



CrossMark  
click for updates

## Correction

**Cite this article:** Haynes KJ, Bjørnstad ON, Allstadt AJ, Liebhold AM. 2013 Geographical variation in the spatial synchrony of a forest-defoliating insect: isolation of environmental and spatial drivers. *Proc R Soc B* 280: 20130112.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.0112>

# Geographical variation in the spatial synchrony of a forest-defoliating insect: isolation of environmental and spatial drivers

Kyle J. Haynes, Ottar N. Bjørnstad, Andrew J. Allstadt  
and Andrew M. Liebhold

*Proc. R. Soc. B* 280, 20122373 (22 February 2013; Published online 2 January 2013) (doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2373)

In table 2, the  $p$ -value for the proximity matrix in the space + environment model was given mistakenly as 0.001.

The correct  $p$ -value for the proximity matrix is 0.083.

Consequently, the statements in the text that spatial proximity was a significant predictor of synchrony in oak masting should be disregarded.

The main conclusions of the article remain unchanged. The evidence for the conclusion that weather may synchronize gypsy moth populations indirectly through effects on the synchrony of oak masting is strengthened following correction of the error because now the results indicate that synchrony in both acorn production and gypsy moth populations was correlated only with synchrony in weather.

The corrected table 2 is provided below.

**Table 2.** MRM results on spatial and environmental factors affecting synchrony in oak masting. Significant results are shown in boldface.

variable	coefficient	$p$ -value
space-only model		
proximity	0.534	<b>0.004</b>
environment-only model		
synchrony in PC1 scores	-0.139	0.642
synchrony in PC2 scores	2.203	<b>0.001</b>
space + environment model		
proximity	-0.451	0.083
synchrony in PC1 scores	-0.143	0.629
synchrony in PC2 scores	3.472	<b>0.001</b>