CORRECTION



Correction to: eDNA detection of corallivorous seastar (*Acanthaster cf. solaris*) outbreaks on the Great Barrier Reef using digital droplet PCR

Sven Uthicke¹ · Miles Lamare² · Jason R. Doyle¹

Published online: 18 August 2021 © Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2021

Correction to: Coral Reefs (2018) 37:1229–1239 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00338-018-1734-6

In the published paper are minor discrepancies between the supplementary table and the data we show in the main text (Table 2, Fig. 3). Due to a change of analytical methods, we had achieved a lower Limit of Quantification (LOQ) for the final data, but presented the initial data in the supplementary material. In addition, an error occurred when averaging some of the datapoints. Here, we present and updated version of Table 2 (statistical analyses) and Fig. 3 (graphical presentation of the linear model results). Changes to data, statistics and graphs are only minor and have no consequence to the conclusions of our publication.

Table 2 Results of linear models comparing eDNA concentrations and the percentage of samples above the Limit of Quantification (LOQ) collected at depth (underwater) or on the ocean surface (surface), and densities of *Acanthaster* cf. *solaris* (CoTS density) (Updated Table 2)

Estimate	SE	t	р	Model R ²
oncentration	n versus C	oTS den	sity	
2.5794	0.1164	22.16	< 0.0001	0.63
0.9805	0.1640	5.98	< 0.0001	
ntration ver	sus CoTS	density		
2.3157	0.1399	16.55	< 0.0001	0.43
0.7572	0.1933	3.92	0.0010	
% > LOQ v	ersus CoT	S density	r	
1.3275	0.0811	16.37	< 0.0001	0.67
0.6792	0.1097	6.19	< 0.0001	
LOQ versus	CoTS der	nsity		
1.5790	0.0639	24.70	< 0.0001	0.49
0.3878	0.0883	4.39	0.0004	
	Estimate oncentration 2.5794 0.9805 ntration ver 2.3157 0.7572 % > LOQ ver 1.3275 0.6792 LOQ versus 1.5790 0.3878	Estimate SE oncentration versus C 2.5794 0.1164 0.9805 0.1640 ntration versus CoTS 2.3157 0.1399 0.7572 0.1933 % > LOQ versus CoT 1.3275 0.0811 0.6792 0.1097 LOQ versus CoTS der 1.5790 0.0639 0.3878 0.0883	Estimate SE t oncentration versus CoTS den 2.5794 0.1164 22.16 0.9805 0.1640 5.98 ntration versus CoTS 2.3157 0.1399 16.55 0.7572 0.1933 3.92 $\&lleelleelleelleelleelleelleelleelleell$	EstimateSEtponcentrationversusCoTSdensity 2.5794 0.1164 22.16 < 0.0001 0.9805 0.1640 5.98 < 0.0001 ntrationversusCoTSdensity 2.3157 0.1399 16.55 < 0.0001 0.7572 0.1933 3.92 0.0010 δ > LOQ versusCoTSdensity 1.3275 0.0811 16.37 < 0.0001 0.6792 0.1097 6.19 < 0.0001 LOQ versusCoTSdensity 1.5790 0.0639 24.70 < 0.0001 0.3878 0.0883 4.39 0.0004

The original article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1007/ s00338-018-1734-6.

Sven Uthicke suthicke@aims.gov.au

- Australian Institute of Marine Science, PMB No. 3, Townsville MC, QLD 4810, Australia
- ² Department of Marine Science, University of Otago, Dunedin 9016, New Zealand



Fig. 3 Linear models of eDNA in water samples taken in situ (underwater) and on the sea surface (surface) as a function of *Acanthaster* cf. *solaris* densities on reefs of the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. Response variables are either the average concentration per site (eDNA) or the proportion of samples above the Limit of Quantification (LOQ). The grey shaded area represents 1 SE of each

fit. Regression equations (intercepts and slopes) for the models are given in Table 2. All variables were log 10(9) transformed prior to analyses. For transformation, 0.5 9 the minimum value observed for the respective variable was added to all values to accommodate zero values (Updated Fig. 3)

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