ERRATA

Information-Theoretic Bell Inequalities. SAMUEL L. BRAUNSTEIN and CARLTON M. CAVES [Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 662 (1988)].

The reference list should be extended to include the work of Garg and Mermin,[12] who derived a generalized Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt inequality for spin-s particles. They showed that the quantum-mechanical predictions for a state of zero total spin violate their inequality for all angles $\theta \leq 180°$ and for all values of the spin.

[12]A. Garg and N. D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. D **27**, 339 (1983).

Calculations for Ni-like Soft X-Ray Lasers: Optimization for W (43.1 Å). S. MAXON, S. DALHED, P. L. HAGELSTEIN, R. A. LONDON, B. J. MACGOWAN, M. D. ROSEN, G. CHARATIS, and G. BUSCH [Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 236 (1989)].

In the abstract, and in the second paragraph of the first column and the first paragraph of the second column on page 238, 2.3×10^{14} should be replaced by 4.6×10^{14}.

In the last sentence of the first paragraph of the second column on page 238, 4.6×10^{14} should be replaced by 9.2×10^{14} W/cm^2.

In the first paragraph of the second column on page 236, 1.9×10^{15} should be replaced by 1.0×10^{15}.

Reference 4 should read Richard A. London, Mordecai D. Rosen, and James E. Trebes, Appl. Opt. **28**, 3397 (1989).

Theory for the Atomic Force Microscopy of Deformable Surfaces. D. TOMÁNEK, G. OVERNEY, H. MIYAZAKI, S. D. MAHANTI, and H. J. GÜNTHERODT [Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 876 (1989)].

Equation (4) should read

$$L(\mathbf{q}) = \tfrac{1}{2}\{X(\mathbf{q}) - [X^2(\mathbf{q}) - 4]^{1/2}\} \tag{4}$$

and Eq. (7) should read

$$w_n(\mathbf{q}) = -f_t \frac{L(\mathbf{q})^{n-1}}{q^4 + 2\delta q^2 + 1 - L(\mathbf{q})}. \tag{7}$$

The results presented in the Letter have been obtained using the correct equations.

Virtual Photoconductivity. E. YABLONOVITCH, J. P. HERITAGE, D. E. ASPNES, and Y. YAFET [Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 976 (1989)].

The derivative in Eq. (3) should have been taken with respect to $E^*(\omega_0)$ rather than $E(\omega_0)$.

The denominator in Eq. (9) should have had the factor $24\pi^2$ rather than $32\pi^2$. Therefore the numerical evaluations of the virtual photoconductivity, and the comparisons with ordinary photoconductivity and virtual-excitonic response given later in the paper, underestimate its magnitude by $\frac{4}{3}$.