Correction to: Social security: social relationship strength and connectedness influence how marmots respond to alarm calls

Daniel T. Blumstein^{1,2} · Holly Fuong^{1,3,4} · Elizabeth Palmer¹

Published online: 16 December 2019
© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2019

Correction to: Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-017-2374-5>

Unfortunately, there was an error in the R script which led to the incorrect labeling of two social network measures. Throughout the article, instances of ‘instrength’ and ‘outstrength’ should be switched.

Page 1, replace the following line in the abstract:

“marmots with a higher outstrength increased foraging” with
“marmots with a higher instrength increased foraging”

Page 4, replace the following line in the methods:

“social network measures (outstrength and incloseness)” with
“social network measures (instrength and incloseness)”

Page 5, replace the following line in the methods:

“The top-loading variable for principal component 1 was outstrength, and for principal component 2 was incloseness” with

The online version of the original article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-017-2374-5>

✉ Daniel T. Blumstein
marmots@ucla.edu

¹ Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, 621 Young Drive South, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1606, USA

² The Rocky Mountain Biological Laboratory, Box 519, Crested Butte, CO 81224, USA

³ Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Environmental Biology, Columbia University, 1200 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, NY 10027, USA

⁴ New York Consortium in Evolutionary Primatology, New York, NY, USA

“The top-loading variable for principal component 1 was instrength, and for principal component 2 was incloseness”

Page 5, replace the following line in the results:

“we found that marmots with a higher outstrength increased foraging” with
“we found that marmots with a higher instrength increased foraging”

Table 1 should be printed as shown below.

Table 1 Rotated (eigenvector >1 with varimax rotation) principal component scores from the analysis of social attributes

Social network measure	PC 1	PC 2
Instrength	0.90*	0.13
Outstrength	0.89	0.07
Outdegree	0.71	0.56
Embeddedness	0.73	−0.01
Eigenvector centrality	0.63	0.62
Incloseness	−0.18	0.96*
Outcloseness	0.12	0.87
Indegree	0.44	0.64

Bold values indicate those social attributes used to define the principal component

*Indicates the top loading social network measure for that principle component

Page 5, replace the following sentence in the discussion:

“We have suggestive evidence that marmots with greater outstrength—those that directed more affiliative behavior to others—also foraged more” with
“We have suggestive evidence that marmots with greater instrength—those that received more affiliative interactions from others—also foraged more”

Table 2 Linear mixed effects models explaining variation in the transformed change in the proportion of time allocated to foraging and vigilance in the first 30 s (i.e., 0–30 s) and second 30 s following playback (i.e., 31–60 s)

Variable	0–30 s: foraging				0–30 s: vigilance				31–60 s: foraging				31–60 s: vigilance			
	Estimate (SE)	t	P		Estimate (SE)	t	P		Estimate (SE)	t	P		Estimate (SE)	t	P	
Fixed effects																
(Intercept)	0.192 (0.470)	0.409	0.685		0.748 (0.756)	0.990	0.330		−0.061 (0.593)	−0.102	0.919		0.897 (0.732)	1.226	0.229	
Instrength	−0.001 (0.004)	−0.365	0.718		0.005 (0.005)	1.003	0.324		0.007 (0.004)	1.792	0.082		0.005 (0.005)	0.991	0.329	
In-closeness	−0.025 (1.256)	−0.020	0.984		4.442 (1.995)	2.227	0.033		2.106 (1.564)	1.347	0.187		5.091 (1.930)	2.637	0.013	
Age (yearling)	0.077 (0.100)	0.767	0.448		−0.260 (0.146)	−1.773	0.086		−0.117 (0.115)	−1.020	0.315		−0.230 (0.142)	−1.625	0.114	
log(Cort)	−0.261 (0.213)	−1.224	0.229		−0.661 (0.323)	−2.043	0.049		−0.237 (0.254)	−0.935	0.357		−0.605 (0.313)	−1.933	0.062	
Body condition	−0.042 (0.044)	−0.958	0.345		0.098 (0.068)	1.455	0.156		0.001 (0.053)	0.015	0.989		−0.036 (0.065)	−0.545	0.590	
Sample size	0.014 (0.031)	0.456	0.651		0.069 (0.047)	1.482	0.148		−0.020 (0.037)	−0.534	0.597		−0.022 (0.045)	−0.486	0.630	
Pups (yes)	0.275 (0.067)	4.112	<0.001		−0.086 (0.118)	−0.726	0.473		0.259 (0.093)	2.787	0.009		−0.042 (0.115)	−0.367	0.716	
Colony (horse mound)	0.085 (0.271)	0.312	0.757		−0.883 (0.404)	−2.185	0.036		0.087 (0.317)	0.275	0.785		−1.382 (0.391)	−3.531	0.001	
Colony (marmot meadow)	−0.157 (0.230)	−0.681	0.500		−0.500 (0.342)	−1.460	0.154		0.125 (0.268)	0.466	0.644		−0.289 (0.331)	−0.872	0.390	
Colony (river–bench)	−0.085 (0.228)	−0.373	0.712		−0.213 (0.361)	−0.590	0.559		0.231 (0.283)	0.815	0.421		0.094 (0.350)	0.268	0.790	
Variable	Variance	SD			Variance	SD			Variance	SD			Variance	SD		
Individual ID	0.022	0.150			0.000	0.000			0.000	0.000			0.000	0.000		
Random effects																

P-values were calculated with a Kenward-Roger approximation. Please note that this table does not describe the results of the permutation tests on the social network measures. Reference levels for categorical variables were: Age (adults), Pups present (no), and Colony (Gothic townsite). Bold indicates significant values of fixed effects (marmot identity was entered as a random effect). The final dataset included 45 playback experiments (29 to adult females, 16 to yearling females) that were conducted on 28 unique individuals with some individuals observed across multiple years

The first sentence of the caption for Fig. 1 should read:

“Observed coefficient estimates of A) instrength and B) incloseness from linear mixed effects models following 1000 permutations of network data (permutation details in text).” Additionally, the y-axis of Fig. 1a should read “instrength” instead of “outstrength”.

Table 2 should be printed as shown here.

We thank Ivo Seitz and Steven Marty for bringing the issue to our attention. The correction does not influence the interpretation of the published findings.

Publisher’s Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.