arXiv:1505.07810v1 [math-ph] 28 May 2015

Random matrix ensembles for *PT*-symmetric systems

Eva-Maria Graefe, Steve Mudute-Ndumbe, and Matthew Taylor

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, London, SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom

Recently much effort has been made towards the introduction of non-Hermitian random matrix models respecting PT-symmetry. Here we show that there is a one-to-one correspondence between complex PT-symmetric matrices and split-complex and split-quaternionic versions of Hermitian matrices. We introduce two new random matrix ensembles of (a) Gaussian split-complex Hermitian, and (b) Gaussian split-quaternionic Hermitian matrices, of arbitrary sizes. They are related to the split signature versions of the complex and the quaternionic numbers, respectively. We conjecture that these ensembles represent universality classes for PT-symmetric matrices. For the case of 2×2 matrices we derive analytic expressions for the joint probability distributions of the eigenvalues, the one-level densities and the level spacings in the case of real eigenvalues.

In recent years there has been a surge of research in PT-symmetric quantum theories, accompanied by a multitude of experimental applications and realisations [1– 17]. For finite-dimensional systems represented by matrices. PT-symmetry is equivalent to the reality of the characteristic polynomial [18]. That is, PT-symmetric matrices have either real or complex conjugate eigenvalues. Their eigenvectors, while not orthogonal with respect to the conventional Dirac inner product, are nonetheless orthogonal with respect to a suitably defined CPT inner product [19]. A major obstacle for the theory is the fact that there is no natural parameterisation of the set of PTsymmetric matrices, and the form of the parity operator P and the CPT inner product are completely dependent on the basis. It has recently been conjectured that PT-symmetry is closely related to split-quaternionic extensions of quantum theory [20, 21]. Here we show that split-quaternionic extensions of Hermitian matrices are indeed a natural representation of PT-symmetric matrices, invariant under unitary transformations. This equivalence allows us to introduce new PT-symmetric random matrix ensembles.

In conventional quantum systems, random matrices play an important role, due to their ability to describe spectral fluctuations in sufficiently complicated systems [22]. In particular, the famous Bohigas-Giannoni-Schmit conjecture states that the spectral features of quantum systems whose classical counterparts are chaotic are described by random matrix ensembles [23, 24]. There are three important universality classes for Hermitian quantum systems, depending on the time-reversal properties of the system, corresponding to the Gaussian orthogonal, unitary, and symplectic ensembles [25]. Non-Hermitian random matrix models, on the other hand, whose eigenvalues are in general complex, are widely studied, and have applications ranging from dissipative quantum systems and scattering theory to quantum chromodynamics (see, e.g., [26] and references therein). Several attempts towards defining PT-symmetric random matrices and identifying universality classes for *PT*-symmetric systems have been made [27–32]. However, most of them are restricted, owing to the lack of a natural parameterisation of *PT*-symmetric $N \times N$ matrices. Here we introduce the split-complex and split-quaternionic versions of the Gaussian unitary and symplectic ensembles as candidates for representing new universality classes for *PT*-symmetric quantum systems. The new ensembles are invariant under orthogonal and unitary transformations, reflecting the invariance of split-complex and split-quaternionic Hermitian matrices, respectively. We show that the split-complex case is closely related to the well-known real Ginibre ensemble [26, 33], which in itself is PT-symmetric. The formulation in terms of splitcomplex Hermitian matrices might offer a new approach towards solving some outstanding problems regarding the spectral features of Ginibre matrices. To the best of our knowledge the split-quaternionic Hermitian ensemble is not directly related to any previously studied ensemble.

Let us start with a brief summary of some important properties of split-complex and split-quaternionic numbers, and split-complex and split-quaternionic matrices that we will need in the following. Split-complex numbers [34] can be viewed as hyperbolic versions of complex numbers. They are numbers of the form z = x + jy, where $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ and j is the imaginary unit of the algebra, such that $j^2 = 1$. The conjugate of a split-complex number is given by $\overline{z} = x - jy$. A split-complex number can be represented as a real 2×2 matrix

$$z \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ y & x \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1}$$

The "norm" of a split complex number, defined by

$$|z|^2 = z\overline{z} = \det\begin{pmatrix} x & y\\ y & x \end{pmatrix} = x^2 - y^2, \tag{2}$$

can be positive, null, or negative.

