A dam $s$ and $O \operatorname{lm}$ sted $R$ eply: $W$ ang [1] m akes the follow ing points about our Letter [2] : (1) He infers that, lcontrary to its title, shear banding [in [2]] em erged from m onotonic curves only if there was a stress gradient", and he points out that nonquiescent relaxation w as found (experim entally) after step strain in geom etries without a stress gradient [3]. (2) He disagrees w ith the values of the param eters we used. (3) In som e recent experim ents the ow was hom ogeneous after cessation of step strain, and only subsequently developed nonquiescent $m$ acroscopic m otion [3]. We only show ed step strains that developed an inhom ogeneity before cessation of ow, as in [4].
(1) A s our title stated [2], we show ed that a uid w ith a m onotonic constitutive curve based on D oiEdw ards (D E ) theory can have signatures sim ilar to shear banding. These signatures arise from a stress gradient (e.g. the bowed steady state velocity pro le obtained in the stress gradient of a cone and plate rheom eter [5] or transient banding-like pro les during startup). F lat geom etries can have transient banding-like signatures: e.g. tw o clearly de ned bands of shear rates during large am plitude oscillatory shear (LAOS) [2, 6], or inhom ogeneous banding-like transients during startup ow s in presence of inhom ogeneous spatial uctuations (noise) (Fig. (1) [2]).


F IG .1: (color online) Startup transients for (left) a cone angle of $4 \quad\left(q=2 \quad 10^{3}\right)$; and (right) a at geom etry with noisy in itial polym er shear stress $x y(0)$ of a few percent, w ith $-\mathrm{d}=14: 8,=0: 728$ and $=10^{5}$, and $d_{\mathrm{d}}=10^{3}$.
(2) O ur param eters w ere $m$ atched to experim ent, for a nonlinear model in which the param eters $d$ and $R$ roughly correspond to their rigorously de ned counterparts in linear meology. B ecause we use (the best available) crude nonlinear theory, the param eters do not correspond precisely. W e used $==\left(\begin{array}{ll}G & d\end{array}\right)^{\prime} 10{ }^{5}$ based a plateau m odulusG ' 3 kP a, reptation time $\mathrm{d}^{\prime} 20 \mathrm{~s}$, and solvent viscosity $\quad$ 1Pas [7]. A though $d=R \quad 10^{3}$ im plies too $m$ any entanglem ents, it ts the experim en-
tal nonlinear rheology well [5]. This inconsistency is an unsatisfactory feature of current theory.
(3) The step strain results in [2] should be com pared w ith [4]-(F ig. 5), where the velocity pro le becam e inho$m$ ogeneous before cessation. Fig. 2 show s a calculation in which inhom ogeneities develop only after cessation of ow, during a strong recoil. $T$ his is for startup in a at geom etry, w ith noisy in itialconditions, and resem bles [4]( $F$ ig. 3) if there w ere no experim ental wall slip.
W ang's newest experim ents show dram atic nupture and intemal fracture, despite a hom ogeneous velocity before cessation [3] (sim ilar fracture planes could be inter-


F IG . 2: R ecoil displacem ent (b) at $t=0: 08 \mathrm{~d}$ after cessation of hom ogeneous shear (a) at $t_{\text {stop }}=0: 0375 \mathrm{~d}$ w ith $-\mathrm{d}=80$, ( = 3) for the R olie-P oly m odel w th $=0: 728$, $=10^{5}$ and $q=0, w$ ith initial noise.
preted in [8]-(Fig. 3f), but in a cone-and-plate geom etry; $m$ oreover, those data are also consistent w ith wall slip and sim ple recoil). O ur calculations ( $F$ ig. (2) go som ew ay tow ards m odelling this phenom enon, but do not capture this rupture, and have not yet been adequately m odied to incorporate slip. It rem ains a strong challenge to distinguish which experim ental features are captured by tube m odels, and which (e.g. nupture) require new physical insight. O ne suggestion is the \elastic yielding" in [1] which $m$ ay be sim ilar to $m$ odifying the D E m odel to inconporate the instability of the spatial distribution of entanglem ents [9]. In fact, the instability in the DE m odel occurs when the shear rate greatly exceeds the reptation tim $e$, which is one criterion for elastic yielding postulated in [1].
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