Erratum: Pauli blocking in the low-lying, low-spin states of ^{141}Pr [Phys. Rev. C **78, 034302 (2008)]**

M. Scheck, S. N. Choudry, E. Elhami, M. T. McEllistrem, S. Mukhopadhyay, J. N. Orce, and S. W. Yates
(Received 11 October 2016; revised manuscript received 16 January 2017; published 27 March 2017)

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.95.039908](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.95.039908)

Table III of our original article contains erroneous $B(M1) \downarrow$ transition rates. In the calculation of these values the conversion formula was erroneously handled. Instead of the correct prefactor 56.8 as should have been used, a value of 5.68 was used. Consequently, the $B(M1) \downarrow$ values as stated are ten times too small and the actual $B(M1) \downarrow$ strengths are a factor ten higher than the values given in Table III of our original article. Apart from the 1608-keV level, the physics interpretation is not affected. The 1608-keV level $J^\pi = 3/2^+$ has been identified as dominated by a $d_{3/2}$ single-particle component and the transition to the $d_{5/2}$ dominated $J^\pi = 5/2^+$ ground state corresponds to the expected strong $M1$ spin-flip transition. The corrected $B(M1) \downarrow \leq 0.854\mu_N^2$ for the 1608-keV transition connecting this level and the ground state is in the order of magnitude that can be expected from a simple shell-model approach for a $d_{3/2} \rightarrow d_{5/2}$ spin-flip transition. The interpretation of the other levels below 2-MeV excitation energy is based on the observed $E2$ transition strength and, therefore, not affected.

Furthermore, the phase convention used to extract the sign of the multipole-mixing ratios δ as given in Table III follow the phase convention of Steffen and Alder [1] and not, as stated, the Rose-Brink convention [2].

The authors acknowledge the contribution of E. E. Peters to correcting the erroneous $B(M1) \downarrow$ values.

[1] R. M. Steffen and K. Alder, *The Electromagnetic Interaction in Nuclear Spectroscopy*, edited by W. D. Hamilton (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1975), p. 505.

[2] H. J. Rose and D. M. Brink, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **39**, 306 (1967).