Erratum to: A piecewise linear modeling approach for testing competing theories of habitat selection: an example with mule deer in northern winter ranges

Jeffrey A. Manning · Edward O. Garton

Published online: 14 February 2013
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2013

Erratum to: Oecologia
DOI 10.1007/s00442-012-2532-4

Unfortunately, in the original version of article, Eq. 4 and Fig. 2 were wrongly published. The corrected equation is given below and the figure is reproduced in the following page.

$$Y_i = \beta_o + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_{E_l} + \beta_3 X_{E_l} + \beta_4 X_{E_H} + \beta_5 X_1 X_{E_H} + \eta_i$$

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s00442-012-2532-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-012-2532-4).

J. A. Manning (✉) · E. O. Garton
Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources,
University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 83844, USA
e-mail: jeffmanning@vandals.uidaho.edu

Fig. 2 Density of mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) in three winter range habitats as a function of regional population density in five game management units (regions) of western Idaho, USA, predicted by the ideal free distribution model ($w_i = 0.94$, pseudo $R^2 = 0.64$; see Eq. 3 in Materials and methods). Habitat classification was based on net energy costs, identified using the energy cost model of Parker et al. (1984), as modified by Manning and Garton (2012). K_2 marks where colonization in the high- and intermediate-quality habitats is dampened when colonization of low-quality habitat begins