

ERRATUM: “CARMA OBSERVATIONS OF PROTOSTELLAR OUTFLOWS IN NGC 1333” (2013, *ApJ*, 774, 22)

ADELE L. PLUNKETT¹, HÉCTOR G. ARCE¹, STUART A. CORDER², DIEGO MARDONES³, ANNEILA I. SARGENT⁴, AND
SCOTT L. SCHNEE⁵

¹ Department of Astronomy, Yale University, P.O. Box 208101, New Haven CT 06520, USA; aplunket@eso.org

² Joint ALMA Observatory, Av. Alonso de Córdova 3107, Vitacura, Santiago, Chile

³ Departameto de Astronomía, Universidad de Chile, Casilla 36-D, Santiago, Chile

⁴ Astronomy Department, California Institute of Technology, 1200 East California Boulevard, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

⁵ National Radio Astronomy Observatory, 520 Edgemont Road, Charlottesville, VA 22903, USA

Received 2015 November 6; accepted 2015 November 20; published 2015 December 21

We inadvertently included an erroneous factor in the previous calculation of turbulent energy (E_{turb}), resulting in approximately a factor of two discrepancy in our reported value of E_{turb} . The correct equation and resulting value are $E_{\text{turb}} = \frac{3}{16 \ln(2)} M_{\text{cloud}} \Delta V_{\text{turb}}^2 = 3.6 \times 10^{45}$ erg. Correspondingly, it follows that this equals about one-half of the gravitational potential energy for the same region, and is approximately five times greater than the total energy of identified outflows in the region (without correction for inclination angle).

Only a couple of other calculations that we reported depend on this value of E_{turb} . The turbulent dissipation rate, which is given by $L_{\text{turb}} = E_{\text{turb}}/t_{\text{diss}}$, should be $L_{\text{turb}} = 2 \times 10^{32}$ erg s⁻¹ (assuming still that the dissipation time is $t_{\text{diss}} = 5.7 \times 10^5$ yr). Finally, the ratio $r_L = L_{\text{out}}/L_{\text{turb}} = 2.3$ ($r_L = 7.7$, with $\xi = 57^\circ 3$).

Qualitative results remain the same as we reported previously: “...the ratio r_L is greater than one, signifying that in this region the outflows have more than enough power to be an important agent for the maintenance of turbulence.” This erratum only impacts Section 4.2 of the original publication.