Similarly, split-quaternions [35] can be viewed as a hyperbolic version of Hamilton's famous quaternions, with three imaginary units, two of which square to plus rather than minus one. A generic split-quaternion $p \in \mathbb{H}_S$ can be written as $p = p_0 + ip_1 + jp_2 + kp_3$, where $p_i \in \mathbb{R}$, and i, j, k satisfy the relations

$$i^2 = -1, \quad j^2 = k^2 = ijk = +1,$$
 (3)

and the skew-cyclic relation

$$j = -ji = k$$
, $jk = -kj = -i$, $ki = -ik = j$. (4)

The conjugate of a split-quaternion is defined as $\overline{p} = p_0 - ip_1 - jp_2 - kp_3$. A split quaternion can be represented as a complex 2×2 matrix

$$p \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} p_0 + ip_1 & p_2 + ip_3 \\ p_2 - ip_3 & p_0 - ip_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (5)

The "norm" of a split-quaternion is defined similar to the split-complex case by

$$\bar{p}p = \det \begin{pmatrix} p_0 + ip_1 & p_2 + ip_3 \\ p_2 - ip_3 & p_0 - ip_1 \end{pmatrix} = p_0^2 + p_1^2 - p_2^2 - p_3^2, \quad (6)$$

and again, can be positive, null, or negative.

In analogy to the case of quaternionic vector spaces [36] we can define an (indefinite) inner product for two vectors $\vec{u}, \vec{v} \in \mathbb{H}_{S}^{N}$ with split-quaternionic components as

$$(\vec{u}, \vec{v}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \bar{u}_n v_n.$$
 (7)

The adjoint A^{\dagger} of a split-quaternionic matrix A is then defined in the familiar way as $(\vec{u}, A\vec{v}) = (A^{\dagger}\vec{u}, \vec{v})$, which in terms of the elements means taking the transpose and split-quaternionic conjugate, $A^{\dagger} = (a_{jk}^{\dagger}) = (\overline{a_{kj}})$. Thus, we can generalise the concept of Hermiticity to split-quaternionic matrices, by referring to matrices with split-quaternionic elements that satisfy $H^{\dagger} = H$ as *split*-Hermitian. We note that the set of split-Hermitian matrices is invariant under standard unitary transformations. The subset of split-complex Hermitian matrices is invariant under orthogonal transformations. Similarly to quaternionic and complex Hermitian matrices the space of $N \times N$ split-Hermitian matrices is $(2N^2 - N)$ dimensional, and the subspace of split-complex Hermitian matrices is N^2 -dimensional.

We can define eigenvalues and eigenvectors of split-Hermitian matrices using the complex 2×2 matrix representation in (5) for the elements. In this way one can show that the characteristic polynomial is real, and the eigenvalues are doubly degenerate. This can be viewed as the "split"-analogue of Kramer's degeneracy occuring for quaternionic Hermitian matrices [21, 22, 24]. In contrast to Hermitian matrices, the eigenvalues of split-Hermitian matrices are not necessarily real, but can come in complex conjugate pairs. Nevertheless, eigenvectors belonging to two distinct eigenvalues are orthogonal with respect to the inner product (7).

Folowing [18] we can define the class of PT-symmetric matrices as the set of complex matrices with real characteristic polynomial. Thus, any split-Hermitian matrix can be interpreted as a PT-symmetric Hamiltonian. A simple counting argument shows that the spaces of split-Hermitian matrices and complex PT-symmetric matrices are indeed isomorphic. An $N \times N$ complex matrix has $2N^2$ real parameters (take for example the real and imaginary parts of the matrix elements). The coefficients of the characteristic polynomial are linearly independent linear functions of the parameters. That is, if we condition the matrix to have a real characteristic polynomial, we find one constraint for the parameters for the coefficient of each power in the characteristic polynomial. Since the characteristic polynomial is of order N with the coefficient of the highest power being one, we have N linearly independent constraints. That is, a PT-symmetric matrix can be parameterised by $2N^2 - N$ parameters, just as a split-Hermitian matrix of the same size. Both complex PT-symmetric and split-Hermitian matrices of size N can thus be interpreted as $\mathbb{R}^{(2N^2-N)}$, and are thus isomorphic. In particular, the subspace of split-complex Hermitian matrices is isomorphic to the space of real PTsymmetric matrices (which in fact, is the space of all real matrices).

