

## Erratum to: Restored tufa-depositing streams: a dynamic interface between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems

Erratum for: Knowl. Manag. Aquat. Ecosyst. 2023, 424, 16–<https://doi.org/10.1051/kmae/2023012>

Vesna Gulin Beljak<sup>1</sup>, Barbara Vlaičević<sup>2</sup>, Mirela Sertić Perić<sup>1</sup> and Renata Matoničkin Kepčija<sup>1,\*</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> University of Zagreb, Faculty of Science, Department of Biology, Horvatovac 102a, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia

<sup>2</sup> Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Department of Biology, Cara Hadrijana 8/A, 31000 Osijek, Croatia

Accepted: 20 June 2023

Regarding the article V. Gulin Beljak et al., 2023. Restored tufa-depositing streams: a dynamic interface between 1001 terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. Knowl. Manag. Aquat. Ecosyst., 424, 16–<https://doi.org/10.1051/kmae/2023012>, published on June 12<sup>th</sup> 2023, several errors occurred:

In Table 1, the rows N3-N5 were forgotten.

**Table 1.** Details of the sampling sites at Skradinski buk barrier and their descriptions.

Site	Coordinates	Details
C1	15.966381, 43.805752	Site located in control stream where water had been present before and after the removal of <i>Ailanthus altissima</i> (Mill.) Swinge and displaying well-developed moss cover
C2	15.966279, 43.805772	Site located in control stream without moss cover
N1	15.965449, 43.806438	Site located in restored stream
N2	15.965324, 43.806624	Site located in restored stream
N3	15.965246, 43.806541	Site located in restored stream
N4	15.965186, 43.806489	Site located in restored stream
N5	15.965538, 43.806225	Site located in restored stream

In the legend for Figure 8, some italic were missing for the species:

**Fig. 8.** Redundancy analysis (RDA) showing the relationships between ciliate species (red arrows) and environmental parameters (blue arrows) among control (C) and restored (N) sites for the one-month immersion period. Abbreviations: N = nitrites; COD = chemical oxygen demand; OM = organic matter; IM = inorganic matter; CHL = chlorophyll a concentration; AC = *Aspidisca cicada*; CU = *Chilodonella uncinata*; CM = *Cinetochilum margaritaceum*; CYC = *Cyclidium* sp.; HO = *Holophrya ovum*; PV = *Platyophrya vorax*; PG = *Pleurotricha grandis*; PA = *Pseudochilodonopsis algivora*; TC = *Trithigmostoma cucullulus*; VAC = *Vorticella aquadulcis*-complex.

RDA ordination for the one-month immersion period was statistically significant ( $F=2.856, p=0.001$ ). The first constrained axis (RDA1) described 13.6% of the variance ( $F = 6.288, p = 0.001$ ), the second (RDA2) explained 11% of the variance ( $F = 5.069, p = 0.003$ ), while the third axis (RDA3) explained 8.5% ( $F = 3.897, p = 0.028$ ) and was therefore not visualized (Fig. 8). Three explanatory variables (environmental parameters) explained 33.1% of the variance in the data: nitrites ( $F = 5.041, p = 0.001$ ), COD ( $F = 2.140, p = 0.030$ ), inorganic matter ( $F = 2.358, p = 0.032$ ).

**Cite this article as:** Vesna Gulin Beljak, Barbara Vlaičević, Mirela Sertić Perić, Renata Matoničkin Kepčija. 2023. Erratum to: Restored tufa-depositing streams: a dynamic interface between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. *Knowl. Manag. Aquat. Ecosyst.*, 424, 21.

\*Corresponding author: [renata.matonickin.kepcija@biol.pmf.hr](mailto:renata.matonickin.kepcija@biol.pmf.hr)