

On the bound states and correlation functions of a class of Calogero-type quantum many-body problems with balanced loss and gain

Debdeep Sinha* and Pijush K. Ghosh †

Department of Physics, Siksha-Bhavana,
Visva-Bharati University,
Santiniketan, PIN 731 235, India.

Abstract

The quantization of many-body systems with balanced loss and gain is investigated. Two types of models characterized by either translational invariance or rotational symmetry under rotation in a pseudo-Euclidean space are considered. A partial set of integrals of motion are constructed for each type of model. Specific examples for the translational invariant systems include Calogero-type many-body systems with balanced loss and gain, where each particle is interacting with other particles via four-body inverse-square potential plus pair-wise two-body harmonic terms. A many-body system interacting via short range four-body plus six-body inverse square potential with pair-wise two-body harmonic terms in presence of balanced loss and gain is also considered. In general, the eigen values of these two models contain quantized as well as continuous spectra. A completely quantized spectra and bound states involving all the particles may be obtained by employing box-normalization on the particles having continuous spectra. The normalization of the ground state wave functions in appropriate Stoke wedges is discussed. The exact n -particle correlation functions of these two models are obtained through a mapping of the relevant integrals to known results in random matrix theory. It is shown that a rotationally symmetric system with generic many-body potential does not have entirely real spectra, leading to unstable quantum modes. The eigenvalue problem of a Hamiltonian system with balanced loss and gain and admitting dynamical $O(2, 1)$ symmetry is also considered.

keywords: Quantum many-body system; Exactly solvable models; Calogero-type models; Correlation functions; Dissipative system

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Quantization of classical Hamiltonian	5

***email:** debdeepsinha.rs@visva-bharati.ac.in

†**email:** pijushkanti.ghosh@visva-bharati.ac.in

3	Translational Invariant Hamiltonian	9
3.1	Simple Harmonic Oscillator	11
3.2	Rational CMS-type many-body systems	13
3.2.1	Solution for V_I	14
3.2.2	Correlation functions for the potential V_I	15
3.2.3	Solution for V_{II}	17
3.2.4	Correlation functions for the potential V_{II}	18
4	Rotationally invariant potential	19
5	Systems with $O(2,1)$ symmetry:	20
6	Summary and discussion	22
7	Acknowledgements	23

1 Introduction

Dissipation is an ubiquitous natural phenomenon. One of the simplest examples of dissipative system is the damped harmonic oscillator with a friction term linear in velocity. Investigation on Hamiltonian formulation of this system was undertaken by Bateman [1] more than eighty five years ago. The Bateman's Hamiltonian is defined in an ambient space with twice the degrees of freedom of the original oscillator. The extra degree of freedom constitutes an auxiliary system which is the time-reversed version of the original dissipative oscillator. Therefore, the gain due to one oscillator is equally balanced due to the loss from the other. Neither the dissipative nor the auxiliary oscillator alone defines a Hamiltonian system, rather it is the combination of the two oscillators which is described by Bateman Hamiltonian. A balanced loss and gain system is the one for which the flow preserves the volume in the position-velocity state space, although individual particles may be subjected to gain and/or loss. Thus, the Bateman oscillator(BO) is an example of Hamiltonian system with balanced loss and gain. The quantization of BO was discussed in Ref.[2] with a motivation to give a macroscopic description of deep inelastic scattering. Various subtle issues and important results related to quantization of BO are discussed in the literature [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8].

The BO neither admits classically stable solutions nor quantum bound states. Further, the dynamics of the dissipative and the auxiliary oscillators are independent of each other. However, the situation changes significantly, if an appropriate \mathcal{PT} symmetric interaction is added to the Bateman Hamiltonian that couples the original and the auxiliary oscillators. The resulting system admits classically stable solutions as well as quantum bound states for some regions in the parameter space for which the \mathcal{PT} -symmetry is unbroken [9]. An equilibrium is reached for the case of unbroken \mathcal{PT} symmetry so that the amount of energy gained by one of the oscillators is reverted back to the other at the equal rate. Similar features have been observed for a large class of Hamiltonian systems with balanced loss and gain[10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. The experimental results obtained in Ref. [15] in the context of whispering gallery modes are explained well by the mathematical model of Ref. [9].

The dynamics of the particles subjected to gain and that of loss are intertwined to each other in the examples considered in Refs. [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. Further, for the case of unbroken \mathcal{PT} -symmetry, equilibrium states exist for the Hamiltonian. Consequently, the concept of auxiliary system or ambient space ceases to exist for these examples and the Hamiltonian of Refs. [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14] should not be seen simply as an extended version of Bateman's

oscillator, rather it should be viewed in its totality as describing a new type of physical system. This indeed is a paradigm shift in interpreting this class of system with balanced loss and gain that is Hamiltonian. As emphasized in Ref. [14], a system with balanced loss and gain is not always amenable to a Hamiltonian formulation without the introduction of an ambient space or auxiliary system. Thus, this new class of Hamiltonian, where there is no hidden or explicit auxiliary system[14], deserves a special attention and treatment from that of Bateman-type Hamiltonian.

It should be mentioned in this context that another type of generalization of Bateman's approach is always allowed, where a clear distinction between original and auxiliary systems exists. In particular, Hamiltonian formulation of dissipative nonlinear system necessitates the introduction of a 'unidirectional coupling' between the system and its auxiliary counterpart[13, 16]. The coupling is unidirectional in the sense that the dynamics of the particles with loss are independent of the dynamics of the particles with gain. However, the converse is not true and no equilibrium state exists for the Hamiltonian. This again leads to a Hamiltonian system with balanced loss and gain, albeit in an ambient space for which a clear distinction between the system and its auxiliary counterpart exists. Such a formulation is useful for studying purely dissipative dynamics by using known techniques associated with a Hamiltonian system like canonical perturbation theory, canonical quantization, KAM theory etc., which is beyond the scope of the present article.

The emphasis in this article is on many-particle Hamiltonian systems with balanced loss and gain for which no ambient space or auxiliary system is introduced. A few exactly solvable systems with balanced loss and gain of this type are presented along with the construction of a set of integrals of motion for each model in Ref. [12]. Stable classical solutions are obtained for a class of systems characterized by translational invariance. However, rotationally invariant systems under rotation in a pseudo-Euclidean space do not admit any classically stable solutions.

The Calogero-Moser-Sutherland (CMS) type of many-body problems[17, 18] are famous examples of exactly solvable models in one dimension. The CMS models and various generalizations of them have been extensively studied in the literature[19, 20, 21]. These models have many implications in various diverse branches of physics and mathematics such as in exclusion statistics[22], quantum chaos [23], spin chains[24], algebraic and integrable structure[25], self-adjoint extensions[26], collective field formulation of many-particle systems[27], quantum Hall effect[28], Tomonaga-Luttinger liquid[29] etc.. Therefore, an extension of CMS model in the context of system having balanced loss and gain and the study of their integrability and/or exact solvability is an obvious curiosity. The rational CMS model with balanced loss and gain has been analyzed previously for two particles and shown to admit stable classical solutions as well quantum bound states[11]. It appears from the analysis in Ref. [12] that the celebrated CMS systems are not amenable to a Hamiltonian formulation for more than two particles, if these models are generalized to include balanced loss and gain terms. However, CMS-type models with balanced loss and gain, where particles interact with each other through pairwise four-body inverse square plus two-body harmonic interactions were shown to admit classically stable solutions. It should be mentioned that the four-body interactions in case of many-body systems without any gain and/or loss term have been considered earlier in the literature [30, 31, 32]. The exactly solvable quantum models of CMS-type with translational invariant two and four-body interactions is investigated in Ref. [31] and exactly solvable four-body interaction with translational non-invariant interactions is discussed in Ref. [32]. The form of the four-body interactions in these models are different from those presented in Ref. [12].

The purpose of this article is to consider quantization of the Hamiltonian system with balanced loss and gain of Ref. [12] and investigate various aspects of these models including eigen spectra. The quantum Hamiltonian obtained in this case has the form of the Hamiltonian describing the motion of particles on a pseudo-Euclidean plane and subjected to a uniform magnetic

field perpendicular to the plane. Therefore, it is always possible to interpret the Hamiltonian of a balanced loss and gain system as describing the motion of particles interacting with each other through a potential in the background of a pseudo-Euclidean metric and is subjected to a uniform magnetic field in specific directions, where the gain/loss parameter plays the role of the “magnetic field”. Further, a unitary transformation may be identified which plays the role of gauge transformation in relating a Hamiltonian describing particles in an external uniform magnetic field in symmetric gauge to that of the same Hamiltonian in the Landau gauge. Two classes of models characterized by their symmetry properties are considered for detail investigations: (i) translational invariant systems and (ii) rotationally invariant systems under rotation in a pseudo-Euclidean space endowed with the metric $[g]_{ij} = (-1)^{i+1}\delta_{ij}$. A duality symmetry is introduced between two types of translational invariant systems and used to relate the eigenspectra of these models.

The specific examples of translational invariant systems include, (i) coupled harmonic oscillators, (ii) Calogero-type many-body systems with balanced loss and gain, where each particle is interacting with other particles via four-body inverse-square potential plus pair-wise two-body harmonic terms and (iii) a many-body system interacting via short range four-body plus six-body inverse square potential with pair-wise two-body harmonic terms. In general, the eigenvalues of these translational invariant models contain quantized as well as continuous spectra. The box-normalization may be used on the particles having continuous spectra in order to obtain a completely quantized spectra and bound states involving all the particles. The appropriate Stokes wedges are identified so that the energy is bounded from below and the ground state wave functions is normalizable. The exact n-particle correlation functions of the two Calogero-type models are obtained through a mapping of the relevant integrals to known results in random matrix theories.

The Lagrangian of BO is invariant under hyperbolic rotation and the corresponding quantum Hamiltonian has the same symmetry. Neither classical stable states nor quantum bound states are possible for BO. The effect of a coupling between the two oscillators of Bateman Hamiltonian through rotationally invariant potential is worth investigating. In this context, a rotationally symmetric Hamiltonian with generic many-body potential respecting this symmetry is investigated in presence of balanced loss and gain. It is shown that such a system does not admit entirely real spectra for the generic potential having rotational symmetry. Consequently, there are quantum modes corresponding to decays and growths and the system is suitable for describing quantum dissipation.

The BO has a dynamical $SU(1,1)$ symmetry which can be used to completely solve the eigenvalue problem[6]. The oscillators of Bateman Hamiltonian may be coupled through specific class of potentials so that dynamical $SU(1,1)$ symmetry is maintained. A many-body system with balanced loss and gain and admitting dynamical $O(2,1)$ symmetry is considered. It is shown that the excitations corresponding to radial degree of freedom can always be obtained analytically for a generic many-body potential by employing the $O(2,1)$ symmetry. The associated eigenfunctions are also normalizable in proper Stokes wedges. However, the solutions of the eigenvalue equation corresponding to angular degrees of freedom depends on the specific form of the potential.

