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PACS 99.10.Cd – Errata

Copyright © EPLA, 2009

After the publication of this article, the authors realized that the example in fig. 1(c) for the illustration of $Q$ and $D$ violating the most weak community definition was inaccurate and only worked well for $D$. The correct figure for this example should be as follows:

![Corrected Figure 1(c)](attachment:corrected_figure_1c.png)

Fig. 1: (Colour on-line) Examples on which optimization of $Q$ or $D$ violates the weak or most weak community definition.

Accordingly, the description for this example on page 2, right column, lines 19–21, \textit{i.e.}

“where $Q$ (respectively, $D$) partitions the network into three communities (two $K_n$ and one $K_5$) when $n \geq 16$ (respectively, $n \geq 21$)”

should read:

“where $Q$ (respectively, $D$) partitions the network into three communities ($K_n$, $K_{n-1}$ and $K_5$) when $n \geq 13$ (respectively, $n \geq 21$)”.

The authors apologize for any confusion this may have caused.
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