ERRATA


On p. 464, in the first line below Eq. (5), \( \lambda_{c} \alpha / \xi \alpha \) should read \( \lambda_{c} \alpha / \xi \alpha \) in line 1 of the second column, \( \phi(\rho) = 0 \) in the third line below Eq. (9).

In the first sentence of the paragraph containing Eq. (10) replace the words after “Josephson junction” by “which is idealized by a world line so that the change in \( \phi \) across it is given by (9), with \( \nu \) in this expression now defined only outside the junction.”

Delete the sentence beginning on the last line of p. 464 and ending on p. 465.

On p. 465, in the paragraph containing Eq. (12) replace all the lines above Eq. (12) by “In a coordinate system comoving with the superfluid, and in the second column, line 4, replace \( \sqrt{2m/\hbar} \) by \( \sqrt{2m/\hbar} \).

On p. 466, column 1, the equation in line 3 of the last paragraph, replace \( \Omega_{n} \) by \( \Omega_{n} - 30 \sin \beta \cos \delta \) \( \times \cos \beta \), where \( \beta \) is the latitude and \( \delta \) is the angle between the normal to the interferometer and the vertical. But this equation, like (15) and (16), assumes that the relative motion between the superfluid and the apparatus is negligible. A more precise treatment that does not make this assumption is given by J. Anandan, in Quantum Optics, Experimental Gravitation and Measurement Theory, edited by P. Meystre and M. O. Scully (Plenum, New York, 1983), and to be published.

On p. 466, column 2 delete the sentence beginning on line 4.

In Ref. 5, line 5, replace \( -\frac{1}{2} \) by \( \frac{1}{2} c^2 \). In Ref. 13, line 3, replace \( t^\mu \) by \( t^\mu \) and in line 5, replace \( \xi \) by \( \xi \). Also delete Ref. 14.


Equation (4) should read,

\[
\langle s_n \rangle = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=2}^{N+1} s P_n(s) = (N+2) - \frac{\langle T_s \rangle}{2^\nu}.
\]

In Eq. (14b), the power-law prefactor in the decay law is incorrect; the equation should read

\[
f_n \sim \frac{\sqrt{(N/N_0)^{1/2}}}{} \exp[-(N/N_0)^{1/3}]\]

This result can be obtained from our approach by including the power-law prefactor in the limiting small-s behavior of \( P_n(s) \). From Eq. (3), one may readily derive

\[
P_n(s) = \langle T_s \rangle^N - 2 T_{s-1}^N + T_{s+2}^N \sim \langle T_s \rangle^N / \theta_s^2.
\]

In a representation where the transfer matrix is diagonal,

\[
\langle T_s \rangle^N = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_s^{(k)} \sum_{n=1}^{N} e_n^{(k)} \phi,
\]

where \( \lambda_s^{(k)} \) is the \( k \)th eigenvalue and \( e_n^{(k)} \) is the \( n \)th component of the \( k \)th eigenvector of \( T_s \), respectively. These results lead to \( P_n(s) \approx N^2 / s^2 \exp(2\cos(\pi/s+1)) \) in the limit \( s/N \rightarrow 0 \). With this asymptotic form of \( P_n(s) \), one readily obtains the correct power-law prefactor in \( f_n \) from the steepest-descent approach of our Letter.

We are grateful to P. Grassberger and T. C. Lubensky for helpful suggestions.


On p. 2260, the last sentence of the next to the last paragraph should read, “The outstanding problem is the doubling of the number of flavors (already too large in the staggered fermion approach).”
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