The Stability of ${}^6\text{Li}_\Lambda$.

L. LOVITCH and S. ROSATI

Istituto di Fisica dell'Università - Pisa
Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare - Sezione di Pisa

R. DALITZ

Department of Theoretical Physics - Oxford

(*Nuovo Cimento*, **53 A**, 301 (1968))

In Fig. 1 the superscript 6 and subscript Λ are missing from « p ${}^6\text{Li}_\Lambda$ range ».

The V appearing in the text between eqs. (13) and (15), and in the second last line of p. 306, should be replaced by U . Equation (14a) has the wrong over-all sign and should read

$$(14a) \quad \delta U_{\Lambda N}(4) = -\frac{1}{2}\delta U_s + \frac{3}{2}\delta U_t = 66 \text{ MeV} \cdot \text{fm}^3,$$

The fourth line below eq. (14b) should therefore read « $\delta U_s = 131 \text{ MeV} \cdot \text{fm}^3$, $\delta U_t = 88 \text{ MeV} \cdot \text{fm}^3$, to be compared with the mean values ».

Equation (16) has the wrong over-all sign and should read

$$(16) \quad \Delta B_\Lambda = -6W_0 \langle \exp[-\mu r]/r \rangle.$$

Hence the second line below eq. (16) should conclude with « $W_0 = (-0.70 \pm 0.1 \text{ MeV} \cdot \text{fm})$ » and two lines below « and the ratio $f_{\Lambda\Lambda\pi}/f_{N\Lambda\pi} \approx -0.05 \pm 0.01$ predicted from the specific mechanism ».

The third to fifth lines below eq. (17) should read « With the empirical estimate $W_0 = -0.70 \text{ MeV} \cdot \text{fm}$, eq. (17) then gives the estimate $\Delta B_\Lambda = -0.21 \text{ MeV}$ for $A = 6$. This result has opposite sign to that required for the level shift needed to ensure stability for ${}^6\text{Li}_\Lambda$ (and a magnitude of about one-third) ».

Incidentally, if we substitute for eq. (15) a similar but spin-independent charge-symmetry-breaking potential which fits the $A = 4$ value of $\Delta B_\Lambda = (0.56 \pm 0.1) \text{ MeV}$, we obtain for the level shift needed to ensure stability for ${}^6\text{Li}_\Lambda$ only one-half the magnitude required, but this time in the right direction. Footnote (17) should be adjusted accordingly ».

Equation (19) and the remainder of that paragraph should read

$$(19) \quad \Delta B_{\Lambda} = -2 \left(\frac{f_{\Lambda\Lambda\pi} f_{\mathcal{N}\mathcal{N}\pi}}{3} \right) \left\langle \left(\cos^2 \theta_3 - \frac{1}{3} \right) \left(1 + \frac{3}{\mu r_1} + \frac{3}{\mu^2 r_1^2} \right) \frac{\exp[-\mu r_1]}{r_1} \right\rangle.$$

This contribution has opposite sign to that of the central part (15) of V_{CSB} . With the theoretical estimate $(f_{\Lambda\Lambda\pi} f_{\mathcal{N}\mathcal{N}\pi}/3) = -0.0014$ from ref. (16) and the appropriate expectation value of 0.026, from Table I *a*), this then leads to $\Delta B_{\Lambda} = 0.014$ MeV which is negligibly small in comparison with the $(\Delta B_{\Lambda})_{\text{CSB}} \geq 0.7$ MeV needed to ensure the stability of ${}^6\text{Li}_{\Lambda}$.

The essential conclusions of our analysis are left unaltered.

We are much indebted to Dr. A. GAL for pointing out that the signs for eqs. (16) and (17) in our preprint were inconsistent, and that the parameter $f_{\Lambda\Lambda\pi}$ quoted had opposite sign to that given in ref. (16).