

ERRATA

We would like to apologize for our negligence in our paper (Dela Torre V. C. P., Nuneza O. M. Species Diversity, Distribution, and Microhabitats of Anurans on Mt. Kalo-Kalo of the Mt. Kalatungan Range Natural Park, Bukidnon, Philippines. *Asian Herpetol Res*, 2021, 12(1): 58–75. DOI: 10.16373/j.cnki.ahr.200023), in which we failed to 1) rephrase some relevant sentences and 2) cite some relevant articles properly. Thus, to address these errors, we would like to change the following sentences and citations:

In page 58–59: Past efforts to document the natural history and biology of amphibians and reptiles by herpetologists and biogeographers have revealed the herpetological and conservation importance of the Philippines (Brown *et al.*, 2008, 2012, 2013; Diesmos and Brown, 2011; Diesmos *et al.*, 2015; Sanguila *et al.*, 2016). However, complete knowledge of the ecology and distribution of many species is still lacking, which is a challenge to effective conservation planning and species-specific intervention. (Margules and Pressey, 2000).

It should be stated as: Several studies have been conducted to describe the species diversity and distribution of the herpetofauna in the Philippines, including forested mountains of the Luzon PAIC (Mcleod *et al.*, 2011; Devan-Song & Brown 2012; Brown *et al.*, 2012; Brown & Siler, 2013; Gojo Cruz *et al.*, 2018), the Babuyan Island Group (Oliveros *et al.*, 2011), Romblon Island Group (Siler *et al.*, 2012), Panay Island (Ferner *et al.*, 2000; Gaulke, 2011), Cebu Island (Supsup *et al.*, 2016), and Leyte Island (Aureo & Bande, 2017). On Mindanao Island, herpetological surveys are also increasing in frequency (David *et al.*, 2006; Delima *et al.*, 2007; Nuñez *et al.*, 2010, 2014, 2015, 2017; Beukema, 2011; Almeria & Nuñez, 2013; Warguez *et al.*, 2013; Sularte *et al.*, 2015; Calo & Nuñez, 2015; Plaza & Sanguila, 2015; Sanguila *et al.*, 2016; Toledo-Bruno *et al.*, 2017; Vidal *et al.*, 2018; and Delima-Baron *et al.*, 2019)". However, numerous Mindanao mountains are still unexplored (Heaney *et al.*, 2006; Peterson *et al.*, 2008; Siler *et al.*, 2009; Beukema, 2011; Sanguila *et al.*, 2016), and a more systematic conservation approach is still needed (Margules and Pressey, 2000).

In page 61: The citation should be Heyer *et al.*, 1994 not Heyer, 1994.

In page 65: *Kalophrynus sinensis* is frequently encountered in the rainy season, calling while floating on temporary pools or water-filled cavities in a variety of habitats of varying levels of disturbance.

It should be stated as: *Kalophrynus sinensis* is often seen floating on temporary pools with varying habitats and disturbances (Sanguila *et al.*, 2016), and on the rocks along the streams in our study area.

In page 65: The discovery of a new, morphologically similar, and exceedingly rare stream frog species that had previously been confused with *Hylarana grandocula* (Brown and Siler, 2013; Brown, 2015) led Brown and Siler (2013) and Brown (2015) to speculate that mountains of northeast Mindanao may also harbor undocumented populations of this second Mindanao *Hylarana* taxon. Oliver *et al.* (2015) recently published a phylogeny for many members of the African, Papuan, and Southeast Asian members of the genus *Hylarana* and recognized "*Pulchrana*" as the available name corresponding to the *Hylarana signata* complex (Brown and Siler, 2013). Although this action is arbitrary and unnecessary and no justification for a maximally reduced classification was provided (Wiens *et al.*, 2009; Poe, 2013; Brown, 2015), the most recently published name was adopted.

It should be stated as: The newly discovered *Hylarana signata* species by Brown (2015) had been one-time confused with *Hylarana grandocula* since they share similar external morphology which led Brown and Siler (2013) and Brown (2015) to speculate that mountains of northeast Mindanao may have undiscovered population of this second Mindanao *Hylarana* taxon. "*Pulchrana*" has been recognized as the available name corresponding to the *Hylarana signata* complex (Brown and Siler, 2013; Oliver *et al.*, 2015). However, this action is deemed unnecessary and no justification for a reduced classification was provided (Wiens *et al.*, 2009; Poe, 2013; Brown, 2015; Sanguila *et al.*, 2016).

In page 65: Common throughout the Mindanao Faunal Region, *Staurois natator* is a frequently observed component of most amphibian communities of the southern Philippines (Alcala and Brown, 1998). Arifin *et al.* (2011)

demonstrated the distinction between Palawan faunal region populations (*S. nubilis*) versus those of the Mindanao PAIC (*S. natator*).

It should be stated as: *Staurois natator* is widely distributed throughout the Mindanao Faunal Region (Alcala and Brown, 1998; Sanguila *et al.*, 2016). The *S. natator* on Mindanao and the *S. nubilis* from Palawan has been described by Arifin *et al.* (2011) as distinct and genetically divergent from each other.

In page 68: This common tree frog inhabits overhanging understory vegetation surrounding rapidly cascading streams in lower to mid-montane forests. Its distinctive advertisement call is a single brief, high frequency, shrill chirp and can be heard over the sound of waterfalls (Sanguila *et al.*, 2016). Previously considered uncommon, this species is now appreciated for its very specific microhabitat preference, where it can be predictably encountered by experienced field workers. Originally classified as “Near-Threatened” in 2010 (NT; IUCN 2010), and “Vulnerable” in 2016 (VU; IUCN 2016); this species now qualifies only for “Least Concern” status (LC; IUCN, 2018) as a result of the numerous new localities at which it has been recorded (Gonzales *et al.*, 2014), and the predictability where it can be found now that its habitat is known and can be purposefully surveyed (Diesmos *et al.*, 2014, 2015).

It should be stated as: *Rhacophorus bimaculatus* has a distinctive call characterized by a single brief, high frequency, and shrill chirp that can be heard on the shrubs growing along the waterfalls and streams (Sanguila *et al.*, 2016). *Rhacophorus bimaculatus* was classified as “Near-Threatened” in 2010 (NT; IUCN 2010), and “Vulnerable” in 2016 (VU; IUCN 2016); this species now qualifies only for “Least Concern” status (LC; IUCN, 2018) as a result of the increasing in frequency of field surveys on different mountains in the Philippines (Gonzales *et al.*, 2014; Diesmos *et al.*, 2014, 2015; Sanguila *et al.*, 2016).

The texts/paragraphs stated above will be deleted from the manuscript and will be replaced with the revisions proposed by the authors. Again, we deeply apologize for our negligence.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,
Von Carlo P. Dela Torre
Corresponding author