

Two-step identification of observables in \mathcal{PT} -symmetric quantum-toboggan models

Miloslav Znojil

Ústav jaderné fyziky AV ČR, 250 68 Řež, Czech Republic
znojil@ujf.cas.cz

Abstract

Many quantum systems with real energies generated by an apparently non-Hermitian Hamiltonian $H \neq H^\dagger$ may re-acquire the consistent probabilistic interpretation via an *ad hoc* metric $\Theta = \Theta(H) \neq I$ which specifies also the set of all the observables in their updated Hilbert space of states. This recipe seemed to fail for the so called “quantum toboggans”. We describe the remedy – firstly we suggest to “rectify” their Schrödinger equations, arriving at the generalized eigenvalue problem $H\psi = EW\psi$ with $W \neq I$. Secondly, we derive the updated necessary formula for $\Theta = \Theta(H, W)$.

1 Introduction

For all the sufficiently elementary quantum models which are based on a Hamiltonian H which is self-adjoint, say, in one of the most common Hilbert spaces $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of complex integrable functions of d real variables (= coordinates) the identification of all the other eligible candidates for the operators of physical observables is trivial. From the formal point of view, any self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}^\dagger$ is acceptable [1].

Fifteen years ago Scholtz et al [2] emphasized that the same principle applies also in all the less elementary models in Quantum Theory. Attention has been paid to the so called Interacting Boson Models in nuclear physics where the complicated structure of the explicit representation $\mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$ of the Hilbert space of states of a nucleus makes this space unsuitable for explicit calculations. The necessary simplification of some (typically, variational) calculations has been achieved via the Dyson's mapping $\Omega^{(Dyson)}$ of the complicated fermionic space $\mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$ into a perceivably simpler bosonic space $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$.

Beyond the framework of nuclear physics the concept of the models which appear to be non-Hermitian “in a wrong space” occurs also, from time to time, in the framework of field theory [3]. In the late nineties, the really dramatic development of the models of this type was inspired by the publication of a few papers by Bender et al [4, 5]. These authors analyzed several non-Hermitian operators H with real spectra and conjectured that the models should be accepted as physical (for more details cf. the recent review [6]).

In what follows we intend to re-analyze the question of the identification of the operators of observables in the non-Hermitian context. In section 2 we review briefly the basic philosophy of the whole approach and emphasize that the underlying mathematics is simply based on a straightforward invertible generalization (called Ω -transformation) of the standard unitary (e.g., Fourier) changes of representation in Quantum Mechanics.

In section 3 we specify the class of operators of our present interest. In particular, we review briefly the models where the coordinates are being

complexified and we also explain the connection between the presence of the strong singularity(ies) in the potential and the possibility of using the topologically nontrivial curves of complex coordinates living on a multisheeted Riemann surface \mathcal{R} of wave functions (cf. also ref. [7]). In subsection 3.2 we explain why we call these models “quantum toboggans” and in subsection 3.3 we offer an elementary illustrative example based on the asymptotically cubic power-law interaction $V(r) \sim ir^3$.

The presentation of our new results will be then separated in two parts. In the first part (section 4) we shall start from our toy cubic tobogganic model and emphasize that the rectification maps its complicated complex curve of coordinates inside a single complex plane \mathcal{C} where the model is characterized by its left-right symmetry (called \mathcal{PT} –symmetry in the literature [6]). Moreover, in subsections 4.1 and 4.2 we remind the readers about the existence and about some properties of the two series of the corresponding rectified bound states.

The second part of our paper will emphasize that the Schrödinger equations for toboggans acquire the form of a generalized eigenvalue problem $H\psi = EW\psi$ with $W \neq I$. Its text is split in sections 5 and 6. In the former one, *in nuce*, we introduce the set of appropriate non-unitary Ω –transformations (subsection 5.1) and explain the main consequences of their use (subsection 5.2). In the subsequent section 6 we shall finally address the question of the specification of the class of the admissible observables. Our answer will be based on the explicit construction of the physical metric $\Theta = \Theta(H, W)$ in terms of the solutions of Schrödinger equation (subsection 6.1). Among the practical aspects of this construction the facilitating technical role of the so called \mathcal{PT} –symmetry will be explained in subsection 6.2. A concise summary of our results will be formulated in section 7.

2 Quasi-Hermitian quantum models

2.1 Non-unitary maps Ω in Quantum Mechanics

The most disturbing feature of all the Dyson-like invertible mappings Ω of spaces is their non-unitarity, $\Omega^\dagger \neq \Omega^{-1}$. Due to it, the “tractable” Hamiltonians H in the space $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$ are manifestly non-Hermitian. This is not too essential of course – for all the physical predictions one can always return to the (in our present notation, lower-case) pull-backs of H s in $\mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$,

$$h = \Omega H \Omega^{-1}. \quad (1)$$

Even if the operators (1) themselves remain, by assumption, too complicated for computational purposes, they are still observable, i.e., self-adjoint in their own Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$,

$$h^\dagger = (\Omega^{-1})^\dagger H^\dagger \Omega^\dagger = h.$$

From this relation one deduces that

$$H^\dagger = \Theta H \Theta^{-1}, \quad \Theta = \Omega^\dagger \Omega. \quad (2)$$

We should note that our use of the symbol Θ for the “metric operator” is not too widespread, being equivalent to T or η_+ or \mathcal{CP} or e^Q of refs. [2] or [8] or [9] or [10], respectively.

