ERRATA

Solution of the Multichannel Kondo Problem. N. ANDREI and C. DESTRI [Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 364 (1984)].

In our paper we presented an exact solution of the multichannel Kondo problem. In the course of the derivation of the recursion relation determining the critical exponents, we made an error in the algebra. Thus Eq. (12) should be replaced by

$$[\eta_n^+/(1+\eta_n^+)](b_{n-1}+b_{n+1})=\lambda b_n, \tag{12}$$

leading to the critical exponent $\tau=4/(f+2)$. (All symbols are defined in the paper.) The mistake was noted by several people whom we thank and, in particular, by H.-U. Desgranges,[1] who studied the equations numerically.

The result was independently reached by A. M. Tsvelick and P. B. Wiegmann[2] (Ref. 12 in our original paper).

[1]H.-U. Desgranges, J. Phys. C **18**, 5481 (1985).

[2]A. M. Tsvelick and P. B. Wiegmann, Z. Phys. B **54**, 201 (1984).

Size Effects of Electrical Breakdown in Quenched Random Media. P. M. DUXBURY, P. D. BEALE, and P. L. LEATH [Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1052 (1986)].

On page 1053 of our Letter, eleven lines above Eq. (1), we quote the result for the current enhancement at the end of an isolated ellipse to be $I_{\text{tip}}=I_{\text{pure}}(1+b/a)$. This equation should be $j_{\text{tip}}=j_\infty(1+b/a)$, as the result is for the current *density* at the ellipse tip. To find the lattice limit of the ellipse result, one must integrate the current density over one lattice spacing along the semimajor-axis direction. On doing this one finds $I_{\text{tip}}\sim(n)^{1/2}$ for an isolated ellipse, rather than $I_{\text{tip}}\sim n$ as quoted in our Letter. However, on consideration of bonds lying between two large defects (or in a continuum system the region lying between two elliptical defects), the result $I_{\text{tip}}\sim n$ is recovered. The conclusions for V_1/L of our Letter are thus correct although the most critical defect used in the Lifshitz argument is modified. The equality of V_1/L and V_b/L is, however, not so obvious. These questions are discussed fully in P. M. Duxbury, P. L. Leath, and Paul D. Beale, Phys. Rev. B (to be published), and Y. S. Li and P. M. Duxbury (to be published).

Low-Energy Antikaon-Nucleon Interaction. J. SCHNICK and R. H. LANDAU [Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 1719 (1987)].

There are some typographical errors in Table I. The value of λ_0^{22} for fit c lacks a minus sign. The correct value is -1.29×10^6, not 1.29×10^6. The exponents in the value of λ_1^{11} for fit d are incorrect. The correct value is $-6.08\times10^3-4.42\times10^3 i$, not $-6.08\times10^4-4.42\times10^4 i$.

New Cellular Automaton Model for Magnetohydrodynamics. HUDONG CHEN and WILLIAM H. MATTHAEUS [Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 1845 (1987)].

Equation (1) should be

$$\rho\left(\frac{\partial\mathbf{v}}{\partial t}+\mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{v}\right)=-\nabla p+(\nabla\times\mathbf{B})\times\mathbf{B}+\nu\nabla^2\mathbf{v}. \tag{1}$$

On page 1845, second column, line 28, $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_a$ should be defined as $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_a=(\cos 2\pi a/6,\sin 2\pi a/6)$.

On page 1846, second column, in the eighteenth line, the equation for conservation of $n\mathbf{B}$ should read

$$\sum_{a,b}\{Q_{ab}\hat{\mathbf{e}}_b+R_{ab}\hat{\mathbf{e}}_a\}\,\Omega_{ab}=0.$$

Immediately after Eq. (8) the parameters β and η should be the vector parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$.

Long-Range Order and Segregation in Semiconductor Superlattices. S. CIRACI and INDER P. BATRA [Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 2114 (1987)].

The following Note Added was inadvertently omitted from the printed version: While our Letter was going to press a Letter by D. M. Wood, S.-H. Wei, and A. Zunger appeared [Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 1123 (1987)]. One of the conclusions arrived at in their Letter is that the (001) $(GaAs)_1(AlAs)_1$ superlattice is intrinsically unstable towards disproportionation into its constituent compounds, GaAs and AlAs. Part of our Letter dealing with the stability of the above superlattice fully supports this finding.