Erratum: Kinematic diffraction is insufficient to distinguish order from disorder [Phys. Rev. B 79, 020203(R) (2009)]

Michael Baake[*] and Uwe Grimm[†]

In our paper, three mistakes crept into the recursion relations for the coefficients a_m and b_m in Sec. III. This concerns the expressions for a_{4m}, a_{4m+3}, and b_{4m+2}. For convenience, we state the complete set of (corrected) equations,

$$a_{4m} = \frac{1 + (-1)^m}{2} a_m, \quad a_{4m+2} = 0,$$

$$a_{4m+1} = \frac{1 - (-1)^m}{4} a_m + \frac{(-1)^m}{4} b_m - \frac{1}{4} b_{m+1},$$

$$a_{4m+3} = \frac{1 + (-1)^m}{4} a_{m+1} - \frac{(-1)^m}{4} b_m + \frac{1}{4} b_{m+1},$$

and

$$b_{4m} = 0, \quad b_{4m+2} = \frac{(-1)^m}{2} b_m + \frac{1}{2} b_{m+1},$$

$$b_{4m+1} = \frac{1 - (-1)^m}{4} a_m - \frac{(-1)^m}{4} b_m + \frac{1}{4} b_{m+1},$$

$$b_{4m+3} = - \frac{1 + (-1)^m}{4} a_{m+1} - \frac{(-1)^m}{4} b_m + \frac{1}{4} b_{m+1}.$$

Our further arguments were based on these equations, and thus remain valid. In particular, the equations imply $b_1 = b_{-1} = 0$ as well as $a_1 = a_{-1} = 0$. The recursion then deals with all other coefficients as stated in the original paper.

---

[*]mbaake@math.uni-bielefeld.de
[†]u.g.grimm@open.ac.uk