BIOLOGY LETTERS

royalsocietypublishing.org/journal/rsbl

Correction

Cite this article: The Biology Letters Editorial Team. 2019 Correction to 'Lionfish predators use flared fin displays to initiate cooperative hunting'. *Biol. Lett.* **15**: 20190766.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2019.0766

Correction to 'Lionfish predators use flared fin displays to initiate cooperative hunting'

The Biology Letters Editorial Team

Biol. Lett. **10**, 20140281. (Published online 25 June 2014) (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2014.0281)

Following the publication of the article 'Lionfish predators use flared fin displays to initiate cooperative hunting' in Biology Letters (*Biol. Lett.* **10**, 20140281. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2014.0281), concerns were raised about the claims of the number of fish used in the study. This led to the journal raising an expression of concern (*Biol. Lett.* **14**, 20180032. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2018.0032) while the matter was investigated. The first author, Dr Lönnstedt, clarified the details of how the fish were counted and provided evidence which was reviewed by an independent expert. The expert concluded that based on the evidence available (evidence that the researcher was at the research station, provision of laboratory notebook and photos, and provision of all primary data) that the experiment took place as described. As a result, the journal published a correction (*Biol. Lett.* **14**, 20180716. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2018.0716).

During the investigation, the author was asked to explain a discrepancy between the number of fish stated to have been used in the study and the number of fish collected. In response, Dr Lönnstedt provided a range of documents including a collage of fish images made by her and this was published alongside the agreed correction. This was published in error, as it does not provide evidence of the number of fish caught. The collage was not used as evidence in the investigation and the independent expert reached a conclusion before having had sight of it.

We remain concerned about the ambiguous inclusion of the collage as part of the supplied documentation. However, we are satisfied with the findings of the independent expert that no misconduct was involved in the experimental work or its reporting in the article.

THE ROYAL SOCIETY PUBLISHING