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Errata in the second and third printings.

- Plate 5 caption, typo: ...seen in Plate 6. → ...seen in Plate 4. noted 2018.04.07 by L. Bouma.

- §1.2, p. 8, Table 1.4: change abundance of P from $N_P/N_H = 3.23 \times 10^{-7.0.03}$, $M_P/M_H = 1.00 \times 10^{-5}$ to $N_P/N_H = 2.82 \times 10^{-7.0.03}$, $M_P/M_H = 8.73 \times 10^{-6}$. noted 2013.10.21 by Bon-Chul Koo.

- §3.6, p. 28, Eq. (3.31), typo: factor of 2 error. Eq. (3.31) should read
  \[
  \sigma_{rr,ul}(E) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{g(X_L)}{g(X_u)} \frac{(I_{X,ul} + E)^2}{E m_e c^2} \sigma_{pi,ul}(h\nu = I_{X,ul} + E),
  \]
  noted 2015.06.01 by E. B. Jenkins

- §3.7, p. 28, Eq. (3.33), typo: sign error. Change $e^{-I_n/kT}$ → $e^{I_n/kT}$. noted 2017.02.09

- §3.8, p. 31, Eq. (3.48), typo: change
  \[
  I_{n\alpha} \propto A_{n\alpha} h\nu_{n\alpha} \int n[H(n)] ds \propto n^{-6} b_n \int n_e n(H^+) ds
  \]
  \[
  \rightarrow I_{n\alpha} \propto A_{n\alpha} h\nu_{n\alpha} \int n[H(n+1)] ds \propto n^{-6} b_{n+1} \int n_e n(H^+) ds
  \]
  noted 2019.02.06

- §5.2.2, p. 50, 3rd paragraph, typos: change para-H$_2$O must have $K_{-1} + K_{+1}$ odd → para-H$_2$O must have $K_{-1} + K_{+1}$ even and ortho-H$_2$O must have $K_{-1} + K_{+1}$ even → ortho-H$_2$O must have $K_{-1} + K_{+1}$ odd noted 2015.01.15 by Neal Evans.
• §8.3, p. 74, Eq. (8.26), typos: $T_{\text{on}}^\alpha (v) \rightarrow T_{\text{off}}^\alpha (v)$ (two occurrences). noted 2013.02.14 by Munan Gong.

• §9.10, Table 9.4, p. 88, typos: for C II and N III, change $^2\text{D}_J \rightarrow ^2\text{D}_J$ for $J = 3/2$ and $J = 5/2.$ noted 2015.02.12 by Semyeong Oh.

• §10.2, sentence preceding Eq. (10.5): change ...
...the Gaunt factor from quantum-mechanical calculations is approximately

...the Gaunt factor is approximately (Scheuer 1960) noted 2018.11.18 by S. Weinberg.

• §11.4, p. 110, Eq. (11.35) should read

$$\nu \propto \frac{e^2 (\Delta n_e)_{L, \text{rms}}}{2\pi m_e c} (2LD)^{1/2} = 1 \times 10^{13} \text{GHz} \left( \frac{\Delta n_e)_{L, \text{rms}}}{10^{-3} \text{cm}^{-3}} \right) \left( \frac{L}{10^{14} \text{cm}} \frac{D}{1 \text{kpc}} \right)^{1/2}.$$ noted 2013.02.03 by W. Vlemmings.

• §12, p. 121, Table 12.1, typos:

CMB, $T_2 = 4000 \text{K}$
$T_2 = 4000 \text{K}$, $W_2 = 1.65 \times 10^{-13}$
$T_3 = 7500 \text{K}$, $W_3 = 1 \times 10^{-14}$
Starlight total
ISRF total
noted 2012.11.08

• §12.5, p. 123, below eq. (12.4): change

...W_1 by 40%, from $W_1 = 5 \times 10^{-13}$ to $7 \times 10^{-13}.$ →
...W_1 by 75%, from $W_1 = 4 \times 10^{-13}$ to $7 \times 10^{-13},$ and raised $W_2$ from $1.0 \times 10^{-13}$ to $1.65 \times 10^{-13}.$ noted 2014.11.11 by S. Bianchi.

