During the final proof read, we caught an inconsistency in the calculation of the sample volume dimensions given in the text. In order to trace back its origin, we went back to our internal experiment design documentation to confirm the values given for reconstruction depth along with the size of the reconstructed images. We found that there was probably a mix-up which occured on transfer of the sample volume extent into the experiment description within our article, where the given reconstruction depth was given too short by a factor of 10. Additionally, the resulting sample volume was incorrectly copied from a different experiment in the same facility.

In the beginning of section 3, we state: "Combined with the reconstruction depth of 4 mm, this leads to a sample volume of 4.86 cm^3 ." I would like to correct this to:  "Combined with the reconstruction depth of 10 mm, this leads to a sample volume of 3.04 cm^3 ."

As the sample volume does not influence any of the article's results and is merely stated as additional information, this change is fortunately very minor.