The plan of the article is as follows. In the next section, the model is introduced with a discussion on the quantization of the system. In section 3, the exact solutions, eigen spectra and n-particle correlations are obtained for translational invariant systems with balanced loss and gain. The models considered in this section are, (i) coupled harmonic oscillators, (ii) Calogero-type many-body systems with balanced loss and gain, where each particle is interacting with other particles via four-body inverse-square potential plus pair-wise two-body harmonic terms and (iii) a many-body system interacting via short range four-body plus six-body inverse square potential with pair-wise two-body harmonic terms. The eigen-value problems of these three models are

considered in sections 3.1, 3.2.1 and 3.2.3, respectively. The exact n -particle correlation functions for the systems (ii) and (iii) are computed in sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.4, respectively. Rotationally invariant systems are considered in section 4. Section 5 deals with systems admitting $O(2, 1)$ symmetry. Finally, summary and discussions of the results are presented in section 6.

2 Quantization of classical Hamiltonian

A system with balanced loss and gain is the one for which the flow preserves the volume in the position-velocity state space, although individual particles may be subjected to gain and/or loss. This also implies that all such systems are closed. In general, many-particle systems with balanced loss and gain and interacting via an arbitrary potential may not be amenable to Hamiltonian formulation[14]. A few examples of Hamiltonian systems with balanced loss and gain were considered in the literature on case-by-case basis in the context of \mathcal{PT} symmetric systems [9]. Existence of equilibrium states and phase-transitions involving broken and unbroken phases of \mathcal{PT} symmetry are interesting features of these Hamiltonian systems. Recently, a Hamiltonian formulation of generic many-body systems having balanced loss and gain is presented in Ref.[12]. Several exactly solved models, including a class of CMS-type models with four-body inverse-square and two-body harmonic interactions, have been introduced with explicit construction of their classical solutions[12]. It should be mentioned here that the Hamiltonian for all these solvable models is defined on the physical space and there is no ambient space or auxiliary system. Quantization of these systems with balanced loss and gain will be discussed in this section. Apart from describing certain general results, eigen spectra of CMS-type N -body problems with balanced loss and gain will be discussed in some detail.

The general form of a Hamiltonian describing a balanced loss and gain system is presented in Ref. [12]. For a particular representation of the matrices M, R, D as described in Ref. [12], the Hamiltonian describing a balanced loss and gain system with $N = 2m$ number of particles may be written in the following form:

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^m \left[2p_{2i-1}p_{2i} + \gamma(x_{2i-1}p_{2i-1} - x_{2i}p_{2i}) - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}x_{2i-1}x_{2i} \right] + V(x_i), \quad (1)$$

where γ is the gain/loss parameter and $V(x_i)$ is the potential. A detail investigation on related issues like how this system represents a balanced loss and gain and various generalizations of the system described by the Hamiltonian (1) may be found in Refs. [12, 13, 14]. The BO is reproduced[1] for $m = 1$ and $V = \frac{\omega^2}{2}x_1x_2$. A generalization of these results to arbitrary m is straightforward. The Hamiltonian for this case corresponds to m copies of Bateman oscillators. The quantum problem for the case $m = 1$ has been studied in detail[3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8] and no bound states can be found. The equations of motion resulting from the H decouple into two differential equations, one with decaying solution and the other with growing solution. The Hamiltonian system does not admit any classically stable solutions. However, stable classical solutions are possible for several choices[9, 10, 15, 12] of V , including many-particle Calogero-type models. Quantization of systems admitting classically stable solutions will be discussed in some detail. It is known that the Hamiltonian H in Eq. (1) can always be reformulated in the background of a pseudo-Euclidean metric[12] with the introduction of a new coordinate system:

$$z_i^- = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x_{2i-1} - x_{2i}), \quad z_i^+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x_{2i-1} + x_{2i}), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m. \quad (2)$$

The new co-ordinate system is related to the old one through an orthogonal transformation with the associated orthogonal matrix given by, $\hat{O} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[I_m \otimes (\sigma_1 + \sigma_3)]$, where I_m is the $m \times m$

identity matrix and σ_1, σ_3 are Pauli matrices. The Hamiltonian in new coordinates takes the following form:

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^m \left[(P_{z_i^+}^2 - P_{z_i^-}^2) + \gamma (z_i^+ P_{z_i^-} + z_i^- P_{z_i^+}) - \frac{\gamma^2}{4} \{ (z_i^+)^2 - (z_i^-)^2 \} \right] + V(z_i^+, z_i^-). \quad (3)$$

The terms linear in γ are components of angular momentum operators in the pseudo-Euclidean metric $g_{ij} = (-1)^{i+1} \delta_{ij}$. The Hamiltonian has the standard form in the background of the pseudo-Euclidean metric.

The canonical quantization of the classical Hamiltonian (3) is achieved by considering the classical variables $P_{z_j^+}, P_{z_j^-}, z_j^+, z_j^-$ as operators satisfying the commutation relations

$$\left[z_j^+, P_{z_j^+} \right] = i, \quad \left[z_j^-, P_{z_j^-} \right] = i. \quad (4)$$

All other commutators involving $P_{z_j^+}, P_{z_j^-}, z_j^+, z_j^-$ are taken to be zero. The co-ordinate representation of the operators $P_{z_j^+}$ and $P_{z_j^-}$ are obtained as follows:

$$P_{z_j^+} := -i\partial_{z_j^+}, \quad P_{z_j^-} := -i\partial_{z_j^-}. \quad (5)$$

With the introduction of the operators,

$$\Pi_{z_i^\pm} := P_{z_i^\pm} - A_i^\pm = -i\partial_{z_i^\pm} \pm \frac{\gamma}{2} z_i^\mp, \quad A_i^\pm := \mp \frac{\gamma}{2} z_i^\mp, \quad (6)$$

the quantum Hamiltonian \hat{H} has the following expression:

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{j=1}^m \left[(P_{z_j^+}^2 - P_{z_j^-}^2) + \gamma (z_j^+ P_{z_j^-} + z_j^- P_{z_j^+}) - \frac{\gamma^2}{4} ((z_j^+)^2 - (z_j^-)^2) \right] + V(z_j^-, z_j^+) \quad (7)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^m \left[(\Pi_{z_i^+})^2 - (\Pi_{z_i^-})^2 \right] + V(z_j^-, z_j^+), \quad (8)$$

where $P_{z_j^-}, P_{z_j^+}$ should be understood as operators defined by Eq.(5). The operators $\Pi_{z_i^\pm}$ satisfy the following relations:

$$\left[\Pi_{z_i^-}, \Pi_{z_j^-} \right] = 0, \quad \left[\Pi_{z_i^+}, \Pi_{z_j^+} \right] = 0, \quad \left[\Pi_{z_i^-}, \Pi_{z_j^+} \right] = -i\gamma \delta_{ij}. \quad (9)$$

It is interesting to note that the Hamiltonian \hat{H} has the form of a Hamiltonian describing the motion of particles on a pseudo-Euclidean plane and subjected to a uniform magnetic field along a direction perpendicular to the plane. Therefore, the Hamiltonian \hat{H} can be interpreted as describing a system of $2m$ particles interacting with each other through the potential $V(z_i^-, z_j^+)$ in the background of a pseudo-Euclidean metric $g_{ij} = (-1)^{i+1} \delta_{ij}$ and is subjected to a uniform ‘‘magnetic field’’ γ in the perpendicular directions of each plane ‘ $z_i^- - z_i^+$ ’. This analogy is helpful in using the existing terminologies for systems with magnetic field to describe different physical situations described by \hat{H} . In particular, the operators A_i^\pm have the form of vector potentials in the symmetric gauge producing uniform magnetic field for each ‘ i ’. A unitary transformation may be used to express \hat{H} in the Landau gauge. In particular,

$$S := \exp \left[\frac{i\gamma}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m z_j^+ z_j^- \right],$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{H}_{L_1} &= S^{-1} \hat{H} S = \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\left(P_{z_i^+} + \gamma z_i^- \right)^2 - P_{z_i^-}^2 \right] + V(z_j^-, z_j^+), \\
\hat{H}_{L_2} &= S \hat{H} S^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^m \left[P_{z_i^+}^2 - \left(P_{z_i^-} - \gamma z_i^+ \right)^2 \right] + V(z_j^-, z_j^+).
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

There is no realistic magnetic field in the system and the origin of gauge degrees of freedom should be explained. In fact, this is related to the fact that the Lagrangian corresponding to \hat{H} , \hat{H}_{L_1} and \hat{H}_{L_2} differ by total derivative terms. It may be noted that the concept of analogous vector potential and associated uniform magnetic field has been discussed previously[33] in the context of BO. The vector potentials A_i^\pm are appropriate generalizations for the many-body interacting systems with balanced loss and gain. The concept of different gauge choices, like the symmetric and Landau gauge, in the context of systems with balanced loss and gain is new, which has not appeared in the literature previously. The quantum problem is analyzed in this article for two classes of potentials, (i) translational invariant potentials and (ii) rotationally invariant potentials. The symmetric gauge Hamiltonian \hat{H} will be used throughout this article including rotationally invariant systems, except for section 3, where the systems with translational invariant Hamiltonian are suitably described in terms of the Landau gauge Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{L_1} and \hat{H}_{L_2} . In fact, the box normalization for translational invariant systems with \hat{H} is problematic. The imposition of the periodic boundary condition on the wave-function of \hat{H} leads to inconsistent and non-physical results. This is an example of the fact that classical Lagrangian differing by a total time derivative term may not lead to the same quantum theory, although the classical dynamics for the two cases are identical. Thus, the correct route to quantize a translational invariant classical system with balanced loss and gain is to start with the Lagrangian that lead to \hat{H}_{L_1} or \hat{H}_{L_2} , instead of starting from the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} corresponding to \hat{H} and following the sequence $\mathcal{L} \Rightarrow \hat{H} \Rightarrow \hat{H}_{L_1}(\hat{H}_{L_2})$.

