Cesium Oscillator Strengths, PHILIP M. STONE [Phys. Rev. **127**, 1151 (1962)]. The oscillator strengths for the nP, $5D$ series given in Table IV are listed incorrectly. The proper values are obtained by multiplying the $nP_{1/2}$, $5D_{3/2}$ entries by 2.5×10^{-2} and by multiplying the $nP_{3/2}$, $5D_{3/2}$ and $nP_{3/2}$, $5D_{5/2}$ entries by 10^{-2}.

Nuclear $E1$ Peak Splitting, D. C. PEASLEE [Phys. Rev. **129**, 808 (1963)]. Dr. D. E. Frederick has kindly pointed out some errors associated with Eqs. (12c) and (12d). The remainder of the paragraph after Eq. (12b) should read as follows:

The present model has a mixture of $1p_{3/2}-1d_{5/2}$ and $1p_{3/2}-2s_{1/2}$ contributions and yields instead of Eq. (12b) the form

$$(\tan\gamma-3/\sqrt{5})^2+(3/\sqrt{5})\times[(3/2)\tan\gamma-1/\sqrt{5}](1+\cos^2\theta), \quad (12c)$$

where $\tan\gamma$ is the ratio of $2s_{1/2}$ to $1d_{5/2}$ amplitudes. If this is cast in the form $1+\lambda\cos^2\theta$, it is clear that $\lambda>0$ for $\tan\gamma>2/3\sqrt{5}=0.3$, reaching $\lambda_{max}=1$ for $\tan\gamma=3/\sqrt{5}=1.34$ and declining to $\lambda=0$ as $\tan\gamma\rightarrow\pm\infty$. On the present model, the amplitude ratio in the upper peak is approximately $\tan\gamma=1.6$ (for $r=0.5$) to $\tan\gamma=3.3$ (for $r=1.0$). The angular distribution (12c) for these two cases can be represented as

$$1+(0.77\pm0.19)\cos^2\theta. \quad (12d)$$

As usual, the angular distribution provides a much more sensitive index of the orbital mixture than the intensity ratio r; unfortunately, this also means that Eq. (12d) can be vitiated by neglect of the weak ($\Delta j=0$) transitions. The chief experimental interest in measuring the angular distribution from the upper peak would be to look for significant deviations from Eq. (12b).

Estimated Cross Section for the Reaction $p+p\rightarrow d+W$, JAMES NEARING [Phys. Rev. **132**, 2323 (1963)]. In calculating the cross section for W production with deuterons, the high-momentum components of the deuteron wave function were calculated in the zero-range approximation. At the high momentum transfers involved, however, the deuteron's Fourier components can be expected to fall off more rapidly than this would indicate and so reduce the cross section by a corresponding amount. For example, if the deuteron is approximated by a Hulthén wave function, then the cross section is reduced by a factor of as much as 3000 in the range shown in Fig. 1. The author would like to thank O. Piccioni for conversations on this point.

Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Line Shapes Resulting from the Combined Effects of Nuclear Quadrupole and Anisotropic Shift Interactions, W. H. JONES, JR., T. P. GRAHAM, AND R. G. BARNES [Phys. Rev. **132**, 1898 (1963)]. The curves in Figs. 3(b) and 4(b) for values of $a=-0.01$ and $a=-0.005$ have been extended beyond the limits of applicability of Eqs. (28c) and (29c), these limits being given by Eq. (22a). Above 6.9 Mc/sec for $a=-0.01$ and 9.7 Mc/sec for $a=-0.005$, the correct expressions are those for $\Delta\nu_{HS}$ and $\nu_0\Delta\nu_{HS}$ given in Eqs. (28a) and (29a). These changes, as well as a slight error in calculating $\Delta\nu_{HL}$ and $\nu_0\Delta\nu_{HL}$ which also affects the $a=+0.002$ curve of Fig. 3(a), lead to no essential changes in the nature of the curves. The correct values of $\Delta\nu$ and $\nu_0\Delta\nu$ should be greater than those plotted, i.e., the correct curve for $a=+0.002$ in Fig. 3(a) should show less downward curvature and the correct curves for $a=-0.005$ and $a=-0.01$ in Figs. 3(b) and 4(b) should show more upward curvature than those plotted in the paper.

Nuclear Superfluidity and Statistical Effects in Nuclear Fission, JAMES J. GRIFFIN [Phys. Rev. **132**, 2204 (1963)]. Equation (25) should read

$$\Delta_0=(1.36)^{1/2}\text{ MeV}=1.16\text{ MeV}. \quad (25)$$

Subsequent discussion in the text would be modified quantitatively by this correction. Note, however, Ref. 33, in which direct empirical evidence indicates $\Delta_0\approx1.35$ MeV.

Kinetic Approach to Condensation, RICHARD L. LIBOFF [Phys. Rev. **131**, 2318 (1963)]. The following corrections should be noted: (1) reverse inequality in Eq. (2); (2) in the parenthetical remark following Eq. (14) change $\bar{n}$ to n^*; (3) in the sequence of Eqs. (9) through (19) change all α to $-\alpha$; (4) in Eq. (16) change the exponent ix to $-ix$; (5) in the third line of Eq. (19) change the exponent $irkw$ to $-irkw$; (6) in the fourth line of Eq. (19) multiply the right-hand side by $+i$.

Magnetic Properties of Nearly Free Electrons: Nonoscillatory Magnetic Susceptibility, M. L. GLASSER [Phys. Rev. **134**, A1296 (1964)]. Professor Schumacher has kindly informed me of a recent measurement[1] of the paramagnetic susceptibility of sodium metal. The entries in the Na column of Table II should accordingly be changed to $\chi_p{}^d=1.13\pm0.05$, $\chi_d{}^b=-0.25\pm0.04$. In particular, there is now excellent agreement between the calculated and experimental "diamagnetism."

[1] R. T. Schumacher and W. E. Vehse, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **24**, 297 (1963).