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This corrigendum provides a replacement for Fig. 8 from the original article. Although the flux results shown in Fig. 8 (corrected) remain unchanged, some of the flux results were incorrectly labelled on the vertical axis of the original figure ("T2.7" as "T1.7"; "T2.11" as "T1.11"; "T2.12" as "T1.12"; "T2.13" as "T1.13"; "T2.14" as "T1.14"; and "T2.15" as "F− and F+ (UA V1)").

Figure 8. NGI flux uncertainty range (thick cyan bars), for each method testing flight survey, as a fraction of $F_0$. The σF uncertainty range (horizontal blue lines) is given on either side of $F_c$ (vertical blue lines). $F_c$ and $F_-$ and $F_+$ averages (vertical blue lines) are plotted for UAV1, UAV2 and for all flight surveys. Standard deviation uncertainty ranges (horizontal blue lines) and standard error uncertainty ranges (thick yellow bars) are given on either side of $F_c$, $F_-$ and $F_+$ values.
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