

**Corrigendum to “Modeling of the planetary ball-milling process: The case study of ceramic powders” [J. Eur. Ceram. Soc. 36 (9) (2016) 2205–2212]**

M. Broseghini<sup>a</sup>, L. Gelisio<sup>a</sup>, M. D’Incau<sup>a,\*</sup>, C.L. Azanza Ricardo<sup>a</sup>, N.M. Pugno<sup>b,c,d</sup>, P. Scardi<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Civil, Environmental & Mechanical Engineering, University of Trento, via Mesiano, 77, 38123 Trento, Italy*

<sup>b</sup> *Department of Civil, Environmental & Mechanical Engineering, Laboratory of Bio-Inspired and Graphene Nanomechanics, University of Trento, via Mesiano, 77, 38123 Trento, Italy*

<sup>c</sup> *Center for Materials and Microsystems, Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Via Sommarive 18, 38123 Povo (Trento), Italy*

<sup>d</sup> *School of Engineering and Materials Science, Queen Mary University of London, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, United Kingdom*

*\* Corresponding author. E-mail address: [mirco.dincau@unitn.it](mailto:mirco.dincau@unitn.it)*

The authors regret that the parameter C reported in Eq. (8) is not correctly defined in the manuscript. Indeed, C is not the total number of collisions but rather the number of points sampling collisions during the simulation time period ( $t$ ) with mean output step size of  $\sim 1E-3$  (resulting from setting Msc. Adams software integrator parameters  $h_{max} = 1E-6$  and  $step = 100$ ). It should thus be stressed that the absolute scale for the power (named specific impact energy) used in Figs. 4–6, implicitly depends on the choice of the integrator parameters and therefore it is arbitrary and not directly comparable with power available in a real apparatus. The authors would like to apologise for any inconvenience caused.