The identification of all the other observables A_1, A_2, \dots in the “tractable” Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$ remains entirely straightforward. Once we return to the derivation of eq. (2) we immediately see that all of these operators must obey the same intertwining rule as the Hamiltonian,

$$A_j^\dagger \Theta = \Theta A_j. \quad (3)$$

In order to avoid confusion or lengthy explanations (“in which space?”), the authors of ref. [2] suggested to call all these “admissible” operators of observables “quasi-Hermitian”.

2.2 Imaginary cubic potentials

An important source of the appeal of using the phenomenological operators of the latter class should be sought in the feasibility of working with them in $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$. In the context of field theory, this idea of simplicity motivated, e.g., the study of Hamiltonian densities containing the most elementary parity-violating interaction terms, typically of the form $ig\varphi^3(\vec{x}, t)$ [4]. In the context of mathematics, many properties of these models found their explanation by means of a return to their quantum-mechanical predecessors

$$V^{(CGM)}(r) = \omega^2 r^2 + ir^3. \quad (4)$$

In the late eighties this one-dimensional non-Hermitian potential was chosen and studied by Caliceti et al [11] using perturbation techniques at $\omega \neq 0$. In its most difficult zero-mass limit $\omega = 0$, the rigorous proof of the reality of the spectrum of the model has only been delivered in 2001, by Dorey et al [12]. In what follows we are going to return to the cubic model (4), for illustration purposes, once more.

3 Topologically nontrivial models

3.1 The birth of models with complex coordinates

It is well known that in nuclear, atomic and molecular systems many features of the observed bound-state spectra can often be very well understood and explained via an elementary differential Hamiltonian

$$H^{(rad)} = -\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{\ell^{(rad)}(\ell^{(rad)} + 1)}{r^2} + V^{(rad)}(r) \quad (5)$$

(units $\hbar = 2m = 1$) where the phenomenological requirements are usually reflected by an appropriate adaptation of the real potential $V^{(rad)}(r)$ defined along the real and nonnegative coordinate $r \in (0, \infty)$. For pragmatic reasons this potential is often chosen as confining. Then, the spectrum itself remains always “acceptable”, i.e., real and discrete and bounded below.

It is rather surprising to reveal that the spectrum *can* stay real, discrete and bounded below even for certain *complexified* potentials and/or paths of

coordinates. For illustration one might recollect the early works by Caliceti et al [11] or by Buslaev and Grecchi [13]. Before all of these apparent “curiosities” fell into oblivion there appeared, in 1998, the influential letter by Bender and Boettcher [5] which offered a numerically and semi-classically inspired hypothesis that the energies may be expected to stay real and discrete for *many* complex potentials. An unexpectedly intensive growth of interest in the similar models followed (cf. [6] or [14] for more references).

In the context of concrete examples it soon appeared to be easy to prove the reality of the energies for a large family of the exactly solvable complex potentials [15]. Subsequently, in 2001, Dorey et al [12] rigorously proved also the Bender’s and Boettcher’s hypothesis for the original class of the field-theory-related power-law complex potentials of ref. [5]. They were even able to introduce more parameters (generalizing also the (half-)integer $\ell^{(rad)}$ in eq. (5) [13] to any real parameter ℓ) and succeeded in an *explicit* specification of the boundaries of the domains \mathcal{D} of these parameters where the reality of the whole spectrum is guaranteed.

It is worth noting that once the coordinates are allowed complex, the singularity at $r = 0$ becomes much less relevant. The solvable spiked-harmonic-oscillator illustration of this observation has been described in our letter [16] where the term $\ell(\ell + 1)/r^2$ has been kept bounded by means of the nonzero shift $\varepsilon > 0$ which defines the \mathcal{PT} -symmetric (i.e., left-right symmetric) integration path

$$r = r_{(\varepsilon)} = x - i\varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon > 0, \quad x \in (-\infty, \infty) \quad (6)$$

of complex (i.e., unmeasurable) coordinates. To our great surprise we revealed that after such a modification the real and discrete spectrum of our spiked harmonic oscillator became non-equidistant.

3.2 Wave functions on Riemann sheets and the birth of quantum toboggans

Due to its “next-to-harmonic” form, the imaginary cubic anharmonicity in eq. (4) attracted a lot of attention in the literature [17]. In 2005 we found it

inspiring that in one of its studies, Dorey et al [12] complemented this model by the same centrifugal term $\ell(\ell+1)/r^2$ as mentioned above, with a puzzling physical meaning which ceases to be related to the angular momenta.