Let us now introduce random matrix ensembles of split-complex and split-quaternionic Hermitian matrices, as direct generalisations of the standard Gaussian unitary and Gaussian symplectic ensembles. That is, we consider split-quaternionic and split-complex matrices whose elements are independently distributed normal random variables, subject to the constraint of split-Hermiticity. Such ensembles can be constructed in the following way. For the split-complex case, let $A = (a_{mn})$ be an $N \times N$ matrix, whose elements are independent and identically distributed normal random variables over the split-complex numbers, $a_{mn} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)_{C_S}$. That is, $a_{mn} = \alpha_{mn} + j\gamma_{mn}$, where $\alpha_{mn}, \gamma_{mn} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{2})_{\mathbb{R}}$ are uncorrelated. We can then define an ensemble of split-Hermitian matrices as $H = \frac{A+A^{\dagger}}{2}$. The resulting probability density function on the space of matrices H is given by

$$\mathbb{P}(H) \,\mathrm{d}H = \left(\frac{1}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}N(N-1)} \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{Tr}(HH^T)} \,\mathrm{d}H, \quad (8)$$

where $dH = \prod_{m < n} d\operatorname{Re}(h_{mn}) d\operatorname{Im}(h_{mn}) \prod_{m=1}^{N} dh_{mm}$. Thus, this ensemble is invariant under orthogonal transformations of H, in accordance with the invariance of the split-complex Hermitian matrices under orthogonal transformations.

In the split-quaternionic case, we choose the elements of A as independent and identically distributed splitquaternionic valued normal random variables, i.e., $a_{mn} \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)_{\mathrm{H}_S}$. That is, $a_{mn} = \alpha_{mn} + \mathrm{i}\beta_{mn} + \mathrm{j}\gamma_{mn} + \mathrm{k}\delta_{mn}$, where $\alpha_{mn}, \beta_{mn}, \gamma_{mn}, \delta_{mn} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{4})_{\mathrm{R}}$ are uncorrelated. The probability distribution on the space of split-quaternionic Hermitian matrices $H = \frac{A+A^{\dagger}}{2}$ is then given by

$$\mathbb{P}(H) \,\mathrm{d}H = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}\right)^{2N(N-1)} \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{Tr}(HH^I + H^I H)} \,\mathrm{d}H,\tag{9}$$

where $dH = \prod_{m < n} dh_{mn}^1 dh_{mn}^i dh_{mn}^j dh_{mn}^k \prod_{m=1}^N dh_{mm}^m$, and here H^I performs the transpose of H and complex conjugation with respect to the imaginary unit i only. Hence this ensemble is invariant under unitary transformations of H, reflecting the invariance class of split-quaternionic Hermitian matrices. Note that the matrix elements of H are by definition statistically independent for both ensembles (8) and (9). That is, these new ensembles fulfil the two defining properties of the standard Gaussian ensembles, of independence of the matrix elements and invariance under the invariance transformations of the class of matrices on which the ensemble is defined. We conjecture that the two split-Hermitian ensembles constitute universality classes for PT-symmetric quantum systems.

We shall now derive analytic expressions for the joint probability density of the eigenvalues and the one-level densities for the case of N = 2, following a method similar to the one used in [37] for the real Ginibre ensemble. Let us start with the split-complex case. Writing

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_1 & \delta - j\gamma \\ \delta + j\gamma & \Lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

with $\Lambda_{1,2}, \delta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, j^2 = 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(H) = \frac{2}{\pi^2} e^{-\text{Tr}(HH^T)} = \frac{2}{\pi^2} e^{-(\Lambda_1^2 + \Lambda_2^2 + 2\delta^2 + 2\gamma^2)}.$$
 (11)

Note that Λ_1, Λ_2 are not the eigenvalues of H, which are given by

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{\Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2}{2} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2}{2}\right)^2 + \delta^2 - \gamma^2}.$$
 (12)

Clearly these eigenvalues can be real or complex conjugate, depending on the values of δ and γ .

