in a magnetic field of 200 000 gauss, the spin of Λ^0 would precess through an angle of 33° in 3×10^{-10} sec if its magnetic moment is one nuclear Bohr magneton.

* On leave of absence from Columbia University, New York, New York.

[1] Lee, Steinberger, Feinberg, Kabir, and Yang, Phys. Rev. **106**, 1367 (1957).

[2] F. S. Crawford *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **108**, 1102 (1957); F. Eisler *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **108**, 1353 (1957); L. Leipuner and R. Adair, Phys. Rev. (to be published).

[3] See, e.g., the review article by L. Wolfenstein, *Annual Review of Nuclear Science* (Annual Reviews, Inc., Stanford, 1956), Vol. 6, p. 43.

[4] It has been pointed out before that the magnetic moment of a hyperon may be measured by using the angular asymmetries in the hyperon decay as an analyzer. M. Goldhaber, Phys. Rev. **101**, 1828 (1956).

Errata

Meson Production by Mesons, SAUL BARSHAY [Phys. Rev. **103**, 1102 (1956)]. In Eq. (9),

$$\exp[i(-\mathbf{k}_1-\mathbf{p}_n-\mathbf{p}_m)\cdot\mathbf{y}]$$

should read:

$$\exp[i(-\mathbf{k}_1-\mathbf{p}_n+\mathbf{p}_m)\cdot\mathbf{y}].$$

In Eq. (21), $\cos2(\theta_1-\theta_2)$ should read: $\cos2(\phi_1-\phi_2)$. In comparing Table I with experiment it would be best (in view of the static model of the nucleon used here) to take the energies given under the heading "Incident-meson kinetic energy" as total available kinetic energies in the pion-nucleon center-of-mass system. The cross sections given are then somewhat larger in magnitude than those given in the work of Franklin[1] on this subject. Large production cross sections near threshold have been found in recent important measurements in the U.S.S.R.[2]

[1] Jerrold Franklin, Phys. Rev. **105**, 1101 (1957).

[2] V. G. Zinov and S. M. Korentchenko, "Pion Production by $\pi^- - p$ Collisions near Threshold," preprint, Joint Institute of Nuclear Research, U.S.S.R.

Associated Production of Hyperons and *K* Mesons, SAUL BARSHAY [Phys. Rev. **104**, 853 (1956)]. In the sigma-sigma-π-meson interaction, the matrices denoted by τ_α are the three-by-three isotopic spin matrices. In Fig. 1(d), the intermediate state baryon should be labeled Σ^0.

Interaction of 0.5- and 1.0-Mev Neutrons with Some Heavy Elements, R. C. ALLEN, R. B. WALTON, R. B. PERKINS, R. A. OLSON, AND R. F. TASCHEK [Phys. Rev. **104**, 731 (1956)]. 0.2 barn per steradian should be subtracted from the ordinate scale of the U^{235} curve in Fig. 3.

Analysis of the $B^{11}(d,n)C^{12}$ Reaction by Nuclear Stripping, GEORGE E. OWEN AND L. MADANSKY [Phys. Rev. **105**, 1766 (1957)]. The equation defining $\mathbf{r}$ which follows Eq. (10) should read: $\mathbf{r}=\mathbf{r}_{n(1)}-\mathbf{r}_{p(1)}$.

Equation (17) should have a phase $(+i)$ instead of $(-i)$. It should read:

$$f_D(k_1R_1)=(+i)2(3\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}}(-V_1)\Gamma_1(R_1)j_1(k_1R_1).$$

The definition of $\mathbf{K}_2$ [preceding Eq. (20)], the relative wave vector of the heavy-particle neutron, is in a direction opposite to that physically required. The proper definition of $\mathbf{K}_2$ is

$$\mathbf{K}_2=\mathbf{k}_n+\frac{M_n}{M_B}\mathbf{k}_D.$$

This correction changes the phase of $G_H(K_2)$, Eqs. (22) and (24), from $(+i)$ to $(-i)$.

With these sign changes the discussion of the phases on page 1771 will read as follows: "The sign of the interference term depends upon the phase of h_D and h_H. Equations (16) and (17) show that the phase of $G_D(K_1)f_D(k_1R_1)$ is $(+i)$. Equations (24) and (25) show that the phase of $G_H(K_2)f_H(k_2R_2)$ is $(-i)$. Therefore the sign of the interference term is positive."

Incorporation of these corrections does not alter in any way the conclusions of the derivation.

Field Effect in Germanium at High Frequencies, H. C. MONTGOMERY [Phys. Rev. **106**, 441 (1957)]. The field effect mobility appropriate to Fig. 5(c) is $\mu_p-\mu_n'+\mu_n+\alpha_1\mu_n'$ and not $\mu_p+\alpha_1\mu_n'$ as stated. Hence, the difference between low- and high-frequency field effect mobility does not contain the Schrieffer correction, and a determination as discussed in the second paragraph on p. 445 is not only impractical, as stated, but is not possible in principle from small signal measurements. The author is indebted to Dr. Ichiro Nakada for pointing this out.

Angular Distribution of Protons from the $Ca^{42}(d,p)$-Ca^{43} Reaction, C. K. BOCKELMAN, C. M. BRAAMS, C. P. BROWNE, W. W. BUECHNER, R. R. SHARP, AND A. SPERDUTO [Phys. Rev. **107**, 176 (1957)]. On p. 180, line 9, "it is seen that a large value of $R=7.5\times10^{-13}$ cm is needed to fit the theoretical maximum of Fig. 5 to the experimental maximum from β-decay evidence" should read: "it is seen that a large value of $r=7.5\times10^{-13}$ cm is needed to fit the theoretical maximum of Fig. 5 to the experimental maximum. The third excited state at 0.991 Mev is believed to be a $\frac{3}{2}^+$ state from β-decay evidence."

Approximate Wave Functions for the *M*-Center by the Point-Ion Lattice Method, BARRY S. GOURARY AND PERRY J. LUKE [Phys. Rev. **107**, 960 (1957)]. In footnote 5 of this paper, we wrote: "Professor Inui has kindly checked his calculations and finds that because of the values of the interionic distance