• §13.1, pp. 128, eq. (13.1), (13.3), (13.4): for notational consistency with the rest of the chapter, change $\sigma_{pe} \rightarrow \sigma_{pi}$ noted 2018.01.07 by L. Bouma.

• §13.1, p. 130, second paragraph, typo:

...to $3 \times 10^{-10} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for Si → ...to $3 \times 10^{-9} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for Si noted 2017.03.05

• §14.6, p. 154, Table 14.8 update: replace

$H_3^+ + e^- \rightarrow H_2 + H$ $1.1 \times 10^{-7} T_2^{-0.56}$ McCall et al. (2004)

with

$H_3^+ + e^- \rightarrow H + H + H$ $8.9 \times 10^{-8} T_2^{-0.48}$ McCall et al. (2004)
$H_3^+ + e^- \rightarrow H_2 + H$ $5.0 \times 10^{-8} T_2^{-0.48}$ McCall et al. (2004)

noted 2013.04.03
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- §14.9, p. 159, typo: factor of 2 error. Eq. (14.41) should read
\[ \sigma_{rr}(E) = \frac{g_e}{2g_u} \frac{(I + E)^2}{E_m c^2} \sigma_{pi}(h\nu = I + E). \] (14.41)
noted 2015.06.01 by E. B. Jenkins.

- §14.9, p. 160, typo: factor of 2 error. Eq. (14.43) should read
\[ \frac{\langle \sigma v \rangle_{rr}}{\langle \sigma v \rangle_{ci}} \approx \frac{2\pi \alpha^3}{f_{pi}} \frac{I}{C kT} e^{I/kT} \frac{1}{\alpha^2}. \] (14.43)
noted 2015.06.01 by E. B. Jenkins.

- §14.9, p. 160, typo: factor of 2 error. Eq. (14.44) and following should read
\[ \frac{I}{kT} e^{I/kT} = \frac{C}{2\pi f_{pi}} \frac{1}{\alpha^2}. \] (14.44)
If \( C \approx 1 \) and \( f_{pi} \approx 1 \), this has solution \( I/kT \approx 10.6. \)
noted 2015.06.01 by E. B. Jenkins.

- Table 15.1, p. 164, typo: \( M/M_\odot \) for O6.5V star: 38.0 → 28.0
noted 2013.01.31

- §16.4, p. 186, Eq. (16.9, 16.10), update: change
\[ \begin{align*}
    \text{H}_3^+ + e^- & \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{H}, \quad k_{16.9} = 4.1 \times 10^{-8} T_2^{-0.52} \text{ cm}^3 \text{s}^{-1} , \\
    \text{H}_3^+ + e^- & \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{H} + \text{H} , \quad k_{16.10} = 7.7 \times 10^{-8} T_2^{-0.52} \text{ cm}^3 \text{s}^{-1} ,
\end{align*} \]
to
\[ \begin{align*}
    \text{H}_3^+ + e^- & \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{H}, \quad k_{16.9} = 5.0 \times 10^{-8} T_2^{-0.48} \text{ cm}^3 \text{s}^{-1} , \\
    \text{H}_3^+ + e^- & \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{H} + \text{H} , \quad k_{16.10} = 8.9 \times 10^{-8} T_2^{-0.48} \text{ cm}^3 \text{s}^{-1} ,
\end{align*} \]
and cite McCall et al. (2004) for \( k_{16.9} \) and \( k_{16.10} \).
noted 2013.04.03

- §16.4, p. 187, typo: in paragraph below Eq. (16.15), change
\[ x_e \approx x_M \approx 1.9 \times 10^{-4} \rightarrow x_e \approx x_M \approx 1.1 \times 10^{-4} \] (see Eq. 16.3)
noted 2013.04.04

- §16.5, p. 189, Fig. 16.3. The original figure was evaluated with a too-large rate for \( k_{16.19} \). The figure has been redone, now also showing the result if \( \zeta_{CR} = 1 \times 10^{-17} \text{s}^{-1} \).
Figure 16.3  Fractional ionization in a dark cloud, estimated using Eq. (16.25), with the grain recombination rate coefficients set to $k_{16.20} = k_{16.22} = 10^{-14}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$ (see Fig. 14.6). The dashed line is a simple power-law approximation $x_e \approx 2 \times 10^{-5} (n_H / \text{cm}^{-3})^{-1/2}$.

noted 2013.03.05.

