Odessa centre | Pastoralism
Research, Policy and Practice

TYPE Correction
PUBLISHED 20 March 2026
DOI 10.3389/past.2026.16426

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY
Nathaniel Jensen,
University of Edinburgh,
United Kingdom

*CORRESPONDENCE
Aníbal Rodríguez-Vargas,
rodriguezvargasraul01@gmail.com
Emmanuel Alexander Sessarego,
e.sessarego14@gmail.com

RECEIVED 16 February 2026
ACCEPTED 02 March 2026
PUBLISHED 20 March 2026

CITATION
Rodríguez-Vargas A, Tafur-Gutiérrez L, Sessarego EA, Alva G, Castañeda-Palomino K, Haro-Reyes JA, Ruiz-Chamorro J, Barrantes-Campos C and Cruz JA (2026) Correction: Characterization of goat production systems in the Amazonian dry tropical forest of Peru through multivariate analysis.
Pastoralism 16:16426.
doi: 10.3389/past.2026.16426

Correction: Characterization of goat production systems in the Amazonian dry tropical forest of Peru through multivariate analysis

Aníbal Rodríguez-Vargas [1]*, Lucinda Tafur-Gutiérrez [2], Emmanuel Alexander Sessarego [1]*, Gudelio Alva [2], Katherine Castañeda-Palomino [1], José Antonio Haro-Reyes [1], José Ruiz-Chamorro [1], Cecilio Barrantes-Campos [3] and Juancarlos Alejandro Cruz [1]

[1]Dirección de Servicios Estratégicos Agrarios, Instituto Nacional de Innovación Agraria, Lima, Peru, [2]Estación Experimental Agraria Amazonas, Instituto Nacional de Innovación Agraria (INIA), Chachapoyas, Peru, [3]Programa de Investigación y Proyección Social en Animales Menores, Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina, Lima, Peru

KEYWORDS

typification, goat farming, multivariate analysis, agricultural sustainability, dry tropical forest

A Correction on
Characterization of goat production systems in the dry tropical forest of Peru through multivariate analysis

by Rodríguez-Vargas A, Tafur-Gutiérrez L, Sessarego EA, Alva G, Castañeda-Palomino K, Haro-Reyes JA, Ruiz-Chamorro J, Barrantes-Campos C and Cruz JA (2025). Pastoralism 15:14861. doi: 10.3389/past.2025.14861

In the funding statement, An incorrect number was provided for Instituto Nacional de Innovación Agraria (INIA). The correct number is CUI 2506684.

There was a mistake in Table 1 as published. Incorrect scientific names were included in the categories for "Preferred forage shrub" variable in the "Productive" component. The corrected Table 1 appears below.

There was a mistake in **Table 5**. In the column "categories" row "Preferred shrub", "carob" should be replaced with "Peruvian mesquite."

The correct **Table 5** appears below.

TABLE 1 Classification of variables used in the analysis of social, productive, and economic factors in goat raising in Amazonas.

Component	T	Variables	Categories and/or units
Economic	S	Age of those driving the property	Years
	O	Farmer's level of education	No education, incomplete primary, complete primary, incomplete secondary, complete secondary, complete higher education
	S	Family members per household	Number
	B	Access to electricity	Yes/No
	N	Source of income	Agriculture, livestock, commerce
	O	Monthly household income (S/.)	Less 500, 501 to 1,000, 1,001 to 2,000
	N	Month of sale	January–March, April–June, July–September, October–December
	O	Age of sale	1–3 months, 4–8 months, over 9 months
	S	Sales weight of the goat	Kg
	N	Reason for raising	For family tradition, for being a breeding area, for low investment, for market for sale, for other reasons
Productive	O	Land area (ha)	<0.5, 0.5–2.0, >2.0
	O	Rearing area (ha)	<1.0, 1.0–2.0, >2.0
	B	Access to irrigation system	Yes/No
	B	Performs mixed breeding	Yes/No
	O	Aging time (years)	<5, 5–10, 11–20, >20
	N	Productive breeding months	January–March, April–June, July–September, October–December
	O	Dedication to parenting (hours)	<3, 3–6, >6
	S	Goat herd size	Number
	S	Goat population	Number
	N	Preferred forage shrub	Huarango (*Vachellia aroma* var. *Huarango*), huarango and Peruvian mesquite (*Prosopis pallida*), faique (*Vachellia macracantha*) and Peruvian mesquite
	N	Month of calving	January–March, April–June, July–September, October–December
	N	Installation types	Only corrals, corrals and sheds, corrals and others
	B	Corrals shared with other species	Yes/No
	B	Perform deworming	Yes/No
	B	Technical assistance received	Yes/No

T = variable type; O = ordinal; N = nominal; E = scalar; B = binary. The goat population ranged from 8 to 160 animals. According to the **INEI (2012)**, the goat population in the area was 2,616.

