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Although this does not affect the main conclusions of the paper (full proofs of which are going to appear in a forthcoming paper with Enrique Parreño Sánchez), Theorem 2.2 and Remark 2.1 are not correctly stated. Namely, one hypothesis is missed in Theorem 2.2, whose correct formulation is as follows:

**Theorem 2.2.** Let $h_\epsilon, 0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, be $C^4$ maps. Assume that for any $\epsilon$ there is $u_\epsilon \in I$ such that the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) $h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon) = u_\epsilon$;

(ii) the map $D(\epsilon) := h'_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)$ is differentiable and $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} D(\epsilon) = -1, \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} D'(\epsilon) < 0$;

(iii) the map $T(\epsilon) := \Sigma h_\epsilon(u_\epsilon)$ is differentiable and $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} T(\epsilon) = 3/2, \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} T'(\epsilon) = 0$.

Then, if $k \geq 3, \epsilon > 0$ is small enough and we put $h = h_\epsilon, u = u_\epsilon$, (1) exhibits a subcritical Neimark-Sacker bifurcation at $\alpha = \alpha_k(r), r = h'(u)$. In particular, if $\alpha > \alpha_k(r)$ is close enough to $\alpha_k(r)$, then $u$ is a local, but not global, attractor of (1).

This issue also affects Remark 2.1, which must be corrected as follows:

**Remark 2.1.** Theorem 2.2 admits an alternative version replacing conditions $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} D'(\epsilon) < 0$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} T'(\epsilon) = 0$ by the weaker assumption $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} T'(\epsilon)/D'(\epsilon) < 1/4$. Then the statement holds true for all $k$ large enough.

One should also notice that this correction does not affect the main counterexample of the paper, that given by equation (8), but it invalidates the one concerning Shepherd’s function, because $D(\epsilon) = -(2 + \epsilon^2 + \epsilon^3 + \epsilon^5)/(2 + \epsilon^2 + \epsilon^3)$, hence $D'(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} T'(\epsilon)/D'(\epsilon) = \infty$. Indeed, our calculations now suggest that, most probably, Neimark-Sacker bifurcation is supercritical in this case for all parameters $p,q > 0$ with $1/p + 2/q < 1$. 
