

Introducing a Relativistic Nonlinear Field System With a Single Stable Non-Topological Soliton Solution in $1 + 1$ Dimensions

M. Mohammadi*

*Physics Department, Persian Gulf University, Bushehr, 75169, Iran.**

(Dated: March 6, 2020)

Abstract

In this paper we present a new extended complex nonlinear Klein-Gordon Lagrangian density, which bears a single non-topological soliton solution with a specific rest frequency ω_s in $1 + 1$ dimensions. There is a proper term in the new Lagrangian density, which behaves like a massless spook that surrounds the single soliton solution and opposes any internal changes. In other words, any arbitrary variation in the single soliton solution leads to an increase in the total energy. Moreover, just for the single soliton solution, the general dynamical equations are reduced to those versions of a special type of the standard well-known complex nonlinear Klein-Gordon systems, as its dominant dynamical equations.

arXiv:1811.06088v5 [physics.class-ph] 5 Mar 2020

* phismohammadi@pgu.ac.ir

Keywords : solitary wave, Non-topological soliton, energetically stability, massless spook, Klein-Gordon, Q-ball.

I. INTRODUCTION

Study of soliton solutions in relativistic classical field theories is an attempt to model particles in terms of non-singular, localized solutions of properly tailored nonlinear PDEs [1–5]. Kink and anti-kink solutions of the real nonlinear Klein-Gordon (KG) equations in $1 + 1$ dimensions were a successful effort to this end [6–40]. In this context, the recent interesting and important results on kink-(anti)kink interactions in models which possess kinks with power-law tails (power-law asymptotical behavior of the kink solutions), can be mentioned [31–35]. Moreover, in the context of kinks and their interactions it is also worth to mention recent results on the ϕ^8 and more complex models [36–40]. Solitons are, in some respects, similar to physical particles. They satisfy the relativistic energy-rest mass-momentum relation and are stable objects. Stability is the main condition for a solitary wave solution to be a soliton¹. As regards stability, there are many different criteria. The first and foremost criterion is to examine whether a solitary wave solution is topological or non-topological. Basically, the topological solitary wave solutions are inevitably stable, among which, one can mention the kink (anti-kink) solutions [6–40] and magnetic monopole solitons of 't Hooft Polyakov model [1, 5, 41–43] and solitons of the Skyrme's model [5, 44–47]

For the non-topological solitary wave solutions, a known standard stability criterion (method) is the Vakhitov-Kolokolov (or the classical) criterion, which involves obtaining the permissible small solutions of the linearized equations of motion above the background of the solitary wave solutions [48–54]. In this method, we first consider any permissible small perturbation as a localized oscillatory function, as an ansatz, with a specific frequency ω , and then try to find the possible eigenfunctions and eigenfrequencies. If we find an eigenfunction with a pure imaginary eigenfrequency ω , or any growing mode, then the solitary wave solution is unstable. If this criterion is used for the topological kink (anti-kink) solutions, the existence of the non-trivial internal modes would be possible for some kink

¹ According to some well-known references such as [1], the stability is just a necessary condition for a solitary wave solution to be a soliton; more precisely, a solitary wave solution is a soliton if it reappears without any distortion after collisions. In this paper, we only accept the stability condition for the definition of a soliton solution.

solutions, which causes such kinks (anti-kink) to display a permanent vibrational behavior in a collision process [6, 10–14]. Moreover, for the non-topological solitary wave solutions of the real one-field nonlinear Klein-Gordon systems, this criterion leads us to conclude that there are not any stable solution at all [51].

For the complex nonlinear Klein-Gordon (CNKG) systems, it was shown that there are some non-topological solutions that are called Q-balls [51–65]. In fact, they are some solitary wave profiles, which can be identified with their specific rest frequencies ω_o . In general, it was shown that Q-balls have the minimum rest energy among the other solutions with the same electrical charge [54, 56]. Based on the Vakhitov-Kolokolov stability criterion, the stability conditions of the Q-balls were obtained in detail [50–54]. Moreover, some researchers have tried to examine the stability of such non-topological solutions according to the paradigm of the quantum mechanics [54, 55], which leads to the quantum mechanical stability criterion. It is based on a comparing between the properties of the Q-ball (such as charge and rest energy) and the properties of the free scalar particle quanta. A Q-ball which is quantum-mechanically stable can not decay to a number of free quanta.

In this paper we use a new criterion (i.e. the energetically stability criterion [66–68]) for the relativistic field systems with the non-topological solitary wave solutions. We assume that a non-topological solitary wave solution is stable if any arbitrary deformation in its internal structure, when it is at rest, leads to an increase in the related total energy. In other words, we assume that a stable solitary wave solution has the minimum energy among the other close solutions. According to this new criterion, we will show that none of the Q-balls are stable objects. It should be noted that, this new criterion is different from the Vakhitov-Kolokolov criterion, but both are classical. Based on the Vakhitov-Kolokolov method, we examine the dynamical equations of motion for the small oscillations above the background of the solitary wave solutions (and linearized them to obtain another eigenvalue equation for the permissible small perturbations). However, the new stability criterion is based on examining the energy density functional for any arbitrary (permissible or impermissible) small variation above the background of the solitary wave solutions. This criterion was used without naming in Derrick’s article [66] about the nonexistent of the stable non-vibrational solitary wave solutions of the nonlinear Klein-Gordon field systems in $3 + 1$ dimensions. In general, a solitary wave solution which is stable according to the new criterion of the stability can be called an energetically stable soliton solution.

Our main goal in this paper is to find a relativistic complex nonlinear field system that has just a single stable non-topological solitary wave solution (a single Q-ball solution). We expect, just for this single solitary wave solution, the general dynamical equations and other properties be reduced to those versions of a special type of the standard well-known CNKG systems. We have borrowed this expectation from the quantum field theory at which any standard (nonlinear) Klein-Gordon (-like) system is used just to describe a special type of the known particles. It should be noted that, for the known CNKG systems [51–65], in general, there are infinite solitary wave solutions with different rest frequencies ω_o , but this new system (which we call it extended CNKG system [67–69]) has just a single solitary wave solution with a specific rest frequency ω_s for which the general dynamical equations are reduced to the same standard CNKG versions, as we expected. In other words, the simple CNKG system is a special case of the general extended CNKG system which is obtained just for the single solitary wave solution. Furthermore, we expect it to be a stable solution according to the new stability criterion which has been introduced in this paper; that is, we expect its energy to be the minimum among the other (close) solutions. Nevertheless, for the single solitary wave solution, introduced in this paper, we will show that it is also a stable solution according to the Vakhitov-Kolokolov and the quantum mechanical stability criteria of the Q-balls.

To achieve these goals, we add a new proper term to the original CNKG Lagrangian density in such way that it and all its derivatives will be equal to zero simultaneously just for the single solitary wave solution. This new proper additional term behaves like a massless spook² which surrounds the particle and resists any arbitrary deformations. There are some parameters A_i 's and B_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3$) in the new additional term, whose larger values result in more stability of the single solitary wave solution. In other words, the larger the values the greater will be the increase in the total energy for any arbitrary small variation above the background of the single solitary wave solution. The additional term, just makes the single solitary wave solution stable and does not appear in any of the observable, meaning that, it acts like a stability catalyser. In fact, this model shows how we can have a nonlinear field system with a single stable non-topological solitary wave solution as a rigid particle, for which the dominant dynamical equations are a special type of the standard CNKG

² We chose the word "spook" in order to avoid any confusion with words such as "ghost" and "phantom", which have their own particular meanings in the literature.

equations.

Furthermore, it is necessary to say that the most important motivation for writing this paper is the existence of several concerns about the fundamental understanding of particles in quantum theory. In general, quantum mechanics and quantum field theory only describe the probabilistic behavior of tiny particles under the influence of other particles and environmental factors. However, despite the undeniable successes of quantum theory, our knowledge of the fundamental particles is still scarce and there are still many unanswered questions about them. For example, why are there few fundamental particles with specific masses, charges and other specific properties in nature? Why is the Planck constant \hbar the same for all particles in the universe? Why are some fundamental particles, such as muons, strange quarks, essentially unstable? Here and in the upcoming works, we do not claim that our models answer all these questions and describe real particles properly. But, trying to answer these questions has motivated us to develop a series of new mathematical tools first, and this article is an important step in this direction.

This paper has been organized as follows: Basic equations and general properties of the CNKG systems with their solitary wave solutions (Q-balls) are first considered. In the next section, a new self-interaction potential and the corresponding localized wave solutions will be considered in detail, together with a stability analysis. In section IV, we will show how to build an extended CNKG system with a single stable solitary wave solution for which the general dynamical equations are reduced to a standard CNKG equation. In section V, the stability of the single soliton solution against any arbitrary small deformations will be studied according to the new criterion. In section VI, we provide a brief discussion about the collisions of the single solitary wave solutions with each other. The last section is devoted to summary and conclusions. It should be noted that, this work is in line with [67, 68], but with more details and accuracy.

