

nent when $|F_\pi|^2$ is plotted.

The fact that we do not have a perfect agreement in the region $0.3 < t < 1.0$ (GeV/c)², shown in Fig. 2, can be partly understood because (i) we do not have the right threshold behavior [one should expect $\text{Im}F_\pi(t) \sim t^{3/2}$ at threshold according to the Gounaris-Sakurai formula¹²], and (ii) we are not considering ρ - ω interference. We expect that when these things are taken into account, appreciable modifications will only arise in the vicinity of the relevant regions.

In the spacelike region plotted in Fig. 3, the

agreement is very good and we get for the pion radius the value 0.67 F for both models. The ρ -dominance comparison curve corresponds to $F_\pi = m_\rho^2/(m_\rho^2 - t)$.

In Fig. 4 we plot our predictions for the region $6 < t < 20$ (GeV/c)².

I would like to thank Professor J. J. Sakurai for suggesting the problem and for many useful discussions. Thanks are also due to J. Frez for valuable help in writing the computer program for the calculations.

*On leave of absence from Facultad de Ciencias Físicas y Matemáticas, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile.

¹Y. Oyanagi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **42**, 898 (1969); M. Namiki and I. Ohba, *ibid.* **42**, 1166 (1969); T. C. Chia, M. Hama, and D. Kiang, Phys. Rev. D **1**, 2126 (1970); F. Drago and A. F. Grillo, Nuovo Cimento **64**, 695 (1970); P. H. Frampton, Phys. Rev. D **1**, 3141 (1970); P. H. Frampton, Phys. Rev. **186**, 1419 (1969); P. di Vecchia and F. Drago, Nuovo Cimento Lett. **18**, 917 (1969); R. Jengo and E. Remiddi, *ibid.* **18**, 922 (1969).

²G. Gounaris, Phys. Rev. D **4**, 2788 (1971).

³M. Greco, Nucl. Phys. **B63**, 398 (1973).

⁴V. E. Balakin *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **41B**, 205 (1972).

⁵M. Bernardini *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **46B**, 261 (1973).

⁶D. Benaksas *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **39B**, 289 (1972).

⁷V. L. Auslander *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **25B**, 433 (1967); V. L. Auslander *et al.*, Yad. Fiz. **9**, 114 (1969) [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **9**, 69 (1969)].

⁸C. N. Brown *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **8**, 92 (1973).

⁹C. Driver *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **35B**, 77 (1971).

¹⁰C. J. Bebek *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **9**, 1229 (1974).

¹¹A. Sofair *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B42**, 369 (1973).

¹²G. J. Gounaris and J. J. Sakurai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **21**, 244 (1968). See also W. R. Frazer and J. R. Fulco, Phys. Rev. **117**, 1609 (1960).

Errata

Erratum: Unified model of current-hadronic interactions [Phys. Rev. D **8**, 2152 (1973)]

J. W. Moffat and A. C. D. Wright

The left-hand side of Eq. (3.12) should read $A(s, t, q_1^2, q_2^2)$ instead of $A_{33}(s, t, q_1^2, q_2^2)$, and on

p. 2159, first column, twelfth line from the bottom, A_{33} should read A .

Erratum: Measurement of the branching ratios of $K_{\mu 2}^+$, $K_{\pi 2}^+$, $K_{e 3}^+$, and $K_{\mu 3}^+$ [Phys. Rev. **155**, 1505 (1967)]

L. B. Auerbach, J. MacG. Dobbs, A. K. Mann, W. K. McFarlane, D. H. White, R. Cester, P. T. Eschstruth, G. K. O'Neill, and D. E. Yount

A mistake was made in the computation of the $K_{\mu 3}^+$ branching ratio. This error, which was pointed out by Gaillard and Chounet,¹ also affects the other branching ratios, $K_{\mu 2}^+$, $K_{\pi 2}^+$, and $K_{e 3}^+$, presented in the paper. Although the experiment

was performed and published some time ago, these results are still used in data compilations and contribute substantially to the degree of disagreement among the experiments on K^+ decay. It is, therefore, useful to recalculate all of the results of the