

Retraction notice to: “Social Bayes: Using Bayesian Modeling to Study Autistic Trait–Related Differences in Social Cognition,” by Meltem Sevgi, Andreea O. Diaconescu, Marc Tittgemeyer, and Leonhard Schilbach. (*Biol Psychiatry* 2016; 80:112–119); [10.1016/j.biopsych.2015.11.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2015.11.025).

This article has been retracted at the request of John H. Krystal, MD, Editor of *Biological Psychiatry*, with agreement from the authors. Please see Elsevier Policy on Article Withdrawal (<http://www.elsevier.com/locate/withdrawalpolicy>).

Following a reanalysis of the data reported in this article, the authors noticed that an error was made when transforming one of the variables used in computing the outcome prediction in their computational model. More specifically, in order to combine the social and nonsocial (card-related) cues into one prediction about the outcome, the card color probabilities in reference to where the social agent directs the gaze had to be transformed. This transformation was performed incorrectly in the original model, leading to an incorrect estimation of the response model parameters.

The authors reanalyzed the properly transformed data and could reproduce all of the results from the original paper, with the exception of the correlation between AQ scores and the social weighting parameter. Instead, the authors found that the model parameter determining belief precision differed as a function of autistic traits. Upon correction, they found that low AQ scorers took the gaze schedule into account to adjust their learning rates about the card probabilities, and performed better on the task. High AQ scorers, on the other hand, failed to adjust their learning rates according to the gaze schedule and thus relied more often on the gaze in phases when it was more unreliable, in phases of high volatility and low accuracy.

The authors voluntarily informed the *Journal* of this honest error upon its discovery. Because of the extent and nature of the changes to the paper, the editors and authors concluded that, to ensure maximum clarity and transparency, the only course of action was to retract this version of the paper. The authors are revising the paper, which the *Journal* will re-review and consider further for publication.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2019.08.017>

© 2019 Society of Biological Psychiatry.
