which is likely to be easily satisfied.

If the decay $D^+ \to \bar{K}^0\pi^+$ is not enhanced, as is to be expected theoretically, the upper limits on all the remaining modes, $K_s\pi^\pm$, $\pi^+\pi^-$, and K^+K^-, lead to no constraints at all, because these modes are suppressed by $\tan^2\theta_C$ relative to the dominant modes.

Obviously, the nonobservation of charmed hadrons at SPEAR does little to strengthen the case for the hidden-charm interpretation of the newly discovered bosons. How much the case is weakened by the new data is a topic for subjective interpretation of the bounds we have quoted above. In our minds the most damaging result is that two-body decays of D^0 account for less than 10% of its total width. While such a suppression is neither unthinkable nor unprecedented, we find it disturbing not only because it is so small but also because, if 90% of the nonleptonic decays are to three or more particles, it will be difficult to understand the observed charged-particle multiplicity. We disagree with the conclusion of Boyarski *et al.* that their upper limit on $B(D^+ \to \bar{K}^0\pi^+$ or $K^-\pi^+\pi^+)$ violates the expectation of the conventional model by a factor of at least 3.[12] In fact, in the conventional model, with all of its pre-J/ψ baggage of sextet enhancement and $\underline{10}$ suppression, both decays are expected to be absent (i.e., not dominant). An incautious interpretation is that the nonobservation of these modes is good for the model, but we do not wish to go so far. Indeed, it is our feeling that if some of the upper limits, such as those given in Eqs. (2), (9), and (13), were decreased by factors of 2 or 3, the conventional charm scheme[2-6] would require modification.

---

*Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Fellow; also at Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 60637.

†Operated by Universities Research Association Inc. under contract with the U. S. Energy Research and Development Administration.

[1]A. M. Boyarski *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 35, 196 (1975).

[2]S. L. Glashow, J. Iliopoulos, and L. Maiani, Phys. Rev. D 2, 1285 (1970).

[3]G. Altarelli, N. Cabibbo, and L. Maiani, Nucl. Phys. B88, 285 (1975). The same result was given independently by R. L. Kingsley, S. B. Treiman, F. Wilczek, and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. D 11, 1919 (1975).

[4]Kingsley, Treiman, Wilczek, and Zee, Ref. 3.

[5]M. B. Einhorn and C. Quigg, Phys. Rev. D (to be published).

[6]M. K. Gaillard, B. W. Lee, and J. L. Rosner, Rev. Mod. Phys. 47, 277 (1975).

[7]J.-E. Augustin *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 34, 764 (1975).

[8]V. Chaloupka *et al.*, Phys. Lett. 50B, 1 (1974).

[9]Y. Dothan and H. Harari, Nuovo Cimento, Suppl. No. 3, 48 (1965). The statement in Ref. 1 that the modes $K^-\pi^+\pi^+$, $\bar{K}^0\bar{K}^0K^+$, $\bar{K}^0\pi^+\eta$, and $\bar{K}^0\pi^+\pi^0$ should occur in the ratios 4:4:3:1 is correct only if they are in the *totally symmetric* $\underline{10}$. It is not true in general.

[10]M. K. Gaillard and B. W. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 33, 108 (1974).

[11]G. Altarelli and L. Maiani, Phys. Lett. 52B, 351 (1974).

[12]The discussion surrounding Table IV of Ref. 6, on which Boyarski *et al.* apparently base their conclusion, clearly warns that these modes may be strongly suppressed.

ERRATUM

BOUND FOR THE KINETIC ENERGY OF FERMIONS WHICH PROVES THE STABILITY OF MATTER. Elliott H. Lieb and Walter E. Thirring [Phys. Rev. Lett. 35, 687 (1975)].

Equation (2), replace $N_{-\alpha/2}(|V+\alpha/2|_-)$ with $N_{-\alpha/2}(-|V+a/2|_-)$.

Equation (13), replace $-3.68N$ with $-3.68N\gamma$.

Equation (15), replace $(\ldots)^2$ with $(\ldots)$.

On page 687, line 15, replace $\geq E$ by $\leq E$.