The parity \mathcal{P} and time-reversal symmetry \mathcal{T} are defined as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P} : z_i^+ &\rightarrow -z_i^+, z_i^- \rightarrow z_i^-, P_{z_i^+} \rightarrow -P_{z_i^+}, P_{z_i^-} \rightarrow P_{z_i^-}, \\
\mathcal{T} : z_i^+ &\rightarrow z_i^+, z_i^- \rightarrow z_i^-, P_{z_i^+} \rightarrow -P_{z_i^+}, P_{z_i^-} \rightarrow -P_{z_i^-}.
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The parity transformation defined by Eq. (11) has a proper geometrical interpretation provided the Hamiltonian \hat{H} is identified as describing a system of m particles in two dimensions characterized by z_i^-, z_i^+ coordinates. The terms quadratic in the canonical momenta $P_{z_i^\pm}$ in \hat{H} are invariant under the parity \mathcal{P} and the time-reversal symmetry \mathcal{T} , separately. The same is true for the terms quadratic in the co-ordinates z_i^\pm . However, \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{T} symmetries are broken individually for each term linear in γ with the effect of a change in overall minus sign. Thus, the terms linear in γ are invariant under the combined \mathcal{PT} -transformation. The operators $\Pi_{z_i^\pm} \rightarrow \pm \Pi_{z_i^\pm}$ under \mathcal{PT} transformation. The potential V being real is invariant under \mathcal{T} transformation for its generic form. The \mathcal{PT} -symmetry of the Hamiltonian H thus reduces to \mathcal{P} -symmetry of the potential. The potential is \mathcal{P} -symmetric provided the following condition is satisfied:

$$V(z_i^-, z_i^+) = V(z_i^-, -z_i^+). \tag{12}$$

It is interesting to note that for $V = V(z_i^-)$, Eq. (12) is automatically satisfied and the potential admits a translational symmetry for translation along all z_i^+ directions. The potentials considered in the next section are of this type and therefore allow both translation and parity-time reversal symmetries. It should be emphasized that there is no relation between the translation symmetry and the \mathcal{P} -symmetry, rather the condition (12) is automatically satisfied by translational invariant

potential. The similarity operator S is invariant under the combined \mathcal{PT} transformation, leading to the relations,

$$[\hat{H}, \mathcal{PT}] = 0 \Rightarrow [\hat{H}_{L_1}, \mathcal{PT}] = 0, \quad [\hat{H}_{L_2}, \mathcal{PT}] = 0, \quad (13)$$

which implies invariance of \hat{H}_{L_1} and \hat{H}_{L_2} under the same transformation.

The parity transformation is not unique and a second choice of parity transformation \mathcal{P}_1 is as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}_1 : z_i^+ \rightarrow z_i^+, \quad z_i^- \rightarrow -z_i^-, \quad P_{z_i^+} \rightarrow P_{z_i^+}, \quad P_{z_i^-} \rightarrow -P_{z_i^-}. \quad (14)$$

The Hamiltonian \hat{H} or equivalently \hat{H}_{L_1} (\hat{H}_{L_2}) are $\mathcal{P}_1\mathcal{T}$ invariant provided,

$$V(z_i^-, z_i^+) = V(-z_i^-, z_i^+). \quad (15)$$

For $V = V(z_i^+)$, Eq. (15) is automatically satisfied and the potential admits a translational symmetry for translation along all z_i^- directions. The operator S is $\mathcal{P}_1\mathcal{T}$ invariant, while $\mathcal{P}_1\mathcal{T} : \Pi_{z_i^\pm} \rightarrow -\Pi_{z_i^\pm}$. The Hamiltonian is invariant under both \mathcal{PT} as well as $\mathcal{P}_1\mathcal{T}$ provided V is an even function of its arguments,

$$V(z_i^-, z_i^+) = V(-z_i^-, -z_i^+). \quad (16)$$

It may be noted that \hat{H} can also be interpreted as describing a system of $2m$ particles in one dimension or a single particle in $N = 2m$ dimensions. The parity transformation for the former case is unique, $\mathcal{P}_0 : z_i^\pm \rightarrow -z_i^\pm, P_{z_i^\pm} \rightarrow -P_{z_i^\pm}$, and \hat{H} is not invariant under $\mathcal{P}_0\mathcal{T}$. The parity transformation \mathcal{P}_N in $N = 2m$ dimensions may be defined as, $\mathcal{P}_N : Z \rightarrow WZ, P_Z \rightarrow WP_Z$, where W is a $2m \times 2m$ orthogonal matrix with determinant -1 and $Z^T \equiv (z_1^+, \dots, z_m^+, z_1^-, \dots, z_m^-), P_Z^T \equiv (P_{z_1^+}, \dots, P_{z_m^+}, P_{z_1^-}, \dots, P_{z_m^-})$. The Hamiltonian \hat{H} can be rewritten as,

$$\hat{H} = P_Z^T G P_Z + \gamma Z^T R P_Z - \frac{\gamma^2}{4} Z^T G Z + V(z_i^+, z_i^-), \quad (17)$$

where $G := \sigma_3 \otimes I_m, R := \sigma_1 \otimes I_m$. \hat{H} is $\mathcal{P}_N\mathcal{T}$ invariant provided,

$$[W, G] = 0, \quad \{W, R\} = 0, \quad [V, \mathcal{P}_N\mathcal{T}] = 0. \quad (18)$$

For odd m , the choice $W = G$ allows to identify $\mathcal{P}_N = \mathcal{P}_1$, while $W = -G$ gives $\mathcal{P}_N = \mathcal{P}$. A more general choice for odd m is $W := \sigma_3 \otimes Q$, where Q is an $m \times m$ orthogonal matrix with unit determinant and can be represented in terms of m dimensional rotation matrices. For even m , it appears that an orthogonal matrix W with determinant -1 satisfying (18) can not be found. Thus, $\mathcal{P}_N\mathcal{T}$ -invariant Hamiltonian \hat{H} is not possible in $N = 4m$ dimensions. It appears that the interpretation of \hat{H} as describing a system of m particles in two dimensions is more appropriate than the others from the viewpoint of \mathcal{PT} symmetry. It is known that classical stable solutions and quantum bound states are obtained in systems with balanced loss and gain in the unbroken \mathcal{PT} regime [9, 10, 11, 12]. In this article, only \mathcal{PT} symmetric many-body systems with balanced loss and gain will be considered.

Few comments are in order before the end of this section. The Schwinger-Keldysh formalism is being used in the context of non-equilibrium many-body systems in a variety of contemporary topics like driven open quantum systems[34, 35, 36], time-dependent density-functional theory[37], relativistic hydrodynamics, physics of black-holes, dynamics of entanglement in quantum field theory etc.[38]. It has been shown recently that the Schwinger-Keldysh action at thermodynamic equilibrium is invariant under time-reversal plus time-translation transformations[35, 36, 39].

This result is worth comparing with that of the systems with balanced loss and gain, where an equilibrium is reached in regard to energy transfer between the system and the bath for unbroken \mathcal{PT} symmetry[9, 10, 11]. The invariance under time-translation generates unitary time-evolution and the symmetry is present for both Schwinger-Keldysh action at thermodynamic equilibrium as well as for \hat{H} and similar models[9, 10, 11]. However, the Schwinger-Keldysh action at thermodynamic equilibrium is invariant under time-reversal symmetry, whereas unbroken \mathcal{PT} symmetry is essential for the existence of quantum bound states[9, 10, 11]. It is shown within this context that the \mathcal{PT} symmetry of a many-body two dimensional system embedded in three dimensions may also be identified as a non-conventional time-reversal symmetry $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\epsilon$ in three dimensions[40, 12]:

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\epsilon = \exp(i\epsilon\pi \sum_{i=1}^m J_{z_i^-}) \mathcal{T}, \quad \epsilon = \pm 1, \quad (19)$$

where $J_{z_i^-}$ denotes generator of rotation for the i -th particle around z_i^- -axis. The canonical transformations generated by $\mathcal{PT}(\mathcal{P}_1\mathcal{T})$ and $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_1(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{-1})$ on z_i^\pm and $P_{z_i^\pm}$ are identical. The standard argument that $[h, \mathcal{PT}] = 0$ implies that Hamiltonian h admits entirely real spectra for unbroken \mathcal{PT} symmetry is also valid if \mathcal{PT} is substituted with $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\epsilon$. Further, nontrivial non-hermitian potentials invariant under $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\epsilon$ may be chosen as in the case of systems with \mathcal{PT} symmetry. Thus, it is a matter of choice to identify the symmetry as \mathcal{PT} or $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\epsilon$. In this article, the notion of \mathcal{PT} symmetry will be followed.

In quantum mechanics, the conventional time reversal symmetry may be replaced with an anti-unitary symmetry in order to describe a realistic system. For example, a hydrogen atom in a constant magnetic field is not invariant under the conventional time-reversal symmetry. However, the same Hamiltonian is invariant under a non-conventional time-reversal symmetry [40]. The operator $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\epsilon$ in Eq. (19) defines such a non-conventional anti-unitary symmetry for the systems considered in this article.

3 Translational Invariant Hamiltonian

In this section, translational invariant systems are considered. The Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{L_1} in Eq. (10) has translational invariance for $V_{L_1} \equiv V(\{z_i^-\})$ under the transformation $L_1 : z_i^+ \rightarrow z_i^+ + \eta_i, z_i^- \rightarrow z_i^-$, where η_i 's are m arbitrary constants. A translation of each co-ordinate $x_{2i-1} \rightarrow x_{2i-1} + \frac{\eta_i}{2}, x_{2i} \rightarrow x_{2i} + \frac{\eta_i}{2}$ generates the transformation L_1 . The conserved quantities $P_{z_i^+}$ corresponding to this symmetry are in involution,

$$[\hat{H}_{L_1}, P_{z_i^+}] = 0, [P_{z_i^+}, P_{z_j^+}] = 0. \quad \forall i, j, \quad (20)$$

and may be identified as m integrals of motion. This implies that the system having $N = 2m$ numbers of degree of freedom is at least partially integrable. In order to explore possible complete integrability of \hat{H}_{L_1} , explicit form of the potential V_{L_1} needs to be specified. Note that V_{L_1} and hence, \hat{H}_{L_1} is \mathcal{PT} symmetric due to the condition (12).

The Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{L_2} in Eq. (10) has translational invariance for $V_{L_2} \equiv V(\{z_i^+\})$ under the transformation $L_2 : z_i^+ \rightarrow z_i^+, z_i^- \rightarrow z_i^- + \eta_i$. The transformations $x_{2i-1} \rightarrow x_{2i-1} + \frac{\eta_i}{2}, x_{2i} \rightarrow x_{2i} - \frac{\eta_i}{2}$ generates the transformation L_2 . As in the case of \hat{H}_{L_1} , the existence of m integrals of motions $P_{z_i^-}$ implies \hat{H}_{L_2} is at least partially integrable. The potential V_{L_2} and \hat{H}_{L_2} are $\mathcal{P}_1\mathcal{T}$ symmetric due to the condition (15). There exists a duality transformation between translational invariant \hat{H}_{L_1} and \hat{H}_{L_2} . In particular,

$$z_i^- \leftrightarrow z_i^+, P_{z_i^-} \leftrightarrow P_{z_i^+}, \gamma \leftrightarrow -\gamma, V_{L_1} \leftrightarrow -V_{L_2} \Rightarrow \hat{H}_{L_1} \leftrightarrow -\hat{H}_{L_2}. \quad (21)$$

The duality transformation may be used to relate the eigenspectra of \hat{H}_{L_1} with \hat{H}_{L_2} and vice versa. In particular, if $\chi(\{z_k^-, z_k^+\})$ is an eigenstate of \hat{H}_{L_1} with eigenvalues E_{L_1} , then H_{L_2} has the eigenvalues $-E_{L_1}$ and the eigenstates $\chi(\{z_k^+, z_k^-\})$. Although the functional forms of the potentials V_{L_1} and V_{L_2} are identical, they correspond to entirely different physical systems, when expressed in terms of the original coordinates x_i . In fact, \hat{H}_{L_1} and \hat{H}_{L_2} are not related to each other through any similarity transformation for non-vanishing V_{L_1} and V_{L_2} . In this article, the eigenvalue problem of \hat{H}_{L_1} will be studied in some detail. The eigenvalues and eigenspectra of \hat{H}_{L_2} will be determined by using the duality symmetry.

It is always possible to choose a basis such that simultaneous eigen states of \hat{H}_{L_1} and $P_{z_i^+}$ are constructed, since \hat{H}_{L_1} and $P_{z_i^+}$ commute. The eigen function of the operator $P_{z_j^+}$ having the continuous eigen value k_j , is of the following form:

$$\chi(\{z_k^-, z_k^+\}) = \psi(\{z_k^-\}) \exp \left[i \sum_{j=1}^m z_j^+ k_j \right], \quad (22)$$

where $\psi(\{z_k^-\})$ is a function of the co-ordinates z_k^- only. Substituting (22) in the time independent Schrodinger equation,

$$\hat{H}_{L_1} \chi = E \chi, \quad (23)$$

the following equation is obtained:

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \left[\partial_{z_j^-}^2 + \gamma^2 \left(z_j^- + \frac{k_j}{\gamma} \right)^2 \right] \psi + V_{L_1}(z_j^-) \psi = E \psi. \quad (24)$$

The original eigenvalue problem is defined in terms of $2m$ independent co-ordinates (z_i^-, z_i^+) . However, the Eq. (24) involves only m co-ordinates z_i^- . The decoupling of m co-ordinates z_i^+ from the eigenvalue equation is due to the judicious choice of the wave-function χ in Eq. (22). With the introduction of a new co-ordinate,

$$\tilde{z}_j = z_j^- + \frac{k_j}{\gamma}, \quad (25)$$

the Eq. (24) can be rewritten as an eigenvalue equation in terms of an effective Hamiltonian H_{eff} and energy E_{eff} . In particular,

$$H_{eff} \psi = E_{eff} \psi, \quad (26)$$

where,

$$H_{eff} = - \sum_{j=1}^m \partial_{\tilde{z}_j}^2 + V_{eff}, \quad V_{eff} = -\gamma^2 \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{z}_j^2 - V_{L_1}(\tilde{z}_j), \quad E_{eff} = -E. \quad (27)$$

Thus, if the eigenvalue equation (26) in terms of the effective Hamiltonian with m degrees of freedom is exactly solved for specific choices of V_{L_1} , the same is true for the Hamiltonian H_{L_1} with $2m$ degrees of freedom. It should be mentioned here that for $V_{L_1} = 0$, the Eq. (27) decouples into m second order differential equations, where each equation describes eigen value equation of an ‘‘inverted harmonic oscillator’’ with shifted origin. No bound states are possible for this case. However, proper choices of V_{L_1} can convert the ‘‘inverted harmonic oscillator’’ to simple harmonic oscillator plus some desirable interactions. A few such examples are discussed below.

3.1 Simple Harmonic Oscillator

For the choice of the potential,

$$V_{L_1}(z_i^-) = -\frac{\omega^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m (z_i^-)^2, \quad (28)$$

and $\gamma^2 \neq \omega^2$, Eq. (24) can be re-written as,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^m \left[-\partial_{z_j}^2 + \Omega^2 z_j^2 \right] \psi &= (-\tilde{E})\psi, \\ \Omega^2 &= \frac{1}{2}(\omega^2 - 2\gamma^2), \quad \tilde{E} = E - \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\omega^2 k_j^2}{2\Omega^2}, \quad z_j = z_j^- - \frac{\gamma k_j}{\Omega^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The modified angular frequency $\Omega = \pm \sqrt{\frac{\omega^2 - 2\gamma^2}{2}}$ can take positive as well as negative values. As will be seen later, the normalization of the wave-function requires $\Omega < 0$. This is related to the fact that the eigen-value equation of a simple harmonic oscillator is different from that of first equation in Eq. (29) due to the appearance of a negative sign in the right hand side of this equation. The reality of Ω is ensured for $-\frac{\omega}{\sqrt{2}} \leq \gamma \leq \frac{\omega}{\sqrt{2}}$. For $m = 1$, the Hamiltonian H actually describes a Bateman oscillator with a coupling term of the form $-\frac{\omega^2}{4}(x_1^2 + x_2^2) = -\frac{\omega^2}{4}[(z_1^-)^2 + (z_1^+)^2]$, which has been considered previously[9]. In fact, a choice of the parameter $\epsilon = -\omega^2$ in Eq. (4) of Ref. [9] reduces to the model under consideration in this section. The choice of the parameter corresponds to broken \mathcal{PT} regime and it should be mentioned here that the specific type of solutions presented for this model in this article have not been discussed previously in the literature. Further, the normalization of wave-functions for both the long-range and short-range Calogero-type models with confining harmonic term is similar to the case of pure harmonic oscillators. Thus, the present example will also be used to explain the normalization scheme for Calogero-type models to be discussed in next sections.

The first equation of Eq. (29) is separable into eigenvalue equations of m oscillators with frequency Ω . The eigenvalues and eigenfunctions are,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\{n_i\},\{k_i\}} &= \sum_{i=1}^m \left[-\left(n_i + \frac{1}{2}\right) 2\Omega + \frac{\omega^2 k_i^2}{2\Omega^2} \right], \quad \{n_i\} \in \mathbb{N}^*, \quad \{k_i\} \in \mathfrak{R}, \\ \chi_{\{n_i\},\{k_i\}} &= \left(\frac{\Omega}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{m}{4}} \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n_i} n_i!}} H_{n_i}(\sqrt{\Omega} z_i) \exp \left[-\frac{\Omega}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m z_i^2 + i \sum_{j=1}^m z_j^+ k_j \right], \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $H_{n_i}(\sqrt{\Omega} z_i)$ is the Hermite polynomial. The energy $E_{\{n_i\},\{k_i\}}$ is bounded from below and positive definite for $\Omega < 0$. The asymptotic nature of χ is given by

$$\chi \sim \exp \left[-\frac{\Omega}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m z_i^2 + i \sum_{j=1}^m z_j^+ k_j \right] \quad (31)$$

and is not normalizable along the real z_i lines for $\Omega < 0$. It is required to fix the proper Stoke wedges in order to have normalizable solutions. For $\Omega < 0$, in Eq. (31) the first term in the exponential becomes $\frac{\Omega}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m z_i^2$. An extension of the $z_i, \forall i$, in complex plane gives

$\sum_{i=1}^m z_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \cos(2\theta_i) + i \sin(2\theta_i)$. For normalizable solution the real part of $\sum_{i=1}^m z_i^2$ should be negative, i.e.

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \cos(2\theta_i) < 0. \quad (32)$$

A possible solution of which may be obtained for $\theta_i = \theta, \forall i$. In this case, $Re(\sum_{i=1}^m z_i^2) = m \cos(2\theta)$. Therefore, the exponential part containing $\sum_{i=1}^m z_i^2$ vanishes in a pair of Stoke wedges with opening angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$ and centered about the positive and negative imaginary axes in the complex z_i -planes. It should be mentioned that the Stoke wedge for which the wave function is normalizable is not unique. Any possible solution satisfying condition (32) gives a Stoke wedge in which the wave function is normalizable. For example, for $m = 2$, one needs to have $\cos(2\theta_1) + \cos(2\theta_2) < 0$ in order to get a normalizable solution. One possibility of achieving this is to take both $\cos(2\theta_1)$ and $\cos(2\theta_2)$ negative. In this case the Stoke wedge for each complex z_i planes are as discussed above. Another possibility is to take $\cos(2\theta_1)$ negative and $\cos(2\theta_2)$ positive but $|\cos(2\theta_1)| > |\cos(2\theta_2)|$. Now, $\cos(2\theta_1)$ is negative for θ_1 in the ranges $\frac{\pi}{4} < \theta_1 < \frac{3\pi}{4}$ and $\frac{5\pi}{4} < \theta_1 < \frac{7\pi}{4}$ and $\cos(2\theta_2)$ is positive for θ_2 in the ranges $\frac{-\pi}{4} < \theta_2 < \frac{\pi}{4}$ and $\frac{-5\pi}{4} < \theta_2 < \frac{5\pi}{4}$. In order to have normalizable solutions one may take values of θ_1 and θ_2 from the specified ranges such that condition (32) is satisfied.

Another issue of normalization arises because of the plane-wave nature of the wave-function in z_i^+ directions. The system is not normalizable unless it is bounded along the $z_i^+, \forall i$ directions. In order to address this issue the system is assumed to be bounded within the length L along $z_i^+, \forall i$ directions with a periodic boundary condition $\chi(z_i^+ + L, z_i) = \chi(z_i^+, z_i)$. This boundary condition necessitates the quantization of $k_j = \frac{2\pi}{L}l_j, l_j = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$. The energy eigenvalues in Eq. (30) contain discrete as well as continuous spectra. After the box normalization, the energy gets completely quantized,

$$E_{\{n_i\}, \{m_i\}} = \sum_{i=1}^m \left[- \left(n_i + \frac{1}{2} \right) 2\Omega + \frac{2\pi^2 \omega^2 l_i^2}{L^2 \Omega^2} \right], \quad \{n_i, l_i\} \in \mathbb{N}^*, \quad \Omega < 0. \quad (33)$$

The same normalization scheme, i.e. (i) fixing the Stoke wedge and (ii) employing box normalization along z_i^+ coordinates, will be used for the CMS-type long-range as well as short-range models considered in section 3.2.

