

Quantum tunneling in deep potential wells and strong magnetic field revisited

Bernard Helffer¹ and Ayman Kachmar^{2,3}

September 6, 2023

¹ Laboratoire de Mathématiques Jean Leray, CNRS, Nantes Université, 44000 Nantes, France. Email: bernard.helffer@univ-nantes.fr

² Lebanese University, Faculty of Sciences, 1700 Nabatieh, Lebanon.

³ Current address:

The Chinese University of Hong Kong (Shenzhen), School of Science and Engineering, 2001 Longxiang Blvd., Longgang District, Shenzhen, China.
Email: akachmar@cuhk.edu.cn

Abstract

Inspired by a recent paper* by C. Fefferman, J. Shapiro and M. Weinstein, we investigate quantum tunneling for a Hamiltonian with a symmetric double well and a uniform magnetic field. In the simultaneous limit of strong magnetic field and deep potential wells with disjoint supports, tunneling occurs and we derive accurate estimates of its magnitude.

* [Lower bound on quantum tunneling for strong magnetic fields. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 54(1), 1105-1130 (2022).]

1 Introduction

1.1 The Hamiltonian

1.1.1 The double well potential

Consider $\mathbf{v}_0 \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_0(x) = v_0(|x|) \text{ is radial \& } v_0^{\min} := \min_{r \geq 0} v_0(r) < 0, \\ \text{supp } \mathbf{v}_0 \subset \overline{D(0, a)} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| \leq a\}, \\ U_0 := \{\mathbf{v}_0(x) = v_0^{\min}\} = \{0\} \quad \& \quad v_0''(0) > 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

We suppose that $\overline{D(0, a)}$ is the smallest disc containing $\text{supp } \mathbf{v}_0$, i.e.

$$a = a(\mathbf{v}_0) := \inf\{r > 0 : \text{supp } \mathbf{v}_0 \subset D(0, r)\}. \quad (1.2)$$

We introduce the *double well* potential (ℓ refers to ‘left’ and r to ‘right’),

$$V(x) = \mathbf{v}_0(x - z^\ell) + \mathbf{v}_0(x - z^r) \quad \text{where } |z^\ell - z^r| =: L > 2a(\mathbf{v}_0). \quad (1.3)$$

The potential wells of V associated with the energy v_0^{\min} are the connected components of $\{V(x) = \min V\}$, i.e.

$$U_\ell = U_0 + z^\ell = \{z^\ell\}, \quad U_r = U_0 + z^r = \{z^r\}. \quad (1.4)$$

Without loss of generality, we choose z^ℓ and z^r in the following manner

$$z^\ell = \left(-\frac{L}{2}, 0\right), \quad z^r = \left(\frac{L}{2}, 0\right). \quad (1.5)$$

1.1.2 The magnetic field

Consider a vertical magnetic field $b\vec{z}$ where

$$b > 0 \text{ is a constant.} \quad (1.6)$$

Notice that

$$b = \text{curl}(b\mathbf{A})$$

where \mathbf{A} is defined in polar coordinates (r, θ) as follows,

$$\mathbf{A}(r, \theta) = \frac{r}{2} \begin{bmatrix} -\sin \theta \\ \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1.7)$$

1.2 Deep symmetric wells in a strong magnetic field

We consider the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_{b,\lambda} := (D - b\mathbf{A})^2 + \lambda^2 V, \quad D := \frac{1}{i}\nabla, \quad (1.8)$$

with a double well electric potential $\lambda^2 V$ and a magnetic potential $b\mathbf{A}$, where λ and b are the coupling parameter and the intensity of the magnetic field, respectively. In this paper, we suppose that $b = \lambda$ and $\lambda \gg 1$ is large¹.

The regime where b does not scale like the coupling parameter λ has been inspected a long time ago. For instance, when $b \ll \lambda$, accurate estimates of the tunnel effect were obtained in [13], while when $b \gg \lambda$, the effect of the potential well becomes weak and the magnetic effect is dominant (see [1] and [14]).

The potential function considered in (1.8) is not analytic, thereby making our setting significantly different from the one of [13], where the magnetic field scales like the coupling parameter, V is analytic and some condition on the intensity of the magnetic field appears. As we shall see, this will induce serious difficulties in deriving accurate bounds on the magnitude of the tunnel effect

¹Writing $\lambda \gg 1$ means that we consider the regime where $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$. In the same vein, writing $\alpha \ll \lambda$ (resp. $\alpha \gg \lambda$), we mean that $\alpha/\lambda \rightarrow 0$ (resp. $\alpha/\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$).

and highlights another interesting new phenomenon related to *tunneling* under a magnetic field compared to recent results in [2, 8].

In order to exploit the connection with the rich literature on the tunnel effect in multiple wells (see [5, 11, 12, 13]), it will be convenient to divide by λ and mainly consider the corresponding equivalent semi-classical problem

$$\mathcal{L}_h := (hD - \mathbf{A})^2 + V, \quad (1.9)$$

where $h = \lambda^{-1} \ll 1$.

