



OPEN ACCESS

APPROVED BY
Frontiers Editorial Office,
Frontiers Media SA, Switzerland

*CORRESPONDENCE

Yanju Ma
✉ yanjuma@mailbox.gxnu.edu.cn
Chi-Yeung Choi
✉ choimo@yahoo.com

RECEIVED 07 November 2023

ACCEPTED 07 November 2023

PUBLISHED 22 November 2023

CITATION

Tang N, Ma Y, Li S, Yan Y, and Citizen Science Project Team of Guangxi Biodiversity Research Conservation Association, Cheng C, Lu G, Li F, Lv L, Qin P, Nguyen HB, Nguyen QH, Le TT, Wee SQW, He T, Yong DL and Choi C-Y (2023) Corrigendum: Identifying the wetlands of international importance in Beibu Gulf along the East Asian – Australasian Flyway, based on multiple citizen science datasets. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 10:1333889. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2023.1333889

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Tang, Ma, Li, Yan, and Citizen Science Project Team of Guangxi Biodiversity Research Conservation Association, Cheng, Lu, Li, Lv, Qin, Nguyen, Nguyen, Le, Wee, He, Yong and Choi. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Corrigendum: Identifying the wetlands of international importance in Beibu Gulf along the East Asian – Australasian Flyway, based on multiple citizen science datasets

Ningxin Tang^{1,2}, Yanju Ma^{1,2*}, Sixin Li^{1,2}, Yizhu Yan^{1,2}, and Citizen Science Project Team of Guangxi Biodiversity Research Conservation Association³, Cheng Cheng⁴, Gang Lu⁵, Fei Li⁶, Liuxuan Lv^{1,2}, Peilin Qin^{1,2}, Hoai Bao Nguyen⁷, Quang Hao Nguyen⁸, Trong Trai Le⁹, Shelby Qi Wei Wee¹⁰, Tao He¹¹, Ding Li Yong¹⁰ and Chi-Yeung Choi^{12,13*}

¹Key Laboratory of Ecology of Rare and Endangered Species and Environmental Protection (Guangxi Normal University), Ministry of Education, Guilin, Guangxi, China, ²Guangxi Key Laboratory of Rare and Endangered Animal Ecology, College of Life Sciences, Guangxi Normal University, Guilin, Guangxi, China, ³Guangxi Biodiversity Research and Conservation Association, Nanning, China, ⁴Hainan Academy of Forestry (Hainan Academy of Mangrove), Haikou, Hainan, China, ⁵Haikou Duotian Wetlands Institute and Hainan Bird Watching Society, Haikou, China, ⁶Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden, New Territories, Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China, ⁷Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Department, University of Science, Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, ⁸WildTour Ltd, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, ⁹Viet Nature Conservation Centre, Hanoi, Vietnam, ¹⁰BirdLife International Asia Division, Tanglin International Centre, Singapore, Singapore, ¹¹Zhanjiang Mangrove National Nature Reserve Bureau, Zhangjiang, Guangdong, China, ¹²Division of Natural and Applied Sciences, Duke Kunshan University, Kunshan, Jiangsu, China, ¹³School of Environmental Science & Engineering, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China

KEYWORDS

waterbird, bird conservation, the Gulf of Tonkin, conservation priorities, East Asian-Australasian Flyway (EAAF), citizen science

A Corrigendum on

Identifying the wetlands of international importance in Beibu Gulf along the East Asian – Australasian Flyway, based on multiple citizen science datasets

by Tang N, Ma Y, Li S, Yan Y, and Citizen Science Project Team of Guangxi Biodiversity Research Conservation Association, Cheng C, Lu G, Li F, Lv L, Qin P, Nguyen HB, Nguyen QH, Le TT, Wee SQW, He T, Yong DL and Choi C-Y (2023) *Front. Mar. Sci.* 10:1222806. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2023.1222806

Text correction

In the published article, there was an error. The number of nationally protected animal species and the number of Endangered species on the IUCN Red List are incorrect.

A correction has been made to **Abstract**. This sentence previously stated:

“Among surveys conducted from 2014 to 2022, 6 and 13 waterbird species were considered as first and second class protected species under the National Key Protected Wild Animal List in China; 2 species were listed as Critically Endangered on the IUCN Red List, 5 as Endangered and 2 as Vulnerable, underlying the critical importance of the Beibu Gulf for the survival of these species”.

The corrected sentence appears below:

“Among surveys conducted from 2014 to 2022, 5 and 11 waterbird species were considered as first and second class protected species under the National Key Protected Wild Animal List in China; 2 species were listed as Critically Endangered on the IUCN Red List, 4 as Endangered and 2 as Vulnerable, underlying the critical importance of the Beibu Gulf for the survival of these species”.

