

Errata

Range-Energy Relations for Protons in Be, C, Al, Cu, Pb, and Air, R. M. STERNHEIMER [Phys. Rev. **115**, 137 (1959)]. In the calculation of $-(1/\rho)(dE/dx)$ for Cu and Pb, the L -shell correction at low energies was calculated incorrectly. Moreover, M -shell corrections should be included for Cu and Pb, as was recently pointed out by Bichsel.¹ The effect of these errors is to tend to make the range values for Cu and Pb somewhat too small at low energies ($T_p \lesssim 100$ Mev) for a given value of the mean excitation potential I . In addition, we note that the range energy relations for Cu and Pb were calculated using the following I values: $I_{Cu} = 371$ ev and $I_{Pb} = 1070$ ev, which were the best available values of I_{Cu} and I_{Pb} at the time when these calculations were carried out (in 1957). However, recent high-energy experiments by Barkas and Von Friesen² indicate that the values of I for Cu and Pb are appreciably lower, namely $I_{Cu} = 323$ ev and $I_{Pb} = 826$ ev. A recalculation of the range-energy relations for Cu and Pb using these lower values of I is in progress. The effect of the decrease of I is numerically more important than that produced by the change of the shell corrections. As a result, the range values for Cu and Pb given in the paper are somewhat too large at all energies, e.g., by $\sim 2\%$ for Cu and $\sim 4\%$ for Pb at $T_p = 200$ Mev.

It should be emphasized that the error in the L -shell correction does not affect the values of $-(1/\rho)(dE/dx)$ and the range-energy relations for Be, C, Al, and air which are given correctly (with an estimated uncertainty of $<1\%$) in the Article. Moreover, for the light elements ($Z \leq 13$), the values of I from recent high-energy experiments are in good agreement with the values used in the paper, so that the corresponding range-energy relations for Be, C, Al, and air are applicable, and can be used to determine the energy from the measured range.

In a subsequent paper,³ the above-mentioned range-energy relations for Cu and Pb were used to derive the constants G_i in an interpolation formula for $R(T_p, I)$ valid for all I values in the range from ~ 60 to 1100 ev. The constants G_i are therefore slightly in error at low energies. It is planned to recalculate the G_i using the results of the revised range-energy relations for Cu and Pb.

¹ H. Bichsel, University of Southern California Linear Accelerator Technical Report No. 2, 1961 (unpublished).

² W. H. Barkas and S. Von Friesen, Suppl. Nuovo cimento **19**, 41 (1961).

³ R. M. Sternheimer, Phys. Rev. **118**, 1045 (1960).

Lifetime of the 2S State of Atomic Hydrogen, WADE L. FITE, R. T. BRACKMANN, DAVID G. HUMMER

AND R. F. STEBBINGS [Phys. Rev. **116**, 363 (1959)]. Recently, Lichten¹ pointed out that under the experimental conditions used in our study of the lifetime of hydrogen atoms in the metastable $2S_{\frac{1}{2}}$ state, the angular distribution of the radiation produced by the electrostatic quenching of the metastable atoms was isotropic, rather than that of a dipole oriented parallel to the applied electric field, as had been taken in the analysis of the experimental data. Using the correct angular distribution alters some of the results stated in our paper as follows:

In Eqs. (5), (6), and (9), the factor $\frac{3}{2}$ should be replaced by 1.

The right-hand side of Eqs. (10) and (11) should read

$$1.5 \times 10^5 C(0)/C(10)$$

instead of

$$9.8 \times 10^4 C(0)/C(10).$$

The approximate values of cross sections for collision quenching listed in Table I should be increased by 50%.

The apparent natural lifetime, or the lower limit of the true natural lifetime of the $2S$ atoms, should be diminished from $2.4 \text{ msec} \pm 50\%$ to $1.6 \text{ msec} \pm 50\%$.

¹ W. Lichten, Phys. Rev. Letters **6**, 12 (1961).

Higher Resonances in Pion-Nucleon Interactions, RONALD F. PEIERLS [Phys. Rev. **118**, 325 (1960)]. There are the following errors in Table I of this paper:

(i) In the expressions for the cross sections there should be a change of sign for all interference terms between an electric and a magnetic amplitude except for $e1m1$ and $e1M1$.

(ii) The cross-section contributions from the interference terms $e1m2$, $e1M2$, $e3m3$, and $m1m3$ are wrong and should be $(1-3x^2)$, $(3x^2-1)$, $2x(5x^2-1)(11-15x^2)$, and $4(3x^2-1)$, respectively.

(iii) The polarization contribution from $e2m1$ interference has the wrong sign.

These changes do not affect any of the conclusions of the paper. I am indebted to Professor G. Salvini and colleagues for pointing out some of these errors and instigating a recalculation of the table.

Collisions of Electrons with Hydrogen Atoms. V. Excitation of Metastable 2S Hydrogen Atoms, R. F. STEBBINGS, WADE L. FITE, DAVID G. HUMMER, AND R. T. BRACKMANN [Phys. Rev. **119**, 1939 (1960)]. Recently, Lichten¹ pointed out that under the experimental conditions used in our studies of excitation of hydrogen atoms to the metastable $2S_{\frac{1}{2}}$ state, the angular distribution of the Lyman alpha radiation produced by the electrostatic