• §18.5, p. 214, Eq. (18.11): Change

... $\Omega_{03}$ is approximately independent of $T_e$, we have

$$\frac{n(\text{O III})}{n(\text{H}^+)} = C \frac{I(\text{O III}5008)}{I(\text{H}\beta)} T_e^{-0.37} e^{2.917/T_e},$$

(18.11)

to

... $\Omega_{03} \propto T_e^{0.12}$ (see Appendix F), we have

$$\frac{n(\text{O III})}{n(\text{H}^+)} = C \frac{I(\text{O III}5008)}{I(\text{H}\beta)} T_e^{-0.49} e^{2.917/T_e},$$

(18.11)

noted 2015.02.27

• §19.3, p. 222: revise value for $A_{10}$: replace

$A_{10} = 6.78 \times 10^{-8}$ s$^{-1}$ \rightarrow $A_{10} = 7.16 \times 10^{-8}$ s$^{-1}$ (see Eq. 5.7).

noted 2013.04.17

• §19.3, p. 223: revised numbers according to revised value for $A_{10}$:


noted 2013.04.17
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  noted 2019.03.25

- §23.1, p. 265, typo:
  lower oscillator strength \( f(C II)_{2325} \text{Å} = 1.0 \times 10^{-7} \)
  →
  larger oscillator strength \( f(C II)_{2325} \text{Å} = 1.0 \times 10^{-7} \)
  noted 2012.12.27

- §26.2, p. 308, Eq. (26.23), numerical error: should read
  \[
  \frac{\omega}{2\pi} = 4.6 \text{GHz} \left( \frac{T_{\text{rot}}}{100 \text{K}} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{0.001 \mu\text{m}}{a} \right)^{5/2}
  \]  
  noted 2014.06.27 by B. Jiang.

- §28.3, p. 328, 4th paragraph, typo: change distance from \( \Theta_1 \text{Ori C} \) to the Orion Bar ionization front:
  \( \sim 7.8 \times 10^{18} \text{cm} \) → \( \sim 7.8 \times 10^{17} \text{cm} \)
  noted 2015.04.07

- §29.1, p. 332, 1st paragraph, typo: \( b = 0 \rightarrow b = 90^\circ \), so that the 2nd sentence reads
  ...
  vary as \( N(\text{HI}, b) = N(\text{HI}, b = 90^\circ)/\sin |b| = N_0 \csc |b| \).
  noted 2012.11.04 by R. Simons.

- §31.4, p. 349, Eq. (31.24), typo: on RHS, change
  \[
  \frac{\pi e^2}{m_e c^2 h} \sum_u f_{\ell u} \lambda_{\ell u}^3 u_{\lambda} f_{\text{shield}, \ell u} \rightarrow \frac{\pi e^2}{m_e c^2 h} \sum_u f_{\ell u} \lambda_{\ell u}^3 u_{\lambda} f_{\text{shield}, \ell u} P_{\text{diss}, u}
  \]  
  noted 2013.04.12 by Ai-Lei Sun.

- §32.9, p. 368, just before eq. (32.11), typo: change
  \( A_V/N_H = 1.87 \times 10^{21} \text{cm}^2 \) → \( A_V/N_H = 5.3 \times 10^{-22} \text{mag cm}^2 \).
  noted 2016.03.04 by Ilsang Yoon.

