# Erratum: Two-photon decay of the pseudoscalar mesons [Phys. Rev. D 13, 129 (1976)] 

Nathan Isgur
An arithmetic error in the calculation of $\Gamma\left(\eta_{c} \rightarrow \gamma \gamma\right)$ requires that the result quoted in this paper be multiplied by $\frac{4}{9}$. The correct prediction is $\Gamma\left(\eta_{c} \rightarrow \gamma \gamma\right)=7 \pm 2 \mathrm{keV}$.

## Erratum: Positive-parity excited baryons in a quark model with hyperfine interactions [Phys. Rev. D 19, 2653 (1979)] <br> Nathan Isgur and Gabriel Karl

The right-hand sides of Eqs. (22) and (23) shouldbe $E_{0}-\frac{2}{5} \Delta$ and $E_{0}-\frac{1}{5} \Delta$, respectively, as shown in Fig. 1. In Table II, one of the $\Sigma^{4} D_{\rho \rho} \frac{1}{2}^{+}$states should be changed to $\Sigma^{4} D_{\lambda \lambda} \frac{1}{2}^{+}$.
In the last column of Table VI, change $\Sigma_{10}{ }^{4} D_{M} \frac{7}{2}^{+}$into $\Sigma_{8}{ }^{4} D_{M} \frac{7}{2}^{+}$and interchange $\Lambda_{1}{ }^{2} D_{M}{ }^{\frac{5}{2}}{ }^{+}$with $\Lambda_{8}{ }^{2} D_{M} \frac{5}{2}^{+}$.
In Eq. (B24) change $\psi_{11}^{\lambda}$ to $\psi_{11}^{A}$.
In Eq. (B28) change ${ }^{4} 10$ to ${ }^{2} 10$.
In Eq. (C11) change $\sqrt{2} / 3$ to $-\sqrt{2} / 3$.
These were all typographic or transcription errors; none found their way into the calculations so they do not affect the physics of the paper at all.

## Erratum: Charmed baryons in a quark model with hyperfine interactions <br> [Phys. Rev. D 20, 768 (1979)]

## L. A. Copley, Nathan Isgur, and Gabriel Karl

Equation (40) of this paper contains a remnant of an earlier notation: $q$ should be replaced by $k$. There are more significant changes in Table II:
(1) The first, second, and seventh amplitudes should have the symbol $h^{\prime}$ replaced by $h^{\prime} z, h^{\prime} z$, and $h^{\prime \prime} z^{-1}$, respectively.
(2) The phase space for $\Sigma_{c}{ }^{\frac{3}{2}}{ }^{+} \rightarrow \Lambda_{c} \frac{1}{2}^{+}+\pi^{0}$ was miscalculated; the prediction for its width should
have been 40 MeV , not 60 MeV .
Finally, we mention that the spectrum of this paper was based on a $\Lambda_{c}$ mass of 2.260 MeV current at the time of its submission. If, as now seems likely, the $\Lambda_{c}$ is heavier by $\Delta m \mathrm{MeV}$, then to a good approximation our entire spectrum will be shifted upwards by the same amount.

## Erratum: Isospin-violating mass differences and mixing angles: The role of quark masses [Phys. Rev. D 21, 779 (1980)]

Nathan Isgur

Table I has several errors:
(1) The electric component of $\Sigma^{-}-\Sigma^{0}$ should be $+\frac{2}{3} \epsilon$, not $+\frac{1}{3} \epsilon$, as is required by the $\Delta I=2$ relation for $\Sigma^{+}+\Sigma^{-}-2 \Sigma^{0}$.
(2) The magnetic column should have all unsubscripted symbols $x$ replaced by $x_{s}$.
(3) The "Total theory" column should have $\Sigma^{+}-\Sigma^{0}=-3.3, \Sigma^{-}-\Sigma^{0}=+4.9$, and $\Xi^{-}-\Xi^{0}=+6.8$.

These changes improve the agreement with experiment. I am grateful to H. J. Schnitzer for a comment which brought these problems to my attention.

