

Correction to Orientation of Phenylphosphonic Acid Self-Assembled Monolayers on a Transparent Conductive Oxide: A Combined NEXAFS, PM-IRRAS, and DFT Study

Matthew Gliboff, Lingzi Sang, Kristina M. Knesting, Matthew C. Schalnatz, Anoma Mudalige, Erin L. Ratcliff, Hong Li, Ajaya K. Sigdel, Anthony J. Giordano, Joseph J. Berry, Dennis Nordlund, Gerald T. Seidler, Jean-Luc Brédas, Seth R. Marder, Jeanne E. Pemberton,* and David S. Ginger*

Langmuir 2013, 29(7), 2166–2174. 10.1021/la304594t

In the Results and Discussion section, there are several instances where α and ϕ have been inadvertently interchanged in the text. The data were processed using the correct definitions, eq 4 and Figure 1 are correct, and the conclusions remain unaffected. However, for consistency throughout the Article, α should always be the orientation of the molecular dipole moment relative to the surface normal, and ϕ is the angle that the incoming X-rays make with the surface normal. The following typographical errors may confuse the reader:

On page 2168, α is given as the incident X-ray angle. ϕ is the incident X-ray angle.

On page 2169, (1) the angle that the transition dipole moment makes with the surface normal is given erroneously as ϕ . α is the angle between the molecular dipole moment and the surface normal. (2) α is again referenced incorrectly as the incident X-ray angle. (3) The sample curves given by dotted lines in Figure 1b are plots of $I_v(\phi)$ (eq 4) for values of $\alpha = 0$ – 90° in 10° steps. The orientation of the phenyl ring normal is correct but is incorrectly referred to in the text as ϕ (although the figure notation is correct). The best fit of $I_v(\phi)$ to the data in Figure 1b yields the result $\alpha = 77 \pm 5^\circ$.