

UC Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara Previously Published Works

Title

Correction to “Stacking Faults Assist Lithium-Ion Conduction in a Halide-Based Superionic Conductor”

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5fp32043>

Journal

Journal of the American Chemical Society, 147(10)

ISSN

0002-7863

Authors

Sebti, Elias

Evans, Hayden A

Chen, Hengning

et al.

Publication Date

2025-03-12

DOI

10.1021/jacs.5c02447

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Correction to “Stacking Faults Assist Lithium-Ion Conduction in a Halide-Based Superionic Conductor”

Elias Sebti, Hayden A. Evans, Hengning Chen, Peter M. Richardson, Kelly M. White, Raynald Giovine, Krishna Prasad Koirala, Yaobin Xu, Eliovardo Gonzalez-Correa, Chongmin Wang, Craig M. Brown, Anthony K. Cheetham, Pieremanuele Canepa,* and Raphaële J. Clément*

J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2022**, *144*, 13, 5795–5811. DOI: [10.1021/jacs.1c11335](https://doi.org/10.1021/jacs.1c11335)



Cite This: *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2025**, *147*, 9000–9000



Read Online

ACCESS |

Metrics & More

Article Recommendations

Summary of corrections: A typographical error needs to be corrected in the Results section, subsection “2.5. Evaluation of Li⁺ Ion Conduction Properties”, fourth paragraph, where the activation energy barriers derived from PFG-NMR were swapped for components 1 and 2, for both BM-LYC and SS-LYC. The same error should also be corrected in the second paragraph of the Discussion section.

Page 5804, left column: “The derived activation energies for ion migration in BM-LYC are 0.25 ± 0.01 eV and 0.18 ± 0.03 eV (all confidence intervals listed are 1σ) for components 1 and 2, respectively. For SS-LYC, these are 0.57 ± 0.09 eV and 0.48 ± 0.1 eV.”

The new version should read: “The derived activation energies for ion migration in BM-LYC are 0.18 ± 0.03 eV and 0.25 ± 0.01 eV (all confidence intervals listed are 1σ) for components 1 and 2, respectively. For SS-LYC, these are 0.48 ± 0.1 eV and 0.57 ± 0.09 eV.”

This error propagates in the second paragraph of the Discussion section, page 5805, left column: “Since *c*-axis conduction usually has a lower migration barrier, component 1 is assigned to diffusion along the *c*-axis and component 2 to *ab*-plane diffusion. For the ball milled sample, both components exhibit much lower activation energy barriers than that of bulk Li⁺ conduction measured by EIS (0.25 ± 0.01 eV and 0.18 ± 0.03 eV vs 0.41 ± 0.006 eV).”

The correct version is “Since *c*-axis conduction usually has a lower migration barrier, component 1 is assigned to diffusion along the *c*-axis and component 2 to *ab*-plane diffusion. For the ball milled sample, both components exhibit much lower activation energy barriers than that of bulk Li⁺ conduction measured by EIS (0.18 ± 0.03 eV and 0.25 ± 0.01 eV vs 0.41 ± 0.006 eV).”

The conclusions of the study are not affected by these changes.

Published: February 28, 2025