Hence we have

$$\mathcal{H}_{b,\lambda} = h^{-2} \mathcal{L}_h.$$

Our result will depend on the size of the support of the potential function (in particular through $a(\mathbf{v}_0)$ in (1.2)). Let us denote by $(e_j^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h))_{j \geq 1}$ the sequence of min-max eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_h . We will investigate the semi-classical asymptotics of

$$e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h), \quad (1.10)$$

and prove roughly speaking (see Corollary 1.3 for a precise statement)

$$e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) \underset{\substack{h \rightarrow 0 \\ a(\mathbf{v}_0) \rightarrow 0}}{\sim} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{h} \int_0^L \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} d\rho\right). \quad (1.11)$$

Under the additional assumption that \mathbf{v}_0 does not vanish in the open disk $D(0, a(\mathbf{v}_0))$, we prove an accurate asymptotics of the form (see Theorem 1.4)

$$e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{=} \exp\left(-\frac{S(\mathbf{v}_0) + o(1)}{h}\right)$$

without the hypothesis that $a(\mathbf{v}_0) \ll 1$.

Our investigation relies on expanding the ground state $e^{\text{sw}}(h)$ of the single well Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}} := (hD - \mathbf{A})^2 + \mathbf{v}_0. \quad (1.12)$$

Under the assumptions in (1.1), we show that:

Theorem 1.1 (Existence of radial ground states and precise expansions).

Assume that \mathbf{v}_0 satisfies the conditions in (1.1). Then, there exists $h_0 > 0$ such that, for all $h \in (0, h_0]$, the following holds:

1. The ground state energy, $e^{\text{sw}}(h)$, of $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$, is a simple eigenvalue and

$$e^{\text{sw}}(h) = v_0^{\min} + h\sqrt{1 + 2v_0''(0)} + \mathcal{O}(h^{3/2}). \quad (1.13)$$

2. There exists a unique positive ground state, \mathbf{u}_h , of $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$, with the properties

- $\mathbf{u}_h(x) = u_h(|x|)$ is a radial function;
- \mathbf{u}_h is normalized, i.e. $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\mathbf{u}_h|^2 dx = 1$.

3. There exists a positive radial function \mathbf{a}_0 on \mathbb{R}^2 satisfying

$$\mathbf{a}_0(0) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sqrt{1 + 2v_0''(0)}}{\pi}, \quad (1.14)$$

such that, for any $R > 0$, the ground state \mathbf{u}_h satisfies, uniformly in the disc $D(0, R) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\left| e^{\mathfrak{d}(x)/h} \mathbf{u}_h(x) - h^{-1/2} \mathbf{a}_0(x) \right| = \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2}), \quad (1.15)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{d}(x) = d(|x|) = \int_0^{|x|} \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho. \quad (1.16)$$

This in particular clarifies the hypotheses imposed in [6]. Then, applying Theorem 1.5 in [6], under the additional assumptions

$$\mathbf{v}_0 \leq 0 \text{ and } L > 4 \left(\sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|} + a(\mathbf{v}_0) \right), \quad (1.17)$$

we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\left(-\frac{L^2 + 4\sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|}L + \gamma(\mathbf{v}_0)}{4h}\right) &\leq e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{(L - a(\mathbf{v}_0))^2 - a(\mathbf{v}_0)^2}{4h}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (1.18)$$

where $\gamma(\mathbf{v}_0)$ is a positive constant.

The bounds in (1.18) follow from the asymptotics (also obtained in [6, Eq. (1.12)] under the assumptions (1.18))

$$e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \left| 2 \int_{D(0,a)} \mathbf{v}_0(x) \mathbf{u}_h(x) \mathbf{u}_h(x_1 + L, x_2) e^{\frac{iLx_2}{2h}} dx \right| \quad (1.19)$$

where \mathbf{u}_h is the radial ground state of $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$ (see Theorem 1.1). The integral in the right hand side of (1.19) is called, after [6], the *hopping coefficient*. It describes the interaction between the two potential “wells” and can be derived through a reduction to the restriction of \mathcal{L}_h on a two dimensional space (yielding an *interaction matrix* like in [11]).

Using the improved expansion of the ground state \mathbf{u}_h in Theorem 1.1 above, we improve the bounds on the hopping coefficient and thereby on $e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h)$ provided the potential \mathbf{v}_0 satisfies the conditions in (1.1).

Besides its role in capturing the tunneling asymptotics, precise estimates of the hopping coefficient are key ingredients in the understanding of tight binding reductions [18] (see also [4, 17]). Hence our new estimates of the hopping have potential applications, to be discussed elsewhere.

Our first result, on the eigenvalue splitting, is as follows.

Theorem 1.2 (New bounds on the eigenvalue splitting).

Assume that \mathbf{v}_0 satisfies the conditions in (1.1) and (1.17). Then, there exist positive constants h_0, C_1, C_2 such that for all $h \in (0, h_0)$, we have

$$C_1 h \exp\left(-\frac{S_0}{h}\right) \leq e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) \leq C_2 h^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{S_a}{h}\right) \quad (1.20)$$

where (with $a = a(\mathbf{v}_0) > 0$)

$$S_a = \int_0^{L-a} \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho + \int_0^a \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho \quad (1.21)$$

and

$$S_0 = \int_0^L \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho. \quad (1.22)$$

Furthermore, if $\mathbf{v}_0 < 0$ in $D(0, a)$, then we have the improved lower bound

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} h \ln(e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h)) \geq -\hat{S}, \quad (1.23)$$

where $\hat{S} < S_0$ is defined as follows

$$\hat{S} = \inf_{0 < r < a} \left(\frac{Lr}{2} + \int_0^{L-r} \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho + \int_0^r \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho \right). \quad (1.24)$$

Notice that, whenever $L > 2a$ and $v_0 \leq 0$, we have,

$$\frac{\rho}{2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} \leq \frac{\rho}{2} + \sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|}, \quad (1.25)$$

from which we deduce (with $a = a(\mathbf{v}_0)$) the following estimates

$$\frac{(L-a)^2 - a^2}{4} < S_a \text{ and } S_0 < \frac{L^2 + 4\sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|}L}{4}. \quad (1.26)$$

Hence the estimates in (1.20) already improve the ones in (1.18) thereby providing a more accurate measurement of the magnitude of the tunnel effect. The guess of S_a and S_0 is based on the consideration of the hopping matrix like it appears in [6] together with the WKB expansion of the single well ground states obtained in the present contribution (Theorem 1.1). The estimate (1.23) is a new improvement of the lower bound in (1.20) since we will prove in Proposition 4.2, that $S_a < \hat{S} < S_0$.