II. COMPLEX NONLINEAR KLEIN-GORDON (CNKG) SYSTEMS

The complex nonlinear Klein-Gordon (CNKG) systems in $1 + 1$ dimensions can be introduced by the following relativistic Lagrangian-density:

$$\mathcal{L}_o = \partial_\mu \phi^* \partial^\mu \phi - V(|\phi|), \quad (1)$$

in which ϕ is a complex scalar field and $V(|\phi|)$ is the self-interaction potential, which depends only on the modulus of the scalar field. Using the least action principle, the dynamical equation for the evolution of ϕ can be obtained as follows:

$$\square\phi = \frac{\partial^2\phi}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2\phi}{\partial x^2} = -\frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi^*} = -\frac{1}{2}V'(|\phi|)\frac{\phi}{|\phi|}. \quad (2)$$

Note that we have used natural units $\hbar = c = 1$ in this paper. For further applications, it is better to use polar fields $R(x, t)$ and $\theta(x, t)$ as defined by

$$\phi(x, t) = R(x, t) \exp[i\theta(x, t)]. \quad (3)$$

In terms of polar fields, the Lagrangian-density (1) and related field equation (2) are reduced respectively to

$$\mathcal{L}_o = (\partial^\mu R \partial_\mu R) + R^2(\partial^\mu \theta \partial_\mu \theta) - V(R), \quad (4)$$

and

$$\square R - R(\partial^\mu \theta \partial_\mu \theta) = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{dV}{dR}, \quad (5)$$

$$\partial_\mu (R^2 \partial^\mu \theta) = 2R(\partial_\mu R \partial^\mu \theta) + R^2(\partial^\mu \partial_\mu \theta) = 0. \quad (6)$$

The related Hamiltonian (energy) density is obtained via the Noether's theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} T^{00} = \varepsilon(x, t) &= \dot{\phi}\dot{\phi}^* + \phi'\phi'^* + V(|\phi|) \\ &= \dot{R}^2 + \dot{R}'^2 + R^2(\dot{\theta}^2 + \theta'^2) + V(R), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

in which dot and prime denote differentiation with respect to t and x , respectively. For such systems, it is possible to have some traveling solitary wave solutions (Q-balls) as follows:

$$R(x, t) = R(\gamma(x - vt)), \quad \theta(x, t) = k_\mu x^\mu = \omega t - kx, \quad (8)$$

provided

$$k = \omega v, \quad (9)$$

and

$$\square R = -\frac{d^2 R}{d\tilde{x}^2} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{dV}{dR} + \omega_o^2 R, \quad (10)$$

where $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1 - v^2}$ and $\tilde{x} = \gamma(x - vt)$. Note that $k^\mu \equiv (\omega, k)$ is a 1 + 1 dimensional vector and $\partial^\mu \theta \partial_\mu \theta = k_\mu k^\mu = \omega_o^2$ is a constant scalar.

If we multiply equation (10) by $\frac{dR}{d\tilde{x}}$ and integrate, it yields

$$\left(\frac{dR(\tilde{x})}{d\tilde{x}}\right)^2 + \omega_o^2 R^2 = V(R) + C, \quad (11)$$

where C is an integration constant. This constant is expected to vanish for a localized solitary wave solution. This equation can be easily solved for R , once the potential $V(R)$ is known:

$$\tilde{x} - x_o = \pm \int \frac{dR}{\sqrt{V(R) - \omega_o^2 R^2}}, \quad (12)$$

In general, by using equation (10), it is easy to see that there are different non-topological solutions for $R(\tilde{x})$ with different values of ω_o . The topological complex kink and anti-kink solutions can also exist when $\omega_o = 0$ and $V(R)$ has more than two vacuum points [65].

In the framework of special relativity, it is clear that the total energy of a solitary wave solution which represents the total relativistic energy of a particle should read

$$E = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \varepsilon(x, t) dx = \gamma E_o, \quad (13)$$

in which

$$E_o = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} [\dot{R}^2 + R^2 \dot{\theta}^2 + V(R)] dx = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} [\dot{R}^2 + R^2 \omega_o^2 + V(R)] dx, \quad (14)$$

is the rest energy of a solitary wave solution.

The Lagrangian-density (1) is invariant under global $U(1)$ symmetry. If we link this symmetry with electromagnetism, then according to Noether's theorem, the following electrical current density is conserved:

$$j^\mu \equiv i(\phi \partial^\mu \phi^* - \phi^* \partial^\mu \phi) = 2R^2 \partial^\mu \theta, \quad \partial_\mu j^\mu = 0. \quad (15)$$

The corresponding charge is

$$Q = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} j^0 dx = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} i(\phi \dot{\phi}^* - \phi^* \dot{\phi}) dx, \quad (16)$$

which is a constant of motion.

III. STABILITY CONSIDERATIONS; AN EXAMPLE

Based on what was done and introduced in [61], the following potential is used for simplicity in line with the purposes of this article:

$$V(R) = R^2 - R^4. \quad (17)$$

With this potential (17), it can be shown that the integral (12) can be easily performed, yielding the following solutions for $\omega_- = 0 \leq \omega_o^2 < 1 = \omega_+$:

$$R(\tilde{x}) = \omega' \operatorname{sech}(\omega' \tilde{x}). \quad (18)$$

where $\omega' = \sqrt{1 - \omega_o^2}$ is called the complementary frequency [61]. Accordingly, there are infinite solitary wave solutions (18), which can be identified with different rest frequencies ω_o (see Fig. 1). Using Eqs. (14) and (16) for profile functions (18), then one can obtain the rest energies and total charges:

$$E_o = \frac{4\omega'}{3}(1 + 2\omega_o^2), \quad Q = 4\omega_o\omega'. \quad (19)$$

Traditionally there are two types of criteria for the stability of the Q-balls. First, the quantum mechanical criterion [54, 55], which specifies that if the ratio between the rest energy and the charge is less than ω_+ (i.e. $E_o/Q < \omega_+$) for a Q-ball solution, it can not decay to the free scalar particle quanta with a specific rest mass equal to ω_+ . Second, the classical criterion [50–54], which is based on examining the permissible small oscillating perturbations above the background of the Q-balls (not any arbitrary small deformations), it says that a Q-ball is stable if $\frac{dQ}{d\omega_o} < 0$. Now, if these stability criteria are used for the system (17) with the Q-ball solutions (18), then it is easy to show that the Q-balls (18) for which $\frac{1}{2} < \omega_o \leq 1$ ($\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = \omega_c < \omega_o \leq 1$) are quantum mechanically (classically) stable. Note that, for the case $\omega_c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, the maximum value of the related module function is $R_{\max} = R_{\omega_c}(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ which is exactly the same turning point of the potential (17) (see Fig. 2). In general, for any arbitrary solution (18), it is obvious that the solutions for which $R_{\max} > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ are essentially unstable. There is another type of stability called fission stability. A Q-ball which does not fulfill the requirement of the fission stability, it naturally decays into two or more smaller Q-balls with some release of energy. In general, it was shown that the condition of the classical stability of the Q-balls is identical to the condition of fission stability [54]. Therefore, the Q-balls for which $\frac{dQ}{d\omega_o} < 0$ are stable against fission too.

However, in this paper we use another rigorous criterion for the stability (i.e. the energetically stability criterion [66–68]). The rest energy of an energetically stable solitary wave solution is at the minimum among the other (close) solutions. In fact, if the total energy always increases for any arbitrary (permissible or impermissible) deformation above the background of a special solitary wave solution which is at rest, it is an energetically




FIG. 1. Related to different ω_o^2 's, there are different solutions for $R(\tilde{x})$.




FIG. 2. The field potential (17) versus R

stable solution. Based on this criterion, it is easy to show that there is no stable solitary wave solution for the CNKG systems in 1 + 1 dimensions at all. For example, for a Q-ball solution, an arbitrary deformation (variation) can be constructed as follows: according to Eq. (14), let us fix the function $R(x)$ and set $\dot{\theta} = 0$, then any small variation in $\dot{\theta}^2$ with $\delta\dot{\theta}^2 < 0$, yields a small reduction in the related total energy (14). Therefore, none of the solitary wave solutions (18) are energetically stable at all. The same argument applies for the possible non-topological solutions of the real nonlinear KG systems in 1 + 1 dimensions.

Moreover, based on the newly defined stability criterion, a primary condition for a special solitary wave solution (18) to be a soliton, is that its rest energy must be at the minimum




FIG. 3. The rest energy (solid blue curve) and the total charge (dashed red curve) versus the rest frequency square for different solitary wave solutions.

among the other (close) solitary wave solutions with different rest frequencies. According to Fig. 3, there is not any solitary wave solution with the minimum rest energy except $\omega_o = 0$ and $\omega_o^2 = 1$. The case $\omega_o = 0$ is a minimum, but for which $R_{\max} = 1 > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, i.e. it is not essentially a stable object. The case $\omega_o^2 = 1$ is the trivial minimum according to the vacuum $R(x) = 0$.

