corrigendum*Homo economicus?*

Andrea Rinaldi

EMBO reports (2009) 10, 823–826. doi:10.1038/embor.2009.175

We regret that the above article, printed in the August issue of the journal, contained an error in the attribution of two quotations. The correct version of the text in each instance is printed below.

“The new field of neuroeconomics has indeed come in for some serious criticism from mainstream economists,” Coates conceded. “Part of this, of course, is purely defensive. But part of it may be justified in that it is not clear what we are to do with results showing, say, that a certain part of the brain, say, the shell of the nucleus accumbens, lights up before someone makes an irrational risk-taking choice,” he said. “But what is economics to do with this information? Recommend that, say, one set of bankers be replaced with another? That is impractical and hiring on the basis of DNA [is] illegal. Economics is at [the] bottom a policy science and so far neuroeconomics has been relatively mute on the practical implications of its findings. But it is early yet, so we have still to see the full impact of neuroscience on economics.”

“In terms of my general view of neuroeconomics [...], I believe that the field of economics, which I think of as the description, modelling and prediction of human financial behaviour, can only be strengthened by adding informative findings from psychology and neuroscience,” said Roiser. “[F]or example, I believe that emotional processes play a role in influencing financial decisions, and that adding emotion to economic models will likely provide a more complete description of human financial behaviour, improving our models and hence our predictions,” he said. “However, of course, we should not add components to economic models until we are sure they are robust and true, otherwise the models will only get worse, underscoring the importance of sound and reliable evidence.”

doi:10.1038/embor.2009.213

Published online 4 September 2009