arXiv:cond-mat/9701063v1 9 Jan 1997

Mila and Poilblanc reply: The main point of Clarke and Strong's comment [1], namely that our results concerning the effect of integrability on the hopping of electrons between chains [2] are probably not related to the notion of coherence proposed in Ref. [3], is important and well taken. In fact, we have already stressed in our work [2] that integrability affects the *intermediate–time* behaviour but not the *short–time* one, while in Ref. [3] the authors make predictions about the long-time dynamics on the basis of a calculation at short times. The logical conclusion is then that these two effects are in fact different phenomena. In more recent papers we have numerically investigated other physical quantities (spectral function [4,5], transverse conductivity [5]) in relation to the notion of coherence developped in Ref. [3].

The proposal [1] that the effect seen in Ref. [2] is related to ergodicity is also very plausible. This has also been suggested as a possible explanation of the effect of integrability on the conductivity of 1D systems [6]. However, as far as we know, this remains a conjecture not fully established on firm grounds.

Now, concerning the details of the discussion of Ref. [1], we think it is important to make further clarifications. Clarke and Strong suggest that $P(\tau)$, the probability of finding the system in its initial state at time τ after turning on the hopping $t_\perp$, is an appropriate test of the notion of coherence of Ref. [3] only for sufficiently short times, the long–time behaviour of this function being related to ergodic properties of the system. Our point of view is slightly different. The notion of coherence discussed in Ref. [3] is related to the splitting of the main peaks in the bonding ($k_\perp = 0$) and antibonding ($k_\perp = \pi$) spectral functions, incoherence meaning that the splitting disappears in the thermodynamic limit [7]. In fact, the same behaviour can also be inferred from a study of $P(\tau)$ provided that: i) The difference at $\tau = 0$ between particle numbers on the two chains ΔN is equal to 1; ii) A non–symmetrized initial wavefunction is used. This claim is supported by Fig. 1, in which we have compared $P(\tau)$ calculated in this way with the results deduced from the spectral functions [4]: The fundamental frequency of the oscillations is the same, and it is equal to the splitting between the bonding and the antibonding bands. The rapid oscillations that appear in $P(\tau)$ deduced from the spectral functions are 1D features that are *not* related to the problem of coherence between chains.

We think that these results help clarify the difference between the notions of coherence discussed in Ref. [3] and Ref. [2] respectively. Let us first define $P(\tau)$ with $\Delta N = 1$ and let us increase the interactions. A reduction of coherence according to Ref. [3] will show up in $P(\tau)$ as a *shift* of the oscillations toward larger times, incoherence being achieved when the period becomes infinite. This is consistent with a decrease of the curvature of $P(\tau)$ at small times when coherence disappears. Alternatively, one can choose a macroscopic value of ΔN. When the interactions are switched on, the *intensity* of the oscillations will decrease dramatically unless the underlying model is integrable, in agreement with the notion of coherence discussed in Ref. [2].




FIG. 1. Return probability calculated on a 2×12 system at 1/3–filling as defined in Ref. [2] but for $\Delta N = 1$ (solid line) compared to the results of Ref. [4] obtained from the single particle transverse Green function (dashed line): (a) Hubbard model with $U/t = 8$ and $t_\perp/t = 0.1$; (b) Extended Hubbard model with $U/t = 6$, $V_1/t = 3$, $V_2/t = 2$ and $t_\perp/t = 0.1$.

In conclusion, we agree that the effect we discussed in Ref. [2] (for $\Delta N > 1$) is probably not related to the notion of coherence introduced in Ref. [3]. From a numerical point of view, this latter effect is best studied by looking at physically measurable quantities, like the spectral function or the transverse optical conductivity. We nevertheless think that the function $P(\tau)$ introduced in Ref. [3] and used by us in Ref. [2] is very useful, at least pedagogically, in clarifying the difference between the effects discussed in these papers.

Frédéric Mila and Didier Poilblanc
Laboratoire de Physique Quantique
Université Paul Sabatier
31062 Toulouse (France)

[1] D. G. Clarke and S. P. Strong, preceding Comment.
[2] Frédéric Mila and Didier Poilblanc, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 287 (1996).
[3] D. G. Clarke, S. P. Strong, P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3218 (1994).
[4] D. Poilblanc, H. Endres, F. Mila, M. G. Zacher, S. Capponi, W. Hanke, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 10261 (1996).
[5] S. Capponi, D. Poilblanc, F. Mila, Phys. Rev. B **54**, No. 24, xxx (1996).
[6] H. Castela, P. Prelovsek, X. Zotos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 972 (1995).
[7] The scaling toward the thermodynamic limit is a subtle issue. The interested reader is urged not to stop at Ref.

[4], but to read Ref. [5] as well.