wish to thank Dr. D. Kurath of the Argonne National Laboratory for the log*ft* calculations.

---

†This work was performed under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

[1]F. S. Goulding, D. A. Landis, J. Cerny, and R. H. Pehl. IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. NS-13, 514 (1966).

[2]J. Cerny, S. W. Cosper, G. W. Butler, H. Brunnader, R. L. McGrath, and F. S. Goulding, to be published.

[3]G. T. Garvey and I. Kelson, Phys. Rev. Letters 16, 197 (1966).

[4]A. E. Baz', V. I. Gol'danskii, and Ya. B. Zel'dovich, Usp. Fiz. Nauk 72, 211 (1960) [translation: Soviet Phys.–Usp. 3, 729 (1961)].

[5]S. W. Cosper, J. Cerny, and R. C. Gatti, Phys. Rev. (to be published).

[6]J. Cerny, S. W. Cosper, G. W. Butler, R. H. Pehl, F. S. Goulding, D. A. Landis, and C. Dètraz, Phys. Rev. Letters 16, 469 (1966).

[7]This peak falls exactly half-way between the positions that would be occupied by the unbound nuclei ^{6}Be and ^{5}Be.

[8]It was also considered that a peak could arise from the disintegration of a nucleus in the Al foil or the front surface of the first ΔE detector [see R. W. Ollerhead, C. Chasman, and D. A. Bromley, Phys. Rev. 134, B74 (1964)]. However, calculation shows that this process is orders of magnitude too small to account for the observed peaks. The peaks could not be due to hyperfragments because their expected short lifetimes would make the yields at the two distances from the target very different.

[9]The energies observed in these experiments are considerably above the Coulomb barriers for the emission of these fragments from uranium and, therefore, are in a region where fragment intensity is decreasing with increasing energy.

[10]No peaks were observed in the positions expected for ^{7}He and ^{9}He in agreement with previous results (see Ref. 5).

[11]A. Schwarzschild, A. M. Poskanzer, G. T. Emery, and M. Goldhaber, Phys. Rev. 133, B1 (1964).

[12]A. M. Poskanzer, P. L. Reeder, and I. Dostrovsky, Phys. Rev. 138, B18 (1965).

[13]D. Kurath, private communication; see also S. Cohen and D. Kurath, Nucl. Phys. 73, 1 (1965).

[14]J. Cerny and G. T. Garvey, Isobaric Spin in Nuclear Physics, edited by J. D. Fox and D. Robson (Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1966), pp. 514 and 517.

[15]I. Dostrovsky, R. Davis, A. M. Poskanzer, and P. L. Reeder, Phys. Rev. 139, B1513 (1965); A. M. Poskanzer, R. A. Esterlund, and R. McPherson, Phys. Rev. Letters 15, 1030 (1965).

ERRATA

π-p CHARGE-EXCHANGE PROCESSES IN THE REGION OF 2 GeV/c. A. S. Carroll, I. F. Corbett, C. J. S. Damerell, N. Middlemas, D. Newton, A. B. Clegg, and W. S. C. Williams [Phys. Rev. Letters 16, 288 (1966)].

An error was made in calculating the sign of the interference term between the Regge amplitude and the resonant amplitudes. As a result the full curves in Fig. 1 correspond to a $J=l+\frac{1}{2}$ assignment to the $N^*(2190)$ and the broken curves to a $J=l-\frac{1}{2}$ assignment. Our conclusions should therefore be changed to say that the analysis favors a $J=l+\frac{1}{2}$ assignment.

This error was drawn to our attention by Dr. R. J. N. Phillips; we are indebted to him for this. Dr. Phillips has also indicated that the tails of other resonances than those included in our calculation can make important changes in the calculated curves, and that the distinction between $J=l+\frac{1}{2}$ and $l-\frac{1}{2}$ may not be so clear cut. The dominance of the Regge amplitude at this low energy is still supported.

COHERENT SCATTERING OF HOT ELECTRONS IN GOLD FILMS. J. G. Simmons, R. R. Verderber, J. Lytollis, and R. Lomax [Phys. Rev. Letters 17, 675 (1966)].

Equation (1) is correct only for electrons escaping from the upper surface of the gold electrode, for which case the component of momentum in the plane of the films is conserved as the electron crosses the electrode-vacuum interface. In the case of electrons escaping from a pinhole edge, the component of momentum parallel to the edge is conserved but the component normal to the edge is not. Under these conditions the image at the phosphor screen is semicircular, and the radius is given by

$$r=2s\left[\frac{(V_b+\eta)\sin^2 2\theta-(\varphi+\eta)}{V_a}\right]^{1/2}.$$

In the third sentence in the fourth paragraph substitute 180° for 90°. The inequality $|v_\parallel|\sin\beta>[(\varphi+\eta)2/m]^{1/2}$ should read $|v_\parallel|\cos\beta>[(\varphi+\eta)2/m]^{1/2}$.