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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 “Eff[ξ]” 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.
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