- §32.11, p. 372, prepenultimate paragraph: terminological correction. Change “core” to “clump” (three occurrences).
  noted 2015.04.16

- §34.4, p. 386, Eq. (34.10): sign mistake on RHS: change
  \[
  -4\pi r^2 \kappa \frac{dT}{dr} \rightarrow 4\pi r^2 \kappa \frac{dT}{dr}
  \]  
  noted 2019.04.18 by G. Halevi.
• §34.4, p. 387, typo: Eq. (34.17) is off by a factor 3, and should read
\[
t_{\text{evap}} = \frac{3M}{2M} = \frac{25 \times 2.3 (n_H) c R_c^2 m_e^{1/2} e^4 \ln \Lambda}{8 \times 0.87 (k T_h)^{2.5}}
\]
(34.17)

Eq. (34.18) is numerically correct, but should have shown the dependence on \(\ln \Lambda\):
\[
= 5.1 \times 10^4 \frac{\gamma p}{(\gamma - 1)} v_x + \frac{(B_y^2 + B_z^2)}{4\pi} v_x - \frac{(B_x B_y v_y + B_x B_z v_z)}{4\pi} - \frac{\kappa dT}{dx}
\]
\[
= \frac{\rho \nu^2}{(\gamma - 1)} v_x + \frac{(B_y^2 + B_z^2)}{4\pi} v_x - \frac{(B_x B_y v_y + B_x B_z v_z)}{4\pi} - \frac{\kappa dT}{dx}
\]
(34.18)

noted 2013.01.05 by B. Hensley.

• §36.2.3, p. 400, Eq. (36.10): \(v_x\) multiplying \(B_y B_x\) should be \(v_y\), and \(v_x\) multiplying \(B_y B_x\) should be \(v_z\).

noted 2015.12.17 by J. Miralda-Escudé.

The equation should read
\[
\left\{\frac{\rho \nu^2}{2} + \frac{\gamma p}{(\gamma - 1)} v_x + \frac{(B_y^2 + B_z^2)}{4\pi} v_x - \frac{(B_x B_y v_y + B_x B_z v_z)}{4\pi} - \frac{\kappa dT}{dx}\right\}_1 = \left\{\frac{\rho \nu^2}{2} + \frac{\gamma p}{(\gamma - 1)} v_x + \frac{(B_y^2 + B_z^2)}{4\pi} v_x - \frac{(B_x B_y v_y + B_x B_z v_z)}{4\pi} - \frac{\kappa dT}{dx}\right\}_2
\]
(36.10)

• §37.1, p. 413, 2nd paragraph: Change
Cases of astrophysical interest will normally have...

→
Many cases of astrophysical interest will have...

noted 2018.04.09.

• §37.1, p. 413, typo just above Eq. (37.3):

\[
J h\nu/c = \rho_1 u_1 h\nu/\mu_1 c \ll \rho_1 (u_1^2 + c_1^2 + B_1^2/8\pi).
\]

→
\[
J h\nu/c = \rho_1 u_1 h\nu/\mu_1 c \ll \rho_1 (u_1^2 + c_1^2) + B_1^2/8\pi.
\]

noted 2016.12.08 by Ryohei Nakatani.

• §37.1, Eq. (37.8): The correction terms for \(u_R, x_R, u_D, \) and \(x_D\) can be improved by analyzing the full cubic equation (37.3): change
\[
\begin{align*}
    u_R &\approx 2c_2 &\rightarrow &u_R \approx 2c_2 \left[1 - \frac{2c_1^2 - 3v_{A1}^2}{8c_2^2}\right]
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
    x_R &\approx \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2c_1^2 + v_{A1}^2}{16c_2^2} \rightarrow &x_R \approx \frac{1}{2}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
    u_D &\approx \frac{2c_1^2 + v_{A1}^2}{4c_2} \rightarrow &\frac{2c_1^2 + v_{A1}^2}{4c_2} \left[1 + \frac{2c_1^2 + v_{A1}^2}{8c_2^2}\right]
\end{align*}
\]
\[ x_D \approx \frac{4c_1^2}{2c_1^2 + v_{A1}^2} \rightarrow x_D \approx \frac{4c_2^2}{2c_2^2 + v_{A1}^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{v_{A1}^2}{8c_2^2} \right] \]

noted 2018.02.19 by Woong-Tae Kim.

