## Erratum

O.G. Berg and C. Blomberg, Association kinetics with coupled diffusion III. Ionic-strength dependence of the lac repressor-operator association, Biophys. Chem. 8 (1978) 271.

Eq. (3.10) has lost a factor  $\rho^{-1}$  in both integrals; they should read:

$$\frac{\dots \int_{\rho}^{R_{c}} \rho^{-1} \exp \dots}{\dots \int_{h}^{R_{c}} \rho^{-1} \exp \dots}$$
(3.10)

Eq. (4.2), the last equality should have  $\lambda$  substituted by  $\Lambda$  giving:

$$k_{\rm a} = \dots = \frac{1}{1 + n_0/K_{\rm c}} \frac{\Lambda}{K_{\rm c}} \left[ (\Lambda L^2/D_1)^{1/2} \coth(\Lambda L^2/D_1)^{1/2} - 1 \right]^{-1} .$$
 (4.2)

Eq. (4.3) has lost a power -1 at the end. It should read:

$$\Lambda = \dots = \lambda \left\{ bk \exp[-V(b)/k_{\rm B}T] \int_{b}^{R_{\rm c}} \rho^{-1} \exp[V(\rho)/k_{\rm B}T] \, \mathrm{d}\rho + 1 \right\}^{-1}. \tag{4.3}$$

Moreover, some statements in the paragraph following eq. (4.4) are inaccurate: The increase in the screening length *does not* provide a more efficient reflection in the potential and thereby it *cannot* provide a more efficient channelling along the chain, in contrast to the statements made. However, it remains true that: decreasing ionic strength decrease the value of the integral in eq. (4.4). This effect increases the unspecific dissociation rate  $\Lambda$ , eq. (4.3), which in turn increases the specific association rate  $k_a$ , eq. (4.2).