The bounds in Theorem 1.2 provide a rather sharp estimate of the gap $e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h)$ when the size of the support of the potential function is small (i.e. $a(\mathbf{v}_0) \ll 1$). In fact, we have

$$S_0 = S_a + R_a \quad (1.27)$$

where

$$R_a := \int_0^a \left(\sqrt{\frac{(L-\rho)^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} - \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} \right) d\rho.$$

If $v_0 \leq 0$ and $0 < 2a < L$, then R_a satisfies (for the upper bound we use (1.25))

$$0 < R_a \leq \left(\frac{L-a}{2} + \sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|} \right) a. \quad (1.28)$$

Moreover, observing that

$$S_0 = \int_0^L \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} d\rho + \int_0^a \left(\sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} - \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} \right) d\rho$$

we obtain (when $v_0 \leq 0$ and for the lower bound we use (1.25))

$$\int_0^L \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} d\rho - \sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|} a \leq S_0 \leq \int_0^L \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} d\rho.$$

We then have the following immediate corollary of Theorem 1.2 (which is our precise meaning of (1.11)).

Corollary 1.3. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 1.2, the following holds*

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_0^L \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} d\rho &\leq \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0^+} h \ln (e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h)) \\ &\leq \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} h \ln (e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h)) \\ &\leq - \int_0^L \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} d\rho + C_L(v_0), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_L(\mathbf{v}_0) = \left(\frac{L - a(\mathbf{v}_0)}{2} + 2\sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|} \right) a(\mathbf{v}_0)$$

and $a(\mathbf{v}_0)$ is introduced in (1.2).

With the improved bound in (1.23) holding when $\mathbf{v}_0 < 0$ in $D(0, a(\mathbf{v}_0))$, we can refine our estimates of the *hopping coefficient* on the r.h.s. of (1.19). The idea is that we insert the profile of \mathbf{u}_h given in Theorem 1.1 into the hopping coefficient in (5.1) and control the arising error terms by (1.23) and a tricky identity from [6] refined by our expansion of \mathbf{u}_h in (1.15) (see Lemma 5.2). The outcome is a precise asymptotics of the tunneling's magnitude through a new sharp constant $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{v}_0, L)$ that we will introduce later in (6.26). More precisely we prove the following.

Theorem 1.4 (Sharp asymptotics of the eigenvalue splitting).

Under the assumptions in Theorem 1.2, if $\mathbf{v}_0 < 0$ in $D(0, a(\mathbf{v}_0))$, then we have

$$h \ln (e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h)) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} -S(\mathbf{v}_0, L),$$

where $S(\mathbf{v}_0, L)$ is a positive constant.

The expression of $S(\mathbf{v}_0, L)$, explicitly given in (6.26), has the form

$$S(\mathbf{v}_0, L) = S_a + I(a(\mathbf{v}_0), L, v_0^{\min})$$

where we see two types of terms:

- S_a , introduced in (1.21), is expressed in terms of the magnetic field, the potential function \mathbf{v}_0 , and the size of its support, $a(\mathbf{v}_0)$ (see (1.2)). It is obtained from the magnetic Agmon distance between the wells.
- $I(a(\mathbf{v}_0), L, v_0^{\min})$ involves, in addition to the size of the well's support, the distance L between the wells and the minimum v_0^{\min} of the potential, which amounts to the “deepness” of the well. We can interpret $I(a(\mathbf{v}_0), L, v_0^{\min})$ as an interaction term between the wells.

Remark 1.5 (Distant wells and narrow wells). *If the distance L between the wells is very large, we observe that*

$$S(\mathbf{v}_0, L) \underset{L \rightarrow +\infty}{=} \frac{L^2}{4} + |v_0^{\min}| \ln L + \mathcal{O}(1)$$

Notice that, to leading order, the foregoing asymptotics is consistent with (1.18).

Even when the support of the well is very small, we find

$$S(\mathbf{v}_0, L) \underset{a \rightarrow 0_+}{\sim} \frac{L}{4} \sqrt{L^2 + 4|v_0^{\min}|} + |v_0^{\min}| \ln \left(\frac{L \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{4|v_0^{\min}|}{L^2}} \right)}{2\sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|}} \right).$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^L \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} d\rho &= \frac{L}{4} \sqrt{L^2 + 4|v_0^{\min}|} + |v_0^{\min}| \sinh^{-1} \left(\frac{L}{2\sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|}} \right) \\ &= \frac{L}{4} \sqrt{L^2 + 4|v_0^{\min}|} + |v_0^{\min}| \ln \left(\frac{L \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{4|v_0^{\min}|}{L^2}} \right)}{2\sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

which is consistent with Corollary 1.3.

