Errata

Erratum: Nonleptonic weak decays of charmed baryons [Phys. Rev. D 46, 1042 (1992)]

Hai-Yang Cheng and B. Tseng

[S0556-2821(97)06003-7]

PACS number(s): 13.30.Eg, 11.40.Ha, 12.40.Aa, 14.20.Kp, 99.10.+g

The overall sign of the amplitudes $B_1^{\rm fac}$ and $B_2^{\rm fac}$ given in Eq. (2.21) and S in Eq. (2.26) should be flipped. Also, Eq. (2.25) should read

$$\Gamma=\frac{1}{8\pi}\frac{E_f+m_f}{E_i}p_c\left[2(|S|^2+|P_2|^2)+\frac{E_V^2}{m_V^2}(|S+D|^2+|P_1|^2)\right].$$

Accordingly, the branching ratios and decay asymmetries in Table II are modified to

Reaction	α	$(\mathrm{BR})_{\rm theory}$
$\Lambda_c^+\to p\overline{K^{*0}}$	-0.09	2.3
	-0.29	3.2
$\Lambda_c^+\to\Lambda\rho^+$	-0.30	4.1
	-0.32	4.0
$\Lambda_c^+\to\Sigma^0\rho^+$	-0.10	0.28
	-0.10	0.05
$\Lambda_c^+\to\Sigma^+\rho^0$	-0.10	0.28
	-0.10	0.05

0556-2821/97/55(3)/1697(1)/$10.00

Erratum: 1/M corrections to baryonic form factors in the quark model [Phys. Rev. D 53, 1457 (1996)]

Hai-Yang Cheng and B. Tseng

[S0556-2821(97)06103-1]

PACS number(s): 12.39.Jh, 12.39.Hg, 13.30.−a, 99.10.+g

The $(E_{J/\psi}+m_{J/\psi})$ term in Eq. (49) should be replaced by $(E_\Lambda+m_\Lambda)$. Accordingly, Eq. (51) reads

$$\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b\to J/\psi\,\Lambda)=1.1\times10^{-4}.$$

0556-2821/97/55(3)/1697(1)/$10.00

Erratum: Two-dimensional SU(N)×SU(N) chiral models on the lattice [Phys. Rev. D 49, 1621 (1994)]

Paolo Rossi and Ettore Vicari

[S0556-2821(97)00203-8]

PACS number(s): 11.15.Ha, 11.15.Pg, 75.10.Hk, 99.10.+g

In the paper there is an error in formula (20) relating the three-loop coefficients, b_{2_L} and b_{2_E}, of the lattice β functions, respectively, in the standard temperature scheme and energy scheme. The correct formula reads

$$b_{2_E}=b_{2_L}+N^2b_0(a_2-a_1^2)-Nb_1a_1. \tag{1}$$

Using this result one finds that, for $N>3$, the coefficient of the linear correction to the two-loop formula of the lattice scale [cf. Eq. (16) of the paper] turns out to be much smaller in the energy scheme than in the standard scheme. Perturbative expansion supports what is observed in Monte Carlo simulations, that is the energy scheme shows a considerable improvement with respect to the standard scheme in the approach to asymptotic scaling, especially at large N. In the paper the above error hid this fact. So the corresponding comments must be corrected accordingly.

We thank Andrea Pelissetto for having brought the above-mentioned error to our attention.

0556-2821/97/55(3)/1698(1)/$10.00

Erratum: Two-dimensional SU(N)×SU(N) chiral models on the lattice II. The Green's function [Phys. Rev. D 49, 6072 (1994)]

Paolo Rossi and Ettore Vicari

[S0556-2821(97)00303-0]

PACS number(s): 11.15.Ha, 11.15.Pg, 75.10.Hk, 99.10.+g

In the paper there is an error in formula (148) relating the three-loop coefficients b_{2_L} and b_{2_E} of the lattice β functions, respectively, in the standard temperature scheme and energy scheme (i.e., when adopting a new temperature proportional to the internal energy). The correct formula reads

$$b_{2_E}=b_{2_L}+N^2b_0(a_2-a_1^2)-Nb_1a_1. \tag{1}$$

As a consequence, the value of coefficient of the linear correction to the two-loop formula in the relation [cf. Eq. (149) of the paper]

$$\Lambda_E=(8\pi\beta_E)^{1/2}e^{-8\pi\beta_E}\left[1+\frac{b_1^2-b_0b_{2_E}}{Nb_0^3}\beta_E^{-1}+O(\beta_E^{-2})\right] \tag{2}$$

changes substantially. For $N>3$ it turns out to be much smaller than the corresponding coefficient of the standard scheme. For example, in the large-N limit one obtains [the following equation corrects Eq. (150)]

$$\frac{b_1^2-b_0b_{2_E}}{Nb_0^3}\underset{N\to\infty}{\to}-0.00884, \tag{3}$$

which should be compared with the number 0.06059 obtained for the corresponding coefficient in the standard scheme [cf. Eq. (137) of the paper]. Perturbative expansion supports what is observed in Monte Carlo simulations, that is the energy scheme shows a considerable improvement with respect to the standard scheme in the approach to asymptotic scaling, especially at large N. In the paper the above error hid this fact. So the corresponding comments must be corrected accordingly.

Moreover in Eq. (164) of the paper the coefficient of the power $1/\beta_E^2$ within square brackets is -0.00081 (instead of 0.00079). The above correction does not have other relevant consequences in the rest of both papers.

We thank Andrea Pelissetto for having brought the above-mentioned error to our attention.

0556-2821/97/55(3)/1698(1)/$10.00

Erratum: More conservation laws and sum rules in the heavy quark limit [Phys. Rev. D 53, 3998 (1996)]

Chi-Keung Chow and Dan Pirjol

[S0556-2821(97)06203-6]

PACS number(s): 12.39.Hg, 11.55.Hx, 12.38.Cy, 99.10.+g

The expression on the right-hand side of Eq. (3.6) should be divided by a factor of 4. The numerical value in Eq. (3.7) becomes correspondingly 4 times smaller. This change does not affect the main conclusions of the paper.

0556-2821/97/55(3)/1699(1)/$10.00