

# Erratum to 'Bateman's principles and human sex roles'<sup>☆</sup>

Gillian R. Brown<sup>1</sup>, Kevin N. Laland<sup>2</sup>, and Monique Borgerhoff Mulder<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Psychology, University of St Andrews, South Street, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 9JP, UK

<sup>2</sup> School of Biology, University of St Andrews, Bute Medical Building, Queen's Terrace, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 9TS, UK

<sup>3</sup> Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis, CA 95616-8522, USA

In our TREE article [1], the  $I_m:I_f$  values provided in Table 1 were unfortunately incorrect. We stated the correct formulae for calculating  $I$  in the notes that accompanied Table 1 (i.e.,  $I_m = \text{variance in male RS divided by the square of the mean male RS}$ ,  $I_f = \text{variance in female RS divided by the square of$

the mean female RS), but gave the incorrect  $I_m:I_f$  values due to human error. As these values were not used in any of the analyses, this error does not affect any of the results or conclusions of the article. The correct  $I_m:I_f$  values are provided in the table below, and all other values remain unchanged.

**Table 1 Mean and variance in reproductive success (RS) of males and females in 18 populations ( $N_m$ , number of males;  $\text{Mean}_m$ , mean male lifetime RS;  $\text{Var}_m$ , variance in male RS;  $N_f$ , number of females;  $\text{Mean}_f$ , mean female lifetime RS;  $\text{Var}_f$ , variance in female RS;  $V_m:V_f$ , ratio of variance in male RS to female RS;  $I_m:I_f$ , ratio of the 'opportunity for selection' in males and females, where  $I = \text{variance in RS divided by the square of the mean RS}$ ; Refs, reference numbers are provided in the original article)**

Country	Population/ethnic group	$N_m$	$\text{Mean}_m$	$\text{Var}_m$	$N_f$	$\text{Mean}_f$	$\text{Var}_f$	$V_m:V_f$	$I_m:I_f$	Mating system	Refs
Finland	1745–1900 genealogies	125	3.4	6	138	3.5	7.6	<b>0.79</b>	0.84	Monogamy	80
Norway	1700–1900 genealogies	955	4.7	8.5	991	4.5	8.3	<b>1.02</b>	0.94	Monogamy	81
Pitcairn Island	Genealogical records	145	4.6	23.6	127	4.7	23.2	<b>1.02</b>	1.06	Monogamy	82
Iran	Yomut Turkmen	267	5.1	8.1	216	3.9	7.1	<b>1.14</b>	0.67	Polygyny/monandry	83
Sweden	1825–1896 genealogies	1201	2.1	11.5	1050	2.4	9.7	<b>1.18</b>	1.55	Monogamy	84
Dominica	Local population	130	4.4	14.3	124	5	11.6	<b>1.23</b>	1.59	Monogamy	85
Tanzania	Pimbwe	138	6.0	9	154	6.1	7.3	<b>1.24</b>	1.27	Serial monogamy	36
USA	General Social Survey	1099	2.0	2.3	1344	2.0	1.8	<b>1.27</b>	1.28	Monogamy	86
Central African Republic	Aka	29	6.3	8.6	34	6.2	5.2	<b>1.66</b>	1.60	Polygyny/monandry	87
Botswana	Dobe !Kung	35	5.1	8.6	62	4.7	4.9	<b>1.77</b>	1.49	Serial monogamy	34
Tanzania	Hadza	54	4.3	9.8	44	3.6	5.1	<b>1.93</b>	1.35	Polygyny/serial monandry	88
Venezuela	Yanomamo	279	3.7	10.1	380	3.4	4.4	<b>2.30</b>	1.94	Polygyny/monandry	89
Chad	Dazagada	44	8.6	15.0	33	6.4	6.5	<b>2.31</b>	1.28	Polygyny/monandry	90
Chad	Arabs	23	10.3	14.4	22	8.3	5.1	<b>2.82</b>	1.83	Polygyny/monandry	90
Brazil	Xavante	62	3.6	12.1	44	3.6	3.9	<b>3.10</b>	3.10	Polygyny/serial monandry	39
Kenya	Kipsigis	82	10.9	24.4	260	6.6	5.9	<b>4.18</b>	1.52	Polygyny/monandry	91
Paraguay	Ache	48	6.4	15.1	25	7.8	3.6	<b>4.22</b>	6.23	Serial monogamy	35
Mali	Dogon	44	6.1	10.7	48	3.2	2.3	<b>4.75</b>	1.28	Polygyny/serial monandry	92

## Reference

1 Brown, G.R. *et al.* (2009) Bateman's principles and human sex roles. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 24, 297–304

0169-5347/\$ – see front matter © 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2013.08.002> Trends in Ecology & Evolution, October 2013, Vol. 28, No. 10

<sup>☆</sup> DOI of original article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2009.02.005>.