Erratum: Comparison of Polarization Observables in Electron Scattering from the Proton and Deuteron [Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 452 (1998)]

B. D. Milbrath, J. I. McIntyre, C. S. Armstrong, D. H. Barkhuff, W. Bertozzi, J. P. Chen, D. Dale, G. Dodson, K. A. Dow, M. B. Epstein, M. Farkhondeh, J. M. Finn, S. Gilad, M. K. Jones, K. Joo, J. J. Kelly, S. Kowalski, R. W. Lourie, R. Madey, D. J. Margaziotis, P. Markowitz, C. Mertz, J. Mitchell, C. F. Perdrisat, V. Punjabi, L. Qin, P. M. Rutt, A. J. Sarty, D. Tieger, C. Tschalær, W. Turchinetz, P. E. Ulmer, S. P. Van Verst, G. A. Warren, L. B. Weinstein, and R. J. Woo

(Bates FPP Collaboration)

[S0031-9007(99)08663-9]

In our Letter, we reported measurements of recoil proton polarization observables for the $p(\vec{e}, e'\vec{p})$ and $d(\vec{e}, e'\vec{p})n$ reactions. Because our proton polarimeter was located near the focal plane of a magnetic spectrometer, we used the optics code COSY [1] to model the proton spin precession through the spectrometer. Subsequent analysis of an overlapping data set that includes nonzero proton recoil momenta [2] revealed instabilities in the first- and second-order matrix elements which resulted from our attempt to model a 3 mrad misalignment of the quadrupole magnets. The values in Table I were obtained using an independent first-order optics model [3] and supersede those previously published. The first errors are statistical while the second are systematic. The new values are within the quoted uncertainties of our previous analysis and do not affect our conclusions.

TABLE I. Summary of polarization observables.

Reaction	Q^2	$D_{\ell\ell}$	$D_{\ell t}$	P_n	$\mu_p G_E^p / G_M^p$
$p(\vec{e}, e'\vec{p})$	0.38	$0.63 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.04$	$-0.48 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.02$	⋯	$0.95 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.02$
$d(\vec{e}, e'\vec{p})$	0.38	$0.60 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.04$	$-0.48 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.03$	$0.001 \pm 0.005 \pm 0.003$	$1.00 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.02$
$p(\vec{e}, e'\vec{p})$	0.50	$0.81 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.05$	$-0.41 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.02$	⋯	$1.02 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.02$
$d(\vec{e}, e'\vec{p})$	0.50	$0.77 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.05$	$-0.41 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.02$	$0.005 \pm 0.005 \pm 0.003$	$1.07 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.02$

[1] M. Berz, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **298**, 473 (1990).
[2] D. H. Barkhuff *et al.* (to be published).
[3] D. H. Barkhuff, Bates/Internal Report No. 97-01, 1997.

