Errata

Erratum: Electrical resistance in the c direction of graphite [Phys. Rev. B 41, 969 (1990)]

K. Matsubara, K. Sugihara, and T. Tsuzuku

The last two lines in the caption of Fig. 2 should read as follows: "The upper three curves for HOPG's still show some discrepancy with the observations, although the lowest curve reproduces well the data for unfaulted single crystals."

Equation (4) has a typographical error. The first term on the right-hand side $l^*\sigma_{sf}$ should be just σ_{sf}, which equals $1/\rho_c$ given by Eq. (2) when $1/\tau_{ph}=0$.

The following should be added to the caption of Table I: "Temperature-dependent coefficients A and B characteristic of each faulted specimen are proportional to the carrier density determined by using Ono-Sugihara's formalism [J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **21**, 861 (1966)] with appropriate SW band parameters."

It has recently been discovered that the HOPG specimen whose r_R was reported to be 60 indicates an increase of ρ_a at 4.2 K so as to make $r_R=30$ after the resistivity measurement; this implies that slight damage was produced by repeated cooling and heating. Consequently, the ρ_c vs r_R plot for this specimen does not appreciably violate the Λ-shaped relationship proposed in Ref. 3. Accordingly, the last paragraph of Sec. III B on p. 972 claiming the inapplicability of the Λ rule should be deleted.

Erratum: Empirical potential for hydrocarbons for use in simulating the chemical vapor deposition of diamond films [Phys. Rev. B 42, 9458 (1990)]

Donald W. Brenner

Equation (10) should read

$$\bar{B}_{ij}=(B_{ij}+B_{ji})/2+F_{ij}(N_i^{(t)},N_j^{(t)},N_{ij}^{\mathrm{conj}})/2 \ .$$

Several errors also occurred in the indices and values of the partial derivatives of the functions F and H in Tables I and III. The correct entries for Table I are

$$\frac{\partial H_{CH}(0,2)}{\partial C}=-0.076\,55, \quad \frac{\partial H_{CH}(2,0)}{\partial H}=-0.130\,75, \quad \frac{\partial F(2,0,1)}{\partial i}=-0.1160, \quad \frac{\partial F(2,1,1)}{\partial i}=-0.132\,05 \ ,$$

$$\frac{\partial F(2,0,2)}{\partial i}=-0.0610, \quad \frac{\partial F(1,2,2)}{\partial i}=0.022\,25, \quad \frac{\partial F(1,3,2)}{\partial i}=0.037\,75, \quad \frac{\partial F(2,3,2)}{\partial i}=0.0565 \ ,$$

$$\frac{\partial F(2,3,1)}{\partial i}=0.0565, \quad \frac{\partial F(2,1,2)}{\partial i}=-0.0602 \ ,$$

and for Table III

$$\frac{\partial H_{CH}(0,2)}{\partial C}=-0.099\,05, \quad \frac{\partial H_{CH}(2,0)}{\partial H}=-0.176\,15, \quad \frac{\partial F(2,0,1)}{\partial i}=-0.0950, \quad \frac{\partial F(2,1,1)}{\partial i}=-0.108\,35 \ ,$$

$$\frac{\partial F(2,0,2)}{\partial i}=-0.0452, \quad \frac{\partial F(1,2,2)}{\partial i}=0.013\,45, \quad \frac{\partial F(1,3,2)}{\partial i}=0.027\,05, \quad \frac{\partial F(2,3,2)}{\partial i}=0.045\,15 \ ,$$

$$\frac{\partial F(2,3,1)}{\partial i}=0.045\,15, \quad \frac{\partial F(2,1,2)}{\partial i}=-0.050\,55 \ .$$

All energies and structures reported were obtained with the correct values, and so the results remain unchanged. Professor G. Schatz and K. Kudla of Northwestern University are thanked for bringing the errors in the tables to my attention.

