

Correction



Cite this article: Ivimey-Cook ER, Murray DS, de Coriolis J-C, Edden N, Immler S, Maklakov AA. 2023 Correction to: 'Fasting increases investment in soma upon refeeding at the cost of gamete quality in zebrafish' (2023) by Ivimey-Cook *et al.* *Proc. R. Soc. B* **290**: 20230872.
<https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2023.0872>

Received: 13 April 2023

Accepted: 13 April 2023

Electronic supplementary material is available online at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.6623292.v1>.

Correction to: 'Fasting increases investment in soma upon refeeding at the cost of gamete quality in zebrafish' (2023) by Ivimey-Cook *et al.*

Edward R. Ivimey-Cook, David S. Murray, Jean-Charles de Coriolis, Nathan Edden, Simone Immler and Alexei A. Maklakov

ERI-C, 0000-0003-4910-0443; SI, 0000-0003-1234-935X; AAM, 0000-0002-5809-1203

Proc. R. Soc. B **290**, 20221556 (Published Online 12 April 2023). (doi:10.1098/rspb.2022.1556)

There was a mistake in the numbering of the supplementary tables. This has now been corrected.

From:

'(average reproduction EMM fed females: 92.7, fasted females: 105.0, contrast = 0.93, $p = 0.566$; electronic supplementary material, Table S8) resulting in a comparable total number of offspring between fed and fasted treatments (although we note the large increase in total number of offspring for females as they transition from fasting to refeeding; Total offspring: fed = 240, fasted = 281, estimate = 0.856, $p = 0.509$; electronic supplementary material, Table S9).'

To:

'(average reproduction EMM fed females: 92.7, fasted females: 105.0, contrast = 0.93, $p = 0.566$; electronic supplementary material, table S8a), resulting in a comparable total number of offspring between fed and fasted treatments (although we note the large increase in total number of offspring for females as they transition from fasting to refeeding; total offspring: fed = 240, fasted = 281, estimate = 0.856, $p = 0.509$; electronic supplementary material, table S8b).'