



OPEN ACCESS

APPROVED BY
Frontiers Editorial Office,
Frontiers Media SA, Switzerland

*CORRESPONDENCE

Stephanie Mehl

✉ stephanie.mehl@staff.uni-marburg.de

RECEIVED 06 January 2024

ACCEPTED 24 January 2024

PUBLISHED 29 February 2024

CITATION

Pytlik N, Soll D and Mehl S (2024)

Corrigendum: Thinking preferences and
conspiracy belief: intuitive thinking and the
jumping to conclusions-bias as a basis for the
belief in conspiracy theories.

Front. Psychiatry 15:1366548.

doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2024.1366548

COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Pytlik, Soll and Mehl. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). 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: Thinking preferences and conspiracy belief: intuitive thinking and the jumping to conclusions-bias as a basis for the belief in conspiracy theories

Nico Pytlik¹, Daniel Soll¹ and Stephanie Mehl^{1,2*}

¹Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy & Center for Mind, Brain and Behavior (MCMBB), Philipps-University, Marburg, Germany, ²Department of Health and Social Work, Frankfurt University of Applied Sciences, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

KEYWORDS

conspiracy theories, paranoia, jumping to conclusions, delusions, intuitive thinking, analytical thinking

A Corrigendum on

[Thinking preferences and conspiracy belief: intuitive thinking and the jumping to conclusions-bias as a basis for the belief in conspiracy theories](#)

By Pytlik, N, Soll, D and Mehl, S (2020) *Front. Psychiatry* 11:568942. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2020.568942

In the published article, there was an error. In **Materials And Methods, Recruitment and procedures**, paragraph 2, the following text was included: “The local ethics committee approved of the study. Participants provided informed consent and were debriefed after the completion of the study.” The corrected statement appears below:

“The requirement of formal ethical review/approval was waived by the Ethics Committee of the University of Marburg (Faculty of Psychology), as no experimental manipulation took place, participants received information on the study, provided written informed consent, and anonymity was assured.”

Consequently, there was also an error in the **Ethics** statement. The correct statement appears below:

“The requirement of formal ethical review/approval of the studies involving human participants was waived by the Ethics Committee of the University of Marburg (Faculty of Psychology), as no experimental manipulation took place, participants received information on the study, provided written informed consent, and anonymity was assured.”

The authors apologize for these errors 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.