# **Complex Semiclassical Approach to Chaotic Tunneling**

Akira Shudo

Department of Physics, Tokyo Metropolitan University

## **Confinement of classical motions**





**Confinement is due to energy barriers** 

# **Confinement of classical motions**





Confinement is not always due to energy barriers *dynamical barriers* also restrict the classical motions

Questions we here ask are

- \* essential differences between one- and multi-dimensions ?
- \* dynamically disconnected regions are connected, why and how ?
- \* evaluate or even define the tunneling probability in multi-dimensional systems, is it possible ?

#### **Plan of Lectures**

- 1. Time domain semiclassical approach to dynamical tunneling
- 2. Complex dynamics in one variable
- 3. Complex dynamics in two variables
- 4. How to apply general theory of complex dynamics to tunneling problems

# 1. Time domain semiclassical approach to dynamical tunneling

We here take *complex* semiclassical approach

- \* a natural extension of semiclassical analyses in the real domain
- **\*** it enables us to clarify what dynamical mechanism works
- to develop the theory in the complex domain follows original spirits of semiclassical methods

Classical paths running in the complex space connect classically inaccessible regions.



#### **Classical dynamics :**

$$F:\left(\begin{array}{c}p'\\q'\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{c}p-V'(q)\\q+T'(p')\end{array}\right)$$

where T(p), V(q) are kinetic and potential functions.

#### **Quantum dynamics :**

$$K_n(a,b) = \langle b | \hat{U}^n | a \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \prod_j dq_j \prod_j dp_j \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar} S(\{q_j\},\{p_j\})\right]$$

where the action  $S(\{q_j\}, \{p_j\})$  is determined such that the variational condition

$$\delta S(\{q_i\},\{p_i\}) = 0$$

yields the classical map *F*.

#### Example 1 Quadratic map

$$F: \begin{pmatrix} p_n \\ q_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p_{n-1} - V'(q_{n-1}) \\ q_{n-1} + p_n \end{pmatrix}$$

where 
$$V(q) = \frac{1}{3}q^3 + cq$$

For simplicity, instead of  $(q_n, p_n)$ , we use  $(q_n, q_{n+1})$  as phase space variables.



**Quantum propagator for the 1-step quadratic map :** 

$$K(q_2, q_0) = \langle q_2 | U | q_0 \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dq_1 \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar}S(q_0, q_1, q_2)\right]$$

where

$$S(q_0, q_1, q_2) = \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{1}{2} (q_j - q_{j-1})^2 - V(q_1)$$

We here evaluate the propagator  $K(q_2, q_0)$  using the *saddle point approximation*. The saddle point condition is given as

$$\frac{\partial S(q_0, q_1, q_2)}{\partial q_1} = 0$$

This yields the equation of motion in the Lagrangian form

$$(q_2 - q_1) - (q_1 - q_0) = q_1^2 + c$$

Of course, this is equivalent to the map *F*.

For given  $q_0$ ,  $q_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ , the saddle point equation

$$(q_2 - q_1) - (q_1 - q_0) = q_1^2 + c$$

has

2 real solutionsif  $q_2 < q_2^*$ classically allowed2 complex (conjugate) solutionsif  $q_2 > q_2^*$ classically fobidden

For  $q_2 > q_2^*$  the initial and final coordinates  $q_0, q_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ , but the intermediate  $q_1 \in \mathbb{C}$ .



**Quantum propagator for the 2-step quadratic map :** 

$$K(q_3, q_0) = \langle q_3 | U | q_0 \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dq_1 dq_2 \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar}S(q_0, q_1, q_2, q_3)\right]$$

where

$$S(q_0, q_1, q_2, q_3) = \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{1}{2} (q_j - q_{j-1})^2 - \sum_{j=1}^2 V(q_j)$$

The saddle point condition is given as

$$\frac{\partial S(q_0, q_1, q_2, q_3)}{\partial q_1} = 0, \qquad \frac{\partial S(q_0, q_1, q_2, q_3)}{\partial q_2} = 0$$

This yields the equations of motion

$$(q_2 - q_1) - (q_1 - q_0) = q_1^2 + c,$$
  $(q_3 - q_2) - (q_2 - q_1) = q_2^2 + c$ 

For given  $q_0$ ,  $q_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ , the saddle point equation has 4 solutions.





