used in the experiment, so that absence of a spinorbit contribution was to be expected.

The present note reports new results for the MCP of F-center emission in KCl and an unsuccessful attempt to observe the spin-orbit contribution under different conditions.

The 5145-Å line of a cw argon-ion laser was used to excite the F emission in KCl. The laser power measured at the sample location was about 30 mW, implying a pumping rate of 500-1000 sec⁻¹ for the F-center concentration typical of our measurements. The MCP signal obtained for excitation with unpolarized laser light consisted of a zero-moment change of the F band, very similar to that observed for KF. The signal increased linearly with magnetic field, and was independent of temperature from 1.3 to 4.2 °K. Using the same analysis as for KF, the circular dichroism is

$$(I_+ - I_-)/I = -4g_{\rm orb}\mu_{\beta}H_z/\delta E, \qquad (1)$$

where $g_{orb} = |\langle 2p_y | L_z | 2p_x \rangle|$, H_z is the applied field in a [100] direction, μ_{β} is the Bohr magneton, and δE is the characteristic energy separation between 2s- and 2p-like relaxed excited states. 3 The measured value for KCl is

$$\Delta = -(9 \pm 1) \times 10^{-8} \ H(G). \tag{2}$$

Using the recent value $\delta {\it E} \simeq 0.017$ eV measured for KCl, 3 this gives

$$g_{\text{orb}} = 0.06 \pm 0.01,$$
 (3)

which is close to the value of 0.04 found for KF.

The search for a spin-dependent contribution was made using intense circularly polarized pumping light. Mollenauer et al. 4 and Karlov et al. 5 showed that this will lead to a saturation value $\langle S_z \rangle^{\rm sat}$ of the spin polarization which is proportional to the circular dichroism in absorption at the excitation wavelength. This optically induced spin polarization will contribute to the MCP depending on the sense (\pm) of circular polarization:

$$\Delta_{\pm} = \frac{-4g_{\rm orb}\mu_{\beta}}{\delta E} \left(H_z \pm \frac{\lambda^*}{\mu_{\beta}} \left\langle S_z \right\rangle^{\rm sat} \right), \tag{4}$$

where λ^* is the spin-orbit coupling constant for the relaxed excited state. If the sense of circular polarization of the pumping light is reversed, the relative change of the MCP signal will be

$$(\Delta_{+} - \Delta_{-})/(\Delta_{+} + \Delta_{-}) = \lambda^{*} \langle S_{z} \rangle^{\text{sat}}/\mu_{\beta}H_{z}.$$
 (5)

For the 5145-Å line, $\langle S_z \rangle^{\text{sat}}$ should be ~ 0.025 in KCl. ⁴ At $H_z = 12$ kG the signal-to-noise ratio was such that a 10% change would have been observable, but none was seen. This implies that $\lambda^* < 0.2 \times 10^{-3}$ eV, whereas in the "unrelaxed" excited state seen in absorption⁶ $\lambda = 6 \times 10^{-3}$ eV.

At the present time I cannot offer a satisfactory explanation of the small value of the spin-orbit coupling constant in the relaxed excited state of the ${\it F}$ center.

Experimentally the use of a higher-power argon laser would probably improve the sensitivity to the point where the spin-dependent contribution to the MCP could be observed.

Work supported by the Advanced Research Projects Agency through the Materials Science Center at Cornell University, MSC Report No. 1369.

Phys. Rev. Letters 23, 1495 (1969).

PHYSICAL REVIEW B

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 10

15 NOVEMBER 1970

ERRATA

Coulomb Effects at Saddle-Type Critical Points, E. O. Kane [Phys. Rev. 180, 852 (1969)]. It was brought to my attention by Y. Petroff that a factor ω^2 was missing in the denominator of Eq. (38). It should also be noted that immediately after Eq. (38), $\langle p^2 \rangle_{av}$ should equal $3 \langle p_x^2 \rangle_{av}$ and Eq. (39) should read $\epsilon_2(\omega) = 6.3 S_{tot}(\hbar\omega)$. This correction results in an estimated longitudinal-to-transverse mass ratio of -12 instead of -60 for CdTe. Theory and experiment are then in better agreement with less need for phonon broadening and a mass ratio which seems more plausible.

¹M. P. Fontana and D. B. Fitchen, Phys. Rev. Letters 23, 1497 (1969).

M. P. Fontana, Phys. Rev. B <u>2</u>, 1107 (1970).

³L. D. Bogan, L. F. Stiles, Jr., and D. B. Fitchen,

⁴L. G. Mollenauer, S. Pan, and S. Yngvesson, Phys. Rev. Letters 23, 683 (1969).

⁵N. V. Karlov, J. Margerie, and Y. Merle-D'Aubigne, J. Phys. Radium 24, 717 (1963).

⁶R. Romestain and J. Margerie, Compt. Rend. <u>258</u>, 2525 (1964).