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An erroneous equation and some consequently underestimated values of dislocation densities in the paper by Černý et al. [J. Appl. Cryst. (2000), 33, 997-1005] are corrected.

In the paper by Cerný et al. (2000), equation (4) on page 998 was erroneously interpreted and used in the calculations. The correct equation is

$$
A=[1-\ln (\ln P) /(4 \ln P)]^{-1} .
$$

The only consequence of this error is that some values of the dislocation densities as given in Table 2 and Fig. 3 of that paper are slightly underestimated. Correct values of the dislocation densities

## addenda and errata

Table 1
Corrected dislocation densities.

| Compound | $\rho\left(10^{11} \mathrm{~cm}^{-2}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{5}$ | $3.8(4)$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{4.25} \mathrm{Co}_{0.75}$ | $3.9(3)$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{3} \mathrm{Co}_{2}$ | $0.52(4)$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{4.6} \mathrm{Mn}_{0.4}$ | $2.7(3), P=3$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{4} \mathrm{Mn}$ | $3.8(3), P=3$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{4.9} \mathrm{Al}_{0.1}$ | $1.6(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{4.7} \mathrm{Al}_{0.3}$ | $0.29(5), P=3$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{3.55} \mathrm{Co}_{0.75} \mathrm{Mn}_{0.4}$ | $0.62(9), P=3$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{3.95} \mathrm{Co}_{0.75} \mathrm{Al}_{0.3}$ | $0.045(7), P=3$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{4.3} \mathrm{Mn}_{0.4} \mathrm{Al}_{0.3}$ | $1.1(1), P=3$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{3.4} \mathrm{Co}_{0.36} \mathrm{Mn}_{0.4} \mathrm{Al}_{0.3}$ | $1.7(3), P=3$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{3.5} \mathrm{Co}_{0.75} \mathrm{Mn}_{0.4} \mathrm{Al}_{0.3}$ | $0.17(1), P=3$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{4} \mathrm{Fe}^{2}$ | $1.7(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{4} \mathrm{Cu}^{2}$ | $0.35(4), P=3$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{4.5} \mathrm{Sn}_{0.5}$ | $0.06(1), P=3$ |
| $\mathrm{La}_{0.5} \mathrm{Ce}_{0.5} \mathrm{Ni}_{5}$ | $5.1(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{LaNi}_{5.2}$ | $3.0(1)$ |

for all studied compounds are given in Table 1 herein. The value for $\mathrm{LaNi}_{5}$ is, however, still lower by one order of magnitude than the value determined for the same compound by Wu et al. (1998).
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