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Fig. 3 in the original publication of this paper should be replaced with the following figure and caption. The figure labels in Figs. 3(c) and 3(d) were wrong and we omitted the information that sub-figures (a) and (b) show data from sample A (as defined in Table I) and that sub-figures (c) and (d) show data from sample B.
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**FIG. 3.** (a) Current modulation $I(\Phi)$ of the NIS junction of sample A at different values of bias voltage applied to it at $T_{bath} = 50\, \text{mK}$. (b) A zoomed view for several values of $V$ in the range $-340\, \mu\text{V} < V < 298\, \mu\text{V}$. (c) Measured flux-to-voltage $V(\Phi)$ curves at different magnitudes of current through the junction of sample B and (d) a zoomed image at some values of current in the range $0.18$–$1.8\, \text{nA}$. The curves are not symmetric around $U = 0$ due to a constant offset flux bias. The suppression of hysteresis is visible in both $I(\Phi)$ and $V(\Phi)$ modulations. This happens as the Josephson inductance $L_J$ exceeds the self-inductance of the superconducting ring.
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