proton spin and momentum vectors during the flight path from the decay vertex to the scattering point. This frequency difference is proportional to the anomalous moment of the proton. See D. F. Nelson, A. A. Schupp, R. W. Pidd, and H. R. Crane, Phys. Rev. Letters 2, 492 (1959). The average correction in our experiment is quite small (~2°).

[10]J. L. Gammel and R. M. Thaler, Phys. Rev. 109, 2041 (1958). A. Juveland and W. Jentschke, Z. Physik 144, 521 (1956). The phase shifts of the latter paper and the formula given in reference 8 were used to calculate the values of P_{an} for energies below 10 Mev.

[11]This is true only for events in which the proton stops. Events in which the proton leaves the chamber have more severe errors in general.

[12]The value $|\alpha| > 0.85$ given in reference 6 may be somewhat uncertain since it is based on the assumption that only s and p waves are present in $\Lambda + K^0$ production by 1-Bev/c π^- on protons. However, even if we take $|\alpha| = 0.7$, our measured asymmetry η_{exp} would still differ by about 3 standard deviations from its expected value for $\alpha = +0.7$, and the ratio $L(-0.7)/L(+0.7)$ is $\approx 10^{+2}$.

[13]This definition holds only for events in which P_{an} is of one sign—viz, $P_{an} < 0$. For events in which $P_{an} > 0$, "right" and "left" must be interchanged.

[14]This is not an algebraic average, but rather is the average magnitude of $(\sin\Gamma P_{an})$. We associate a negative sign with it since most of the scattering events have $P_{an} < 0$. For events with $P_{an} > 0$, we reverse the sign of $\sin\Psi$ in Fig. 4.

[15]See reference 3, page 423.

[16]E. Boldt, H. S. Bridge, D. O. Caldwell, and Y. Pal, Phys. Rev. Letters 1, 256 (1958).

[17]R. W. Birge and W. B. Fowler, Phys. Rev. Letters 5, 254 (1960).

ERRATUM

SELF-CONSISTENT CALCULATION OF THE MASS AND WIDTH OF THE $J=1$, $T=1$, $\pi\pi$ RESONANCE. Fredrik Zachariasen [Phys. Rev. Letters 7, 112 (1961)].

Due to an error in the numerical computations the mass value $m_\rho \sim 950$ Mev is wrong and should be changed to $m_\rho \sim 350$ Mev. While the agreement with the experimental value is slightly less good, it is perhaps encouraging to have too large a coupling constant going with too small a mass. An improved calculation might then give a smaller coupling constant, corresponding to a weaker attraction which could be consistent with a larger mass, while it is hard to see how a smaller coupling constant could go with a smaller mass.

I am indebted to J. Mathews for pointing out that the mass was incorrect, and to C. Zemach for aid in computing the correct value.