Errata

Erratum: Fusion-energy reaction ${}^{2}H(t, \alpha)n$ from $E_{t} = 12.5$ to 117 keV [Phys. Rev. C 29, 2031 (1984)]

Nelson Jarmie, Ronald E. Brown, and R. A. Hardekopf

In Table X there are an insufficient number of significant digits given in the coefficients t_n to allow the quantity $\langle S \rangle$ to be calculated accurately over the full temperature range kT = 0-20 keV. The following coefficients should be used instead of those given in the original paper:

| n: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| t _n : | 11.591 951 69 | 1.714 699 009 | -19.240 682 20 | 101.380 998 2 | -276.406 974 8 | 462.387 793 7 |
| n: | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| t _n : | -495.796 101 2 | 346.206 957 6 | -155.600 394 2 | 43.178 903 71 | -6.712 638 719 | 0.446 674 956 2 |

We thank Ronald L. Miller for pointing out the problem with Table X.

Erratum: Angular distributions in heavy-ion-induced fission [Phys. Rev. C 32, 195 (1985)]

B. B. Back, R. R. Betts, J. E. Gindler, B. D. Wilkins, S. Saini, M. B. Tsang, C. K. Gelbke, W. G. Lynch, M. A. McMahan, and P. A. Baisden

An indexing error has been discovered in the computer program used to calculate the partial wave distribution of the touching cross section. This calculation is described on pages 207-209, Appendix B. The error occurred in the indexing for the table lookup of the proximity function $\Phi(s)$ having the effect of exaggerating the radius deviations $C_2\beta Y_{20}(\theta)$ and ΔC

TABLE III. Parameters used in cross section calculations.

| σ_3/C_2^{d} | $\sigma_2{}^{\mathrm{c}}$ | δ_2 | V LDM b touch (MeV) | V _{touch} a (MeV) | Reaction |
|--------------------|---------------------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 0.055 | | and a second control of the second control of the c | 78.7 | 77.3 | ¹⁶ O + ²⁰⁸ Pb |
| | 0.02 | 0.46 | 84.7 | 83.2 | $^{16}O + ^{232}Th$ |
| | 0.02 | 0.53 | 86.1 | 84.7 | $^{16}O + ^{238}U$ |
| | 0.02 | 0.58 | 89.2 | 87.7 | $^{16}O + ^{248}Cm$ |
| 0.055 | | | 87.3 | 85.8 | $^{19}\text{F} + ^{208}\text{Pb}$ |
| 0.060 | | | 115.1 | 113.1 | 24 Mg + 208 Pb |
| 0.060 | | | 132.9 | 130.5 | $^{28}\text{Si} + ^{208}\text{Pb}$ |
| 0.105 | | | 146.3 | 143.7 | $^{32}S + ^{197}Au$ |
| 0.060 | | | 150.4 | 147.7 | $^{32}S + ^{208}Pb$ |

^aInteraction barrier calculated using the surface tension coefficient γ of Eq. (10).

bInteraction barrier calculated using liquid drop model (LDM) estimate of surface tension coefficient γ .

^cSee Eq. (B9) for definition.

^dSee Eq. (B6) for definition.

in Eqs. (B2) and (B3), respectively, by a factor of 2. The effect was to overestimate the near-barrier and subbarrier cross section and the associated high spin tails of the spin distribution for *prescribed* values of the surface fluctuations. Subsequent calculations with a corrected code show, however, that essentially identical spin distributions are obtained when the parameters controlling the surface fluctuations are adjusted to reproduce the published excitation function calculations. Consequently, this error has *no* bearing on the analysis of fission angular distributions presented in the article. The values given in Table III on page 206 are, however, misleading and should be replaced by Table III as given here.

Additional changes are as follows:

Page 208, omit the phrase "where σ_{β} is given by Eq. (11) in Ref. 26."

Page 208, Eq. (B10) should read

$$\rho(C) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho(\beta) \rho_{\beta}(C) d\beta = (2\pi \sigma_{\beta}^{2})^{-1/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left[-\frac{(\beta - \beta_{0})^{2}}{2\sigma_{\beta}^{2}}\right] \rho_{\beta}(C) d\beta . \tag{B10}$$