Title

Corrigendum to "A functional size-spectrum model of the global marine ecosystem that resolves zooplankton composition", Ecological Modelling, 2020, 435: 109265

Authors

Ryan F. Heneghan[1,2,3*], Jason D. Everett[1,4,5], Patrick Sykes[1], Sonia D. Batten[6], Martin Edwards[7], Kunio Takahashi[8], Iain M. Suthers[4], Julia L. Blanchard[5], Anthony J. Richardson[1,9]

[1] Centre for Applications in Natural Resource Mathematics, School of Mathematics and Physics, University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

[2] Institut de Ciència i Tecnologia Ambientals, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

[3] School of Mathematical Sciences, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia

[4] School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia

[5] Institute of Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, Hobart, TAS, Australia

[6] The CPR Survey, Marine Biological Association, Nanaimo, BC, Canada

[7] Marine Biological Association of the UK, Citadel Hill, The Hoe, Plymouth, United Kingdom

[8] National Institute of Polar Research, Tokyo, Japan

[9] CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Queensland Biosciences Precinct, St Lucia, QLD, Australia

*Corresponding Author: ryan.heneghan@gmail.com

Main text

The authors regret that some references were incorrect in the original article's Table 2. Below is Table 2 with corrected references.

The authors would like to apologise for any inconvenience caused.

Table 2 | Trait values for the nine zooplankton and three fish groups.

Group	Minimum Size		Maximum Size		$\log_{10}$PPMR range	Carbon (% of wet weight)
	ESD	$\log_{10}$(g)*	ESD	$\log_{10}$(g)*		
Heterotrophic flagellates	3.3µm[a]	−10.7[a]	70µm[a]	−6.8[a]	0.2–0.7[2]	14[b]
Heterotrophic ciliates	10µm[c]	−9.3[c]	100µm[c]	−6.3[c]	2.5–2.9[2]	15[d]
Larvaceans	90µm[e]	−6.4[e]	1mm[e]	−3.2[e]	6.8–10.0[f]	2[8]
Omnivorous copepods	40µm[g]	−7.5[g]	0.8mm[h]	−3.5[h]	3.6–4.6[2]	12[8,10]
Carnivorous copepods	40µm[g]	−7.5[g]	1.8mm[h]	−2.5[h]	0.8–1.9[2]	12[8,10]
Euphausiids	0.6mm[i]	−4.2[i]	1.5 cm[j]	0.2[j]	6.6–7.8[k]	12[8,10]
Chaetognaths	0.15mm[l]	−5.9[l]	6mm[l]	−0.9[l]	1.7–3.1[m]	4[8,10]
Salps	0.5mm[n]	−4.7[n]	3.6cm[n]	1.4[n]	6.8–12.9[o]	2[8]
Jellyfish	1.2mm[p]	−3[p]	6cm[p]	2[p]	2.7–4.7[2]	0.5[8,10]
Small pelagic fish	1.2mm[q]	−3[q]	6cm	2	2[22]	10[23]
Medium pelagic fish	1.2mm[q]	−3[q]	27cm	4	2[22]	10[23]
Large pelagic fish	1.2mm[q]	−3[q]	124cm	7	2[22]	10[23]

*g wet weight calculated from ESD, assuming 1 gram = 1 cm^3.

[a] Volume from Table 3 in (1), converted to g wet weight and ESD, assuming 1 gram = 1 cm^3 [b] Calculated using geometric mean size of heterotrophic flagellates, with equation for heterotrophic flagellates carbon content in Table 3 of (3), [c] From Figure 1 in (4), [d] Calculated using geometric mean size of heterotrophic ciliates, with equation for carbon content of loricate ciliates in Table 4 of (3), [e] Minimum and maximum larvacean trunk lengths taken from (5) and (6) respectively, and converted to ESD and wet weight using equation derived in (6), [f] Larvacean PPMR range calculated using linear regression fit to predator-prey size data from (6) and (7). [g] Minimum copepod carbon mass obtained from supplementary material in (9), converted to wet weight and ESD using copepod carbon:wet weight ratio, [h] Maximum omnivorous and carnivorous copepod lengths taken from Table 2 in (11) and converted to ESD and then wet weight using equation derived in (12), [i] Euphausiid embryo ESD from Figure 2 in (13), [j] Maximum euphausiid length taken from supplementary material in (14) and converted to ESD and wet weight using equation in Table 2 from (15), [k] PPMR range for euphausiids centred on prey between 5µm-20µm ESD, as shown in Figure 5.4 of (16). [l] Minimum and maximum chaetognath ESD from supplementary material in (14) [m] PPMR range for chaetognaths calculated using linear regression fit to predator-prey size data in (14), and the non-isometric scaling relationship in (2). [n] Minimum salp length taken from Box 1, Table I in (17), maximum salp length taken as geometric mean of *Thalia democratica* and *Thetys vagina* maximum length from Table 1 in (17), then converted to ESD and wet weight using equation derived in (18), using a carbon content of 1% from (8), [o] Salp PPMR range fixed so that feeding for all salps is centred on picoeukaryotes ~1-3µm ESD, based on (19). [p] From supplementary material in (20), [q] From (21).

