González-Lezana *et al.* Reply: Our counterarguments to what is claimed in the above Comment [1] are the following:

I. Our results for both trimer states are based on severe convergence tests reported in our study of several triatomic rare gas systems [2] and were not presented in our Letter for obvious reasons of brevity. To be precise: (i) the values of $\langle \cos^n \theta \rangle$ were to be within the limits corresponding to equilateral triangles ($1/2^n$) and linear arrangements ($1/3$ for n odd and 1 for n even), θ being any of the three internal angles. In fact, the angular distributions were calculated from the first seven moments. (ii) The values of $\langle S \rangle$ and $\langle S^2 \rangle$, S being the area of the triangle, were positive and fulfilled the condition $\langle S^2 \rangle \geq \langle S \rangle^2$. (iii) The deviations from the triangle requirement (DTR) defined for each vibrational state as

$$\text{DTR}^{(v)} = 1 - \int_0^\infty dR_1 \int_0^\infty dR_2 \times \int_{|R_1-R_2|}^{R_1+R_2} |\Phi_v(R_1, R_2, R_3)|^2 dR_3 \quad (1)$$

were lower than 2%.

After such strict tests, it would be quite surprising to have 100% of the error in the binding energy of the trimer ground state. In addition, we point out that we were also able to obtain a ground energy of $\approx -0.09 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ when the basis set used decreased drastically the presence of linear configurations. On the other hand, as is well known, the energy value is not the only criterium to discriminate among different results. In particular, after Table I, it should be noticed that several methods giving similar energy values led to completely different and dominant triangular configurations implying, therefore, a strong discrepancy in the corresponding wave functions.

II. The distributed Gaussian functions (DFGs) used to illustrate the method in the dimer, where it is not very efficient numerically, have nothing to do with those employed in the trimer which, in turn, presents a nice reduction in size as compared with the dimer. For the trimer, the DGFs extended beyond $160 \text{ \AA}$ ($\approx 300 \text{ a.u.}$), the last Gaussian function being centered at $139 \text{ \AA}$, which reasonably cover the particle distances included in the Comment and those reported in [5]. Hence, the agreement with the excited state energy does not seem to us fortuitous at all

for $\lambda = 1$. Certainly, at smaller λ values, adding Gaussian functions at longer distances could decrease somewhat the energy of the excited state leaving obviously unaffected the ground level. Searching for an additional excited state is by now out of our computer capabilities. On the other hand, we call the attention of the reader to the fact that the Efimov treatment involves several approximations, as, e.g., the factorization of the total wave function in the interaction region, and the consideration of only the first term ($\ell = 0$) in the partial wave series [9]. Therefore, an exact reproduction of the model conclusions from the remarkable Efimov work may hardly be expected.

Therefore, from the above points, one can conclude that this very interesting boson trimer system still remains an open problem.

T. González-Lezana,¹ J. Rubayo-Soneira,² S. Miret-Artés,¹ F. A. Gianturco,³ G. Delgado-Barrio,¹ and P. Villarreal¹

¹Instituto de Matemáticas y Física Fundamental
Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas
Serrano 123

28006 Madrid, Spain

²Instituto Superior de Ciencia y Tecnología Nucleares
Ciudad de La Habana
6163 Cuba

³Department of Chemistry
The University of Rome
Città Universitaria
00185 Rome, Italy

Received 21 January 2000

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.4190

PACS numbers: 36.90.+f, 31.15.Ja

- [1] B. D. Esry *et al.*, preceding Comment, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4189 (2001).
- [2] T. González-Lezana *et al.*, J. Chem. Phys. **110**, 9000 (1999).
- [3] M. Lewerenz, J. Chem. Phys. **106**, 4596 (1997).
- [4] D. Bressanini *et al.*, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 717 (2000).
- [5] E. Nielsen *et al.*, J. Phys. B **31**, 4085 (1998).
- [6] A. K. Motovilov *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. D **13**, 33 (2001).
- [7] V. Roudnev and S. Yakovlev, Chem. Phys. Lett. **328**, 97 (2000).
- [8] D. Blume *et al.*, J. Chem. Phys. **113**, 2145 (2000).
- [9] See, specifically, V. N. Efimov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **12**, 589 (1971).

TABLE I. Ground and first excited energies and dominant geometries for the He₃ trimer recently reported in the literature. Meaning of symbols: QLinear: quasilinear; Equi: equilateral triangle; NEequi: nonequilateral triangle; NLinear: nonlinear configuration.

	Ref. [3]	Ref. [4]	Ref. [5]	Ref. [6]	Ref. [7]	Ref. [8]
$\nu = 0$ (K)	-0.131	-0.126	-0.1252	-0.1259	-0.1264	-0.1252
Geometry	QLinear	QLinear	Equi	?	?	NEqui
$\nu = 1$ (mK)	...	...	-2.269	-2.28	-2.271	-2.269
Geometry	...	...	NLinear	?	Linear	NLinear