

## Reply

PHILIP D. THOMPSON

*National Center for Atmospheric Research<sup>1</sup>, Boulder, Colo. 80307*

27 May 1977

There is considerable doubt in my mind that Prof. Danard's comments need any reply. There is nothing to refute, in that his results and mine agree and both are correct. Looking at somewhat different problems,

---

<sup>1</sup>The National Center for Atmospheric Research is sponsored by the National Science Foundation.

but with similar points of view, we have evidently arrived at several complementary results that, with a common set of assumptions, are completely coincident. I am glad that my arithmetic was right. I am even more gratified that my few words did not fall on deaf ears. In fact, the main purpose of my paper was not to

show originality of method, which I attributed to Gauss (1809), but to promulgate some ideas that are either misunderstood or (in some quarters) downright unpopular. In this respect, Prof. Danard has served my purpose well. I am also indebted to him for pointing out that the ratio on the left-hand side of Eq. (7) of my paper should be inverted. This does not controvert the conclusions.