

## Corrigendum: Fabrication and heating rate study of microscopic surface electrode ion traps

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

2012 New J. Phys. 14 079504

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/1367-2630/14/7/079504>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 131.215.220.186

The article was downloaded on 24/08/2012 at 15:41

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

## Corrigendum: Fabrication and heating rate study of microscopic surface electrode ion traps

2011 *New J. Phys.* **13** 013032

**N Daniilidis<sup>1,2</sup>, S Narayanan<sup>1,2</sup>, S A Möller<sup>1,2</sup>, R Clark<sup>2,3</sup>,  
T E Lee<sup>4</sup>, P J Leek<sup>5</sup>, A Wallraff<sup>5</sup>, St Schulz<sup>3</sup>, F Schmidt-Kaler<sup>6</sup>  
and H Häffner<sup>1,7</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

<sup>2</sup> Institut für Quantenoptik and Quanteninformation, Innsbruck, Austria

<sup>3</sup> Center for Ultracold Atoms, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA

<sup>4</sup> Department of Physics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

<sup>5</sup> Department of Physics, ETH Zürich, CH-8093 Zürich, Switzerland

<sup>6</sup> Universität Mainz, QUANTUM, D-55128 Mainz, Germany

<sup>7</sup> Materials Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

E-mail: [hhaeffner@berkeley.edu](mailto:hhaeffner@berkeley.edu)

*New Journal of Physics* **14** (2012) 079504 (1pp)

Received 19 June 2012

Published 31 July 2012

Online at <http://www.njp.org/>

doi:10.1088/1367-2630/14/7/079504

It was brought to our attention that the values plotted in figure 5 are inconsistent with our measured heating rates in figure 4. This is due to a numerical error in obtaining the  $\omega S_E$  values for our trap, which are plotted in figure 5. The correct values are  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  and  $5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ (V m)}^{-2}$ , respectively, corresponding to the stated 5 and 50  $\text{ph ms}^{-1}$  in figure 4. This change does not alter the main conclusions of the paper. We would like to acknowledge Michael Brownnutt and Guido Wilpers for bringing this inconsistency to our attention.