Erratum: Systematic behavior of mass distributions in ^{48}Ti -induced fission at near-barrier energies [Phys. Rev. C **85**, 014611 (2012)]

C. J. Lin, R. du Rietz, D. J. Hinde, M. Dasgupta, R. G. Thomas, M. L. Brown, M. Evers,
L. R. Gasques, and M. D. Rodriguez

(Received 21 June 2017; published 2 August 2017)

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.96.029901](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.96.029901)

Recently, an error was found in Fig. 5 of the original paper. When the theoretical mass width from the scission-point model was estimated by Eq. (4) of our original paper, the mass number of the target nucleus instead of the compound nucleus was wrongly used to calculate the level density parameter $a = A/8.5 \text{ MeV}^{-1}$, which results in underestimating the minimum proportion of quasifission (QF) $P(\text{QF})_{\min} = 1 - \sigma_{\text{M}}^{\text{sci}}/\sigma_{\text{M}}^{\text{exp}}$. The change typically increases the minimum proportion of quasifission by 4%. The correct data are plotted in Fig. 5 and listed in Table I for reference.

FIG. 5. The estimated minimum fraction of QF (see the text) at $E_{\text{c.m.}}/V_B = 1.15$ (target symbols) with linear fit (solid line), plotted as a function of fissility. Results at $E_{\text{c.m.}}/V_B = 0.99$ (blue crosses) also are shown for comparison.

TABLE I. Values of $P(\text{QF})_{\text{min}}$ for ^{48}Ti -induced fissions at $E_{\text{c.m.}}/V_B = 0.99$ and 1.15, respectively.

Target	0.99		1.15	
	$P(\text{QF})_{\text{min}}$	Error	$P(\text{QF})_{\text{min}}$	Error
^{144}Sm	0.096	0.028	0.095	0.005
^{154}Sm	0.051	0.012	0.127	0.005
^{162}Dy	0.363	0.028	0.251	0.008
^{166}Er	0.463	0.009	0.305	0.021
^{170}Er	0.541	0.011	0.245	0.006
^{174}Yb	0.590	0.010	0.326	0.005
^{186}W	0.755	0.022	0.413	0.005
^{192}Os	0.680	0.013	0.429	0.002
^{196}Pt	0.623	0.018	0.490	0.002
^{200}Hg	0.633	0.042	0.531	0.013
^{208}Pb	0.398	0.023	0.587	0.005