

only couples to natural-parity exchanges. Once this possibility is granted then the energy dependence must be dominated by the unnatural-parity trajectories or a fixed pole generated, say, by the gauge-invariant electric Born term to give the observed $\alpha_{\text{eff}}(t)$. Of course our selection rule strictly applies only at the pole so we would not expect it to be valid over the whole t region. Since we would like to retain some interpretation of the dip, no-dip structure,¹³ we would expect that our effect would have been lost by $t = -0.5$ (GeV/c)². However, by then the energy dependence of the leading trajectories has also dropped to $\alpha_{\text{eff}}(t) = 0$, and

also we note that fits to σ_1 are acceptable in this region.¹⁴

In conclusion we must state that we are well aware that most of the remarks of this section are at best speculative or highly qualitative. We present them only because we feel that they may merit further consideration once we have a more detailed understanding of the nucleon form factor.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank Dr. D. G. Sutherland for an interesting correspondence.

*This research has been sponsored in part by "Les Instituts Internationaux de Physique et Chimie fondés par E. Solvay."

¹D. G. Sutherland, Nucl. Phys. B2, 433 (1967); see also M. Veltman, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A301, 107 (1967).

²See, e.g., J. J. Sakurai, *Currents and Mesons* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1969).

³S. G. Brown and G. B. West, Phys. Rev. 174, 1777 (1968).

⁴R. Perrin, Phys. Rev. 170, 1367 (1968).

⁵S. L. Adler, Phys. Rev. 177, 2426 (1969).

⁶P. D. Mannheim, Phys. Rev. D 3, 2840 (1971).

⁷See, e.g., S. L. Adler and R. F. Dashen, *Current Algebras and Applications to Particle Physics* (Benjamin, New York, 1968).

⁸A. C. Hearn, Nuovo Cimento 21, 333 (1961).

⁹C. Truffin, R. Brout, and F. Englert, Nuovo Cimento A2, 169 (1971).

¹⁰K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. 179, 1499 (1969).

¹¹M. Ross and L. Stodolsky, Phys. Rev. 149, 1172 (1966); P. D. Mannheim and U. Maor, Phys. Rev. D 2, 2105 (1970).

¹²Particle Data Group, Phys. Letters 33B, 1 (1970).

¹³See, e.g., H. Harari, rapporteur's talk in *International Symposium on Electron and Photon Interactions at High Energies, Liverpool, England, 1969*, edited by D. W. Braben and R. E. Rand (Daresbury Nuclear Physics Laboratory, Daresbury, Lancashire, England, 1970).

¹⁴R. Diebold and J. A. Poirier, Phys. Rev. Letters 22, 906 (1969).

Errata

Theory of η - π Mixing with Applications to Meson Decays, Laurie M. Brown, Nilendra G. Deshpande, and Frank A. Costanzi [Phys. Rev. D 4, 146 (1971)]. The value of ϵ_4 in the Appendix was deduced incorrectly from Eq. (A9). The correct value for the case $M = (-4.3 \pm 1.5) \times 10^3$ MeV² is $\epsilon_4 = 15 \pm 5$; for $M = (9.1 \pm 3) \times 10^3$ MeV² it is $\epsilon_4 = -30 \pm 10$. This gives decay rates [Eqs. (5) and (6)]: $\Gamma(\varphi \rightarrow \eta\gamma) = 4 \pm 2$ keV (instead of 10 keV), $\Gamma(\omega \rightarrow \eta\gamma) = 49 \pm 4$ keV (instead of 40 keV). Other parts of our paper are not affected. We wish to thank Professor Paul Singer for calling this error to our attention. We also take this opportunity to point out that Dr. David Greenberg [Phys. Rev. 178, 2190 (1969)] has also considered pole models for κ and η decays.

Fixed Pole in the Virtual Compton Amplitude A_2 , R. Rajaraman and G. Rajasekaran [Phys. Rev. D 3, 266 (1971)]. Equation (22) should read as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{v}_1(q^2, \nu) + q^2 \tilde{v}_2(q^2, \nu) \\ & \equiv v_1 + q^2 v_2 - \sum_i (-i\pi) \frac{\beta_i(q^2)}{q^2} \nu^{\alpha_i} \frac{(e^{i\pi\alpha_i} + 1)}{\sin\pi\alpha_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Field-Theoretic Model for Low-Energy $J = \frac{3}{2}^+ K^+ p$ Scattering, L. B. Rédei [Phys. Rev. D 3, 1650 (1971)]. In the Acknowledgments, Nathorst Foundation should read Nathorst Foundation. The author is indebted to Professor L. Hulthén for pointing out to him the error in spelling.