

Albano and Saracco reply. In our paper [1], it is assumed that, at criticality and starting from a ground-state configuration, the order parameter (OP) decays according to

$$OP(t) / t^{-z} = \text{const}; \quad (1)$$

(Eq. (9) in [1]), where it is implicit that $z = z_k$. In the preceding comment, Caracciolo et al. (CGGP) [2] have suggested, instead, that z must be interpreted as $z_?$. Based on this assumption CGGP conclude that the exponent $= z_?$ reported in [1] supports the field-theoretical equation developed in reference [3] (Eq.(1) in [1]), while the numerical estimate of the exponent $c_?$ differs from the prediction of both field-theoretical models considered by us, given by Eqs.(1) and (2) in [1], which were taken from references [3] and [4], respectively. The conclusions of CGGP are in contrast to the main finding of our paper that fully supports the universality class predicted by Eq.(2) in [1].

Let us now show that the agreement between the exponent $= z_?$ predicted by Eq.(1) in [1] and our numerical data is merely coincidental and that the conclusions of CGGP are inconsistent since the relevance of the exponent $c_?$ to determine the universality class is simply disregarded.

Taking the logarithmic derivative of Eq.(1) at criticality one has

$$d \ln OP(t) / dt = -z; \quad (2)$$

Furthermore, inserting Eq.(2) in Eq.(1) one gets $\ln(OP) / \ln(OP^*)$, which gives an unbiased estimation of z independent of any assumption about z . Our data shown in Figure 1 are well fitted by an exponent $= 0.330$, in agreement with the universality class predicted by Eq.(2) in [1], while the value $= 1=2$ predicted by Eq.(1) in [1] can clearly be ruled out.




FIG. 1. Log-log plot of OP versus the logarithmic derivative of OP. The full line with slope $= 0.330$ is the best fit of the data. The dashed line has slope $= 1=2$.

From Eq.(2) it also follows that $OP \propto t^{-z}$. Our numerical results shown in Figure 2 are in full agreement with $z = z_k = 1.998$, while the value $z_? = 4$ suggested by CGGP can clearly be ruled out.




FIG. 2. Log-log plots of the OP versus t . The full line with slope $1=z_k = 0.501$ is the best fit of the data. The dashed line has slope $1=z_? = 0.25$.

Summing up, we have provided conclusive evidence showing that, in contrast to the suggestions of the preceding comment [2]: 1) The decay of the order parameter is governed by the time evolution of the correlation length parallel to the field and consequently the exponent z of Eq.(1) must be identified as z_k as in our original paper [1]; 2) A numerical determination of the exponent can be performed independently of any assumption on the value of z ; 3) All exponents measured are fully consistent with the universality class predicted by Eq.(2) in [1] and developed in reference [4].

Acknowledgments: This work was supported by CONICET, UNLP and ANPCYT (Argentina). G.S. acknowledges the CIC for a research fellowship.

Ezequiel V. Albano and Gustavo Saracco. Instituto de Investigaciones Físicoquímicas Teóricas y Aplicadas (INIFTA), UNLP, CONICET, Casilla de Correo, 16 Sucursal 4, (1900) La Plata, Argentina.

- [1] E.V. Albano and G. Saracco, Phys. Rev. Lett, 88 145701 (2002).
- [2] S. Caracciolo, A. Gambassi, M. Gubinelli and A. Pelissetto, preceding comment, Phys. Rev. Lett. XX, xxxxxx (2003).
- [3] H. K. Janssen and B. Schmittmann, Z. Phys. B 64, 503 (1986). K.-t. Leung and J. L. Cardy, J. Stat. Phys. 44, 567 (1986); *ibid* 45, 1087 (Erratum) (1986).
- [4] P. L. Garrido, F. de los Santos and M. A. Muñoz, Phys. Rev. E 57, 752 (1998), and P. L. Garrido, M. A. Muñoz, and F. de los Santos, Phys. Rev. E 61, R4683 (2000).