ERRATA

ELECTRIC-FIELD-INDUCED INFRARED ABSORPTION IN DIAMOND. E. Anastassakis, S. Iwasa, and E. Burstein [Phys. Rev. Letters 17, 1051 (1966)].

The last paragraph on p. 1053 should read as follows: The nonzero contributions to $\epsilon_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}(\omega)$ are those for which $\vec{\mathcal{E}}(\omega)$, $\vec{\mathcal{E}}(0)$, and $\hat{d}(j,0)$ have components which are mutually orthogonal to one another due to the restriction $\mu \neq \lambda \neq \sigma$. For the configuration used in this experiment, with $\vec{E}(0)$ along [001] and $\vec{q}$ along [1$\bar{1}$0], only the component of the em radiation with $\vec{E}(\omega)$ along [110] and the TO vibration mode with $\hat{d}$ along [110] interact.

TEST OF TIME-REVERSAL INVARIANCE IN $K_{\mu\nu\gamma}$ DECAY. S. W. MacDowell [Phys. Rev. Letters 17, 1116 (1966)].

After the publication of this paper, there was called to my attention a paper on the same subject by J. L. Gervais, J. Iliopoulos, and J. M. Kaplan [Phys. Letters 20, 432 (1966)]. In addition to the amplitude for interval bremsstrahlung, the general form of interaction includes two terms, one from an axial-vector coupling $\langle\gamma|J_\mu{}^A|K\rangle\bar{u}_l\gamma_\mu u_\nu$ and one from a vector coupling $\langle\gamma|J_\mu{}^V|K\rangle\bar{u}_l\gamma_\mu u_\nu$. In the present paper only the first of these terms was considered; whereas in the paper by Gervais *et al.* they have considered a model which includes the second term only. In the latter case the polarization *does not* change sign and may become much larger than in the former. Their results show that the average transverse polarization could be as large as 20% with a maximum value in the Dalitz plot of 57%. Therefore, modifying my concluding statement, one could say that the transverse polarization of muons in $K_{\mu\nu\gamma}$ decay is a reasonably good test of T invariance.

INELASTIC LIGHT SCATTERING FROM LANDAU-LEVEL ELECTRONS IN SEMICONDUCTORS. R. E. Slusher, C. K. N. Patel, and P. A. Fleury [Phys. Rev. Letters 18, 77 (1967)].

Page 78, column 2, lines 28 and 29 should read as follows: "··· we obtain $m^*=0.0152m$ at 26 kOe and $m^*=0.0166m$ at 52 kOe from the spin-flip scattering results."