Errata

Erratum: Chemisorption geometry of $c(2\times2)$ oxygen on Cu(001) from angle-resolved core-level x-ray photoemission [Phys. Rev. B 22, 6085 (1980)]

S. Kono, S. M. Goldberg, N. F. T. Hall, and C. S. Fadley

We have noted a minor textual error in the definition of the angles θ_k and θ_{r_j} on p. 6088 just after Eq. (4). The statement "$\ldots\theta_k$ or θ_{r_j} are the angles between the polarization plane and $\vec{k}$ or $\vec{r}_j\ldots$" should be changed to "$\ldots\theta_k$ or θ_{r_j} are the angles between *the direction of radiation propagation* and $\vec{k}$ or $\vec{r}_j\ldots$." All calculations reported in the paper utilized the correct definition, and thus all results and conclusions remain as originally stated.

Erratum: Structural phase transitions in the perovskite-type layer compounds $NH_3(CH_2)_3NH_3CdCl_4$, $NH_3(CH_2)_4NH_3MnCl_4$, and $NH_3(CH_2)_5NH_3CdCl_4$ [Phys. Rev. B 23, 5301 (1981)]

R. Kind, S. Plesko, P. Günter, J. Roos, and J. Fousek

We have become aware of an error in Sec. III A. The plausible but erroneous assumption that the principal axes of the time-averaged electric-field-gradient (efg) tensor should coincide always with the time-averaged orientation of the $NH_3(CH_2)_nNH_3$ groups led to a misevaluation of the data. As a consequence, Eq. (1), which is derived from Fig. 3 and thus gives the correct relation between the order parameter η and the time-averaged orientation of the molecule, cannot be applied for the angular shifts of the deuteron NMR-NQR rotation patterns. The correct relation for the high-field case between the order parameter and the measured angle ϕ according to Fig. 2 is

$$\eta=\tan(2\phi_{\text{meas}})/\tan(2\phi_0)\ .$$

For $\eta=0$ and $\eta=\pm1$ the efg tensor axes coincide with the time-averaged orientation ϕ_{mol} of the molecule, but in between the difference between ϕ_{meas} and ϕ_{mol} goes up to 8° for the value $\eta=0.5$ since $\phi_0=35°$. Accordingly, the critical exponents β of the order parameters had to be redetermined. The new values are $2C_3Cd$, $\beta=0.21\pm0.02$; $2C_4Mn$, $\beta=0.34\pm0.02$; and $2C_5Cd$, $\beta=0.26\pm0.02$. The values in Table I: β third column and μ/β last column should be replaced. With the new values the faintness index μ/β becomes 2 for $2C_3Cd$ and $2C_5Cd$ so that the problem mentioned in item (iv) of the Conclusions is solved for these two compounds. These corrections have, however, no consequences for the major part of the paper.