

Errata

Performance of two *Picea abies* (L.) Karst. stands at different stages of decline

VI. Nutrient concentration

R. Oren, K.S. Werk, E.-D. Schulze, J. Meyer, B.U. Schneider, and P. Schramel

Oecologia (1988) 77:151–162

In Table 2 and Appendix 1 of the above mentioned article wrong units were reported. The correct units are:
nitrogen in $\text{mmol g}^{-1} \text{ dw}$;
aluminum, calcium, magnesium, manganese, phosphorus, potassium in $\mu\text{mol g}^{-1} \text{ dw}$

How can the functional response best be determined?

Joel C. Trexler, Charles E. McCulloch, and Joseph Travis

Oecologia (1988) 76:206–214

Two equations in our paper were inverted. These were the weights for empirical logistic regression reported on the bottom of page 212 and top of page 213. The corrected weight from the bottom of page 212 is:

$$(R_j(N_j - R_j))/N_j.$$

When R_j equals 0 or N_j the weight, incorrectly given on top of page 213, is:

$$[(R_j + 1/2)(N_j - R_j + 1/2)]/(N_j + 1).$$

These changes have no effect on the results we report as these equations were not used in our analyses. We opted for the more accurate maximum likelihood solution to logistic regression, which we continue to advocate over the empirical logistic approach.