

ERRATA

Effect of Scattering on the Attenuation of X Rays, J. J. DeMarco and P. Suortti [Phys. Rev. B **4**, 1028 (1971)]. The polarization factor  $K(\text{pol})$  introduced in Eq. (2) represents the average polarization in a powder cone and should be defined as  $\frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos^2 2\theta)$  instead of  $(1 + k \cos^2 2\theta)/(1 + k)$ . The value of  $k$  given in the captions for each of the three figures should be unity.

This correction does not significantly alter the value of  $\sigma/\mu$  shown in Figs. 1 and 2. It does affect the magnitude of  $\sigma/\mu$  shown in Fig. 3 to the extent that the  $\sigma/\mu$  values for Cu  $K\alpha$  radiation should be reduced by 5% and those for Cr  $K\alpha$  radiation by 15%.

Application of the Method of Lattice Statistics to Vacancies in  $\alpha$ -Iron, John W. Flocken [Phys. Rev. B **2**, 1743 (1970)]. The equation for the relaxation energy which appears on p. 1747 should have a negative sign immediately following the "equals" sign. In addition, the value for the relaxation energy given in Table III should be  $-0.181$  eV.

Theory of Acoustically Induced Optical Harmonic Generation, D. F. Nelson and M. Lax [Phys. Rev.

B **3**, 2795 (1971)]. The right-hand side of Eq. (5.46) should read  $\chi_{(ifg)(kl)}^{\omega_C \omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_A}$ .

Theory of the Photoelastic Interaction, D. F. Nelson and M. Lax [Phys. Rev. B **3**, 2778 (1971)]. The left-hand side of Eqs. (4.15) and (4.17) should read  $\chi_{ij(kl)}^{\omega_B \omega_0 \omega_A}$ . The left-hand side of Eqs. (4.16) and (4.18)–(4.20) should read  $\chi_{ij[kl]}^{\omega_B \omega_0 \omega_A}$ . The left-hand side of Eq. (4.21) should read  $p_{ij[kl]}^{\omega_B \omega_0 \omega_A}$ .

Some Implications of an Expression for the Response of the Electron Liquid, Flavio Toigo and Truman O. Woodruff [Phys. Rev. B **4**, 371 (1971)]. The sentence after Eq. (3.4) should read "We notice that this expression is the same as would be obtained by summing Eqs. (2) and (4) of Ref. 5, except that two of the signs are different." The next to the last sentence in Sec. III should then be dropped. Also, there is a typographical error in the formula after (3.5), which should read  $Q_0(k, 0) = \frac{16}{3}(\alpha r_s/\pi) \times (1/k^4)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . We are grateful to Professor K. S. Singwi for pointing out the sign differences.

Second- and Third-Order Elastic Constants of Aluminum and Lead, Tetsuro Suzuki [Phys. Rev. B **3**, 4007 (1971)]. Equation (3.6) should read

$$F(q) = -\frac{mk_F}{4\pi^2 \hbar^2 \Omega} \left[ -\left( \frac{4\pi Z e^2}{q^2} + \frac{4\pi U_0 r_c}{q^2} \right) \cos(qr_c) + \frac{4\pi U_0}{q^3} \sin(qr_c) \right]^2 \left( 1 + \frac{4k_F^2 - q^2}{4k_F q} \ln \left| \frac{2k_F + q}{2k_F - q} \right| \right) / \epsilon(q, k_F).$$

Using this corrected form for the calculation of  $F(q)$ :

The Hubbard-Sham dielectric-function results in Table I should read:

TABLE I

	Core radius $r_c$ (a.u.)	Depth of well $U_0$ (a.u.)	Calculated binding energy ( $10^{11}$ erg)	Calculated second-order elastic constants		
				$C_{11}$	$C_{12}$ ( $10^{11}$ dyn/cm <sup>2</sup> )	$C_{14}$
Al Hubbard-Sham	2.0	-1.73	10.07	8.39	6.57	2.94
	2.2	-1.63	9.84	8.04	5.86	2.93
	2.3	-1.57	9.69	8.12	5.50	3.22
	2.4	-1.52	9.52	8.62	5.28	3.84
	2.6	-1.41	9.17	11.13	5.59	6.03
Pb Hubbard-Sham	2.0	-1.51	13.58	7.64	5.08	3.39
	2.2	-1.72	14.06	6.86	4.90	2.86
	2.4	-1.73	14.07	6.84	4.90	2.85
	2.6	-1.68	13.91	6.90	4.84	2.94
	2.8	-1.62	13.67	7.30	4.83	3.36

In Table II the third column heading and figures should read:

TABLE II

	Hubbard-Sham $r_c = 2.3$ a. u. $U_0 = -1.57$ a. u.
$C_{111}$	-7.06
$C_{112}$	-2.78
$C_{123}$	1.50
$C_{144}$	0.20
$C_{166}$	-3.48
$C_{456}$	0.59

In Table III the third column heading and figures should read:

TABLE III

	Hubbard-Sham $r_c = 2.4$ a. u. $U_0 = -1.73$ a. u.
$C_{111}$	-5.16
$C_{112}$	-2.70
$C_{123}$	0.57
$C_{144}$	0.25
$C_{166}$	-2.71
$C_{456}$	0.58

In Table IV lines 2 and 5 should read:

TABLE IV

		$\partial C' / \partial p$	$\partial C_{44} / \partial p$	$\partial B / \partial p$
Al	Hubbard-Sham	1.17	2.37	3.62
Pb	Hubbard-Sham	0.67	1.94	4.06

The first sentence of the last paragraph of the text should read: "The use of the Hubbard-Sham dielectric function produced some improvement over the results obtained from use of the Hartree dielectric function for the second-order elastic constants of Pb."

The author is grateful to J. F. Thomas, Jr. for bringing the error to his attention.