Corrigendum

DOUG M. SMITH, NICK J. DUNSTONE, ADAM A. SCAIFE, EMMA K. FIEDLER, DAN COPSEY, AND
STEVEN C. HARDIMAN

Met Office Hadley Centre, Exeter, United Kingdom

(Manuscript received 26 February 2018, in final form 16 March 2018)

There is an error in the units of EP flux in Fig. 12 of [Smith et al. \(2017\)](#). The color bars show vertical EP flux in units of 10^6 kg s^{-2} rather than $10^{-6} \text{ kg s}^{-2}$, and the horizontal and vertical vectors have been scaled separately. This does not affect any of the conclusions of the paper.

A corrected figure and caption are supplied below ([Fig. 12](#)).

REFERENCE

Smith, D. M., N. J. Dunstone, A. A. Scaife, E. K. Fiedler, D. Copsey, and S. C. Hardiman, 2017: Atmospheric response to Arctic and Antarctic sea ice: The importance of ocean–atmosphere coupling and the background state. *J. Climate*, **30**, 4547–4565, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0564.1>.

Corresponding author: Doug Smith, doug.smith@metoffice.gov.uk

DOI: 10.1175/JCLI-D-18-0100.1

© 2018 American Meteorological Society. For information regarding reuse of this content and general copyright information, consult the [AMS Copyright Policy](#) (www.ametsoc.org/PUBSReuseLicenses).

FIG. 12. Northern Hemisphere DJF wave activity fluxes as a function of latitude and height (pressure) in (a),(e) AMIP climatology, and the response to reduced sea ice in (b),(f) AMIP (c),(g) CPLD, and (d),(h) AMIP_CPLD. Color shading shows (top) the vertical EP flux (10^6 kg s^{-2}) and (bottom) the EP flux divergence ($\text{m s}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$). Arrows show the EP flux vector (scaled by dividing by density to aid visualization). Black contours show climatological winds (contour interval 5 m s^{-1} ; negative contours are dashed).