

Note to the Editor regarding the 'Comment' by Daniel Errandonea

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

2004 J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 16 8805

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0953-8984/16/47/033>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 129.252.86.83

The article was downloaded on 27/05/2010 at 19:15

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

REPLY

Note to the Editor regarding the ‘Comment’ by Daniel Errandonea

A K Verma, R S Rao and B K Godwal

High Pressure Physics Division, Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai-400085, India

Received 26 August 2004, in final form 24 September 2004

Published 12 November 2004

Online at stacks.iop.org/JPhysCM/16/8805

doi:10.1088/0953-8984/16/47/033

Errandonea, in his comment, has pointed out the drawbacks of the ‘dislocation-mediated melting model’ [1] and the ‘Lindemann rule’ [2]—used in our earlier publication [3]. However, his comment should not be treated as a ‘Comment’ on our paper [3]. Our work was on shock Hugoniot and was motivated by the fact that effects of shock melting were not addressed in the work of Wang *et al* [4]. Thus we calculated both the solid and the liquid Hugoniot, and used the existing melting curve models to indicate which parts of the Hugoniot were relevant. Our purpose was to verify whether shock melting had any effect on Hugoniot. Note that, in evaluating these Hugoniot, we had not used the two prescriptions of melting models referred to in Errandonea’s comment. Our focus was never on the melting curve, as was evident from the fact that there was no mention of the melting formulation or intention to improve upon the existing melting models in the entire ‘introduction’ section of our paper [3]. We only used the readily available models of melting and, in particular, were not aware at the time of submitting the manuscript of the improvements carried out by Belonoshko *et al* [5]. As Belonoshko *et al* [5] used an improved model, it is not proper for Errandonea to highlight the differences in the results obtained by the dislocation-mediated melting model in the two calculations, as they are expected to be different. The error range was estimated as about 17% in the original work of Burakovsky *et al* [1].

Errandonea has pointed out the improvements needed on the original model of dislocation-mediated melting [1], and his work should be published as an independent paper—not as a ‘Comment’. If the author wants to communicate it as a ‘Comment’, it should be a ‘Comment’ on the original work of Burakovsky *et al* [1].

We request that the editors make the contents of this note known to the referee when the Comment by Errandonea is sent for refereeing.

Apart from stressing the inappropriateness of treating Errandonea’s communication as a ‘Comment’ on our paper [3], we do not like to reply to the ‘Comment’ in scientific terms, as all the reasoning for the discrepancy is given in his work.

References

- [1] Burakovsky L, Preston D L and Sibar R R 2000 *Phys. Rev. B* **61** 15011
- [2] Lindemann F A 1910 *Z. Phys.* **11** 609
- [3] Verma A K, Rao R S and Godwal B K 2004 *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **16** 4799
- [4] Wang Y, Chen D and Zhang X 2000 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84** 3220
- [5] Belonoshko A B, Sinak S I, Kochetov A E, Johansson B, Burakovsky L and Preston D L 2004 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92** 195701