TU Delft

Delft University of Technology

Document Version
Final published version

Licence
Dutch Copyright Act (Article 25fa)

Citation (APA)
Guo, W., Yan, S., Liu, Y., Wang, H., Bosch-Rekveldt, M., & Ning, Y. (2026). Erratum to “Orchestrated reciprocity over equilibrium: How relational behavior and task conflict configure pathways to relationship quality in inter-organizational projects”(International Journal of Project Management, (2026), 44, 1, (102796), (S0263786325001218), 10.1016/j.ijproman.2025.102796). *International Journal of Project Management*, *44*(4), Article 102833. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2026.102833

Important note
To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright
In case the licence states “Dutch Copyright Act (Article 25fa)”, this publication was made available Green Open Access via the TU Delft Institutional Repository pursuant to Dutch Copyright Act (Article 25fa, the Taverne amendment). This provision does not affect copyright ownership.
Unless copyright is transferred by contract or statute, it remains with the copyright holder.

Sharing and reuse
Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy
Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

This work is downloaded from Delft University of Technology.

International Journal of Project Management 44 (2026) 102833

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

International Journal of Project Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ijproman

Erratum

Erratum to "Orchestrated reciprocity over equilibrium: How relational behavior and task conflict configure pathways to relationship quality in inter-organizational projects" [Int. J. Proj. Manag., 44 (2026), 102796]

Wenqian Guo [a], Sixuan Yan [a], Yan Liu [b,*], Hanfei Wang [a], Marian Bosch-Rekveldt [c], Yan Ning [b]

[a] School of Economics and Management, Beijing Jiaotong University, Beijing 100044, PR China
[b] School of Management and Engineering, Nanjing University, 5 Pingcang Lane, Gulou District, Nanjing, 210008 PR China
[c] Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Gebouw 23, TU Delft, Stevinweg 1, Delft 2628 CN, the Netherlands

The publisher regrets that in the above referenced paper a rendering issue meant that crossed circle symbols within the tables and certain paragraphs in the main text were not represented correctly. The tables and affected paragraphs are now reproduced correctly below.

(Page 6) The intermediate solutions generated by the fsQCA software application through its standardized analysis outperform both the complex and the parsimonious solutions (Guo et al., 2022). This study provides intermediate solutions to explore configurations of relationship quality. In each configuration in the table, "●" means high level of a condition, "⊗" means low level of a condition, and a blank space

DOI of original article: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2025.102796.
* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: ly@nju.edu.cn (Y. Liu).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2026.102833

Available online 30 March 2026
0263-7863/© 2026 Elsevier Ltd, APM and IPMA. All rights are reserved, including those for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Table 7
Configurations for high satisfaction and low satisfaction.

	High satisfaction						Low satisfaction					
	1a	1b	1c	1d	2a	2b	3a	3b	4a	4b	5	6
Flexibility of one party	●	●	●	●	●	●	⊗	⊗	●	●		⊗
Information exchange of one party	●	⊗	●	●	⊗	●	⊗	⊗		⊗		⊗
Solidarity of one party	●		⊗	⊗		●	⊗			●	●	●
Flexibility of the collaborator	●	●	●	●	●	●	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗
Information exchange of the collaborator	●	●	●	●	⊗		⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗
Solidarity of the collaborator	●	●	⊗	⊗	●	●	⊗	⊗	⊗		⊗	
Task conflict		⊗	⊗	●	⊗	⊗		●	●	●	●	●
Time delay		⊗	⊗	●	●	●			●	●	●	●
Consistency	0.875	0.908	0.925	0.904	0.916	0.887	0.891	0.945	0.906	0.938	0.910	0.878
Raw coverage	0.454	0.104	0.086	0.050	0.071	0.135	0.395	0.341	0.121	0.083	0.141	0.148
Unique coverage	0.232	0.015	0.016	0.014	0.019	0.002	0.046	0.013	0.015	0.015	0.013	0.015
Overall solution consistency	0.875						0.878					
Overall solution coverage	0.538						0.519					

Note: 1) core conditions are denoted by "●" (high level) and "⊗" (low level); contributing conditions are denoted by "●" (high level) and "⊗" (low level). 2) Configurations 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d (or 2a and 2b; 3a and 3b; 4a and 4b) are "neutral permutations" in that they share the same core conditions and differ only in their contributing conditions. 3) consistency cutoff = 080; PRI consistency = 0.70; Case frequency = 2 cases/configuration.

Table 8
Configurations for high trust and low trust.

	High trust						Low trust				
	1a	1b	2a	2b	2c	3	4	5a	5b	5c	6
Flexibility of one party	●	●	⊗	⊗	⊗		⊗	●	●	●	●
Information exchange of one party	●		⊗		⊗	⊗	⊗		●	●	
Solidarity of one party	●	●		●	●		⊗	●	●	●	⊗
Flexibility of the collaborator	●	●	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗		⊗		⊗	⊗
Information exchange of the collaborator	●	●	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗
Solidarity of the collaborator	●	●	⊗	⊗		⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗
Task conflict		⊗	●	●	●	●	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	●
Time delay		⊗		●	●	●	⊗	⊗	⊗		●
Consistency	0.893	0.905	0.928	0.962	0.956	0.939	0.849	0.898	0.881	0.902	0.910
Raw coverage	0.469	0.257	0.331	0.108	0.096	0.194	0.141	0.102	0.102	0.147	0.084
Unique coverage	0.221	0.008	0.062	0.017	0.008	0.013	0.035	0.008	0.010	0.018	0.008
Overall solution consistency	0.891						0.879				
Overall solution coverage	0.477						0.507				

Note: 1) core conditions are denoted by "●" (high level) and "⊗" (low level); contributing conditions are denoted by "●" (high level) and "⊗" (low level). 2) Configurations 1a and 1b (or 2a, 2b, and 2c; and 5a, 5b, and 5c) are "neutral permutations" in that they share the same core conditions and differ only in their contributing conditions. 3) consistency cutoff = 080; PRI consistency = 0.70; Case frequency = 2 cases/configuration.

indicates that the presence or absence of a condition is irrelevant. Larger circles represent core conditions, while smaller circles represent contributing conditions (Dwivedi et al., 2018). The results are grouped according to different core conditions in the configuration. As shown in Table 7 and Table 8, each high or low relationship quality has multiple configurations, and the consistency of the overall solution and the consistency of each path is greater than 0.80.