Errata for Connolly and Thompson CMP 102, 347-366.

The example of the calculation of fluid-rock ratios, F, by Eq. (6) on p. 360 contains a numerical error.
Consequently, the maximum ratios estimated from the models, as reported in the abstract and discussion (p. 363) are too low and should be increased by a factor of five.

Given the numbers provided in the text on p. 360, the correct ratios calculated by Eq. (6) are 830, 8.3, and 0.83 for d-dimensions of 1, 100, and 1000 m, respectively. Fluid-rock ratios can also be determined graphically from the time integrated fluid fluxes plotted in Fig. 9. Making the approximation $\rho_{H2O} = 1$, the fluid-rock ratio obtained for a rock section of dimension d perpendicular to the flux, is simply the flux divided by d. For example, from Fig. 9a, after 60 ma rocks at an initial depth of 30 km would (or, at least, could) record fluid-rock ratios of about 2500 for a d-dimension of 1m (100 cm), whereas rocks at an initial depth of 50 km would record ratios of about 1000.

Eq. (3) (D'Arcy's law in the gravitational field), is written incorrectly, it should read:

$$q_f = -\frac{k}{\mu}\left(\frac{dP_f}{dz} - \rho_f \mathrm{g}\right)$$

In the paper, the rightmost term is correctly approximated by for lithostatic fluid pressures $g\left(\rho_r - \rho_f\right)$ this approximation neglects a $\left(1-\phi\right)$ term, which is assumed to differ negligbly from unity. For mass fluxes, the kinematic viscosity should be substituted in this equation. However, given the accuracy of the models, the difference in the magnitude (in cgs units) of viscosity and the kinematic viscosity is unimportant.

On p. 352, it is stated that Eq. (5) was solved by "an implicit Crank-Nicolson finite difference approximation." The word "implicit" should be omitted.