Throughout the article the term "carob" or "carob tree" was inaccurate, instead "Peruvian mesquite" should have been used. Corrections have been made to the following sections:

In the Results, *Analysis of socioeconomic and productive component of categorical variables* section, sixth paragraph:

"SET depends mainly on huarango (*Vachellia aroma var. Huarango*) as a forage resource (92.3% vs. 55.9% in SEM; $p < 0.001$), while SEM diversifies with faique and Peruvian mesquite (20.5%)."

In the Results, *Socioeconomic and productive segmentation in goat systems (clusters)* section, second paragraph:

"Fodder is diversified (faique, Peruvian mesquite, and huarango), and the infrastructure is more advanced, with a predominance of individual corrals."

In the Discussion, *Analysis of socioeconomic and productive component of categorical variables* section, seventh paragraph:

10.3389/past.2026.16426

TABLE 5 Comparison of categorical productive variables between goat production systems.

Variables	Categories	SEM (cluster 1)		SET (cluster 2)		Chi-square
		n	%	n	%	p-value
Area of the property	<0.5 ha	28	82.4	25	96.2	0.004150906**
	0.5–2 ha	2	5.8	0	0.0	
	>2 ha	4	11.8	1	3.8	
Breeding area	<1 ha	4	11.8	1	3.8	0.100877276
	1–2 ha	2	5.8	2	7.7	
	>2 ha	28	82.4	23	88.5	
Irrigation system	Yes	5	14.7	1	3.8	0.007808996**
	No	29	85.3	25	96.2	
Mixed breeding	Yes	20	58.8	22	84.6	5.1224E-05***
	No	14	41.2	4	15.4	
Parenting time	<5 years	16	47.1	17	65.5	0.00651954***
	Form 5 to < 10 years	4	11.7	5	19.2	
	From 10 to <20 years old	5	14.7	1	3.8	
	>20 years	9	26.5	3	11.5	
Months of parturition	January – March	6	17.6	8	30.8	0.019458991*
	April – June	13	38.3	9	34.6	
	July – September	8	23.5	7	26.9	
	October – December	7	20.6	2	7.7	
Time dedicated to goat rearing	<3	7	20.6	3	11.5	0.000381104***
	3 to 6	9	26.5	14	53.9	
	6 to 9	18	52.9	9	34.6	
Preferred shrub	Faique and Peruvian mesquite	7	20.5	2	7.7	2.38275E-08***
	Huarango	19	55.9	24	92.3	
	Huarango and Peruvian mesquite	4	11.8	0	0.0	
	Others	4	11.8	0	0.0	
Month of calving	January – March	4	11.8	0	0.0	3.66504E-06***
	April – June	17	50	9	34.6	
	July – September	10	29.4	16	61.6	
	October – December	3	8.8	1	3.8	
Facilities	Single pens	22	64.7	22	84.6	0.00017188***
	Unique corrals with shed	7	20.6	4	15.4	
	Corrals and other environments	5	14.7	0	0.0	
Shared corrals	Yes	19	55.9	22	84.6	9.0313E-06***
	No	15	44.1	4	15.4	

(*Continued*)

TABLE 5 Continued

Variables	Categories	SEM (cluster 1)		SET (cluster 2)		Chi-square
		n	%	n	%	p-value
Deworming	Yes	9	26.5	2	7.7	0.000414376***
	No	25	73.5	24	92.3	
Technical assistance	Yes	7	20.6	4	15.4	0.338530296
	No	27	79.4	22	84.6	

n: number of observations; SEM: enhanced extensive system; SET: traditional extensive system; (*) p-value <0.05; (**) p-value <0.01; (***) p-value <0.001.

"Regarding forage management, SET relies mostly on huarango (92.3%), while SEM diversifies with faique and Peruvian mesquite (20.5%), which provides greater resilience (**Sarria et al., 2014**; **Contreras et al., 2023**)."

The incorrect scientific name for Huarango was used.

A correction has been made to the **Results**, *Analysis of socioeconomic and productive component of categorical variables* section, sixth paragraph:

"Differences in management are notable. SET depends mainly on huarango (*Vachellia aroma var. Huarango*) as a forage resource (92.3% vs. 55.9% in SEM; $p < 0.001$), while SEM diversifies with faique and Peruvian mesquite (20.5%)."

An incorrect forage species was indicated as predominant in the region.

A correction has been made to the **Results**, *Descriptive analysis* section, third paragraph:

"Ninety percent of the farms do not have irrigation systems, and 73.3% use corrals. The principal tree/shrub forage species is huarango (71%). In terms of animal management, 95% do not use identification methods, and 100% visually select the animals. Sales are mainly motivated by economic needs (36.7%)."

The original version of this article has been updated.