†</sup>These authors share first authorship

RECEIVED 06 June 2025

ACCEPTED 17 June 2025

PUBLISHED 03 July 2025

## CITATION

Yang T, Xie C and Wang X (2025) Correction:  
Forgetting phenomena in the Iowa Gambling  
Task: a new computational model among  
diverse participants.  
*Front. Psychol.* 16:1642513.  
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1642513

## COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Yang, Xie and Wang. This is an  
open-access article distributed under the  
terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution  
License \(CC BY\)](#). The use, distribution or  
reproduction in other forums is permitted,  
provided the original author(s) and the  
copyright owner(s) are credited and that the  
original publication in this journal is cited, in  
accordance with accepted academic practice.  
No use, distribution or reproduction is  
permitted which does not comply with these  
terms.

# Correction: Forgetting phenomena in the Iowa Gambling Task: a new computational model among diverse participants

Tiancheng Yang<sup>1†</sup>, Chenghan Xie<sup>2†</sup> and Xuehe Wang<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Artificial Intelligence, Sun Yat-sen University, Zhuhai, China, <sup>2</sup>College of Engineering, Department of Information Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

## KEYWORDS

Forgetting Phenomena, Iowa Gambling Task, Exploitation and Exploration with Forgetting model, Sequential Exploration Decay, Forgetting Interval

## A Correction on

**Forgetting phenomena in the Iowa Gambling Task: a new computational model among diverse participants**

by Yang, T., Xie, C., and Wang, X. (2025). *Front. Psychol.* 16:1510151.  
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1510151

In the published article, there was an error. Two sentences in section 5.1. *Extension of EEFLA model with loss aversion, Paragraphs 4 and 5*, used outdated statistical values.

Corrections have been made to 5.1 *Extension of EEFLA model with loss aversion, Paragraphs 4 and 5*. These paragraphs previously stated:

“Figure 7 shows the comparison of SED and FI, and we can find that although the EEFLA model performed slightly worse than the EEFL model (the SED of EEFLA is 1.598, with a difference of 0.106 from the original data, while the SED of EEFL has a difference of only 0.008 from the original data; the FI of EEFLA is 4.02, with a difference of 2.22 from the original data, while the FI of EEFL has a difference of 2.07), it still outperformed the other models. This indicates that the EEFLA model is still capable of effectively simulating human decision-making behaviors.

However, it can be seen from Figure 8 that the performance of the EEFLA model is not outstanding in terms of parameter recovery and fixed-effects statistical model analysis. The average correlation coefficient for EEFLA's parameter recovery is 0.77155 (range: 0.60 – 0.93), which is lower than the EEFL model's 0.8299 (range: 0.64 – 0.96). Additionally, the EEFLA model did not perform well in the previously mentioned fixed-effects statistical model analysis.”

The corrected paragraphs appear below:

“Figure 7 shows the comparison of SED and FI, and we can find that although the EEFLA model performed slightly worse than the EEFL model (the SED of EEFLA is 1.598, with a difference of 0.049 from the original data, while the SED of EEFL has a difference of only 0.008 from the original data; the FI of EEFLA is 4.02, with a difference of 2.22 from the

original data, while the FI of EEF has a difference of 2.11), it still outperformed most of the other models. This indicates that the EEFLA model is still capable of effectively simulating human decision-making behaviors.

However, it can be seen from Figure 8 that the performance of the EEFLA model is not outstanding in terms of parameter recovery and fixed-effects statistical model analysis. The composite correlation coefficient for EEFLA's parameter recovery is 0.785 (range: 0.58–0.93), which is lower than the EEF model's 0.849 (range: 0.69–0.96). Additionally, the EEFLA model did not perform well in the previously mentioned fixed-effects statistical model analysis.”

The original article has been updated.

## Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.