• §37.1 and §37.2, pp. 414-416: the mathematics is correct, but the “weak-type”, and “strong-type” terminology was unfortunately inverted: all occurrences of “weak-type” should be changed to “strong-type”, and vice-versa:
  • §37.1.1, p. 414, first paragraph:
    ...are called **strong R-type**. Strong R-type solutions...
    \[ \rightarrow \]
    ...are called **weak R-type**. Weak R-type solutions...
  • §37.1.1, p. 414, second paragraph:
    ...referred to as **weak R-type**,... \[ \rightarrow \]...referred to as **strong R-type**,....
  • §37.1.1, p. 414, second paragraph:
    Hence, only strong R-type I-fronts are physically relevant.
    \[ \rightarrow \]
    Hence, only weak R-type I-fronts are physically relevant.
  • §37.1.2, p. 414, first paragraph:
    ...is termed **weak D-type**. ...is termed **strong D-type**.
  • §37.1.2, p. 414, second paragraph:
    ...is termed **strong D-type**. ...is termed **weak D-type**.
• Fig. 37.1 and caption should be:

![Figure 37.1](image)

**Figure 37.1** \( u_2/u_1 = \rho_1/\rho_2 \), as a function of the velocity \( u_1 \) of the I-front relative to the neutral gas just ahead of the I-front, for D-type and R-type ionization front solutions (see text) for an example with \( c_1 = 1 \text{ km s}^{-1}, v_{A1} = 2 \text{ km s}^{-1}, \) and \( c_2 = 11.4 \text{ km s}^{-1} \). The astrophysically relevant solutions are the strong D-type and weak R-type cases, shown as heavy curves. There are no solutions with \( u_1 \) between \( u_D \) and \( u_R \).
• §37.1, p. 416, first paragraph:
...will be strong R-type, ... \rightarrow ...will be weak R-type, ...

• §37.1, p. 417, fourth line:
...will now be weak D-type, ... \rightarrow ...will now be strong D-type, ...

noted 2016.12.06 by Ryohei Nakatani.

• §37.2, p. 418, typos:
...moving at a speed $v_s$ that will be close to (just slightly larger than) the speed of the I-front:

$$v_s \approx V_i.$$ \hfill (37.21)

\rightarrow

...moving at a speed $V_s$ that will be close to (just slightly larger than) the speed of the I-front:

$$V_s \approx V_i.$$ \hfill (37.21)

noted 2016.12.08 by Ryohei Nakatani.

• §38.3, p. 428, last paragraph, typo:
$M_w \approx 2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ km s}^{-1} \rightarrow M_w \approx 2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ M}_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$

noted 2015.12.17 by J. Miralda-Escudé.

• §39.1.2, p. 433, Eqs. (39.22, 39.23, 39.24), typos: the factor $(E_{51} n_0^{2})$ should be $(E_{51} n_0)$, so that the equations should read

$$v_s(t_{\text{rad}}) = 188 \text{ km s}^{-1} (E_{51} n_0)^{0.07},$$ \hfill (39.22)

$$T_s(t_{\text{rad}}) = 4.86 \times 10^5 \text{ K} (E_{51} n_0)^{0.13},$$ \hfill (39.23)

$$kT_s(t_{\text{rad}}) = 41 \text{ eV} (E_{51} n_0)^{0.13}.$$ \hfill (39.24)

noted 2012.10.02 by G.B. Field.

• §39.4, p. 438, Eqs. (39.35) and (39.36), typos: they should read

$$N_{SN} = 0.24 S_{-13} E_{51}^{1.26} n_0^{-1.47} c_{s,6}^{-13/5} e_{d,6}^{13/5}$$

$$= 0.48 S_{-13} E_{51}^{1.26} n_0^{-0.17} p_4^{-1.30}, \quad p_4 \equiv \frac{p/k}{10^4 \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ K}}$$ \hfill (39.35, 39.36)

noted 2014.06.27 by B. Jiang.

