

## You may also like

Erratum: An Analysis of Solid-State Electrodeposition-Induced Metal Plastic Flow and Predictions of Stress States in Solid Ionic Conductor Defects [*J. Electrochem. Soc.*, **167**, <u>020534 (2020)</u>]

To cite this article: Luis Barroso-Luque et al 2020 J. Electrochem. Soc. 167 089005

View the article online for updates and enhancements.

- Status of CORC<sup>®</sup> cables and wires for use in high-field magnets and power systems a decade after their introduction
  D C van der Laan, J D Weiss and D M McRae
- <u>Evaluation of inductive heating energy of</u> <u>ITER toroidal field conductor by</u> <u>calorimetry</u> H Ozeki, T Suwa, T Saito et al.
- <u>Novel technologies and configurations of</u> <u>superconducting magnets for MRI</u> Yuri Lvovsky, Ernst Wolfgang Stautner and Tao Zhang



This content was downloaded from IP address 3.12.71.237 on 07/05/2024 at 19:49



[2]

## Erratum: An Analysis of Solid-State Electrodeposition-Induced Metal Plastic Flow and Predictions of Stress States in Solid Ionic Conductor Defects [*J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 167, 020534 (2020)]

## Luis Barroso-Luque,<sup>1</sup> Qingsong Tu,<sup>1</sup> and Gerbrand Ceder<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Materials Science and Engineering University of California Berkeley, CA, United States of America <sup>2</sup>Materials Sciences Division Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory Berkeley, CA, United States of America

© 2020 The Electrochemical Society ("ECS"). Published on behalf of ECS by IOP Publishing Limited. [DOI: 10.1149/1945-7111/ ab904d] Published May 13, 2020.

follows,

1. Equation 4 in the text and in Table I has two wrong minus signs in the publication. It should read,

$$\sigma_e = \frac{E\nu}{(1+\nu)(1-2\nu)} \operatorname{tr}(\epsilon_e) \mathbb{I} + \frac{E}{1+\nu} \epsilon_e$$
[1]

 $(1 + \nu)(1 - 2\nu)$   $1 + \nu$ This term is eventually neglected as described in the publication and thus does not affect the subsequent analysis and results.

2. Equation 9 in the text and in Table I, is missing a factor of 2 and should involve the strain rate tensor  $\dot{\epsilon}_p$ . It is correctly stated as

This mistype does not affect our results since the factor of 2 is correctly accounted for in our simplification of the above equation (Eq. 17). We reproduce Eq. 17 for reference,

 $-\nabla P + 2\nabla \cdot \eta \dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_p = 0.$ 

$$-\nabla P + \eta \nabla^2 \dot{\boldsymbol{u}} = 0$$
 [3]