IV. AN EXTENDED CNKG MODEL WITH A SINGLE STABLE Q-BALL SOLUTION

In general, there is an unwritten postulate in the quantum field theory that states any standard Lagrangian density and the related dynamical equations of motion are used just for a special type of the tiny particles. Namely, the Dirac Lagrangian density with some specific inputs (electrons mass and charge) is used just for electrons and positrons, but the same Dirac Lagrangian densities with other specific inputs are used for other known particles like muons and neutrinos. Another example is a special version of the complex nonlinear Klein-Gordon Lagrangian densities (a complex ϕ^4 system) which is used just to theoretically introduce the Higgs particles. Moreover, in the standard relativistic quantum field theory, the Lagrangian densities, which are used for the scalar fields are usually (complex) (nonlinear) Klein-Gordon types.

In light of the above, first we postulate that for the soliton solutions (as the particle-like objects) of the classical scalar field models, the dominant Lagrangian densities (or the dominant dynamical equations) should be the same standard (complex) (nonlinear) Klein-Gordon types. Second, if a classical Lagrangian density leads to more than one soliton solution with the same standard dominant dynamical equations, we postulate that it is not a physical case. For example, the pervious Lagrangian density (4) with the potential (17) is not a physical case, because it leads to infinite soliton-like solutions (18) according to infinite particle-like objects for which the dominant Lagrangian density (4) or the dominant dynamical equations (5) and (6) are the same. Note that, we used "soliton-like" instead of "soliton", because, according to the new criterion of the stability, essentially none of them (18) are energetically stable soliton solutions. So far, according to the new criterion of the stability, no classical field system has been introduced that leads to a non-topological stable soliton solution. However, we will introduce a new field system in the following. In fact, the topological property for many soliton solutions is considered to guarantee the stability automatically and inevitably. The topological property of a soliton solution imposes difficult conditions for constructing multi-particle solutions. But with non-topological solutions, they simply result in multi-particle solutions just by adding them when they are sufficiently far apart.

To meet all these requirements, one can assume that there is an extended complex nonlinear Klein-Gordon (CNKG) Lagrangian density [67–69], which is reduced to a simple standard CNKG form just for a special soliton solution. Briefly, we are going to consider the possibility of the existence of a new extended CNKG system with a single stable solitary wave solution, according to the new criterion of the stability, for which the complicated general dynamical equations are reduced to the same standard CNKG versions (5) and (6) as we expected. Note that, unlike the quantum field theory, the particle concept in the classical field theory is completely objective (i.e. a stable localized energy density in the space which can move in any arbitrary direction).

To make it more objective, we can imagine that a stable solitary wave solution of an unknown relativistic field system with a specific rest frequency $\omega_s = 0.8$ exists in following

form:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_s(x, t) &= R_s(\gamma(x - vt)) \exp(ik_\mu x^\mu) = R_s(\tilde{x}) \exp(i\gamma\omega_s(t - vx)) \\ &= \omega'_s \operatorname{sech}(\omega'_s \tilde{x}) \exp(i\omega_s \tilde{t}),\end{aligned}\tag{20}$$

in which $\tilde{t} = \gamma(t - vx)$ and $\omega'_s = 0.6$. In other words, it is considered to be one of the Q-balls (18) which is quantum mechanically and classically stable. We can consider this special solitary wave solution (SSWS) (20) like a detected stable tiny particle in the laboratory for which we suppose that the dominant dynamical equations of motion or the dominant Lagrangian density be the same standard versions of the CNKG system which were introduced in the previous sections. In other words, we assume that the dynamical equations of the system have a general complicated form, and just for the SSWS (20) are reduced to the same simple standard CNKG forms (5) and (6).

Accordingly, one should consider a new Lagrangian density in the following form:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_o + F = [(\partial^\mu R \partial_\mu R) + R^2(\partial^\mu \theta \partial_\mu \theta) - V(R)] + F,\tag{21}$$

in which \mathcal{L}_o is the same original CNKG Lagrangian density (4) for which the SSWS (20) is one of its solutions. According to the standard classical relativistic field theory, the Lagrangian densities are considered to be functions of the fields themselves and their first derivatives. In addition, since the Lagrangian densities must be scalar functionals, they should be functions of the possible allowed scalars. Along with the scalar fields R and θ , the other basic (simplest) allowed scalars in our model, which are made via the different possible contractions of the first derivatives of the scalar fields, are $\partial_\mu R \partial^\mu R$, $\partial_\mu \theta \partial^\mu \theta$ and $\partial_\mu R \partial^\mu \theta$. Accordingly, we conclude that the new additional functional F (which is a part of the new lagrangian density) should be function of all possible allowed scalars R , θ , $\partial_\mu R \partial^\mu R$, $\partial_\mu \theta \partial^\mu \theta$ and $\partial_\mu R \partial^\mu \theta$. To ensure that the electrical charge conservation is satisfied again, the additional term F must not be function of the phase field θ . The new dynamical equations of motion for this new extended Lagrangian density (21) are

$$\square R - R(\partial^\mu \theta \partial_\mu \theta) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dV}{dR} + \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial (\partial_\mu R)} \right) - \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial R} \right) \right] = 0\tag{22}$$

$$\partial_\mu (R^2 \partial^\mu \theta) + \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial (\partial_\mu \theta)} \right) \right] = 0.\tag{23}$$

Also, the new energy density function is

$$\varepsilon(x, t) = \left[\dot{R}^2 + \dot{R}^2 + R^2(\dot{\theta}^2 + \dot{\theta}^2) + V(R) \right] + \left[\dot{R} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \dot{R}} + \dot{\theta} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \dot{\theta}} \right].\tag{24}$$

For the SSWS (20), as we indicated before, we expect all Eqs. (21), (22), (23) and (24) to be reduced to the same original versions (1), (5), (6) and (7) respectively. In other words, we expect all additional terms F , $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial(\partial_\mu R)} \right)$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial(\partial_\mu \theta)} \right)$, $\frac{\partial F}{\partial R}$, $\frac{\partial F}{\partial \dot{R}}$ and $\frac{\partial F}{\partial \dot{\theta}}$ to be zero just for the SSWS (20). It means that just for the SSWS (20), the general equations of motion (23) and (24) turn to the same standard equations (4) and (5) respectively.

Therefore, first, we find the standard CNKG Lagrangian density \mathcal{L}_o as the dominant Lagrangian density for the SSWS (20). Second, we try to find the proper additional term F in such a way that \mathcal{L}_o to be the dominant Lagrangian density just for the SSWS (20), meaning that, the additional term F and its other derivatives simultaneously turn to zero just for the SSWS (20). And third, we expect this additional term to guarantee the energetically stability of the SSWS (20), meaning that the rest energy of the SSWS (20) be at a minimum among the other (close) solutions of the new system (21). Note that, for this new relativistic field system (21), there is just a single solitary wave solution (Q-ball) (20) with a specific rest frequency $\omega_s = 0.8$, that is, the other Q-balls (18) of the original system (1) with different rest frequencies are not the solutions of this new system (21) anymore.

Since F and all its derivatives must be zero for the SSWS (20), one can conclude that it should be a function of powers of \mathbb{S}_i 's, where \mathbb{S}_i 's are introduced as the possible independent scalars which are zero simultaneously for the SSWS (20). As mentioned earlier, in general, F must be a function of the allowed scalars, on the other hand, F is considered to be a function of the powers of the \mathbb{S}_i 's, thus \mathbb{S}_i 's must be functions of the allowed scalars as well. Therefore, there are just three basic independent combinations of the allowed scalars, which would be zero for the SSWS (20) simultaneously as follows:

$$\mathbb{S}_1 = \partial_\mu \theta \partial^\mu \theta - \omega_s^2, \quad (25)$$

$$\mathbb{S}_2 = \partial_\mu R \partial^\mu R + V(R) - \omega_s^2 R^2, \quad (26)$$

$$\mathbb{S}_3 = \partial_\mu R \partial^\mu \theta. \quad (27)$$

It is straightforward to show that these special scalars all are equal to zero for the SSWS (20). For simplicity's sake, if one considers F as a function of n 'th power of \mathbb{S}_i 's, i.e. $F =$

$F(\mathbb{S}_1^n, \mathbb{S}_2^n, \mathbb{S}_3^n)$, it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial (\partial_\mu R)} \right) &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \left[n(n-1) \mathbb{S}_i^{(n-2)} \frac{\partial \mathbb{S}_i}{\partial x^\mu} \frac{\partial \mathbb{S}_i}{\partial (\partial_\mu R)} \frac{\partial F}{\partial Z_i} + n \mathbb{S}_i^{(n-1)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbb{S}_i}{\partial (\partial_\mu R)} \frac{\partial F}{\partial Z_i} \right) \right] \\ \frac{\partial F}{\partial R} &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \left[n \mathbb{S}_i^{(n-1)} \frac{\partial \mathbb{S}_i}{\partial R} \frac{\partial F}{\partial Z_i} \right] \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial (\partial_\mu \theta)} \right) &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \left[n(n-1) \mathbb{S}_i^{(n-2)} \frac{\partial \mathbb{S}_i}{\partial x^\mu} \frac{\partial \mathbb{S}_i}{\partial (\partial_\mu \theta)} \frac{\partial F}{\partial Z_i} + n \mathbb{S}_i^{(n-1)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbb{S}_i}{\partial (\partial_\mu \theta)} \frac{\partial F}{\partial Z_i} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

where $Z_i = \mathbb{S}_i^n$. It is easy to understand for $n \geq 3$, all these relations would be zero for the SSWS (20) as we expected. Accordingly, one can show that the general form of the functional F which satisfies all required constraints, can be introduced by a series:

$$F = \sum_{n_3=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n_2=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} a(n_1, n_2, n_3) \mathbb{S}_1^{n_1} \mathbb{S}_2^{n_2} \mathbb{S}_3^{n_3}, \quad (28)$$

provided $(n_1 + n_2 + n_3) \geq 3$. Note that, coefficients $a(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ are also arbitrary well-defined functional scalars, i.e. they can be again functions of all possible allowed scalars R , $\partial_\mu R \partial^\mu R$, $\partial_\mu \theta \partial^\mu \theta$ and $\partial_\mu R \partial^\mu \theta$ (except θ).

