section. In the two-dimensional case (cylindrical reactor with absorbing rod), however, the host atoms are smeared out into line filaments when the rod diameter tends to zero and, thus becoming one-dimensional, cannot have an arbitrarily large cross section (the cross sections actually vanish). Similarly, in three dimensions, a point absorber forces also the host atoms to become geometrical points. Thus, in two and three dimensions, the δ-function character of the absorbing volume overrides the assumption of the diverging cross sections, whereas in one dimension, it does not.

Imre Pázsit

Chalmers University of Technology
Department of Reactor Physics
S-412 96 Göteborg, Sweden

September 17, 1993

REFERENCES

1. A. M. WEINBERG and H. C. SCHWEINLER, *Phys. Rev.*, **74**, 851 (1948).

2. M. M. R. WILLIAMS, "Reactor Noise in Heterogeneous Systems: 1. Plate-Type Elements," *Nucl. Sci. Eng.*, **30**, 188 (1967); see also M. M. R. WILLIAMS, "Reactivity Changes Due to the Random Vibration of Control Rods and Fuel Elements," *Nucl. Sci. Eng.*, **40**, 144 (1970).

3. A. D. GALANIN, *Thermal Reactor Theory*, Pergamon Press, Oxford (1960).

4. I. PÁZSIT, *Ann. Nucl. Energy*, **15**, 333 (1988).

5. "Reactor Physics Constants," ANL-5800, Argonne National Laboratory (1963).

6. I. PÁZSIT, *Ann. Nucl. Energy*, **11**, 441 (1984).

Response to "Comment on 'Analysis of Cluster Geometries Using the DP1 Approximation of the $J_{\pm}$ Technique'"

There seems to be confusion between my definition of the $J_{\pm}$ technique and that of Mohanakrishnan.[1] In fact, what he calls the $J_{\pm}$ technique is what I would call the interface current method. The main difference between the two techniques is that the $J_{\pm}$ technique refers to a decomposition of a cell into isolated homogeneous zones, while the interface current method allows for a decomposition of the cell into heterogeneous zones. As a result, the computation of transmission probabilities is sufficient when the $J_{\pm}$ technique is considered, while the interface current method generally requires additional collision and leakage probabilities. However, for a given cell, the number of transmission probabilities required by the $J_{\pm}$ technique is generally much larger than that required by the interface current method. Since the purpose of my paper[2] was to discuss the use of the $J_{\pm}$ method, I did not think that a complete literature review of the interface current method was needed.

G. Marleau

Institut de Génie Énergétique
École Polytechnique de Montréal
Montréal, Québec
Canada H3C 3A7

September 27, 1993

REFERENCES

1. P. MOHANAKRISHNAN, "Comment on 'Analysis of Cluster Geometries Using the DP1 Approximation of the $J_{\pm}$ Technique,'" *Nucl. Sci. Eng.*, **114**, 371 (1993).

2. G. MARLEAU and A. HÉBERT, "Analysis of Cluster Geometries Using the DP1 Approximation of the $J_{\pm}$ Technique," *Nucl. Sci. Eng.*, **111**, 257 (1992).