Environ Monit Assess (2020) 192: 438
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-020-08380-5

CORRECTION

Correction to: Zooplankton indicator-based assessment in relation to site location and abiotic factors: a case study from the Gulf of Riga

Astra Labuce · Inta Dimante-Deimantovica · Juris Tunens · Solvita Strake

Published online: 17 June 2020

Correction to: Environ Monit Assess (2020) 192: 147
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-020-8113-9

This paper, published in *Environ Monit Assess* 192, 147 (2020), contains errors in Table 5. The corrected table is provided below. The errors were small (inaccurately indicated column names for columns 4, 7, and 10 and site titles for rows 6 and 7) and the corrections do not alter in any way the conclusions of the article.

The online version of the original article can be found at https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-020-8113-9

A. Labuce (✉) · I. Dimante-Deimantovica · J. Tunens · S. Strake
Latvian Institute of Aquatic Ecology, Agency of Daugavpils University, Voleru str. 4, Riga LV-1007, Latvia
e-mail: astra.labuce@lhei.lv

I. Dimante-Deimantovica
Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Gaustadalléen 21, NO-0349 Oslo, Norway

Table 5 Mean Size and Total Stock (MSTS)–based assessment for period 2012–2017 of the Gulf of Riga (GoR). For sites location, see Fig. 1

Site	GES thresholds			Assessment (2012–2017)							
				Mean			$_{L}$CI 99%			Decision	
	MS	TZB	TZA	MS	TZB	TZA	MS	TZB	TZA	Mean	$_{L}$CI 99%
C1	2.29	303.3	93.2	4.10	299.3[b]	96.2[b]	*1.72*	*96.1*	*30.1*	GES	Sub-GES
C2	2.39	282.7	86.6	3.85	303.5[b]	103.4[b]	*0.98*	*114.1*	*47.8*	GES	Sub-GES
C3	2.02	108.3	25.7	3.14	394.8	139.5	2.16	176.5	61.3	GES	GES
C4	1.23	102.3	18.8	4.07	313.6	98.7	1.54	117.7	41.3	GES	GES
Coastal	2.54	258.3	54.7	3.79	321.8[b]	110.9	*1.62*	*155.8*	*54.0*	GES	Sub-GES
O1	2.90	154.7	36.3	5.66	253.5	61.2	3.32	*140.8*	*33.7*	GES	Sub-GES
O2	2.81	76.9	19.2	5.23	351.8	73.6	3.03	195.9	41.4	GES	GES
Open	2.89	130.1	32.1	5.45	333.2	80.4	3.62	179.0	40.5	GES	GES
GoR	3.09	209.2	47.5	4.62	305.8	92.5	*2.80*	*191.3*	49.0	GES	Sub-GES

Sub-GES cases are italicized

TZB total zooplankton biomass (mg m^{-3}), *TZA* total zooplankton abundance (1000 ind m^{-3}), *MS* mean size of mesozooplankton, *GES* good environmental status, *$_{L}$CI 99%* lower 99% confidence interval.

[b] CuSum dropped below GES threshold value during 2012–2017 (Fig. 5)