ford[4] and Cornell[7] groups who analyzed the inelastic (deuteron breakup) process. However, no analysis of the inelastic process to date has accounted for the presence of the $D$ state in the deuteron, nor all of the final-state interactions, except in a rough manner.[2,8]

There is some uncertainty introduced into our results by unknown relativistic and meson-current effects. Nevertheless we feel that these effects will be small in the region of low momentum transfer considered here.[9]

---

*Work supported by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

†On leave from the University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany.

[1]N. K. Glendenning and G. Kramer, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory Report UCRL-9904 (to be published). The potentials were required to yield the deuteron binding energy and quadrupole moment and give a scattering phase shift at zero energy consistent with the known scattering length. In addition, the phase shifts at higher energies were calculated and they agree roughly with the analysis of the experimental data at 95 Mev by M. H. MacGregor, Phys. Rev. 123, 2154 (1961), and with two of the solutions in the energy range up to 300 Mev of M. H. Hull, K. E. Lassila, H. M. Ruppel, F. A. McDonald, and G. Breit, Phys. Rev. 122, 1606 (1961).

[2]V. Z. Jankus, Phys. Rev. 102, 1586 (1956).

[3]R. Hofstadter, Ann. Rev. Nuclear Sci. 7, 231 (1957).

[4]R. Hofstadter, C. de Vries, and R. Herman, Phys. Rev. Letters 6, 290 (1961); R. Hofstadter and R. Herman, Phys. Rev. Letters 6, 293 (1961). We used Eqs. (9) through (12) in the second of these references.

[5]J. I. Friedman, H. W. Kendall, and P. A. M. Gram, Phys. Rev. 120, 992 (1960).

[6]F. Bumiller, H. Croissiaux, E. Dally, and R. Hofstadter, Phys. Rev. 124, 1623 (1961).

[7]D. N. Olson, H. F. Schopper, and R. R. Wilson, Phys. Rev. Letters 6, 286 (1961). R. M. Littauer, H. F. Schopper, and R. R. Wilson, Phys. Rev. Letters 6, 141 (1961); 6, 144 (1961).

[8]L. Durand, III, Phys. Rev. Letters 6, 631 (1961); Phys. Rev. 123, 1393 (1961).

[9]R. Blankenbecler, thesis, Stanford University, 1958 (unpublished), has studied relativistic corrections, using a simplified model of the deuteron (two bosons, one of which is charged, bound by a separable potential). In this model the corrections can give rise to a 25 to 30% reduction in the cross section at $q = 3\ \mathrm{f}^{-1}$ which would mean that the scalar charge form factor would be larger by as much as 15%. Whether the corrections would be as large in a realistic model is not clear. However, suppose that this is the correction that obtains at $q = 3\ \mathrm{f}^{-1}$. Then if we applied a correction that is 15% at $q = 3\ \mathrm{f}^{-1}$ and goes linearly to zero as $q \to 0$, the limits we place on $F_1{}^n$ would lie one above and one below the zero value for all values of $q$ listed in our table except at $q = 2.2\ \mathrm{f}^{-1}$, where both limits are positive.

## ERRATA

RESONANCE IN THE $\Lambda\pi$ SYSTEM. Margaret Alston, Luis W. Alvarez, Philippe Eberhard, Myron L. Good, William Graziano, Harold K. Ticho, and Stanley G. Wojcicki [Phys. Rev. Letters 5, 520 (1960)].

Due to a typographical error, a sentence in the second paragraph on page 523, line 26, is incorrect and should read: "We find the ratio of events with $|\xi| < 0.5$ to all events is 0.355." The conclusions of the paragraph remain unchanged.

$\pi$-$\pi$ RESONANCE IN $\pi^-$-$p$ INTERACTIONS AT 1.25 Bev. E. Pickup, D. K. Robinson, and E. O. Salant [Phys. Rev. Letters 7, 192 (1961)].

Due to a computational error, the mean value of the $\pi^-\pi^0$ and $\pi^-\pi^+$ cross sections at the maximum of the resonance was incorrectly stated as $\sigma_{\pi-\pi} = 95$ mb. The correct value is $65.0 \pm 7.5$ mb. The values of the ordinate in Fig. 3 should be multiplied by 0.68.

LIFETIME EFFECTS IN CONDENSED FERMION SYSTEMS. A. Bardasis and J. R. Schrieffer [Phys. Rev. Letters 7, 79 (1961)].

It has been pointed out by P. Nozières that a more accurate estimate of the damping coefficient $\alpha$ for $\mathrm{He}^3$ can be made with the aid of the theoretical expression for the thermal conductivity given by Abrikosov and Khalatnikov.[1] Our original assumption that the thermal conductivity relaxation time is given by

$$\tau = \hbar / 2\alpha (kT)^2,$$

leads to $\alpha = 9.1 \times 10^{16}\ \mathrm{erg}^{-1} \simeq 37.6/E_F$. The more refined estimate using $m^* = 2.82\ m$ gives $\alpha = 4.27 \times 10^{15}\ \mathrm{erg}^{-1} \simeq 1.77/E_F$. With this value one finds that damping effects reduce the transition temperature $T_c{}^0$, predicted in the absence of damping, to

$$T_c \simeq 0.32\ T_c{}^0.$$

[1]A. A. Abrikosov and I. M. Khalatnikov, Reports on Progress in Physics (The Physical Society, London, 1959), Vol. 22, p. 329.