Correction to: Efficiency drivers for the South Pacific West coast port terminals: a two-stage non-convex metafrontier dea approach

Víctor Chang¹ · Beatriz Tovar²

Published online: 3 June 2021
© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2021

Correction to: Operational Research

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12351-021-00626-5>

In the original publication of the article, the below-mentioned errors had been occurred in the article. The corrected errors in the equations are given as follows:

$$TE_i^* = f(z_i, \beta) + \epsilon_i \quad (10)$$

$$TE_{it}^* = f(\text{container index}_{i,t}, \text{bulk rate}_{i,t}, \text{dgest}_{i,t}, \text{berth}_{i,t}, \text{distance}_{i,t}, \text{occupancy rate}_{i,t}, \text{class}_i, \beta) + \epsilon_{i,t} \quad (14)$$

In the last paragraph in section 2.2 there is a sentence where the subscripts had been incorrectly published. The correct sentence is given as follows:

(where the TE_i^* , TE_i^k and TGR_i scores are the dependent variables analysed).

In the original publication of the article, the below-mentioned Table 3 had been incorrectly published. The corrected table is given as follows (Table 3).

In the second paragraph in section 4.2 there is a sentence which had been incorrectly published (and footnote 16 was no published too). The correct sentence is given as follows:

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12351-021-00626-5>.

✉ Beatriz Tovar
beatriz.tovar@ulpgc.es
<http://www.personales.ulpgc.es/btoovar.daea>

Víctor Chang
c20795@utp.edu.pe

¹ Universidad Tecnológica del Perú, Av. Petit Thouars 385/Av. Arequipa 265, Cercado de Lima 15046, Lima, Peru

² Tourism and Transport Research Unit, Institute of Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development, University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (ULPGC), Campus de Tafira, Modulo D, Despacho 2.20, 35017 Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain

Table 3 Descriptive statistics: first stage and second stage

	Variables	Class 1		Class 2	
		Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error
First stage	Output	1,260,977	881,260	2,753,578	2,823,008
	Input	203	175,231	207	221,0708
Second stage	Aggregate output by PCA				
	Labour (Number of workers)	12,672	10,278	19,663	18,911
	Capital (Net stock of fixed assets)	0.58	0.38	0.68	0.34
	Container index	0.38	0.36	0.4	0.27
	Bulk ratio	82.35	46.49	118.34	76.69
	Capital ratio	0.67	0.48	0.6	0.49
	Dgest (Private = 1, public = 0)	3.74	1.47	5.6	4.37
	Berth (Number)	418.17	127.36	334.13	254.43
	Distance to the nearest port				
	Occupancy rate	0.32	0.11	0.33	0.17

PCA = Principal Component Analysis; Net stock of fixed assets = Basic infrastructure, superstructure, machines and mobile equipment were grouped into a capital variable approximated by the stock of net fixed assets, obtained from each terminal. This data was then converted into MUSS constant values (the year 2000 = 100); Container index = Containerized cargo/Total general cargo; Bulk ratio = Bulk cargo/Total cargo; Capital ratio = Capital/Labour; Dgest = Type of management (private or public); Distance to the nearest port = The natural logarithm of distance to the nearest port (Km); Occupancy rate = The effective hours of berth occupancy/The potential hours of berth occupancy

The average TE_i^{*15} and the average TGR_i^{*16} by terminal during the whole period are shown in Fig. 3.”

¹⁶ This is the average relationship between the technical efficiency with respect to k-th group $[TE_i^k(x^k, y^k)]$ and the technical efficiency with respect to the metafrontier $[TE_i^*(x^*, y^*)]$.

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