frontiers | Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution

TYPE Correction
PUBLISHED 17 May 2023
DOI 10.3389/fevo.2023.1191544

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Sergey Dobretsov,
Sultan Qaboos University, Oman

*CORRESPONDENCE
Ali Nasrolahi
✉ a_nasrolahi@sbu.ac.ir

RECEIVED 22 March 2023
ACCEPTED 17 April 2023
PUBLISHED 17 May 2023

CITATION
Loghmannia J, Nasrolahi A, Rezaie-Atagholipour M and Kiabi BH (2023) Corrigendum: Epibiont assemblages on nesting hawksbill turtles show site-specificity in the Persian Gulf. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* 11:1191544. doi: 10.3389/fevo.2023.1191544

Corrigendum: Epibiont assemblages on nesting hawksbill turtles show site-specificity in the Persian Gulf

Javad Loghmannia[1], Ali Nasrolahi[1]*, Mohsen Rezaie-Atagholipour[2] and Bahram H. Kiabi[1]

[1]Department of Animal Sciences and Marine Biology, Faculty of Life Sciences and Biotechnology, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran, [2]Qeshm Environmental Conservation Institute (QECI), Qeshm, Iran

KEYWORDS

barnacles, epibionts, environmental extremes, Strait of Hormuz, sea turtles

A corrigendum on

Epibiont assemblages on nesting hawksbill turtles show site-specificity in the Persian Gulf

by Loghmannia, J., Nasrolahi, A., Rezaie-Atagholipour, M., and Kiabi, B. H. (2021). *Front. Ecol. Evol.* 9:690022. doi: 10.3389/fevo.2021.690022

In the published article, there was an error in the **Conflict of interest** as published. The corrected Conflict of interest appears below.

The handling editor SD and author AN declare a shared professional partnership at the time of review. This collaboration was ongoing during the review process.

The remaining authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

In the published article, there was an error in Figure 2 as published. In the caption, Part **(j)** of the caption should state "*Nitzschia* sp." and not "*Poulinea lepidochelicola.*" The corrected Figure 2 caption appears below.

FIGURE 2. Examples of epibiont taxa recorded on the body surface of hawksbill sea turtles in the Iranian coasts of the Persian Gulf: **(a)** *Chelonibia testudinaria* on the carapace of hawksbill sea turtle; **(b)** specimens of *Stephanolepas muricata*; **(c)** *Chelonibia testudinaria*; **(d)** *Platylepas hexastylos*; **(e)** Tanaid; **(f)** Rotaliid foraminifer; **(g)** *Chaetomorpha* sp.; **(h)** *Polysiphonia* sp.; **(i)** *Psammodictyon* sp.; **(j)** *Nitzschia* sp.; **(k)** *Tabularia* sp.1; **(l)** *Amphora* sp.1

In the published article, there was an error in Table 3 as published. In the text of the table, the systematic group of the epibiont taxon "*Emiliania huxleyi*" was miswritten as Algae: Bacillariophyceae, whereas the correct name is Haptophyta: Isochrysidales. The corrected Table 3 and its caption appear below.

In the published article, we neglected to explain whether all the various micro, meio, and macro epibionts were quantified or not. A correction has been made to **Materials and methods**, *Statistical analysis*, 2. This sentence previously stated:

"The analysis of epibiont structure was based on abundance data whereas species composition was evaluated based on presence-absence data."

The corrected sentence appears below:

"Except for diatoms and other algal taxa, for which only presence-absence data were recorded, the analysis of epibiont structure was based on absolute abundance data.

10.3389/fevo.2023.1191544

TABLE 3 Results of the SIMPER procedure to identify the relative contribution of each epibiont taxa to the dissimilarity between the epibiont assemblages of hawksbills (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) nesting on Shibderaz (Qeshm Island) and Dayyer-Nakhiloo National Park (DNNP; Bushehr) beaches, Iran: (a) all epibionts, (b) micro-epibionts, and (c) macro-epibionts.