#### Example 2 Standard map

$$F:\left(\begin{array}{c}p_n\\q_n\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{c}p_{n-1}-V'(q_{n-1})\\q_{n-1}+p_n\end{array}\right)$$

where  $V(q) = K \cos q$ 



**Quantum propagator for the 1-step standard map :** 

$$K(q_2, q_0) = \langle q_2 | U | q_0 \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dq_1 \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar}S(q_0, q_1, q_2)\right]$$

where

$$S(q_0, q_1, q_2) = \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{1}{2} (q_j - q_{j-1})^2 - K \cos q_1$$

The saddle point condition yields,

$$(q_2 - q_1) - (q_1 - q_0) = K \sin q_1$$

For given  $q_0$ ,  $q_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ , the saddle point equation has the solutions

 $\begin{cases} 2 \text{ real solutions} & \text{if } |q_2| < q_2^* \\ 2 \text{ complex (conjugate) solutions} & \text{if } |q_2| > q_2^* \end{cases}$ 



**Quantum propagator for the 2-step standard map :** 

$$K(q_3, q_0) = \langle q_3 | U | q_0 \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dq_1 dq_2 \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar}S(q_0, q_1, q_2, q_3)\right]$$

where

$$S(q_0, q_1, q_2, q_3) = \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{1}{2} (q_j - q_{j-1})^2 - \sum_{j=1}^2 V(q_j)$$

The saddle point condition yields,

$$(q_2 - q_1) - (q_1 - q_0) = K \sin q_1, \quad (q_3 - q_2) - (q_2 - q_1) = K \sin q_2$$

This gives

$$q_3 - 2q_0 = q_1 + 2(2q_1 + K\sin q_1) + K\sin(q_0 + 2q_1 + K\sin q_1)$$

For given  $q_0$ ,  $q_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ , this has infinitely many solutions.

Note : In the case of **real semiclassics**, the number of stationary phase solutions is always finite within a finite time step *n*.

**Classical dynamics** 

$$F:\left(\begin{array}{c}p'\\q'\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{c}p-V'(q)\\q+p'\end{array}\right)$$

Forbidden process in classical dynamics

 $\mathcal{A}_a \cap F^{-n}(\mathcal{B}_b) = \emptyset$  for  $\forall n$ , if  $\mathcal{A}_a, \mathcal{B}_b (\in \mathbb{R})$  are dynamically separated.



**Quantum dynamics** 

$$K(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}) = \langle \boldsymbol{b} | \hat{\boldsymbol{U}}^{n} | \boldsymbol{a} \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \prod_{j} dq_{j} \prod_{j} dp_{j} \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar} S(\{q_{j}\},\{p_{j}\})\right]$$

**Tunneling process in quantum dynamics** 

 $K(a, b) \neq 0$  even if  $\mathcal{A}_a, B_b \in \mathbb{R}$  are dynamically separated.















## **Complex Semiclassical approach to dynamical tunneling**

Quantum propagator

$$K(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}) = \langle \boldsymbol{b} | \hat{\boldsymbol{U}}^{n} | \boldsymbol{a} \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \prod_{j} dq_{j} \prod_{j} dp_{j} \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar} S(\{q_{j}\},\{p_{j}\})\right]$$

 $|a\rangle$ : initial state  $|b\rangle$ : final state

Semiclassical propagator (  $\Leftarrow$  saddle point evaluation of K(a, b) )

$$K^{sc}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}) = \sum_{\gamma} A_n^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}) \exp\left\{\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\hbar} S_n^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b})\right\}$$

 $\mathcal{A}_a = \{ (q, p) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid A(q, p) = a \}: \text{ initial manifold}$  $\mathcal{B}_b = \{ (q, p) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid B(q, p) = b \}: \text{ final manifold}$ 

**Example** The quantum propagator in *p*-representation

$$K(\boldsymbol{p}_a,\boldsymbol{p}_b) = \langle \boldsymbol{p}_b | \hat{U}^n | \boldsymbol{p}_a \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \prod_j dq_j \prod_j dp_j \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar} S(\{q_j\},\{p_j\})\right]$$

 $\mathcal{A}_{a} = \{ (q, p) \in \mathbb{C}^{2} \mid p = p_{a} \in \mathbb{R} \}: \text{ initial manifold}$  $\mathcal{B}_{b} = \{ (q, p) \in \mathbb{C}^{2} \mid p = p_{b} \in \mathbb{R} \}: \text{ final manifold}$ 

- $\Rightarrow \mathcal{A}_a$  and  $\mathcal{B}_b$  are both 1-dimesional complex lines in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ .
  - Note : This holds in arbitrary representations, for example in the *coherent state representation* .



