

Erratum: Pseudogauge ambiguity in the distributions of energy density, pressure, and shear force inside the nucleon [Phys. Rev. D **113**, 016025 (2026)]

Kenji Fukushima¹ and Tomoya Uji²

(Received 22 April 2026; published 26 May 2026)

DOI: [10.1103/3f69-stdm](https://doi.org/10.1103/3f69-stdm)

We found an error in the numerical implementation of Eq. (17) in the paper. When solving the equation of motion numerically, we treated all the dimensionful quantities in the physical unit of “fm.” However, inadvertently, the factor f_π^2 in




FIG. 2. Replacement for Fig. 2 of the original paper.




FIG. 3. Replacement for Fig. 3 of the original paper.

Published by the American Physical Society under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license. Further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the published articles title, journal citation, and DOI.




FIG. 4. Replacement for Fig. 4 of the original paper.




FIG. 5. Replacement for Fig. 5 of the original paper.




FIG. 6. Replacement for Fig. 6 of the original paper.




FIG. 7. Replacement for Fig. 7 of the original paper.




FIG. 8. Replacement for Fig. 8 of the original paper.

the second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (17) was taken to be unity, while it should be $[92.2 \text{ MeV}/(197 \text{ MeV} \cdot \text{fm})]^2 \simeq (0.469)^2 \text{ fm}^{-2}$ in this unit.

With the physical value of f_π^2 , the numerical results in Figs. 2–8 in the paper should be modified. We have recalculated all the quantities to find that the modification is numerically minor. The nucleon mass in Eq. (30) changes from 1.46 to 1.45 GeV. Accordingly, the value of χ in Eq. (41) is slightly shifted from 0.64 to 0.65. The surface tension energies in Eqs. (38) and (39) change from 2.5 to 2.3 GeV and from 0.47 to 0.48 GeV, respectively.

Since the quantitative differences are small, our qualitative conclusions of the paper remain unchanged. Here, we present our modified numerical results in the figures with the labels numbered in the same way as the original paper. Specifically, though the modification is quantitatively small, the agreement between p_{Bel} and SLy4 looks further improved as seen in Fig. 8.