2547 (1970).

[9]R. Shotwell, thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1973 (unpublished).

[10]Whether or not the mapping improves Eq. (6) for any finite n depends upon how the physical structure manifests itself in terms of the behavior of the individual coefficients of the ACE. As M. J. Moravcsik points out {in *Proceedings of the KEK Summer School, Ibaraki, Japan, 1972,* edited by M. Kawagushi and K. Takahashi [National Laboratory for High Energy Physics (KEK), Ibaraki, Japan, 1972], pp. 179–191}, in the only instance where the ACE results were compared with the results of a more conventional phase-shift analysis and where there is no disagreement as to the phase shifts, in nucleon-nucleon scattering, the results are ambiguous. It is not known whether the increased economy of representation (which occurs only in several instances) is due to the ACE technique or to the extra information obtained by the use of the second-derivative matrices from Moravcsik's analyses (the ACE fit was not to the experimental data).

[11]R. E. Cutkosky, Ann. Phys. (New York) 54, 350 (1969).

[12]Y. A. Chao, Phys. Rev. Lett. 25, 309 (1970).

[13]R. C. Miller, T. B. Novey, A. Yokosawa, R. E. Cutkosky, H. R. Hicks, R. L. Kelley, C. C. Shih, and G. Burleson, Nucl. Phys. B37, 401 (1972).

[14]A similar comment is made in Ref. 10.

ERRATA

SUPERMULTIPLET SYMMETRY IN THE REACTION $^3H+{}^9Be\rightarrow{}^6Li+{}^6He$, $^6Li^*+{}^6He$. W. von Oertzen, E. R. Flynn, J. D. Garrett, and E. Cosman [Phys. Rev. Lett. 31, 724 (1973)].

Recent measurements in the full angular range of the two reactions $^9Be(t,{}^6He)^6Li$ and $^9Be(t,{}^6He)^6Li^*$(3.56 MeV) (22–160° c.m.) and a reanalysis of the previous data show that the transition leading to the $T=1$ state in ^6Li at 3.56 MeV is almost symmetric by 90° within the overall experimental error of 20–60% (depending on angle). The previously cited deviations of almost a factor of 2 which occurred at two angles appear as experimental deviations at certain angles due to difficulties in background subtraction.

DYNAMIC JAHN-TELLER EFFECT FOR AN ELECTRONIC E STATE COUPLED TO THE PHONON CONTINUUM. Napoléon Gauthier and M. B. Walker [Phys. Rev. Lett. 31, 1211 (1973)].

An amended version of this paper was submitted by the authors after having received the report of the referee; unfortunately the original version was published. The corrections contained in the amended version are as follows:

On page 1212, the first sentence following Eq. (8) should be replaced by "First, assume $\hat{H}_s=0$; the equation $[E_0-\Delta(E_0)]|\psi\rangle=0$ then determines E_0. Next, write $E=E_0+E'$, and assume that $|E'-\hat{H}_s|$ is small, so that

$$[E'-\hat{H}_s-\bar{\epsilon}_p]^{-1}\approx\bar{\epsilon}_p^{-1}-[E'-\hat{H}_s]\bar{\epsilon}_p^{-2}, \qquad (9)$$

where $\bar{\epsilon}_p\equiv\epsilon_p-E_0$; to second order in $f_{p\alpha}$,

$$\bar{\epsilon}_p=\epsilon_p+\sum_{p',\alpha'}\epsilon_{p'}^{-1}|f_{p'\alpha'}|^2."$$

In Eq. (10), replace ϵ_p^{-2} by $\bar{\epsilon}_p^{-2}$. Equation (11) should read

$$\hat{\Delta}(E)=E_0-b(E'-\hat{G}_1\hat{I})-c\hat{G}_2\hat{A}_2-d(\hat{G}_\theta\hat{U}_\theta+\hat{G}_\epsilon\hat{U}_\epsilon). \qquad (11)$$

On page 1212, in the paragraph after Eq. (12) replace $E-\hat{H}_s$ by $E'-\hat{H}_s$. On page 1212, in Eq. (13) replace E by E' and delete "to within an unimportant additive constant" in the line following. In Eqs. (16) and (18), replace ϵ_p^{-2} by $\bar{\epsilon}_p^{-2}$ in the second-order contributions.

The sentence following Eq. (17) should carry a reference to the following footnote: "Stimulated by this result, Frank S. Ham (private comunication) has re-examined the proof given in Ref. 4 that the relation $q=\frac{1}{2}(1+p)$ is valid in general for linear coupling, and has found it to be in error."

On page 1213, column 1, line 7, replace A^2 by a^2. In the first sentence following Eq. (19), read $|E'-\hat{H}_s|$. In Eq. (21) replace $E-\hat{H}_{eff}$ by $E'-\hat{H}_{eff}$

so that it reads

$$\hat{G}^R(E \pm i0) = (1+b)\hat{G}(E \pm i0) = [E' - \hat{H}_{\rm eff} \pm i\hat{\Gamma}^R(E)]^{-1}. \quad (21)$$

Equation (23) should read

$$\langle m|\hat{\Gamma}^R(E_0+E_m)|m\rangle = \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{m'} w_{mm'}. \quad (23)$$

In Ref. 2, add "see also A. Abragam and B. Bleaney, *Electron Paramagnetic Resonance of Transition Ions* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1970)."

DYNAMIC EFFECTIVE-FIELD SCHEME FOR RARE-EARTH SYSTEMS. Albert Furrer and Heinz Heer [Phys. Rev. Lett. 31, 1350 (1973)].

The first sentence in the second column on page 1351 should be replaced by the following: "Equation (14) limits the summation procedure in Eq. (15) to the argument range $|H_{\rm dyn,s}| \leq 2(2\ln 2\, k_B T\lambda)^{1/2}$. Moreover, symmetry considerations show that in the paramagnetic state one has to take only positive values for $H_{\rm dyn,s}$."

ZERO-FIELD SUSCEPTIBILITY OF THE TWO-DIMENSIONAL ISING MODEL NEAR T_c. Eytan Barouch, Barry M. McCoy, and Tai Tsun Wu [Phys. Rev. Lett. 31, 1409 (1973)].

The final term was omitted from the printed version of Eq. (13b). The correct form of the equation is

$$C_{0^-} = D\int_0^\infty \theta\, d\theta\Big([1-\eta(\theta)]\exp\{\int_\theta^\infty [1-\eta^2(x)]x\ln x\, dx - g(\theta)\} - 2\Big).$$