



Corrigendum

Corrigendum to “Foraging behavior of lactating South American sea lions (*Otaria flavescens*) and spatial–temporal resource overlap with the Uruguayan fisheries” [Deep-Sea Res. II 88–89 (2013) 106–109]



Federico G. Riet-Sapriza^{a,*}, Daniel P. Costa^b, Valentina Franco-Trecu^a, Yamandú Marín^c, Julio Chocca^c, Bernardo González^c, Gastón Beathyate^c, B. Louise Chilvers^d, Luis A. Hückstadt^e

^a Proyecto Pinnípedos, Cetáceos Uruguay, Sección Etología, Facultad de Ciencias (UDELAR), Iguá 4225, CP 11400, Montevideo, Uruguay

^b Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, 100 Shaffer Road, Santa Cruz, CA 95060, USA

^c Laboratorio de Tecnología Pesquera, Dirección Nacional de Recurso Acuáticos, M.G.A.P., Constituyente 1497, C.P. 11200, P.O. Box 1612, Montevideo, Uruguay

^d Aquatic & Threats Unit, Department of Conservation, P.O. Box 10–420, Wellington 6011, New Zealand

^e Ocean Sciences Department, University of California, 100 Shaffer Rd, Santa Cruz, CA 95060, USA

The authors of Riet-Sapriza et al. (2013) regret that after publication of the original manuscript an error was found in the estimation of lactating South American sea lions prey consumption and led to an overestimation of the daily and annual prey consumption.

In this corrigendum the amendments include:

1. Results sections

The corrected Table 4 is shown below.

The sentences (page 112) in the original manuscript states:

‘Thus, the total daily consumption and total food consumption for the year 2009 for the entire adult female population from Isla de Lobos was estimated in 298 t/day and 108,862 t, respectively (Table 4). The annual and daily prey consumption density estimated was 1.4 t/year/km² and 0.004 t/day/km², respectively (Fig. 6).’

These sentences should be changed to:

‘Thus, the total daily consumption and total food consumption for the year 2009 for the entire adult female population from Isla de Lobos was estimated in 2.75 t/day and 1004.88 t/year, respectively (Table 4). The daily prey consumption and annual consumption density estimated was estimated in 0.0009 t/day/km² and 0.31 t/year/km², respectively (Fig. 6).’

2. Discussion sections

The sentences (page 116, subheading 4.3. ‘Spatial resource overlap with the Uruguayan fisheries’) in the original manuscript states:

‘We estimate that female SASL from Isla de Lobos consumed annually (108,862 t) approximately 3.1 times as much prey as the CBTF landings (35,511 t) (Table 4). Furthermore, if we take into account the annual consumption of overlapping prey, SASL consumed 2.5 times more than the artisanal and CBTF fisheries (Table 4).’

These sentences should be changed to:

‘We estimate that female SASL from Isla de Lobos annual prey consumption (1004.88 t) was approximately 97% less than the CBTF landings (35,511 t) (Table 4). Furthermore, if we take into account the annual consumption of overlapping prey, female SASL consumed (728 t) 98% less than the total artisanal and CBTF fisheries catch (32,491 t) (Table 4).’

The authors regret the mistake and would like to apologize for any inconvenience caused. We are very thankful to Dr. Arliss Winship for his suggestion and assistance to correctly estimate the sea lion prey consumption.

DOI of original article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2012.09.005>

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: frietsapriza@gmail.com (F.G. Riet-Sapriza).

Table 4
Estimate of the composition of the total annual Uruguayan artisanal fishery and coastal bottom trawl fishery catches, and diet composition and prey quantity of South American sea lion's (*Otaria flavescens*), and comparison of consumption of overlapping prey species. Composition of the South American sea lions diet expressed as percentage of frequency of occurrence (FO%, percentage of scat in which a prey was observed), % number (N%, percentage of the total prey number across all samples), % biomass (W%, percentage of the number of prey times the average body mass), and index of relative importance (IRI/100). NA was not possible to obtain biomass since no length-body mass regression is available.

Prey and catch species		Diet composition of SASL				Total catch (t) (%) ^a		Sea lion consumption (t) (%)	Consumption of overlapping prey (t)	
Common name	Scientific	FO%	N%	W%	IRI	Artisanal	Trawling		Fisheries	Sea lions
Brazilian codling	<i>Urophycis brasiliensis</i>	15.79	3.73	17.0	3.27	181 (10.0)	188 (0.5)	171 (17.0)	369	171
Largehead hairtail	<i>Trichiurus lepturus</i>	31.58	9.94	23.98	10.7	–	–	241 (23.98)	–	–
White mouthcroaker	<i>Micropogonias furnieri</i>	10.53	8.70	46.66	5.83	1379 (76.4)	22,349 (62.9)	469 (46.66)	23,728	469
Striped weakfish	<i>Cynoscion guatucupa</i>	31.58	13.04	0.72	4.34	177 (9.8)	6177 (17.4)	7 (0.72)	6354	7
Argentine seabass	<i>Acanthistius brasiliensis</i>	10.53	6.83	NA	–	–	–	NA	–	–
Argentine croaker	<i>Umbrina canosai</i>	10.53	3.73	8.10	1.24	51 (2.8)	1989 (5.6)	81 (8.10)	2040	81
Argentine conger	<i>Conger orbignyanus</i>	5.26	1.24	NA	–	–	10 (0.0)	NA	–	–
Argentine hake	<i>Merluccius hubbsi</i>	10.53	3.11	3.54	0.70	–	–	36 (3.54)	–	–
Squid	<i>Loligoginidae</i>	10.53	11.18	NA	–	–	1585 (4.5)	NA	–	–
King weakfish	<i>Macrondon ancylodon</i>	–	–	–	–	16 (0.9)	3213 (9.0)	–	–	–
Argentine anchoita	<i>Engraulis anchoita</i>	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Searobin	<i>Prionotus sp.</i>	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Cephalopods	<i>Omastrephidae</i>	5.26	38.51	NA	–	–	–	NA	–	–
Total catch/prey						1804	35,511	1004.88	32,491	728

^a Source: Uruguay DINARA (2010).

Reference

Uruguay DINARA, 2010. Boletín Estadístico Pesquero 2009/ Uruguay. Dirección Nacional de Recursos Acuáticos. MGAP-DINARA, Montevideo, pp. 52.