Remark 1.6 (Consistency with non-magnetic tunneling). *By a simple change of scales, our results include the Hamiltonian*

$$\mathcal{L}_h^\beta := (\hbar D - \beta \mathbf{A})^2 + V, \quad (1.29)$$

where $\beta > 0$ measures the strength of the magnetic field.

If we denote by $(e_j(\hbar, \beta))_{j \geq 1}$ the sequence of min-max eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_\hbar^β and introduce the effective semi-classical parameter $h = \beta^{-1}\hbar$, we reduce the analysis to the Hamiltonian in (1.9), thanks to the relation

$$\mathcal{L}_\hbar^\beta := \beta^2 \left((hD - \mathbf{A})^2 + \beta^{-2}V \right).$$

This yields

$$e_2(\hbar, \beta) - e_1(\hbar, \beta) = \beta^2 \left(e_2^{\beta^{-2}\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\beta^{-2}\mathbf{v}_0}(h) \right).$$

As a consequence of Theorem 1.4, we get

$$\hbar \ln \left(e_2(\hbar, \beta) - e_1(\hbar, \beta) \right) \underset{\hbar \rightarrow 0}{\sim} -\beta S(\beta^{-2}\mathbf{v}_0)$$

and we shall see that (cf. Proposition 6.11)

$$\beta S(\beta^{-2}\mathbf{v}_0) \underset{\beta \rightarrow 0}{\sim} 2 \int_0^{L/2} \sqrt{v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho,$$

which is the term obtained in the non-magnetic setting [12, 19].

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4. In Section 2, we revisit the harmonic approximation in the presence of a magnetic field and conclude by proving Proposition 2.1, which proves the first and second items in Theorem 1.1. In Section 3, we recall the WKB approximation in the setting of radially symmetric potential and ground state; the third item in Theorem 1.1 then follows from Propositions 3.3 and 3.5. Section 4 is devoted to the properties of the constants S_0 , S_a and \hat{S} appearing in the tunneling estimates (1.20) and (1.23). The proof of Theorem 1.2 occupies Section 5 (see (5.1) and Propositions 5.5 and 5.6). Finally, Section 6 is devoted to the proof Theorem 1.4. Theorem 1.4 only yields the decay rate of the tunneling and an estimate of the amplitude. Capturing the leading term of the amplitude seems quite challenging and will be discussed in Remark 6.10. Another perspective could be to relax the “radial” hypothesis on the potential function \mathbf{v}_0 , in particular, establishing that tunneling occurs when \mathbf{v}_0 is compactly supported with a unique non-degenerate minimum.

2 Magnetic harmonic approximation

In the presence of a magnetic field and a unique non-degenerate well, the method of harmonic approximation was treated in [13, Sec. 2], but we revisit it here in the setting of a radial potential, which allows us to derive more precise results on the ground states. We can also refer to Matsumoto [15] and Matsumoto-Ueki [16] for an independent discussion in the general case.

2.1 The Landau Hamiltonian

In the absence of an electric field, $\mathbf{v}_0 = 0$, the operator in (1.12) reduces (after rescaling) to the Landau Hamiltonian

$$L = (D - \mathbf{A})^2$$

whose spectrum consists of the Landau levels, i.e.

$$\sigma(L) = \{\Lambda_n := (2n - 1) : n \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

where each Λ_n is an eigenvalue of infinite multiplicity.

Moreover, L has a normalized radial ground state given by

$$\phi_0(x) = \pi^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{|x|^2}{2}\right).$$

We can decompose L via the orthogonal projections on the Fourier modes,

$$\Pi_m u := e^{im\theta} \pi_m u, \quad \pi_m u := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u(r, \theta') e^{-im\theta'} d\theta' \quad (m \in \mathbb{Z}). \quad (2.1)$$

In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; dx) &= \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \Pi_m(L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; dx)) \simeq \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} L^2(\mathbb{R}_+, r dr), \\ L &= \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} L \Pi_m \simeq \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} H_{m,0}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$H_{m,0} := \pi_m L \pi_m^* = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} - \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{r^2}{4} + \frac{m^2}{r^2} - m$$

is the self-adjoint operator in $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+, r dr)$ associated with the quadratic form

$$q_{m,0}(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(|u'(r)|^2 + \frac{1}{r^2} \left(m - \frac{r^2}{2}\right)^2 |u|^2 \right) r dr.$$

Then we get

$$\sigma(L) = \overline{\bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \sigma(H_{m,0})}.$$

For each Landau level Λ_n , we introduce the set

$$\mathcal{J}_n = \{m \in \mathbb{Z} : \Lambda_n \in \sigma(H_{m,0})\}.$$

For a given $m \in \mathcal{J}_n$, Λ_n is a simple eigenvalue of $H_{m,0}$. However, since Λ_n is an eigenvalue of L with infinite multiplicity, we deduce that \mathcal{J}_n is infinite. Note that $0 \in \mathcal{J}_1$ and by the min-max principle, $\mathcal{J}_1 \subset [0, +\infty)$.

