Erratum to: Magnitude and Trophic Fate of Black Needlerush (*Juncus Roemerianus*) Productivity: Does Nutrient Addition Matter?

Amy Hunter · Just Cebrian · Jason P. Stutes ·
David Patterson · Bart Christiaen · Celine Lafabrie ·
Josh Goff

Published online: 26 January 2015
© Society of Wetland Scientists 2015

Erratum to: *Wetlands* DOI 10.1007/s13157-014-0611-5

Table 2 in the paper Magnitude and Trophic Fate of Black Needlerush (*Juncus Roemerianus*) Productivity: Does Nutrient Addition Matter? is missing the heading for the variables “Rhizome Biomass”, “Root Biomass”, “Carbon to Nitrogen ratio in live leaf biomass” and “Carbon to Nitrogen ratio in dead leaf biomass”. This head-

ing should be located following the “Within Subjects” “Error” row for the variables “Porewater N concentration”, “Porewater P concentration”, “Aboveground live biomass” and “Aboveground dead biomass”. The “Within Subjects” “Error” row for the variables “Rhizome Biomass”, “Root Biomass”, “Carbon to Nitrogen ratio in live leaf biomass” and “Carbon to Nitrogen ratio in dead leaf biomass” is also missing. We now provide the correct version of Table 2.

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13157-014-0611-5>.

A. Hunter
Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alabama,
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487, USA

A. Hunter · J. Cebrian (✉) · J. P. Stutes · D. Patterson ·
B. Christiaen · J. Goff
Dauphin Island Sea Lab, 101 Bienville Blvd., Dauphin
Island, AL 36528, USA
e-mail: jcebrian@disl.org

J. Cebrian · B. Christiaen
Department of Marine Sciences, University of South Alabama,
Mobile, AL 36688, USA

C. Lafabrie
ECOSYM, Ecology of Coastal Marine Systems, 2 Place Eugène
Bataillon, 34095 Montpellier Cedex 5, France

Table 2 Results of repeated-measures ANOVA

Source of variation	Porewater N concentration			Porewater P concentration			Aboveground live biomass			Aboveground dead biomass		
	df	F	<i>p</i>	df	F	<i>p</i>	df	F	<i>p</i>	df	F	<i>p</i>
Between subjects												
Site	1	2.3	0.16	1	15.5	≤0.05	1	0.9	0.36	1	1.6	0.23
Treatment	1	9.7	≤0.05	1	8.3	≤0.05	1	0.0	0.95	1	0.5	0.51
Site × treatment	1	0.3	0.60	1	0.0	0.95	1	0.3	0.60	1	0.4	0.53
Error	11			11			10			10		
Within subjects												
Time	14	17.8	≤0.05	14	10.6	≤0.05	6	6.5	≤0.05	6	2.7	≤0.05
Time × site	14	1.5	0.10	14	1.5	0.11	6	2.7	≤0.05	6	1.8	0.12
Time × treatment	14	4.3	≤0.05	14	2.8	≤0.05	6	0.8	0.57	6	0.8	0.57
Time × site × treatment	14	0.6	0.84	14	0.8	0.64	6	1.2	0.33	6	1.1	0.36
Error	154			154			60			60		
Rhizome biomass												
Root biomass												
Carbon to Nitrogen ratio in live leaf biomass												
Carbon to Nitrogen ratio in dead leaf biomass												
Source of variation	Rhizome biomass			Root biomass			Carbon to Nitrogen ratio in live leaf biomass			Carbon to Nitrogen ratio in dead leaf biomass		
	df	F	<i>p</i>	df	F	<i>p</i>	df	F	<i>p</i>	df	F	<i>p</i>
Between subjects												
Site	1	10.7	≤0.05	1	4.0	0.07	1	4.0	0.07	1	9.9	≤0.05
Treatment	1	3.9	0.07	1	0.3	0.62	1	3.2	0.10	1	8.1	≤0.05
Site × treatment	1	0.1	0.73	1	0.2	0.68	1	0.3	0.60	1	0.7	0.41
Error	11			11			12			12		
Within subjects												
Time	6	7.1	≤0.05	6	28.8	≤0.05	2	113.1	≤0.05	2	58.2	≤0.05
Time × site	6	1.6	0.16	6	2.0	0.08	2	5.6	≤0.05	2	1.5	0.25
Time × treatment	6	0.7	0.64	6	1.2	0.32	2	1.3	0.28	2	2.7	0.09
Time × site × treatment	6	1.2	0.34	6	1.7	0.12	2	1.5	0.23	2	1.6	0.22
Error	66			66			24			24		
Carbon to Nitrogen ratio in rhizome biomass												
Carbon to Nitrogen ratio in root biomass												
Carbon to Phosphorus ratio in live leaf biomass												
Carbon to Phosphorus ratio in dead leaf biomass												
Source of variation	Carbon to Nitrogen ratio in rhizome biomass			Carbon to Nitrogen ratio in root biomass			Carbon to Phosphorus ratio in live leaf biomass			Carbon to Phosphorus ratio in dead leaf biomass		
	df	F	<i>p</i>	df	F	<i>p</i>	df	F	<i>p</i>	df	F	<i>p</i>
Between subjects												
Site	1	2.1	0.18	1	37.4	≤0.05	1	13.8	≤0.05	1	15.5	≤0.05
Treatment	1	0.0	0.85	1	0.8	0.40	1	1.9	0.19	1	2.0	0.18
Site × treatment	1	1.5	0.24	1	8.2	≤0.05	1	0.0	0.91	1	0.1	0.82
Error	10			11			12			12		
Within subjects												
Time	2	13.5	≤0.05	2	33.3	≤0.05	2	14.4	≤0.05	2	3.1	0.07
Time × site	2	1.7	0.21	2	9.7	≤0.05	2	2.2	0.13	2	0.0	0.98
Time × treatment	2	0.9	0.43	2	1.2	0.32	2	0.5	0.64	2	0.1	0.93
Time × site × treatment	2	0.3	0.74	2	0.1	0.90	2	0.7	0.52	2	0.2	0.84
Error	20			22			24			24		
Carbon to Phosphorus ratio in rhizome biomass												
Carbon to Phosphorus ratio in root biomass												
Leaf productivity												
Herbivory												
Source of variation	Carbon to Phosphorus ratio in rhizome biomass			Carbon to Phosphorus ratio in root biomass			Leaf productivity			Herbivory		
	df	F	<i>p</i>	df	F	<i>p</i>	df	F	<i>p</i>	df	F	<i>p</i>
Between subjects												
Site	1	4.7	0.06	1	0.6	0.47	1	11.5	≤0.05	1	2.1	0.17
Treatment	1	1.8	0.21	1	0.9	0.38	1	2.2	0.16	1	0.1	0.80
Site × treatment	1	0.7	0.42	1	0.7	0.43	1	1.1	0.32	1	1.6	0.24
Error	10			10			12			12		

Table 2 (continued)

Within subjects												
Time	2	1.8	0.19	2	0.3	0.73	5	28.4	≤ 0.05	5	13.6	≤ 0.05
Time $\times$ site	2	0.3	0.75	2	0.3	0.74	5	7.8	≤ 0.05	5	2.7	≤ 0.05
Time $\times$ treatment	2	0.3	0.73	2	0.6	0.57	5	0.9	0.49	5	1.0	0.42
Time $\times$ site $\times$ treatment	2	1.1	0.36	2	0.4	0.68	5	2.0	0.10	5	1.7	0.15
Error	20			20			60			60		