

1 This manuscript is textually identical with the published paper:

2 Borza P, Huber T, Leitner P, Remund N, Graf W (2018): Correction to: Niche differentiation among
3 invasive Ponto-Caspian *Chelicorophium* species (Crustacea, Amphipoda, Corophiidae) by food
4 particle size. Aquatic Ecology 52(2): 191-192. DOI: 10.1007/s10452-018-9659-2

5 The original publication is available at:

6 <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10452-018-9659-2>

7

8

9 Correction to: Niche differentiation among invasive Ponto-Caspian *Chelicorophium* species
10 (Crustacea, Amphipoda, Corophiidae) by food particle size

11

12 Péter Borza^{1,2*}, Thomas Huber³, Patrick Leitner³, Nadine Remund⁴, Wolfram Graf³

13

14 ¹GINOP Sustainable Ecosystems Group, MTA Centre for Ecological Research, Klebelsberg Kuno utca
15 3, H-8237 Tihany, Hungary

16 ²Danube Research Institute, MTA Centre for Ecological Research, Karolina út 29-31, H-1113
17 Budapest, Hungary

18 ³Department of Water, Atmosphere & Environment, Institute for Hydrobiology & Water Management,
19 BOKU - University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences, Gregor Mendel Strasse 33, A-
20 1180 Vienna, Austria

21 ⁴Info fauna – CSCF, Passage Maximilien-de-Meuron 6, CH-2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland

22 * E-mail: borza.peter@okologia.mta.hu, tel: +361-279-3100/306

23

24 A calibration mistake caused systematic error in the microscopic measurements; all filter mesh size
25 values should be divided by a factor of 2.56. As our conclusions were based on the inter- and
26 intraspecific variations of the trait, this systematic error does not influence them in any way.

27 Filter mesh sizes ranged between 2.47 and 7.17 μm in *C. curvispinum*, between 1.83 and 5.09 μm in *C.*
28 *robustum*, and between 1.03 and 2.68 μm in *C. sowinskyi*. Interspecific differences were estimated

29 correctly as 1.12 μm (SE = 0.15) between *C. curvispinum* and *C. robustum*, and 1.37 μm (SE = 0.15)
30 between *C. robustum* and *C. sowinskyi*. The correct version of Figure 2 and Table 3 are provided in
31 this correction.
32 The 100-fold magnification mentioned in the text refers to the magnification of the microscope
33 objective.

34 **Tables**

35 **Table 3** Parameters and variance components of the single-species linear mixed-effects models. Note: the *P*-values of the parameter estimations and the
 36 variance components of the models are not affected by the calibration error

37

Species	Intercept (μm)	Slope (body length)	Body length-dependency (= fixed effects)	Among-individual variation (= random effects)	Within- individual variation (= residual)
<i>C. curvispinum</i>	2.94 (<i>SE</i> = 0.56; <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.40 (<i>SE</i> = 0.16; <i>P</i> = 0.015)	0.15	0.80	0.05
<i>C. robustum</i> (< 5.5 mm)	1.96 (<i>SE</i> = 0.25; <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.36 (<i>SE</i> = 0.06; <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.41	0.27	0.32
<i>C. robustum</i> (\geq 5.5 mm)	3.87 (<i>SE</i> = 0.03; <i>P</i> < 0.001)	not significant	-	0.11	0.89
<i>C. sowinskyi</i>	0.69 (<i>SE</i> = 0.18; <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.32 (<i>SE</i> = 0.06; <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.52	0.44	0.04

38 **Figure captions**

39

40 **Fig. 2** Filter mesh sizes of *Chelicorophium* species as a function of body length. Lines
41 represent the fitted values of the single-species linear mixed-effects models. This figure
42 represents a rescaled version (all values divided by a factor of 2.56) of Fig. 2 in the original
43 publication.

44

45 **Figures**

46

47 Fig. 2