• §39.4, p. 438, Eq. (39.37), typos: Eq. (39.37) should read

$$\frac{p}{k} = S_{-13}^{0.77} E_{51}^{0.97} n_0^{-0.13} \times 5700 \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ K}$$ \hfill (39.37)

noted 2014.06.27 by B. Jiang.
• §40.5, p. 447, typo: protons with $E \lesssim 10^5$ GeV have $R_{\text{gyro}} < 10^{-4}$ pc \rightarrow protons with $E \lesssim 10^3$ GeV have $R_{\text{gyro}} < 10^{-4}$ pc
  noted 2011.04.26

• §41.3, p. 456, typo: missing factor of $G$. Eq. (41.36) should read

$$E_{\text{grav}} = -\frac{G}{2} \int dV_1 \int dV_2 \frac{\rho(r_1) \rho(r_2)}{|r_1 - r_2|}$$ (41.36)

  noted 2015.04.30 by J. Greco.

• §41.3.2, p. 457, Eq. (41.46), typo: replace

$$E_{\text{mag}} = \frac{B_{\text{rms}}^2 - B_0^2}{8\pi} \rightarrow E_{\text{mag}} = \frac{B_{\text{rms}}^2}{8\pi} V$$

  noted 2011.04.28

• §41.4, p. 460, Eq. (41.55), typo: $m_m \rightarrow m_n$
  noted 2013.04.30 by K. Silsbee

• Appendix A, p. 473, typo: entry for $a_0$ should read
  ...Bohr radius $\equiv h^2/m_e e^2 = ...$
  noted 2013.03.05 by Wenhua Ju.

• Appendix D, p. 481: corrected typos:
  F VI \rightarrow VII: $I = 147.163 \rightarrow 157.163$
  Ne VI \rightarrow VII: $I = 154.214 \rightarrow 157.934$
  Ti III \rightarrow IV: $I = 24.492 \rightarrow 27.492$
  Ti V \rightarrow VI: $I = 123.7 \rightarrow 99.299$
  Zn VI \rightarrow VII: $I = 133.903 \rightarrow 108.0$
  noted 2015.07.10 by Guangtun Ben Zhu.

• Appendix E, p. 495: $^2D^n_{3/2,5/2}$ energy levels were misplotted for S II and Ar IV.
  noted 2013.10.21 by Bon-Chul Koo.
  Corrected figure [Opportunity taken to update energy Ar IV energy levels
using latest values from NIST Atomic Spectra Database (ver. 5.1 [Online]):

• Appendix F, Table F.2, p. 497, typo: the first transition listed for S III: change $^{3}P_0 - ^{3}P_0 \rightarrow ^{3}P_0 - ^{3}P_1$ noted 2016.10.03 by C.D. Kreisch.

• Appendix F, Table F.3, p. 498: updated electron collision strengths for O I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ion</th>
<th>$l - u$</th>
<th>$\Omega_{u\ell}$</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O I</td>
<td>$^{3}P_2 - ^{3}P_1$</td>
<td>0.0105 $T_4^{0.4861+0.0054 \ln T_4}$</td>
<td>$a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^{3}P_2 - ^{3}P_0$</td>
<td>0.00459 $T_4^{0.4507-0.0066 \ln T_4}$</td>
<td>$a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^{3}P_1 - ^{3}P_0$</td>
<td>0.00015 $T_4^{0.4709-0.1396 \ln T_4}$</td>
<td>$a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^{3}P_j - ^{1}D_2$</td>
<td>0.0312(2$J+1$) $T_4^{0.945-0.001 \ln T_4}$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^{3}P_j - ^{1}S_0$</td>
<td>0.00353(2$J+1$) $T_4^{0.000-0.135 \ln T_4}$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$^{1}D_2 - ^{1}S_0$</td>
<td>0.0893 $T_4^{0.662-0.089 \ln T_4}$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...  

