

Erratum: Geomagnetic secular variation and the statistics of palaeomagnetic directions

Martijn H.L. Deenen,¹ Cor G. Langereis,¹ Douwe J.J. van Hinsbergen¹
and Andrew J. Biggin²

¹*Department of Earth Sciences, Utrecht University, Budapestlaan 4, 3584 CD Utrecht, the Netherlands*

²*Geomagnetism Lab, University of Liverpool, Oliver Lodge Laboratories, Oxford Road, Liverpool L69 7ZE, UK*

Deenen, M.H.L., Langereis, C.G., van Hinsbergen, D.J.J., and Biggin, A.J., 2011, Geomagnetic secular variation and the statistics of palaeomagnetic directions, *Geophysical Journal International* 186, pp. 509–520.

In our recent paper, we defined a reliability envelope for palaeomagnetic data, based on the number of samples used to determine the mean (N). This envelope is defined by a lower and upper 95 per cent confidence envelope on model runs of Fisherian VGP distributions that can be expected from palaeosecular variation of the palaeomagnetic field. We used a VGP distribution with $K = 12.5$ for the maximum $A95$ ($A95_{\max}$), and a distribution with $K = 50$ for the minimum $A95$ ($A95_{\min}$; and ‘not’ $K = 25$ as erroneously indicated in the caption of Fig. 3).

Unfortunately, eq. (4) for $A95_{\min}$ as printed in the main text is incorrect. The correct equations for the reliability envelope are given in the legend of Fig. 6 and are:

$$A95_{\max} = 82 \times N^{-0.63} \quad (3)$$

$$A95_{\min} = 12 \times N^{-0.40} \quad (4)$$

We apologize to the readers of *Geophysical Journal International* for the inconvenience caused, and we wish to thank Valerian Bachtadse for noticing the error. For those who have used the published eq. (4) for $A95_{\min}$: it was more stringent than the correct one. The correct equation is slightly more lenient and will accept more data as representing secular variation.