very low value for ^{204}Pb. It also should be noted that the behavior of the ratios for a given Z as shown for Ru and Pt nuclei is opposite to the expectation that the $B(E2)$ ratio will approach 1.43 as the $2\rightarrow 0$ enhancement increases.

Data on $4\rightarrow 2$ transition probabilities are increasing at a rapid rate due to the availability of heavy-ion beams. It will be most interesting to investigate the high lying 4+ states in nuclei where the energy ratio $E(4+)/E(2+)$ is close to 2.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Dr. L. Grodzins for calling to his attention the apparent anomaly in the old ^{192}Pt lifetime measurement. Dr. M. Perlman has frequently made his double focusing β-ray spectrometer available for conversion studies. We appreciate greatly his aid and hospitality.

APPENDIX

The Decay Scheme of ^{192}Ir-^{192}Pt

The decay of ^{192}Ir has been investigated by many authors. Most of the properties of the level scheme of ^{192}Pt are established on the basis of very precise γ ray and internal-conversion energy measurements and conversion-coefficient data. Most of the previous work (to May 1963) has been enumerated in the Nuclear Data Sheets.[7]

One point in the decay scheme of particular relevance to this work has been investigated. In the early work of Cork *et al.*[15] and of Johns and Nablo,[16] a γ ray of $\sim$174 keV was observed. This transition was assumed to be between the 4+ level and the second 2+ state and to have an intensity of about 2% of the 468-keV transition between the 4+ and the first 2+ state. If this assignment were correct, then the reduced transition probability for the $4\rightarrow 2'$ transition would be greater by a factor of about 3 than that of the $4\rightarrow 2$ transition.

The transition energy between the 4+ and the second 2+ state should be (172.105±0.020) keV (based on energies of Graham *et al.*, see Fig. 1). The line reported by Johns and Nablo had an energy of (174.0±0.4) keV. (Almost all of the γ-ray energies reported by Johns and Nablo in 1954 agree extremely well with the more recent high-precision measurements.) We therefore suspected that this γ ray does not belong in the decay scheme as previously placed.

A careful search was made with a high-resolution β spectrometer for the internal conversion line of the "174"-keV transition observed by Johns and Nablo. In the region of K internal conversion of γ rays between 170 and 177.5 keV we have found no line with intensity greater than 1/40 of the K conversion line of the 468-keV ($4\rightarrow 2$) transition [Combining this result with theoretical conversion coefficients one finds that $I_\gamma(170\text{–}177.5)/I_\gamma(468)<7\times10^{-3}$ even if the transition were an $E1$.] A more careful search in the immediate region of 172.1 keV yielded a limit for the intensity of conversion line of a transition of 172.1 keV. The limit is $I_K(172.1)/I_K(468)<1.5\times10^{-2}$. Combining this result with theoretical $E2$ conversion coefficients we find $I_\gamma(4\rightarrow 2')/I_\gamma(4-2)<1.3\times10^{-3}$. We therefore believe that the 174-keV line observed by Johns and Nablo is not present in the ^{192}Ir decay. Using the above limit on the $I_\gamma(4\rightarrow 2')$ and the measured $\tau(4+)$ we find that the transition probability for the $4\rightarrow 2'$ transition is enhanced by less than a factor 7 relative to the Weisskopf estimate and that $B(E2;\ 4\rightarrow 2')/B(E2;\ 4\rightarrow 2)<0.23$. This result does not seem particularly surprising.

[15] J. M. Cork, J. M. LeBlanc, A. E. Stoddard, W. J.Childs, C. E. Branyan, and D. W. Martin, Phys. Rev. **82**, 258 (1951).
[16] M. W. Johns and C. V. Nablo, Phys. Rev. **96**, 1599 (1954).

Errata

Measurement and Statistical Theory Analysis of $Fe^{56}(He^3,p)$ and $Cu^{63}(He^3,p)$ Energy and Angular Distributions—Nuclear Shell Effects, JEAN-PIERRE HAZAN AND GEORGE MERKEL [Phys. Rev. **139**, B835 (1965)]. Equation (3), p. B839 should read

$$a=0.0748(\bar{j}_n+\bar{j}_p+1)A^{2/3}$$

instead of

$$a=0.0748(\bar{j}_n+\bar{j}_p+1).$$

Analysis of Triple Correlation Measurements, GALE I. HARRIS, HANS J. HENNECKE, AND D. D. WATSON [Phys. Rev. **139**, B1113 (1965)]. The coefficient in the denominator of Eq. (5) should read

$$\bar{Z}_1(\Lambda_2J_2\Lambda_2J_2;\,\mathcal{J}_3M)\quad\text{instead of}\quad\bar{Z}_1(\Lambda_2J_2\Lambda_2J_2,\tau_3M).$$

In Eq. (7), the quantum number in the second row, second column of the 9-J symbol should be L_1' instead of J_1'.