Erratum: From graphene to graphite: A general tight-binding approach for nanoribbon carrier transport [Phys. Rev. B 76, 121405(R) (2007)]

Daniel Finkenstadt,* G. Pennington, and M. J. Mehl
(Received 18 December 2007; published 14 January 2008)

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevB.77.049902 PACS number(s): 73.61.Wp, 71.15.−m, 73.20.At, 73.23.−b, 99.10.Cd

In our paper we misstated that, "semiclassical transport is applicable when the carrier mean free path between scattering events is much larger than the ribbon length L." The correct statement is that "semiclassical transport is applicable when the mean free path between scattering events is much *smaller* than the ribbon length L."

We also miswrote our final expression for the nanoribbon conductance G. The correct expression is[1]

$$G[n] = \frac{en}{\hbar FL}\frac{\sum_k f_k[n]\partial_k \varepsilon_k}{\sum_k f_k[n]} = \frac{env_F}{FL}\frac{\sum_k sgn(k) f_k[n]\left(1+\frac{\varepsilon_{gap}^2}{4\hbar^2 v_F^2 k^2}\right)^{-1/2}}{\sum_k f_k[n]}.$$

Our simulated nanoribbon conductance data relied on the first, more fundamental expression, which sums over $\partial_k \varepsilon_k$ using the band data directly. The second expression, which assumes our parameterized model in ε_{gap} and v_F from Eq. (2), should have included the exponent $-1/2$ on the band-gap dependent term. Since we actually use the first expression in our numerical work, the rest of the paper is correct, and our conclusions remain the same.

*daniel.kris@gmail.com

[1] G. Pennington and N. Goldsman, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 045426 (2003); G. Pennington, N. Goldsman, A. Akturk, and A. E. Wickenden, Appl. Phys. Lett. **90**, 062110 (2007).