To deduce the joint probability density of the eigenvalues $\lambda_{1,2}$ we have to transform from $\Lambda_{1,2}$, γ , and δ to $\lambda_{1,2}$, γ , and δ , and then integrate over γ and δ . We have

$$\Lambda_{1,2} = \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}{2} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{2}\right)^2 - \delta^2 + \gamma^2}, \qquad (13)$$

and thus the Jacobian for the variable transformation from $\Lambda_{1,2}$ to $\lambda_{1,2}$ is given by

$$|\det(J)| = \frac{|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|}{2\sqrt{\left(\frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{2}\right)^2 - \delta^2 + \gamma^2}}.$$
 (14)

That is, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{1,2},\delta,\gamma) = \frac{1}{\pi^2} \frac{|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \mathrm{e}^{-(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + 4\gamma^2)}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{2}\right)^2 - \delta^2 + \gamma^2}}.$$
 (15)

When integrating over δ we have to consider that Λ_1, Λ_2 are real by definition. That is, we integrate over the region $\delta^2 \leq \left(\frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{2}\right)^2 + \gamma^2$, to find

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \gamma) = \frac{1}{\pi} e^{-(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2)} |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| e^{-4\gamma^2}.$$
(16)

The region over which we have to integrate γ is given by the reality condition for δ , as $\gamma^2 \ge -\left(\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_2}{2}\right)^2$. That is, we integrate from $-\infty$ to $-|\text{Im}(\lambda_{1,2})|$, and from $|\text{Im}(\lambda_{1,2})|$ to ∞ to find

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2)} |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \mathrm{erfc}(2|\mathrm{Im}(\lambda_{1,2})|)}{2\sqrt{\pi}}.$$
 (17)

From the joint probability distribution we can deduce the one-level density of the eigenvalues. For this purpose we have to distinguish between the case of real or complex conjugate eigenvalues. If λ_1, λ_2 are real the joint probability distribution reduces to

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2 | \lambda_{1,2} \in \mathbb{R}) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2)} |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|.$$
(18)

Integrating over one of the real eigenvalues then yields the one-level density for real eigenvalues

$$R_1^{\mathbb{R}}(\lambda) = R_1(\lambda|\lambda \in \mathbb{R}) = \frac{\lambda e^{-\lambda^2}}{2} \operatorname{erf}(\lambda) + \frac{e^{-2\lambda^2}}{2\sqrt{\pi}}.$$
 (19)

We see that there is a non-zero probability to obtain two real eigenvalues, which is given by integration of $R_1^{\mathbb{R}}(\lambda)$ over λ . This probability is equal to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$.

If λ_1, λ_2 are complex conjugate, then the knowledge of one of the eigenvalues entirely determines the other. In this case, the joint probability density automatically reduces to the one-level density. By substituting $\lambda_1 = \lambda$, and $\lambda_2 = \overline{\lambda}$ into (17), and multiplying by two, to account for the fact that we cannot distinguish between λ_1 and λ_2 , we find that the one-level density for the case of complex conjugate eigenvalues is

$$R_{1}^{\mathbb{C}}(\lambda) = \frac{2|\mathrm{Im}(\lambda)|}{\sqrt{\pi}} \mathrm{e}^{-2(\mathrm{Re}(\lambda)^{2} - \mathrm{Im}(\lambda)^{2})} \mathrm{erfc}(2|\mathrm{Im}(\lambda)|). \quad (20)$$

The total one-level density of a complex eigenvalue is then given by

$$R_1(\lambda) = R_1^{\mathbb{C}}(\operatorname{Re}(\lambda), \operatorname{Im}(\lambda)) + \delta(\operatorname{Im}(\lambda))R_1^{\mathbb{R}}(\operatorname{Re}(\lambda)).$$
(21)

Figure 1 depicts the numerically obtained histogram of the eigenvalues of a large number of split-complex Hermitian matrices sampled from the distribution (8). We also plot the probabilities conditional on real and complex eigenvalues respectively in comparison with the analytical results. We observe a good agreement between the numerics and the analytical results; in particular, there is a sharp peak in the histogram for $\text{Im}(\lambda) = 0$, reflecting the δ -function in the analytic distribution.