The eigenvalue problem of \hat{H}_{L_2} with the potential

$$V_{L_2}(z_i^+) = \frac{\omega^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m (z_i^+)^2, \quad (34)$$

can be studied by using the duality transformation (21). The potential corresponds to the choice of the parameter $\epsilon = \omega^2$ in Eq. (4) of Ref. [9] and the system is in broken \mathcal{PT} regime. The energy eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of \hat{H}_{L_2} are found using Eq. (21) as,

$$E_{\{n_i\}, \{k_i\}} = \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\left(n_i + \frac{1}{2} \right) 2\Omega - \frac{\omega^2 k_i^2}{2\Omega^2} \right], \quad \{n_i\} \in \mathbb{N}^*, \quad \{k_i\} \in \mathfrak{R},$$

$$\chi_{\{n_i\}, \{k_i\}} = \left(\frac{\Omega}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{m}{4}} \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n_i} n_i!}} H_{n_i}(\sqrt{\Omega} \tilde{z}_i^+) \exp \left[-\frac{\Omega}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m (\tilde{z}_i^+)^2 + i \sum_{j=1}^m z_j^- k_j \right], \quad (35)$$

with $\tilde{z}_i^+ = z_i^+ + \frac{\gamma k_j}{\Omega^2}$. The wave-function is normalizable along the real axis for $\Omega > 0$. However, the eigenvalue is neither bounded from below nor from above. On the other hand, the eigenvalue

is bounded from above for $\Omega < 0$ and the wave-function is normalizable in the same Stoke wedges as in the case of V_{L_1} in Eq. (28). Thus, the Hamiltonian $-\hat{H}_{L_2}$ has a well-defined ground-state with normalizable wave-function. Further, the box-normalization may be used to obtain complete spectra.

3.2 Rational CMS-type many-body systems

The BO describing a balanced loss and gain system in a harmonic well and without any coupling does not allow classical stable solutions. However, stable classical solutions can be obtained for various choices of the potential V in (1) [9, 10, 15, 11, 12]. In Ref. [12] a many particle model with four-body interaction in one dimension in the presence of balanced loss and gain terms is introduced and its exact stable classical solutions are obtained. The purpose of this section is to discuss the quantization and to find exact solutions of some of the Calogero-type many-body systems in the presence of balanced loss and gain. In particular, the quantization of a many-body system with balanced loss and gain and are interacting via four-body inverse square potential plus pair-wise two-body harmonic term is considered. In z_i^- coordinate this potential takes the following form:

$$V_I(z_i^-) = -\frac{\omega^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m (z_i^-)^2 - \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^m \frac{g}{(z_i^- - z_j^-)^2}. \quad (36)$$

Apart from a negative sign, the potential in Eq. (36) is the reminiscent of rational CMS model describing a one dimensional many-particle system interacting with each other via a long range inverse square potential and are confined by a common harmonic potential. This potential is exactly solvable and can be mapped to a set of free harmonic oscillators[41]. The inverse square part of the potential remains invariant under any constant shift of the coordinates z_i^- . It should be noted that the potential (36) in transformed z_i^- coordinates admits a permutation symmetry which is partly lost, when it is expressed in terms of the original coordinates x_i :

$$V_I = \sum_{i=1}^m -\frac{\omega^2}{4} (x_{2i-1} - x_{2i})^2 - \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^m \frac{2g}{(x_{2i-1} - x_{2i} - x_{2j-1} + x_{2j})^2}. \quad (37)$$

Many-body systems with four-body interaction have been considered earlier. For example, the exactly solvable quantum models of CMS-type with translational invariant two and four-body interactions is investigated in Ref. [31] and exactly solvable model with translational non-invariant four-body interaction is discussed in Ref. [32]. The most general four-body inverse-square interaction for a many-particle system with $2m$ number of particles has the form[30]:

$$V_4 = \sum_{\substack{i,j,p,q=1 \\ i \neq j \neq p \neq q}}^{2m} \frac{g}{(x_i - x_j - x_p + x_q)^2}. \quad (38)$$

This potential admits a permutation symmetry and remains invariant under all the operations of a permutation group S_{2m} . On the other hand, the potential V_I is not invariant under all the operations of a permutation group S_{2m} . However, if we map each pair of particles $(x_{2i-1}, x_{2i}), i = 1, \dots, m$ to one element of a permutation group S_m , then V_I remains invariant under all the operations of the permutation group S_m and obviously this forms a subgroup of the larger group S_{2m} . It may be recalled that the Hamiltonian formulation of generic many-body systems with

balanced loss and gain is possible, only when the balancing of loss and gain terms occurs in a pair-wise fashion. A set of pairs $(x_{2i-1}, x_{2i}), i = 1, \dots, m$ is chosen in this article out of $m(2m-1)$ number of possible sets of pairs. The union of elements of S_m corresponding to each such set gives all the elements of S_{2m} .

The potential V_I is singular at $m(m-1)/2$ points. The configuration space is divided into $\frac{m(m-1)}{2}$ disjoint sectors. The standard approach is to solve the eigen-value equation in the one of the sectors, say $z_1^- < z_2^- < \dots < z_m^-$, and then use the permutation symmetry of the Hamiltonian to extend the solutions to all the sectors of the configuration space. The Hamiltonian \hat{H}_L is not invariant under permutation symmetry of S_{2m} . However, the effective Hamiltonian is invariant under permutation symmetry under the operations of S_m , since z_i^+ degrees of freedom decouples completely. Thus, the same approach as in the case of rational CMS model may be taken for V_I also.

The second CMS-type model considered in this section has the following potential:

$$V_{II}(z_i^-) = -\frac{\omega^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m (z_i^-)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{2g}{(z_i^- - z_{i+1}^-)^2} + \sum_{i=2}^{m-1} \frac{2G}{(z_{i-1}^- - z_i^-)(z_i^- - z_{i+1}^-)}. \quad (39)$$

The potential V_{II} describes short-range nearest-neighbour and next-to-nearest neighbour interactions that was introduced and studied in Ref. [42]. The model is not completely solvable. However, infinitely many exact states can be obtained analytically. The ground-state wavefunction is related to the joint probability density function of the eigenvalues of short-range Dyson models[42]. The potential V_{II} , when expressed in x_i coordinates, describes short-range four-body and six-body inverse-square interactions in presence of pair-wise harmonic confinement.

3.2.1 Solution for V_I

For the potential V_I in Eq. (36) and with $k_j = k \forall j$, Eq. (24) reduces to the following form:

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \left(-\partial_{z_j}^2 + \Omega^2 z_j^2 \right) \psi + \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^m \frac{g}{(z_i - z_j)^2} \psi = -\tilde{E} \psi. \quad (40)$$

The Eq. (40) takes the form of a many body system interacting via an inverse-square two-body potential in a harmonic well[18] with angular frequency Ω . The solutions are taken to have the following form:

$$\psi = \prod_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^m (z_i - z_j)^\lambda \phi(r) P_l(z), \quad r^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m z_i^2, \quad \lambda = \frac{1}{2} [1 + (1 + 4g)^{\frac{1}{2}}], \quad (41)$$

where $P_l(z_1, \dots, z_m)$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree $l \geq 0$ satisfying the generalized Laplace equation[17]. The normalizable solution of $\psi(r)$ has the following form[18]:

$$\phi_n(r) = \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\Omega r^2\right] L_n^b[\Omega r^2], \quad n = 0, 1, 2, 3\dots \quad (42)$$

with L_n^b being the Laguerre polynomial and $b = \frac{-\tilde{E}}{2\Omega} - 2n - 1$. The energy eigenvalues are[18]

$$E = -2\Omega[2n + l + \frac{1}{2}m + \frac{\lambda}{2}m(m-1)] + \frac{mk^2\omega^2}{2\Omega^2}. \quad (43)$$

The energy eigenvalues become negative and unbounded from below in the $k = 0$ sector, unless $\Omega < 0$. This in turn necessitates the normalization of the wave functions in proper Stoke wedges. Since, the asymptotic form of the total wave function χ for the potential V_I is given by Eq. (31) with $k_j = k\forall j$, its normalization in proper Stoke wedges is the same as considered at the end of section-3 for the case of simple harmonic oscillators. The eigenvalues consists of discrete as well as continuous spectra. The box-normalization may be used to confine the particles with continuous spectra within a length L along their co-ordinates. The momentum vector k gets quantized and the energy E has the expression,

$$E = -2\Omega[2n + l + \frac{1}{2}m + \frac{\lambda}{2}m(m-1)] + \frac{2m\pi^2\omega^2i^2}{L^2\Omega^2}, \quad \Omega < 0, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (44)$$

It may be noted that this is not the complete spectra due to the assumption $k_j = k\forall j$. It is not apparent whether or not analytical eigen spectra may be obtained for V_I with m independent k_j 's.

The eigenvalue problem of \hat{H}_{L_2} for the potential $V_{L_2}(z_i^+) = -V_I(z_i^+)$ can be studied by using the duality transformation (21). In x_i coordinates the potential V_{L_2} has the following form

$$V_{L_2}(x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\omega^2}{4} (x_{2i-1} + x_{2i})^2 + \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^m \frac{g}{2(x_{2i-1} + x_{2i} - x_{2j-1} - x_{2j})^2}. \quad (45)$$

It is evident that although the functional form of V_{L_2} and $V_I(z_i^-)$ are same, they correspond to entirely different physical systems when expressed in the coordinates x_i . The energy spectra for the eigenvalue problem of \hat{H}_{L_2} for the potential $V_{L_2}(z_i^+) = -V_I(z_i^+)$ is given by

$$E = 2\Omega[2n + l + \frac{1}{2}m + \frac{\lambda}{2}m(m-1)] - \frac{mk^2\omega^2}{2\Omega^2}. \quad (46)$$

The eigenvalue is bounded from above for $\Omega < 0$ and the wave-function is normalizable in the complex z_i^+ planes in the same Stoke wedges as in the case of $V_I(z_i^-)$ ensuring that the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{L_2} has a well-defined ground-state with normalizable wave-function for the potential $V_{L_2}(z_i^+)$. In this case the box-normalization may also be used to obtain complete spectra as discussed for the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{L_1} with the potential $V_I(z_i^-)$.

