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ABSTRACT

We correct a numerical mistake and mislabellings in Fig. 4.

In the four plots of Fig. 4, the y-axis label should read \(2\langle \cos(2, 4)\phi \rangle\) instead of \(\langle \cos(2, 4)\phi \rangle\) and, in addition, the curves of Fig. 4 (a) & (b) should be divided by 2. Overall, Fig. 4 should be replaced by a new figure (Fig. 1).

Correspondingly, in the section 6 and the caption of Fig. 4, \(\langle \cos(2, 4, n)\phi \rangle\) should all read \(2\langle \cos(2, 4, n)\phi \rangle\). On page 221, “\(\langle \cos(2\phi) \rangle\) nearly reaches 30%” should read “\(2\langle \cos 2\phi \rangle\) nearly reaches 15%”. Our conclusions remain unchanged.
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Fig. 1. \(2\langle \cos n\phi_{CS} \rangle\) for \(n=2, 4\) computed for \(|\cos \theta_{CS}| < 0.25\) and for \(0.25 < \cos \theta_{CS} < 0.5\) for \(k^2 = 3.3\) GeV\(^2\) for 3 values of \(M_{Q\bar{Q}}\) (8, 12 and 21 GeV) relevant respectively for the LHCb [1], CMS [2] and ATLAS [3] kinematics. The spectra are plotted up to \(M_{Q\bar{Q}}/2\). Our results do not depend on \(Y_{Q\bar{Q}}\). The uncertainty bands result from the use of both our models of \(h_1^\perp\). The solid line, which shows the largest asymmetries corresponds to the Model 2 (saturation of the positivity bound) and the dashed line to Model 1.