Bayman *et al.* Respond: The main point made in the first part of Ref. 1 was that the relatively large sizes of Li, Be, and B nuclei make it unlikely that their mean free paths, λ, in emulsion could be inferred from systematics based on more compact nuclei, such as ^{4}He and nuclei with $Z \geq 8$. To illustrate this point, we gave simple arguments, mainly geometrical in nature. DiGiacomo is correct in stating that a more accurate calculation would involve not only nuclear sizes, but also nucleon number densities. We have, in fact, recently performed such calculations (similar to those of Karol[2] and DeVries and Peng[3]) employing the best available experimental and theoretical information regarding density distributions of all the nuclei concerned.

Some relevant results are presented in Table I. We list the values of ξ, defined by

$$\xi \equiv \lambda(Z,A)/\lambda(^4\text{He}).$$

For comparison, ξ values calculated from the empirical formula of Ref. 4 are also given. This formula provides a logarithmic interpolation between $Z=2$ and $Z \geq 6$. Significant differences occur only in the cases of Li and Be. For these nuclei, our calculated values of ξ are appreciably lower than the interpolated ones. Measurements are available for ^{6}Li (Heckman and Judek[5]) and yield a ξ value close to 0.7, in agreement with our calculated value.

We conclude that this calculation, which incorporates the nucleon-nucleon interaction effects emphasized by DiGiacomo, supports the contention of Ref. 1 that the logarithmic interpolation cannot be relied upon to predict λ for light primary projectiles. If we use our calculated λ for primary Li and Be, the discrepancy between primary and secondary values is decreased. It seems clear that further experimental data are required to decide whether or not there is in fact a significant difference.

TABLE I. Calculated and interpolated values of ξ.

Projectile	From Karol[a]-type calculation	From logarithmic interpolation[b]
^{4}He	1.0	1.0
^{6}Li	0.72	0.84
^{9}Be	0.63	0.74
^{11}B	0.64	0.67
^{12}C	0.61	0.62
^{14}N	0.59	0.58
^{16}O	0.54	0.54
^{32}S	0.41	0.40
^{40}Ca	0.38	0.36
^{56}Fe	0.33	0.32

[a]Ref. 2. [b]Ref. 4.

B. F. Bayman
P. J. Ellis
S. Fricke
Y. C. Tang
School of Physics and Astronomy
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Received 12 October 1982
PACS numbers: 25.70.Ba, 21.10.Ft, 25.70.Hi

[1]B. F. Bayman, P. J. Ellis, and Y. C. Tang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 532 (1982).
[2]P. J. Karol, Phys. Rev. C 11, 1203 (1975).
[3]R. M. DeVries and J. C. Peng, Phys. Rev. C 22, 1055 (1980).
[4]E. M. Friedlander, R. W. Gimpel, H. H. Heckman, Y. J. Karant, B. Judek, and E. Ganssauge, Phys. Rev. Lett. 45, 1084 (1980).
[5]H. H. Heckman and B. Judek, private communication.

ERRATUM

TRANSVERSE ELECTROMAGNETIC WAVES WITH FINITE ENERGY, ACTION, AND $\int \vec{E}\cdot\vec{B}\,d^4x$. Avinash Khare and Trilochan Pradhan [Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 1227 (1982)].

It was claimed in our paper that the condition for $\vec{E} \parallel \vec{B}$, i.e., Eq. (9), is satisfied for our choice of $\vec{a},\vec{b}$ which unfortunately is not the case. However, although $\vec{E}(t)$ is not parallel to $\vec{B}(t)$, $\vec{E}(t=0) \parallel \vec{B}(t=0)$ and $\int d^3x\, \vec{E}(t)\times\vec{B}(t)=0$. All other conclusions of our paper remain valid in spite of the error.

 © 1982 The American Physical Society