In our own subsequent analysis [7] of the consequences of the presence of such a singularity we deduced that as long as the wave functions are *analytic*, they must have the general form

$$\psi(r) \sim c_1 r^{\ell+1} + c_2 r^{-\ell}, \quad |r| \ll 1 \quad (7)$$

near the origin so that, at a generic real ℓ , their *natural* domain of definition will be the logarithmic Riemann sheet \mathcal{R} [18] rather than just the usual single complex plane.

In this spirit we proposed to change the variables $r \rightarrow z$. Via one of the eligible conformal mappings

$$ir = (iz)^\alpha, \quad \alpha = \frac{1}{2N+1}, \quad N = (0,) 1, 2, \dots \quad (8)$$

we succeeded in mapping the complex lines of r (6) on the toboggan-shaped spirals of $z = z^{[N]}(x)$ which resembled the latter straight lines at large $|x|$,

$$z^{[N]}(x) = -i \left\{ ir^{[0]}(x) \right\}^{2N+1} = (-1)^N x^{2N} \left[x - (2N+1)i\epsilon + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) \right]. \quad (9)$$

We also proposed that the latter curves could be interpreted as integration paths of a new type. We suggested that the resulting quantum systems generated by the usual Hamiltonians (5) but *redefined* along the new, topologically nontrivial paths, say, of the form (9) might carry the name of “quantum toboggans”.

3.3 Example

It is necessary to emphasize that the tobogganic $0 \rightarrow N$ generalization of the integration paths (6) \rightarrow (9) in Schrödinger equations is unexpectedly nontrivial. Firstly, its consequences may prove fairly counterintuitive. For example, one encounters bound states called quantum knots [19] even when the potential itself vanishes. Secondly, its mathematical essence immediately inspires various further generalizations. For example, one can introduce tobogganic

systems containing more than one branch point [20] and/or describing certain less usual forms of the scattering [21].

An open question inspired by interest in quantum toboggans concerns their quantum-mechanical probabilistic interpretation. In our present paper we intend to pay attention precisely to this interesting and challenging problem.

In an introductory remark we should emphasize that the curve (9) encircles the origin in the z -plane strictly N -times. This is easily seen when we reparametrize eq. (6) using the prescription $x = x(\gamma) = \varepsilon \tan \gamma$ so that

$$r_{(\varepsilon)} = r^{[0]}[x(\gamma)] = -i \varrho(\gamma) e^{i\gamma}, \quad \varrho(\gamma) = \frac{\varepsilon}{\cos \gamma}, \quad \gamma \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2).$$

Obviously, after the mapping (8) we get the following explicit recipe for the evaluation of our tobogganic integration paths (9),

$$z^{[N]}[x(\gamma)] = -i \varrho^{2N+1}(\gamma) e^{i(2N+1)\gamma}. \quad (10)$$

This spiral-shaped curve may be interpreted as lying on a Riemann surface \mathcal{R} which pertains to a given analytic eigenfunction $\psi(z)$ of $H^{(rad)}$ where we replaced r by z . Indeed, at the small z all our wave functions have the same generic form (7). Hence, they all possess the essential singularity in the origin at a generic ℓ [18]. In effect, the curve (10) extends over an $(N+1)$ -plet of neighboring Riemann sheets of \mathcal{R} .

Let us return to the ordinary differential expressions of the form (5) and pick up, for the sake of definiteness, the imaginary cubic anharmonic-oscillator potential (4). In contrast to the standard recipes working inside the single complex plane, let us modify the model and specify our Hamiltonian operator H as acting along the unusual and topologically nontrivial integration path (9) at any suitable integer N .

One of the most straightforward methods of solution of the resulting tobogganic Schrödinger equation

$$\left[-\frac{d^2}{dz^2} + \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{z^2} + \omega^2 z^2 + iz^3 \right] \varphi_n^{[N]}(z) = E_n^{[N]}(\omega) \varphi_n^{[N]}(z) \quad (11)$$

along the spirals $z = z^{[N]}(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and with the bound-state solutions $\varphi_n^{[N]}(z)$ specified by the asymptotic boundary conditions on different Riemann

sheets,

$$\varphi_n^{[N]} \{z^{[N]}[x(\pm\pi/2)]\} = 0 \quad (12)$$

may be based on the inversion of the change of coordinates (8) complemented by the parallel modification of the wave functions [7]. The tobogganic model (11) with the cubic interaction and with the first nontrivial choice of the winding number $N = 1$ becomes equivalent to its straight-line rearrangement

$$\left[-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{L(L+1)}{r^2(x)} + 9\omega^2 r^{10}(x) + 9ir^{13}(x) \right] \psi_n[r(x)] = 9 E_n^{[N]}(\omega) r^4(x) \psi_n[r(x)] \quad (13)$$

where we have $r(x) = x - i\varepsilon$ and

$$\psi_n(r) = z^{-N/(2N+1)} \varphi_n^{[N]}(z), \quad L = (2N+1) \left(\ell + \frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{2}.$$

The real one-dimensional variable $x \in (-\infty, \infty)$ can be perceived as a new coordinate. In this way we managed to return our tobogganic toy model from its fairly exotic representation (11) using wave functions $\varphi_n^{[N]}(z)$ defined on complex spirals $z = z^{[N]}(x)$ to its less exotic though still non-selfadjoint differential-equation representation (13) with wave functions $\psi_n[r(x)]$ which lie in the entirely standard Hilbert space $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbb{R}) \equiv \mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$.

