

Masuda et al. reply: In our original work [1] we reported the observation of an incommensurate ordered state in the frustrated quasi-one-dimensional antiferromagnet LiCu_2O_2 . The Comment by Drechsler et al. challenges our conclusions regarding the hierarchy of relevant exchange interactions in the system and the microscopic origin of frustration. In Ref. [1] we postulated a simple model that seemed to explain the available data with only two AF exchange constants $J_1 > J_2 > 0$ (see inset in Fig. 1). Drechsler et al. point out that structural arguments and LDA calculations [2] favor a totally different picture [5]: $J_4 > J_2 > 0$ and $J_1 = 0$.

A determination of exchange parameters from bulk data is notoriously ambiguous. To resolve the controversy we have instead recently performed 3-axis inelastic neutron scattering experiments that probe the coupling constants directly [3]. Fig. 1 (symbols) shows the spin wave dispersion measured along the $(0.5; k; 0)$ reciprocal space rod at $T = 1.7 \text{ K}$. Additional data (not shown) were taken along $(h; 0.827; 0)$ and reveal a sinusoidal dispersion with maxima at integer h values and a bandwidth of 7.5 meV . The measured dispersion curves can be analyzed in the framework of linear spin wave theory (SWT) [4]. It can be shown that in the generalized J_1 - J_2 - J_4 model with inter-chain coupling J_z there are exactly two sets of SWT coupling constants that fit the data: (i) $J_1 = 105 \text{ meV}$, $J_2 = 34 \text{ meV}$, $J_4 = 2 \text{ meV}$ and $J_z = 0.2 \text{ meV}$ and (ii) $J_1 = 6.4 \text{ meV}$, $J_2 = 11.9 \text{ meV}$, $J_4 = 7.4 \text{ meV}$ and $J_z = 1.8 \text{ meV}$. In the energy range shown in Fig. 1, the spectra calculated from these two models (solid line) are indistinguishable. Solution (i) almost exactly corresponds to our original J_1 - J_2 model. Note, however, that the fitted effective J 's are unrealistically large. While this may merely reflect severe quantum renormalization corrections, the alternative model (ii) appears to be a more likely candidate for LiCu_2O_2 . It incorporates a ferromagnetic J_2 bond, just like the LDA-based model of [2]. However, it involves only weak frustration and requires a strong AF J_1 bond, as originally proposed in our work. In addition, the estimated inter-chain coupling constant is smaller than the LDA result by half an order of magnitude. These two discrepancies will have opposite effects on the Curie-Weiss temperature, which could in turn explain why the LDA-based model still yields reasonable estimates of this quantity.

Trying to reconcile the result by Drechsler et al. with the measured dispersion of spin waves, we note that just the data taken along $(0.5; k; 0)$ can be also perfectly reproduced by $J_1 = 0$, $J_2 = 10 \text{ meV}$, $J_4 = 7 \text{ meV}$ and $J_z = 8 \text{ meV}$. This set of parameters is at least qualitatively consistent with their model. However, with these numbers SWT gives an a -axis bandwidth of 13 meV , almost twice as large as observed. One possibility is that Drechsler's model is actually correct, but SWT breaks down qualitatively, and can not give correct excitation energies in the entire Brillouin zone even using some ef-




FIG. 1: Spin wave dispersion in LiCu_2O_2 measured using constant-E (solid symbols) or constant-Q scans (open symbols). Lines are as described in the text.

fective set of renormalized coupling constants. This intriguing possibility deserves a closer theoretical investigation, but seems unlikely. Indeed, in LiCu_2O_2 the suppression of T_c is not too pronounced, and a renormalized quasiclassical picture should work rather well.

In summary, the frustration mechanism in LiCu_2O_2 is more complex than we originally thought, and involves a ferromagnetic J_2 bond. However, our present understanding of the inelastic neutron scattering results suggests a strong "rung" interaction J_1 and weak inter-chain coupling, in contradiction with the model of Drechsler et al. This work was partially supported by the Civilian Research and Development Foundation project RU-P1-2599-04. Work at ORNL was supported by the U. S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725.

T. Masuda^y, A. Zheludev^y, A. Bush[†], M. Markina[†], and A. Vasiliev[†]

^y Condensed Matter Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6393, USA.

[†] Moscow Institute of Radiotechnics, Electronics and Automation, Moscow 117464, Russia.

[†] Low Temperature Physics Department, Moscow State University, Moscow 119992, Russia.

[1] T. Masuda et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 177201 (2004).

[2] A. A. Gippius et al., Phys. Rev. B 70, Rapid Comm., in press (2004), cond-mat/0312576.

[3] T. Masuda, A. Zheludev, B. Roessli, A. Bush, M. Markina and A. Vasiliev, in preparation.

[4] T. Nagamiya, Solid State Physics, Academic Press, New York, 1967, Vol. 20, p. 305.

[5] Drechsler et al. use a different notation, related to ours through $J_1 \leftrightarrow J_{DC}$, $J_2 \leftrightarrow J_1$ and $J_4 \leftrightarrow J_2$.