ERRATA

Erratum: Accurate theoretical analysis of photonic band-gap materials [Phys. Rev. B 48, 8434 (1993)]

R. D. Meade, A. M. Rappe, K. D. Brommer, J. D. Joannopoulos, and O. L. Alherhand

[S0163-1829(97)02823-3]

On p. 8436, first paragraph, the equation should be

$$\varepsilon_{m,ij} = \widetilde{\varepsilon}_m n_i n_j + \overline{\varepsilon_m} e_{nil} e_{kjl} n_k n_n \, .$$

Use of the correct version of this formula is vital to obtain good convergence in the solution. This correction does not affect the results or conclusions.

We would like to thank S. G. Johnson for pointing out this error.

0163-1829/97/55(23)/15942(1)/$10.00

Erratum: Electronic and magnetic structure of $KNiF_3$ perovskite [Phys. Rev. B 52, 2381 (1995)]

J. M. Ricart, R. Dovesi, C. Roetti, and V. R. Saunders

[S0163-1829(97)04724-3]

The comparison between our calculated and the experimental (see Ref. 35) magnetic coupling constant J (p. 2384) is not consistent.

In obtaining J from the relation

$$\Delta E = 2zJS^2, \tag{1}$$

resulting (under the hypothesis of additivity) from the Ising two-particle spin Hamiltonian

$$H = -2JS_{z1}S_{z2}, \tag{2}$$

where S is the total spin of the Ni ion ($S=1$ in this case), z is the number of first Ni-Ni neighbors, and ΔE is the energy difference between the ferromagnetic and the antiferromagnetic states, the double (instead of the single) cell total energy has been erroneously used. The calculated J value must therefore be divided by two (14.9 instead of 29.8 K) before comparison with experiment.

We thank Professor F. Illas[1] for bringing our attention to this point.

[1] F. Illas (private communication); see also: I. de P. R. Moreira and F. Illas, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 1 (1997).

Erratum: Skyrmions and edge-spin excitations in quantum Hall droplets [Phys. Rev. B 54, 16 850 (1996)]

J. H. Oaknin, L. Martín-Moreno, and C. Tejedor

[S0163-1829(97)04127-1]

There is a mistake in the discussion of the edge reconstruction of a Hall droplet with 30 electrons contained both at the end of the first column of p. 16 857 and in the caption of Fig. 6. The spin instability was claimed to be that produced by the operator $\mathcal{P}(\Sigma_1^\dagger)^{15}$. However, for the parameters given in the paper, the first spin instability is produced by

$$\Sigma_3^\dagger = \sum_m \sqrt{\frac{(m+3)!}{m!}} c_{m+3,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{m,\uparrow} . \tag{1}$$

When this operator is applied on a compact state $|C_N\rangle$, it does not produce a state with a well defined third component of the center-of-mass angular momentum. However, the correction introduced by the necessary projection operators does not produce important changes for the case of the 30 electrons we are considering. In other words, for $B \geqslant B_r^S = 3.735T$ the new ground state is well approximated by $\Sigma_3^\dagger |C_{30}\rangle$.

The error in the identification of the particular edge-spin excitation that gives the new ground state does not alter our conclusions. Since the two fields $B_r^S = 3.735T$ and $B_r^C = 3.832T$ at which the spin and charge-edge reconstructions take place are so close, our main claim that no conclusion can be drawn from the experiments of Klein *et al.*[1] remains valid.

[1] O. Klein, D. Goldhaber-Gordon, C. de C. Chamon, and M. Kastner, Phys. Rev. B **53**, R4221 (1996).