3.2.2 Correlation functions for the potential V_I

The ground state wave function for the potential V_I is given by:

$$\chi \sim \prod_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^m |z_i - z_j|^\lambda \exp \left[-\frac{\Omega}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m z_j^2 \right], \quad (47)$$

and χ is independent of z_i^+ . A scale transformation $y_i = \sqrt{\frac{\Omega}{\lambda}} z_i$ of z_i coordinates gives

$$|\chi|^2 = C \prod_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^m |y_i - y_j|^{2\lambda} \exp \left(\sum_{j=1}^m -\lambda y_j^2 \right), \quad (48)$$

where C is the normalization constant and is given by

$$C^{-1} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\chi(y_1, \dots, y_m)|^2 \prod_{i=1}^m dy_i dz_i^+. \quad (49)$$

Since, $\Omega < 0$ and $\lambda > 0$, the scale transformation $y_i = \sqrt{\frac{\Omega}{\lambda}} z_i$ also involves a rotation by $\frac{\pi}{2}$ in the complex z_i plane which takes care that all the relevant integrations are carried out in proper Stoke wedge. It should be noted that the system is not normalizable unless it is bounded along the z_i^+ , $\forall i$ directions. It is assumed that the system is bounded within the length L along z_i^+ , $\forall i$ directions. The expression for C may now be written as[18]:

$$C = \frac{[\Gamma(1 + \lambda)]^m}{L^m (2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}m} (2\lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}m - \frac{1}{2}\lambda m(m-1)} \prod_{j=1}^m \Gamma(1 + \lambda_j)}. \quad (50)$$

The constant C vanishes in the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, since the particles in z_i^+ directions are no more confined. The n -particle correlation function for the model V_I in the x_i coordinate may be defined as:

$$R_n(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\chi(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)|^2 \prod_{i=n+1}^N dx_i, \quad n < N. \quad (51)$$

It should be noted that the coordinate transformation (2) maps the original problem of many-body systems with balanced loss and gain and are interacting via four-body inverse square potential plus pair-wise two-body harmonic term to the rational CMS model with a common harmonic confinement. Therefore, it is expected that the correlation functions of Eq. (51) can be mapped to the correlation function corresponding to the rational CMS model with a common harmonic confinement. However, due the special nature of the transformation (2), only the even $2n$ point correlation functions of Eq. (51) in x_i coordinate can be mapped to the rational CMS model. In particular, Eq. (51) may be rewritten as:

$$R_{2n}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{2n}) = \frac{N!}{(N-2n)!} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\chi(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)|^2 \prod_{i=n+1}^m dx_{2i-1} dx_{2i}, \quad n < m. \quad (52)$$

which after the coordinate transformation of the form (2) takes the following form:

$$R_{2n} = \frac{N!}{(N-2n)!} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\chi(z_1^+, \dots, z_m^+, z_1^-, \dots, z_m^-)|^2 \prod_{i=n+1}^m dz_i^+ dz_i^-. \quad (53)$$

Since $|\chi|^2$ is independent of z_i^+ coordinates, Eq. (53), after integrating over the z_i^+ variables takes the following form:

$$R_{2n} = \frac{N! L^{m-n}}{(N-2n)!} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\chi(z_1^-, \dots, z_m^-)|^2 \prod_{i=n+1}^m dz_i^-. \quad (54)$$

Substituting the expression for $|\chi|^2$ from Eq. (48), the following Eq. is obtained

$$R_{2n} = \frac{CN! L^{m-n}}{(N-2n)!} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \prod_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^m |y_i - y_j|^{2\lambda} \exp\left(\sum_{j=1}^m -\lambda y_j^2\right) \prod_{i=n+1}^m dy_i. \quad (55)$$

The right hand side of Eq. (55), apart from a multiplicative factor, gives the $2n$ -particle correlation function for rational CMS model with a common harmonic confinement. For $n = 1$, the 2-particle correlation function is obtained as:

$$R_2 = \begin{cases} \frac{N(N-1)}{m\pi L}(2m - y^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, & y^2 < 2m \\ 0, & y^2 > 2m. \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

For $n = 2$, the 4-particle correlation function is obtained as:

$$R_4 = \frac{N!(m-2)!}{L^2 m!(N-4)!}(1 - Y(s)), \quad s = \frac{2\sqrt{m}}{\pi}|y_1 - y_2|. \quad (57)$$

The expressions of $Y(s)$ for various λ are as given in Ref.[18].

It should be noted that the correlation functions for the eigenvalue problem of \hat{H}_{L_2} for the potential $V_{L_2}(z_i^+) = -V_I(z_i^+)$ can be obtained in a similar manner as discussed above for the eigenvalue problem of \hat{H}_{L_1} for the potential $V_I(z_i^-)$. This is an important result due to the duality symmetry (21), since the potentials $V_{L_2}(z_i^+)$ and $V_I(z_i^-)$ correspond to entirely different physical systems when expressed in the x_i coordinates.

3.2.3 Solution for V_{II}

For the potential V_{II} in Eq. (39) and $k_j = k \forall j$, Eq. (24) reduces to the following form:

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \left(-\partial_{z_j}^2 + \Omega^2 z_j^2 \right) \psi + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{2g}{(z_i - z_{i+1})^2} \psi - \sum_{i=2}^{m-1} \frac{2G\psi}{(z_{i-1} - z_i)(z_i - z_{i+1})} = -\tilde{E}\psi, \quad (58)$$

and the solutions are taken to be of the form:

$$\psi_n = \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} (z_i - z_{i+1})^\lambda \phi(r) P_l(z), \quad g = \lambda(\lambda - 1), \quad G = \lambda^2. \quad (59)$$

where $P_l(z_1, \dots, z_m)$ is a translation-invariant homogeneous polynomial of degree $l \geq 0$ [42]. The normalizable solutions for ϕ can readily be obtained as[42]:

$$\phi_n(r) = \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\Omega r^2\right] L_n^b[\Omega r^2], \quad n = 0, 1, 2, 3\dots \quad (60)$$

with L_n^b being the Laguerre polynomial and $b = \frac{\tilde{E}}{2\Omega} - 2n - 1$. The energy eigenvalues are

$$\tilde{E} = -2\Omega\left[2n + l + \frac{m}{2} + \lambda(m-1)\right]. \quad (61)$$

It should be noted that the energy eigenvalues become negative, unless $\Omega < 0$. This fact necessitates the normalization of the wave functions in proper Stoke wedges. Since, the total wave function χ corresponding to the potential V_{II} has the asymptotic form of Eq. (31), the normalization in proper Stoke wedges is the same as considered at the end of section-3. The expression for E and its fully quantized form may be obtained in a similar way as in the case of V_I and may be written as

$$E = -2\Omega\left[2n + l + \frac{m}{2} + \lambda(m-1)\right] + \frac{2m\pi^2\omega^2 i^2}{L^2\Omega^2}, \quad \Omega < 0, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (62)$$

It may be noted that this is not the complete spectra due to the assumption $k_j = k \forall j$. It is not apparent whether or not analytical eigen spectra may be obtained for V_I with m independent k_j 's.

The eigenvalue problem of \hat{H}_{L_2} for the potential $V_{L_2}(z_i^+) = -V_{II}(z_i^+)$ can also be studied by using the duality transformation (21). The energy spectra for the eigenvalue problem of \hat{H}_{L_2} for the potential $V_{L_2}(z_i^+) = -V_{II}(z_i^+)$ may be written by exploiting the duality symmetry, in the following form:

$$E = 2\Omega[2n + l + \frac{m}{2} + \lambda(m - 1)] - \frac{mk^2\omega^2}{2\Omega^2}. \quad (63)$$

The eigenvalue is bounded from above for $\Omega < 0$ and the wave-function is normalizable in the same Stoke wedges in the complex z_i^+ planes as in the case of $V_{II}(z_i^-)$. In this case the box-normalization may also be used to obtain complete spectra as discussed for the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{L_1} with the potential $V_{II}(z_i^-)$.

3.2.4 Correlation functions for the potential V_{II}

The ground state wave function for the potential V_{II} is given by:

$$\chi \sim \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} |z_i - z_{i+1}|^\lambda \exp \left[-\frac{\Omega}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m z_j^2 \right], \quad (64)$$

which is independent of z_i^+ . A scale transformation $y_i = \sqrt{\frac{\Omega}{\lambda}} z_i$ of z_i coordinates gives,

$$|\chi|^2 = C \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} |y_i - y_{i+1}|^{2\lambda} \exp \left(\sum_{j=1}^m -\lambda y_j^2 \right), \quad (65)$$

where C is the normalization constant. The box normalization and the integration over z_i^+ coordinate are as discussed before for the case of calculating the correlation function for the potential V_I . Apart from a constant factor the two and four particle correlation functions for the potential V_{II} can be mapped to the one and two point correlation functions as discussed in Ref. [42] for the potential V_{II} . Therefore, in the present case the two and four particle correlation functions for the potential V_{II} are respectively given as:

$$R_2 = \frac{N(N-1)}{2\pi L} \frac{\sqrt{|\Omega|}}{\sqrt{2\pi(1+\lambda)}} \exp \left[-\frac{|\Omega|z_1^2}{2(1+\lambda)} \right], \quad (66)$$

$$R_4^\lambda(s) = \frac{N!(m-2)!}{L^2 m!(N-4)!} \sum_{k=1}^{\lambda} B^k \exp[(1+\lambda)s\{B^k - 1\}], \quad B = \exp\left(\frac{2i\pi}{1+\lambda}\right), \quad (67)$$

for any integer λ .

It should be noted that the correlation functions for the eigenvalue problem of \hat{H}_{L_2} for the potential $V_{L_2}(z_i^+) = -V_{II}(z_i^+)$ can also be obtained in a similar manner as discussed above for the eigenvalue problem of \hat{H}_{L_1} for the potential potential $V_{II}(z_i^-)$. This is an important result and is the manifestation of the duality symmetry (21). It should be noted that although the potentials $V_{L_2}(z_i^+)$ and $V_{II}(z_i^-)$ have the same functional form, they correspond to entirely different physical systems when expressed in the x_i coordinates.

4 Rotationally invariant potential

The Lagrangian of BO is invariant under hyperbolic rotation and the same symmetry persists in the quantum case. Stable classical solutions are not possible, if the two oscillators of Batman Hamiltonian are coupled maintaining this rotational symmetry and the result remains unchanged for a generalized model with $2m$ particles[12]. The quantum problem of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (7) with a rotationally symmetric potential is considered in this section. The radial variable R in the pseudo-Euclidean co-ordinate with the metric $g_{ij} = (-1)^{i+1}\delta_{ij}$ is defined as,

$$R^2 = 2 \sum_{i=1}^m x_{2i-1} x_{2i} = \sum_{i=1}^m \left[(z_i^+)^2 - (z_i^-)^2 \right], \quad (68)$$

and the potential is taken to be $V \equiv V(R)$. It should be noted that in this case the condition (16) is automatically satisfied and the Hamiltonian becomes both \mathcal{PT} and $\mathcal{P}_1\mathcal{T}$ symmetric. The Hamiltonian in Eq. (7) with $\gamma = 0$ is rotational invariant. It may be noted that the rotational invariance of the Hamiltonian is partially lost for $\gamma \neq 0$, since the term linear in γ is the sum of angular momenta for rotations in m planes specified by ' $z_i^- - z_i^+$ '. The Hamiltonian is invariant under rotation when the planes of rotations are chosen as ' $z_i^- - z_i^+$ '. The m integrals of motion L_i may be defined for this system which are in involution. In particular,

$$L_i = -i \left(z_i^+ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i^-} + z_i^- \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i^+} \right), \quad [L_i, L_j] = 0, \quad [H, L_i] = 0, \quad (69)$$

implying that the system is at least partially integrable. It may be noted that the integrals of motion can also be identified as generators of rotation in m planes of rotations ' $z_i^- - z_i^+$ '.

