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We recently discovered an error in [1] due to a misalignment of rows between columns in the dataset. Specifically, we misaligned by 1 year the population size with the number of wolves culled and the policy signal. The correct results are slightly different than the ones we presented: the effect we report becomes slightly stronger and some parameters see minor adjustments of their posterior values. The conclusion of our paper is still supported by the correct results.

The correct results indicate that with no culling policy signal, the annual potential growth rate was $r = 0.17 \pm 0.02$ 95% credible interval (CI) = 0.13–0.21 in Wisconsin ($r = 0.15 \pm 0.02$ 95% CI = 0.11–0.19 in Michigan). However, with a year-long culling policy signal, we found annual growth rate had a 92% probability to be lower (figure 1 in this article) with $r = 0.12 \pm 0.03$ 95% CI = 0.06–0.18 in Wisconsin ($r = 0.10 \pm 0.03$ 95% CI = 0.04–0.16 in Michigan). Corrected prior and posterior values for all model parameters are given in table 1.

Two other typographical errors were not detected during the proof process.

Electronic supplementary material is available online at https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.3634499.
| prior choice | posterior distribution | median ± s.d. | 95% credible interval |
|--------------|------------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| population dynamic | | | |
| $\alpha_{\text{proc}} \sim \text{unif}(0,0.5)$ | | $0.06 \pm 0.02$ | $0.03 - 0.09$ |
| $\gamma \sim \text{Norm}(\mu = 1.06, \tau = 14^2)$ | | $1.06 \pm 0.07$ | $0.92 - 1.2$ |
| $\beta_0 \sim \text{Norm}(\mu = 0, \tau = 10^{-6})$ | | $0.17 \pm 0.02$ | $0.13 - 0.21$ |
| $\beta_1 \sim \text{Norm}(\mu = 0, \tau = 10^{-6})$ | | $0.15 \pm 0.02$ | $0.11 - 0.19$ |
| $\alpha_{\text{proc}} \sim \text{unif}(0,100)$ | | $4.38 \pm 3.3$ | $0.17 - 12.29$ |
| $\alpha_{\text{proc}} \sim \text{unif}(0,100)$ | | $5.33 \pm 4.4$ | $0.23 - 16.42$ |
| $\omega_{\text{MIN}} \sim \text{Norm}(\mu = 1, \tau = 10^{-6})$ | | $0.97 \pm 0.02$ | $0.93 - 1$ |
| $\omega_{\text{MAX}} \sim \text{Norm}(\mu = 1, \tau = 10^{-6})$ | | $1.03 \pm 0.02$ | $1 - 1.08$ |
| $N_{\text{MIN}} \sim \text{Gamma}(10^{-6}, 10^{-6})$ | | $91.10 \pm 6.15$ | $79.43 - 103.57$ |
| $N_{\text{MAX}} \sim \text{Gamma}(10^{-6}, 10^{-6})$ | | $92.06 \pm 7.4$ | $78.15 - 107.39$ |
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