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This article [J. Med. Imag. 5(1), 011016 (2018), doi: 10.1117/1JMI.5.1.011016] was originally published online on 4 January 2018 with the following error. The Pearson correlation coefficients were not computed and reported in a consistent fashion, most notably in Table 10, where values labeled "r^2" were instead the values of r without appropriate squaring. Figure 8 contained a similar inconsistency, though not all values were affected.

Original (erroneous) and corrected correlation coefficients from Table 10 are enlisted here with their corresponding measurements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Original (erroneous) Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Corrected Measurements</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient r^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3 ± 4.3</td>
<td>0.792 ± 0.216</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.626 ± 0.337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The original and the corrected Figure 8 are depicted below:

Original

Corrected

This article was corrected online on 23 March 2019. 
It appears correctly in print.