**Problems** When  $\mathcal{A}_a$  and  $\mathcal{B}_b$  are dynamically separated,

- 1. how are dynamically disconnected regions  $\mathcal{A}_a$  and  $\mathcal{B}_b$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  are connected under the dynamics in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ ?
- 2. is it possible to relate the dynamics from  $\mathcal{A}_a$  to  $\mathcal{B}_b$  to some invariant structures in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ ?
- 3. how to evaluate the tunneling probability from  $\mathcal{A}_a$  to  $\mathcal{B}_b$ ?
- 4. does some specific relevant orbit(s) (like the instanton) exclusively control the transition from  $\mathcal{A}_a$  to  $\mathcal{B}_b$ , or are there any other principles ?

Quantum propagator for the **1-step** quadratic map :

$$K(q_2, q_0) = \langle q_2 | U | q_0 \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dq_1 \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar}S(q_0, q_1, q_2)\right]$$
where
$$S(q_0, q_1, q_2) = \sum_{j=1}^{2} \frac{1}{2}(q_j - q_{j-1})^2 + \frac{1}{3}q_1^3 + cq_1$$

$$Re q_n$$
The saddle point condition gives
$$Re q_n$$

 $\begin{cases} 2 \text{ real solutions} & \text{if } q_2 < q_2^* \\ 2 \text{ complex (conjugate) solutions} & \text{if } q_2 > q_2^* \end{cases}$ 

For the classically forbidden side, one solution gives exponentially decay, but the other exponentially divergent.  $K(q_2, q_0)$  can be transformed into a canonical form of the Airy integral

Ai(x) = 
$$\int_C d\xi \exp i \left[ \frac{1}{3} \xi^3 + x \xi \right] = \int_{C_1} + \int_{C_2} \xi^3 + x \xi = \int_{C_1} + \int_{C_2} \xi^3 + x \xi = \int_{C_2} \frac{1}{3} \xi^3 + x \xi = \int_{C_2}$$

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  denote the steepest descent contours passing respectively through the saddle points  $\xi_1 = i|x|^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{\frac{1}{2}i\theta}$  and  $\xi_2 = -i|x|^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{\frac{1}{2}i\theta}$ 



Saddle point method in multiple integrals — Stokes phenomenon in multidimensions —

Quantum propagator for the **2-step** quadratic map :

$$K(q_3, q_0) = \langle q_3 | U | q_0 \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dq_1 dq_2 \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar}S(q_0, q_1, q_2, q_3)\right]$$

where

$$S(q_0, q_1, q_2, q_3) = \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{1}{2} (q_j - q_{j-1})^2 - \sum_{j=1}^2 V(q_j)$$

- Steepest descent surfaces ?
- Uniqueness?
- Practical recipe ?

We do not discuss the issue of Stokes phenomena in our lectures

# 2. Complex dynamics in one variable

For the moment, we forget about

- boundary conditions (initial and final)
- Stokes phenomenon (non-contributing complex orbits)

just focus on the dynamics in  $\mathbb{C}$  or  $\mathbb{C}^2$ .