It is found in Ref. [12] that the classical solutions for a chain of nonlinear oscillators belonging to this class of models are unstable. It may be shown that the quantum Hamiltonian with generic rotationally invariant potential $V(R)$ does not admit entirely real spectra. There are complex as well as real eigenvalues in the spectra, implying the existence of growing and decaying modes. To see this, an imaginary scale transformation,

$$z_i^- \rightarrow -iz_i^-, \quad P_{z_i^-} \rightarrow iP_{z_i^-}, \quad z_i^+ \rightarrow z_i^+, \quad P_{z_i^+} \rightarrow P_{z_i^+}, \quad (70)$$

is performed on the Hamiltonian (8) which reduces to the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \mathcal{H} + i\gamma\mathcal{L}, \\ \mathcal{H} &= \sum_{i=1}^m (P_{z_i^+}^2 + P_{z_i^-}^2) - \frac{\gamma^2}{4} \tilde{R}^2 + V(\tilde{R}), \quad \mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^m (z_i^+ P_{z_i^-} - z_i^- P_{z_i^+}), \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where \tilde{R} is the radial variable in the $2m$ dimensional Euclidean space. It may be noted that after the imaginary scale transformation has been performed, the quantum problem is defined in a Hilbert space in which \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{L} are hermitian[43, 44]. The operator \mathcal{L} has the interpretation of the sum of angular momentum operators in Euclidean space corresponding to rotations in m planes of rotations ' $z_i^- - z_i^+$ '. The operators \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{L} commute with each other and therefore admit simultaneous eigen states. With the suitable choices of $V(\tilde{R})$, entirely real spectra with normalizable eigenfunctions may be obtained for \mathcal{H} . However, due to the presence of the imaginary coupling $i\gamma$, the eigenvalues of H become complex with the exceptions for the cases corresponding to the zero eigenvalue of the operator \mathcal{L} . As an example, the Hamiltonian[43, 44] of the Pais-Uhlenbeck oscillator(PUO) after an imaginary scale transformation of variables as above has been performed is similar to \mathcal{H} for the choice of the potential,

$$V(\tilde{R}) = \frac{\omega^2}{4} \tilde{R}^2, \quad \omega^2 > \gamma^2. \quad (72)$$

It is known[43, 44] that consistent quantum mechanical description with well defined bound states is possible for PUO. Thus, the Hamiltonian H does not admit entirely real spectra due to the coupling $i\gamma$ in the second term. It follows from the discussions above that the necessary condition for a Hamiltonian describing a system with balanced loss and gain to admit entirely real spectra is,

$$[V(\{z_i^-\}, \{z_i^+\}), L_i] \neq 0 \forall i. \quad (73)$$

In other words, the vanishing commutators among $V(\{z_i^-\}, \{z_i^+\})$ and L_i 's imply that the spectra contains complex eigenvalues. Consequently, no bound states can be formed.

5 Systems with $O(2, 1)$ symmetry:

The BO has dynamical $SU(1, 1)$ symmetry[33] which can be used to find its complete spectra. The purpose of this section is to investigate systems with balanced loss and gain with specific class of V such that dynamical $SU(1, 1)$ is preserved. Further, it is known that systems with inverse-square interactions are examples of conformal quantum mechanics and appear in diverse branches of physics[45, 21, 46]. The basic underlying symmetry of such systems are $O(2, 1)$ which is related to $SU(1, 1)$. The rational CMS models belongs to this class and the entire spectra corresponding to radial excitations may be found by using the underlying $O(2, 1)$ symmetry. The CMS-type models discussed in Sec. 3.1.1 appear as an effective system with reduced degrees of freedom. In this section, $O(2, 1)$ symmetric systems with $N = 2m$ degrees of freedom are discussed.

Three operators H_0 , D and K are defined in the following fashion:

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\Pi_{z_i^+}^2 - \Pi_{z_i^-}^2 \right) + V_c(z_i^-, z_i^+), \\ D &= -\frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(z_i^+ \Pi_{z_i^+} + z_i^- \Pi_{z_i^-} + \Pi_{z_i^+} z_i^+ + \Pi_{z_i^-} z_i^- \right), \\ K &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(z_i^{+2} - z_i^{-2} \right) = \frac{R^2}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

where the potential $V_c(z_i^-, z_i^+)$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree -2 ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \left[z_i^- \partial_{z_i^-} + z_i^+ \partial_{z_i^+} \right] V_c(z_i^-, z_i^+) = -2V_c(z_i^-, z_i^+). \quad (75)$$

The Hamiltonian is \mathcal{PT} symmetric for $V_c(z_i^-, z_i^+) = V_c(z_i^-, -z_i^+)$. The operator K is \mathcal{PT} symmetric, while D is not invariant under \mathcal{PT} . The operators H_0, D and K satisfy the $O(2, 1)$ algebra:

$$[H_0, D] = iH, \quad [H_0, K] = 2iD, \quad [D, K] = iK. \quad (76)$$

The operators,

$$K_1 = \frac{1}{2}(K + H_0), \quad K_2 = \frac{1}{2}(K - H_0), \quad K_3 = D, \quad (77)$$

satisfy the $SU(1, 1)$ algebra:

$$[K_1, K_2] = iK_3, \quad [K_1, K_3] = iK_2, \quad [K_3, K_2] = iK_1. \quad (78)$$

With the choice of the potential $V(z_i^-, z_i^+)$ in Eq. (8) as,

$$V(z_i^-, z_i^+) = 2V_c(z_i^-, z_i^+) + \beta^2 R^2, \quad (79)$$

the Hamiltonian H can be expressed in terms of H_0 and K as,

$$H = 2(H_0 + \beta^2 K). \quad (80)$$

Note that H is \mathcal{PT} symmetric. In the limit of vanishing β , H and H_0 are related as $H = 2H_0$. It is argued in the previous section that the spectra is not entirely real for rotationally invariant V . In order to avoid such situation, it is assumed that V_c is not rotationally invariant.

The eigenvalue problem of H is discussed below with the help of the $O(2, 1)$ symmetry. Following coordinate transformation is employed:

$$\begin{aligned} z_1^+ &= R \cosh \theta_1, \\ z_1^- &= R \sinh \theta_1 \cosh \theta_2, \\ &\dots\dots\dots \\ z_m^+ &= R \sinh \theta_1 \sinh \theta_2 \sinh \theta_3 \dots\dots \cosh \theta_{2m-1}, \\ z_m^- &= R \sinh \theta_1 \sinh \theta_2 \sinh \theta_3 \dots\dots \sinh \theta_{2m-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

In this $2m$ dimensional coordinate, the Hamiltonian H can be re-written as,

$$H = \Pi_R^2 + \beta^2 R^2 + \frac{\tilde{C}}{R^2}, \quad \tilde{C} = 4C - m(m-2), \quad (82)$$

where $\Pi_R^2 = -(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial R^2} + \frac{(2m-1)}{R} \frac{\partial}{\partial R})$ is the radial part of the conjugate momenta, C is the Casimir operator of the $O(2, 1)$ symmetry,

$$C = \frac{1}{2} (H_0 K + K H_0) - D^2 \quad (83)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \left[\sum_{i < j}^m -L_{ij}^2 + R^2 V + m(m-2) \right], \quad (84)$$

and $L_{ij} = (z_i^+ \Pi_{z_j^-} + z_i^- \Pi_{z_j^+})$ are the components of angular momentum operators. The Hamiltonian H can always be separated into a radial part and an angular part in the $2m$ dimensional coordinate defined by Eq. (81), since the term $R^2 V$ contains only the angular variables. In particular, the equation for the radial variable R may be obtained from the time independent Schrodinger equation $H\xi(R)Y(\theta_i, \phi_i) = E\xi(R)Y(\theta_i, \phi_i)$ in the following form,

$$\frac{d^2 \xi}{dR^2} + \frac{(2m-1)}{R} \frac{d\xi}{dR} + (E - \beta^2 R^2 - \frac{C'}{R^2})\xi = 0, \quad (85)$$

where C' is the eigenvalue of the operator \tilde{C} . The normalizable solution of the radial variable equation can readily be obtained as:

$$\xi(R) = C_N R^{2s} \exp[-\frac{\beta}{2} R^2] L_n^{2s+m-1}(\beta R^2), \quad s = \frac{-(m-1) + \sqrt{C' + (m-1)^2}}{2}, \quad (86)$$

where C_N is normalization constant. The energy spectrum is given by:

$$E_n = 4\beta(n + s + \frac{m}{2}). \quad (87)$$

The asymptotic form of the wave-function may be written as:

$$\xi(R) \sim \exp\left[-\frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m ((z_i^+)^2 - (z_i^-)^2)\right]. \quad (88)$$

The 2nd term in the exponential of Eq. (88) for $\beta > 0$, i. e. $\frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m (z_j^-)^2$, is a source of divergence. However, $\sum_{j=1}^m (z_j^-)^2$ vanishes in a pair of Stoke wedges with opening angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$ and centered about the positive and negative imaginary axes in the complex z_j^- -planes. It may be noted that a complete knowledge of the spectra involves analysis of eigenvalue equation for the angular variables. The form of the potential is to be specified for such an analysis which is left for future investigation.

6 Summary and discussion

The quantization of many-body systems with balanced loss and gain of Ref. [12] has been investigated in this article. It has been argued that the quantum Hamiltonian can be interpreted as an interacting many-body system in the background of a pseudo-Euclidean metric and subjected to uniform “magnetic field” proportional to the gain/loss parameter γ . The analogous “magnetic field” is perpendicular to each plane formed by the pair of co-ordinates related to balanced loss and gain. Further, it is shown that either symmetric gauge or Landau gauge may be used to solve the quantum problem. The Hamiltonian corresponding to these two gauge are related through an unitary transformation and at the classical level, the corresponding Lagrangian differ by a total time derivative term.

Two types of many-body systems characterized by either (i) translational invariance or (ii) rotational invariance in a space endowed with the metric $g_{ij} = (-1)^{i+1} \delta_{ij}$ have been considered. For the case of translational invariant systems, the Landau gauge Hamiltonian has been used, since the wave-function of a symmetric gauge Hamiltonian is not suitable for box-normalization for the co-ordinates associated with continuous spectra. This is a reminiscent of the fact that two Lagrangian differing by a total time-derivative term may not lead to the same quantum theory, although the classical dynamics is identical for the two cases. Thus, the correct route for quantization of the system is to start from the Lagrangian that leads to Landau gauge Hamiltonian, instead of obtaining $\hat{H}_{L_1}(H_{L_2})$ from \hat{H} via the unitary transformation.

