[1]D. Pines, *Elementary Excitations in Solids* (Benjamin, New York, 1964), Chap. 3; K. S. Singwi, M. P. Tosi, R. H. Land, and A. Sjölander, Phys. Rev. B 1, 1044 (1970), and other references in this paper.

[2]J. Hubbard, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A239, 267 (1957).

[3]D. C. Langreth, Phys. Rev. 181, 753 (1969).

[4]J. W. F. Woo and S. S. Jha, Phys. Rev. B 3, 87 (1971).

[5]To make contact with earlier calculations, let us point out that in RPA, $\mathcal{L}(K, Q)$ is just $l(K, Q)$ with the self-energy $\Sigma(\vec{k}) = 0$, and in the self-consistent Hartree-Fock calculation of Woo and Jha, $\mathcal{L}$ is obtained from Eq. (6) by replacing $Y_Q(K, K')$, given by Eq. (7), by its first term $V(|\vec{k} - \vec{k}'|)$.

[6]G. Baym and L. P. Kadanoff, Phys. Rev. 124, 287 (1961).

PHYSICAL REVIEW B VOLUME 4, NUMBER 3 1 AUGUST 1971

ERRATA

Comments on Effects of Electron-Electron Interactions on Nuclear Spin-Lattice Relaxation Times in Aluminum, F. Y. Fradin and T. J. Rowland [Phys. Rev. B 3, 1781 (1971)]. Some lines of this article were misplaced during the page makeup procedure.

(i) The last three lines in the second column of p. 1781 "... the apparent values of δ found in a number of experiments on aluminum are considerably greater than 2^{10}" should appear at the end of the text on p. 1782.

(ii) The first four lines at the top of p. 1782 "of magnetization ... measured by Pifer[5]" should be omitted, since they belong to the following paper.

Comments on Effects of Electron-Electron Interactions on Nuclear Spin-Lattice Relaxation Times in Aluminum—A Reply, D. P. Tunstall and D. Brown [Phys. Rev. B 3, 1783 (1971)]. Some lines of this article were erroneously inserted in the preceding article during the page makeup procedure. The paragraph preceding the *note added in proof* should read:

The value of δ that FR quote as measured by their technique, 2.65, as compared to our value of 2.15, is more worrying. It seems to us, from our arguments in the preceding paragraph, that the size of the quadrupole bath in thermal contact with the dipolar bath in the FR measurements will vary (a) during a single measurement, a fixed H_1, of magnetization against time and (b) with the amplitude of H_1, due to the mixing effect of the presence of H_1. As further support for our value we may note the value of $\delta = 2.07$ measured by Pifer.[5]