



## OPEN ACCESS

APPROVED BY  
Frontiers Editorial Office,  
Frontiers Media SA, Switzerland

\*CORRESPONDENCE  
Pamela Barone  
✉ pamela.barone@uib.es

RECEIVED 07 October 2024  
ACCEPTED 08 October 2024  
PUBLISHED 17 October 2024

CITATION  
Barone P, Bedia MG and Gomila A (2024)  
Corrigendum: A minimal Turing test:  
reciprocal sensorimotor contingencies for  
interaction detection.  
*Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 18:1507296.  
doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2024.1507296

COPYRIGHT  
© 2024 Barone, Bedia and Gomila. 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.

# Corrigendum: A minimal Turing test: reciprocal sensorimotor contingencies for interaction detection

Pamela Barone<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Manuel G. Bedia<sup>3,4</sup> and Antoni Gomila<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, University of the Balearic Islands, Palma, Spain, <sup>2</sup>Human Evolution and Cognition Group (EvoCog), University of the Balearic, IFISC, Associated Unit to CSIC, Palma, Spain, <sup>3</sup>Department of Computer Science and Systems Engineering, University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain, <sup>4</sup>Interactive Systems, Adaptivity, Autonomy and Cognition Lab, Aragón Institute of Engineering Research, University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain

## KEYWORDS

Turing test, interaction, sensorimotor contingencies, reciprocity, perceptual crossing

## A Corrigendum on A minimal Turing test: reciprocal sensorimotor contingencies for interaction detection

by Barone, P., Bedia, M. G., and Gomila, A. (2020). *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 14:102.  
doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2020.00102

In the published article, there was an error in **Figure 1** as published. The probability of success for block 3 in the bot condition should be 0.70, as correctly stated in Table 1 and the second paragraph of the **Results** section. However, in **Figure 1**, this value is incorrectly shown as 0.95. The corrected **Figure 1** and its caption appear below.

The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. 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.

