Errata

Erratum: Muon-spin-relaxation and neutron-scattering studies of magnetism in single-crystal $La_{1.94}Sr_{0.06}CuO_4$ [Phys. Rev. B 41, 8866 (1990)]

B. J. Sternlieb, G. M. Luke, Y. J. Uemura, T. M. Riseman, J. H. Brewer, P. M. Gehring, K. Yamada, Y. Hidaka, T. Murakami, T. R. Thurston, and R. J. Birgeneau

In the discussion of our quasielastic-neutron-scattering data (p. 8870, the second paragraph), we incorrectly claimed an energy resolution of $\Delta E = 1$ meV. The corrected clause should read as follows: ". . . the H7 spectrometer has a HWHM energy resolution of $\Delta E = 0.5$ meV. . . ."

Since the time scale of spin fluctuations probed by quasielastic neutrons is related to the energy resolution ΔE via $t \sim \hbar/\Delta E$, the frequency sensitivity of our measurements is limited by $\Delta E/\hbar$ *not* $\Delta E/h$. Hence, in the second paragraph on page 8870, the sentence "Consequently, all fluctuations with frequencies $\nu \lesssim 1$ meV$/h \sim 10^{12}$ Hz contributed to the quasielastic scattering intensity." should read "Consequently, all fluctuations with frequencies $\nu \lesssim 0.5$ meV$/\hbar \sim 10^{12}$ Hz contributed to the quasielastic scattering intensity."

These corrections do not affect the conclusions presented in the paper.

Erratum: Low-temperature properties of the quasi-two-dimensional antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model [Phys. Rev. B 41, 9563 (1990)]

Bang-Gui Liu

In Eq. (13), the exponent -1 is neglected. The corrected equation should read

$$\langle S^z \rangle = \tfrac{1}{2}(1+W)^{-1} \approx \tfrac{1}{2} - W/2 \ . \qquad (13)$$

Because the summation on the right-hand side of Eq. (14) is carried out over the first Brillouin zone of the fcc lattice, the numerical factor before the summation symbol should be $2/N$ not $1/N$.

Erratum: Theory of energy dissipation in sliding crystal surfaces [Phys. Rev. B 42, 760 (1990)]

J. B. Sokoloff

An error was made in evaluating the integral

$$\int d^3k \, |\bar{g}[v_d(k_x+G_x)]|^2 v_d(k_x+G_x)\delta[v_d^2 k_x^2 - \omega_0^2(\mathbf{k})] \ ,$$

which appears in Eq. (19), which changes the numerical value of one of the main results of the article. The correct evaluation of the integral is as follows: The integral over $\mathbf{k}$ reduces approximately to an integral over a small ellipsoid, which is the approximate form of the surface over which the functions $v_d k_x$ and $\omega_0(\mathbf{k})$ intersect. The semimajor and semiminor axes of the ellipsoid are $(2\pi/a)(v_d/v_{pz})$ and $(2\pi/a)(v_d/v_p)$, respectively, giving an approximate value for the integral of $\pi^2(2\pi/a)^2(v_d^2/v_p v_{pz}\bar{v}_p)$ where $\bar{v}_p$ is the average of the phonon velocity over this ellipsoid. As a result of this, the dissipative stress quoted as 10^8 dyn/cm^2 for slow speed motion of two commensurate surfaces is multiplied by a factor of $\pi^2(c/a)v_d^2/(v_p v_{pz}) \approx 10$, resulting in a dissipative stress of about 10^9 dyn/cm^2. Furthermore, the force of friction given in Eq. (23) is now proportional to v_d in the regime of velocities in which Eq. (15) is a valid description of the dislocations.

