ERRATA

DYNAMICS OF BROKEN SU(3) ⊗SU(3). Richard A. Brandt and Giuliano Preparata [Phys. Rev. Lett. 26, 1605 (1972)].

There are two errors in our paper. We failed to notice that A_π and B_π must vanish by charge conjugation invariance. (This does not contradict asymptotic symmetry since A_K and B_K are of order ϵ_3.) (We are grateful to Bruno Renner and Probir Roy for pointing this out to us.) Also, because of a sign mistake, Eqs. (22) are incorrect.

We find that the corrected equations, unlike the original ones, have two solutions, depending on whether the continuum contributions are parametrized as having zero or one oscillation. The solutions give, respectively, $\xi = -0.2$ and $\xi = -0.8$. However, a similar treatment of the π_{l3} amplitude in our framework rules out the first relation, and so our conclusions are unchanged. It remains true, furthermore, that, in view of the recent accurate determination of λ_+ as 0.023 [P. Basile *et al.*, Phys. Lett. 36B, 619 (1971); V. Bisi *et al.*, Phys. Lett. 36B, 533 (1971).], a large negative ξ can only be obtained in the weak PCAC framework. Our corrected analysis will be published elsewhere.

MEASUREMENT OF π^-/π^+ RATIOS IN PHOTOPRODUCTION FROM DEUTERIUM: THE DIP TEST OF AN ISOTENSOR CURRENT. T. Fujii, S. Homma, K. Huke, S. Kato, H. Okuno, F. Takasaki, T. Kondo, S. Yamada, I. Endo, and H. Fujii [Phys. Rev. Lett. 28, 1672 (1972)].

The statement on page 1672, column 1, line 10 should read "where $x = [2(\frac{3}{5})^{1/2}T/V][1 - (\frac{3}{5})^{1/2}T/V]^{-1}$." Also on page 1673, the first sentence in the third paragraph should read "$\cdots$to $\pm$ 74 MeV at $k = 800$ MeV$\cdots$."