of 1.41 days is studied by means of non-stationary model calculations under assumptions of conservation of total mass and total orbital angular momentum of the system. As a result of mass exchange between the components we obtain a binary with masses of 8.46 and 0.54 $m_\odot$. Physical parameters of the final product indicate possible connection with shell stars.

It is also pointed out that the new secondary component can become rotationally unstable soon after the end of mass exchange.

Petr Harmanec: **Case B of Mass Exchange in Systems** $4+3.2\ m_\odot$ **and** $4+1.6\ m_\odot$. (Received 10 November, 1969.)

Two examples of case B of mass exchange are computed to estimate the effect of basic initial parameters on the course and the results of mass exchange.

It seems that the resulting mass of original primary is independent of the initial mass ratio, the resulting orbital period is independent of initial mass of primary and surface hydrogen content is independent of both of these parameters.

Roger K. Ulrich: **Convective Energy Transport in Stellar Atmospheres. I: A Convective Thermal Model.** (Received 11 November, 1969.)

The treatment of convection in the presence of non-uniformities associated with the super-adiabatic layer of model atmospheres requires more information than is available from the standard mixing length theory. This paper discusses and modifies the meteorological model known as the convective thermal for the purpose of obtaining the strength of coupling between adjacent layers with different properties. As in the standard mixing length theory the principle uncertainty remains the average initial radius of the cells. This initial radius is determined to be between 700 and 950 km by a comparison to the solar granulation.

ERRATUM

In the article entitled 'The Electron Temperature Distributions and Internal Kinematics of Seven Diffuse Nebulae', *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **5**, on pp. 474, 482–3, the values given for the radial velocities of different parts of the one nebula M8 differ significantly from those given in an earlier article (*Astrophys. Space Sci.* **4**, 132).

The difference is due in small part to a remeasurement of the data, but mainly to a constant calculation error in the correction for the Earth's motion. The correct values are those given in the later article.

P. FOUKAL