Spin Gaps and Spin Dynamics in $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ and $YBa_2Cu_3O_{7-\delta}$ [Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 2810 (1993)]

A. J. Millis and H. Monien

We have found errors in our computation of the oxygen and copper relaxation rates from the mean-field analysis of our model, Eq. (1), of the magnetic dynamics of two coupled planes. The results were presented in Fig. 3 of the original paper; a corrected version appears below. The errors do not affect our principal conclusion, that the spin dynamics of $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ and $YBa_2Cu_3O_{6+x}$ are very different. However, our interpretation of the spin dynamics of $YBa_2Cu_3O_{6+x}$ in terms of the coupled plane model of Eq. (1) must be substantially revised. A more detailed discussion will be presented elsewhere [A. J. Millis and H. Monien (unpublished)].

In addition, our results for the sum of the core and van Vleck susceptibilities for $La_{2-x}Sr_xCuO_4$ appeared with an incorrect minus sign. The correct values are $(\chi_c + \chi_{vV}) = +1.3$ states/(eV planar Cu) for fields perpendicular to the CuO₂ plane and $(\chi_c + \chi_{vV}) = -1.0$ states/(eV Cu) for fields parallel to it.



FIG. 3. Copper (Cu), oxygen (O), and yttrium (Y) relaxation rates calculated via Schwinger boson mean-field analysis of a model of two coupled antiferromagnetically correlated planes for parameters near to, but on the disordered side of, the T=0magnetic transition. The left ordinate shows the Cu and O relaxation rates $1/T_1T$ (solid lines); the right ordinate shows the ratio of the O and Y $1/T_1T$ to the calculated spin susceptibility $\chi_s(T)$.

Baryon Asymmetry of the Universe in the Minimal Standard Model [Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 2833 (1993)]

Glennys R. Farrar and M. E. Shaposhnikov

The correct address for the first author, Glennys R. Farrar, is as follows: Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08855-0849.

On page 2836, first column, line 14, $f(\rho) = \frac{4}{9}\rho$ for $\rho \ll 1$ should read $f(\rho) = \frac{4}{3}\rho$ for $\rho \ll 1$.

In Ref. [5] Report No. CERN-TH. 6732/92 should read CERN-TH. 6734/93.