Jung and Hänggi Reply: In a previous Letter<sup>1</sup> we have numerically evaluated (error < 0.1%) the lowest, nonvanishing eigenvalue  $\lambda_1(\tau)$  of a colored-noise driven bistable system. We compared our numerical results with theoretical predictions which had been derived at weak noise and small noise color  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ , and in addition commented on the behavior of moderate to large noise color. Although a previous "crude" (see p. 697 in Ref. 2) approximation for the stationary probability,<sup>2</sup> i.e., the decoupling theory (DT), is in *qualitative* agreement with our numerical findings, we explicitly commented in this context critically on an a priori use of the DT. We state in Ref. 1 that the DT overestimates the value of the slope for the data by a factor of 5 [note our discussion following Eq. (2) in Ref. 1]. In the asymptotic large- $\tau$ regime,  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ , the DT overestimates the correct slope of  $(8V_0/27D_0)\tau$ , which has been derived first in Ref. 3, by a factor of 6.75.... In particular, we nowhere state that our own numerical study<sup>1</sup> is in quantitative agreement with DT. Therefore, contrary to the statements in the preceding Comment,<sup>4</sup> we believe that our argumentation in Ref. 1 on the possible use (misuse) of DT is quite clear, and not misleading.

The information plotted in Figs. 1 and 2 of the preceding Comment is not challenged. The fact that the decoupling approximation is in *quantitative disagreement* with precise results is well known,  $^{1-8}$  and has already been noted by the authors Ref. 4 repeatedly in previous items, see, e.g., Fig. 3 in Ref. 5 and Figs. 3–5 in Ref. 6.

P. Jung and P. Hänggi

Lehrstuhl für Theoretische Physik Universität Augsburg D-8900 Augsburg, Federal Republic of Germany

Received 16 March 1989

PACS numbers: 05.40.+j, 02.50.+s

<sup>1</sup>P. Jung and P. Hänggi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 11 (1988).

<sup>2</sup>P. Hänggi, T. J. Mroczkowski, F. Moss, and P. V. E. McClintock, Phys. Rev. A **32**, 695 (1985).

 $^{3}$ J. F. Luciani and A. D. Verga, Europhys. Lett. 4, 255 (1987); see Eq. (11) therein.

<sup>4</sup>G. P. Tsironis, K. Lindenberg, E. P. Lopez, and B. J. West, preceding Comment, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 214 (1989).

 ${}^{5}G$ . P. Tsironis and P. Grigolini, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 7 (1988).

<sup>6</sup>J. Masoliver, B. J. West, and K. Lindenberg, Phys. Rev. A **35**, 3086 (1987).

 $^{7}$ K. Vogel, Th. Leiber, H. Risken, P. Hänggi, and W. Schleich, Phys. Rev. A **35**, 4882 (1897).

<sup>8</sup>P. Jung and P. Hänggi, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B 5, 979 (1988).