

Eggert, Aleck, and Horton Reply to the Comment on 'Neel order in doped quasi one-dimensional antiferromagnets' "

In the Comment [1] it is pointed out correctly that the old theory treatment that was used in our recent Letter [2] to obtain some of the results for the Heisenberg antiferromagnetic chain is indeed only valid in the limit of long length L , low temperature T , and small magnetization S^z . In particular, this treatment becomes only asymptotically correct in a region where the dispersion is linear and the spin-wave velocity v can be approximated by a constant [3], which according to our numerics is the case if both $T < 0.2J$ and $L > 10$ sites. There is no restriction on the product $LT=v$ as long as v is approximately constant.

However, we must emphasize that we were indeed able to calculate the staggered susceptibility χ_1 for arbitrary L and T as mentioned in the introduction by combining the old theory results with numerical calculations [4]. The numerical calculations are especially reliable for values of L and T where the old theory predictions become invalid and vice versa. We can therefore describe the entire crossover of χ_1 to the limit of large T and/or small L , which shows an interesting behavior by itself that was unfortunately not explicitly presented in the Letter [2]. If we for example consider the staggered susceptibility χ_1 without impurities as a function of T we see that it crosses over from the bosonization formula to a high temperature expansion as shown in Fig. 1.

$$\chi_1(T) \sim \begin{cases} \frac{8}{b} \frac{p}{\ln(a=T)} & T \ll J \\ \frac{1+J=2T}{4T} & T \gg J \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $a = 23J$ and $b = \frac{8}{4} \frac{2^{(1=4)}}{2^{(3=2)} 3^{(2=4)}} = 0.277904$. In the case of shorter chain lengths L we again find a significant drop from the thermodynamic limit as well as a split at $T < 4J=L$ for even and odd chains as depicted for $L = 10$ and $L = 11$ in Fig. 1. The crossover from finite size behavior to the thermodynamic limit is therefore very similar to Fig. 1 in our Letter [2] which shows the behavior predicted by bosonization in the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, $T \rightarrow 0$ as a function of LT , compared to numerical results for large L . Even for smaller L we find again that $\chi_1(T;L)/L$ for even chains as $T \rightarrow 0$ and $\chi_1(T;L) \rightarrow c/T$ for odd chains, where the intercept c can be approximated by a length independent constant even down to $L = 1$ as shown in the inset of Fig. 1.

Now that we have displayed χ_1 for arbitrary T we may be tempted to again apply the chain mean field equation

$$zJ^0 \chi_1(T_N) = 1 \quad (2)$$

even in the case where J^0 is of the order of J . Although we might not expect any one-dimensional physics to survive in that limit, we find for example that this




FIG. 1: The staggered susceptibility $\chi_1(T)$ in the thermodynamic limit determined by combining bosonization results at lower temperature and numerical simulations at higher temperature. The numerical results for $L = 10$ and $L = 11$ are also shown. Inset: the intercept $c = \lim_{T \rightarrow 0} T \chi_1(T; L)$ as a function of L .

would result in $T_N = 1.386J$ for a simple cubic lattice with $J = J^0$, which is indeed higher than the accepted values [5], but still an improvement over the ordinary mean field result of $T_N = 1.5J$. If J^0 is of order J only extreme doping levels will significantly affect the ordering temperature, since finite size effects are small at higher temperatures $T > 4J=L$. In conclusion we have calculated the staggered susceptibility for arbitrary L and T and outlined in more detail the behavior in the limit of large T and small L .

Sebastian Eggert, Ian Aleck, and Matthew D.P. Horton

-
- [1] A.A. Zvyagin, recent Comment
[2] S.Eggert, I.Aleck, and M.D.P.Horton, Phys.Rev.Lett. 89, 47202 (2002).
[3] S.Eggert and I.Aleck, Phys.Rev.B 46, 10866 (1992).
[4] We never claimed that the results for arbitrary T and L were obtained solely by bosonization methods as clearly outlined on the top of page 2 in the Letter.
[5] K.K.Pan, Phys.Rev.B 59, 1168 (1999).