## **ERRATA**

ANOMALOUS CONDUCTION-ELECTRON PO-LARIZATION IN SUPERCONDUCTING YRh<sub>4</sub>B<sub>4</sub>. P. K. Tse, A. T. Aldred, and F. Y. Fradin [Phys. Rev. Lett. 43, 1825 (1979)].

The values in Table I, line 4, are incorrect and should read as follows:

$$\frac{x}{\mu_{\text{eff}}}$$
 (corr) ( $\mu_{\text{B}}/\text{Er}$ ) ··· 9.49 10.80 9.87 9.58

The first sentence at the top right-hand side of p. 1826 should read:

"Because of the inhomogeneous Knight-shift broadening, we only observe the  $\pm \frac{1}{2}$  transition

for the alloys. There is a gradual loss...."

RIPPLONS, <sup>3</sup>He, AND HEAT CONDUCTION ON THE SURFACE OF SUPERFLUID <sup>4</sup>He. I. B. Mantz, D. O. Edwards, and V. U. Nayak [Phys. Rev. Lett. 44, 663 (1980)].

There is a factor of 2 error in the formula for the 2D  $^3$ He- $^3$ He cross section  $\sigma_v$  in the last paragraph of the paper. The formula for  $\sigma_v$  should read

$$\sigma_{n} = M |V^{s}(0)|^{2}/(2\hbar^{3}v)$$

which gives for the numerical estimate of the conductivity,  $K_3 \sim 3 \times 10^{-5} T$  erg sec<sup>-1</sup> K<sup>-2</sup>.

ION-BEAM NEUTRALIZATION-REIONIZATION SPECTROSCOPY OF ION-PAIR FORMATION IN REACTIONS OF He\*( $2^3S$ ) AND He\*( $2^1S$ ) WITH O<sub>2</sub>. Thomas M. Miller and Keith T. Gillen [Phys. Rev. Lett. 44, 776 (1980)].

The byline and address should read as follows:

## Thomas M. Miller

Molecular Physics Laboratory, SRI International, Menlo Park, California 94025, and Physics Department, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73019<sup>(a)</sup>

and

## Keith T. Gillen

Molecular Physics Laboratory, SRI International, Menlo Park, California 94025

Footnote (a) should read (a) Present address.

HIGH-RESOLUTION INFRARED STUDY OF HYDROGEN  $(1 \times 1)$  ON TUNGSTEN (100). Y. J. Chabal and A. J. Sievers [Phys. Rev. Lett. 44, 944 (1980)].

The vertical scale in Fig. 2 should read 0%, 2.5%, 5%, and 7.5% instead of 0%, 5%, 10%, and 15%, i.e., the peak absorption should be 8% instead of 16%. The effective charge,  $e^*/e$ , derived from the data is thus  $0.029 \pm 0.007$ , in better agreement with the model proposed in the Letter.