Why the dynamics in  $\mathbb{C}$ ? (our interest is the dynamics in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ )

- not so familiar even in  ${\mathbb C}$
- better understood in C than C<sup>2</sup>
- need technically hard tools in  $\mathbb{C}^2$

## 1-dimensinol polynomial maps and the Julia set

Consider 1-dimensinol polynomial maps with degree *d* 

$$P: z \mapsto P(z)$$

where

$$P(z) = z^d + a_1 z^{d-1} + \dots + a_d$$
  $(d \ge 2)$ 

Classify the orbits according to the behavior of  $n \rightarrow \infty$ 

$$F_P = \{ z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \lim_{n \to \infty} P^n(z) = \infty \} :$$
Fatou set  
$$K_P = \{ z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \lim_{n \to \infty} P^n(z) \text{ is bounded } \} :$$
Filled Julia set  
$$K_P = \mathbb{C} - F_P$$

In particular

 $J_P = \partial K_P \quad : \qquad \text{Julia set}$ 

Example 1  $P(z) = z^2$ 

It is easy to show that

 $F_P = \{ |z| > 1 \}, K_P = \{ |z| \le 1 \}, J_P = \{ |z| = 1 \}$ 

- $z = \infty$  is an attracting fixed point of *P*. The points  $z \in F_P$  tend to  $\infty$  montonically.
- z = 0 is also is an attracting fixed point of *P*. The points  $z \in K_P - J_P$  converge to z = 0 monotonically.
- The orbits  $z \in J$  are chaotic.

Putting  $z = e^{2\pi i\theta}$ , then the map on  $J_P$  can be reduced to  $\theta \mapsto 2\theta \pmod{1}$ .

#### Note: $K_P$ has interior points and Area( $K_P$ )> 0.

# Example 2 $P(z) = 2z^2 - 1$

It is also easy to show that

 $F_P = \mathbb{C} - [-1, 1], \quad K_P = J_P = [-1, 1]$ 

- Since  $P(\cos \theta) = \cos(2\theta)$ , we generally have  $P^n(\cos \theta) = \cos(2^n \theta)$ .
- Then the iteration on  $z \in [-1, 1]$  is described by  $\theta \mapsto 2\theta \pmod{1}$ .
- One can show that if  $z \in \mathbb{C} [-1, 1]$ ,  $P^n(z) \to \infty$  as  $n \to \infty$ .

Note:  $K_P$  has no interior points and Area( $K_P$ ) = 0.

**Properties of the Julia set** 

*"P* is chaotic on *J<sub>P</sub> "* 



- 1. Sensitive dependence on initial conditions there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that, for any  $z \in J_P$  and any nbd U of z, there exists  $\zeta \in U$  and  $n \ge 0$  such that  $|P^n(z) - P^n(\zeta)| > \delta$
- 2. Density of repelling periodic orbits

 $J_P = \partial K_P = \{ \text{ repelling fixed points } \}$ 

#### **3.** Topological transitivity

For any open sets  $U, V \subset J_P$ , there exists k > 0 such that  $P^k(U) \cap V \neq \emptyset$ 

#### Why polynomial maps?

- Polynomial maps have "filtration property".

For sufficiently large *R*, one can show that  $P(V) \subset V$  where  $V = \{ |z| > R \}$ . Hence,

$$F_P = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} P^{-n}(V)$$

- Transcendental maps do not have.

ex) 
$$P(z) = z + \sin(2\pi z), P(z) = z + e^{z} + 1, \cdots$$



Why polynomial maps?

- Polynomial maps do not have "wandering domain".

Theorem (Sullivan) for any component of  $\Omega$  in the Fatou set  $F_P$ ,  $\Omega$ ,  $P(\Omega)$ ,  $P^2(\Omega)$ ,  $\cdots$  is eventually periodic.

- Transcendental maps can have.

ex)  $P(z) = z + \sin(2\pi z)$ 

**Definition** A component  $\Omega$  in the Fatou set  $F_P$  is:

(a) *periodic* if  $\exists n > 0$  such that  $P^n(\Omega) = \Omega$ ,

(b) eventually periodic if  $\exists m > 0$  such that  $P^m(\Omega)$  is periodic,

(c) *wandering* if the sets  $P^n(\Omega)$  for  $n \ge 0$  are pairwise disjoint.

Suppose

$$P: z \mapsto a_1 z + a_2 z^2 + \cdots + a_d z^d \qquad (a_1 \neq 0)$$

Then, z = 0 and  $z = \infty$  are attracting fixed points.

The dynamics around z = 0 and  $z = \infty$  are rather simple.

```
P(z) \sim zaround z = 0P(z) \sim z^daround z = \infty
```