4 Rectified Schrödinger equations

4.1 Left and right eigenstates in $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$

The “new energy” in our illustrative Schrödinger eq. (13) is strictly zero while one has to quantize the coefficient $E_n^{[N]}$ at a quartic component of the potential. In the language of linear algebra this means that we have to solve the generalized eigenvalue problem

$$H |n\rangle = E_n W |n\rangle \quad (14)$$

where H is our rectified Hamiltonian and where the weight-operator $W \neq I$ is complex, invertible and possibly coordinate-dependent {cf. its sample $W[r(x)] = 9r^4(x) \equiv 9(x - i\varepsilon)^4$ in eq. (13)}.

One of the most striking formal features of our tobogganic Schrödinger eq. (13) in its abstract and general version (14) can be seen in its manifest non-Hermiticity in the usual Dirac's (i.e., transposition plus complex conjugation) sense, with $H \neq H^\dagger$ and with $W \neq W^\dagger$. This means that whenever we employ the standard Dirac's conventions we must be careful when using the ket-symbols $|\psi\rangle$ (denoting the elements of $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbb{R}) \equiv \mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$) and the bra-symbols $\langle\psi|$ (denoting the corresponding linear functionals of the same Hilbert space which is, of course, self-dual).

The ket $|n\rangle$ representing the n -th eigenstate of H defined by eq. (14) is *not* proportional to a solution of the Hermitian conjugate version of this equation. Thus, for the elements of $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$ which satisfy such a “complementary” Schrödinger equation it proved useful to introduce *another*, special, “doubled” ket symbol $|n\rangle\rangle$ [22]. Of course, we may write the latter equation either as a generalized eigenvalue problem for functionals,

$$H^\dagger |n\rangle\rangle = E_n^* W^\dagger |n\rangle\rangle \quad (15)$$

or in the more natural, conjugate form where the operators would act to the left,

$$\langle\langle n| H = \langle\langle n| W E_n. \quad (16)$$

Actually, the latter form of our “second”, non-equivalent Schrödinger equation is solved directly in the dual vector space $(\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)})^\dagger$.

4.2 Biorthogonality and completeness in $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$

Let us now re-number the states in $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$ directly by their energies, $|n\rangle = |E_n\rangle = |\lambda\rangle$ with the new set of the real indices $\lambda \in \{E_0, E_1, \dots\}$. In such a reduced notation our two Schrödinger equations (14) and (15) will read

$$H |\lambda\rangle = \lambda W |\lambda\rangle, \quad \langle\langle \lambda'| H = \langle\langle \lambda'| W \lambda' \quad (17)$$

Under certain general assumptions the left and right generalized eigenstates of our H may be shown to be mutually biorthogonal with respect to the

weight-operator W ,

$$\langle\langle \lambda' | W | \lambda \rangle\rangle = \delta_{\lambda, \lambda'} \cdot \sigma_\lambda, \quad \sigma_\lambda = \langle\langle \lambda | W | \lambda \rangle\rangle. \quad (18)$$

In parallel, the completeness relations in $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$ will be assumed in the form

$$I = \sum_\lambda |\lambda\rangle \frac{1}{\sigma_\lambda} \langle\langle \lambda | W. \quad (19)$$

For the time being we shall not specify the values σ_λ , noticing only that in contrast to the Hermitian case, the choice of the numerical factors in our solutions is by far not unique even when one specifies the overlaps σ_λ . Indeed, any infinite sequence $\vec{\kappa} = \{\kappa_{\lambda_0}, \kappa_{\lambda_1}, \dots\}$ of virtually arbitrary complex numbers can be used to redefine our superscript-marked choice of the numerical factors in any “initial” set of $|\lambda\rangle = |\lambda\rangle^{[1]}$ and $\langle\langle \lambda' | = {}^{[1]}\langle\langle \lambda' |$. Without any change in the biorthogonality relations (18), in the completeness relations (19) or in the values of coefficients σ_λ these solutions can very easily be replaced by any other set

$$|\lambda\rangle = |\lambda\rangle^{[\vec{\kappa}]} = |\lambda\rangle^{[1]}/\kappa_\lambda, \quad \langle\langle \lambda | = {}^{[\vec{\kappa}]}\langle\langle \lambda | = \kappa_\lambda {}^{[1]}\langle\langle \lambda | \quad (20)$$

with $\lambda = E_0, E_1, \dots$. The same renormalization freedom applies to the spectral decomposition of our Hamiltonian operator,

$$H = \sum_\lambda W |\lambda\rangle \frac{\lambda}{\sigma_\lambda} \langle\langle \lambda | W. \quad (21)$$

Thus, the presence and the free variability of the superscript $^{[\vec{\kappa}]}$ should always (at least, tacitly) be kept in mind.

