

## Reply to Comment on: "Rashba precession in quantum wire with interaction"

Wolfgang Hausler

Fachbereich Physik, Universität Siegen, EN C, D-57068 Siegen and  
 I. Institut für Theoretische Physik der Universität Hamburg, Jungiusstr. 9, D-20355 Hamburg, Germany  
 (Received: )

It is shown that the recent Comment [1] by Y. Yu on the above article is not substantiated.

Recently a Comment appeared on the ArXiv preprint server [1] on my article 'Rashba precession in quantum wires with interaction' [2]. Its main statement is to question the dependence of the Rashba spin-orbit generated persistent spin current on the interaction. I demonstrate now that Comment [1] contains numerous faults, one of which leading to the above (mis)conclusion.

The Author begins by stating that non-integer valued  $J$  would contradict to the seminal work by Haldane [3]. In this regard [2] carefully distinguishes between eigenvalues and expectation values at non-zero  $\alpha$  and it are the latter for which Eq. (2) of [1] is correct (as clearly stated before Eq. (7) in [2]). It should be pointed out that the expression  $J^*$  found after Eq. (9) in [1] is non-integer either ( $q_R = m$  is tuned externally), contrary to what is stated one sentence later.

Secondly, the Fermi velocities  $v_{F,a}$  in [1] are taken as spin dependent which in the effective mass description is erroneous at given Fermi energy. The effective mass description holds up to the perturbative order  $O(\alpha^5)$ , as is carefully derived in [2], cf. also [4]. The  $v_{F,a}$  in [1] describe a non-equilibrium situation.

The main error, however, occurs in Eq. (10) of [1] where the shifted current  $J^*$  is inserted into the interaction, instead of the current  $J$ . For not explicitly spin dependent interactions the  $J = 0$  state is of course the state of lowest interaction energy and not the state  $J^* = 0$ . Correct insertion would immediately lead to the (correct) result, Eq. (2) of [1]. In Eq. (10) of [1] the in-

teraction depends on the Rashba coupling  $q_R$  while the Rashba spin-orbit term depends explicitly on the interaction strength. Both is clearly not representing the model under consideration, the Rashba spin-orbit coupling being a single particle operator, cf. Eq. (1) of [2].

In Eq. (14) the prefactor  $v_F =$  has simply been written ad hoc in front of the  $J$ -linear term, without further justification. Correct would have been this term proportional to  $q_R$  precisely as in Eq. (14) with  $\alpha = 1$ , describing indeed SU(2) symmetric spin sectors (a case which has not been considered in [5]). It is not the scope of this Reply to correct for the inconsistencies between Eq. (14) of [1] and the work by Y.-S. Wu [5], where the Author of [1] is Coauthor.

In conclusion, the persistent spin current and the Rashba length both being ground state properties (and as such unrelated to  $H_q$ ) do depend on the interaction. The Comment [1] by Y. Yu lacks substantiation.

---

[1] Y. Yu, preprint, cond-mat/0306019.

[2] W. Hausler, Phys. Rev. B 63, 121310 (2001).

[3] F. D. M. Haldane, J. Phys. C 14, 2585 (1981).

[4] W. Hausler, Physica E 18, 337 (2003).

[5] Y.-S. Wu and Y. Yu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 890 (1995).