ERRATA

Erratum: Short-time scaling behavior of growing interfaces [Phys. Rev. E 55, 668 (1997)]

Michael Krech

[S1063-651X(97)11006-6]

PACS number(s): 68.35.Fx, 64.60.Ht, 05.70.Ln, 05.40.+j, 99.10.+g

The transformation Eq. (1.10) of this paper, first established in Ref. [1], was generally believed to constitute an invariance transformation for the continuum model of ideal molecular-beam epitaxy (MBE) [2] given by Eq. (1.9) (see also Ref. [3] and references therein). In a recent Letter [4], however, it has been shown that this transformation is mathematically ill-defined and does *not* lead to the quoted invariance of Eq. (1.9). Therefore, several equations in the paper must be modified, but these modifications do not affect the short-time behavior of ideal MBE discussed in the paper.

The scaling relation $\alpha+z=4$ [1] quoted in the text between Eq. (1.10) and Eq. (1.11) is entirely based on Eq. (1.10) and therefore does not hold. As a consequence, the exponents α and z do *not* obey Eq. (1.11). However, as demonstrated in Ref. [4], Eq. (1.11) still yields a very good approximation for α and z as functions of the spatial dimension d. As a further consequence, Eq. (3.3), which is an extension of Eq. (1.10) in Fourier representation, also does not constitute an invariance of Eq. (1.9) and should be disregarded. Moreover, one has $\lambda_1^R=Z_{\lambda_1}\lambda_1\neq\lambda_1$ contrary to the statement made in the text between Eq. (3.3) and Eq. (3.4) and in Ref. [1]. Therefore, Eq. (3.6) has to be replaced by

$$Z_{\nu_1}=1+\frac{d-6}{d}\frac{u}{\varepsilon}+O(u^2),\quad Z_D=1,$$

$$Z_h=\widetilde{Z}_h=1,\quad Z_{g_1}=Z_{\lambda_1}^2Z_{\nu_1}^{-3},$$

and accordingly Eq. (3.7) has to be written in the form

$$\zeta_{\nu_1}(u)=\frac{d-6}{d}u+O(u^2),\quad \zeta_{\lambda_1}(u)=O(u^2),$$

$$\beta(u)=[d-4+2\zeta_{\lambda_1}(u)-3\zeta_{\nu_1}(u)]u.$$

The response functions given by Eqs. (C5) and (C14) are only correct to one-loop order. Due to scaling arguments, the leading finite-time correction in Eq. (C5) is given by the scaling argument $\mathbf{q}^2(t-t')^{2/z+1}/t$ rather than $\mathbf{q}^2(t-t')^2/t^{d/2}$ as quoted in the text following Eq. (C5) and in Sec. V. Likewise, the finite-time correction in Eq. (C14) is governed by the scaling argument $\mathbf{q}^4(t-t')^{4/z+1}/t$ rather than $\mathbf{q}^4(t-t')^2/t^{d/4}$ as quoted in the text following Eq. (C14) and Sec. V. Finally, the relation $(\partial/\partial t')C^R(\mathbf{0},t,t'=0)=2D^R$ quoted in the text following Eq. (C9) does not hold, so that Eq. (C9) gives a quite realistic (rather than only a rough) idea of the true scaling form of C^R for $\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{0}$.

[1] T. Sun, H. Guo, and M. Grant, Phys. Rev. A **40,** 6763 (1989).
[2] Z.W. Lai and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66,** 2348 (1991).
[3] A.-L. Barabasi and H.E. Stanley, *Fractal Concepts in Surface Growth* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1995).
[4] H.K. Janssen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78,** 1082 (1997).

