between K_{e3}^+ and K_{e3}^0 decays is 1% rather than 4% as quoted by Willis in Ref. 1 seems to have been first noted by Dr. T. W. Quirk (private communication).

[8]N. Cabibbo, in Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on High Energy Physics, Berkeley, 1966 (University of California Press, Berkeley, Calif., 1967), p. 29.

[9]Aachen-Bari-CERN-Padova-Madrid-Valencia Collaboration, in Proceedings of the International Conference on Elementary Particles, Heidelberg, Germany, 1967 (North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, to be published); private communication from Dr. R. C. Field (to be published).

[10]The most direct test is to examine the π-e angular correlation in the dilepton center of mass. See S. W. MacDowell, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 18, 171 (1962).

[11]J. L. Acioli and S. W. MacDowell, Nuovo Cimento 24, 606 (1962).

[12]The branching ratio $K_{e2}/K_{\mu 2}$ (see Ref. 2), as well as being a test of the presence of a pseudoscalar interaction, is also a test of e-μ universality. This process, however, involves the axial-vector current.

ERRATA

SOME EFFECTS OF QUANTIZATION OF INTERNAL ROTATION ON SPIN-LATTICE RELAXATION AND HYPERFINE STRUCTURE. W. L. Gamble, I. Miyagawa, and R. L. Hartman [Phys. Rev. Letters 20, 415 (1968)].

Line 4 of the first column of p. 416 should read "2, 4, and 6 at low temperatures."

The sentence beginning on line 15 of paragraph 3, column 2, on p. 416 should read, "The levels marked A are nondegenerate and totally symmetric with respect to the elements of the symmetry group C_3."

The chemical formula in line 14, paragraph 2, column 1, on p. 418 should be "H_3C-$\dot{C}HR$."

Since there has been some confusion, the authors would like to point out explicitly that the quantum effect referred to in the last sentence of the abstract is that of the failure of the modified Bloch equation. Additional evidence that a quantized rotational model for methyl groups is necessary at low temperatures has been obtained by ENDOR experiments [James W. Wells and Harold C. Box, J. Chem. Phys. 46, 2935 (1967); S. Clough and F. Poldy, Phys. Letters 24A, 545 (1967), and 25A, 186 (1967)].

ORIGIN OF SOLVENT KNIGHT SHIFTS IN ALLOYS. R. E. Watson, L. H. Bennett, and A. J. Freeman [Phys. Rev. Letters 20, 653 (1968)].

The curves of the figure labeled "theory" (Fig. 1) include the effects of lattice volume changes on P_F (contrary to the statement in the caption) although the P_F curves, as shown, do not include these volume effects. In any case, as noted in footnote 10, the placement of the "theory" curves is uncertain (whether above or below the experimental curves) because of the difficulties in obtaining any estimate of χ_p. Details have been given elsewhere [R. E. Watson, L. H. Bennett, and A. J. Freeman, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. 12, 689 (1968), and L. H. Bennett, R. W. Mebs, and R. E. Watson, Phys. Rev. (to be published)]. We thank A. J. McAlister for pointing out this error in the figure.

CORRECTIONS TO THE EXPERIMENTAL VALUE FOR THE ELECTRON g-FACTOR ANOMALY. Arthur Rich [Phys. Rev. Letters 20, 967 (1968)].

The following typographical errors were made:

Page 967, read

$$a_{\text{theory}}^{B} = 0.001\,159\,641(3)$$

instead of 0.001 159 614(3).

Page 968, Eq. (1),

$$a\left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1}\right)\frac{[v_z^2]}{c^2}$$

instead of

$$a\left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1}\right)\frac{[v_z^2]}{C^2};$$

Equation (2), $\{B(z_1')\}^{-1/2}$ instead of $\{B(z')\}^{-1/2}$.

Page 969, Eq. (3b), $[v_z^2(z')]$ instead of $[v_z^2(z)]$.

Page 970, top of the first column,

$$\int_{z_i^m}^{z^M} \rho dz' \text{ instead of } \int_{z_1^m}^{z^M} \rho dz';$$

top of the second column, $\delta\langle[B]\rangle_i = \pm\frac{1}{2}([B(z^M)] - [B(z_i^m)])$ instead of $\delta\langle[B]\rangle = \pm\frac{1}{2}([B(z^M)] - [B(z_2^m)])$, and $[v_z^2(z_i^m)]$ instead of $[v_z^2(z_1^m)]$.

NUCLEAR SPIN-LATTICE RELAXATION MEASUREMENTS BY TONE-BURST MODULATION. D. C. Look and D. R. Locker [Phys. Rev. Letters 20, 987 (1968)].

Equation (4) should read, $X = \pi\gamma H_1^2/2\nu_m H_m$. Also the parameter τ of Eq. (2) should be given as $\tau = 1/2\nu_m$. A derivation of X for solids, using Provotorov's theory of saturation, is given in the recently published article: M. Goldman, et al., Phys. Rev. 168, 301 (1968).