
Page 3319. One of the authors’ names was incorrectly printed as G. Maron. The correct spelling is G. Marom.

Page 3323. Discussion about the TEM image in Figure 8. As for the decorated fibrous crystal networks in between the big crystal lamellae, although these appear to look like the classic “shish-kebab” crystal, the lack of significant stress during the formation of the structure made it unlikely that these are real shish-kebabs, as tentatively suggested in the paper. It is more probable that they are immature lamellae formed by the chains with lower molecular weight which were rejected from the larger crystalline lamellae during crystallization.


The labels of the curves in Figure 8 are incorrect. Below is the correct labeling and caption for Figure 8.

Figure 8. Dashed line shows the predicted Lam−Hex phase boundaries computed using the PIL, upper-bound (leftmost boundary), and UCA, lower-bound (rightmost boundary), approximations for the SST Hex phase. The solid line is the Lam−Hex boundary computed using the SST results of section III. The dotted lines are the Hex−BCC phase boundaries by comparing the PIL, upper-bound (leftmost), and UCA, lower-bound (rightmost), SST results for those morphologies. For comparison the \( \gamma N \approx 100 \) SCFT results for the Lam−Hex boundary are shown as diamonds, \( \bigcirc \), and the BCC−Hex boundary are shown as open circles, \( \triangle \).
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