2.2 The magnetic harmonic oscillator

Consider the case where $\mathbf{v}_0(x) = \mu|x|^2$, where μ is a positive constant. The single well operator in (1.12) becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}} = (hD - \mathbf{A})^2 + \mu|x|^2.$$

After rescaling² we get

$$\sigma(\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}) = h\sigma(L_\mu^{\text{mag}})$$

where

$$L_\mu^{\text{mag}} = (D - \mathbf{A})^2 + \mu|x|^2. \quad (2.2)$$

We decompose the operator L_μ^{mag} via the orthogonal projections on the Fourier modes as follows

$$L_\mu^{\text{mag}} \simeq \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} H_{m,\mu}$$

where

$$H_{m,\mu} := \pi_m L_\mu^{\text{mag}} \pi_m^* = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} - \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \left(\frac{1}{4} + \mu\right)r^2 + \frac{m^2}{r^2} - m.$$

The min-max principle yields

$$\forall m < 0, \quad \lambda_1(H_{m,\mu}) > \inf_{u \neq 0} \frac{\langle (-\Delta + (\frac{1}{4} + \mu)|x|^2)u, u \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}}{\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}} = 2\sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \mu}. \quad (2.3)$$

Moreover, the rescaling $r \mapsto (1 + 4\mu)^{1/4}r$ yields the reduction to the Landau Hamiltonian,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{m,\mu} &= \sqrt{1 + 4\mu} \left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} - \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{r^2}{4} + \frac{m^2}{r^2} - m \right) + \left(\sqrt{1 + 4\mu} - 1 \right) m \\ &= \sqrt{1 + 4\mu} H_{m,0} + \left(\sqrt{1 + 4\mu} - 1 \right) m. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Consequently, we infer from (2.3) and (2.2)

$$\inf_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \lambda_1(H_m) = \lambda_1(H_0) = \sqrt{1 + 4\mu}, \quad \inf_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{Z} \\ m \neq 0}} \lambda_1(H_m) > \sqrt{1 + 4\mu}.$$

This implies that

$$\lambda_1(L_\mu^{\text{mag}}) = \sqrt{1 + 4\mu} \quad (2.5)$$

is a simple eigenvalue and that its (normalized) associated eigenfunction is radial:

$$\phi_\mu^{\text{mag}}(x) = \pi^{-1/2} (1 + 4\mu)^{1/4} \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{1 + 4\mu}}{2}|x|^2\right). \quad (2.6)$$

²We do the change of variable $y = h^{-1/2}x$.

2.3 Eigenvalue asymptotics and radial ground states

Assuming that the potential function \mathbf{v}_0 satisfies (1.1), we have an accurate description of the spectrum of the operator $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$ introduced in (1.12), which will provide an example where the hypotheses imposed by Fefferman–Shapiro–Weinstein in [6] hold (see their Assumption 1.4).

In the sequel we use the notation $(\lambda_j(\mathcal{P}))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ for the sequence of min-max eigenvalues of a given self-adjoint operator \mathcal{P} .

Proposition 2.1. *For every fixed $j \in \mathbb{N}$, the j 'th eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$ satisfies,*

$$\lambda_j(\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}) = v_0^{\min} + h \lambda_j(L_\mu^{\text{mag}}) + \mathcal{O}(h^{3/2}) \quad (h \rightarrow 0_+),$$

where L_μ^{mag} is the operator introduced in (2.2), with $\mu = \frac{v_0''(0)}{2}$.

Moreover, the lowest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$ is simple with a radial ground state.

As a consequence of Proposition 2.1 and the construction of accurate quasi-modes, the lowest eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}})$ can be expanded to any order in powers of h (see Proposition 3.3 below).

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Except the last statement, the proof is standard (see [13] for the magnetic case) and corresponds to the so-called Harmonic approximation in the case of a non degenerate well (see [3, 19] and [7, Ch. 7]). We write

$$\mathbf{v}_0(x) = \mathbf{v}_0^{\text{app}}(x) + \mathcal{O}(|x|^3) \quad (x \rightarrow 0)$$

where

$$\mathbf{v}_0^{\text{app}}(x) := v_0^{\min} + \mu|x|^2.$$

For any $C > 0$, the spectrum below $v_0^{\min} + Ch$ of $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$ is effectively given (modulo $\mathcal{O}(h^{3/2})$) by that of

$$(hD - \mathbf{A})^2 + \mathbf{v}_0^{\text{app}}(x) = v_0^{\min} + hL_\mu^{\text{mag}},$$

so we are reduced to the operator analyzed in Sec. 2.2, thereby getting the asymptotics displayed in Proposition 2.1.

To prove the last statement, we consider a normalized ground state ψ_h of $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$. After rescaling, we obtain from ψ_h the following normalized function

$$\mathbf{u}_h(x) := h^{-1/2} \psi_h(h^{1/2}x).$$

Moreover, the operator $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$ can be fibered as $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}} \simeq h \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{L}_{h,m}$, where

$$\mathcal{L}_{h,m} := \pi_m \mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}} \pi_m^* = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} - \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + h^{-1} v_0(h^{1/2}r) + \frac{r^2}{4} + \frac{m}{r^2} - m.$$

For h sufficiently small, the ground state energy of $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$ is simple, so there exists a unique $m_* \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mathbf{u}_h = \Pi_{m_*} \mathbf{u}_h$, where Π_{m_*} is the projection introduced

in (2.1). Note that m_* could depend on h but we skip the reference to h to simplify the presentation.

