has shown that the solution as deduced from η decay leads to a ratio $a_3 : a_8$ much too large to account for the electromagnetic masses of the baryons. Recently Cicogna *et al* (1974) have shown that without neglecting the SU_3 non-invariance of vacuum and the contribution of subclasses of Feynman diagrams, one can get a reasonable solution of the $\eta \to 3\pi$ puzzle with a value of $\epsilon_3 \simeq -0{\cdot}28\ m_\pi^3$. In any case we find that a U_3 term implies $\eta\pi^0$ mixing and in the (8, 8) model, eq. (13) is more justified, so that the correct width predicted from the (8, 8) model is very encouraging.

In this model we have also found out the intrinsic symmetry breaking contribution to the $\eta\pi^0$ transition [Dittner *et al* (1973), Brown *et al* (1961) and Socolow (1968)].

$$\langle \eta \mid \pi \rangle_{\text{int}} = -3{\cdot}1 \times 10^3\ \text{MeV}^2.$$

This can be compared to the value obtained by Brown *et al* (1971).

References

Baglin C, Bezaguet A, Degrange B, Musset P, Bingham H H *et al* 1969 *Phys. Lett.* **29B** 445
Bardeen W, Brown L S, Lee B W and Nieh H T 1967 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **18** 1170
Barnes K and Isham C 1970 *Nucl. Phys.* **B17** 267
Bell J S and Sutherland D 1968 *Nucl. Phys.* **B4** 315
Bose S and Zimerman A 1966 *Nuovo Cimento* **43A** 1165
Brehm J J 1971 *Nucl. Phys.* **B34** 269
Browman A *et al* July 1973 CLNS 242
Brown L M, Deshpande N G and Conntanzi, Fronk A 1971 *Phys. Rev.* D4 146
Cantor A 1971 *Phys. Rev.* D3 3205
Cicogna G, Strocchi F and Caffarelli V R 1974 *Lett. Nuovo Cimento* **10** 25
Chiu Y, Schecter J and Ueda Y 1967 *Phys. Rev.* **162** 1612
Dashen R 1969 *Phys. Rev.* **183** 1245
Dittner P, Dondi P H and Eliezer S 1973 *Phys. Rev.* D8 2253.
Dolgov A D, Vainstein A I and Zakharov V I 1967 *Phys. Lett.* **24B** 425
Dutt R and Eliezer S 1971 *Phys. Rev.* D4 180
Gell-Mann M, Oakes R J and Renner B 1968 *Phys. Rev.* **175** 2195
Genz H, Katz J and Steiner H 1973 *Phys. Rev.* D7 2100
Graham R, Raifeartaigh L O and Pakvasa S 1967 *Nuovo Cimento* **48** A 830
Kanazaw A and Kariya T 1968 *Progr. Theor. Phys.* **40** 842
Kondo H and Noda H 1970 *Progr. Theor. Phys.* **43** 1614
Oakes R J 1969 *Phys. Lett.* **30B** 262
Socolow R H 1968 *Phys. Rev.* **168** 1534
Sutherland D 1967 *Nucl. Phys.* **B2** 433

ERRATUM

'The structure of bis-(L-threonine) copper (II). H_2O' by V Amirthalingam and K V Muralidharan in Vol. 4, No. 2, February 1975, pp. 83-94.

1. The statement in Sec. 4:

   For Cu-O distances [1·975 (5) and 1·979 (5)] read as [1·957 (5) and 1·979 (5) Å]

2. In figure 3 read $\text{Cu-O}_1 = 1{\cdot}957$ (5) and $\text{Cu-O}_4 = 1{\cdot}979$ (5) Å