

---

 E R R A T A
 

---

RATIO OF THE WAVE-FUNCTION RENORMALIZATION CONSTANTS. N. N. Khuri [Phys. Rev. Letters 16, 75 (1966)].

In taking the limit  $q_0 \rightarrow \infty$  for finite cutoff  $\lambda$  and going from Eq. (7) to Eq. (10), the contribution from disconnected terms goes to zero. However, if one separates out the disconnected terms before taking  $q^0 \rightarrow \infty$ , then one recovers the usual Källén-Lehmann sum rule plus other terms which must vanish for all  $q^0$ . This sheds strong doubts upon the validity of the interchanges of orders of limits used in our paper. Even though the result might still be correct the derivation is not correct, even heuristically. We thank Professor F. Zachariasen for correspondence that clarified this point. Doubts about assumption (c) were expressed earlier by C. R. Hagen.

EXPERIMENTAL TEST OF TIME-REVERSAL INVARIANCE IN THE DECAY  $K_L^0 \rightarrow \pi^- + \mu + \nu$ . D. Bartlett, C. E. Friedberg, K. Goulianos, and D. Hutchinson [Phys. Rev. Letters 16, 282 (1966)].

Equation (7) should read

$$P_{\text{expt}}^T = \left\langle \frac{(\vec{p}_\pi \times \vec{p}_\mu) \cdot \vec{p}_K}{|(\vec{p}_\pi \times \vec{p}_\mu) \cdot \vec{p}_K|} (\vec{\sigma}_\mu \cdot \vec{p}_K) \right\rangle.$$

The last sentence of footnote 9 should be changed to, "The approximately 20% extra sensitivity that is gained by using decays favorable to seeing a transverse polarization is lost by looking for the polarization along a fixed direction, rather than along the normal to the decay plane."

ALGEBRA OF CURRENTS AND  $K_{e_3}$  DECAY. V. S. Mathur, S. Okubo, and L. K. Pandit [Phys. Rev. Letters 16, 371 (1966)].

The SU(3) symmetry value of  $f_+(0)$  is  $(1/\sqrt{2}) \times \sin\theta_\nu \approx 0.18$ , not 0.13 as quoted in the paragraph following Eq. (8). Our result of Eq. (8),  $f_+(0) = 0.20$ , is thus much nearer to the SU(3) value than stated. Agreement with the experimental value improves if we use the recent estimate<sup>1</sup> of  $\sin\theta_\nu \approx 0.21$ ; our value from Eq. (8) then changes to  $f_+(0) = 0.16$ , and the SU(3) value to 0.15.

<sup>1</sup>S. Oneda and J. Sucher, Phys. Rev. Letters 15, 927 (1965).