Monthly Notices
of the
ROYAL ASTRONOMICAL SOCIETY

MNRAS **447,** 325 (2015) doi:10.1093/mnras/stu2478

Erratum: The stellar masses of ∼40 000 UV-selected galaxies from the WiggleZ survey at $0.3 < z < 1.0$: analogues of Lyman break galaxies?

by Manda Banerji,[1,2] Karl Glazebrook,[3]★ Chris Blake,[3] Sarah Brough,[4] Matthew Colless,[4] Carlos Contreras,[3] Warrick Couch,[3] Darren J. Croton,[3] Scott Croom,[5] Tamara M. Davis,[6] Michael J. Drinkwater,[6] Karl Forster,[7] David Gilbank,[8] Mike Gladders,[9] Ben Jelliffe,[5] Russell J. Jurek,[10] I-hui Li,[11] Barry Madore,[12] D. Christopher Martin,[7] Kevin Pimbblet,[13] Gregory B. Poole,[3,14] Michael Pracy,[3,5] Rob Sharp,[4,15] Emily Wisnioski,[3,16] David Woods,[17] Ted K. Wyder[7] and H. K. C. Yee[11]

[1]*Institute of Astronomy, University of Cambridge, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HA, UK*
[2]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK*
[3]*Centre for Astrophysics and Supercomputing, Swinburne University of Technology, PO Box 218, Hawthorn, VIC 3122, Australia*
[4]*Australian Astronomical Observatory, PO Box 915, North Ryde, NSW 1670, Australia*
[5]*Sydney Institute for Astronomy, School of Physics, University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia*
[6]*School of Mathematics and Physics, University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia*
[7]*California Institute of Technology, MC 278-17, 1200 East California Boulevard, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA*
[8]*South African Astronomical Observatory, PO Box 9, Observatory 7935 South Africa*
[9]*Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of Chicago, 5640 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, USA*
[10]*Australia Telescope National Facility, CSIRO, Epping, NSW 1710, Australia*
[11]*Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of Toronto, 50 St George Street, Toronto, ON M5S 3H4, Canada*
[12]*Observatories of the Carnegie Institute of Washington, 813 Santa Barbara St, Pasadena, CA 91101, USA*
[13]*School of Physics, Monash University, Clayton, VIC 3800, Australia*
[14]*School of Physics, University of Melbourne, Parksville, VIC 3010, Australia*
[15]*Research School of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Australian National University, Weston Creek, ACT 2600, Australia*
[16]*Max Planck Institut für extraterrestrische Physik, Postfach 1312, D-85748 Garching, Germany*
[17]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of British Columbia, 6224 Agricultural Road, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1, Canada*

Key words: errata, addenda – galaxies: evolution – galaxies: formation – galaxies: stellar content.

The paper 'The stellar masses of ∼40 000 UV-selected galaxies from the WiggleZ survey at $0.3 < z < 1.0$: analogues of Lyman break galaxies?' was published in MNRAS 431, 2209 (2013). In section 4.1.2 of the paper, we incorrectly stated regarding the use of the KG04 stellar mass fitting code: *'In contrast to the results obtained using* FAST*, we find little difference in both the stellar mass estimate and the 1σ error on it with and without the addition of the NIR* (i.e. near-infrared) *photometry'*. We subsequently discovered that we were using an incorrect file for that part of the analysis. When we use the correct file, we find that:

(i) When we do not use the NIR photometry the derived stellar masses are ≃0.2 dex higher. This is consistent with the results from the FAST code.

(ii) We find median formal uncertainties of 0.23 dex without NIR and 0.15 dex with NIR. This decrease is in the same sense as that obtained with the FAST code (0.46 dex improving to 0.27 dex with NIR) though the absolute size of the errors is significantly smaller.

(iii) 16 per cent of the galaxies have stellar masses that are discrepant at the $>3\sigma$ level when comparing masses derived with and without NIR photometry. This is higher than FAST (4 per cent) which we attribute to the different stellar population models used in the KG04 code but lower than that of the Taylor et al. (2011) GAMA comparison sample (25 per cent).

These results support the conclusion in section 4.1.2 that the inclusion of NIR data does not worsen stellar mass spectral energy distribution (SED) fits and that the effect of the NIR on stellar masses is strongly influenced by the choice of priors in the SED models. The rest of the paper includes NIR data for all the stellar mass fits and so is not affected by this error. The conclusions of the paper remain unchanged.

REFERENCE

Taylor E. N. et al., 2011, MNRAS, 418, 1587

★E-mail: kglazebrook@swin.edu.au

This paper has been typeset from a TEX/LATEX file prepared by the author.