We notice that the distributions (19) and (20) are similar to those obtained from the 2×2 real Ginibre ensemble [37]. In fact, the two ensembles can be explicitly related. Let us consider the 4×4 representation of a 2×2 split-



FIG. 1. One-level density for the 2×2 split-complex Hermitian ensemble (8). The top left panel shows the histogram of the eigenvalues using numerically obtained eigenvalues from 200,000 matrices. The two right panels show the histogram of the conditionally complex eigenvalues (top) in comparison to the analytical result (bottom). The bottom left panel shows the numerical and analytical distribution for conditionally real eigenvalues.

complex Hermitian matrix,

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} h_{11} & h_{12} \\ h_{21} & h_{22} \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} h_{11} & 0 & h_{12}^1 & h_{12}^1 \\ 0 & h_{11} & h_{12}^j & h_{12}^1 \\ h_{12}^1 & -h_{12}^j & h_{22} & 0 \\ -h_{12}^j & h_{12} & 0 & h_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$
(22)

If we apply a similarity transformation using the matrix

$$O = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$
 (23)

we obtain

$$\tilde{H} = O^T H O = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta & 0 & 0 \\ \delta & \gamma & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha & \delta \\ 0 & 0 & \beta & \gamma \end{pmatrix},$$
(24)

where $\alpha = h_{22}, \beta = h_{12}^1 - h_{12}^j, \delta = h_{12}^1 + h_{12}^j, \gamma = h_{11}$. It follows that the $\alpha, \beta, \delta, \gamma$ are distributed as $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{2})$, and are all independent. Hence the 2 × 2 split-complex Hermitian ensemble can be brought, via a parameterindependent orthogonal transformation on the 4 × 4 matrix representation, to a matrix which is spectrally equivalent to two copies of a matrix from the 2 × 2 real Ginibre ensemble, with elements distributed as $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{2})$ instead of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. That is, the 2 × 2 split-complex Hermitian ensemble has the same spectral density as the 2 × 2 real Ginibre ensemble with elements distributed as $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{2})$. We expect that there is a similar relationship in the general $N \times N$ case. Let us now consider the split-self-dual case. Let

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_1 & \delta - i\mu - j\gamma - k\sigma \\ \delta + i\mu + j\gamma + k\sigma & \Lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

with $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \delta, \mu, \gamma, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}$; that is, we have the probability distribution

$$\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \delta, \mu, \gamma, \sigma) = \frac{32}{\pi^3} e^{-\operatorname{Tr}(HH^I + H^I H)} = \frac{32}{\pi^3} e^{-2(\Lambda_1^2 + \Lambda_2^2 + 2(\delta^2 + \mu^2 + \gamma^2 + \sigma^2))}.$$
(26)

Again, Λ_1 and Λ_2 are not the eigenvalues of H. These are given by

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{\Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2}{2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{(\Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2)^2}{4} + \delta^2 + \mu^2 - \gamma^2 - \sigma^2},$$
(27)

from which we obtain

$$\Lambda_{1,2} = \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}{2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{(\lambda_+ - \lambda_-)^2}{4} - \delta^2 - \mu^2 + \gamma^2 + \sigma^2}.$$
(28)

The transformation from the original parameters $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \delta, \mu, \gamma, \sigma$ to the new parameters $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \delta, \mu, \gamma, \sigma$ has Jacobian

$$|\det(J)| = \frac{\lambda_{+} - \lambda_{-}}{\sqrt{(\lambda_{+} - \lambda_{-})^{2} + 4(\gamma^{2} + \sigma^{2} - \delta^{2} - \mu^{2})}}, \quad (29)$$

that is, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{1,2},\delta,\mu,\gamma,\sigma) = \frac{32}{\pi^3} \frac{e^{-2(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + 4(\gamma^2 + \sigma^2))} |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|}{\sqrt{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 + 4(\gamma^2 + \sigma^2 - \delta^2 - \mu^2)}}.$$
(30)

We now proceed to integrate over the regions where the original parameters remain real. First, to ensure that $\Lambda_{1,2} \in \mathbb{R}$ we need

$$\frac{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2}{4} - \delta^2 - \mu^2 + \gamma^2 + \sigma^2 \ge 0.$$
 (31)

Rearranging this inequality as a limit on μ and subsequently integrating over the reality of μ leaves

