A dam s and 0 lm sted R ep ly: W ang [1] m akes the follow ing points about our Letter [2]: (1) He infers that, \contrary 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 with the values of the param eters we used. (3) In some recent experiments the ow was hom ogeneous after cessation of step strain, and only subsequently developed nonquiescent m acroscopic m otion [3]. We only showed step strains that developed an inhom ogeneity before cessation of ow, as in [4].

(1) A sourtitle stated [2], we showed that a uid with a monotonic constitutive curve based on Doi-Edwards (DE) theory can have signatures similar to shear banding. These signatures arise from a stress gradient (e.g. the bowed steady state velocity prole obtained in the stress gradient of a cone and plate rheom eter [5] or transient banding-like proles during startup). Flat geometries can have transient banding-like signatures: e.g. two clearly de ned bands of shear rates during large am plitude oscillatory shear (LAOS) [2, 6], or inhom ogeneous banding-like transients during startup ows in presence of inhom ogeneous spatial uctuations (noise) (Fig.1) [2].



FIG.1: (color online) Startup transients for (left) a cone angle of 4 (q = 2 10³); and (right) a at geometry with noisy initial polymer shear stress $_{xy}$ (0) of a few percent, with $_{d} = 14.8$, = 0:728 and = 10⁵, and $_{d} = _{R} = 10^{3}$.

(2) O ur param eters were m atched to experiment, for a nonlinear model in which the parameters $_{\rm d}$ and $_{\rm R}$ roughly correspond to their rigorously de ned counterparts in linear theology. Because we use (the best available) crude nonlinear theory, the parameters do not correspond precisely. We used = = (G $_{\rm d}$) ' 10 ⁵ based a plateau modulus G ' 3kP a, reptation time $_{\rm d}$ ' 20 s, and solvent viscosity ' 1P as [7]. A lthough $_{\rm d}$ = $_{\rm R}$ 10³ im plies too m any entanglements, it ts the experimen-

- [2] J. M . A dam s and P. D. O lm sted, Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 067801 (2009).
- [3] P. E. Boukany, S.-Q. W ang, and X. R. W ang, M acrom olecules 42, 6261 (2009).
- [4] S.-Q.W ang, et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 187801 (2006).
- [5] P. Tapadia and S. Q. W ang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 016001 (2006).
- [6] a) Y.T.Hu, et al, J.R heol51, 275 (2007); b) P.Tapadia,

tal nonlinear rheology well [5]. This inconsistency is an unsatisfactory feature of current theory.

(3) The step strain results in [2] should be compared with [4]-(Fig. 5), where the velocity pro le became inhom ogeneous before cessation. Fig. 2 shows a calculation in which inhom ogeneities develop only after cessation of ow, during a strong recoil. This is for startup in a at geom etry, with noisy initial conditions, and resembles [4]-(Fig. 3) if there were no experimental wall slip.

W ang's new est experiments show dramatic rupture and internal fracture, despite a hom ogeneous velocity before cessation β (sim ilar fracture planes could be inter-



FIG.2: Recoil displacement (b) at t = 0:08 $_{\rm d}$ after cessation of hom ogeneous shear (a) at t_{stop} = 0:0375 $_{\rm d}$ with $_{\rm d}$ = 80, (= 3) for the Rolie-Poly model with = 0:728, = 10 5 and q = 0, with initial noise.

preted in [8]-(Fig. 3f), but in a cone-and-plate geom etry; m oreover, those data are also consistent with wall slip and sim ple recoil). O ur calculations (Fig.2) go som e way towards m odelling this phenom enon, but do not capture this rupture, and have not yet been adequately modied to incorporate slip. It remains a strong challenge to distinguish which experimental features are captured by tube models, and which (e.g. nupture) require new physical insight. O ne suggestion is the \elastic yielding" in [1] which may be sim ilar to modifying the DE model to incorporate the instability of the spatial distribution of entanglements [9]. In fact, the instability in the DE model occurs when the shear rate greatly exceeds the reptation tim e, which is one criterion for elastic yielding postulated in [1].

J.M . A dam s^1 and P . D . O $\mathrm{Im}\;\mathrm{sted}^2$

¹D epartm ent of Physics, University of Surrey,

Guildford, GU2 7XH, United Kingdom

²School of Physics & Astronom y, University of Leeds Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

Recieved 9 October 2009

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.219802

PACS num bers: 61 25 he, 83 50 A x

- S.Ravindranath, and S.Q.W ang, Phys.Rev.Lett.96, 196001 (2006); c) L.Zhou, et al., Proceedings of the XV th InternationalC ongress on Rheology p.189 (M onterey, CA, A IP, 2008).
- [7] S.R avindranath and S.-Q.W ang, J.R heol. 52, 957 (2008).
- [B] S. Ravindranath and S.-Q. W ang, M acrom olecules 40, 8031 (2007).
- [9] P.G. de Gennes, Eur. Phys. J.E 23, 3 (2007).