The stability conditions impose serious constraints on function F which causes series (28) to be reduce to special formats. However, again there are many choices which can lead to a stable SSWS (20). Among them, one can consider the additional term in the following form:

$$F = \sum_{i=1}^3 A_i f(Z_i), \quad (29)$$

where $Z_i = B_i \mathcal{K}_i^n$ for which n is any arbitrary odd number larger than 1 (i.e. $n = 3, 5, 7, \dots$), $f(Z_i)$ is any arbitrary odd sinh-like function whose odd derivatives are all non-negative at $Z_i = 0$ (for example $f = Z_i$ [67] or $f = Z_i^3$), A_i 's and B_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are just some positive constants, and functionals \mathcal{K}_i 's are three independent linear combinations of \mathbb{S}_i 's as follows:

$$\mathcal{K}_1 = R^2 \mathbb{S}_1, \quad (30)$$

$$\mathcal{K}_2 = R^2 \mathbb{S}_1 + \mathbb{S}_2, \quad (31)$$

$$\mathcal{K}_3 = R^2 \mathbb{S}_1 + \mathbb{S}_2 + 2R \mathbb{S}_3, \quad (32)$$

It is obvious that \mathcal{K}_1 , \mathcal{K}_2 and \mathcal{K}_3 are all zero just for the SSWS (20) with the rest frequency $\omega_s = \pm \frac{4}{5} = \pm 0.8$. Note that, these special linear combinations of the \mathbb{S}_i 's in Eqs. (30)-(32)

are introduced just in line with the objectives of this paper and are not unique. One can use other combinations to obtain different systems with different properties.

The energy-density (24) that belongs to the new extended Lagrangian-density (21), for this special choice (29), turns to

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(x, t) = & \left[\dot{R}^2 + \dot{R}^2 + R^2(\dot{\theta}^2 + \dot{\theta}^2) + V(R) \right] + \\ & \sum_{i=1}^3 [nA_i B_i C_i \mathcal{K}_i^{n-1} f'_i - A_i f(Z_i)] = \varepsilon_o + \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $f'_i = \frac{df(Z_i)}{dZ_i}$, and

$$C_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{K}_i}{\partial \dot{\theta}} \dot{\theta} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{K}_i}{\partial \dot{R}} \dot{R} = \begin{cases} 2R^2 \dot{\theta}^2 & i=1 \\ 2(\dot{R}^2 + R^2 \dot{\theta}^2) & i=2 \\ 2(\dot{R} + R\dot{\theta})^2 & i=3. \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

Note that, C_i 's are positive definite and this property will be used in the further conclusions. In fact, this main property originates from the proper combination of the \mathbb{S}_i 's in Eqs. (30)-(32) to introduce special functionals \mathcal{K}_1 , \mathcal{K}_2 and \mathcal{K}_3 .

Since $f(Z_i)$ is considered an odd sinh-like function, hence it can be shown generally by a convergent Maclaurin's series

$$f(Z_i) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j Z_i^{2j+1} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j B_i^{2j+1} \mathcal{K}_i^{2nj+n}, \quad (35)$$

where a_j 's are all non-negative. It is easy to obtain f'_i (as an even function) in a series format:

$$f'_i = \frac{df(Z_i)}{dZ_i} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j (2j+1) Z_i^{2j} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j (2j+1) B_i^{2j} \mathcal{K}_i^{2nj}. \quad (36)$$

Now, functions ε_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3$) in Eq. (33) can be expressed in the following series:

$$\varepsilon_i = [nA_i B_i C_i \mathcal{K}_i^{n-1} f'_i - A_i f(Z_i)] = A_i \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j B_i^{2j+1} \mathcal{K}_i^{2nj+n-1} D_{ij}, \quad (37)$$

where $D_{ij} = [nC_i(2j+1) - \mathcal{K}_i]$. Since n is considered as equal to a positive odd number, the power of \mathcal{K}_i 's (i.e. $2nj+n-1$) in the Eq. (37) would be always even numbers. Moreover, since $a_j \geq 0$, like a sinh function, the terms $A_i a_j B_j^{2j+1} \mathcal{K}_i^{2nj+n-1}$ in Eq. (37) will be positive

definite and are always zero just for the SSWS (20). Now, from Eq. (34), one can easily calculate coefficients $D_{ij} = [nC_i(2j + 1) - \mathcal{K}_i]$:

$$D_{ij} = \begin{cases} R^2[5\dot{\theta}^2 + \dot{\theta}^2 + \omega_s^2] + C_1(2jn + n - 3) & i=1 \\ [5R^2\dot{\theta}^2 + 5\dot{R}^2 + R^2\dot{\theta}^2 + \dot{R}^2 + U(R)] + C_2(2jn + n - 3), & i=2 \\ [5(R\dot{\theta} + \dot{R})^2 + (R\dot{\theta} + \dot{R})^2 + U(R)] + C_3(2jn + n - 3), & i=3 \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

where $U(R) = 2\omega_s^2 R^2 - V(R) = R^4 + \frac{7}{25}R^2$, which is a non-negative function and bounded from below. Therefore, since $n \geq 3$ and C_i 's are positive definite, we are sure that all terms in the above relations are positive definite which means that all terms of the series (37) would be positive definite. In other words, all ε_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are positive definite functions which are zero just for the SSWS (20) and the vacuum ($R = 0$) simultaneously.

Since \mathcal{K}_1 , \mathcal{K}_2 and \mathcal{K}_3 (or equivalently \mathbb{S}_1 , \mathbb{S}_2 and \mathbb{S}_3) are three independent scalars for two scalar fields R and θ , it is not possible to find a special variation in the SSWS (20) for which all of \mathcal{K}_i 's do not change and stay zero simultaneously. In other words, just for the SSWS (20) (and the vacuum $R = 0$), all \mathcal{K}_i 's would be zero simultaneously and for other non-trivial solutions of the extended CNKG system (21), at least one of the \mathcal{K}_i 's (\mathbb{S}_i 's) would be a non-zero function (see the Appendix A). Therefore, if constants A_i 's or B_i 's are considered to be large numbers, we expect for other solutions of the new extended system (21), according to Eq. (37), at least one of ε_i 's would be a large positive function, and then the related rest energy would be larger than SSWS rest energy. Accordingly, we expect the rest energy of the SSWS (20) would be at a minimum among the other solutions, except the ones which are very close to the vacuum state ($R = 0$).

To summarize, the odd functions $f(Z_i)$ for which the coefficients of the related Maclaurin's series (35) are all non-negative (i.e. $a_j \geq 0$), are the proper functions to guarantee the stability of the SSWS (20). In fact, for these special odd sinh-like functions $f(Z_i)$, the additional terms of the energy density function (33), i.e. ε_1 , ε_2 and ε_3 , would be positive definite functions and all are zero simultaneously just for the SSWS (20). To prove that the SSWS (20) is genuinely a stable object, we just considered functions ε_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3$) but we did not consider function ε_o ! In the next section, we will show that theoretically and numerically for systems with large enough values of B_i 's (or A_i 's), the influence of the function ε_o in the stability property is small and negligible.