Systematic group	Epibiont taxon	Shibderaz vs. DNNP		
		Average dissimilarity	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
a				
Algae: Rhodophyta	Unknown	2.53	7.10	7.10
Mollusca: Gastropoda		2.26	6.32	13.42
Mollusca: Bivalvia		2.02	5.64	19.07
Cnidaria: Hydrozoa	Campanulariidae	1.98	5.55	24.62
Algae: Rhodophyta	*Ceramium* sp.	1.98	5.54	30.16
Algae: Chlorophyta	*Ulva* sp.	1.82	5.11	35.27
Crustacea: Amphipoda	*Hyachelia* sp.	1.76	4.93	40.20
Nematoda		1.74	4.88	45.07
Crustacea: Ostracoda		1.51	4.23	49.31
Algae: Chlorophyta	*Chaetomorpha* sp.	1.49	4.18	53.48
Crustacea: Cirripedia	*Stomatolepas transversa*	1.39	3.90	57.38
Annelida: Polychaeta	Polychaeta	1.37	3.84	61.22
Crustacea: Cirripedia	*Stephanolepas muricata*	1.29	3.61	64.83
Algae	Algae sp. 1	1.28	3.58	68.41
Crustacea: Tanaidacea	Tanaidacea	1.16	3.25	71.66
Foraminifera: Miliolida	*Quinqueloculina* spp.	0.75	2.11	73.77
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Amphora ovalis*	0.67	1.86	75.63
Crustacea: Cumacea		0.59	1.64	77.27
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Amphora* sp. 1	0.52	1.45	78.72
Foraminifera: Textulariida		0.50	1.41	80.13
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Cocconeis scutellum*	0.48	1.34	81.47
Porifera		0.42	1.17	82.64
Haptophyta: Isochrysidales	*Emiliania huxleyi*	0.36	1.00	83.64
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Cocconeis* spp.	0.30	0.84	84.48
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Achnanthes* spp.	0.27	0.77	85.25
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Licmophora* spp.	0.27	0.77	86.02
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Navicula* sp. 1	0.27	0.77	86.79
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Opephora* sp.	0.22	0.63	87.41
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Actinocyclus* sp.	0.22	0.61	88.02
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Amphicocconeis* sp.	0.22	0.61	88.63
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Amphora coffeiformis*	0.22	0.61	89.23
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Berkeleya* sp.	0.22	0.61	89.84
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Cocconeis distans*	0.22	0.61	90.45
b				
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Cocconeis* spp.	23.28	23.83	23.83
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Caloneis* sp.	9.21	9.43	33.26
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Amphora* sp. 1	6.97	7.14	40.40

(Continued)

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Systematic group	Epibiont taxon	Shibderaz vs. DNNP		
		Average dissimilarity	Contribution (%)	Cumulative (%)
Haptophyta: Isochrysidales	*Emiliania huxleyi*	6.68	6.84	47.24
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Amphora ovalis*	6.65	6.80	54.04
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Achnathidium* sp.	5.66	5.80	59.84
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Mastogloia horwatiana*	5.66	5.80	65.63
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Cocconeis scutellum*	4.67	4.78	70.42
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Achnanthes* spp.	3.44	3.53	73.94
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Licmophora* spp.	3.44	3.53	77.47
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Navicula* sp. 1	3.44	3.53	80.99
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Amphicocconeis* sp.	1.98	2.02	83.02
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Grammatophora* sp.	1.98	2.02	85.04
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Opephora* sp.	1.98	2.02	87.06
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Actinocyclus* sp.	1.23	1.26	88.32
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Amphora coffeiformis*	1.23	1.26	89.57
Algae: Bacillariophyceae	*Berkeleya* sp.	1.23	1.26	90.83
c				
Algae: Rhodophyta	Unknown	4.11	10.45	10.45
Mollusca: Gastropoda		3.67	9.31	19.76
Algae: Rhodophyta	*Ceramium* sp.	3.26	8.28	28.05
Cnidaria: Hydrozoa	Campanulariidae	3.24	8.23	36.27
Mollusca: Bivalvia		3.23	8.19	44.47
Algae: Chlorophyta	*Ulva* sp.	3.02	7.66	52.13
Crustacea: Amphipoda	*Hyachelia* sp.	2.82	7.17	59.30
Nematoda		2.79	7.09	66.39
Algae: Chlorophyta	*Chaetomorpha* sp.	2.31	5.87	72.26
Crustacea: Cirripedia	*Stomatolepas transversa*	2.27	5.76	78.02
Annelida: Polychaeta		2.16	5.48	83.50
Crustacea: Cirripedia	*Stephanolepas muricata*	2.09	5.30	88.80
Crustacea: Tanaidacea	Tanaidacea	1.83	4.65	93.45

Species composition of the entire epibiont community (including micro, meio, and macro-epibionts) was evaluated based on presence-absence data."

In the published article, we stated *Emiliania huxleyi* was a diatom species. A correction has been made to **Results**, 4. This previously stated:

"The SIMPER analysis revealed 97.68 and 39.37% dissimilarity between the two sites, respectively. Diatom species—including *Cocconeis* spp. (23.83%), *Caloneis* sp. (9.43%), *Amphora* sp. 1 (7.14%), *Emiliania huxleyi* (6.84%), and *Amphora ovalis* (6.80%)—contributed around 54% to the differences of the micro-epibionts (Table 3)."

The corrected sentence appears below:

"The SIMPER analysis revealed 97.68 and 39.37% dissimilarity between the two sites, respectively. Diatom species—including *Cocconeis* spp. (23.83%), *Caloneis* sp. (9.43%), *Amphora* sp. 1 (7.14%), and *Amphora ovalis* (6.80%)—contributed around 47% to the differences of the micro-epibionts (Table 3)."

In the published article, there was an error. Diatoms were the microepibionts focused on in this study and thus should not be described as dominating within this group. A correction has been made to **Discussion**, 5. This sentence previously stated:

"Our results revealed that while macro- and meio-epibiont taxa assemblages are relatively similar at both sites [...], micro-epibionts (26 taxa at Shibderaz and 6 taxa at DNNP, Table 1), dominated by diatoms, differ significantly"

10.3389/fevo.2023.1191544

The corrected sentence appears below:

"Our results revealed that while macro- and meio-epibiont taxa assemblages are relatively similar at both sites [...], micro-epibionts (26 taxa at Shibderaz and 6 taxa at DNNP, Table 1), represented mostly by diatoms, differ significantly"

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