

---



---

**ERRATA**


---



---

**Erratum: Optical alignment of axial Fe centers in  $\text{KTaO}_3$**   
**[Phys. Rev. B 51, 6707 (1995)]**

H.-J. Reyher, B. Faust, M. Käding, H. Hesse, E. Ruža, and M. Wöhlecke

[S0163-1829(96)01030-2]

While repeating some experiments we realized that due to a systematic error the directions of light polarizations have been interchanged in the investigation concerning the detection of aligned centers by optically detected magnetic resonance. This leads to the new statement that the optical transitions of  $\text{Fe}^{3+}\text{-O}_1$  are polarized predominantly *perpendicular* to the center axes ( $\sigma$  transitions). Other statements of the article are not affected. In detail, the corrections to be applied are: In Fig. 4,  $0^\circ$  and  $90^\circ$  have to be interchanged. The same applies to the caption and the part of text interpreting this figure on p. 6709, and later, on p. 6710 in the section referring to the “ $F_A$  center model,” where “parallel” and “perpendicular” have to be interchanged. Finally, in the linear dichroism (LD) section, where the angles  $\theta$  are given correctly, the “strongly different amplitudes” (p. 6709) of the spectra depicted in Fig. 5 may now be understood on the basis of  $\sigma$ -polarized optical absorption bands, as to be published.

0163-1829/96/54(5)/3662(1)/\$10.00

© 1996 The American Physical Society

---

**Erratum: Excitation spectrum of the attractive Hubbard model**  
**[Phys. Rev. B 52, 16 223 (1995)]**

R. Micnas, M. H. Pedersen, S. Schafroth, T. Schneider, J. J. Rodríguez-Núñez, and H. Beck

[S0163-1829(96)00930-7]

The above-mentioned paper contains the following misprints:

In Eq. (4),  $\varepsilon(\mathbf{k})$  should read  $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mu$ .

Equation (7) should read  $1 - U\chi(0,0) = 0$ .

The caption of Fig. 7 should read “The static spin susceptibility  $\chi_s(T)$  vs  $T$  for  $U=4.0$  and  $\rho=0.1$  in the  $T$ -matrix approximation ( $\nabla$ ). We have included also the results of an RPA calculation ( $\diamond$ ) and the moment approach ( $\Delta$ ).”

0163-1829/96/54(5)/3662(1)/\$10.00

© 1996 The American Physical Society

---

**Erratum: Magnetostrictive bending of a film-substrate system**  
**[Phys. Rev. B 53, 2481 (1996)]**

P. M. Marcus

[S0163-1829(96)06829-4]

The expressions for the curvatures of a free and a flat magnetic film-substrate system in Eqs. (25) and (26), respectively [and their application in Eqs. (29) and (32)] are too large by a factor of 2. After division by 2, Eq. (25) agrees with Eq. (34), the result obtained in Ref. 3. The derivation is corrected by noting that the magnetostrictive strains  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  used in the elastic strain energy of the film in Eq. (15), should include a factor  $r$  (the ratio of film to substrate thickness) when defined as strains under magnetization of the system film plus substrate, rather than for the isolated film as in Eq. (7). Hence  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are negligible.

0163-1829/96/54(5)/3662(1)/\$10.00

54 3662

© 1996 The American Physical Society

**Erratum: Electric-field-dependent variable-range hopping conductance  
in quasi-two-dimensional systems: Application to PrBa<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>7-y</sub>-based  
superconductor–normal-metal–superconductor junctions  
[Phys. Rev. B 53, 6806 (1996)]**

M. Singh, B. Thompson, and O. Dumas

[S0163-1829(96)02130-3]

Equation (6) in this paper is incorrect. It should be replaced with

$$\eta = \frac{2}{3\pi}, \quad \beta = 1,$$

$$\eta = \frac{\beta}{\pi(\beta^2 - 1)} + \frac{2}{\pi(1 - \beta^2)^{3/2}} \tan^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{1 - \beta}{1 + \beta}}, \quad \beta < 1,$$

$$\eta = \frac{\beta}{\pi(\beta^2 - 1)} - \frac{2}{\pi(\beta^2 - 1)^{3/2}} \tanh^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{\beta - 1}{\beta + 1}}, \quad \beta > 1.$$

The behavior of this new definition of  $\eta$  is almost identical to the old incorrect  $\eta$ . Therefore, the parameters  $T_0^M$  and  $\alpha$  derived in our article are still valid.