(9) A factor of $\frac{1}{4}$ was omitted in the expression of L_w in the fifth line below Eq. (66). The expression should read $[x^2+\frac{1}{4}(w+1)^2]^{-1}$.

(10) The left-hand side of Eq. (74) should read $I_{0m}^{(2)}$.

(11) In the line following Eq. (76) $d_j^{(x)}$ should read $d_j^{(2)}$.

(12) K_m in Eqs. (90) through (93) should read $K_m^{(M)}$. This also applies to the first line following Eq. (91), as well as the first line of the following paragraph.

(13) In Appendix A the following corrections should be noted: f_a is recoilless fraction for absorber being considered, $t_{rs}=f_{s0}\sigma_0 a_{s1} n_s$, and $L_w(x)=[x^2+\frac{1}{4}(w+1)^2]^{-1}$.

Erratum: Cooperative weak links in sintered Y-Ba-Cu-O superconductor [Phys. Rev. B 37, 3681 (1988)]

Lu Li, Duan Hong-min, and Zhang Dian-lin

In our paper[1] a factor of π was missing in both formula (1) and the representation of $I_c(0)$. The corresponding correct forms should be

$$I_c(T)=b\frac{\pi\Delta(T)}{2eR_N}\tanh\left[\frac{\Delta(T)}{2k_BT}\right], \quad I_c(0)=b\frac{\pi\Delta(0)}{2eR_N}.$$

However, all the numerical results in the paper were calculated using the correct formulas.

In addition, we neglected to mention that the samples used in our experiments were prepared by solid-state reaction with appropriate amounts of $BaCO_3$, Y_2O_3, and CuO. The mixture was thoroughly ground, mixed, and heated in a tubular furnace in air. The procedure used was preheating at 800 °C for 6–8 h followed by sintering at 900–950 °C for 10–15 h. Then the samples were naturally cooled in the furnace.[2]

The critical current I_c reported in Ref. 1 corresponds to a current density $j_c \sim 5$ A/cm^2 at 77 K. This low value of j_c is consistent with our picture that weak links dominate in the samples. When we use this picture to describe the I-V characteristics, we find that the normal-state resistance R_N should be 0.147 Ω rather than the measured value of ~8 mΩ. This discrepancy can be reconciled by assuming the existence of another nonsuperconducting phase which shunts the weak links. This is consistent with our model that the surface and twin boundaries may play an important role in the superconductivity of the material.[3,4]

The energy gap determined in the paper was close to the results of point-contact measurements which have now been published.[5,6]

We appreciate useful comments from L. Kirkup concerning these points.

[1]Lu Li, Duan Hong-min, and Zhang Dian-lin, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 3681 (1988).
[2]Zhao Bairu, Shi Yinhuan, Lu Yong, Wang Huisheng, Zhao Yuying, and Li Lin, Chin. Phys. Lett. **4**, 286 (1987).
[3]Duan Hongmin, Lu Li, and Zhang Dianlin, Chin. Phys. Lett. **5**, 253 (1988).
[4]Duan Hong-min, Lu Li, and Zhang Dian-lin, Solid State Commun. **67**, 809 (1988).
[5]J. Moreland, J. W. Ekin, L. F. Goodrich, T. E. Capobianco, and A. F. Clark, in *Extended Abstracts; High Temperature Superconductors,* edited by D. U. Gubser and M. Schluter (Materials Research Society, Pittsburgh, 1987), Vol. EA-11, pp. 73–75.
[6]Tao Hongjie *et al.*, Chin. Phys. Lett. **4**, 481 (1987).

Erratum: Temperature dependence of spin dynamics in the impurity-doped quasi-two-dimensional antiferromagnet $C_2H_5(NH_3)_2MnCl_4^{2+}:Cu^{2+}$ [Phys. Rev. B 37, 9564 (1988)]

C. Tien, J. S. Karra, and G. Kemmerer

There is an error in the beginning of the parenthesis in the chemical formula of the antiferromagnet $C_2H_5(NH_3)_2MnCl_4^{2+}:Cu^{2+}$. It ought to be $(C_2H_5NH_3)_2MnCl_4^{2+}:Cu^{2+}$.