5 Changing the representation at $W \neq I$

5.1 An update of the metric $\Theta_{(Dirac)}^{(auxiliary)} \rightarrow \Theta_{(non-Dirac)}^{(physical)}$

Due to the relations $H \neq H^\dagger$ and $W \neq W^\dagger$ the space $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$ cannot be interpreted and accepted as the Hilbert space of states of our quantum system. Instead, we have to follow and modify the recipe which has been used in the special case where $W = I$ and $H \neq H^\dagger$ in $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$ [2]. Thus, we shall

assume that the correct physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$ must be introduced via a non-unitary though still invertible mapping of the kets $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$ on their “spiked-ket” images $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$. In this notation the mapping

$$\Omega : \mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$$

will be realized by the operators Ω which can be written in the form of the series

$$\Omega = \Omega^{[\vec{\kappa}]} = \sum_{\lambda} |\lambda\rangle \frac{1}{\sigma_{\lambda}} [\vec{\kappa}] \langle\langle \lambda | W \quad (22)$$

containing not yet normalized (i.e., formally, superscript-independent) spiked kets $|\lambda\rangle$. Under this convention, the explicit presence of the superscript in $\Omega^{[\vec{\kappa}]}$ is essential because of the absence of the cancellation between the numerators and denominators,

$$\Omega^{[\vec{\kappa}]} = \sum_{\lambda} |\lambda\rangle \left(\frac{\kappa_{\lambda}}{\sigma_{\lambda}} \right) [\vec{\kappa}] \langle\langle \lambda | W. \quad (23)$$

This indicates that $\Omega^{[\vec{\kappa}]} \neq \Omega^{[\vec{\kappa}']}$ for $\vec{\kappa} \neq \vec{\kappa}'$ and that there exists a “hidden” ambiguity in the definition

$$|\lambda\rangle = \Omega |\lambda\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{(physical)}, \quad \langle\langle \lambda | = \langle\langle \lambda | \Omega^{\dagger} \in \left(\mathcal{H}^{(physical)} \right)^{\dagger} \quad (24)$$

of the same eigenstates (or of their arbitrary linear superpositions) in their two different representations.

In $\mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$ we may now parallel the recipe of ref. [2] and introduce the operator $h = \Omega H \Omega^{-1}$ which represents our original non-Hermitian upper-case Hamiltonian $H \neq H^{\dagger}$ in the new space. The same type of transformation must be used to generate also the physical partner $w = \Omega W \Omega^{-1}$ of our original non-Hermitian weight operator $W \neq W^{\dagger}$. These two lower-case operators are both assumed acting in the physical space so that they must both be self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$,

$$h^{\dagger} = \left(\Omega^{-1} \right)^{\dagger} H^{\dagger} \Omega^{\dagger} = h, \quad w^{\dagger} = \left(\Omega^{-1} \right)^{\dagger} W^{\dagger} \Omega^{\dagger} = w.$$

This implies that in $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$ we must have

$$H^{\dagger} = \Theta H \Theta^{-1}, \quad W^{\dagger} = \Theta W \Theta^{-1} \quad (25)$$

where we abbreviated $\Theta = \Omega^\dagger \Omega$. In the special case of $W = I$ this conclusion degenerates to the one presented in [2].

Let us now insert expressions (25) in our “second” Schrödinger eq. (15) and compare it with its “first” form (14). Under the standard non-degeneracy assumption and after an introduction of another, triple-ket symbol for the other specific elements of $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$ this implies the following elementary proportionality between the eigenkets (= eigen-double-kets) of H^\dagger and the metric-premultiplied eigenkets of H (denoted as triple-kets),

$$|\lambda \rangle\rangle^{[\bar{\kappa}]} = |\lambda \rangle\rangle\rangle^{[\bar{\kappa}]} \cdot q(\lambda), \quad |\lambda \rangle\rangle\rangle^{[\bar{\kappa}]} \equiv \Theta^{[\bar{\kappa}]} |\lambda \rangle^{[\bar{\kappa}]} . \quad (26)$$

The explicit knowledge of the metric would be needed to extract the values of the proportionality constants $q(\lambda)$ here.

