© ERRATUM

In E. Jurčišinová, M. Jurčišin, and R. Remecký “Influence of helicity on the turbulent Prandtl number: Two-loop approximation” (Vol. 169, No. 2, 1573–1582, 2011), Eqs. (12) and (17), the last three unlabeled equations in Sec. 5, and Fig. 4 should be changed. Although all three two-loop diagrams of the model were calculated correctly, the helical part of one two-loop diagram was used with the wrong sign in obtaining the final results. The numerical results in the paper must therefore be corrected. Namely, Eq. (12) is

$$z_{21}^{(2)} = -1.1374 \cdot 10^{-5} - 1.2034 \cdot 10^{-6} \rho^2,$$

Eqs. (17) are

$$g_* = \frac{40\pi^2}{3} \varepsilon (1 - 1.101\varepsilon), \quad u_* = 1.393 + (0.0712 + 0.1101\rho^2)\varepsilon,$$

and the last three unlabeled equations in Sec. 5 are

$$\begin{aligned} B(u_*^{(1)}, \rho) &= \frac{(2\pi)^6}{S_3^2} z_{21}^{(2)} = -4.432 \cdot 10^{-3} - 4.689 \cdot 10^{-4} \rho^2, \\ u_{eff} &= 1.393 + (0.01245 + 0.1101\rho^2)\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2), \\ Pr_t^{-1} &= u_{eff} = 1.4179 + 0.2202\rho^2. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, in the text after the equation that follows Eq. (18), the value of $\lambda(\rho)$ must be $\lambda(\rho) = -1.101$, i.e., it is independent of the helicity parameter. Finally, the correct form of Fig. 4 is given below.

Fig. 4. The dependence of the turbulent Prandtl number on the absolute value of the helicity parameter ρ .

Therefore, the main conclusion in the paper is that the turbulent Prandtl number decreases as a function of the helicity parameter.