CORRECTION

Correction to: If horses had toes: demonstrating mirror self recognition at group level in *Equus caballus*

Paolo Baragli[1,2] · Chiara Scopa[3] · Veronica Maglieri[4] · Elisabetta Palagi[4,5]

Correction to: Animal Cognition (2021) 24:1099–1108
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-021-01502-7

In the original publication of the article, the table (Table 3) has been incorrectly published, this has been corrected in this paper (Table 3).

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

The original article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-021-01502-7.

✉ Paolo Baragli
paolo.baragli@unipi.it

Chiara Scopa
cscopa@izsvenezie.it

Veronica Maglieri
v.maglieri@studenti.unipi.it

Elisabetta Palagi
elisabetta.palagi@unipi.it

1   Department of Veterinary Sciences, University of Pisa, Viale delle Piagge 2, 56124 Pisa, Italy

2   Research Center "E. Piaggio", University of Pisa, Largo Lucio Lazzarino 1, 56122 Pisa, Italy

3   Italian National Reference Centre for Animal Assisted Interventions, Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale delle Venezie, Viale dell'Università 10, 35020 Legnaro, Padua, Italy

4   Unit of Ethology, Department of Biology, University of Pisa, Via Alessandro Volta 4bis, 56126 Pisa, Italy

5   Natural History Museum, University of Pisa, Via Roma, 79, 56011 Calci, Pisa, Italy

Table 3 Analyses at individual level for the contingency behaviors

Horses	Head movements			Peek-a-boo			Look behind			Tongue protrusion		
	CM	OM	X^2; p	CM	OM	X^2; p	CM	OM	X^2; p	CM	OM	X^2; p
Antonia	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	4.9	N/A	0.0	4.6	N/A	0.0	10.1	$X^2=8.2$; $p=0.004$
Arramon	0.0	2.5	N/A	0.0	2.6	N/A	13.7	29.8	$X^2=5.2$; $p=0.0221$	0.0	0.0	N/A
Ercole	0.0	25.9	$X^2=23.9$; $p<0.0001$	0.0	2.0	N/A	0.0	24.6	$X^2=22.6$; $p<0.0001$	0.0	0.0	N/A
Falco2	15.6	31.1	$X^2=4.5$; $p=0.034$	0.0	3.1	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A
King	3.7	1.9	N/A	0.0	27.9	$X^2=25.9$; $p<0.0001$	0.0	20.8	$X^2=18.8$; $p<0.0001$	0.0	0.0	N/A
Naidjia	0.0	29.7	$X^2=27.7$; $p<0.0001$	0.0	0.0	N/A	2.2	23.5	$X^2=16.0$; $p<0.0001$	0.0	0.0	N/A
Oliver	0.0	6.7	N/A	0.0	18.6	$X^2=16.7$; $p<0.0001$	0.0	4.2	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A
Oti	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	2.2	N/A	0.0	22.2	$X^2=20.2$; $p<0.0001$	0.0	0.0	N/A
Serafine	0.0	15.6	$X^2=13.7$; $p<0.001$	0.0	18.6	$X^2=16.7$; $p<0.0001$	2.9	8.1	$X^2=1.6$; $p=0.206$	0.0	0.4	N/A
Shaif	2.2	26.4	$X^2=18.8$; $p<0.0001$	0.0	30.2	$X^2=28.2$; $p<0.0001$	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A
Sunshine	0.0	38.3	$X^2=36.3$; $p<0.0001$	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A

Results of the analyses (Chi-Square, X^2; p values) at individual level for the four contingency behaviors recorded in the covered mirror (CM) and open mirror (OM) conditions. Values in CM and OM columns are reported in seconds

N/A not shown as having a meaningful interpretation