$$\sim -\frac{1}{2}\int \sum_n \sum_{p\neq q} \left(\frac{\vec{k}}{m}\cdot\vec{\nabla}_n\psi_0\right)\left(\frac{\vec{k}}{m}\cdot\vec{\nabla}_n v(\vec{r}_{pq})\right)\psi_0 d\vec{r}^N$$

$$= -\frac{1}{4}\int \sum_n \sum_{p\neq q} \left(\frac{\vec{k}}{m}\cdot\vec{\nabla}_n|\psi_0|^2\right)\frac{\vec{k}}{m}\cdot\vec{\nabla}_n v(\vec{r}_{pq}) d\vec{r}^N$$

$$= \frac{1}{4}\int \sum_n \sum_{p\neq q} |\psi_0|^2\left(\frac{\vec{k}}{m}\cdot\vec{\nabla}_n\right)^2 v(\vec{r}_{pq}) d\vec{r}^N$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}N^2\int g(\vec{r})\left(\frac{\vec{k}}{m}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)^2 v(\vec{r})\, d\vec{r} = \frac{N\epsilon(\vec{k})}{3m}\langle\Delta V\rangle ,$$

where

$$\langle\Delta V\rangle = N\int g(\vec{r})\nabla^2 v(\vec{r})\, d\vec{r} \quad ;$$

~ means "when $\underline{k}$ is large enough to make $\underline{S}(\underline{k})$ equal to 1," and we have done a partial integration in the fifth line and used the definition of the radial distribution function $\underline{g}(\vec{r})$ is the sixth. Thus we find

$$\langle\vec{k}|(\hat{H}-E_F(\vec{k}))^3|\vec{k}\rangle \sim \frac{N\epsilon(\vec{k})}{3m}\langle\Delta V\rangle$$

instead of zero as concluded before. It follows directly that

$$\frac{\langle\vec{k}|\hat{H}^3|\vec{k}\rangle}{\langle\vec{k}|\vec{k}\rangle} \sim E_F^3(\vec{k}) + 4\langle K\rangle\epsilon(\vec{k})E_F(\vec{k}) + \frac{\epsilon(k)}{3m}\langle\Delta V\rangle$$

and that the validity of the Mihara-Puff conjecture hinges upon the smallness of the third term on the right-hand side in comparison with the first two terms. If we use Sear's recent estimate of $\langle\Delta \underline{V}\rangle$ [Phys. Rev. 185, 200 (1969)] we get $\frac{1}{3}\langle\Delta \underline{V}\rangle = 148\ ^\circ\mathrm{K}\ \mathrm{Å}^{-2}$ and find that, with $\langle K\rangle \approx 14\ ^\circ\mathrm{K}$, the third term is less than $\frac{1}{5}$ of the right-hand side for $\underline{k} > 3\ \mathrm{Å}^{-1}$.

Therefore, our conclusion, that the Mihara-Puff conjecture

$$\frac{\langle\vec{k}|\hat{H}^3|\vec{k}\rangle}{\langle\vec{k}|\vec{k}\rangle} \approx E_F^3(\vec{k}) + 4\langle K\rangle\epsilon(\vec{k})E_F(\vec{k})$$

is accurate for all $\underline{k}$ large enough to make $\underline{S}(\underline{k})$ equal to unity, would still seem to be valid, although its truth is no longer axiomatic but asymptotic.

Derivation of Kinetic Equations from the Generalized Langevin Equation. A. Z. Akcasu and J. J. Duderstadt [Phys. Rev. 188, 479 (1969)]. Several typographical errors occurred in this article:

(i) The symbol G is missing from the title of Sec. II, as well as in two places in Eq. (32).

(ii) A plus sign should appear between the integrals on the second line of Eq. (29).

(iii) Replace $\vec{P}$ by $\vec{p}^\alpha$ in Eq. (22) and G by G in Eq. (41).

(iv) In Eq. (35), define $b(\vec{p}) \equiv (1-P_a)\dot{a}(\vec{p})$.

Propagation of Small-Area Pulses of Coherent Light through a Resonant Medium. M. D. Crisp [Phys. Rev. A 1, 1604 (1970)]. (i) Equation (2a) on page 1605 should read

$$(X-iY)e^{-i\omega(t-\eta z/c)+i\varphi(z,t)} \equiv 2ab^* .$$

(ii) Equation (26) on p. 1607 should read

$$\mathcal{E}(z,t) = k!\,\mathcal{E}_0\exp\left(-\frac{(t-\eta z/c)}{T_2}\right)\left(\frac{t-\eta z/c}{\alpha_0 z}\right)^{k/2}\tau^{-k}$$
$$\times U(t-\eta z/c)J_k(2[\alpha_0 z(t-\eta z/c)]^{1/2}) .$$