The theory of harmonic approximation yields that the ground state \mathbf{u}_h is close to the normalized radial ground state ϕ_μ^{mag} of the operator L_μ^{mag} introduced in (2.6). In fact, we have a spectral gap

$$\delta(\mu) := \lambda_2(L_\mu^{\text{mag}}) - \lambda_1(L_\mu^{\text{mag}}) > 0$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{u}_h - \phi_\mu^{\text{mag}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} = \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2}) \quad (h \rightarrow 0_+).$$

Now we write the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}_h - \phi_\mu^{\text{mag}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Pi_m(\mathbf{u}_h - \phi_\mu^{\text{mag}})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \\ &= \|\Pi_0 \mathbf{u}_h - \phi_\mu^{\text{mag}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{Z} \\ m \neq 0}} \|\Pi_m \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\Pi_0 \phi_\mu^{\text{mag}} = \phi_\mu^{\text{mag}}$ and, for $m \neq 0$, $\Pi_m \phi_\mu^{\text{mag}} = 0$, since the function ϕ_μ^{mag} is radial.

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_0 \mathbf{u}_h - \phi_\mu^{\text{mag}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 &= \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2}), \\ \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{Z} \\ m \neq 0}} \|\Pi_m \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 &= \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2}) \quad (h \rightarrow 0_+) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbf{u}_h = \Pi_0 \mathbf{u}_h + \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2}).$$

This proves that $m_* = 0$ and that the ground state \mathbf{u}_h is radial. ■

3 Decay of ground states for the single well potential

Again, we recall standard results but just take advantage of the additional assumption that the one well potential is radial.

3.1 The Agmon distance

Consider the radial potential function \mathfrak{w} on \mathbb{R}^2

$$\mathfrak{w}(x) := \frac{|x|^2}{4} + \mathfrak{v}_0(x) = \frac{r^2}{4} + v_0(r) \quad (r = |x| \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{R}^2). \quad (3.1)$$

We introduce the smooth radial function on \mathbb{R}^2 associated with the potential \mathfrak{w} ,

$$\mathfrak{d}(x) = d(|x|) \quad (3.2a)$$

with

$$d(r) := \int_0^r \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho \quad (3.2b)$$

The function \mathfrak{d} amounts to the (Agmon) distance to the well $\{0\}$, relative to the potential \mathfrak{w} .

3.2 Agmon estimates

If f is a radial function, then

$$\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}} f = -h^2 \Delta f + \mathfrak{w} f \quad (3.3)$$

Therefore, when restricting the action of $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$ to radial functions, we consider \mathfrak{w} as the effective potential. Hence, we can apply the semi-classical analysis relative to the Schrödinger operator without magnetic potential as considered in [12] or [19] (see [11] or [5] for a more pedagogical presentation). The identity in (3.3) and an integration by parts yield the following result [11, Thm. 3.1.1].

Proposition 3.1. *For all $R > 0$, let $D_R = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| < R\}$. If $\phi \in C^0(\overline{D_R}; \mathbb{R})$ and $u \in C^2(\overline{D_R}; \mathbb{R})$ are radial functions such that ϕ is Lipschitz and $u = 0$ on ∂D_R , then the following identity holds*

$$\int_{D_R} \left(h^2 |\nabla(e^{\phi/h} u)|^2 + (\mathfrak{w} - |\nabla\phi|^2) |e^{\phi/h} u|^2 \right) dx = \int_{D_R} e^{2\phi/h} u \mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}} u dx.$$

We have the following standard application of Proposition 3.1 on the decay of ground states of the operator $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$.

Proposition 3.2. *For all $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exist $a(\delta), C_\delta, h_0 > 0$ such that $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0_+} a(\delta) = 0$ and, if \mathbf{u}_h is a ground state of $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$ and $h \in (0, h_0)$, then we have,*

$$\left\| \nabla \left(e^{(1-\delta)\mathfrak{d}(x)/h} \mathbf{u}_h \right) \right\|^2 + \left\| e^{(1-\delta)\mathfrak{d}(x)/h} \mathbf{u}_h \right\|^2 \leq C_\delta e^{a(\delta)/h} \|\mathbf{u}_h\|^2,$$

where \mathfrak{d} is the Agmon distance introduced in (3.2a).

The estimate in (3.2) is not optimal since we work under the assumption in (1.1). In fact, we can write estimates with $\delta = 0$ as we shall see in Proposition 3.5 later on.

3.3 WKB approximation

For all $S > 0$, we introduce the set

$$B_\mathfrak{d}(S) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \mathfrak{d}(x) < S\}, \quad (3.4)$$

where \mathfrak{d} is the Agmon distance to 0 introduced in (3.2a). Since \mathfrak{d} is monotone increasing with respect to $|x|$, we have

$$B_\mathfrak{d}(S) = D(0, R_S) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| < R_S\} \quad (3.5)$$

where R_S is the unique solution of $d(R) = S$. Clearly, R_S is monotone increasing with respect to S .

We can then perform the WKB construction outlined in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3 (cf. Prop. 4.4.3 in [11]). *There exist $N_0 \geq 1$ and two sequences $(E_k)_{k \geq 0} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $(\mathbf{a}_k)_{k \geq 0} \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that, for all $N \geq 1$ and $S > 0$,*

$$e^{\mathfrak{d}(x)/h} \left(\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}} - E^N(h) \right) \vartheta^N = \mathcal{O}(h^{N-N_0}) \quad \text{on } B_{\mathfrak{d}}(S),$$

where

$$E^N(h) = \sum_{k=0}^N E_k h^k, \quad E_0 = v_0^{\min}, \quad E_1 = \sqrt{1 + 2v_0''(0)}$$

$$\vartheta^N(x) = h^{-1/2} \left(\sum_{k=0}^N \mathbf{a}_k(x) h^k \right) e^{-\mathfrak{d}(x)/h}, \quad \mathbf{a}_0(0) = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1 + 2v_0''(0)}{\pi}}.$$

Moreover $\mathbf{a}_0(x) > 0$ and for every k , the function \mathbf{a}_k is radial.

