

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Comparative analysis of discrete and continuous absorption weighting estimators used in Monte Carlo simulations of radiative transport in turbid media: erratum.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4ms0x49c>

Journal

Journal of the Optical Society of America A, 38(5)

ISSN

1084-7529

Authors

Hayakawa, Carole K
Spanier, Jerome
Venugopalan, Vasam

Publication Date

2021-05-01

DOI

10.1364/josaa.427204

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed



Comparative analysis of discrete and continuous absorption weighting estimators used in Monte Carlo simulations of radiative transport in turbid media: erratum

CAROLE K. HAYAKAWA,^{1,2,*} JEROME SPANIER,² AND VASAN VENUGOPALAN^{1,2}

¹Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, University of California, Irvine, California 92697, USA

²Beckman Laser Institute, University of California, Irvine, California 92697, USA

*Corresponding author: hayakawa@uci.edu

Received 8 April 2021; posted 10 April 2021 (Doc. ID 427204); published 26 April 2021

This erratum corrects the relative error plots and references in our paper [J. Opt. Soc. Am. A 31, 301 (2014)].

© 2021 Optical Society of America

<https://doi.org/10.1364/JOSAA.427204>

Due to a unit conversion error, the values reported in the relative error plots and references in Ref. [1] are incorrect and should be reduced by a factor of 10. Thus, in Figs. 1(c), 1(d), 1(g), 1(h), 1(k), and 1(l) and Figs. 2(c), 2(d), 2(g), 2(h), 2(k), and 2(l) the y -axis tick labels should be reduced by a factor of 10. In addition, in Figs. 1(b), 1(f), and 1(j) and Figs. 2(b), 2(f), and 2(j) the error bars should be reduced by a factor of 10. In Table 2, the relative error values shown for “ R ” should be reduced by a factor of 10 for both the “DAW” and the “CAW” columns. In addition, the computational efficiency values shown for “ $\text{Eff}[\xi]$ ”

should be increased by a factor of 100 for both the “DAW” and the “CAW” columns. All conclusions that we provide related to the comparison of discrete absorption weighting (DAW) to continuous absorption weighting (CAW) remain valid.

REFERENCE

1. C. K. Hayakawa, J. Spanier, and V. Venugopalan, “Comparative analysis of discrete and continuous absorption weighting estimators used in Monte Carlo simulations of radiative transport in turbid media,” *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A* **31**, 301–311 (2014).