Corrigendum


Jee Ian Tam a, Philip Holmes a,b,*
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b Program in Applied and Computational Mathematics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

It has come to our attention that certain numerical parameter values quoted in the above-referenced paper are incorrect. Corrected versions of the relevant passages appear below. We apologize for any inconvenience occasioned for readers by these errors, which were inadvertently introduced by the second author in preparing the manuscript.

Section 2, second paragraph (p. 1768):
“... free beam length \( L = 108.8 \pm 0.5 \text{ mm} \) ...”

Section 2, third paragraph (p. 1768):
“Two cylindrical rare earth magnets of radius \( r = 12.7 \text{ mm} \), height \( h = 6.35 \text{ mm} \) ...”

Section 3.2, second paragraph (p. 1770):
“... \( \chi = 10^2 \) [19] is the estimated volumetric magnetic susceptibility of the beam material, ...”

Section 3.2, third paragraph (p. 1770):
“... a Cartesian grid with spatial length scale \( 10^{-6} \text{ mm} \).”

Section 4.1, foot of p. 1771:
“... resulting in \( \zeta = 0.173 \pm 0.005 \) and \( f_0 = 17.9 \pm 0.3 \text{ Hz} \) ... The corresponding value of \( \delta = 6.20 \pm 0.2 \).”

Section 4.2, first paragraph (p. 1772):
“... equilibria lie at \( -10 \pm 0.2 \text{ mm} \) and \( +9.8 \pm 0.2 \text{ mm} \).”

We also note that the undamped natural frequency \( f_0 = 17.81 \text{ Hz} \), quoted on p. 1771, was obtained using slightly more precise figures for beam thickness, density, and Young’s modulus than those quoted in Section 2, namely: \( \Delta = 2.54 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m} \), \( \rho = 7833 \text{ kg m}^{-3} \), and \( E = 2.06843 \times 10^{11} \text{ Pa} \).

Using the values given in the paper, \( \Delta = 2.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m} \), \( \rho = 7830 \text{ kg m}^{-3} \), and \( E = 2.06 \times 10^{11} \text{ Pa} \), yields \( f_0 = 17.50 \text{ Hz} \).