In the published article, there was an error. Of the 25 important wetlands designated, the number of wetlands under national or international protection was incorrect. Of the 25 international wetlands designated, 5 sites are under national or international protection and 20 are not.

A correction has been made to **Abstract**. This sentence previously stated:

“Our study identified 25 sites in the Beibu Gulf that met the criteria for designation as internationally important wetlands. Alarming, less than a quarter ($n = 6$, or 24%) of these sites benefit from national or international protection”.

The corrected sentence appears below:

“Our study identified 25 sites in the Beibu Gulf that met the criteria for designation as internationally important wetlands. Alarming, less than a quarter ($n = 5$, or 20%) of these sites benefit from national or international protection”.

A correction has been made to **Results, Conservation Status**, First paragraph. This sentence previously stated:

“Yet, the remaining 19 sites (76%) are located outside the national protected area system”.

The corrected sentence appears below:

“Yet, the remaining 20 sites (80%) are located outside the national protected area system”.

In the published article, there was an error. The number of nationally protected animal species is incorrect.

A correction has been made to **Results, Species abundance and distribution along the Beibu Gulf**, First paragraph. This sentence previously stated:

“Six of the 97 observed bird species belonged to the first class, while 13 fell under the second class of the National Key Protected Wild Animal List of China”.

The corrected sentence appears below:

“Five of the 97 observed bird species belonged to the first class, while 11 fell under the second class of the National Key Protected Wild Animal List of China”.

In the published article, there was an error. The number of spoon-billed sandpipers only exceeded the 1% threshold in Xingchang and did not exceed the 1% threshold at the site of Haiwei-Yangwu.

A correction has been made to **Results, Species abundance and distribution along the Beibu Gulf**, Second paragraph. This sentence previously stated:

“It is worth highlighting that Xichang and Haiwei-Yangwu in Guangxi, China, were found to support a population of spoon-billed sandpipers ($n = 8$) exceeding 1% of its global population estimate”.

The corrected sentence appears below:

“It is worth highlighting that Xichang in Guangxi, China, was found to support a population of spoon-billed sandpipers ($n = 8$) exceeding 1% of its global population estimate”.

In the published article, there was an error. In this sentence, 13 sites are not protected but close to the ecological redline, but then it is said that 6 sites are inconsistent.

A correction has been made to **Results, Conservation Status**, First paragraph. This sentence previously stated:

“13 unprotected areas in China (Jintan, Bailangtan, Shanxinsha Island, Shaluoliao, Sanning Bay, Haiwei-Yangwu, Gaoqiao Town, Suixi Jiaotou, Qishui Chidouliao, Houshui Bay, Danzhou Bay, Changhua River Estuary, and Yinggehai, Figure S1) were located within or close to Ecological Redline boundaries (Choi et al., 2022), which is a spatial planning framework to protect areas that provide essential ecosystem services while biodiversity conservation could be a byproduct, thus providing some level of protection to these 6 unprotected sites”.

The corrected sentence appears below:

“13 unprotected areas in China (Jintan, Bailangtan, Shanxinsha Island, Shaluoliao, Sanning Bay, Haiwei-Yangwu, Gaoqiao Town, Suixi Jiaotou, Qishui Chidouliao, Houshui Bay, Danzhou Bay, Changhua River Estuary, and Yinggehai, Figure S1) were located within or close to Ecological Redline boundaries (Choi et al., 2022), which is a spatial planning framework to protect areas that provide essential ecosystem services while biodiversity conservation could be a byproduct, thus providing some level of protection to these unprotected sites”.

In the published article, there was an error. The article writes that there are 10 stations in Beibu Gulf that support wintering or stopovers great knot, while there are 9 stops in Table 2 that support great knot.

A correction has been made to **Discussion**, First paragraph. This sentence previously stated:

“The Beibu Gulf region also supports the wintering or stopover populations of three other endangered shorebird species, namely Far Eastern curlew (present in at least 2 sites), great knot (10 sites), and spotted greenshank (6 sites)”.

The corrected sentence appears below:

“The Beibu Gulf region also supports the wintering or stopover populations of three other endangered shorebird species, namely Far Eastern curlew (present in at least 2 sites), great knot (9 sites), and spotted greenshank (6 sites)”.

In the published article, there was an error. Of the 66 Beibu Gulf coastal wetlands surveyed, the number of coastal wetlands in China and the number of coastal wetlands in Vietnam were incorrect.

A correction has been made to **Discussion**, Fifth paragraph. This sentence previously stated:

“It is important to note that relatively few surveys were conducted in Vietnam (58 sites in China; 8 sites in Vietnam were surveyed)”.

The corrected sentence appears below:

“It is important to note that relatively few surveys were conducted in Vietnam (60 sites in China; 6 sites in Vietnam were surveyed)”.

The authors apologize for these errors and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.