mesons of mass M, $M^2 \gg m_\rho^2$, the contributions to the sum rule are seen to be of the order M^{-3}, and can be completely neglected.

Because the contributions of neither the (0,0) or (0,1) supermultiplets can be ignored in meson-superconvergence sum rules we can only make predictions when one of the supermultiplets has its contributions depressed for reasons of kinematics. The scattering of $J^{PC}=2^{++}$ mesons with pseudoscalar mesons provides such a case because the low ν values of the resonances belonging to the (0,1) supermultiplet cause their contributions to be depressed in moment sum rules.

Predictions have been made which, in the limit of $U(6)\times U(6)\times O_L(3)$ mass degeneracy, are in agreement with the predictions of a $U(6)\times U(6)$ meson classification, rather than a classification by $U(6)\times U(6)\times O_L(3)$. In practice such higher-symmetry predictions are in strong disagreement with experiment. For the prediction where the kinematic suppression of the (0,1) supermultiplet is the stronger, the insertion of physical masses in the sum rule gives a prediction in much better agreement with experiment.

The assumption that the higher supermultiplets can be neglected for these sum rules has been examined insofar as there is experimental evidence and found to be reasonable.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Dr. H. F. Jones, Dr. M. D. Scadron, C. L. Cook, and O. Nwachuku for many informative and stimulating discussions about this work.

Errata

Bound States of a Relativistic Two-Body Hamiltonian: Comparison with the Bethe-Salpeter Equation, NGUYEN D. SON† AND J. SUCHER [Phys. Rev. **153**, 1496 (1967)]. There are typographical omissions in the expression for $V_0(k,k')$ after Eq. (12); it should read

$$V_0(k,k')=\frac{-g^2}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{1}{2kk'}\frac{(k+k')^2+\mu^2}{(k-k')^2+\mu^2}\times\frac{m}{E(k)}\times\frac{m}{E(k')}.$$

† Deceased.

Radiative ρ-Meson Decay, P. SINGER [Phys. Rev. **130**, 2441 (1963)].

(1) Eq. (12) should read

$$I(k)=k_m\left(\frac{m_\rho}{2}-\frac{m_\pi^2}{m_\rho}-k\right)\ln\frac{1+\xi}{1-\xi}-\xi\left[k_m\left(\frac{m_\rho}{2}-k\right)-k^2\right].$$

(2) The figures in Table I should read:

k (MeV)	15	30	45	60	105	165	225	285
R_k	2.3×10^{-2}	1.6×10^{-2}	1.2×10^{-2}	9.7×10^{-3}	5.3×10^{-3}	2.6×10^{-3}	1.1×10^{-3}	3.3×10^{-4}
R_k'	8.3×10^{-3}	5.1×10^{-3}	3.7×10^{-3}	3.0×10^{-3}	1.6×10^{-3}	7.4×10^{-4}	3.1×10^{-4}	8.7×10^{-5}

Figure 2 should also be appropriately corrected. The revised numbers are slightly higher than the original ones. The correction does not alter any of the conclusions of the paper and is given only to assure an error-free comparison with experiment.

(3) The heading of the fourth column of Table II should read

$$\Gamma_{\rho^{+,-}}(\pi^{+,-}\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma_{\rho^{+,-}}(2\pi).$$

I am grateful to M. Sapir for discovering the error in Eq. (12) and for re-evaluating Table I.