



Corrigendum: Abundance and Potential Biological Removal of Common Dolphins Subject to Fishery-Impacts in South Australian Waters

Guido J. Parra^{1*}, Kerstin Bilgmann^{1,2,3}, Katharina J. Peters^{1,4,5,6} and Luciana M. Möller^{1,2}

¹ Cetacean Ecology, Behaviour and Evolution Laboratory (CEBEL), College of Science and Engineering, Flinders University, Adelaide, SA, Australia, ² Molecular Ecology Laboratory, College of Science and Engineering, Flinders University, Adelaide, SA, Australia, ³ Department of Biological Sciences, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW, Australia, ⁴ Cetacean Ecology Research Group, School of Natural Sciences, Massey University, Auckland, New Zealand, ⁵ Evolutionary Genetics Group, Department of Anthropology, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland, ⁶ Global Ecology Partuyarta Ngadluku Wardli Kuu, College of Science and Engineering, Flinders University, Adelaide, SA, Australia

Keywords: Dolphins, *Delphinus delphis*, aerial survey, distance sampling, fishery interaction, bycatch, potential biological removal, conservation

A Corrigendum on:

Abundance and Potential Biological Removal of Common Dolphins Subject to Fishery Impacts in South Australian Waters

by Parra GJ, Bilgmann K, Peters KJ and Möller LM (2021) *Front. Mar. Sci.* 8:617075. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2021.617075

OPEN ACCESS

Edited and reviewed by:

Guillermo Luna-Jorquera,
Universidad Católica del Norte, Chile

*Correspondence:

Guido J. Parra
guido.parra@flinders.edu.au

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Marine Megafauna,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Marine Science

Received: 06 April 2022

Accepted: 25 April 2022

Published: 10 May 2022

Citation:

Parra GJ, Bilgmann K, Peters KJ and
Möller LM (2022) Corrigendum:
Abundance and Potential
Biological Removal of Common
Dolphins Subject to Fishery-Impacts in
South Australian Waters.
Front. Mar. Sci. 9:913726.
doi: 10.3389/fmars.2022.913726

In the original article, there was a mistake in **Table 4** as published. The PBR estimates in the table are incorrect. While reporting PBR estimates we copied the wrong estimated values from our data analysis. The corrected **Table 4** appears below.

Due to the mistake in **Table 4** as published in the original article, there were wrong values reported in the Abstract, Results and Discussion sections. Corrections have been made to the **Abstract**, paragraph one: “Annual PBR estimates, assuming a conservative maximum population growth rate of $R_{max} = 0.02$ and a recovery factor of $F_r = 0.5$ for species of unknown conservation status, ranged from 189 (summer/autumn) to 239 dolphins (winter/spring), and from 378 (summer/autumn) to 478 dolphins (winter/spring) with an $R_{max} = 0.04$.” should have read “Annual PBR estimates, assuming a conservative maximum population growth rate of $R_{max} = 0.02$ and a recovery factor of $F_r = 0.5$ for species of unknown conservation status, ranged from 95 (summer/autumn) to 120 dolphins (winter/spring), and from 189 (summer/autumn) to 239 dolphins (winter/spring) with an $R_{max} = 0.04$.”

In addition, corrections have been made to the **Results, Estimates of Potential Biological Removal**, paragraph one: “Estimates of the annual PBR of common dolphins in the study area, assuming a conservative maximum population growth rate of $R_{max} = 0.02$ and a recovery factor of $F_r = 0.5$ for species of unknown conservation status, ranged from 189 (summer/autumn) to 239 dolphins (winter/spring) (**Table 4**).” should have read “Estimates of the annual PBR of common dolphins in the

TABLE 4 | Estimates of abundance (\hat{N}) coefficient of variation (CV), 20th Percentile of abundance (N_{\min}) and the maximum number of common dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*) that may be removed sustainably (Potential Biological Removal, PBR) from central South Australia under different recovery factors (F_r) and maximum population growth rates (R_{\max}).

Season	\hat{N}	CV	N_{\min}	PBR Estimates		
				F_r	$R_{\max} = 0.02$	$R_{\max} = 0.04$
Summer/Autumn	21,733	0.25	18,910	0.1	19	38
				0.5	95	189
				1	189	378
Winter/Spring	26,504	0.19	23,919	0.1	24	48
				0.5	120	239
				1	239	478

Estimates are based on abundance estimates derived from double platform aerial surveys conducted in central South Australia in summer/autumn and winter/spring of 2011.

study area assuming a conservative maximum population growth rate of $R_{\max} = 0.02$ and a recovery factor of $F_r = 0.5$ for species of unknown conservation status, ranged from 95 (summer/autumn) to 120 dolphins (winter/spring) (Table 4). Using a maximum rate of population increase of $R_{\max} = 0.04$ and an $F_r = 0.5$ resulted in annual PBR estimates of 189 (summer/autumn) and 239 dolphins (winter/spring) (Table 4)."

Finally, corrections have been made to the Discussion, paragraph nine: "If common dolphin abundance in 2011 was similar to 2004/5, when dolphin bycatch was the highest recorded in the SASF (423 dolphin mortalities), all PBR estimates, with the exception of those assuming a maximum population growth rate of $R_{\max} = 0.04$ and a recovery factor of $F_r = 0.1$ for species not at risk, suggest that common dolphin mortality in this fishery alone was likely unsustainable." should have read "If common dolphin abundance in 2011 was similar to 2004/5, when dolphin bycatch was the highest recorded in the SASF (423 dolphin mortalities), all PBR estimates, with the

exception of those assuming a maximum population growth rate of $R_{\max} = 0.04$ and a recovery factor of $F_r = 1$ for species not at risk, suggested that common dolphin mortality in this fishery alone was likely unsustainable."

The authors apologize for these errors and state that they do not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Copyright © 2022 Parra, Bilgmann, Peters and Möller. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.