CORRIGENDUM/ERRATUM/ADDENDUM

Allometry and population structure of *Nicolea uspiana* (Polychaeta: Terebellidae) — CORRIGENDUM/ERRATUM/ADDENDUM

A.R.S. GARRAFFONI, L.Q. YOKOYAMA AND A.C.Z. AMARAL

1) Where it is read in the printed text (p. 878, right column, between lines 1 and 8) '...the correct form of Akaike's information criterion was calculated:.... The AIC_c differences, $\Delta_i = AIC_{c,i} - AIC_{c,min}$ were...' it should be:

'...the Akaike's information criterion was calculated: $AIC = n(\log(2\pi RSS/n) + 1) + 2k$ where n is the number of observations, RSS the residual sum of squares, and k the number of regression parameters plus 1. The model with the smallest AIC value (AIC_{min}) was selected as the "best" among those tested. The AIC differences, $\Delta_i = AIC_i - AIC_{min}$ were...'.

2) As the reference (Hurvich & Tsai, 1989) in 'Materials and Methods' was excluded from the text, it should not be considered in the 'References' section.

3) Table 2 was updated and below is the new version.

4) Table 3 was updated and below is the new version.

5) The second paragraph of the 'Results' should be:

'The relative growth among parameters *L/Ns*, *L/Ln*, *L/L18*, *L/W18*, *Ns/Ln* and *Ns/W18* was considered to be best assessed by the linear model (Table 2). The total length has a larger growth than the number of segments, length of the notopodial region and width of segment 18 (Table 3). On the other hand, the number of segments increases in a smaller proportion than the length of the notopodial region and the width of segment 18 (Table 3). An isometric relationship between the ratio *L/L18* showed that the length of segment 18 was the best measure for assessing size-classes of specimens. The cubic model had the highest plausibility relationships in the ratios *L/W5*, *Ns/W5* and *Ns/L18* (Table 2). In this case, the variation in the relative growth among the parameters, mainly the number of segments, was observed over time.'

Table 2. Values of AIC, AIC difference (Δ_i), and Akaike weight (w_i) for the four models applied to each relation of *Nicolea uspiana*. The most plausible models are indicated by bold characters.

		L/NS	*L/Ln*	*L/W5*	*L/L18*	*L/W18*	*Ns/Ln*	*Ns/W5*	*Ns/L18*	*Ns/W18*
AIC	*Lr*	−402.2	−228.9	−8.9	−30.0	135.5	107.4	132.7	101.5	159.7
	Q	−385.4	−133.4	−18.7	151.1	137.4	138.6	134.0	151.1	161.6
	C	−384.1	−134.2	−24.0	−26.3	139.0	134.3	124.3	94.5	161.6
	BS	−385.5	−134.4	−23.1	−26.8	138.9	135.3	127.5	99.3	163.5
Δ_i	*Lr*	0.00	0.00	15.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.34	6.95	0.00
	Q	16.81	95.49	5.24	181.02	1.90	31.20	9.66	56.53	1.91
	C	18.11	94.72	0.00	3.71	3.53	26.91	0.00	0.00	1.89
	BS	16.70	94.46	0.88	3.21	3.39	27.94	3.22	4.82	3.80
w_i(%)	*Lr*	**99.94**	**100.00**	0.03	**73.67**	**57.39**	**100.00**	1.26	2.76	**51.98**
	Q	0.02	0.00	4.23	0.00	22.22	0.00	0.65	0.00	19.99
	C	0.01	0.00	**58.22**	11.53	9.84	0.00	**81.72**	**89.22**	20.25
	BS	0.02	0.00	37.52	14.80	10.55	0.00	16.37	8.02	7.77

AIC, Akaike's information criterion; BS, 'broken-stick' model; C, cubic model; L, total length; Ln, length of the notopodial region; Lr, linear model; L18, segment 18 length; Ns, number of segments; Q, quadratic model; W5, segment 5 width; W18, segment 18 width.

Table 3. Linear regressions of most plausible regression models of *Nicolea uspiana* and Student's *t*-test results to evaluate allometry critical values.

Regression	N	a	b ± SD	r²	P	Regression type
L/Ns	551	1.459	0.2 ± 0.008	0.518	<0.001	Negative allometry
L/Ln	390	−0.223	0.844 ± 0.011	0.934	<0.001	Negative allometry
L/W18	392	−0.917	0.683 ± 0.033	0.525	<0.001	Negative allometry
L/L18	199	−1.42	0.932 ± 0.025	0.874	n.s.	Isometry
Ns/Ln	389	−2.998	2.201 ± 0.111	0.503	<0.001	Positive allometry
Ns/W18	392	−4.016	2.299 ± 0.128	0.453	<0.001	Positive allometry

a, Y-intercept; *b*, regression coefficient; *L*, total length; *Ln*, length of the notopodial region; *L18*, segment 18 length; *N*, number of individuals; *Ns*, number of segments; *Ns.*, non-significant; *P*, probability; *r²*, coefficient of determination; *SD*, standard deviation; *W5*, segment 5 width; *W18*, segment 18 width.

6) In the 'Discussion' (p. 879, right column, between lines 23 and 29), where it is read: 'In four of nine analysed morphometric. . . . . . plausible for five other relationships (*L/Ns*, *L/Ln*, *L/L18*, *L/W18* and *Ns/Ln*).', it should be:
'In three of nine analysed morphometric relationships, the linear model was not the most plausible, corroborating the hypothesis that it could not detect points of discontinuity in the curves of relative growth (Katsanevakis *et al.*, 2007; Protopapas *et al.*, 2007). However, the linear model was the most plausible for six other relationships (*L/Ns*, *L/Ln*, *L/L18*, *L/W18*, *Ns/Ln* and *Ns/W18*).'

REFERENCE

Garraffoni A.R.S., Yokoyama L.Q. and Amaral A.C.Z. (2010) Allometry and population structure of *Nicolea uspiana* (Polychaeta: Terebellidae). *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom* 90, 877–883.