Compound Nucleus Effects in Deuteron Reactions: $C^{13}(d,\alpha)B^{11}$ and $C^{13}(d,t)C^{12}$, JERRY B. MARION AND GUSTAV WEBER [Phys. Rev. **102**, 1355 (1956)]. On page 1363, the equation "$\Gamma_d \cong 0.2$ kev" should read "$(2l+1)\Gamma_d \cong 0.2$ kev." The heading of the middle column of Table V should be "$(2l+1)\gamma_d{}^2 \times (2\mu R/3\hbar^2)$." With this correction, for a deuteron angular momentum of 4, the reduced width is 0.7% of the sum-rule limit, and for $l=5$, it is about 30%. This latter value seems quite large for a deuteron reduced width, so that the conclusion that $l_d \leq 4$ is not altered.

Nucleon Energy Levels in a Diffuse Potential, A. A. ROSS, HANS MARK, AND R. D. LAWSON [Phys. Rev. **102**, 1613 (1956)]. The drawing above the caption of Fig. 1 should be interchanged with the drawing above the caption of Fig. 4.

Modulation of Conductivity by Surface Charges in Metals. G. BONFIGLIOLI, E. COEN, AND R. MALVANO [Phys. Rev. **101**, 1281 (1956)]. The authors would like to point out that the effects described in this paper belong to metallic films of thicknesses ranging from ~100 to ~2000 A. As a matter of fact, we did not know, at the time of publication, that an effect of modulation of conductivity by a transverse electric field had been studied a long time before by Perucca, and by Deaglio.[1] It is, however, to be remarked, that the structure of the films studied by them was very different, as shown by the value of the ratio Resistance/Area: $\sim 10^{11}$ ohms/cm² *versus* $\sim 10^2$ ohms/cm², as in our case. Consequently, the results referred to cannot be compared with ours, because the physical phenomena involved are clearly not exactly the same.

[1] E. Perucca, Compt. rend. **198**, 456 (1934); R. Deaglio, Sonderdruck aus die Naturwiss. **31**, 525 (1934).

Quantum-Electrodynamical Fourth-Order Corrections for Triplet Fine Structure of Helium, GENTARO ARAKI [Phys. Rev. **101**, 1410 (1956)]. The sentence beginning at line 10 of the third paragraph should read: "Such a term gives no influence on our problem because the expectation value of $\delta(\mathbf{x}_{12})$ vanishes in the triplet state in which the orbital function of the atom is antisymmetric with respect to two electrons" instead of "Such a term gives no influence on our problem because the expectation value of $\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2$ vanishes in the singlet state and that of $\delta(\mathbf{x}_{12})$ vanishes too in the triplet state in which the orbital function of the atom is antisymmetric with respect to two electrons.

PHYSICAL REVIEW VOLUME 103, NUMBER 6 SEPTEMBER 15, 1956

Author Index to Volume 103

References with (L) are to Letters to the Editor. References with (E) are to Errata.