1.Hansen et al. (1997), 2. Wirtz (2012), 3. Menden-Deuer and Lessard (2000), 4. Taylor (1978), 5. López-Urrutia (2004), 6. Deibel (1998), 7. Conley et al. (2018), 8. McConville et al. (2017), 9. Kiørboe & Hirst (2014), 10. Kiørboe (2013), 11. Benedetti et al. (2016), 12. Acevedo et al. (2012), 13. Kawaguchi et al. (2011), 14. Fuchs and Franks (2010), 15. Hewitt and Demer (1993), 16. Schmidt and Atkinson (2016), 17. Henschke et al. (2016), 18. Heron et al. (1988), 19. Dadon-Pilosof et al. (2019) 20. Acuña et al. (2011), 21. Heneghan et al. (2016), 22. Andersen *et al.,* (2016b), 23. Pauly and Christensen (1995).

References (for Table 2, in order of appearance)

1. Hansen, P. J., Bjørnsen, P. K. & Hansen, B. W. Zooplankton grazing and growth: Scaling within the 2-2,000-µm body size range. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **42**, 687–704 (1997).
2. Wirtz, K. W. Who is eating whom? Morphology and feeding type determine the size relation between planktonic predators and their ideal prey. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **445**, 1–12 (2012).
3. Menden-Deuer, S. & Lessard, E. J. Carbon to volume relationships for dinoflagellates, diatoms, and other protist plankton. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **45**, 569–579 (2000).
4. Taylor, W. D. Maximum growth rate, size and commonness in a community of bactivorous ciliates. *Oecologia* **36**, 263–272 (1978).
5. López-Urrutia, Á., Harris, R. P. & Smith, T. Predation by calanoid copepods on the appendicularian Oikopleura dioica. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **49**, 303–307 (2004).
6. Deibel, D. (1998) *Feeding and metabolism of Appendicularia, in: Bone, Q. (Ed.), The Biology of Pelagic Tunicates*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 139–149.
7. Conley, K. R., Lombard, F., & Sutherland, K. R. Mammoth grazers on the ocean's minuteness: A review of selective feeding using mucous meshes. In *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **285,** 1878 (2018).
8. McConville, K., Atkinson, A., Fileman, E. S., Spicer, J. I., & Hirst, A. G. Disentangling the counteracting effects of water content and carbon mass on zooplankton growth. *Journal of Plankton Research*, **39(2),** 246–256 (2017).
9. Kiørboe, T. & Hirst, A. G. Shifts in Mass Scaling of Respiration, Feeding, and Growth Rates across Life-Form Transitions in Marine Pelagic Organisms. *Am. Nat.* **183**, E118–E130 (2014).
10. Kiørboe, T. Zooplankton body composition. *Limnology and Oceanography*, **58(5),** 1843–1850 (2013).
11. Benedetti, F., Gasparini, S., Ayata, S.D., Identifying copepod functional groups from species functional traits. *J. Plankton Res.* **38**, 159–166 (2016).
12. Acevedo, F. de, Dias, J.D., Braghin, L. de S.M., Bonecker, C.C., Length-weight regressions of the microcrustacean species from a tropical floodplain. *Acta Limnol. Bras*. **24**, 01–11 (2012).
13. Kawaguchi, S. *et al.* Will krill fare well under Southern Ocean acidification? *Biol. Lett.* **7**, 288–291 (2011).
14. Fuchs, H. L. & Franks, P. J. S. Plankton community properties determined by nutrients and size-selective feeding. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **413**, 1–15 (2010).
15. Hewitt, R. P., & Demer, D. A. Dispersion and abundance of Antarctic krill in the vicinity of Elephant Island in the 1992 austral summer. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **99(1–2),** 29–39 (1993).
16. Schmidt, K and Atkinson, A., 2016. Feeding And Food Processing Antarctic Krill (Euphausia Superba Dana), in: Volker, S., *Biology and Ecology of Antarctic Krill. 1st ed*, Springer International Publishing, pp. 175–224.
17. Henschke, N., Everett, J. D., Richardson, A. J. & Suthers, I. M. Rethinking the Role of Salps in the Ocean. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **31**, 720–733 (2016).
18. Heron, A. C. Length-weight relation in the salp Thalia democratica and potential of salps as a source of food. **42**, 125–132 (1988).
19. Dadon-Pilosof, A., Lombard, F., Genin, A., Sutherland, K. R., & Yahel, G. Prey taxonomy rather than size determines salp diets. *Limnology and Oceanography*, **64(5),** 1996–2010 (2019).
20. Acuña, J. L., López-Urrutia, Á. & Colin, S. Faking giants: The evolution of high prey clearance rates in jellyfishes. *Science (80-.).* **333**, 1627–1629 (2011).
21. Heneghan, R. F., Everett, J. D., Blanchard, J. L. & Richardson, A. J. Zooplankton Are Not Fish: Improving Zooplankton Realism in Size-Spectrum Models Mediates Energy Transfer in Food Webs. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **3**, 1–15 (2016).
22. Andersen, K. H., Jacobsen, N. S. & Farnsworth, K. D. The theoretical foundations for size spectrum models of fish communities. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **73**, 575–588 (2016).
23. Pauly, D. & Christensen, V. Primary production required to sustain global fisheries. *Nature* **376**, 279 (1995).