Corrigendum
Studies concerning charged nickel hydroxide electrodes. II. Thermodynamic considerations of the reversible potentials

R. BARNARD, C. F. RANDELL, F. L. TYE

Berec Group Ltd, Group Technical Centre, St Ann's Road, London, UK
J. Appl. Electrochem. **10** (1980) 127.

Equation 9 on p. 129 should read:

$$\ln \gamma_y = \frac{A}{RT}(1 - x_y)^2. \qquad (9)$$

On pp. 131 and 132, the subscripts u and v need transposing: p. 131, last line, should read $x_v = 0.07$; p. 132, first line, should read $x_u = 0.93$ and p. 132, fifth paragraph, lines 2 and 3, should read ... values of x_v of 0.25 and x_u of 0.75.

The authors thank Dr K. Micka (J. Heyrovsky Institute) for pointing out an error concerning the value for S/L given in the paper on p. 136. The value of S/L used in deriving Figs. 6 and 7 was fixed at 1.7×10^4 cm and not 10^3 cm as stated previously. The final statement regarding the S/L term (2nd paragraph, p. 137) should read: for example, if S/L were increased to 1.7×10^6 the minimum oxidation state could be lowered to 2.1.

There is also some ambiguity regarding the sign of η required in Equations 46, 48 and 49. The sign of η as given on the horizontal axis of Fig. 6 w.r.t. β-Ni(OH)$_2$/β-NiOOH must be reversed before using it in the conductivity equations. This arises because the sign of the potential difference across the conductivity cell is opposite to the arbitrarily defined electrochemical overpotential. This factor has been taken into account in deriving Figs. 6 and 7 in the paper.