the vector mean free path $\vec{l}(\vec{k})$ will be parallel to $\vec{k}$, and hence one may write

$$\vec{l} = \tau_d \vec{v}, \tag{1}$$

where $\vec{v} = \partial E/\partial \vec{p}$ is the electron velocity ($\vec{p} \equiv \hbar \vec{k}$) and $\tau_d = \tau_d(E)$ is the same as the τ_{ec} of Ref. 2 because, with electric field $\vec{\mathcal{E}}$ only, the Ohmic deviation of the distribution function f from the thermal equilibrium f_0 is given by

$$f - f_0 \equiv f_1 = e\vec{l} \cdot \vec{\mathcal{E}} \frac{df_0}{dE} . \tag{2}$$

In this case the general result for Hall mobility reduces to

$$\mu_H = e\langle \tau_d^2 v^2/m_c \rangle / \langle \tau_d v^2 \rangle, \tag{3}$$

where

$$m_c(E) = p/v \tag{4}$$

is the "cyclotron mass." For the nondegenerate state, the averaging indicated by $\langle\ \rangle$ is over the classical distribution given by $f_0 = e^{(\zeta - E)/K_B T}$.

By (1) and (2), numerical evaluation of f_1 per unit field is equivalent to evaluation of $\tau_d(E)$, and hence gives the Hall mobility by (3). The vector mean free path satisfies an equation adjoint to the Boltzmann equation, however, and may be evaluated directly by the same numerical procedures as for f_1: variational and iterative[5] and evidently the ingenious method of Ref. 2 also.

[1]D. L. Rode, Phys. Rev. B 2, 1012 (1970); D. L. Rode and S. Knight, *ibid.* 3, 2534 (1971).
[2]K. Fletcher and P. N. Butcher, J. Phys. C 5, 212 (1972).
[3]P. J. Price, IBM J. Res. Develop. 1, 239 (1957).
[4]P. J. Price, IBM J. Res. Develop. 2, 200 (1958).
[5]See Sec. 5 of Ref. 3. The in-scattering operator of Rode's method is replaced by the out-scattering operator, its adjoint.

PHYSICAL REVIEW B VOLUME 6, NUMBER 12 15 DECEMBER 1972

ERRATA

Electron Correlations at Metallic Densities. V, P. Vashishta and K. S. Singwi [Phys. Rev. B 6, 875 (1972)]. In the evaluation of $\bar{\gamma}$, defined by Eq. (33), from the self-consistent values of $S(q)$, there has been a slight error. The corrected Table I for $\bar{\gamma}$ on p. 882 should now read as follows:

TABLE I. Values of $\bar{\gamma}$.

r_s	1	2	3	4	5	6
$\bar{\gamma}$	0.462 21	0.500 24	0.525 12	0.543 11	0.556 81	0.567 60

This correction in turn changes the values of correlation energy given in Table II. The corrected values in the first and seventh rows should read as follows:

TABLE II. Correlation energy (Ry/electron).

r_s	1	2	3	4	5	6
Present theory	−0.130	−0.098	−0.081	−0.070	−0.062	−0.056
Toigo–Woodruff	−0.134 (−0.120)	−0.095 (−0.092)	−0.079 (−0.077)	−0.068 (−0.068)	−0.061 (−0.061)	(−0.056)

Our corrected values of the correlation energy for $r_s = 1$–6 can be fitted to the following analytic expression to within 0.75% accuracy:

$$\epsilon_{\text{corr}} = -0.112 + 0.0335 \ln r_s - \frac{0.02}{(0.1 + r_s)} \text{ Ry} .$$

Equation (34) of the paper should now be replaced by the above equation. The rest of the conclusions of the paper remain unchanged.

Electronic Structure of Noble-Metal–Noble-Metal Alloys, David Beaglehole and Erich Erlbach [Phys. Rev. B 6, 1209 (1972)]. The following references were omitted in the printing of the article:

[24]P. S. Szczepanek and D. Beaglehole, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. 16, 636 (1971).
[25]C. E. Morris and D. W. Lynch (unpublished).
[26]M. Garfinkel, J. J. Tiemann, and W. E. Engeler, Phys. Rev. 148, 695 (1966).
[27]D. Beaglehole, Proc. Phys. Soc. (London) 87, 461 (1966).
[28]E. A. Stern, Phys. Rev. Letters 26, 1630 (1971).
[29]N. F. Berk, Phys. Rev. B 1, 1336 (1970).
[30]K. Levin and H. Ehrenreich, Phys. Rev. B 3, 4172 (1971).
[31]R. E. Watson, H. Ehrenreich, and L. Hodges, Phys. Rev. Letters 24, 829 (1970).
[32]Reference 7.
[33]E. A. Stern, in *Optical Properties and Electronic Structure of Metals and Alloys*, edited by F. Abeles (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1966).
[34]B. Velicky and K. Levin, Phys. Rev. B 2, 938 (1970).
[35]W. B. Pearson (private communication).