

tries of the right column of the table; the present statistical accuracy is poor for large x , while the various defects in the theoretical model become more important for particles at the lower energies. The balance of the table is included to indicate the qualitative nature of these preliminary calculations. An indication of the statistical accuracy is given by the 95% confidence intervals (estimated as $2\sigma_{\bar{P}}$, where $\sigma_{\bar{P}}$ is the standard deviation of \bar{P}) listed where such intervals have statistical significance. Future computations on 5000 showers, using the correct cross sections,⁴ are expected to give mean polarizations reliable to within a few percent.

We are indebted to Dr. D. L. Judd for suggesting this calculation.

*This work was performed under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

¹K. W. McVoy and F. J. Dyson, Phys. Rev. 106, 1360 (1957).

²Macq, Crowe, and Haddock, University of California Radiation Laboratory Report UCRL-8263, April 24, 1958 (to be published).

³Similar Monte Carlo calculations without polarization transmission have been performed: Robert R. Wilson, Phys. Rev. 86, 261 (1952).

⁴The correct cross sections have been calculated: H. Olsen and L. C. Maximon, Phys. Rev. 110, 589 (1958).

⁵We consider only 100% polarization for the incident particle.

⁶Only the primary effects are included, i. e., we have neglected photoelectric effect, Compton effect, electron atomic-electron bremsstrahlung, etc.

ERRATA

DETERMINATION OF THE PARITIES OF STRANGE PARTICLES FROM DISPERSION RELATIONS. Saul Barshay [Phys. Rev. Lett. 1, 177 (1958)].

The following typographical errors are to be noted on page 178: in Eq. (2b) m_k^2 should be m_k^{-2} ; in Eq. (3b) $1.01 g_1^2$ should be $-1.01 g_1^2$; in the last line of the next to the last paragraph of column two, Eq. (3b) should be Eq. (2b).

In the same paragraph the sentence referring to Igi's analysis should read "Igi's analysis⁴ shows that if the effective $K^+ - p$ potential is repulsive and if the $K^+ - p$ cross section increases from ~ 6 mb at 0 kinetic energy to ~ 17 mb at ~ 100 Mev, then F is negative for either a

repulsive or an attractive $K^- - p$ effective potential.⁸" In reference 8, the opening phrase should read "Igi notes that if the $K^+ - p$ cross section, in fact, is essentially isotropic and energy independent from 0 to ~ 200 Mev kinetic energy then $F \dots$."

F AND V CENTERS THERMOLUMINESCENT RECOMBINATION. G. Bonfiglioli, P. Brovotto, and C. Cortese [Phys. Rev. Lett. 1, 94 (1958)].

At a certain point of the paper, three experimental values were given of the transition probabilities p_i , which were actually wrong because of an error in the numerical computations. The corrected ratios are

$$p_1 : p_2 : p_3 = 5.03 \times 10^3 : 1.73 \times 10^1 : 1;$$

and the corrected absolute values (always for 10^{16} F centers/cm³) are

$$p_1 = 2 \times 10^{-8}; p_2 = 9 \times 10^{-11}; p_3 = 5 \times 10^{-12} \\ (\text{cm}^3 \text{ sec}^{-1}).$$

ELECTRIC DIPOLE MOMENT OF THE MUON. D. Berley, R. L. Garwin, G. Gidal, and L. M. Lederman [Phys. Rev. Lett. 1, 144 (1958)].

The measured values of θ , the angle through which the trajectory is bent in the magnetic field, should have read as follows:

$$\theta = + 0.064 \pm 0.024 \text{ radians (105}^\circ \text{ run),} \\ \theta = - 0.017 \pm 0.028 \text{ radians (153}^\circ \text{ run).}$$

EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE FOR THE INFLUENCE OF ATOMIC BINDING ON THE DECAY RATE OF NEGATIVE MUONS. R. A. Lundy, J. C. Sens, R. A. Swanson, V. L. Telegdi, and D. D. Yovanovitch [Phys. Rev. Lett. 1, 102 (1958)].

The authors of the paper cited in reference a of Table I are J. Steinberger and H. B. Wolfe, not S. Lokanathan and J. Steinberger.

PHOTOPRODUCTION OF K MESONS. B. D. McDaniel, A. Silverman, R. R. Wilson, and G. Cortellessa [Phys. Rev. Lett. 1, 109 (1958)].

The cross section, $d\sigma(\theta)/d\Omega$, given in Table I, and in Fig. 3, for $k = 1010$ Mev, $\theta_{\text{c.m.}} = 26^\circ$, should be corrected to be $(1.32 \pm 0.14) \times 10^{-31} \text{ cm}^2/\text{sterad}$. This correction of an error of computation makes the angular distribution for this energy appear significantly more isotropic.