however, suggestive that the form of cuts generated in models of that kind substantially preserve the results from exchange degeneracy, at least near the forward direction. The cuts associated with double-Regge-pole exchange, such as the vacuum-vacuum and the vacuum-pole cuts, which are the largest corrections at high energy, can in fact be represented as an imaginary constant times a convolution integral over the two Regge poles evaluated at $t=-\mathbf{q}_1^2$ and $t_2=-(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{q}_1)^2$, respectively, $-\mathbf{q}^2=t$ being the actual momentum transfer for the reaction. It is therefore easy to see that residue functions falling off rapidly enough with t would produce at $t\simeq 0$ a vacuum-vacuum cut term mainly imaginary, and a vacuum-pole cut with roughly the same phase as the original Regge pole at $t=0$. In particular, exchange-degenerate poles would generate exchange-degenerate cuts with nearly the same ratio of real to imaginary part. This mechanism[13] would therefore produce violations of the relations derived from duality, which are smaller than the absolute corrections of cuts to the Regge amplitude. At the same time, one would preserve near the forward direction both the results of duality and the possibility of improving the Regge picture with respect to the energy dependence of the individual total cross sections, which is probably necessary in order to interpret the recent data from Serpukhov.[14]

[13] A similar point of view about duality and Regge cuts and a more detailed discussion of it can be found in V. Barger and R. J. N. Phillips, University of Wisconsin Report No. COO-247 1969 (unpublished).

[14] V. Barger and R. J. N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Letters **24**, 291 (1970).

PHYSICAL REVIEW D VOLUME 1, NUMBER 11 1 JUNE 1970

Errata

Vector Dominance and the K_{l4} Vector Form Factor, L. E. Wood [Phys. Rev. **181**, 1890 (1969)]. A misprint occurred in the first line of Eq. (14); the number 2.15×10^{11} MeV^4 should read 3.15×10^{11} MeV^4. Also, an error of normalization was made in comparing the results of Ref. 18 with the present work. In my normalization, the results of Ref. 18 are $|d|\simeq 5.4\pm 2.0$ and $|d|\simeq 2.6\pm 2.0$.

I thank Professor C. Kacser for calling the first error to my attention.

Two-Body K^-d Reactions as a Test of One-Meson Exchange, M. E. Schillaci and R. R. Silbar [Phys. Rev. **171**, 1764 (1968)]. Equation (6a) should read

$$(\sum d\sigma)_\pm = \left\{2\left[\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_{K^-p\to\bar{K}^0n}\right]^{1/2} \pm \left[\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_{K^-p\to K^-p}\right]^{1/2}\right\}^2.$$

The comments following this equation remain true, but the cross-section corridor plotted in Fig. 3 is only qualitatively correct. We hesitate to replot this graph inasmuch as data for $K^-n\to K^-n$ are now available [N. N. S. Jew, UCRL Report No. UCRL-19359, 1969 (unpublished)], and the $K^-d\to\Lambda n$ backward cross section can be obtained directly from Eqs. (2) and (4b) without the use of an isospin inequality. We wish to thank Mme. J. Noppe for calling this error to our attention.