

Journal of
Applied Remote Sensing

RemoteSensing.SPIEDigitalLibrary.org

Comparing the theoretical performances of 1.65- and 3.3- μm differential absorption lidar systems used for airborne remote sensing of natural gas leaks (Erratum)

Ashwin Yerasi
William D. Tandy Jr.
William J. Emery
Rory A. Barton-Grimley

SPIE.

Ashwin Yerasi, William D. Tandy Jr., William J. Emery, Rory A. Barton-Grimley, "Comparing the theoretical performances of 1.65- and 3.3- μm differential absorption lidar systems used for airborne remote sensing of natural gas leaks (Erratum)," *J. Appl. Remote Sens.* **12**(2), 029901 (2018), doi: 10.1117/1.JRS.12.029901.

Comparing the theoretical performances of 1.65- and 3.3- μm differential absorption lidar systems used for airborne remote sensing of natural gas leaks (Erratum)

Ashwin Yerasi, William D. Tandy Jr., William J. Emery, and
Rory A. Barton-Grimley

University of Colorado, Ann and H.J. Smead Department of Aerospace Engineering Sciences,
Boulder, Colorado, United States

[DOI: [10.1117/1.JRS.12.029901](https://doi.org/10.1117/1.JRS.12.029901)]

This article [*J. Appl. Remote Sens.* **12**(2), 026030 (2018)] contained a typographical error when it was published June 22, 2018. Two numbers in the following sentence in the abstract were transposed:

“The noise floors of the 1.65- and 3.3- μm instruments simulated in this particular analysis are ~ 0.1 and ~ 1.4 ppm m, respectively.”

The corrected sentence reads:

“The noise floors of the 1.65- and 3.3- μm instruments simulated in this particular analysis are ~ 1.4 and ~ 0.1 ppm m, respectively.”

All online versions of the article were corrected on 3 June 2018.