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Incorrect results were provided in Table 1 for Eqs. (27) and (28) and for the evaluation of the integral based on the iterated solution of \( f \). The main difference between the two tables is that Eq. (27) is far more accurate than originally suggested, it has about the same accuracy as Eq. (28). With the exception of the last column, numbers in the new table tend to be slightly closer to the numerical results. Note that in the last column the iterated values are above the numerical results by 8 and 9 respectively on the 4th decimal place, whereas the original table suggested they were 8 and 2 less
Table 1: Calculated values of $\frac{\int f \, dy^2}{\alpha + 1}$ using different methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\alpha = 0.5$</th>
<th>$\alpha = 1$</th>
<th>$\alpha = 1.5$</th>
<th>$\alpha = 2$</th>
<th>$\alpha = 5$</th>
<th>$\alpha \to \infty$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eq. (27)</td>
<td>0.0809</td>
<td>0.0891</td>
<td>0.0939</td>
<td>0.0971</td>
<td>0.1050</td>
<td>0.1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eq. (28)</td>
<td>0.0809</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
<td>0.0941</td>
<td>0.0973</td>
<td>0.1051</td>
<td>0.1129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the integral based on the iterated solution of $f$, i.e., Eq. (32) with $m = 3$, in which Eq. (27) is used as a first approximation</td>
<td>0.0807</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
<td>0.0942</td>
<td>0.0975</td>
<td>0.1055</td>
<td>0.1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the integral based on the iterated solution of $f$, i.e., Eq. (32) with $m = 3$, in which Eq. (28) is used as a first approximation</td>
<td>0.0807</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
<td>0.0942</td>
<td>0.0975</td>
<td>0.1055</td>
<td>0.1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerical solution</td>
<td>0.0810</td>
<td>0.0894</td>
<td>0.0942</td>
<td>0.0973</td>
<td>0.1051</td>
<td>0.1126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

than the numerical results. These corrections do not change the conclusions of that paper.
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