so

$$N_i = S^{-1}{}_{i\mu}\bar{N}_\mu\,,$$
$$N_i{}^0 = S^{-1}{}_{i\mu}\bar{N}_\mu{}^0 \quad \text{for} \quad i=1,\cdots,n. \qquad \text{(III.5')}$$

Equations (III.4') can be inverted by the Wiener-Hopf method to give:

$$\bar{N}_i \underset{s>s_M}{=} O_i\bar{N}_i{}^0 \quad \text{for} \quad i=1,\cdots,n. \qquad \text{(III.6')}$$

Thus we have:

$$N_i(s)=B_i(s)+\int_{s_\mu}^{s_M} U_{i\mu}(s,s')N_\mu(s')ds'$$
$$+S^{-1}{}_{\mu\nu}\int_{s_M}^{\sigma}(U_{i\mu}O_\nu)(s,s')\bar{N}_\nu{}^0(s')ds'$$
$$\text{for} \quad s<s_M \quad i=1,\cdots,n \qquad \text{(III.7'a)}$$

where

$$(U_{i\mu}O_\nu)(s,s')=\int_{s_M}^{\sigma} ds''U_{i\mu}(s,s'')O_\nu(s'',s')\,,$$

$$N_i{}^0(s)=B_i(s)+\int_{s_\mu}^{s_M} U_{i\mu}(s,s')N_\mu(s')ds'$$
$$+\int_{s_M}^{\sigma} K_{i\mu}(s,s')N_\mu(s')ds'$$

or

$$\bar{N}_i{}^0(s)=\bar{B}_i(s)+S_{i\mu}\int_{s_\mu}^{s_M} U_{\mu\nu}(s,s')N_\nu(s')ds'$$
$$+S_{i\mu}S^{-1}{}_{\nu\rho}\int_{s_M}^{\sigma}(K_{\mu\nu}O_\rho)(s,s')\bar{N}_\rho{}^0(s')ds'$$
$$\text{for} \quad s_M<s<\sigma; \quad i=1,\cdots,n \qquad \text{(III.7'b)}$$

where

$$\bar{B}_i(s)=S_{i\mu}B_\mu(s)\,,$$

$$(K_{\mu\nu}O_\rho)(s,s')=\int_{s_M}^{\sigma} ds''K_{\mu\nu}(s,s'')O_\rho(s'',s')\,.$$

Equations (III.7') are a system of coupled integral equations with $N_i(s)$ for $s_1<s<s_M$ and $\bar{N}_i{}^0(s)$ for $s_M<s<\sigma$ as unknown functions. The functions $U_{ij}(s,s')$ are square integrable for $s_1<s<s_M$, $s_1<s'<\sigma$, and the functions $K_{ij}(s,s')$ are square integrable for $s_M<s$, $s'<\sigma$. The singular function $O_\nu(s'',s')$ no longer appears alone but only folded with these nonsingular functions, so the difficulty explained at the beginning of this erratum will not arise. The functions $(U_{i\mu}O_\nu)(s,s')$ can easily be shown to be square integrable for $s_1<s<s_M$, $s_1<s'<\sigma$ and likewise the functions $(K_{\mu\nu}O_\rho)(s,s')$ for $s_M<s$, $s'<\sigma$. Thus, we have achieved a system of Fredholm equations.

Electric Polarization of the Deuteron by a Point Charge, RICHARD J. DRACHMAN [Phys. Rev. **132**, 374 (1963)]. An algebraic error was responsible for several incorrect results. In Eq. (17), the coefficient of the last term should be 3, rather than $\frac{3}{2}$. Two subsequent equations should now read as follows:

$$V_2{}^{(1)}(t)=\frac{2Z^2Me^4}{3\hbar^2t^4}\{-\tfrac{3}{8}+e^{-2t}[-2t^5+t^4-t^3+3t^2-\tfrac{3}{2}t+\tfrac{3}{2}]$$
$$-9e^{-4t}/8-4t^6\,\mathrm{Ei}(-2t)\}\,, \qquad \text{(18)}$$

$$V_2{}^{(1)}(t)\sim-\frac{Z^2Me^4}{4\hbar^2t^4}\left\{1-e^{-2t}(4t^2+4t-16)+3e^{-4t}\right.$$
$$\left.-\frac{16}{3}t^5e^{-2t}\sum_{n=6}^{N}\frac{n!(-1)^n}{(2t)^n}\right\}. \qquad \text{(20)}$$

Using the exact equation (18) instead of the asymptotic equation (20), one obtains new and smaller entries in Table I:

TABLE I. The deviation of the dipole polarization potential from t^{-4} form: $V_2{}^{(1)}(t)=-(Z^2Me^4/4\hbar^2t^4)(1+D)$, where $x=t/2\gamma=2.2t$ F.

t	D
3	−0.103
4	−0.024
5	−0.005
6	−0.001

Finally, the limiting value discussed in the first two sentences of p. 377 should read $V_2{}^{(1)}(0)=0$. Delete the remainder of the paragraph.