5.2 Schrödinger equation in $\mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$

It is easy to verify that after the change Ω of the Hilbert space *both* of eqs. (17) degenerate to the *same* equation which is self-adjoint,

$$h |\lambda \succ = \lambda w |\lambda \succ . \quad (27)$$

Under some very general and more or less usual mathematical assumptions its form enables us to deduce the orthogonality relations

$$\prec \lambda | w | \lambda' \succ = \tilde{\sigma}_\lambda \cdot \delta_{\lambda, \lambda'}, \quad \tilde{\sigma}_\lambda = \prec \lambda | w | \lambda \succ . \quad (28)$$

In $\mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$ the completeness relations are also valid,

$$I = I^{(physical)} = \sum_\lambda |\lambda \succ \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda} \prec \lambda | w \quad (29)$$

and the lower-case Hamiltonian h can equally easily be assigned the usual spectral expansion,

$$h = \sum_\lambda w |\lambda \succ \frac{\lambda}{\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda} \prec \lambda | w . \quad (30)$$

In such a setting it is important to add that in the light of our illustrative example (13) the spectrum of the operator w (which is, by construction, isospectral to W) will be assumed non-negative. This will allow us to assume

also the positivity of the self-overlaps $\prec \lambda | w | \lambda' \succ$ in eq. (28) etc. Both these assumptions will, of course, significantly simplify our forthcoming considerations.

In some sense, all the relations (28) – (30) are of a rather academic value since all the mathematical manipulations should preferably be performed in the simpler Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$, anyhow. Still, all of them improve our insight in the possible physics behind our models which can solely be discussed inside the physical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$.

On a more pragmatic level the mapping Ω can be read as returning us back from the “correct” $\mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$ to the “simpler” Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$. In particular, in the light of eq. (24) we may complement the proportionality relation (26) between the eigen-double-kets and eigen-triple-kets of H^\dagger by the new explicit formula

$$\langle\langle \lambda | = \langle \lambda | \Theta = \prec \lambda | \Omega$$

which enables us to transfer eqs. (28) and (29) to $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$,

$$\prec \lambda | w | \lambda' \succ = \langle \lambda | \Theta W | \lambda' \rangle = \langle\langle \lambda | W | \lambda' \rangle = \tilde{\sigma}_\lambda \cdot \delta_{\lambda, \lambda'}, \quad (31)$$

$$I = I^{(auxiliary)} = \sum_\lambda |\lambda\rangle \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda} \langle\langle \lambda | W. \quad (32)$$

A similar translation applies also to the alternative spectral decomposition

$$H = \sum_\lambda W | \lambda \rangle \frac{\lambda}{\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda} \langle\langle \lambda | W \quad (33)$$

of our Hamiltonians in $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$. In the light of eq. (26), the only difference from the respective eqs. (18), (19) and (21) degenerates to the following relation between the tilded and untilded overlaps

$$\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda = \langle\langle \lambda | W | \lambda \rangle = \left[\frac{1}{q(\lambda)} \right]^* \sigma_\lambda, \quad \sigma_\lambda = \langle\langle \lambda | W | \lambda \rangle \quad (34)$$

which are all, incidentally, \vec{k} -independent.

6 Observability

6.1 The formula for the metric

Let us return to the simpler Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{(auxiliary)}$ and, via a suitable multiplier in the eigen-doublekets $|\lambda\rangle\rangle$, postulate that $\sigma_\lambda = 1$. In parallel, in $\mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$, the maximum of simplicity will be achieved by setting $\tilde{\sigma}_\lambda = 1$ via a premultiplication of our basis vectors $|\lambda\rangle$ by some suitable numerical constants at each energy λ . Thus, we shall have $q(\lambda) = 1$ in eq. (26) as well as in eq. (34), i.e.,

$$\langle\lambda|w|\lambda\rangle = 1. \quad (35)$$

Under these updated conventions we shall be allowed to work, without any loss of generality, with the simplified $\sigma_\lambda = 1$ versions of eqs. (18) and (19) and with the similarly simplified representation (21) of the Hamiltonian H .

Even though we have no direct access to the metric Θ and/or to the overlaps and matrix elements defined in terms of the “inaccessible” and “prohibitively complicated” vectors $|\lambda\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$ we can still recall the simplified definition of the metric and of the mappings Ω and write

$$\Theta = \Omega^\dagger \Omega = \sum_{\lambda, \lambda'} W^\dagger |\lambda\rangle\rangle M_{\lambda, \lambda'} \langle\langle \lambda' | W, \quad M_{\lambda, \lambda'} = \langle\lambda | \lambda'\rangle. \quad (36)$$

The not yet known matrix M of coefficients cannot vary with the (tacitly present) superscripts $[\vec{\kappa}]$ so that, in the light of eq. (23), there is no cancellation between numerators and denominators and

$$\Theta^{[\vec{\kappa}]} \neq \Theta^{[\vec{\kappa}']} \quad \text{for} \quad \vec{\kappa} \neq \vec{\kappa}'.$$

The change of the superscripts will change the metric only via the eigenvectors of H^\dagger [cf. eq. (20)] so that we can rewrite the superscript-dependence of the metric in eq. (36) in the following explicit form

$$\Theta^{[\vec{\kappa}]} = \sum_{\lambda, \lambda'} W^\dagger |\lambda\rangle\rangle^{[1]} \kappa_\lambda^* M_{\lambda, \lambda'} \kappa_{\lambda'}^{[1]} \langle\langle \lambda' | W. \quad (37)$$

It remains for us to return to the factorization $\Theta = \Omega^\dagger \Omega$ of the metric and to identity (35) and definition (22) and to insert all of these formulae in eq. (31).