V. STABILITY FOR SMALL DEFORMATIONS

In this section, based on the new criterion of the stability (energetically stability criterion), we are going to study the variations of the total energy above the background of the SSWS (20) for small variations. In general, the arbitrary small variations for the non-moving SSWS (20) can be considered as follows:

$$R(x, t) = R_s(x) + \delta R(x, t) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta(x, t) = \theta_s(t) + \delta\theta(x, t) = \omega_s t + \delta\theta(x, t), \quad (39)$$

where δR and $\delta\theta$ (small variations) are any small functions of space-time. The subscript s is referred to the special solution (20) for which $\omega_s^2 = 0.8$ and $R_s(x) = 0.6 \operatorname{sech}(0.6x)$. Now, if we insert the deformed version of the non-moving SSWS (39) in $\varepsilon_o(x, t)$ and keep the terms up to the first order of variations, then it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_o(x, t) &= \varepsilon_{os}(x) + \delta\varepsilon_o(x, t) \approx \left[\dot{R}_s^2 + R_s^2 \omega_s^2 + V(R_s) \right] + \\ &2 \left[\dot{R}_s(\delta\dot{R}) + R_s(\delta R)\omega_s^2 + R_s^2 \omega_s(\delta\theta) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dV(R_s)}{dR_s}(\delta R) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Note that, for a non-moving SSWS (20), $\dot{R}_s = 0$, $\dot{\theta}_s = 0$ and $\dot{\theta}_s = \omega_s = \pm\sqrt{0.8}$. Therefore, $\delta\varepsilon_o$ can be considered as a linear function of the first order of small variations δR , $\delta\dot{R}$ and $\delta\dot{\theta}$. It is obvious that $\delta\varepsilon_o$ is not necessarily a positive definite function for arbitrary variations. If one performs the similar procedure for ε_i 's, they lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_i(x, t) &= \varepsilon_{is}(x) + \delta\varepsilon_i(x, t) = \delta\varepsilon_i(x, t) \\ &= A_i \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j B_i^{2j+1} \left[(D_{ijs} + \delta D_{ij})(\mathcal{K}_{is} + \delta\mathcal{K}_i)^{2nj+n-1} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Note that \mathcal{K}_i 's for the SSWS (20) would be zero (i.e. $\mathcal{K}_{is} = 0$). Now, for simplicity, if one sets $n = 3$, then

$$\delta\varepsilon_i(x, t) = A_i \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j B_i^{2j+1} \left[(D_{ijs} + \delta D_{ij})(\delta\mathcal{K}_i)^{6j+2} \right] \approx A_i a_0 B_i D_{i0s} (\delta\mathcal{K}_i)^2, \quad (42)$$

According to Eq. (34), $D_{i0s} = 3C_{is} - \mathcal{K}_{is} = 3C_{is} = 6R_s^2 \omega_s^2$, then Eq. (42) is simplified to

$$\delta\varepsilon_i(x, t) \approx 6A_i B_i a_0 R_s^2 \omega_s^2 (\delta\mathcal{K}_i)^2 \propto A_i B_i (\delta\mathcal{K}_i)^2 \geq 0, \quad (43)$$

hence, for small variations $\delta\varepsilon_i$'s are all positive definite functions as we generally expected.

It is easy to show that $\delta\mathcal{K}_i$'s, similar to $\delta\varepsilon_o$, are all linear functions of the first order of small variations. In fact, according to Eqs. (30)-(32) and (25)-(27) we can define three linear functions G_1 , G_2 and G_3 in terms of small variations as follows: $\delta\mathcal{K}_1 = G_1(\delta\theta) = 2\omega_s R_s^2 \delta\theta$, $\delta\mathcal{K}_2 = G_2(\delta R, \delta\dot{R}, \delta\dot{\theta}) = G_1 - 2\dot{R}_s(\delta\dot{R}) + (\frac{dV(R_s)}{dR_s} - 2\omega_s^2 R_s)\delta R$ and $\delta\mathcal{K}_3 = G_3(\delta R, \delta\dot{R}, \delta\dot{\theta}, \delta\theta, \delta\dot{\theta}) = G_2 + 2R_s(\omega_s \delta\dot{R} - \dot{R}_s \delta\dot{\theta})$ respectively. Hence, from Eq. (43), one can simply conclude that $\delta\varepsilon_i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) is a linear function of the second order of small variations which is multiplied by coefficient $A_i B_i$. In other words, we can define three linear functions W_1 , W_2 and W_3 in such a way that $\delta\varepsilon_1 = A_1 B_1 W_1([\delta\dot{\theta}]^2)$, $\delta\varepsilon_2 = A_2 B_2 W_2([\delta R]^2, [\delta\dot{R}]^2, [\delta\dot{\theta}]^2, \delta R \delta\dot{R}, \delta R \delta\dot{\theta}, \delta\dot{R} \delta\dot{\theta})$ and $\delta\varepsilon_3 = A_3 B_3 W_3([\delta R]^2, [\delta\dot{R}]^2, [\delta\dot{\theta}]^2, [\delta\theta]^2, [\delta\dot{\theta}]^2, \delta R \delta\dot{R}, \delta R \delta\dot{\theta}, \delta R \delta\dot{\theta}, \dots, \delta\theta \delta\dot{\theta})$. For small variations, it is obvious that the magnitude of the first order of variations is larger than the magnitude of the second order of them (for example, $\delta R < (\delta R)^2$), hence, it is easy to understand that for small variations: $W_i < G_i$ or $W_i < \delta\varepsilon_o$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$). But, if constants A_i 's or B_i 's are considered to be large numbers, the comparison between $\delta\varepsilon_i = A_i B_i W_i$ and G_i (or $\delta\varepsilon_o$) needs more considerations. For example, if one considers $A_i = B_i = 10^{20}$, then for the variations larger (smaller) than $\delta R = 10^{-10}$ we have $\delta R < A_i B_i (\delta R)^2$ ($\delta R > A_i B_i (\delta R)^2$), hence the same argument goes for the comparison between $\delta\varepsilon_i$'s and G_i 's or the comparison between $\delta\varepsilon_i$'s and $\delta\varepsilon_o$.

Accordingly, if constants A_i 's and B_i 's are not large numbers, it is obvious that $|\delta\varepsilon_o| < \sum_{i=1}^3 \delta\varepsilon_i$ for all small deformations. But, if constants A_i 's and B_i 's are considered to be large numbers, $|\delta\varepsilon_o|$ just for too small variations may be larger than $\sum_{i=1}^3 \delta\varepsilon_i$, and then the variation of the total energy density may be negative, i.e. it may be $\delta\varepsilon = \delta\varepsilon_o + \sum_{i=1}^3 \delta\varepsilon_i < 0$. For such too small variations the stability conditions of the new criterion may not fulfilled; nevertheless, they are physically too small which can be ignored in stability considerations. In fact, these too small variations are a sign of the fact that, the dominant dynamical equations of motion for the SSWS (20) are the same standard original CNKG equations (5) and (6). Therefore, like a chicken in the egg in which its internal movements are confined by the egg shell, this SSWS (20) can have some unimportant internal deformations which are confined by the additional term F in the new system (21).

To summarize, if we consider the extended CNKG systems with large A_i 's or B_i 's, $\delta\varepsilon$ would be always positive for all significant physical variations (δR and $\delta\theta$) and then the stability of the SSWS would guaranteed appreciably. Just for some unimportant too small variations, it may be possible to see the violation of the stability, but the rest energy reduc-

tion for these variations are so small that they can be ignored physically. Although, the A_i 's and B_i 's parameters can be taken as very large values, but they will not affect the dynamical equations and the other properties of the SSWS (20). In other words, the additional term F (29) in the new system (21) with large values of parameters B_i 's (or A_i 's) behaves like a stability catalyser, but does not have any role in the observables of the SSWS (20). In the following, we will introduce many arbitrary variations and will show numerically how considering systems with large A_i 's and B_i 's appreciably guarantees the stability of the SSWS (20).

From now on, according to Eq. (35) and the pervious discussions, let us consider an odd function in the following form:

$$f(Z_i) = \sinh(Z_i), \quad (44)$$

where $Z_i = B_i \mathcal{K}_i^3$. Therefore, the related extended Lagrangian density is

$$\mathcal{L} = [\partial^\mu R \partial_\mu R + R^2 (\partial^\mu \theta \partial_\mu \theta) - V(R)] + \sum_{i=1}^3 A_i \sinh(B_i \mathcal{K}_i^3) = \mathcal{L}_o + \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_3. \quad (45)$$

The related equations of motion are

$$\left[\square R - R (\partial^\mu \theta \partial_\mu \theta) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dV}{dR} \right] + \sum_{i=2}^3 \left[\frac{3}{2} A_i B_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \left(\mathcal{K}_i^2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{K}_i}{\partial (\partial_\mu R)} \cosh(B_i \mathcal{K}_i^3) \right) \right] - \sum_{i=2}^3 \left[\frac{3}{2} A_i B_i \left(\mathcal{K}_i^2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{K}_i}{\partial R} \cosh(B_i \mathcal{K}_i^3) \right) \right] = 0, \quad (46)$$

$$\partial_\mu (R^2 \partial^\mu \theta) + \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[\frac{3}{2} A_i B_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \left(\mathcal{K}_i^2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{K}_i}{\partial (\partial_\mu \theta)} \cosh(B_i \mathcal{K}_i^3) \right) \right] = 0, \quad (47)$$

and the related energy density is

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(x, t) = & \left[\dot{R}^2 + \dot{R}^2 + R^2 (\dot{\theta}^2 + \dot{\theta}^2) + V(R) \right] + \left[6A_1 B_1 R^2 \dot{\theta}^2 \mathcal{K}_1^2 \cosh(B_1 \mathcal{K}_1^3) - A_1 \sinh(B_1 \mathcal{K}_1^3) \right] + \\ & \left[6A_2 B_2 (\dot{R}^2 + R^2 \dot{\theta}^2) \mathcal{K}_2^2 \cosh(B_2 \mathcal{K}_2^3) - A_2 \sinh(B_2 \mathcal{K}_2^3) \right] + \\ & \left[6A_3 B_3 (\dot{R} + R\dot{\theta})^2 \mathcal{K}_3^2 \cosh(B_3 \mathcal{K}_3^3) - A_3 \sinh(B_3 \mathcal{K}_3^3) \right] = \varepsilon_o + \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

