Correction to: A theory for ecological survey methods to map individual distributions

Nao Takashina^{1,7} · Maria Beger^{2,3} · Buntarou Kusumoto⁴ · Suren Rathnayake⁵ · Hugh P. Possingham^{2,6}

Published online: 23 June 2018
© Springer Nature B.V. 2018

Correction to: Theor Ecol (2018)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12080-017-0359-7>

The original version of this article unfortunately contained a mistake. The x -axis in Figs. 4–6 in the original version of this article should be replaced with the x -axis shown in the improved figures below. This does not change the calculations and conclusions.

The online version of the original article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12080-017-0359-7>

✉ Nao Takashina
nao.takashina@gmail.com

¹ Tropical Biosphere Research Center, University of the Ryukyus, 3422 Sesoko Motobu, Okinawa 905-0227, Japan

² ARC Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions, School of Biological Sciences, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD 4072, Australia

³ School of Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK

⁴ Center for Strategic Research Project, University of the Ryukyus, 1 Senbaru, Nishihara, Okinawa 903-0213, Japan

⁵ School of Biological Sciences, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD 4072, Australia

⁶ The Nature Conservancy, 4245 North Fairfax Drive Suite 100, Arlington, VA 22203-1606, USA

⁷ Present address: Biodiversity and Biocomplexity Unit, Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University, Onna-son, Okinawa 904-0495, Japan

Fig. 4 (color online) Analytical and simulated (candlestick) values of **a** the presence mapped fraction (PM fraction) and **b** the fraction of individuals covered within presence mapped patches (IC fraction) across mapping unit scales. x-axis is the area of mapping unit (m²). Each candlestick

shows, from the bottom, 5, 25, 50, 75, and 95 percentile values of 1000 simulation trials. The values of the sampling density and detectability are $\alpha = 0.5$ and $\beta = 0.9$, respectively. The other parameter values are the same as in Fig. 1

Fig. 5 (color online) Analytical and simulated (only IC fraction of Thomas process) values of **a** the homogeneous Poisson process and **b** Thomas process. All the values are the same as in Fig. 4 in the main text, but different presentation to facilitate the comparison of PM and IC fractions of each process

Fig. 6 Effect of the intensity ($\lambda, \bar{c}\lambda p$) in the observation window, W , on the theoretical presence mapped (PM) fraction, Eqs. 18 and 22. The intensity of the Thomas process is manipulated by changing the parent intensity λp . Individual distribution patterns are according to the **a** homogeneous Poisson process and **b** Thomas process. For the Thomas process, the curves for PM fraction converge as the

intensity becomes small, and come close to the corresponding curve of the homogeneous Poisson process as the intensity of the Thomas process increases. This is an effect that the increased parents intensity decreases spatial heterogeneity over the concerned region. For both panels, the order of the intensity monotonically decreases from left to right