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Dohm and Folk\cite{DohmFolk} have reported that in attempting to reproduce the fits shown in Fig. 2(a) they found results different from ours. We have, therefore, reexamined our numerical procedure and have indeed found an error in the relative weights that we assigned to the different data points. The corrected analysis changes some of the quantitative aspects of the fits, but leaves the main conclusions of the work unaffected. The most visible change in the results is in the dashed curve of Fig. 2(a), which now fits the data better than before for $t < 10^{-4}$, and worse for $t > 10^{-4}$. The model $F$ curves are affected very little by the error, and the statements made concerning the relative quality of the fits for Models $E$ and $F$ remain valid. Detailed fits based on the correct weights will be presented in the near future.\cite{AhlersHohenbergKornblit}
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It has been realized that Eqs. (1), (2), and (3) are not equivalent to Eqs. (3) and (4). This can be seen by using, instead of perturbation theory to lowest order in $z_s$, exact trigonometric identities in Eq. (4) to find $\langle f \rangle = \langle f \rangle_0$. The model studied in the paper is defined by Eqs. (3) and (4); therefore the result $T_{KT}(x) > T_{KT}(0)$ is now intuitively clear. With this fact taken into account all the results remain intact save the comparison of the experimental increase of $T_{KT}$ with reducing $\Theta_i$.

The author thanks J. Bruno for having pointed out this important fact.
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The following misprints should be corrected:

On page 87, second column, line 14, the word “coherent” should read “Coherent.” On page 88, second column, line 4, the term $2\, ^3P_1$ should be replaced by $2\, ^1P_1$, and on line 8 the term $4\%$ should read $4\%$. On page 89, first column, line 24, the term $2\, ^3P_{1.5/2} - 2\, ^3P_{1.5/2}$ should read $2\, ^3P_{1.5/2} - 2\, ^3P_{1.5/2}$.