sustainability

MDPI

Erratum

Erratum: Fox, S. Irresponsible Research and Innovation? Applying Findings from Neuroscience to the Analysis of Unsustainable Hype Cycles. *Sustainability* 2018, *10*, 3472

Stephen Fox

VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland, FI-02044 Espoo, Finland; stephen.fox@vtt.fi; Tel.: +358-40-747-8801

Received: 5 November 2019; Accepted: 8 November 2019; Published: 13 November 2019



The author would like to make the corrections listed below to the published paper [1].

(1) In Section 4.3. Implications for Practice, replacing citation 73 with citation 94. This citation correction involves no changes to the References list.

(2) In Section 5. Conclusions, adding a reference and revision in order to clarify the paper's final paragraphs by replacing the original version:

> Similarly, some proponents of robotics envisage that robots will emancipate humans by undertaking all working and paying taxes to fund our entertainment. By contrast, some opponents of robotics envisage that robots will consume all available resources, including all humans [139]. More support for responsible research and innovation is needed from both sides of such polarized positions. In this paper, an analogy has been drawn between the behavior of some adults in hype cycles and irresponsible adolescent behavior. However, there are also other potential analogies that could be explored in the broader literature concerned with predictably irrational decision making [140].

with

> Similarly, some envisage that robots could pay taxes to help humans [139], while others envisage that robots could harm humans [140]. Thus, even reasoned debate concerning technology, which has been hyped-up by others, can take place at opposite ends of a continuum. Such debate can overlook that whatever end prevails, there could be environmental degradation. Hence, more consideration for human/environmental balance can be needed from both sides of polarized positions.
>
> Overall, in this paper, an analogy has been drawn between the behavior of some adults in hype cycles and irresponsible adolescent behavior. As stated in the Introduction section, cases are referred to in order to illustrate patterns in hype cycles, not to define individual motivations in specific cases. Additionally, it is important to note that there may be other potential analogies in the broader literature concerned with predictably irrational decision making [141].
>
> And consequently adding the following reference to the References list:
>
> 140. Bostrom, N. Ethical issues in advanced artificial intelligence. In Cognitive, Emotive and Ethical Aspects of Decision Making in Humans and in Artificial Intelligence; Smit, I., Lasker, G.E., Eds.; International Institute for Advanced Studies in Systems Research and Cybernetics: Windsor, ON, Canada, 2003; Volume 2, pp. 12–17.

The authors and the Editorial Office would like to apologize for any inconvenience caused to the readers by these changes. The change does not affect the scientific results. The manuscript will be updated and the original will remain online on the article webpage.

References

1. Fox, S. Irresponsible Research and Innovation? Applying Findings from Neuroscience to Analysis of Unsustainable Hype Cycles. *Sustainability* **2018**, *10*, 3472. [CrossRef]



© 2019 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).