ERRATA

Erratum: Action at a distance as a full-value solution of Maxwell equations: The basis and application of the separated-potentials method [Phys. Rev. E 53, 5373 (1996)]

Andrew E. Chubykalo and Roman Smirnov-Rueda

[S1063-651X(97)02203-4]

PACS number(s): 03.50.De, 03.50.Kk, 99.10.+g

Following Eq. (1), the third line, instead of ''We shall see that formula (1) does not satisfy ... '' must be ''We shall see that formula (1) *satisfies* D'Alembert's equation along the X axis at any time. To begin with, we note that in a free space along the X axis (except the site of a charge) an electric field component E_x satisfies the homogeneous wave equation:''

Equation (7) was in error.

Following Eq. (6), beginning with ''As a result of ... '' and ending with '' ... , solution (1) is compatible with (2)'' should be replaced by ''As a result of the substitution of (5) into (2), one obtains zero (y, y_0, z, z_0 approach zero after the differentiation). The fact that (5) satisfies (2) shows that along the X axis longitudinal electromagnetic waves appear. This is in contradiction to the generally accepted point of view that these waves do not exist in a vacuum.''

These errata do not influence the results and conclusions of the paper.

1063-651X/97/55(3)/3793(1)/$10.00

Erratum: Nonlinear analysis of the coupling between interface deflection and hexagonal patterns in Rayleigh-Bénard-Marangoni convection [Phys. Rev. E 53, 5982 (1996)]

Layachi Hadji

[S1063-651X(97)08103-8]

PACS number(s): 47.20.Bp, 47.20.Dr, 47.54.+r, 47.27.Te, 99.10.+g

The results of the analysis of the interface deflection shown in Tables I(b) and II are incorrect owing to a sign error in Eq. (3.8), which should start as $p = GP\eta + (R/2)\ldots$ with the equal sign replaced by a minus sign. Thus, the signs in front of $\hat{G}\hat{P}\zeta$ in Eqs. (3.22) should be positive. The expressions for the pressure, Eqs. (3.30), should have a minus sign in front of the terms containing $1/C$ ($\hat{G}$ should be $\hat{P}\hat{G}$); the expressions for the interface deflection, Eqs. (3.32), should have a minus sign in front of the term $(1/\hat{C})\nabla_h^2\zeta$. The results of the analysis of the interface deflection shown in Tables I(b) and II should be replaced with those in Tables I(a) and III, respectively. The denominator in Eqs. (4.9) and (4.10) should read $\hat{G}\hat{C}\hat{P}+1$, thus precluding the resonance condition, Eq. (5.4), from occurring.

