Correction to:
Microscopic and thermodynamic interpretations of experimental data on ionic conductivity in lithium silicate glasses
Marcio Luis Ferreira Nascimento,1,* Ana Candida Martins Rodrigues2 & Jean Louis Souquet2,†

The above paper appeared with several typographical errors and the incorrect Figure 5. The correct Figure 5 is placed below. The electronic version of the paper on the Ingenta website has been updated to incorporate all the corrections: http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/sgt/pcg/2010/00000051/00000001/art00006

I would like to apologise to all the authors, our readers and subscribers for these errors.

David Moore, Managing Editor

Figure 5. Activation energy (eV) calculated from data in Figure 1 as a function of the Li₂O molar ratio x. The dashed and dotted lines represent the activation energy calculated from the Anderson–Stuart model with a jump distance of λ=7 Å and λ=5·5 Å, respectively. The solid line represents the variation in activation energy calculated by the weak electrolyte approach, (Section 3.2). Note that, in this case, the absolute value may not be calculated. The solid line is adjusted to the experimental data by a translation in the coordinate axis.
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