Errata

Investigation of the ρ Bootstrap and the Determinantal Approximation, D. ATKINSON AND KWOK MAW ONG [Phys. Rev. **168**, 1692 (1968)]. In Eq. (2.4) the indices J and J' of the two Legendre functions should be interchanged.

Reanalysis of the Lowest-Mass Negative-Parity Baryon Resonances using the Symmetric Quark Model, D. R. DIVGI AND O. W. GREENBERG [Phys. Rev. **175**, 2024 (1968)]. Four of the resonances were misplaced in Table II. We correct the placement of resonances in this table using the criterion that a resonance should be placed where it has the largest $(S, SU(3))$ amplitude. We add three new experimental resonances, $\Sigma(1670)\ \frac{1}{2}^-$, $\Sigma(1769)\ \frac{1}{2}^-$, and $\Xi(1815)\ \frac{3}{2}^-$, which were reported in R. D. Tripp's rapporteur's talk at the Fourteenth International Conference on High-Energy Physics, Vienna, 1968. There is no change in the calculated resonance masses, so that 17 resonances are now fitted with 6 parameters, 3 of which are coefficients of $SU(3)$-invariant mass operators which determine the location of the centers of mass of the nine $SU(3)$ multiplets in the $(\mathbf{70}, 1^-)$. We do not place the $\Xi(1930)$ in the table because its J^P has not been measured; however, it is compatible with several of our predicted Ξ masses. We thank H. Harari for a helpful discussion.

TABLE II. Calculation versus experiment for the $(\mathbf{70}, 1^-)$. The left columns are masses calculated with a six-parameter mass formula. The right columns are experimental masses. The superscript M indicates resonances mixed by more than 20% in the square of the mixing amplitude.

	^4P						^2P				
	$J=\frac{5}{2}$		$\frac{3}{2}$		$\frac{1}{2}$			$\frac{3}{2}$		$\frac{1}{2}$	
							Ω	2062		2062	
							Ξ	1950		1938	
							Σ	1815		1809	1769
Ξ	1895		1831^M		1801		Δ	1669	1691	1669	1635
Σ	1765	1767	1722^M		1639^M						
Λ	1809	1827	1792		1779		Ξ	1816^M	1815	1743	
N	1689	1678	1690	1680	1691	1710	Σ	1630^M	1660	1682^M	1670
							Λ	1690	1690	1689^M	1670
							N	1527	1520	1528	1540
							Λ	1527	1519	1428^M	1405

Inelastic Effects in P_{11}-State πN Scattering, KWOK MAW ONG [Phys. Rev. **174**, 1977 (1968)]. On p. 1979, the equation defining s_- (line 17 on the left) should read

$$s_- = 2m^2 - m^{*2} + 2\,,$$

and the statement defining $\alpha(s)$ (lines 27 and 28 on the left) should be

$$\alpha(s) \equiv \mathrm{Im} f_{1-}{}^{\mathrm{Born}}(s)\,.$$

This $\alpha(s)$ should not be confused with the phase of the associated elastic wave defined in Sec. 4.

Low-Energy Kaon-Nucleon Scattering, S. BABA PUNDARI AND B. DUTTA-ROY [Phys. Rev. **165**, 1663 (1968)]. There has been a confusion in the notations for the ΛNK and ΣNK coupling constants, especially in the comparison of our values with those obtained by others. The values of $g_{\Lambda pK}{}^2/4\pi$ and $g_{\Sigma pK}{}^2/4\pi$ obtained on solving Eqs. (5) and (6) are 16.1 and 3.14, respectively, whereas the couplings $g_{\Lambda NK}{}^2/4\pi$ and $g_{\Sigma NK}{}^2/4\pi$ given in Eq. (1) are defined by

$$g_{YpK}{}^{-2} = [f(YpK^-)]^2 g_{YNK}{}^2\,,$$

where $f(YpK^-)$ is the corresponding f coefficient in BBP coupling (M. Gell-Mann and Y. Ne'eman, *The Eightfold Way*), which is $-\sqrt{3}$ for $Y=\Lambda$ and $-\sqrt{2}$ for $Y=\Sigma$. So the values given in Eq. (1) are correspondingly smaller by factors of 3 and 2, respectively. When comparing these with other estimates, we have to

take the values 16.1 and 3.14 (in what follows we use simply ΛNK and ΣNK, whereby we mean 16.1 and 3.14, respectively).

ΛNK agrees reasonably well with that of K. Raman [Phys. Rev. **149**, 1122 (1966); **152**, 1517(E) (1966)], C. H. Chan and F. T. Meiere [Phys. Rev. Letters **20**, 568 (1968)], and J. K. Kim's corrected value (see Chan and Meiere), all of which are compatible with $SU(3)$. ΣNK, however, is larger than the estimates given by Chan and Meiere and by Kim, which are close to zero. The values obtained by M. Lusignoli *et al.* [Phys. Letters **21**, 229 (1966); see also Nucl. Phys. **23**, 616 (1967)] and N. Zovko [Phys. Letters **23**, 143 (1966)], who used forward KN dispersion relations, are smaller by a factor of 3 for ΛNK and 2 for ΣNK. However, using essentially the same method, J. K. Kim [Phys. Rev. Letters **19**, 1079 (1967)] and Chan and Meiere, who took more accurate account of the unphysical region from the elastic threshold to the $\Lambda\pi$ threshold, obtained values, as mentioned above, compatible with ours (for ΛNK) and with $SU(3)$. This comparison is to be contrasted with that given in our Ref. 7.

It is to be noted that the correct values have been used in our calculations, and that the conclusions and the model presented in our paper remain completely unchanged.

We wish to thank Dr. C. Weil for bringing this confusion to our notice.

Part of the Table of Contents of Part II of the 25 January (Section 5) issue, which should have appeared on the inside back cover of Part II, was inadvertently omitted. The missing information is furnished below.

CONTENTS—*Continued*