Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY Monique A. R. Udell, Oregon State University, United States

★CORRESPONDENCE Federica Amici Mamici@eva.mpg.de

RECEIVED 23 March 2023 ACCEPTED 07 April 2023 PUBLISHED 02 May 2023

CITATION

Amici F, Widdig A, von Fersen L, Lopez Caicoya A and Majolo B (2023) Corrigendum: Intra-specific variation in the social behavior of Barbary macaques (*Macaca sylvanus*). *Front. Psychol.* 14:1192731. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1192731

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Amici, Widdig, von Fersen, Lopez Caicoya and Majolo. 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.

Corrigendum: Intra-specific variation in the social behavior of Barbary macaques (*Macaca sylvanus*)

Federica Amici^{1,2*}, Anja Widdig^{1,2}, Lorenzo von Fersen³, Alvaro Lopez Caicoya^{4,5} and Bonaventura Majolo⁶

¹Department of Human Behavior, Ecology and Culture, Research Group "Primate Behavioural Ecology", Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, Germany, ²Faculty of Life Science, Behavioral Ecology Research Group, Institute of Biology, University of Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany, ³Zoo Nuernberg, Nuernberg, Germany, ⁴Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychobiology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain, ⁵Institute of Neurosciences, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain, ⁶School of Psychology, University of Lincoln, Lincoln, United Kingdom

KEYWORDS

intra-specific variation, Barbary macaques, neophobia, social integration, access to food, social behavior

A corrigendum on

Intra-specific variation in the social behavior of Barbary macaques (*Macaca sylvanus*)

Amici, F., Widdig, A., von Fersen, L., Lopez Caicoya, A., and Majolo, B. (2021). Front. Psychol. 12:666166. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.666166

In the published article, there was an error. It was stated that the adjusted steepness values of our study groups were 0.637 in Nürnberg, 0.591 in Cordoba, 0.225 in Gibraltar, 0.165 in Kinztheim-1 and 0.136 in Kintzheim-2. However, there was a mistake in the script used to calculate adjusted steepness. After correcting the mistake in the script, the correct adjusted steepness values are: 0.202 in Nürnberg, 0.203 in Cordoba, 0.156 in Gibraltar, 0.144 in Kinztheim-1 and 0.136 in Kintzheim-2. A correction has been made to *Results, Dominance Style, Paragraph 1*. The corrected paragraph is shown below.

"The study groups varied in their dominance style. Adjusted steepness values decreased as the group size increased, being highest in Cordoba (i.e., 0.203, N = 6) and Nürnberg (i.e., 0.202, N = 5), while decreasing in Gibraltar (i.e. 0.156, N = 19), and being lowest in the two larger groups (i.e., 0.144 in Kintzheim-1, N = 59; and 0.136 in Kintzheim-2, N = 48). Adjusted steepness values decreased as the group size increased, being highest in Nürnberg (i.e., 0.637, N = 5) and Cordoba (i.e., 0.591, N = 6), while decreasing in Gibraltar (i.e., 0.225, N = 19), and being lowest in the two larger groups (i.e., 0.165 in Kintzheim-1, N = 59; and 0.136 in Kintzheim-2, N = 48). Similarly, the proportion of agonistic interactions against the hierarchy was lower in the smaller groups (i.e., 1/64 = 2% in Nürnberg; 6/229 = 3% in Cordoba; and 2/125 = 2% in Gibraltar), and higher in the larger ones (i.e., 177/1,412 = 13% in Kintzheim-1 and 199/1,253 = 16% in Kintzheim-2)."

Please note that the steepness values presented in the paper were only given for descriptive reasons and these steepness values were not included in any further analysis. Thus, the results of our statistical analyses in the paper are not affected by this mistake. Moreover, the changes in the steepness values do not affect the order of the steepness values

for the various study groups: the correct steepness values remain highest in Nürnberg and Cordoba, while decreasing in Gibraltar, and being lowest in the two larger groups (i.e., Kintzheim-1 and Kintzheim-2). Therefore, this mistake does not affect the interpretation of our results and our conclusions.

The authors apologize for this error and state that this does 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.