For translational invariant system, the original eigenvalue equation in terms of $2m$ degrees of freedom is reduced to an eigen-value equation of an effective Hamiltonian in terms of m degrees freedom. This reduction is possible due to the existence of m integrals of motion. If the eigenvalue problem for this effective Hamiltonian is solvable, then the starting Hamiltonian is also solvable. Three examples have been considered: (i) coupled harmonic oscillators, (ii) rational CMS-type many-body systems with balanced loss and gain, where each particle is interacting with other particles via four-body inverse-square potential plus pair-wise two-body harmonic terms and (iii) a many-body system interacting via short-range four-body plus six-body inverse square potential with pair-wise two-body harmonic terms. The eigenvalues of these systems are partly discrete and partly continuous. The box-normalization has been used for the co-ordinates associated with continuous spectra and a fully quantized eigen spectra have been obtained. Further, proper Stoke’s wedge has been identified so that energy is bounded from below and the corresponding eigenfunctions are normalizable. The exact correlation functions have been obtained for models (ii) and (iii). Apart from an overall multiplication factor, these correlation functions are identical with the corresponding quantities for the effective Hamiltonian.

A partial set of integrals of motion has been obtained for many-body systems with balanced loss and gain and generic rotationally invariant potential. It has been argued on general ground

that eigen spectra of such systems are not entirely real and unstable quantum modes are present. Radial excitations are obtained analytically for systems with $O(2, 1)$ symmetry.

Examples of exactly solvable models are very rare to find in physics. The models considered in this article include many-body systems with balanced loss and gain for which exact eigenvalues, eigenfunctions and more importantly, a few-particle correlation functions are obtained analytically. It appears that no other exactly solvable many-body system with balanced loss and gain having nonlinear coupling is known in the literature for three or more particles. Thus, the model presented being only one of its kind, the result is immensely significant from the viewpoint of exactly solvable and integrable models.

A very pertinent question one would like to pose is whether or not the solvable model is of sufficient interest from the viewpoint of physical applications? It is not apparent whether there exists any specific physical set-up, where the proposed system can be realized experimentally. However, the importance of the results lies elsewhere. It may be recalled that the Calogero model does not directly represent any experimentally realizable system, yet, it appears in the study of various diverse subjects, ranging from cosmology to condensed matter systems. Its relevance in the context of exclusion statistics [22], symmetric polynomials [47], random matrix theory [48, 49], Yang-Mills theory [50], conformal quantum mechanics [50, 51], spin chains [24] with long range correlations are worth mentioning. An important aspect that is central to all types of Calogero model is that the many-body interaction scales inverse-squarely. The models presented in the article share this property, raising the expectation that some of the features of the standard Calogero model may also be present for the systems under considerations. The example of conformal quantum mechanics is already presented in Sec. 5 within the context of many-body system with balanced loss and gain. The permutation symmetry in the models described in Sec. 3 is realized in a restricted form which may lead to a different kind of statistics obeyed by the particles that should lead to the standard exclusion statistics in the limit of vanishing loss and gain. Further, the n -particle correlation functions are computed using known results of random matrix theory, which indicates that the model may be obtained as a reduction of some matrix models and Yang-Mills theory. A possible connection of the system with quantum chaotic system is worth exploring. Within this background, the results of the article should be seen as a first step towards unraveling a new class of solvable models with balanced loss and gain which may have relevance in the wider context.

7 Acknowledgements

The work of PKG is supported by grants(SERB Ref. Nos. **SR/S2/HEP-24/2012 & MTR/2018/001036**) from Science & Engineering Research Board(SERB), Department of Science & Technology(DST), Govt. of India. **DS** acknowledges a research fellowship from CSIR.

References

- [1] H. Bateman, Phys. Rev. **38**, 815 (1931).
- [2] H. Feshbach and Y. Tikochinsky, in A Festschrift for I. I. Rabi, Trans. New York. Acad. Sci., Series 2 **38**, 44 (1977).
- [3] F. Bopp, Sitz.-Ber. Bayer. Akad. Wiss. Math.-naturw. Kl. **67**, (1973).
- [4] Y. Tikochinsky, J. Math. Phys. **19**, 888 (1978).
- [5] H. Dekker, Phys. Rep. **80**, 1 (1981).

- [6] E. Celeghini, M. Rasetti, and G. Vitiello, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y)* **215**, 156 (1992).
- [7] R. Banerjee and P. Mukherjee, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **35**, 5591 (2002).
- [8] D. Chruscinski and J. Jurkowski, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **321**, 854 (2006).
- [9] C. M. Bender, M. Gianfreda, S. K. Ozdemir, B. Peng, and L. Yang, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 062111 (2013).
- [10] C. M. Bender, M. Gianfreda and S. P. Klevansky, *Phys. Rev A* **90**, 022114 (2014).
- [11] D. Sinha, P. K. Ghosh, *Eur. Phys. J. Plus.* **132**, 460 (2017); arXiv:1705:03426.
- [12] P. K. Ghosh, D. Sinha, *Ann. Phys.* **388**, 276304 (2018); arxiv:1707.01122.
- [13] D. Sinha, P. K. Ghosh, *Ann. Phys.* **400**, 109-127 (2019).
- [14] P. K. Ghosh, Arxiv: 1810.04137.
- [15] B. Peng, S. K. Ozdemir, F. Lei, F. Monifi, M. Gianfreda, G. L. Long, S. Fan, F. Nori, C. M. Bender, and L. Yang, *Nature Physics*, **10**, 394 (2014).
- [16] T. Shah, R. Chattopadhyay, K. Vaidya, S. Chakraborty, *Phys. Rev. E* **92**, 062927 (2015).
- [17] F. Calogero, *Jour. Math. Phys.* **10**, 2191 (1969), F. Calogero, *Jour. Math. Phys.* **10**, 2197 (1969), F. Calogero, *Jour. Math. Phys.* **12**, 419 (1971).
- [18] B. Sutherland, *J. Math. Phys.(N.Y.)* **12**, 246 (1971); **12**, 251 (1971); *Phys.Rev. A* **4**, 2019 (1971).
- [19] M. A. Olshanetsky and A. M. Perelomov, *Phys. Rep.* **71**, 314 (1981); **94**, 6(1983).
- [20] A. P. Polychronakos, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 703 (1992);
- [21] P. K. Ghosh, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45**, 183001 (2012).
- [22] M. V. N. Murthy and R. Shankar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 3331(1994).
- [23] B. D. Simons, P. A. Lee and B. Altshuler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 64(1994); S. Jain, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **11**, 1201(1996).
- [24] F. D. M. Haldane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 635 (1988); B. S. Shastry, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 639 (1988).
- [25] K. Hikami and M. Wadati, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 1191(19994); H. Ujino and M. Wadati, *J. Phys. Soc. Jap.* **63**, 3585(1994).
- [26] B. Basu-Mallick, P. K. Ghosh and Kumar S. Gupta, *Phys. Lett. A* **311**, 87(2003), hep-th/0208132; B. Basu-Mallick, P. K. Ghosh and Kumar S. Gupta, *Nucl. Phys. B* **659**, 437 (2003), hep-th/0207040; B. Basu-Mallick, P. K. Ghosh and Kumar S. Gupta, *Pramana-J. Phys.* **62**, 691 (2004); B. Basu-Mallick and Kumar S. Gupta, *Phys. Lett. A* **292**, 36 (2001), hep-th/0109022.
- [27] V. Bardek, J. Feinberg, S. Meljanac, *JHEP* **08**, 018(2010); V. Bardek, J. Feinberg, S. Meljanac, *Annals of Physics* **325**, 691 (2010).
- [28] H. Azuma and S. Iso, *Phys. Lett. B* **331**, 107(1994).

- [29] N. Kawakami and S.-K. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2493(1991).
- [30] Wolfes, Ann. Phys. **85**, 454 (1974).
- [31] O. Haschke, W. Ruhl, arXiv:hep-th/9807194.
- [32] A. Bachkhaznadji, M. Lassaut, Few-Body Syst. **54**, 1945 (2013).
- [33] M. Blasone, E. Graziano, O. K. Pashaev, G. Vitiello, Annals Phys. **252**, 115 (1996).
- [34] L. M. Sieberer, M. Buchhold, S. Diehl, Rep. Prog. Phys. **79**, 096001 (2016), arXiv:1512.00637.
- [35] L. M. Sieberer, A. Chiocchetta, A. Gambassi, U. C. Tuber, S. Diehl, Phys. Rev. B **92**,134307 (2015), arXiv:1505.00912; L. M. Sieberer, S. D. Huber, E. Altman, S. Diehl, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 134310 (2014).
- [36] C. Aron, G. Biroli and L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Stat. Mech. 1011, P11018, (2010), arXiv:1007.5059.
- [37] R. V. Leeuwen, N. E. Dahlen, G. Stefanucci, C-O. Almbladh, U. V. Barth, arXiv:cond-mat/0506130.
- [38] F. M. Haehl, R. Loganayagam and M. Rangamani, J. High. Energ. Phys., 2017:69 (2017), arXiv:1610.01940; F. M. Haehl, R. Loganayagam, and M. Rangamani, J. High. Energ. Phys., 2017:70 (2017), arXiv:1610.01941.
- [39] C. Aron, G. Biroli, L. F. Cugliandolo, arXiv:1705:10800.
- [40] F. Haake, Quantum Signatures of Chaos, Springer Series in Synergetics(1st edition, 1991).
- [41] N. Gurappa and P. K. Panigrahi, Phys. Rev. B **59**, R2490(R) (1999).
- [42] S. R. Jain and A. Khare, Phys. Lett. A **262**, 35 (1999), G. Auberson, S. R. Jain, A. Khare, Phys. Lett. A **267**, 293 (2000); J. Phys. A **34**, 695 (2001).
- [43] C. M. Bender and P. D. Mannheim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 110402 (2008).
- [44] A. Mostafazadeh Phys. Rev. D **84**, 105018 (2011).
- [45] V. de Alfaro, S. Fubini and G. Furlan, Nuvo Cimento **A34**, 569 (1976).
- [46] P. K. Ghosh, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **34**, 5583 (2001).
- [47] P. Desrosiers, L. Lapointe and P. Mathieu, Nucl. Phys. B **606**, 547(2001), hep-th/0103178.
- [48] A. Dabholkar, Nucl. Phys. B **368**, 293(1992).
- [49] S. James Gates Jr., A. Jellal, E. L. Hassan Saidi and M. Schreiber, JHEP **0411**, 075(2004).
- [50] P. K. Ghosh, J. Phys. A **34**, 5583 (2001);hep-th/0009055.
- [51] N. Wyllard, J. Math.Phys. **41**, 2826(2000); hep-th/9910160.