An arbitrary hypothetical variation for the non-moving SSWS (20) can be introduced as follows:

$$R(x) = R_s + \delta R = 0.6 \operatorname{sech}(0.6x) + \xi \exp(-x^2), \quad \theta(t) = \omega_s t, \quad (49)$$

in which ξ is a small coefficient. Larger ξ is related to larger variations for the modulus function. We consider the phase function to be fixed at $\theta(t) = \omega_s t$. Now, the total energy

density (48) for this variation (49) is reduced to

$$\varepsilon(x, t) = \left[\dot{R}^2 + R^2(\omega_s^2) - R^4 + R^3 + 10R^2 \right] + \left[6A_2B_2\omega_s^2R^2\mathcal{K}_2^2 \cosh(B_2\mathcal{K}_2^3) - A_2 \sinh(B_2\mathcal{K}_2^3) \right] + \left[6A_3B_3\omega_s^2R^2\mathcal{K}_3^2 \cosh(B_3\mathcal{K}_3^3) - A_3 \sinh(B_3\mathcal{K}_3^3) \right]. \quad (50)$$

Note that for this arbitrary variation (49): $\dot{R} = 0$, $\dot{\theta}^2 = \omega_s^2 = 0.64$, $\dot{\theta} = 0$ and then




FIG. 4. The variations of the total rest energy E_o versus small ξ for different B_i 's if one considers an arbitrary deformation in the module function of the SSWS (20) according to Eq. (49). We have set $A_i = 1$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$).

$\mathcal{K}_1 = 0$. The integration of $\varepsilon(x, t)$ (50) over all space from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$ yields the total energy (E) which is a function of ξ . The total energy of the non-deformed SSWS (20) is $E_o = E(\xi = 0) = \frac{228}{125} = 1.824$. As we can see in the Fig. 4, for small B_i 's (i.e. $B_i = 10$ and $B_i = 100$), clearly $E(\xi = 0)$ is not a minimum, but by increasing B_i 's this behavior fades away slowly, i.e. $E(\xi = 0)$, when we used large B_i 's (i.e. $B_i \geq 10^3$), is apparently a minimum. If we zoom on around the $\xi = 0$ for the cases $B_i \geq 10^3$, the output result can be seen in the Fig. 5. As we see, for smaller $|\xi|$, $E(\xi = 0)$ is not really a minimum for the cases $B_i = 10^3$ and $B_i = 10^4$. Again, by increasing B_i 's, this behavior fades away slowly and this routine continues in the same way. In other words, we can always find a very small range for the coefficients ξ around $\xi = 0$, where $E(\xi = 0)$ is not a minimum. This range for larger B_i 's is apparently smaller. Note that, the same results can be obtained for the large values of A_i 's.




FIG. 5. The variations of the total rest energy E_o versus small ξ for different B_i 's if one considers an arbitrary deformation in the module function of the SSWS (20) according to Eq. (49). We have set $A_i = 1$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$). Compare this figure with Fig. 4.

Therefore, mathematically, the SSWS (20) is not really a stable object, but physically, if we consider large values for B_i 's, there will be a very small shift from $E(\xi = 0)$ which is completely unimportant and the stability of the solitary wave solutions is enhanced appreciably. Therefore, with a very good approximation, we can consider the single solitary wave solution (20) as a stable object. This treatment is observed for a special hypothetical Gaussian variation for the R function (49), though it is independent of the form of variations. To support this claim, we can study six other arbitrary hypothetical variations which are introduced in the following forms:

$$R = \omega'_s \operatorname{sech}(\omega'_s x), \quad \theta = \omega_s t + \xi t e^{-x^2}, \quad (51)$$

$$R = (\omega'_s + \xi) \operatorname{sech}(\omega'_s x), \quad \theta(t) = \omega_s t, \quad (52)$$

$$R = \omega'_s \operatorname{sech}((\omega'_s + \xi)x), \quad \theta(t) = \omega_s t, \quad (53)$$

$$R = \omega'_s \operatorname{sech}(\omega'_s x), \quad \theta = (\omega_s + \xi)t, \quad (54)$$

$$R = \omega'_s \operatorname{sech}(\omega'_s x) + \frac{\xi}{1+x^2} \cos(t), \quad \theta = \omega_s t, \quad (55)$$




FIG. 6. Variations of the total rest energy E_o versus small ξ and different B_i 's at $t = 0$. We have set $A_i = 1$. The Figs a-f are related to different variations (51)-(56), respectively.

$$R = \sqrt{1 - (\omega_s + \xi)^2} \operatorname{sech}(\sqrt{1 - (\omega_s + \xi)^2} x), \quad \theta = (\omega_s + \xi)t. \quad (56)$$

All of these variations for $\xi = 0$ turn to the same non-moving undeformed SSWS (20).

The expected results for the variations of the total energy E versus ξ , for six arbitrary deformations (51)-(56) at $t = 0$, are shown in the Fig. 6 respectively. Note that, the case $B_i = 0$ is related to the same original standard CNKG system (1) with the potential (17), and it is quite clear that this case is by no means stable according to the new criterion.

In short, if constants A_i 's and B_i 's are considered to be large numbers, the new additional term (29) behaves like a zero rest mass spook which surrounds the SSWS (20) and resists any arbitrary deformation. In fact, it causes to have a frozen or rigid solitary wave solution (20) for which the modulus and phase functions freeze to $R(x, t) = \omega'_s \operatorname{sech}(\omega'_s \gamma(x - vt))$ and $\theta(x, t) = k_\mu x^\mu = \gamma \omega_s (t - vx)$, respectively; and the related dominant dynamical equations are the same known standard versions (5) and (6).

VI. COLLISIONS

In general, a multi lump solution can be constructed easily just by adding single SSWSs when they are sufficiently far from each other. In the new extended model (21), the dynamical equations (22) and (23) are too complicated to be numerically considered. However, based on the numerical results that obtained from the simple case $B_i = 0$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$), we can bring up some statements about the collisions fates in the new extended system (21) with large B_i 's. For two SSWSs which are initialized with the same speed to collide with each other, undoubtedly, their profiles would change (a little or a lot) when they approach each other. We expect the possible changes in the profiles of the SSWSs, would be approximately similar to those of the simple case $B_i = 0$ which are seen in the Fig. 7. Now, for different systems with different parameters B_i 's, if the total energy is calculated numerically for each profile, it can be shown that for larger B_i 's the possibility that two SSWSs get closer to each other would be smaller (Table. I).

The total energy of two far apart SSWSs, when they move at the same speed of $v = 0.5$, is $E = 2\gamma E_o \approx 4.21$. But, if they want to get close to each other with a finite distance, depending on how large B_i 's are, they require more initial energy to occur. Accordingly, if parameters B_i 's are considered to be large numbers, we expect two SSWSs to interact with each other through their tail and then reappear after collisions, i.e. essentially they can never be too close together. In fact, the possible changes in a SSWS just occurred for the energetic collisions, i.e. the collisions for which the speed of the SSWSs are very close




FIG. 7. The module representation of two SWSs which are initialized to collide with each other at the same speed $v = 0.5$ for eight different times. We have used the original CNKG system (i.e. $B_i = 0$)

to light.

