Correction to: Coaseian Biodiversity Conservation and Market Power

Thomas Eichner¹ · Rüdiger Pethig²

Published online: 5 March 2018

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V., part of Springer Nature 2018

Correction to: Environ Resource Econ <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-018-0225-0>

This erratum corrects an error in that part of the article, which relates to the exertion of market power. Equations (C3), (C7) and (C8) in “Appendix” should be replaced by

$$\begin{aligned}p_x &= P^x \left[(b_i)_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \right] = a_x - \frac{2\alpha_x \beta_x}{n+s} \sum_{\mathcal{N}} \sqrt{\ell - b_i}, \\p_y &= P^y \left[(b_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \right] = a_y - \frac{2\alpha_y \beta_y}{n+s} \sum_{\mathcal{S}} \sqrt{\ell - b_j}, \\p_x &= P^x \left[(z_i)_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \right] = a_x - \frac{2\alpha_x \beta_x}{n+s} \sum_{\mathcal{N}} \sqrt{\ell - {}_1 b_i - z_i}, \\p_y &= P^y \left[(z_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \right] = a_y - \frac{2\alpha_y \beta_y}{n+s} \sum_{\mathcal{S}} \sqrt{\ell - {}_1 b_j - z_j},\end{aligned}$$

and in the first-order conditions (C5), (C6), (C10), (C11), (C13) and (C14) the differential quotients $\frac{\partial P^x}{\partial b_{\mathcal{N}}}, \frac{\partial P^y}{\partial b_{\mathcal{S}}}, \frac{\partial P^x}{\partial z_{\mathcal{N}}}, \frac{\partial P^y}{\partial z_{\mathcal{S}}}$ should be replaced by $\frac{\partial P^x}{\partial b_i}, \frac{\partial P^y}{\partial b_j}, \frac{\partial P^x}{\partial z_i}, \frac{\partial P^y}{\partial z_j}$. While the analysis and the numerical simulations in the regimes without strategy remain unchanged, the correct numbers in the regimes with strategies are listed in Tables 1, 2 and 3 below. These tables replace the last three rows of the Tables 8, 9 and 10, respectively, in “Appendix” of the article.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-018-0225-0>.

✉ Thomas Eichner
thomas.eichner@fernuni-hagen.de

Rüdiger Pethig
pethig@vwl.wiwi.uni-siegen.de

¹ Department of Economics, University of Hagen, Universitätsstr. 41, 58097 Hagen, Germany

² Department of Economics, University of Siegen, Unteres Schloss 3, 57072 Siegen, Germany

Table 1 Equilibrium values in Example 1 ($\beta_x = 0.1$)

	$\sum_{\Omega} k^b h$	$k^b \mathcal{N}$	$k^b \mathcal{S}$	$\sum_{\Omega} k^w h$	$k^w \mathcal{N}$	$k^w \mathcal{S}$	$k^p x$	$k^p y$	$k^g d - k^G \mathcal{N}$
Regime 1 ^s	1536.17	10.11	20.61	1,859,470	19,204.8	17,984.6	949.05	891.09	1058.29
Regime 2 ^s	1544.02	10.11	20.77	1,859,510	19,205.5	17,984.7	949.05	891.10	1066.05
Regime 3 ^s	2314.89	18.37	27.92	1,861,430	19,222.1	18,006.5	949.10	891.51	969.54

Table 2 Equilibrium values in Example 2 ($\alpha_y = 0.9$)

	$\sum_{\Omega} k^b h$	$k^b \mathcal{N}$	$k^b \mathcal{S}$	$\sum_{\Omega} k^w h$	$k^w \mathcal{N}$	$k^w \mathcal{S}$	$k^p x$	$k^p y$	$k^g d - k^G \mathcal{N}$
Regime 1 ^s	2278.11	10.11	35.45	1,787,600	19,265.4	16,486.6	949.05	892.77	2542.43
Regime 2 ^s	2284.50	10.11	35.58	1,787,635	19,266.0	16,486.7	949.05	892.78	2548.76
Regime 3 ^s	2989.02	18.37	41.41	1,789,390	19,284.0	16,503.8	949.10	893.11	2392.23

Table 3 Equilibrium values in Example 3 ($\beta_x = 0.5$)

	$\sum_{\Omega} k^b h$	$k^b \mathcal{N}$	$k^b \mathcal{S}$	$\sum_{\Omega} k^w h$	$k^w \mathcal{N}$	$k^w \mathcal{S}$	$k^p x$	$k^p y$	$k^g d - k^G \mathcal{N}$
Regime 1 ^s	1572.20	10.83	20.61	1,857,855	19,154.7	18,002.4	945.28	891.09	986.52
Regime 2 ^s	1580.04	10.83	20.77	1,857,895	19,155.4	18,002.5	945.28	891.10	994.28
Regime 3 ^s	2361.07	19.30	27.92	1,859,800	19,173.4	18,022.6	945.51	891.51	888.66

The correct strategic effects turn out to be smaller than shown in Tables 8, 9, and 10 of the article. However, apart from minor deviations the economic interpretation of Examples 1 and 2 with strategy is the same as in the article. When the correct numbers of Table 3 below are applied, the interpretation of Example 3 with strategy is qualitatively the same as that of Examples 1 and 2.