This gives the relation

$$\langle \lambda | \Theta W | \lambda' \rangle = \sum_{\lambda''} \langle \lambda | \lambda'' \rangle \langle \lambda'' | W^2 | \lambda' \rangle = \delta_{\lambda, \lambda'}. \quad (38)$$

We see that once we succeed in evaluating all the necessary “input” matrix elements $\langle \lambda | W^2 | \lambda' \rangle$, the “missing” matrix of coefficients $M_{\lambda, \lambda'} = \langle \lambda | \lambda' \rangle$ will be defined as its inverse,

$$M = N^{-1}, \quad N_{\lambda, \lambda'} = \langle \lambda | W^2 | \lambda' \rangle. \quad (39)$$

This is to be inserted in our final formula (37) for the metric Θ . Our task is completed.

6.2 The role of \mathcal{PT} -symmetry

An important formal feature of our illustrative tobogganic examples can be seen in the so called \mathcal{PT} -symmetry (cf. [6]) where \mathcal{P} denotes space-reversal (i.e., parity) while \mathcal{T} represents the time reversal (i.e., in effect, Hermitian-conjugation antilinear operator). Such a feature of the toboggan-like models can be interpreted here as the *doublet* of the parity-pseudo-Hermiticity properties

$$H^\dagger = \mathcal{P} H \mathcal{P}^{-1}, \quad W^\dagger = \mathcal{P} W \mathcal{P}^{-1}. \quad (40)$$

The main role of this “generalized symmetry” lies in possible simplification of the necessary proof that all the energies remain real, $E_n = E_n^*$, i.e., that the states of the underlying quantum system remain observable.

In addition, the generalized \mathcal{PT} -symmetry (40) will enable us to replace eq. (15) by its equivalent representation

$$H \mathcal{P}^{-1} | n \rangle \rangle = E_n W \mathcal{P}^{-1} | n \rangle \rangle. \quad (41)$$

From eq. (14) and from another simplifying assumption that the spectrum is nondegenerate we immediately deduce that we must have

$$| n \rangle \rangle = \mathcal{P} | n \rangle Q_n \quad (42)$$

where the coefficients of proportionality Q_n called quasi-parities [23] are, in principle, arbitrary. Still, one must keep in mind that once we postulate the

standard biorthogonality and completeness relations, $\langle\langle n' | n \rangle\rangle = \delta_{nm'}$, and $I = \sum_n |n\rangle \langle\langle n|$, we are forced to define the quasiparities $Q_n = Q_n(\kappa_n)$, at all the energy levels, in terms of the matrix elements of the parity operator,

$$Q_n(\kappa_n) = \frac{1}{[\kappa_n] \langle n | \mathcal{P} | n \rangle^{[\kappa_n]}}.$$

Thus, the knowledge of these matrix elements fixes the values of quasiparities while equation (42) replaces the second Schrödinger eq. (15) as it becomes an *explicit definition* of its solutions. This fact can, of course, shorten the ultimate construction of Θ very significantly.

7 Summary

Many quantum Hamiltonians with real spectra which appeared manifestly non-Hermitian in the current Dirac's sense were recently re-assigned a new, consistent probabilistic interpretation mediated by a new metric Θ in the physical Hilbert space of states. For certain models of this type (exemplified here by “quantum toboggans”), the Mostafazadeh's spectral-expansion formula for Θ [8] ceases to be applicable because their Schrödinger equation acquires the generalized eigenvalue-problem form $H\psi = EW\psi$ containing an invertible though not necessarily positive-definite weight $W \neq I$. For all of these models we derived the necessary generalized spectral-expansion formula for Θ .

We started our considerations from a given non-Hermitian tobogganic Hamiltonian playing the usual role of the generator of the time evolution but acting, very unusually, along a certain topologically nontrivial path $z^{[N]}$ of complex coordinates. Via a suitable change of variables we achieved a rectification of this path and obtained a much more usual non-Hermitian representation H of the Hamiltonian operator in an auxiliary Hilbert space $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathbb{R})$.

For the purely pragmatic reasons we constrained our attention to the mere “first nontrivial” toboggans with the single branch point. Our formulation of the corresponding bound-state problem has been facilitated by their

rectification. Still, as long as the change of the variables induced a nontrivial weight operator W in our Schrödinger equation, the standard recipes of dealing with similar situations proved inapplicable and we were forced to modify them accordingly. Fortunately, via a subsequent non-unitary mapping Ω we were able to replace the non-Hermitian “upper case” operators H and W by their respective “lower-case” avatars h and w defined as Hermitian in another, physical Hilbert space of states $\mathcal{H}^{(physical)}$.

