



Correction to: Testing the Late Pleistocene Arctic Origins of East Asian Psychology Using Ancient and Modern DNA

Davide Piffer¹

Published online: 5 December 2025

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2025

Correction to: Adaptive Human Behavior and Physiology (2025) 11:18 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40750-025-00271-8>

In this article, the author found some errors:

1. Figure 6 caption on page 18, “Temporal Trends in Extraversion PGS Before and After the Last Glacial Maximum” is wrong. It should be “Temporal Trends in Neuroticism PGS Before and After the Last Glacial Maximum”.
2. In the pdf, Fig. 7 of west eurasian hinge regressions is located in east eurasian section. It should be put at the end of the “Factor analysis at the group level” section.
3. Replacement on the following paragraphs:

Hinge regressions of the group-level factor (z -scored) on time (Years BP), with knots at 12,000 and 19,000 BP, controlled for latitude and coverage and used precision-motivated weights (\sqrt{N} , softly scaled by coverage) (Table 12). (Fig. 7).

Knot at 12,000 BP. Model fit: $R^2=0.418$ (adjusted $R^2=0.393$), $F(4, 92)=16.52$, $p=3.10 \times 10^{-10}$. The pre-knot slope was $+0.109$ SD per kyr ($SE=0.027$, $t=4.07$, $p=9.97 \times 10^{-5}$). The hinge term was -0.168 SD per kyr ($SE=0.042$, $t=-4.03$, $p=1.17 \times 10^{-4}$), implying a post-knot slope of -0.058 SD per kyr. Latitude and coverage were positive covariates (Latitude: $\beta = +0.060$ SD/ $^\circ$, $SE=0.010$, $t=5.86$, $p=7.28 \times 10^{-8}$; Coverage: $\beta = +0.216$ SD/unit, $SE=0.064$, $t=3.36$, $p=0.0011$).

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40750-025-00271-8>

✉ Davide Piffer
pifferdavide@gmail.com

¹ Ulster Institute for Social Research, London, UK

Knot at 19,000 BP. Model fit: $R^2=0.386$ (adjusted $R^2=0.360$), $F(4, 92)=14.48$, $p=3.32 \times 10^{-9}$. The pre-knot slope was $+0.083$ SD per kyr ($SE=0.0248$, $t=3.33$, $p=0.00123$). The hinge term was -0.175 SD per kyr ($SE=0.0536$, $t=-3.26$, $p=0.00159$), yielding a post-knot slope of -0.092 SD per kyr. Latitude and coverage again entered positively (Latitude: $\beta = +0.060$, $p=1.32 \times 10^{-7}$; Coverage: $\beta = +0.227$, $p=8.78 \times 10^{-4}$).

Overall, the factor (higher=more agreeable and emotionally stable) increases prior to each knot and declines thereafter, with covariates behaving consistently across specifications.

with:

“Group-level factor scores (standardized) were regressed on time (Years BP) using hinge regressions with knots placed at 12,000 and 19,000 BP. All models controlled for latitude and genomic coverage and were weighted by the square root of sample size, scaled by coverage (Table 12; Fig. 7).

Knot at 12,000 BP. The model explained 42% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.418$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.393$; $F(4, 92)=16.52$, $p=3.1 \times 10^{-10}$). Before the knot, the factor increased by 0.109 SD per thousand years ($SE=0.027$, $t=4.07$, $p=9.97 \times 10^{-5}$). The hinge term (-0.168 SD per kyr; $SE=0.042$, $t=-4.03$, $p=1.17 \times 10^{-4}$) indicates a post-knot decline of -0.058 SD per kyr. Both latitude and coverage were significant positive covariates (Latitude: $\beta = +0.060$ SD/ $^\circ$, $SE=0.010$, $t=5.86$, $p=7.28 \times 10^{-8}$; Coverage: $\beta = +0.216$ SD/unit, $SE=0.064$, $t=3.36$, $p=0.0011$).

Knot at 19,000 BP. Results were similar ($R^2 = 0.386$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.360$; $F(4, 92)=14.48$, $p=3.32 \times 10^{-9}$). The pre-knot slope was $+0.083$ SD per kyr ($SE=0.025$, $t=3.33$, $p=0.0012$), followed by a hinge term of -0.175 SD per kyr ($SE=0.054$, $t=-3.26$, $p=0.0016$), yielding a post-knot decline of -0.092 SD per kyr. Latitude and coverage again had positive effects (Latitude: $\beta = +0.060$, $p=1.32 \times 10^{-7}$; Coverage: $\beta = +0.227$, $p=8.78 \times 10^{-4}$).

Overall, the latent factor, representing higher Agreeableness and emotional stability, increased before each climatic threshold and declined thereafter. Covariate effects remained stable across model specifications, underscoring the robustness of the temporal pattern”.

4. Figure 8 caption “This data is mandatory. Please provide” is incorrect. It must be corrected to read “Mean percentage of ancestry components by culture”.
5. This paragraph says “East Asians had the lowest Extraversion and Neuroticism PGS and the second highest Agreeableness PGS, following Indigenous Mexicans (“Mexico IMX”) and other admixed Amerindian groups (Suppl. Figures 1,2,3).” The supplementary figures are not available in the online version. Therefore, they are included in the erratum article.
6. Data Availability says “No datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.” it should be “This study did not generate any new datasets. The analyses were performed using publicly available datasets.”
7. In Table 4, the p values of 0 should be <0.001 .

Table 4 Regression Results
Table. D.V. = PFS

Variable	Estimate	Standard Error	t value	p value
(Intercept)	0.846	0.096	8.81	<0.001
AFR	-2.798	0.14	-19.939	<0.001
Admix. American	-0.93	0.22	-4.223	<0.001
Arctic	-0.339	0.248	-1.367	0.175
Central Asian	-0.023	0.22	-0.104	0.917
EUR	-0.605	0.132	-4.578	<0.001
MENA	-1.348	0.163	-8.254	<0.001
Nat. Am	-0.478	0.248	-1.925	0.058
SAS	-0.41	0.14	-2.921	0.004
SE Asian	-0.399	0.188	-2.119	0.037
Adj. R2	0.843			

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40750-025-00273-6>

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.