
ERRATA

Erratum: Polarization spectra of excited-state-Mg($3p$)–rare-gas-atom optical collisions
[Phys. Rev. A 50, 423 (1994)]

R. A. Lasell, D. A. Olsgaard, M. D. Havey, and Dmitriy V. Kuprianov

[S1050-2947(98)08307-3]

PACS number(s): 33.80.Gj, 33.80.Wz, 34.30.+h, 99.10.+g

In this paper there is an omission in the author line. The author line should read R. A. Lasell, D. A. Olsgaard, S. B. Bayram, M. D. Havey, and Dmitriy V. Kuprianov.

1050-2947/98/58(1)/779(1)/\$15.00

© 1998 The American Physical Society

Erratum: Time-dependent close-coupling calculations
of correlated photoionization processes in helium
[Phys. Rev. A 57, 318 (1998)]

M. S. Pindzola and F. Robicieux

[S1050-2947(98)03107-2]

PACS number(s): 32.80.Fb, 99.10.+g

In this paper we calculated various correlated photoionization processes in helium by direct solution of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation. In Tables II through V we compared our theoretical results with various recent experiments. In all the tables we took the ratio of the specific correlated photoionization process to the single photoionization of helium leaving the atom in the $n=1$ ground state. However, this ratio is not the one measured in the double photoionization experiments. Thus, we have corrected Tables IV and V by calculating the ratio of the correlated double photoionization process to the single photoionization of helium, leaving the atom in any of the $n=1, 2$, and 3 bound states. The agreement between theory and experiment has noticeably improved.

TABLE IV. Ratio of double photoionization to single photoionization for helium.

ω	TDCC $\Delta r=0.2$	TDCC $\Delta r=0.1$	Experiment [6] (error)	Experiment [7] (error)
90.0 eV	1.93%	1.55%	2.45% (0.04)	1.66% (0.02)
120.0 eV	3.64%	3.33%	3.66% (0.13)	3.26% (0.03)
140.0 eV	3.99%	3.72%	3.91% (0.05)	3.70% (0.03)
160.0 eV	4.20%	3.89%	4.14% (0.06)	3.89% (0.03)
190.0 eV	4.20%	3.96%	4.20% (0.05)	3.97% (0.04)

TABLE V. Ratio of double photoionization to single photoionization for helium.

ω	TDCC $\Delta r=0.2$	TDCC $\Delta r=0.1$	Experiment [8] (error)
90.0 eV	1.93%	1.55%	1.40% (0.05)
100.0 eV	2.79%	2.44%	2.28% (0.05)
130.0 eV	3.84%	3.56%	3.23% (0.07)
175.0 eV	4.20%	3.95%	3.70% (0.07)
200.0 eV	4.28%	3.95%	3.60% (0.08)

Erratum: Evanescent light-wave atomic funnel: A tandem hollow-fiber, hollow-beam approach [Phys. Rev. A 57, 1957 (1998)]

Jianping Yin, Yifu Zhu, and Yuzhu Wang

[S1050-2947(98)02207-0]

PACS number(s): 32.80.Pj, 32.80.Lg, 39.10.+j, 42.50.Vk, 99.10.+g

There is a typographical error in the expression for the electrical-field distribution of the LP_{01} mode in a hollow optical fiber presented in Ref. [1]. The subscript ‘‘1’’ of Bessel functions in Eq. (1) should be replaced by ‘‘0’’ and ‘‘exp($i\theta$)’’ in Eq. (1) should be deleted. Therefore, Eq. (1) should read

$$E_i(r, \theta) = \begin{cases} AI_0(vr), & r < a \\ BJ_0(ur) + CY_0(ur), & a \leq r \leq b \\ DK_0(wr), & b < r, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where J_0 and Y_0 are the zeroth-order Bessel functions of the first and second kind, respectively, whereas I_0 and K_0 are the modified zeroth-order Bessel functions of the first and second kind. Then Eq. (2) should read

$$E(r, \theta, z) = c' \left\{ \int_0^a Ar_1 I_0(vr_1) J_1(2\pi r_1 \rho) e^{ikr_1^2/2Z} dr_1 + \int_a^b r_1 [BJ_0(ur_1) + CY_0(ur_1)] J_1(2\pi r_1 \rho) e^{ikr_1^2/2Z} dr_1 + \int_b^\infty Dr_1 K_0(wr_1) J_1(2\pi r_1 \rho) e^{ikr_1^2/2Z} dr_1 \right\}. \quad (2)$$

[1] Jianping Yin, Yifu Zhu, and Yuzhu Wang, Phys. Rev. A 57, 1957 (1998).