$a$ fit to Bell et al. (1998)

$b$ fit to Zatsarriny & Tayal (2003)

noted 2015.02.27

• Appendix F, Table F.6, p. 501: The table title should be “Rate Coefficients for ... Deexcitation...” rather than “... Excitation...”. noted 2015.07.03

• Appendix F, Table F.6, p. 501: the rates for entries 5 and 6 should be interchanged, so that entries 4-6 read
\begin{align*}
\text{H} & \quad \text{CI} & \quad 3^3P_0 - 3^3P_1 & \quad 1.26 \times 10^{-10} T_2^{0.115+0.057} \ln T_2 & \quad b \\
\text{H} & \quad \text{CI} & \quad 3^3P_0 - 3^3P_2 & \quad 8.90 \times 10^{-11} T_2^{0.228+0.046} \ln T_2 & \quad b \\
\text{H} & \quad \text{CI} & \quad 3^3P_1 - 3^3P_2 & \quad 2.64 \times 10^{-10} T_2^{0.231+0.046} \ln T_2 & \quad b \\
\text{H} & \quad \text{CI} & \quad 3^3P_0 - 3^3P_1 & \quad 1.49 \times 10^{-10} T_2^{0.369-0.026} \ln T_2 & \quad h \\
\text{H} & \quad \text{CI} & \quad 3^3P_2 - 3^3P_1 & \quad 1.37 \times 10^{-10} T_2^{0.395-0.005} \ln T_2 & \quad h \\
\text{H} & \quad \text{CI} & \quad 3^3P_2 - 3^3P_0 & \quad 2.37 \times 10^{-10} T_2^{0.255+0.016} \ln T_2 & \quad h \\
\text{H} & \quad \text{CI} & \quad 3^3P_0 - 3^3P_0 & \quad 2.23 \times 10^{-10} T_2^{0.284+0.035} \ln T_2 & \quad h \\
\text{H} & \quad \text{CI} & \quad 3^3P_1 - 3^3P_0 & \quad 2.10 \times 10^{-12} T_2^{0.117+0.070} \ln T_2 & \quad h \\
\text{H} & \quad \text{CI} & \quad 3^3P_1 - 3^3P_0 & \quad 3.00 \times 10^{-12} T_2^{0.792+0.188} \ln T_2 & \quad h \\
\end{align*}

\text{noted 2015.07.03 by Munan Gong.}

- Appendix F, Table F.6, p. 501: the rates for entries 23-28 should be changed to

\begin{align*}
\text{H}_2\text{(para)} & \quad \text{O} \quad 3^3P_2 - 3^3P_1 & \quad 1.49 \times 10^{-10} T_2^{0.369-0.026} \ln T_2 & \quad h \\
\text{H}_2\text{(para)} & \quad \text{O} \quad 3^3P_2 - 3^3P_0 & \quad 2.37 \times 10^{-10} T_2^{0.255+0.016} \ln T_2 & \quad h \\
\text{H}_2\text{(ortho)} & \quad \text{O} \quad 3^3P_2 - 3^3P_0 & \quad 2.23 \times 10^{-10} T_2^{0.284+0.035} \ln T_2 & \quad h \\
\text{H}_2\text{(ortho)} & \quad \text{O} \quad 3^3P_1 - 3^3P_0 & \quad 2.10 \times 10^{-12} T_2^{0.117+0.070} \ln T_2 & \quad h \\
\text{H}_2\text{(ortho)} & \quad \text{O} \quad 3^3P_1 - 3^3P_0 & \quad 3.00 \times 10^{-12} T_2^{0.792+0.188} \ln T_2 & \quad h \\
\end{align*}

\text{noted 2015.08.24 by E.B. Jenkins.}

- Appendix G, p. 503, typo just before Eq. (G.7): change

\[
\text{...solution } x_0 = e^{-i\omega t} \rightarrow \text{...solution } x = x_0 e^{-i\omega t},
\]

\text{noted 2019.02.11}

- Appendix I, p. 506, typo: ...a time \( \sim E_{u\ell}/\hbar \rightarrow ...a \text{ time } \sim \hbar/E_{u\ell} \)

\text{noted 2013.02.07 by Munan Gong.}

- Appendix I, p. 507, typo (15.78 \rightarrow 31.56): Eq. (I.7) should read

\[
\frac{Ze^2}{a_0 kT} = \frac{31.56Z}{T_3}
\]

\text{noted 2019.01.14.}

- Appendix J, p. 510, Eq. (J.13), typo:

\[
\Pi_0 \equiv \oint d\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{r}_p \rightarrow \Pi_0 \equiv \frac{1}{3} \int d\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{r}_p
\]

\text{noted 2017.03.08.}