In general, for any arbitrary profile, the part of the energy density that belonged to the additional term F (i.e. $\sum_{i=1}^3 \varepsilon_i$), would be always a large positive definite non-zero function, except for the far apart SWSs profiles. In a collision process, while the SWSs are far away from each other and then their profiles are independently unchanged, the role of the

TABLE I. If the various profiles which are shown in the Fig. 7 are considered as the approximations of the profiles of two SSWSs for other systems (45) with different B_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3$), when they approach each other, they lead to different total energies. We have set $A_i = 1$.

systems	profiles							
	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
$B_i = 10^8$	$E \approx 4.21$	$E \approx 10.1$	$E \approx 62.9$	$E \approx 587$	$E \sim 10^5$	$E \sim 10^{50}$	$E \sim \infty$	$E \sim \infty$
$B_i = 10^7$	$E \approx 4.21$	$E \approx 4.8$	$E \approx 10.1$	$E \approx 62.4$	$E \approx 604$	$E \sim 10^6$	$E \sim 10^{106}$	$E \sim \infty$
$B_i = 10^6$	$E \approx 4.21$	$E \approx 4.3$	$E \approx 4.8$	$E \approx 10.0$	$E \approx 63.0$	$E \approx 637$	$E \sim 10^{12}$	$E \sim 10^{256}$
$B_i = 10^5$	$E \approx 4.21$	$E \approx 4.21$	$E \approx 4.3$	$E \approx 4.8$	$E \approx 10.1$	$E \approx 61.8$	$E \approx 1500$	$E \sim 10^{28}$
$B_i = 10^4$	$E \approx 4.21$	$E \approx 4.21$	$E \approx 4.21$	$E \approx 4.3$	$E \approx 4.8$	$E \approx 10$	$E \approx 63.5$	$E \sim 10^4$
$B_i = 10^3$	$E \approx 4.21$	$E \approx 4.8$	$E \approx 10.1$	$E \approx 66.5$				
$B_i = 10^2$	$E \approx 4.21$	$E \approx 4.3$	$E \approx 4.8$	$E \approx 10$				
$B_i = 10^1$	$E \approx 4.21$	$E = 4.21$	$E \approx 4.3$	$E \approx 4.8$				
$B_i = 0$	$E \approx 4.21$	$E \approx 4.21$						

spook term F is zero (i.e. $\sum_{i=1}^3 \varepsilon_i = 0$), but when they get close to each other and then their profiles change slightly, the role of the spook term becomes important and strongly opposes a closer approach and more changes in the profiles of the SSWSs. For example, according to Fig. 1 and Table. I, if we consider a system with $B_i = 10^8$, to put two SSWSs at an approximate distance of 10, the initial energy must be in the order of 10^5 or the initial speed must be approximately equal to 0.999999999. Therefore, we can be sure that for the systems with large B_i 's, there is always a huge repulsive force between SSWSs which not allow two distinct SSWSs to get close together. Hence, we expect they reappear with no considerable changes after collisions.

If we consider the systems for which parameters B_i 's (or A_i 's) be extremely large numbers, we can divide the nature of such systems into two distinct stationary parts: first, the vacuum state, and second, the free far apart SSWSs. Except the free far apart SSWSs and the vacuum state ($R = 0$), for other possible stable field solutions (structures), always $\sum_{i=1}^3 \varepsilon_i$ would be a very large positive definite function which yields a very large total energy, then infinite energy is required for them to be created.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We first reviewed some basic properties of the complex nonlinear KG (CNKG) systems in $1+1$ dimensions. Each CNKG system may have some non-dispersive solitary wave solutions with particular rest frequencies (ω_o) and rest energies (E_o), called Q-balls. Traditionally, two distinct criteria are used to check the stability of the Q-balls: the classical criterion and the quantum mechanical criterion. In this paper, we used a new criterion for examining the stability (i.e. the energetically stability criterion) of a solitary wave solution that is based on examining the changes in the total energy for arbitrary small variations above the background of the special solitary wave solution. In other words, a special solitary wave solution is energetically stable, if the total energy, for any arbitrary variation in its internal structure, always increases. Accordingly, we showed that in general, there is not any CNKG system with an energetically stable Q-ball solution at all.

Inspire by the well-known quantum field theory in which any standard Lagrangian density is (nonlinear) Klein-Gordon (-like) and is used just for a special type of known particles with specific properties, classically we assume that there is a new extended CNKG system with a single stable solitary wave solution (Q-ball) for which the general dynamical equations (and the other properties) are reduced to those versions of a standard CNKG system. In fact, we put forward three basis postulates. First, we assumed a relativistic localized wave function (20) as a single hypothetical particle of an unknown field model. Second, we assumed that the dominant dynamical equations of motion just for this special solution (20) are the same standard known CNKG versions. And eventually we assumed that this special solution (20) is an energetically stable solution. All of these postulates oblige us to add a proper term F to the original CNKG Lagrangian density, where it and all of its derivatives should be zero for this special solitary wave solution (SSWS) (20).

In this regard, it was introduced three independent functional scalars \mathbb{S}_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$), which are zero simultaneously just for the trivial vacuum state $R = 0$ and a non-trivial SSWS (20). In other words, the SSWS (20) is the unique non-trivial common solution of three independent conditions \mathbb{S}_i 's = 0. The proper additional term F , which is considered in the new extended CNKG model (21), can be considered in the following form: $F = \sum_{i=1}^3 A_i f(Z_i)$, where $Z_i = B_i \mathcal{K}_i^n$, $n = 3, 5, 7, \dots$, A_i 's and B_i 's are some positive constants, f is any arbitrary odd sinh-like function, and \mathcal{K}_i 's are three special independent linear

combinations of \mathbb{S}_i 's. For such proper additional terms (29), the corresponding energy density function (33) is decomposed into four distinct parts ε_i ($i = 0, 1, 2, 3$). In general, ε_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are positive definite functions, that any of their terms contains one of the even powers of \mathcal{K}_i 's, and are zero simultaneously just for the non-trivial SSWS (20) and trivial vacuum state $R = 0$. Except ε_o , which originates from the basic standard CNKG system (1), the other parts of the energy density function, i.e. ε_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$), all originate from the additional term F and all contain parameters B_i 's and A_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3$). If parameters B_i 's and A_i 's are considered to be large numbers, thus ε_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are large functions in compared with function ε_o . More precisely, for the other solutions of the system, which are not very close to the trivial vacuum state $R = 0$ and non-trivial SSWS (20), always at least one of the independent functionals \mathcal{K}_i 's is not zero, and then at least one of the ε_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) is a large non-zero positive function. Accordingly, it was shown analytically and numerically that the SSWS (20) would be approximately an energetically stable solution, provided B_i 's or A_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are considered to be large number. In fact, there are always very small arbitrary variations above the background of the SSWS (20) for which the total energy decreases. But, this decreasing is so small that can be physically ignored in the stability considerations. However, for the other significant small variations, it was shown that the total energy always increases and the energetically stability of the SSWS (20) would guaranteed appreciably.

The stability for the SSWS (20) would be intensified by taken into account the larger values of parameters B_i 's or A_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3$) which appeared in the new additional term F . In other words, the larger the values the greater will be the increase in the total energy for any arbitrary small variation above the background of SSWS (20). Accordingly, the proper additional term F (29) behaves like a massless spook which surrounds the single SSWS (20) and resists any arbitrary significant small deformations in its internal structure. The role of the additional term F in the collisions behaves like a huge repulsive force which does not allow two SSWSs to get close each other. Therefore, it is expected that SSWSs reappear without any distortion in collisions with each other.

If one considers a system for which parameters B_i 's (or A_i 's) be extremely large numbers, then the other configurations of the fields R and θ , which are not very close to any number of distinct far apart SSWSs and trivial vacuum state $R = 0$, require infinite external energy to be created. In other words, if one considers this system as a real physical system, since it

is not possible to provide an extremely large external energy at a special place for creating the other configurations of the fields R and θ , thus the only non-trivial configurations of the fields with the finite energies would be any number of the far apart SSWSs as a multi-particle-like solution. Physically this issue can be interesting, in fact it classically explains how a system leads to many identical particles with the specific characteristics. In fact, the free far apart SSWSs can be called the quanta of the system classically.

To summarize, this paper introduces an extended CNKG system that yields a single non-topological energetically stable solitary wave solution for which the general dynamical equations are reduced to those versions of a special type of the standard well-known CNKG systems. It is noteworthy to mention, only some relativistic topological solutions such as kinks (antikinks) have been introduced as energetically stable objects so far, but the existence of a relativistic energetically stable non-topological solution has not been previously reported (at least as far as we searched) and this work introduces a new one (20). Moreover, for other forthcoming works, especially in $3 + 1$ dimensions, it has been attempted to accurately provide all the mathematical tools required in this paper. For example, we hope to write a series of articles in near future that classically explains how the universal constant \hbar can be justified for all particles, and the mathematical tools presented in this article are very important for achieving this goal.

Appendix A

Here, we are going to show that three PDEs

$$\mathbb{S}_1 = \dot{\theta}^2 - \theta'^2 - \omega_s^2 = 0, \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$\mathbb{S}_2 = \dot{R}^2 - R'^2 + V(R) - \omega_s^2 R^2 = 0, \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\mathbb{S}_3 = \dot{R}\dot{\theta} - R'\theta' = 0. \quad (\text{A3})$$

do not have any non-trivial common solution except the SSWS (20). Equation (A3) leads to obtain $\dot{\theta}$ in terms of θ' , R' and \dot{R} as follows:

$$\dot{\theta} = \frac{R'\theta'}{\dot{R}}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

If we insert this into Eq. (A1), we can obtain θ' in terms of φ' and $\dot{\varphi}$ as follows:

$$\theta' = \frac{\omega_s \dot{R}}{\sqrt{R'^2 - \dot{R}^2}}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

where $\omega_s = \pm 0.8$. Using Eqs. (A4) and (A5), $\dot{\theta}$ can be obtained as well:

$$\dot{\theta} = \frac{\omega_s R'}{\sqrt{R'^2 - \dot{R}^2}}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