We should emphasize that in similar models, the non-unitary correspondence between two Hilbert spaces is of a key importance. Its main purpose lies in a *decisive simplification* of mathematics (i.e., e.g., of the solution of equations) in one of the spaces, combined with a facilitated return to the consistent probabilistic interpretation of the system in the other one. In this sense, our tobogganic models also fit very well the basic methodical premise that the lower-case, “correct” representation h of the Hamiltonian appears, in the purely technical terms, *too complicated* in comparison with H .

Having paid our main attention to the correct physical interpretation of the elementary though nontrivial tobogganic models we formulated a straightforward $W \neq I$ generalization of the known $W = I$ theory of ref. [2]. We succeeded in a derivation of the explicit formula for the metric operator Θ . We revealed that the coefficients in this formula coincide with an inverse of certain matrix N representing the square of the weight operator W in a certain basis. In this sense, our formula degenerates to the older theories in the limit $W \rightarrow I$ where N becomes a diagonal matrix.

Another conclusion resulting from our formula for Θ is that without essential changes, the ambiguity problem in the assignment of Θ to a given set of observables $A_j \neq A_j^\dagger$ (containing the Hamiltonian $H = A_0$, etc) survives the transition to the systems with a nontrivial weight operator W . Indeed, when we only take the Hamiltonian $H = A_0$ into consideration, the same infinite sequence of arbitrary complex parameters κ_λ enters the formula for the metric [cf. eq. (37)] in *both* the $W = I$ and $W \neq I$ scenarios.

Acknowledgement

Work supported by GAČR, grant Nr. 202/07/1307, Institutional Research Plan AV0Z10480505 and by the MŠMT “Doppler Institute” project Nr. LC06002.

References

- [1] A. Messiah, Quantum Mechanics (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1961).
- [2] F. G. Scholtz, H. B. Geyer and F. J. W. Hahne, Ann. Phys. (NY) 213 (1992) 74.
- [3] T. D. Lee and G. C. Wick, Nucl. Phys. B 9 ((1969) 209;
N. Nakanishi, Phys. Rev. D 3 (1971) 811.
- [4] C. M. Bender and K. Milton, Phys. Rev. D 55 (1997) R3255;
C. M. Bender and K. A. Milton, Phys. Rev. D 57 (1998) 3595.
- [5] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 5243.
- [6] C. M. Bender, Reports on Progress in Physics 70 (2007) 947.
- [7] M. Znojil, Phys. Lett. A 342 (2005) 36.
- [8] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. 43, 205 (2002).
- [9] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody and H. F. Jones, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89 (2002) 0270401.
- [10] H. F. Jones and J. Mateo, Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 085002;
H. F. Jones, J. Mateo and R. J. Rivers, Phys. Rev. D 74 (2006) 125022.
- [11] E. Caliceti, S. Graffi, and M. Maioli, Comm. Math. Phys. 75 (1980) 51.
- [12] P. Dorey, C. Dunning and R. Tateo, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 34 (2001) L391 and 5679;
P. Dorey, C. Dunning and R. Tateo, The ODE/IM Correspondence, arXiv:hep-th/0703066.
- [13] V. Buslaev and V. Grecchi, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 26 (1993) 5541.
- [14] Y. Sibuya, Global Theory of Second Order Linear Differential Equation with Polynomial Coefficient, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1975;
E B Davies, Linear operators and their spectra, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [15] G. Levai and M. Znojil, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 33 (2000) 7165.
- [16] M. Znojil, PT symmetric harmonic oscillators Phys. Lett. A 259 (1999) 220.
- [17] G. Alvarez, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 27 (1995) 4589;
O. Mustafa and M. Znojil, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 35 (2002) 8929;
C. M. Bender, P. N. Meisinger and Q. Wang, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 36 (2003) 1973;
H. Břila, Czech. J. Phys. 54 (2004) 1049;
C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody and H. F. Jones, Phys. Rev. D 70 (2004) 025001;

- H. F. Jones and J. Mateo, Czech. J. Phys. 55 (2005) 1117;
A. Mostafazadeh, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 39 (2006) 10171;
F. G. Scholtz and H. B. Geyer, Phys. Lett. B 634 (2006) 84;
C. M. Bender, J.-H. Chen and K. Milton, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 39 (2006) 1657.
- [18] see, e.g., "branch point" in <http://eom.springer.de>.
- [19] M. Znojil, Phys. Lett. A, to appear: doi: 10.1016/j.physleta.2008.02.016 (arXiv: 0802.1318v1 [quant-ph] 10 Feb 2008)
- [20] M. Znojil, Phys. Lett. A 372 (2008) 584;
M. Znojil, J. Phys. Conf. Ser., to appear (arXiv:0710.1485v1 [quant-ph] 8 Oct 2007)
- [21] M. Znojil, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 39 (2006) 13325.
- [22] M. Znojil, SIGMA 4 (2008) 001 (arXiv: 0710.4432v3 [math-ph]).
- [23] M. Znojil, Rendic. Circ. Mat. Palermo, Ser. II, Suppl. 72 (2004) 211 (arXiv:math-ph/0104012).