

Errata

Erratum: Model adsorption potentials of rare gases on boron nitride [Phys. Rev. B 36, 7576 (1987)]

M. Karimi and G. Vidali

The following errors appear:

- (1) In Eq. (7), β^3 should be changed to β^2 . This is a typographical mistake and has no consequence in the calculations.
- (2) In Eq. (10), the constant 4π in both terms on the right-hand side should be changed to 2π . As a consequence, α becomes $92.8 \times 10^{-3} \text{ \AA}^{-3}$ and $\gamma = 2.41 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$. In Table I, the following changes should be made:

$$\text{Ar-BN } \alpha_0 = 2.09 \times 10^5 \text{ meV \AA}^3 \text{ and } \langle z \rangle = 2.40 \text{ \AA} ;$$

$$\text{Kr-BN } \alpha_0 = 2.97 \times 10^5 \text{ meV \AA}^3 \text{ and } \langle z \rangle = 2.55 \text{ \AA} ;$$

$$\text{Xe-BN } \alpha_0 = 4.57 \times 10^5 \text{ meV \AA}^3 \text{ and } \langle z \rangle = 2.66 \text{ \AA} .$$

The other entries are not affected.

We are grateful to Professor Milton Cole for bringing these errors to our attention.

© 1990 The American Physical Society

Erratum: Renormalization of Bloch electrons in coherent light [Phys. Rev. B 40, 10 218 (1989)]

Ahmet Elçi

In Section III, Lowdin's theorem was improperly applied in that the interband transitions were counted twice. The matrix $Z_{\beta\beta}(E)$ defined in Sec. II Eq. (2.24a) must be such that the sums over the intermediate states in the expansion terms must exclude the state β . Thus, Eqs. (3.4a) and (3.11) should be replaced by $Z_{cc}(E) = h_{cc} + |h_{cv}|^2(E - h_{vv})^{-1}$ and $Z_{cv}(E) = h_{cv}$, respectively, when the radiative recoil is neglected. In the eigenvalue equation (3.5), the factor 2 in front of $|h_{cv}|^2$ should be omitted and the Rabi frequency becomes $\hbar\Omega_E = 2|h_{cv}|$. Therefore, in (3.15), (3.16), (3.24'''), (3.40a), (3.40b), and (3.41), $\hbar\Omega_E$ should be replaced by $\sqrt{2}\hbar\Omega_E$. The examples concerning the four-band model should similarly be corrected for double counting. The physical conclusions remain unchanged.

© 1990 The American Physical Society

Erratum: Electronic-structure study of the (110) inversion domain boundary in SiC [Phys. Rev. B 41, 2948(1990)]

Walter R. L. Lambrecht and Benjamin Segall

The values of $\Delta E^{(2)}$ in Table I are incorrect. In addition, we also give its decomposition into the intrasphere and the Madelung contributions, as discussed in the text. For $n = 5$, these contributions are 1.449 and -1.000 eV. This corresponds to a total of 0.449 eV instead of the 0.724 eV value in the paper. For $n = 7$, the corresponding values are 1.435, -0.995 , and 0.440 eV and for $n = 9$, the values are 1.432, -0.995 , and 0.437 eV. In addition, the value of $\Delta E_{\text{Madelung}}$ for $n = 5$ should read 3.215 eV. This gives as final values for ΔE_{tot} for $n = 5, 7, 9$, respectively, 5.81, 5.78, and 5.76 eV.

These small changes do not affect our general conclusions in any way. In fact, they improve the agreement between the atomic-sphere and self-consistent dipole profile approximations. However, it is interesting to note that the energy of formation obtained in the self-consistent dipole profile approach can be lower than the one obtained within the fully self-consistent atomic-sphere approximation. This is consistent with the fact that the procedure only guarantees an extremum.