



# Correction to: Comparing the impacts of an invasive grass on nitrogen cycling and ammonia-oxidizing prokaryotes in high-nitrogen forests, open fields, and wetlands

Tyler M. Rippel  · Christine L. Iosue · Pasquale J. Succi · Dennis D. Wykoff · Samantha K. Chapman

Published online: 25 March 2020  
© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

## Correction to: Plant and Soil

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-020-04458-8>

There is a formatting error which impacts the interpretation of Table 2. Some equations in the “Predictor Variables and Standardized Beta Estimates” section in Table 2 are not correctly associated with their correct “Model Rank” due to these formatting issues. A newly formatted Table is below.

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

---

The online version of the original article can be found at  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-020-04458-8>

---

C. L. Iosue · P. J. Succi · D. D. Wykoff · S. K. Chapman  
Department of Biology, Villanova University, 800 Lancaster Ave.,  
Villanova, PA 19085, USA

*Present Address:*

T. M. Rippel (✉)  
Georgetown University, 3700 O St NW, Washington, DC 20057,  
USA  
e-mail: tr599@georgetown.edu

**Table 2** Best-fit models from linear mixed model selection with the relative abundance of AOA *amoA* and the relative abundance of AOB *amoA* as response variables.

Response Variable	Model Rank	AIC	P Value	Intercept ( $\pm$ se)	Predictor Variables and Standardized $\beta$ estimates ( $\pm$ se)
Archaeal <i>amoA</i>	1	94.0	0.001	9.4 $\pm$ 1.3	<b>aNH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup></b> (-0.24 $\pm$ 0.16) + <b>SM</b> (-0.28 $\pm$ 0.18) + <b>BD</b> <sup>•</sup> (-0.32 $\pm$ 0.16) + <b>pH</b> * (-0.37 $\pm$ 0.15) + <b>MVB</b> <sup>•</sup> (-0.33 $\pm$ 0.16)
	2	94.2	0.012	8.7 $\pm$ 1.4	<b>SM</b> (-0.28 $\pm$ 0.19) + <b>BD</b> (-0.32 $\pm$ 0.17) + <b>pH</b> (-0.37 $\pm$ 0.17) + <b>MVB</b> (-0.23 $\pm$ 0.17)
	3	94.2	0.012	8.5 $\pm$ 1.3	<b>aNH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup></b> (-0.22 $\pm$ 0.14) + <b>pH</b> (-0.36 $\pm$ 0.16) + <b>BD</b> (-0.19 $\pm$ 0.14) + <b>MVB</b> (-0.24 $\pm$ 0.17)
	4	95.1	0.012	9.1 $\pm$ 1.5	<b>aNH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup></b> (-0.12 $\pm$ 0.14) + <b>SM</b> (-0.18 $\pm$ 0.19) + <b>Density</b> (-0.29 $\pm$ 0.17) + <b>pH</b> (-0.48 $\pm$ 0.18)
Bacterial <i>amoA</i>	1	142.7	0.012	6.0 $\pm$ 2.0	<b>pH</b> <sup>•</sup> (-0.29 $\pm$ 0.15) + <b>pNH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup></b> <sup>•</sup> (0.25 $\pm$ 0.14)
	2	143.4	0.018	5.8 $\pm$ 1.9	<b>BD</b> (-0.17 $\pm$ 0.15) + <b>pH</b> (-0.21 $\pm$ 0.16) + <b>pNH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup></b> (0.30 $\pm$ 0.15)
	3	143.4	0.017	7.3 $\pm$ 2.2	<b>BD</b> (-0.25 $\pm$ 0.16) + <b>pH</b> (-0.26 $\pm$ 0.16) + <b>Roots</b> (-0.21 $\pm$ 0.15) + <b>pNH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup></b> (0.30 $\pm$ 0.15)
	4	143.6	0.015	7.4 $\pm$ 1.9	<b>pH</b> (-0.37 $\pm$ 0.14)

Symbols: **aNH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>** = resin-available NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, **pNH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>** = soil NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> pool, **BD** = bulk density, **pH** = soil pH, **MVB** = *M. vimineum* biomass, **SM** = soil moisture content. The full list of predictor variables input for each response variable is located in the Materials and Methods. Significance: \*\*\* =  $p < 0.001$ , \*\* =  $p < 0.01$ , \* =  $p < 0.05$ , • =  $p < 0.1$

The original article has been corrected.