ERRATA

Where the Sign of the Metric Makes a Difference. STEVEN CARLIP and CÉCILE DEWITT-MORETTE [Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1599 (1988)].

Reference 3 should read as follows:

[3]For a more intuitive proof using explicit constructions of the Stiefel-Whitney classes in terms of the transition functions of the bundles, see Yvonne Choquet-Bruhat and Cécile DeWitt-Morette, "Analysis, Manifolds and Physics. Part II. Recent Applications" (North-Holland, Amsterdam, to be published), problem entitled "Obstruction to the Construction of a Pin-bundle."

High Proton Momenta and Nucleon-Nucleon Correlations in the Reaction ^{3}He$(e,e'p)$. C. MARCHAND, M. BERNHEIM, P. C. DUNN, A. GÉRARD, J. M. LAGET, A. MAGNON, J. MORGENSTERN, J. MOUGEY, J. PICARD, D. REFFAY-PIKEROEN, S. TURCK-CHIEZE, P. VERNIN, M. K. BRUSSEL, G. P. CAPITANI, E. DE SANCTIS, S. FRULLANI, and F. GARIBALDI [Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1703 (1988)].

On p. 1703, right-hand column, line 3 should read "0 to 90 MeV" instead of "0 to 90."

On p. 1705, Fig. 3(b), the references inset should be "^{3}He Refs. 1,14" instead of "^{3}He Refs. 1,10"; "^{3}He this experiment" (no change); and "^{2}H Refs. 12" instead of "^{2}H Ref. 15."

On p. 1705, Table II heading, change the units of $n_2(p)$ and $n_3(p)$ to 10^{-3} $(\text{GeV}/c)^{-3}$ sr^{-1} instead of $(\text{GeV}/c)^{-3}$ sr^{-1}.

The final sentence in text, p. 1706, should read "Further refinements of the reaction theory relating to the final-state continuum are needed before the discrepancies that remain between theory and experiment are evaluated."

Modulated Structures for Incommensurate Monolayer Solid Phases of D$_2$ Physisorbed on Graphite. JINHE CUI, SAMUEL C. FAIN, JR., H. FREIMUTH, H. WIECHERT, H. P. SCHILDBERG, and H. J. LAUTER [Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1848 (1988)].

Two errors should be corrected.

On p. 1848, right-hand column, in the line "ZYX data are discussed in more detail elsewhere" Ref. 4 should be replaced by Ref. 14.

On p. 1850, left-hand column, the fifteenth line from the bottom should read "The ratio of the satellite intensity (2 or 5) to the main peak (3+4) was 0.05 $\pm 0.01 \ldots$." The error on p. 1850 is especially serious as a satellite of intensity 0.5 would have implications much different than what was actually observed.

Slowing-Down-Tail Enhancement of the Neoclassical Energy Flux of α's. PETER J. CATTO [Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1954 (1988)].

In the second sentence following Eq. (16) the inequalities are given in the wrong order. The sentence should read, "Consequently, an acceptable radial energy loss via the tail α's requires $\epsilon^{1/2}(v_0/\Omega_{p\alpha}r)^2 \ll 1$, which is more restrictive than the condition needed to avoid drift losses,[1] $\epsilon^{3/2}(v_0/\Omega_{p\alpha}r)^2 \ll 1$."