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{1,2},\delta,\gamma,\sigma) = \frac{16|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|}{\pi^2} e^{-2(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + 4(\gamma^2 + \sigma^2))}.$$
 (32)

But requiring that $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ means that we have a subsequent condition on our parameters, namely

$$\delta^2 \le \frac{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2}{4} + \gamma^2 + \sigma^2. \tag{33}$$

Eliminating δ thus leaves

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{1,2},\gamma,\sigma) = \frac{32|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|}{\pi^2} e^{-2(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + 4(\gamma^2 + \sigma^2))} \times \sqrt{\frac{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2}{4} + \gamma^2 + \sigma^2}.$$
 (34)

To ensure that $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, we additionally require

$$\frac{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2}{4} + \gamma^2 + \sigma^2 \ge 0. \tag{35}$$

Now, transforming our variables (γ, σ) into polar coordinates (r, ϕ) and integrating over $\phi \in [0, 2\pi]$ leaves the joint probability density function of λ_1, λ_2 ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \frac{64|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|}{\pi} e^{-2(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2)} \\ \times \int_{\Gamma} r e^{-8r^2} \sqrt{\frac{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2}{4} + r^2} \, \mathrm{d}r, \quad (36)$$

where Γ is the region over which we choose to integrate r. This region is different for real eigenvalues in comparison to complex conjugate eigenvalues.

In the case of real eigenvalues, condition (35) implies that we integrate over $r \in [0, \infty]$. We thus find the joint probability distribution for real eigenvalues as

$$\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{R}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \frac{2}{\pi} (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 e^{-2(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2)} + \frac{|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-4\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \operatorname{erfc}(\sqrt{2}|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|).$$
(37)

Integrating over one of the eigenvalues we find the onelevel density in the case of real eigenvalues as

$$R_1^{\mathbb{R}}(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-4\lambda^2}}{8\lambda^2\sqrt{2\pi}} + \frac{e^{-2\lambda^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(2\lambda^2 + 1 - \frac{1}{8\lambda^2}\right).$$
 (38)

If λ_1 and λ_2 are complex conjugate, however, condition (35) simplifies to

$$\gamma^2 + \sigma^2 \ge \operatorname{Im}(\lambda_{1,2})^2. \tag{39}$$

That is, we now have to integrate over $r \in [|\text{Im}(\lambda_{1,2})|, \infty]$. Accounting for the fact that we could have also taken $\lambda_2 = \overline{\lambda_1}$, and that the joint probability density in the case of complex conjugate eigenvalues simplifies to the one-level density directly, we thus obtain the one-level density for complex eigenvalues

$$R_1^{\mathbb{C}}(\lambda) = 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} |\mathrm{Im}(\lambda)| \mathrm{e}^{-4\left((\mathrm{Re}(\lambda))^2 + (\mathrm{Im}(\lambda))^2\right)}.$$
 (40)

Again we can express the total one-level density of a complex eigenvalue as

$$R_1(\lambda) = R_1^{\mathbb{C}}(\operatorname{Re}(\lambda), \operatorname{Im}(\lambda)) + \delta(\operatorname{Im}(\lambda))R_1^{\mathbb{R}}(\operatorname{Re}(\lambda)).$$
(41)

In the split-quaternionic case, the probability of obtaining real eigenvalues is $1 - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}$. Figure 2 depicts numerically obtained eigenvalue densities for a large number of matrices sampled from the distribution (9) in comparison with the analytical results. We again observe an excellent agreement.



FIG. 2. One-level density for the 2×2 split-quaternionic Hermitian ensemble (9). The top left panel shows the histogram of the eigenvalues using numerically obtained eigenvalues from 200,000 matrices. The two right panels show the histogram of the conditionally complex eigenvalues (top) in comparison to the analytical result (bottom). The bottom left panel shows the numerical and analytical distribution for conditionally real eigenvalues.