Decay of Pd^{100} to Odd-Odd Rh^{100}, J. S. EVANS AND R. A. NAUMANN [Phys. Rev. **138**, B1017 (1965)]. We have incorrectly used the ambiguous word "lifetime" in our paper. If "lifetime" be replaced by "half-life" everywhere, then the calculations and conclusions are numerically correct.

Doubly Excited States in Lithium, J. D. GARCIA AND J. E. MACK [Phys. Rev. **138**, A987 (1965)]. Parts of Table IV and the accompanying discussion are incorrect, partly in view of the work of Werner[13] and of Toresson and Edlén,[14] to which we should have referred, and partly on account of a printer's misalignment. In Table IV, first column, for line (5) "1420 Å (8.72 eV)" should be deleted, and instead of "9572 Å (1.30 eV)," which was aligned with line (7), there should be "8517 Å (1.45 eV)," placed between lines (6) and (7) to indicate ambiguity; actually the line may be a transition between (unlisted) doublet terms. The terms associated with the four new assignments should have been listed in a new Table V, which must be considered approximate and incomplete pending further studies of the fine and hyperfine structure and isotope shift

TABLE V. New terms in Li I (tentative).

$1s2s2p\ ^4P^0$	454000[a] cm^{-1}	$+x$
$1s2p^2\ ^4P$	488072	$+x$
$1s2s3s\ ^4S$	496778	$+x$
$1s2s3p\ ^4P^0$	498800[a]	$+y$
$1s2p3s\ ^4P^0$	514987	$+x$
$1s2p3p\ ^4P$	520498	$+y$

[a] The last three digits in these levels are arbitrary; x and y are small unknown additive constants (see Table II and Ref. 10).

of the lines. Professor Edlén has kindly called our attention to our oversight with respect to Refs. 13 and 14.

[13] S. Werner, Studier over spektroskopiske lyskider . . . (Copenhagen: Aschehoug, 1927).
[14] Y. G. Toresson and B. Edlén, Ark. Fys. 23, 117 (1962).

Study of K_{e4} Decays, CLAUDE KACSER, PAUL SINGER, AND TRAN N. TRUONG [Phys. Rev. **137**, B1605 (1965)]. Certain errors were made in the above paper. The right-hand side of the equation before (3.5) should be divided by 4, so that now $G^2m_K^2=8.01\times10^{-14}$. This increases all rates by a factor of 4, except in Appendix B. Thus we no longer obtain the correct rate for those scattering lengths which give a reasonable fit to the $\pi\pi$ spectrum. For example, for $\alpha_0\sim1$ (in units of $\hbar/m_\pi c$), which gives a good fit to the spectrum, the calculated rate is now too large by a factor of 4. If, on the other hand, we assume a σ resonance, then we find a rate ~800 times larger than experiment. Assuming a σ, we can no longer obtain agreement between the dispersion theory calculation and the unitary symmetry model of Appendix B. The latter leads to a rate ~80 times larger than experiment. (This number was previously erroneously stated to be 200 times too large).

We hence strongly favor the nonresonant $\pi\pi$ interaction model with $\alpha_0\sim1$. The rate discrepancy is not unreasonable, since:

(i) Our use of the PCAC hypothesis and the K-pole contribution ignored a possible continuum or background term. In the pion lifetime calculation this background term is about 10% and decreases the rate, so that a 50% negative background term is not so unreasonable, if one remembers that the K pole is proportionally nearer the continuum.

(ii) On our model the characteristic radius of the K_{e4} decay is $s_p^{-1/2}$, which is about a nucleon Compton wavelength. Because of this short range our calculation of the enhancement factor cannot be completely trustworthy.

Assuming that (i) is the main source of difficulty, then, since the P- to S-wave ratio is independent of β, we still predict that the P wave contributes about 20% of the total rate for our favored $\alpha_0\sim1.0$. Then all spectra remain as presented in the paper.

ANNOUNCEMENT: ZIP Code Information

THE U. S. Post Office Department has announced that the use of ZIP Codes will be mandatory on all domestic addresses for subscriptions and other mailings by 1 January 1967. Accordingly, the American Institute of Physics has established a procedure for obtaining the necessary information. You are requested to *follow this procedure exactly.*

First, do *not* submit a change of address request consisting *merely* of the addition of your ZIP Code. Second, if your address changes in any other way, do include the ZIP Code of the new address. Third, and most important, be sure to furnish your ZIP Code in accordance with instructions included with all renewal invoices and renewal orders which have been sent out by the AIP.

Failure to conform to this procedure may result in delays.