ERRATA

Many-Body Approach to Hyperfine Structure in the ^2P State of Lithium. J. D. Lyons, R. T. Pu, and T. P. Das [Phys. Rev. **178**, 103 (1969)]. In extending this work to an analysis of level crossing in ^2P Li, the authors have found that the relations given as Eq. (39) are in error. The right-hand side of each of these relations should be divided by 3. The corrected relations are:

$$(\mathcal{H}_c')_{22} = -(\mathcal{H}_c')_{11}, \quad (\mathcal{H}_c')_{33} = (\mathcal{H}_c')_{11},$$

$$(\mathcal{H}_c')_{23} = 0, \quad (\mathcal{H}_0')_{22} = (\mathcal{H}_0')_{11},$$

$$(\mathcal{H}_0')_{33} = (\mathcal{H}_0')_{23} = 0, \quad (\mathcal{H}_d')_{22} = -(\mathcal{H}_d')_{11}.$$

$$(\mathcal{H}_d')_{33} = -2(\mathcal{H}_d')_{11}, \quad (\mathcal{H}_d')_{23} = \tfrac{3}{2}\sqrt{2}\,(\mathcal{H}_d')_{11}.$$

Also, in converting the final values for the coupling constants from atomic units to Mc/sec, the values used for the physical constants were not those current. The *Handbook of Physics*[1] gives $\mu_B = 9.2732 \times 10^{-21}$ erg/G, $\mu_n = 5.0505 \times 10^{-24}$ erg/G, $h = 6.6256 \times 10^{-27}$ erg sec, $a_B = 5.29167 \times 10^{-9}$ cm, and $\mu_N(\text{Li}^7) = 3.2564\mu_n$. To obtain results consistent with these values, all results for magnetic hyperfine constants given in Mc/sec in the paper need to be multiplied by 1.00015. Thus, the pertinent results are now given as:

	$J=\tfrac{1}{2}$ (Mc/sec)	$J=\tfrac{3}{2}$ (Mc/sec)
a_c	9.5698	−9.5698
a_0	17.3476	8.6738
a_d	18.9459	−1.8946
a_{total}	45.8633	−2.7906

[1] Handbook of Physics, edited by E. U. Condon and H. Odishaw (McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1967), 2nd ed.

Angular Distribution of the Outgoing Electrons in Electronic Ionization. A. E. Glassgold and G. Ialongo [Phys. Rev. **175**, 151 (1968)]. The factor $8\pi^5$ in Eqs. (2.17b), (2.32), and (4.4) should be replaced by $1/8\pi$. In going from Eq. (2.16) to Eq. (2.17) we dropped a factor of $(2\pi)^{-3}$ in replacing the Fourier transform of the potential by the Born-approximation scattering amplitude. It almost goes without saying that this change in the cross sections does not alter any of our conclusions. Indeed, all of the physical discussion of coincidence measurements in the atomic $(e, 2e)$ reaction was based on the relative cross-section formulas. Since our paper was published, measurements of the type we proposed have now been reported in the literature.[1,2] We would like to thank Dr. L. Vriens for correspondence on the proper normalization of our cross sections.

[1] H. Ehrhardt, M. Schulz, T. Tekaat, and K. Willmann, Phys. Rev. Letters **22**, 89 (1969).

[2] U. Amaldi, A. Egidi, R. Marconero, and G. Pizzella, Rev. Sci. Instr. **40**, 1001 (1969).

Evidence for Condensation of He^3 Atoms on the Surface of Bubbles in Liquid He^4. A. J. Dahm [Phys. Rev. **180**, 259 (1969)]. An estimate of the energy of a vortex line near a free surface is in error. The increase in energy caused by the deformation of the surface was estimated, but the decrease in the energy of the fluid was ignored. The latter term is larger in magnitude, since the surface is deformed in equilibrium. The author wishes to thnak Professor T. M. Sanders for calling this error to his attention.