thickness. The last equation is equivalent to the condition that the stress component σ_{zz} vanishes. Eliminating all variables except w_0 in (5), we find

$$\frac{d^4w_0}{dx^4}=\frac{f}{B_1}-\frac{1}{Qh}\frac{d^2f}{dx^2}. \tag{6}$$

This equation is of the same form as found previously[1] except for the operator B, which is

$$B_1=\tfrac{1}{3}h^3Q(Q+R)/(2Q+R). \tag{7}$$

This operator coincides with the coefficient in the theory of bending of plates for the elastic case.

[1] M. A. Biot, Phys. Rev. **97**, 1463 (1955).

Errata

Expansion of Copper Bombarded by 21-Mev Deuterons, WILLIAM R. MCDONELL AND HENRY A. KIERSTEAD [Phys. Rev. **93**, 247 (1954)]. A numerical error in the calculation of the volume change corresponding to the deflection of the copper tube has necessitated a downward revision of the reported expansion by a factor of 10. The ordinate of the graph shown should thus read $\Delta V/V\times10^4$ and the deflection sensitivity 0.24 mm per 0.01 percent volume change. This results in an expansion equal to about $\frac{1}{10}$ the atomic volume of displaced atoms predicted by the Seitz theory.

Further experiment has verified the magnitude of the bombardment-induced deflection, but has shown that only a small fraction anneals out at room temperature, contrary to the implication of the initial report. A summary of the annealing characteristics has been published [Henry A. Kierstead, Phys. Rev. **98**, 245(A) (1955)].

Self-Diffusion in Copper, A. KUPER, H. LETAW, JR., L. SLIFKIN, E. SONDER, AND C. T. TOMIZUKA [Phys. Rev. **96**, 1224 (1954)]. It has been pointed out to us by Dr. A. D. LeClaire that certain aspects of the statistical analysis of our data are in error. The corrected representation for the self-diffusion coefficient in copper over the temperature range 685–1062°C is $D=0.20\exp(-47\,120/RT)$ cm²/sec. The probable errors in the frequency factor aad activation energy are ±0.03 cm²/sec and ±0.33 kcal/mole, respectively. The frequency factor calculated by Zener's theory is 0.28 cm²/sec which is in excellent agreement with the experimental value.

Capture-Positron Branching Ratios, P. F. ZWEIFEL [Phys. Rev. **96**, 1572 (1954)]. The statement made that the conclusions of Sherr and Miller[1] concerning the amount of Fierz interference present in the decay of Na^{22} were "invalidated" was worded incorrectly. Actually, as Sherr has pointed out,[2] the inclusion of screening effects in the calculation of the branching ratio reduces the value of C_A/C_T from (-1 ± 2) percent to (0 ± 2) percent. Because of uncertainties in the experiment as well as other approximations in the calculated value of λ_k/λ_+, the conclusion of Sherr and Miller that the amount of Fierz interference is "less than several percent" is essentially unchanged.

Sherr has pointed out further[2] that it would be possible to repeat the experiment with a higher degree of accuracy. If this should be done, a more accurate calculation of λ_k/λ_+, including the effects of finite nuclear size,[3] various second-order corrections,[4] and the change in the end point of the positron spectrum due to screening,[5] might provide a better upper limit to the amount of Fierz interference present.

[1] R. Sherr and R. H. Miller, Phys. Rev. **93**, 1076 (1954).
[2] R. Sherr (private communication).
[3] M. E. Rose and D. K. Holms, Phys. Rev. **83**, 190 (1951); H. Brysk and M. E. Rose, unclassified Oak Ridge National Laboratory Report ORNL-1830 (unpublished).
[4] P. F. Zweifel, Phys. Rev. **95**, 112 (1954); M. E. Rose and R. K. Osborne, Phys. Rev. **93**, 1315 (1954).
[5] P. F. Zweifel, thesis, Duke University (unpublished).

Radioactivity of In^{117} and Sb^{117}, CARL L. MCGINNIS [Phys. Rev. **97**, 93 (1955)]. The percent modes of decay of the 1.9-hr in^{117m} are correctly given in Table I, page 95, but incorrectly given in the abstract, page 93, and on Fig. 5, page 96.

Possible Triple-Scattering Experiments, L. WOLFENSTEIN [Phys. Rev. **96**, 1654 (1954)]. In Eqs. (2.5) and (2.6) $\sin\beta$ should be replaced by $(-\sin\beta)$. In Table I, β should be replaced $(-\beta)$ and the columns e_{3s} and e_{3s}' should be interchanged. Also in Eq. (3.3) the term $PI_0\mathbf{n}$ should not be divided by $2(2s+1)$.

Radiative Corrections to Muon Decay, R. J. FINKELSTEIN AND R. E. BEHRENDS [Phys. Rev. **97**, 568 (1954)]. In Eq. (1), the third term "ln2" should read "4 ln2," and the last term "$-(\epsilon_m^2-4\epsilon_m\epsilon-17\epsilon^2)/3\epsilon^2$" should read "$-(\epsilon_m^2+4\epsilon_m\epsilon-17\epsilon^2)/3\epsilon^2$."

Decay of Co^{57}, L. MADANSKY AND F. RASETTI [Phys. Rev. **97**, 837 (1955)]. It was pointed out to us by Dr. M. A. Grace that our suggested decay scheme is incompatible with the results obtained by him and his collaborators at Oxford. We performed further experiments and established that our previous measurements with an NaI(Tl) crystal containing the active cobalt were erroneous, presumably owing to inefficiency of the scintillating crystal in the vicinity of the Co atoms, causing