Remark 3.4. *The function \mathbf{a}_0 satisfies the transport equation*

$$2\nabla \mathfrak{d} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{a}_0 + (\Delta \mathfrak{d} - E_1) \mathbf{a}_0 = 0.$$

Since \mathfrak{d} and \mathbf{a}_0 are radial, we get

$$\mathbf{a}_0(x) = a_0(|x|) := \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1 + 2v_0''(0)}{\pi}} \exp \left(- \int_0^{|x|} f(\rho) d\rho \right)$$

where

$$f(\rho) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{u'(\rho)}{u(\rho)} + \frac{1}{2\rho} - \frac{E_1}{2\sqrt{u(\rho)}}$$

and

$$u(\rho) = \frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}.$$

Proposition 3.5 (cf. Theorem 4.4.4 in [11]). *There exists $N_0 \geq 1$, and for all $h \in (0, 1]$, there exists a ground state \mathbf{u}_h of $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$ such that*

$$\|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} = 1,$$

and if Ω is an open bounded set in \mathbb{R}^2 , then for any N the following holds

$$\left\| e^{\mathfrak{d}(x)/h} (\mathbf{u}_h - \vartheta^N) \right\|_{H^2(\Omega)} = \mathcal{O}(h^{N-N_0}).$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The first item in Theorem 1.1 follows from Proposition 2.1. Consider the normalized ground state \mathbf{u}_h of $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$ in Proposition 3.5. By

Proposition 2.1, \mathbf{u}_h is radial. By the Sobolev embedding theorem and Propositions 3.5 and 3.3, we have for $\Omega = D(0, R)$ and $R > 0$,

$$\left\| e^{\mathfrak{d}(x)/h} (\mathbf{u}_h - h^{-1/2} \mathbf{a}_0) \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2})$$

thereby proving that \mathbf{u}_h is positive, since \mathbf{a}_0 is. This proves the second and third items in Theorem 1.1. ■

4 About the measure of the tunneling

Let us inspect more closely the constants S_0 and S_a appearing in the tunneling estimates in (1.20). Recall that

$$S_0 = \int_0^L \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho. \quad (4.1)$$

Since $\mathbf{v}_0(x) = v_0(|x|)$ vanishes outside $D(0, a)$, we can rewrite the expression of S_a in (1.21) as follows

$$S_a := 2 \int_0^a \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho + \int_a^{L-a} \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} d\rho. \quad (4.2)$$

We now prove a variational characterization of S_0 and S_a involving the function d in (3.2b).

Proposition 4.1. *We have*

$$S_0 = \inf_{0 < u < a} (d(u) + d(L + u)) \quad (4.3)$$

and if $v_0 < \frac{L(L-2a)}{4}$,

$$S_a = \inf_{0 < u < a} (d(u) + d(L - u)). \quad (4.4)$$

Proof.

Proof of (4.3).

The function

$$(0, a) \ni u \mapsto \psi_*(u) = \int_0^u \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho + \int_0^{L+u} \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho$$

satisfies (for $0 < u < a$),

$$\psi'_*(u) = \sqrt{\frac{u^2}{4} + v_0(u) - v_0^{\min}} + \sqrt{\frac{(L+u)^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} > 0.$$

Hence, it is monotone increasing and

$$\min_{0 < u < a} \psi_*(u) = \psi_*(0) = S_0$$

where S_0 is introduced in (4.1).

Proof of (4.4).

Consider the function

$$(0, a) \ni u \mapsto \varphi_*(u) = \int_0^u \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho + \int_0^{L-u} \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho. \quad (4.5)$$

Notice that, for $u \in (0, a)$ and $a < \frac{L}{2}$, we have $a < L - a < L - u$ and

$$\varphi'_*(u) = \sqrt{\frac{u^2}{4} + v_0(u) - v_0^{\min}} - \sqrt{\frac{(L-u)^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}},$$

with

$$\varphi'_*(0) < 0, \quad \varphi'_*(a) < 0$$

and

$$\varphi'_*(u) = 0 \text{ iff } v_0(u) = \frac{L(L-2u)}{4} \geq \frac{L(L-2a)}{4} > 0.$$

Consequently, $\varphi'_*(u)$ can not vanish on $(0, a)$ if we know that $v_0(u) < \frac{L(L-2a)}{4}$. Under this assumption, we have

$$\varphi'_* < 0 \text{ on } (0, a)$$

and

$$\varphi_*(a) < \varphi_*(u) < \varphi_*(0),$$

thereby proving (4.4). ■

We now consider the constant \hat{S} introduced in (1.24). Recall that, by (1.24),

$$\hat{S} = \min_{r \in [0, a]} g_0(r)$$

where

$$g_0(r) = \frac{Lr}{2} + d(L-r) + d(r),$$

and $d(r)$ is introduced in (3.2b).

Proposition 4.2. *We have*

$$S_a < \hat{S} < \min \left(S_0, S_a + \frac{La}{2} \right), \quad (4.6)$$

and if $g_0(r_0) = \hat{S}$, then $0 < r_0 < a$. Moreover, if $v'_0 \geq -\frac{L}{4}$, then r_0 is unique.