Let us finally derive the level spacing distributions in the case of real eigenvalues for the split-Hermitian ensembles. These are the distributions of the spacings $\tilde{s} = |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|, \ \tilde{s} = \sqrt{as}$, subject to the requirements

$$\int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(s) \,\mathrm{d}s = \int_0^\infty s \,\mathbb{P}(s) \,\mathrm{d}s = 1. \tag{42}$$

For this purpose we subsitute $\mu_1 = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$, $\mu_2 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$, in the joint probabilities of the real eigenvalues. For the split-complex case this yields

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{\pi}} |\mu_1| e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mu_1^2 - \frac{1}{2}\mu_2^2}.$$
 (43)

Integrating μ_2 over the whole real line yields

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_1) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} |\mu_1| e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mu_1^2}.$$
(44)

We have $s \propto |\mu_1|$. After appropriate normalisation over the positive real line and a rescaling to ensure that the mean spacing is 1, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(s) \,\mathrm{d}s = \frac{\pi}{2} s \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\pi}{4}s^2} \,\mathrm{d}s. \tag{45}$$

We note that this is identical to the level spacing for the GOE, as has been noted before for the real Ginibre ensemble [26].

For the split-quaternionic Hermitian ensemble we again substitute in $\mu_1 = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$, $\mu_2 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ in the joint probability distribution for real eigenvalues to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \frac{\mu_1^2}{\pi} e^{-\mu_1^2 - \mu_2^2} + \frac{|\mu_1|}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\mu_2^2 + \mu_1^2} \operatorname{erfc}(\sqrt{2}|\mu_1|).$$
(46)

Integrating μ_2 over the whole real line leaves

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu_1) = \frac{\mu_1^2}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\mu_1^2} + \frac{|\mu_1|}{2\sqrt{2}} e^{\mu_1^2} \operatorname{erfc}(\sqrt{2}(|\mu_1|)).$$
(47)

After appropriate normalisations we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(s) \,\mathrm{d}s = \frac{4\sqrt{2a^3} \left(\frac{s^2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \mathrm{e}^{-as^2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \mathrm{se}^{as^2} \mathrm{erfc}(\sqrt{2a}s)\right)}{2\sqrt{2} - 1},\tag{48}$$

where

$$a = \left(\frac{3\sqrt{2} - \sinh^{-1}(1)}{(2\sqrt{2} - 1)\sqrt{\pi}}\right)^2.$$
 (49)

Figure (3) depicts the numerically obtained histogram



FIG. 3. The left panel shows the histogram for the splitcomplex Hermitian ensemble level spacing distribution in the case of real eigenvalues. The right panel shows the histogram for the split-quaternionic Hermitian ensemble.

of the level spacings of the eigenvalues of a large number of split-complex Hermitian (left) and split-quaternionic Hermitian (right) matrices sampled from distributions (8) and (9). We observe an excellent agreement between the numerical histograms and the analytical reasults. Note that the level repulsion is linear for both ensembles.

In summary, we have shown that the space of PTsymmetric matrices is isomorphic to the space of split-We have introduced two new Hermitian matrices. random matrix ensembles of split-complex and splitquaternionic Hermitian Gaussian random amtrices. We have derived analytic expressions for these new ensembles in the 2×2 matrix size, and have demonstrated a relation between the real Ginibre ensemble and our split-complex Hermitian ensemble. It is a challenging but achievable task to derive analytic results for general $N \times N$ matrices for the new ensembles. The split-complex Hermitian ensemble might help in understanding some of the still-unknown spectral properties of the $N \times N$ real Ginibre ensemble. We have conjectured that the newly derived ensembles constitute universality classes for PTsymmetric systems. Hitherto only few PT-symmetric model systems have been investigated with respect to their statistical spectral properties. In [38], GOE-type statistics were obtained in the special case of real eigenvalues, which is consistent with the spectral properties

of the split-complex ensemble introduced here. It is an important task to compare the spectral features of the new ensembles to those of further PT-symmetric model systems.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

EMG acknowledges support via the Imperial College JRF scheme, the L'Oréal UNESCO Women in Science programme, and from the Royal Society. SMN acknowledges support from an EPSRC DTA grant.

