Erratum: Einstein Equations for Generalized Theories of Gravity and the Thermodynamic Relation $\delta Q = T \delta S$ are Equivalent [Phys. Rev. Lett. 103, 101301 (2009)]

Ram Brustein and Merav Hadad (Received 5 November 2010; published 30 November 2010)

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.239902

PACS numbers: 04.70.Dy, 04.62.+v, 99.10.Cd

Equation (1) had a sign error due to a sign error in Eq. (32) of Ref. [6]. It should read

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_{pabq}} \delta R_{pabq} = 2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_{pabq}} \nabla_p \nabla_q \delta g_{ab} - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_{pabc}} R^q_{abc} \delta g_{pq}. \tag{1}$$

Consequently, the correct form of Eq. (2) is

$$\sqrt{-g} \left(-\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial g_{ab}} - 2\nabla_p \nabla_q \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_{paba}} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_{para}} R^b_{pqr} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-g} g^{ab} \mathcal{L} = 0, \tag{2}$$

and the coefficients of $\nabla_p \nabla_q \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_{pabq}}$ in Eqs. (3)–(5) should be -2.

Another unrelated sign error occurred in the inline equation in the paragraph before Eq. (12), which should read $d(W^{cd}\epsilon_{cd}) = -2\nabla_c W^{cd}\epsilon_d$. Consequently, the coefficients of the right-hand side (rhs) of Eqs. (12),(13) should be +2/T and the coefficient on the rhs of Eq. (15) should be +2.

So, the new Eq. (15) holds if and only if

$$T^{ab} = 2 \left[-2\nabla_p \nabla_q \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_{n(ab)a}} \right] + g^{ab} f, \tag{3}$$

where $R_{p(ab)q}$ is symmetric in (a, b). Since

$$-2\nabla_{p}\nabla_{q}\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_{p(ab)q}} = -2\nabla_{p}\nabla_{q}\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_{pabq}} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_{pqra}}R_{pqr}^{b},\tag{4}$$

we find that Eq. (16) should read

$$T^{ab} = 2 \left[-2\nabla_p \nabla_q \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_{pabq}} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial R_{pqra}} R_{pqr}{}^b \right] + g^{ab} f.$$
 (5)

The conclusions of the Letter are unaffected by correcting the sign errors. We thank Dan Gorbonos for pointing to us the sign error in [6] and Joey Medved for discovering the second sign error and for useful discussions.