Corrigenda

G. C. POMRANING and F. RAHNEMA, "Reply to 'On the Use of First-Order Perturbation Theory in Interface Shift Problems,' " *Nucl. Sci. Eng.*, **84**, 73 (1983).

The substance of the final sentence of the Letter cited can be more clearly stated as:

> This new formula reduces to the classical first-order perturbation formula for perturbations of order ϵ_M, reduces to Eq. (17) of Ref. 2 for the order ϵ_V interface shift problem and, in general, correctly treats in first order an arbitrary perturbation that alters the scalar flux and current by an amount of the order of ϵ.

The Editorial Office regrets any contribution it may have made to a misunderstanding; further, the Editorial Office regrets that the affiliation for one of the authors was incorrectly shown as the University of California at Berkeley instead of at Los Angeles.

J. W. T. DABBS et al., "Measurement of the ^{242m}Am Neutron Fission Cross Section," *Nucl. Sci. Eng.*, **84**, 1 (1983).

A correction factor was inadvertently omitted from 78 data points above 101 keV. This factor reduces the fission cross section shown in Fig. 4 by 5.9% above 101 keV and changes the fourth and fifth entries in columns six and seven of Table VII to 2.416 and 2.054 b and to +1 and −20%, respectively. The data tape furnished the National Nuclear Data Center, described in Sec. V.D of the subject paper, is correct.

S. J. LEE and R. W. ALBRECHT, "The Use of Neutronic Fluctuations to Locate a Vibrating Control Rod in a Pressurized Water Reactor Model," *Nucl. Sci. Eng.*, **83**, 427 (1983).

On p. 430, the equals sign, "=," in Eqs. (7a), (9a), and (9b) should be followed by a minus sign, "−"; i.e., the first term on the right side of each of these equations is negative. *Nuclear Science and Engineering* regrets the error.