Correction to: Computational Verification of the Optimum Boundary Condition of the Brazilian Tensile Test

R. Gutiérrez-Moizant¹ · M. Ramírez-Berasategui¹ · S. Santos-Cuadros¹ · C. García-Fernández²

Published online: 5 September 2018

© Springer-Verlag GmbH Austria, part of Springer Nature 2018

Correction to: Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00603-018-1553-7>

An erratum has been detected in the units of the Young's modulus of Tables 5 and 6. The units should be in GPa and not in MPa. The results obtained are correct, since the error has only been made when writing the units in the aforementioned tables. The corrected tables are presented below (Tables 5, 6).

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00603-018-1553-7>.

✉ R. Gutiérrez-Moizant
ragutier@ing.uc3m.es

¹ Mechanical Engineering Department, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Avenida de la Universidad no 30, 28911 Leganés, Madrid, Spain

² Department of Mining Exploitation and Prospecting, Universidad de Oviedo, 33004 Oviedo, Asturias, Spain

Table 5 Results of the statistical comparison of the 2^2 factorial design for $2\alpha=20^\circ$ and $\mu=0$

Material	E (GPa)	ν ($\mu\epsilon/\mu\epsilon$)	P (N)	σ_{G_FEM} (MPa)	σ_G (MPa)	$ \sigma_G - \sigma_{G_FEM} $ (MPa)	$k_p \cdot u(\sigma_G)$ (MPa)	I_C
Mat_0	30	0.31	10,159	4.245	4.31	0.065	0.07	0.93
Mat_1	70	0.31		4.244		0.066		0.95
Mat_2	70	0.20		4.244		0.066		0.95
Mat_3	30	0.20		4.246		0.064		0.92
Mat_4	90	0.31		4.240		0.070		1.00
Mat_5	50	0.25		4.241		0.069		0.98

Table 6 Results of the statistical comparison of the 2^2 factorial design for $2\alpha=20^\circ$ and $\mu=0.75$

Material	E (GPa)	ν ($\mu\epsilon/\mu\epsilon$)	P (N)	σ_{G_FEM} (MPa)	σ_G (MPa)	$ \sigma_G - \sigma_{G_FEM} $ (MPa)	$k_p \cdot u(\sigma_G)$ (MPa)	I_C
Mat_0	30	0.31	10,095	4.13	4.25	0.12	0.07	1.66
Mat_1	70	0.31		4.17		0.08		1.11
Mat_2	70	0.20		4.15		0.10		1.40
Mat_3	30	0.20		4.12		0.13		1.81
Mat_4	90	0.31		4.18		0.07		1.00
Mat_5	50	0.25		4.15		0.10		1.43