Global Change Biology

Global Change Biology (2015) 21, 3193, doi: 10.1111/gcb.13001

CORRIGENDUM

In the paper by Mazziotta *et al.* (2015) entitled 'Applying a framework for landscape planning under climate change for the conservation of biodiversity in the Finnish boreal forest', we recently found a critical calculation mistake. The mistake concerns the calculation of the climate vulnerability index. The good news is that the new results do not change the main message of the article, and the approach we proposed to evaluate the proportion of climate change response categories in the landscape is still valid.

The mistake is the following: when we calculated the scaled Climate Vulnerability (CV) (page 643, second equation in the 'Climate vulnerability' subsection of 'Materials and methods') we made the mistake of multiplying the original CV value by the Stand Conservation Capacity (SCC) calculated for the first three simulated decades (years 2010–2039), while CV should have been multiplied (as specified in the article) by the SCC for the last three simulated decades (years 2070–2099). This sounds like a small mistake but it has repercussions for the results. Please find below a brief summary of what has remained unchanged and what has changed in the article; details are presented in the 'Errata Corrige' presented as Supporting Information with the online version of this Corrigendum.

The main message remains unchanged. The uncertainty for landscape managers regarding the choice of what conservation strategies they should adopt is still increasing in the face of climate change, especially in the Finnish southernmost boreal zones.

How are the results changed? As a consequence of the new Climate Vulnerability values, there was an increase by the end of the 21st century of the currently low conservation capacity for the majority of the Finnish landscape (for about three quarters of the NFI plots). This means that most forests, irrespective of their conservation capacity, will have low vulnerability to climate change, strongly increasing the potential for species persistence and adaptation to new climates. On the other hand, about a quarter of the landscape will still reduce its conservation capacity, confirming that climate change effects on biodiversity will likely be stronger in landscapes subject to intensive human land use. New Climate Vulnerability values changed the distribution of forest patches into the climate change response categories. The new results indicate that in the Finnish landscape resistant (more than 50% of the NFI plots), resilient (about 20%) and sensitive (about 20%) patches are all likely to be highly represented thereby increasing uncertainty for landscape managers in the choice of conservation strategies. This is because the proportion of resistant and resilient forest patches increased with respect to the original results, given the reduction in stand Climate Vulnerability under climate change. However, most of these forests (the resistant ones) still have at present a low conservation capacity that may be improved through restoration projects.

Which sections of the article have remained unchanged? There are only minor changes in the Abstract, and Materials and methods. Likewise, the Introduction, Results and Discussion sections concerning the analysis of the Stand Conservation Capacity, and most other parts of the Discussion, have remained unchanged.

We are very sorry for the mistake. We present the novel corrected version of the article as Supporting Information with the online version of this Corrigendum, including the new text that should replace the previous versions of sections of the article, as indicated. We apologize for any confusion this may have caused.

Reference

Mazziotta A, Triviño M, Tikkanen O-P, Kouki J, Strandman H, Mönkkönen M (2015) Applying a framework for landscape planning under climate change for the conservation of biodiversity in the Finnish boreal forest. *Global Change Biology*, 21, 637–651.

Supporting Information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

Errata Corrige. The corrected version of the article.