ERRATA

Study of the Decay $K_L \rightarrow \pi^\pm \pi^0 e^+ \nu(\nu)$


In our paper, the value for $L_3$ is given in the abstract and in the conclusion. Other estimates based upon $\pi \pi D$ wave scattering and upon the analysis of charged $K_{L4}$ data are also given. In all cases, there was a sign error; the correct expressions have $L_3$ as being negative. In particular, the value deduced from our data is $L_3 = -(3.4 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-3}$.

In the determination of the value of $L_3$ from the measured branching ratio, the parameter $f_p$ was set equal to zero. It is expected to reach roughly 5% of the value of $g$; however, allowing for this in the extraction of $L_3$ changes the quoted result negligibly.

Finally, the uncertainty quoted on $L_3$ includes experimental statistical and systematic errors. The extraction of $L_3$ is based on chiral perturbation theory at the one-loop level; theoretical systematic uncertainties from possible higher order terms await evaluation.

We are most grateful to Juerg Gasser and Gilberto Colangelo for many clarifying communications.

Critical Cluster Size: Island Morphology and Size Distribution in Submonolayer Epitaxial Growth

Jacques G. Amar and Fereydoon Family

(a) The parameters $\tau_n$ and $\tau_e$ are typographical errors and should be replaced by $r_n$, the relative diffusion rate of atoms with $n$ neighbors, and $r_e = e^{-\Delta U_e/k_B T}$, the edge-diffusion rate, respectively.

(b) In the sixth line of the caption in Fig. 2, the range of $r_e$ should have been $r_e = 0 - 10^{-4}$ rather than $0 - 10^{-4}$.

(c) On p. 2067, the sentence after the definition of $r_e$ should have read, “...we assume that atoms with...” The second sentence of the first full paragraph on p. 2068 should have read, “Figure 2(b) shows that our...”