

The correct labels of paths $\neg M \neg C$ and $\neg S \neg C \neg R$ in table 4 are ‘useless rivals’ and ‘unattractive losers’, respectively (not ‘feasible allies’ and ‘radical partners’). Below is a corrected version of the table.

Table 4: Government exclusion of radical parties (parsimonious solution)

	INCL	COV	Raw COV	Unique COV	Total N	Unique N	TLCs^a
$\neg M \neg C$ (‘useless rivals’)	0.907		0.325	0.108	40	19	4
$\neg S \neg CR$ (‘unattractive losers’)	0.902		0.184	0.070	12	9	0
$\neg W \neg C \neg P$ (‘redundant antagonists’)	0.937		0.228	0.049	29	8	1
<i>sm-G.1</i>	0.912	0.452			57		

Note: Conservative solution: $\neg M \neg C \neg R \neg P \vee \neg M \neg W \neg C \neg P \vee \neg MS \neg W \neg CR \vee S \neg W \neg C \neg R \neg P \vee M \neg S \neg W \neg CRP \vee M \neg SW \neg CR \neg P$.

^a True logical contradictions, i.e. observations with high (> 0.5) membership in the outcome and low (< 0.5) membership in the condition. The true logical contradictory observations here are PRM in 1992(a-c), Attack in 2013 and ANEL in 2015.