

We provide our reply to the comment by Greiter and Schuricht (GS)¹. Let us first stress that there is no doubt about the mathematical correctness of our derivation. We now show that our interpretation of the physics of spinons is correct. Against the existence of spinon attraction, GS recall that spinons constitute an "ideal gas of half fermions"². In reality, spinons feel a statistical interaction associated to a rule for progressively filling single-particle states. The fully dressed S-matrix for spinons⁴ in the Haldane-Shastry model (HSM)⁵ takes the trivial form $S = i \text{ times the identity } I$. (This is well known – GS strangely fail to quote the result we derived on page 9 of the second paper of Ref.³ which is equivalent to computing the S-matrix associated to exchange statistics of semions – which can also be done by Asymptotic Bethe Ansatz – there is an extra i in our formula: it comes from a misprint in the final version of the paper). Triviality of the S-matrix means that spinons are alleged asymptotic states of the HSM. Their long-distance behavior is not affected by their dynamical short range attraction. In our paper, we explicitly show the short-distance effects of the interaction on two spinon wavefunctions³. We now consider the points raised by GS separately.

1. GS claim our interpretation of the $p_{m,n}(e^i)$ as two-spinon relative wavefunction is ambiguous, because the $p_{m,n}$'s are defined by expanding the (overcomplete) set of states in the (basis of) energy eigenfunctions $\psi_{m,n}$. This statement is false. In real space, spinons are non-local excitations, with typical size of the order of the lattice step³. The $\psi_{m,n}$'s should be thought of as the lattice version of two-particle coherent states. The overcompleteness of the $\psi_{m,n}$'s is, therefore, the lattice version of the usual overcompleteness of coherent states. Two spinons at the same site correspond to a localized spin-1 excitation, unambiguously described by $(z_1; \dots; z_{N=2-1})^3$. The physical meaning of $p_{m,n}(1)$ as the probability enhancement when the two spinons are at the same site (and form the spin-1 excitation) is hence absolutely non-ambiguous, at odds to GS's statement that the $p_{m,n}(1)$'s "cannot be interpreted as probability distribution". We also find a similar short-range attraction between a spinon and a holon (in the supersymmetric J model with $1/r^2$ -interaction) although the states of a localized spinon and a localized holon do not form an overcomplete set³. We wish to remark that using over-

complete sets of states to treat nonlocal excitations as quantum-mechanical particles is in fact widely used for Laughlin quasiholes, a fact which Greiter correctly and explicitly points out in a prior publication⁶. The spinon situation is no different.

2. GS assert that "The second argument of BGL is that the last term in their expression for the energy of the two-spinon states represents a negative interaction contribution that becomes negligibly small in the thermodynamic limit". We clearly state that the additional negative contribution to the two spinon energy is negligibly small in the thermodynamic limit for most values of the moments. The interaction, however, is not at all negligible for spinons of large momenta difference $m-n$. The probability enhancement $p_{m,n}$ depends on this difference. As we clearly show in our plot, in the thermodynamic limit the spinon attraction becomes most important.

3. The spinon-interaction is in fact evident from the real space effective Hamiltonian for the two-spinon subspace which we derived in equation [20] of³. Besides the kinetic terms appropriate for each of the spinons, the effective Hamiltonian also contains a term proportional to the difference in the spinon velocities and inversely proportional to the distance between spinons. This is extremely suggestive of the gauge-like statistical forces between fractionalized particles.

4. GS remark that "it is not $p_{m,n}(e^i)$ as a function of m and n which enter their derivation of the DSS, but $p_{m,n}(1)$ as a function of m and n ". This is exactly what we explicitly say in our paper. If spinons were noninteracting, $p_{m,n}(1)$ would not depend at all on m and n , and the distribution would be flat. On the contrary, the strong dependence of $p_{m,n}(1)$ on m and n , which is a consequence of the strong nonuniformity of $p_{m,n}(e^i)$ on m and n , is the key ingredient, to obtain the square-root singular threshold in the dynamical spin susceptibility. With the experimental observation of the square-root singularity in $KCuF_3$, Tennant et al. have observed fractional quantization in spin chains by looking at the main effect of the static interaction arising from quantum number fractionalization.

B. A. Bernevig, D. Giuliano and R. B. Laughlin

¹ M. Greiter and D. Schuricht, cond-mat/0511607.

² F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 937 (1991); Y. S. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 922 (1994).

³ B. A. Bernevig, D. Giuliano and R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 3392 (2001), 87, 177206 (2001); Phys. Rev. B 64, 024425 (2001).

⁴ F. H. L. Essler, Phys. Rev. B 51, 13357 (1995).

⁵ F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 365 (1988); S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 369 (1988).

⁶ M. Greiter, Physica E 1, 1 (1997).