

ERRATA

While all possible care was exercised during preparation of the article by Eskov *et al.* (2024), most unfortunate errors crept inadvertently into the caption to Fig. 1 and in the text (p. 94).

The caption should read (highlighted in bold):

Fig. 1: Clavate trichobothria of Liphistiidae and Mygalomorphae on tarsus III (A–C, E, F) and II, showing also filiform trichobothria (D): (A, C) *Liphistius desultor* (Liphistiidae), (C) same, enlarged, (D) *Hapalopus formosus* (Theraphosidae), (E) *Ummidia gandjinoi* (Halonoproctidae), (F) *Ischnocolus meron* (Theraphosidae).

The text on page 94 should read (highlighted in bold):

“However, the above-mentioned morphological differences seem overrated. In *Liphistius* the clavate trichobothria, in fact, are “interspersed among the filiform ones” in the same way as in mygalomorphs (Fig. 1A cf. Fig. 1D). In theraphosids and barychelids “rows of tiny spikes” on setal shaft surface clearly differ from the *Liphistius* ones, being sufficiently smaller and arranged in longitudinal (non-oblique) rows (Fig. 1C cf. Fig. 1F; Guadanucci 2012, figs 18, 134), whereas the clavate trichobothria of the halonoproctid genus *Ummidia* Thorell, 1875 (Fig. 1E) and the idiopid genus *Prothemenops* (Schwendinger & Hongpadharakiree 2014, fig. 1C) seem indistinguishable in this respect from the *Liphistius* ones (Fig. 1C).”

The authors and editorial office apologise for any inconvenience these mistakes might have caused.

REFERENCES

- ESKOV, K.Y., ZONSTEIN, S.L. & MARUSIK, Y.M. 2024. On the liphistiomorph trichobothria and the significance of their structure for tracking the bothria evolution in the order Araneae. *Israel Journal of Entomology* **53**: 93–112.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12790018>