The obvious mathematical expectation $(\dot{\theta})' = \frac{d}{dx} \frac{d\theta}{dt} = \frac{d}{dt} \frac{d\theta}{dx} = (\dot{\theta}')$ leads to the following result:

$$\ddot{R} - R'' + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R'^2 - \dot{R}^2}} (\dot{R}^2 \ddot{R} + R'^2 R'' - 2\dot{R}R'\dot{R}') = 0, \quad (\text{A7})$$

which simply can be written in a covariant form:

$$\partial_\mu \partial^\mu R + \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\partial_\mu R \partial^\mu R}} (\partial_\nu R \partial_\sigma R) (\partial^\nu \partial^\sigma R) = 0 \quad (\text{A8})$$

Therefore, to find the common solutions of three independent nonlinear PDEs (A1), (A2) and (A3), equivalently, we can search for the common solutions of the two different PDEs (A2) and (A8). In general, it is easy to show that each non-vibrational function $R_v(x, t) = R_o(\gamma(x - vt))$, would be a solution of the PDE (A8) or (A7). Moreover, for any non-vibrational solitary wave solution, Eqs. (A5) and (A6) lead to $\theta' = \omega_s \gamma v = \omega v$ and $\dot{\theta} = \gamma \omega_s = \omega$ as we expected. On the other hand, we know that the SSWS (20) is the single non-vibrational localized solution of the PDE (A2). Hence, for PDEs (A2) and (A8), the single common non-vibrational localized solitary wave solution is the same SSWS (20), as we expected. Accordingly, for the module field R , there are two completely different PDEs (A2) and (A8). Hence it does seem that there are other common vibrational localized solutions along with the non-vibrational SSWS (20).

-
- [1] R. Rajaraman, *Solitons and Instantons* (North Holland, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1982).
 - [2] A. Das, *Integrable Models* (World Scientific, 1989).
 - [3] G. L. Lamb, *Elements of Soliton Theory* (Dover Publications, 1995).
 - [4] P. G. Drazin and R. S. Johnson, *Solitons: an Introduction* (Cambridge University Press, 1989).
 - [5] N. Manton, P. Sutcliffe, *Topological Solitons*, (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
 - [6] D. K. Campbell and M. Peyrard, *Physica D*, **19**, 165 (1986).
 - [7] D. K. Campbell and M. Peyrard, *Physica D*, **18**, 47 (1986).
 - [8] D. K. Campbell, J. S. Schonfeld, and C. A. Wingate, *Physica D*, **9**, 1 (1983).
 - [9] M. Peyrard and D. K. Campbell, *Physica D*, **9**, 33 (1983).

- [10] R. H. Goodman and R. Haberman, *Siam J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, **4**, 1195 (2005).
- [11] O. V. Charkina, M. M. Bogdan, *Symmetry Integr. Geom.*, **2**, 047 (2006).
- [12] A. R. Gharaati, N. Riazi and F. Mohebbi, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, **45**, 53 (2006).
- [13] M. Mohammadi and N. Riazi, *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, **126**, 237 (2011).
- [14] M. Mohammadi and N. Riazi, *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul.*, **72**, 176-193 (2019).
- [15] J. R. Morris, *Annals of Physics*, **393**, 122-131 (2018).
- [16] J. R. Morris, *Annals of Physics*, **400**, 346-365 (2019).
- [17] V. A. Gani and A. E. Kudryavtsev, *Phys. Rev. E*, **60**, 3305 (1999).
- [18] C. A. Popov, *Wave Motion*, **42**, 309 (2006).
- [19] M. Peyravi, A. Montakhab, et al., *Eur. Phys. J. B*, **72**, 269 (2009).
- [20] M. Mohammadi, N. Riazi, and A. Azizi, *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, **128**, 615 (2012).
- [21] A. M. Wazwaz, *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals*, **28**, 1005 (2006).
- [22] H. Hassanabadi, L. Lu, et al., *Annals of Physics*, **342**, 264-269 (2014).
- [23] A. Alonso-Izquierdoa, J. Mateos Guilarteb, *Annals of Physics*, **327**, 2251-2274 (2012).
- [24] P. Dorey, K. Mersh, T. Romanczukiewicz, and Y. Shnir, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **107**, 091602 (2011).
- [25] V. A. Gani, A. E. Kudryavtsev, and M. A. Lizunova, *Phys. Rev. D*, **89**, 125009 (2014).
- [26] A. Khare, I. C. Christov, and A. Saxena, *Phys. Rev. E*, **90**, 023208 (2014).
- [27] A. Moradi Marjaneh, V. A. Gani, D. Saadatmand, *J. High Energ. Phys.*, **07**, 028 (2017).
- [28] D. Bazeia, E. Belendryasova, and V. A. Gani, *Eur. Phys. J. C*, **78**, 340 (2018).
- [29] V. A. Gani, A. Moradi Marjaneh, et al., *Eur. Phys. J. C*, **78**, 345 (2018).
- [30] P. Dorey and T. Romaczukiewicz, *Physics Letters B*, **779**, 117-123 (2018).
- [31] I. C. Christov, R. J. Decker, et al., *Phys. Rev. D*, **99**, 016010 (2019).
- [32] E. Belendryasova and V. A. Gani, *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul.*, **67**, 414-426 (2019).
- [33] D. Bazeia, R. Menezes, and D. C. Moreira, *J. Phys. Commun.*, **2**, 055019 (2018).
- [34] I. C. Christov, R. J. Decker, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **122**, 171601 (2019).
- [35] N. S. Manton, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, **52**, 065401 (2019).
- [36] V. A. Gani, V. Lensky, and M. A. Lizunova, *J. High Energ. Phys.*, **08**, 147 (2015).
- [37] V. A. Gani, M. A. Lizunova, and R. V. Radomskiy, *J. High Energ. Phys.*, **04**, 043 (2016).
- [38] D. Bazeia, A. R. Gomes, et al., *Physics Letters B*, **793**, 26-32 (2019).
- [39] V. A. Gani, A. Moradi Marjaneh, and D. Saadatmand, *Eur. Phys. J. C*, **79**, 620 (2019).
- [40] D. Bazeia, A. R. Gomes, et al., *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A*, **34**, 1950200 (2019).

- [41] G. 't Hooft, Nuclear Physics B, **79**, 276 (1974).
- [42] M. K. Prasad, Physica D, **1**, 167-191 (1980).
- [43] S. Nishino, R. Matsudo, et al., Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys., **2018**, 103B04 (2018).
- [44] T. H. R. Skyrme, Proc. Roy. Soc. A, **260**, 127 (1961).
- [45] T. H. R. Skyrme, Nucl. Phys., **31**, 556 (1962).
- [46] N. S. Manton, B. J. Schroers, and M. A. Singer, Commun. Math. Phys., **245**, 123-147 (2004).
- [47] N. S. Manton, Commun. Math. Phys., **111**, 469 (1987).
- [48] N. G. Vakhitov and A. A. Kolokolov, Radiophys Quantum Electron, **16**, 783 (1973).
- [49] A. A. Kolokolov, J. Appl. Mech. Tech. Phys., **14**, 426 (1973).
- [50] R. Friedberg, T. D. Lee and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. D, **13**, 2739 (1976).
- [51] A. G. Panin, and M. N. Smolyakov, Phys. Rev. D, **95**, 065006 (2017).
- [52] A. Kovtun, E. Nugaev, and A. Shkerin, Phys. Rev. D, **98**, 096016 (2018).
- [53] M. N. Smolyakov, Phys. Rev. D, **97**, 045011 (2018).
- [54] M. I. Tsumagari, E. J. Copeland, and P. M. Saffin, Phys. Rev. D, **78**, 065021 (2008).
- [55] T. D. Lee and Y. Pang, Phys. Rep., **221**, 251 (1992).
- [56] S. Coleman, Nucl. Phys. B, **262**, 263 (1985).
- [57] D. Bazeia, M. A. Marques, and R. Menezes, Eur. Phys. J. C, **76**, 241 (2016).
- [58] D. Bazeia, L. Losano, et al., Physics Letters B, **765**, 359 (2017).
- [59] K. N. Anagnostopoulos, M. Axenides, et al., Phys. Rev. D, **64**, 125006 (2001).
- [60] M. Axenides, S. Komineas, et al., Phys. Rev. D, **61**, 085006 (2000).
- [61] P. Bowcock, D. Foster, and P. Sutcliffe, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor., **42**, 085403 (2009).
- [62] T. Shiromizu, T. Uesugi, and M. Aoki, Phys. Rev. D, **59**, 125010 (1999).
- [63] T. Shiromizu, Phys. Rev. D, **58**, 107301 (1998).
- [64] N. Riazi, Int. J. Theor. Phys., **50**, 3451 (2011).
- [65] M. Mohammadi and N. Riazi, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys., **2014**, 023A03 (2014).
- [66] G. H. Derrick, Journal of Mathematical Physics, **5**, 1252 (1964).
- [67] M. Mohammadi, Iran. J. Sci. Technol. Trans. Sci., **43**, 2627-2634 (2019).
- [68] M. Mohammadi and R. Gheisari, Physica Scripta, **95**, 015301 (2020).
- [69] J. Diaz-Alonso and D. Rubiera-Garcia, Annals of Physics, **324**, 827-873 (2009).