



CORRECTION

Open Access



Correction to persistence of fire-killed conifer snags in California, USA

Lindsay M. Grayson¹, Daniel R. Cluck² and Sharon M. Hood^{1*}

Correction to: *Fire Ecol* 15, 1 (2019).

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s42408-018-0007-7>

After publication of the original article Grayson et al. (2019) the authors noticed the following errors:

1. In Table 3, the white fir model should have a CI:DBH interaction, not CI:PGC as listed. The values are correct, but they are on the wrong line.
2. In Fig. 4 the curves are incorrect and so is the caption where the description of **a** and **b** panels are switched. The model is correct, but the curves were plotted incorrectly.

Table 3 and Fig. 4 and the captions have been updated along with the text in the result and discussion sections, which were wrong as a result of Tables 3 and 4. The updated information is available in this correction article. This does not affect the conclusions of the article.

Associated corrected text in result section:

- Larger white fir and yellow pine snags with lower CI stood longest compared to similarly sized snags with high CI. Smaller white fir and unprotected yellow pine snags with higher CI persisted longer than similarly sized snags with low CI (Figs. 3c and 4). These interactions in pattern occurred around 50 cm DBH and 50% CI for white fir and 30 cm DBH and 50% CI for unprotected yellow pine. Yellow pine smaller than 30 cm DBH that were protected by green conifers lasted longer than unprotected snags (Fig. 4a, b); however, protection by green conifers dramatically

decreased the probability of persistence of large yellow pine snags as CI increased (Fig. 4a, b).

Associated corrected text in discussion section:

- Higher crown injury in smaller white fir and unprotected yellow pine led to increased persistence.

Author details

¹USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire, Fuel, and Smoke Science Program, 5775 US Highway 10 W, Missoula, MT 59808, USA.

²USDA Forest Service, Forest Health Protection, Northeastern California Shared Service Area, 2550 Riverside Drive, Susanville, California 96130, USA.

Published online: 31 January 2022

Reference

Grayson, L.M., Cluck, D.R. & Hood, S.M. Persistence of fire-killed conifer snags in California, USA. *Fire Ecol* 15, 1 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42408-018-0007-7>.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42408-018-0007-7>.

* Correspondence: sharon.hood@usda.gov

¹USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire, Fuel, and Smoke Science Program, 5775 US Highway 10 W, Missoula, MT 59808, USA
Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s). 2021 **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Table 3 Coefficient estimates of regressions (from Eqs. 1–3: α_1, α_2 , etc., are the covariate coefficients corresponding to x_1, x_2 , etc.; μ is the intercept; and σ is the scale); coefficient standard error estimate in parentheses. Variable codes are: diameter at breast height (DBH; cm); crown injury percent (CI); years to mortality post fire (YTD), and protected by green conifers (PGC; 0 = no and 1 = yes) by species and status. Species codes are: IC = incense cedar; SP = sugar pine; WF = white fir; and YP = yellow pine. Superscript numbers indicate model-averaged variable importance rank. Δ AIC is the difference between this model and the best AIC model. Those terms that are less than 0.8 in model-averaged importance are noted with an asterisk (*)

Species	Covariate Models				Time-only			
	IC	SP	WF	YP	YP	SP	WF	IC
Δ AIC	6.7	3.8	0.4	0.05				
Scale	0.2148 (0.0011)	0.3835 (0.0334)	0.3184 (0.025)	0.2946 (0.0098)	0.3181 (0.0104)	0.4252 (0.0366)	0.3323 (0.0257)	0.2104 (0.0756)
Intercept	2.3333 (0.1875)	1.5084 (0.1618)	0.9633 (0.3302)	0.6394 (0.1841)	1.9812	2.5754	2.4821	2.7368
DBH		0.0173 (0.003)	0.0290 (0.0079) ¹	0.0457 (0.0090) ¹				
CI			0.0141 (0.0043) ²	0.0164 (0.0028) ¹				
PGC				0.6026 (0.1262) ⁴				
YTD	0.2250 (0.0975)							
CI: DBH			-0.0003 (0.0001) ³	-0.0005 (0.0001) ³				
CI: PGC				-0.0058 (0.0018) ⁵				
PGC: DBH				-0.0082 (0.0046) ^{6*}				

