

Correction to “Conformation, Defects, and Dynamics of a Discotic Liquid Crystal and Their Influence on Charge Transport”

Lucas A. Haverkate, Mohamed Zbiri, Mark R. Johnson, Bruno Deme, Fokko M. Mulder,* and Gordon J. Kearley

J. Phys. Chem. B **2011**, *115*, 13809–13816. DOI: 10.1021/jp2068478

It has been brought to our attention by the authors De Haas and Warman of ref 16¹ in our paper that the value that we cite from their paper for the charge carrier mobility in the liquid crystalline phase of HAT6 ($1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ cm}^2/(\text{V s})$) is incorrect. The actual value given in reference 16 and in a review of charge transport in discotic materials² is $2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ cm}^2/(\text{V s})$. This is a factor of 200 smaller than the value of $0.4 \text{ cm}^2/(\text{V s})$ for the hexabenzocoronene compound HBC-C₁₂² rather than a factor of 4000 based on the erroneous value for HAT6.

The two main factors contributing to the difference in intracolumnar charge transport between the two compounds are the intercore distance distribution and the reorganization energy. As described in the discussion section of our paper, the former effect would be expected to result in a decrease in the mobility by approximately 100 in going from HBC-C₁₂ to HAT6, while the latter effect should contribute less than an order of magnitude. The factor of 200 found, using the correct mobility value for HAT6, is therefore now seen to be in good agreement with these combined estimates, strengthening the conclusion in the paper that the disorder in core–core distances is a main factor contributing to the limited conductivity of HAT6 compared to larger DLCs such as HBC-C₁₂.

■ REFERENCES

- (1) Van de Craats, A. M.; De Haas, M. P.; Warman, J. M. *Synth. Met.* **1997**, *86*, 2125–2126.
- (2) Van de Craats, A. M.; Warman, J. M. *Mol. Cryst. Liq. Cryst.* **2003**, *396*, 41–72.