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In the original article, there was an error in Figure 1 as published. The value of $\Psi_{\text{soil}}$ at 33 DAT should be $-1.44$ MPa. The corrected Figure 1 appears here.

The associated text in the Results section Dynamic of Soil Status has also been updated to reflect the correction to Figure 1, as described below.

The originally published sentence “By withholding irrigation from 27 to 33 DAT during the progressive drying process, RSWC in the drought treatment decreased gradually from 82.90 to 37.27% and $\Psi_{\text{soil}}$ decreased by 1.12 MPa correspondingly.” has been corrected to read “By withholding irrigation from 27 to 33 DAT during the progressive drying process, RSWC in the drought treatment decreased gradually from 82.90 to 37.27% and $\Psi_{\text{soil}}$ decreased by 1.04 MPa correspondingly.”

In the original article, there was an error in Figure 3 as published. The value of $\Psi_{\text{soil}}$ at 33 DAT should be $-1.44$ MPa. The corrected Figure 3 appears here.

The associated text in the Results section Quantitative Analysis of Photosynthetic Limitation in Response to Soil Drying has also been updated to reflect the correction to Figure 3, as described below.
The originally published sentence “Thirdly, with $\psi_{\text{soil}}$ decreasing to $-1.54$ MPa, $l_m$ contributed to $41.99\%$ reduction in photosynthesis, followed by $l_i$ (36.93%) and $l_b$ (21.08%), showing that $g_m$ was the most important limiting factor to photosynthetic capacity under the severe drought condition.” has been corrected to read “Thirdly, with $\psi_{\text{soil}}$ decreasing to $-1.44$ MPa, $l_m$ contributed to $41.99\%$ reduction in photosynthesis, followed by $l_i$ (36.93%) and $l_b$ (21.08%), showing that $g_m$ was the most important limiting factor to photosynthetic capacity under the severe drought condition.”

In the original article, there were errors in Table 2 as published. Owing to a miscalculation, the values of the parameters were incorrect. The corrected Table 2 appears here.

The associated text has also been updated to reflect the correction to Table 2, as described below.

In the Results section Sensitivity Analyses of Parameters in the Estimation $g_m$, the originally published sentence “20% variation of $R_d$, $I^*$ did not affect $g_m$ significantly (Table 2).” has been corrected to read “20% variation of $R_d$, $I^*$ did not affect $g_m$ significantly, whereas $I^*$ has a significantly effect on $g_m$ in well-watered plants (Table 2).”

In the Results section Sensitivity Analyses of Parameters in the Estimation $g_m$, the originally published sentence “20% underestimation of $C_i$ resulted in an overestimation of $g_m$, while $g_m$ was unaffected by overestimation of $C_i$ in both the well-watered and drought treatments.” has been corrected to read “Variation of $C_i$ resulted in an overestimation of $g_m$ in well-watered plants, whereas $g_m$ in drought treatment was unaffected by overestimation of $C_i$."

In the Discussion section Response of $g_m$ to $\psi_{\text{soil}}$ and ABA Under Soil Drought, the originally published sentence “However,
the sensitivity analyses showed that an overestimation of $C_i$ did not induce $g_m$ decline neither in the well-watered nor drought-stressed plants (Table 2).” has been corrected to read “However, the sensitivity analyses showed that an overestimation of $C_i$ did not induce $g_m$ decline in drought-stressed plants (Table 2).”

In the original article, there were errors (incorrect $P$-values) in the following sentence from the Results section $\Psi_{\text{leaf}}$ and ABA in the Regulation of $g_s$, $g_m$, $g_t$, and $A_n$: “In summary, ABA was negatively related to $g_m$ ($r = -0.64$, $P < 0.001$) and $g_s$ ($r = -0.55$, $P < 0.001$) (Table 1).” The sentence should have read “In summary, ABA was negatively related to $g_m$ ($r = -0.64$, $P < 0.01$) and $g_s$ ($r = -0.55$, $P < 0.01$) (Table 1).”

The authors apologize for these errors and state that they do not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.
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