- C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 5243
- [2] C. E. Rüter et al, Nature Physics 6 (2010) 192
- [3] Joseph Schindler, Ang Li, Mei C. Zheng, F. M. Ellis, and Tsampikos Kottos, Phys. Rev. A 84 (2011) 040101
- [4] A. Regensburger, C. Bersch, M-A Miri, G. Onishchukov, D. N. Christodoulides, and U. Perschel, Nature 488 (2012) 167
- [5] S. Bittner, B. Dietz, U. Günther, H. L. Harney, M. Miski-Oglu, A. Richter, and F. Schäfer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108 (2012) 024101
- [6] L. Feng, Y-L Xu, W. S. Fegadolli, M-H Lu, J. E. B. Oliveira, V. R. Almeida, Y-F Chen, and A. Scherer, Nature Materials **112** (2013) 108
- [7] M. Brandstetter, M. Liertzer, C. Deutsch, P. Klang, J. Schöberl, H. E. Türeci, G. Strasser, K. Unterrainer, and S. Rotter, Nature Communications 5 (2014) 4034
- [8] B. Peng, S. K. Özdemir, F. Lei, F. Monifi, M. Gianfreda, G. L. Long, S. Fan, F. Nori, C. M. Bender, and L. Yang, Nature Physics **10** (2014) 394
- [9] Y. Sun, W. Tan, H. Li, J. Li, and H. Chen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 112 (2014) 143903
- [10] L. Chang, X. Jiang, S. Hua, C. Yang, J. Wen, L. Jiang, G. Li, G. Wang, and M. Xiao, Nature Photonics 8 (2014) 524
- [11] L. Feng, Z. J. Wong, R-M Ma, Y. Wang, and X. Zhang, Science **346** (2014) 972
- [12] H. Hodaei, M-A Miri, M Heinrich, D. N. Christodoulides, and M. Khajavikhan, Science **346** (2014) 975
- [13] B. Peng, S. K. Özdemir, S. Rotter, H. Yilmaz, M. Liertzer, F. Monifi, C. M. Bender, F. Nori, and L. Yang, Science **346** (2014) 328
- [14] D. C. Brody and E-M Graefe, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109 (2012) 230405
- [15] H. Schomerus, Phys. Rev. Lett. 104 (2010) 233601
- [16] R. El-Ganainy, K. G. Makris, D. N. Christodoulides, and Z. H. Musslimani, Opt. Lett. **32** (2007) 2632
- [17] A. Guo, G. J. Salamo, D. Duchesne, R. Morandoti, M. Volatier-Ravat, V. Aimez, G. A. Siviloglou, and D. N. Christodoulides, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103** (2009) 093902
- [18] C. M. Bender and P. D. Mannheim, Phys. Lett. A 374 (2010) 1616
- [19] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody, and H. F. Jones, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89 (2002) 270401

- [20] D. C. Brody and E. M. Graefe, J. Phys. A 44 (2011) 072001
- [21] M. Sato, K. Hasebe, K. Esaki, and M. Kohmoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. **127** (2012) 937
- [22] M. L. Mehta, Random Matrices and the Statistical Theory of Energy Levels, Academic Press, London, 1967
- [23] O. Bohigas, M. J. Giannoni, and C. Schmit, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52 (1984) 1
- [24] F. Haake, Quantum Signatures of Chaos, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1992
- [25] F. J. Dyson, J. Math. Phys. 3 (1962) 1199
- [26] B.A. Khoruzhenko and H.J. Sommers, in *The Oxford Handbook of Random Matrices*, edited by G. Akemann, J. Baik, and P.D Francesco. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011
- [27] Z. Ahmed and S. R. Jain, Phys. Rev. E 67 (2003) 045106
- [28] Q. Wang, J. Phys. A 43 (2010) 29
- [29] J. Gong and Q.-H. Wang, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical 45(44) (2012) 444014

- [30] S. C. L. Srivastava and S. R. Jain, Fortschritte der Physik 61 (2013) 2
- [31] Z. Ahmed, J. Phys. A **36** (2013) 12
- [32] O. Bohigas and M. P. Pato, AIP Advances 3 (2013) 032130
- [33] J. Ginibre, J. Math. Phys. 6 (1965) 440
- [34] I. Yaglom, Complex Numbers in Geometry, Academic Press, New York, 1968
- [35] J. Cockle, Philosophical Magazine Series 3 35 (1849) 434
- [36] L. Rodman, Topics in Quaternion Linear Algebra, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 2014
- [37] H-J Sommers and W. Wieczorek, J. Phys. A 41 (2008) 405003
- [38] T. Deguchi, P. K. Ghosh, and K. Kudo, Phys. Rev. E 80 (2009) 026213