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In Fig. 1 of the Letter, we have plotted an estimator for $\Omega_0 h_0^2$, rather than $\Omega_0$, where $h_0 = 0.68$ is the Hubble constant divided by 100 km/s/Mpc. This is inconsistent with the legend of Fig. 1, which states that an estimator for $\Omega_0$ is plotted, as well as with the conventions used throughout the rest of the Letter. A new figure showing the estimator for $\Omega_0$ with $h_0 = 0.68$ is shown below. This does not affect any other result in the Letter.
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**FIG. 1.** We show the estimator for $\Omega_0$ in each frequency bin, along with $\pm 2\sigma$ error bars, in the frequency band that contains 99% of the sensitivity for $\alpha = 0$. The loss of sensitivity at around 65 Hz is due to a zero in the overlap reduction function. There are several lines associated with known instrumental artifacts which do not lead to excess cross-correlation. The data are consistent with Gaussian noise, as described in the Results section.