Proof. We have, for $0 \leq r \leq a$,

$$g'_0(r) = \frac{L}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{(L-r)^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} + \sqrt{\frac{r^2}{4} + v_0(r) - v_0^{\min}}.$$

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} g'_0(0) &= \frac{L}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{L^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} < 0, \\ g'_0(a) &= \frac{L}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{L(L-2a)}{4} + \frac{a^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} + \sqrt{\frac{a^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} \\ &\geq \frac{L}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{L(L-2a)}{4}} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

So g_0 has a minimum r_0 and $r_0 \in (0, a)$. Consequently,

$$\hat{S} = g_0(r_0) < g_*(0) = S_0, \quad \hat{S} < g_0(a) = S_a + \frac{La}{2},$$

and, by (4.4),

$$\hat{S} = g_0(r_0) \geq S_a + \frac{Lr_0}{2} > S_a.$$

Finally, we observe that

$$g''_0(r) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\frac{L-r}{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{(L-r)^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\frac{r}{2} + 2v'_0(r)}{\sqrt{\frac{r^2}{4} + v_0(r) - v_0^{\min}}},$$

and if furthermore $g'_0(r) = 0$, we have

$$g''_0(r) = \frac{\left(\frac{L}{2} + 2v'_0(r)\right) \sqrt{\frac{r^2}{4} + v_0(r) - v_0^{\min}} + \frac{Lr}{4}}{2 \left(\frac{L}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{r^2}{4} + v_0(r) - v_0^{\min}}\right) \sqrt{\frac{r^2}{4} + v_0(r) - v_0^{\min}}},$$

which is positive if $\frac{L}{2} + 2v'_0(r) \geq 0$. ■

For technical reasons (see Proposition 5.6), we need to minimize, with respect to $r \in [0, a]$, the following function

$$g(r, \varepsilon) = \frac{(1-\varepsilon)Lr}{2} + d(\sqrt{(L-r)^2 + 2\varepsilon Lr}) + d(r), \quad (4.7)$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ is fixed and $d(\cdot)$ is introduced in (3.2b).

For all $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, we set

$$S(\varepsilon) := \inf_{0 < r < a} g(r, \varepsilon),$$

and notice that $\hat{S} = S(0)$ (see Proposition 4.2).

Proposition 4.3 (Optimizing w.r.t. ε). *We have $\hat{S} = \inf_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} S(\varepsilon)$ and there exists $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ such that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,*

$$S(\varepsilon) = g(r_\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \text{ with } 0 < r_\varepsilon < a.$$

Furthermore, if $v'_0 \geq -\frac{L}{4}$, r_ε is unique and satisfies $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} r_\varepsilon = r_0$, where r_0 is introduced in Proposition 4.2

Proof. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \varepsilon}(r, \varepsilon) &= -\frac{Lr}{2} + \frac{Lr}{\sqrt{(L-r)^2 + 2\varepsilon Lr}} \sqrt{\frac{(L-r)^2 + 2\varepsilon Lr}{4}} - v_0^{\min} \\ &\geq -\frac{Lr}{2} + \frac{Lr}{\sqrt{(L-r)^2 + 2\varepsilon Lr}} \sqrt{\frac{(L-r)^2 + 2\varepsilon Lr}{4}} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\inf_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1} g(r, \varepsilon) = g(r, 0) = \frac{Lr}{2} + d(L-r) + d(r).$$

Consequently

$$\hat{S} = \inf_{r \in [0,a]} g(r, 0) = \inf_{r \in [0,a]} \left(\inf_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} g(r, \varepsilon) \right) = \inf_{\varepsilon \in (0,1]} S(\varepsilon). \quad (4.8)$$

We have seen in the proof of Proposition 4.2 that

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial r}(0, 0) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial g}{\partial r}(a, 0) > 0.$$

By continuity of $\frac{\partial g}{\partial r}(r, \varepsilon)$ w.r.t. ε , we know that, for ε sufficiently small

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial r}(0, \varepsilon) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial g}{\partial r}(a, \varepsilon) > 0.$$

This yields that every minimum r_ε of $g(r, \varepsilon)$ is in $(0, a)$.

To study the behavior of r_ε as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we start by noticing that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} S(\varepsilon) = \hat{S}. \quad (4.9)$$

In fact, by (4.8), for every $\delta > 0$, there exists ε_δ such that

$$\hat{S} \leq S(\varepsilon_\delta) \leq \hat{S} + \delta$$

and by the monotnicity of $g(r, \cdot)$ we get

$$\forall \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_\delta), \quad \hat{S} \leq S(\varepsilon) \leq S(\varepsilon_0) \leq \hat{S} + \delta$$

which proves (4.9).

Now, consider a sequence $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ that converges to 0 such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} r_{\varepsilon_n} = r_0 \in [0, a]$. Then

$$S(\varepsilon_n) = g_{\varepsilon_n}(r_{\varepsilon_n}, \varepsilon_n) \rightarrow g(r_0, 0)$$

thereby, in light of (4.9), $g(r_0, 0) = \hat{S}$. Thus, by Proposition 4.2, we have $0 < r_0 < a$. If moreover $v_0' \geq -\frac{L}{4}$, then r_0 is the unique minimum of $g_0(\cdot) := g(\cdot, 0)$, hence $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} r_\varepsilon = r_0$. By a continuity argument, for ε small enough, $\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial r^2}(r_\varepsilon, \varepsilon) > 0$, hence the uniqueness of the minimum of $g(\cdot, \varepsilon)$. ■

5 Bounds on the eigenvalue splitting

5.1 The hopping coefficient

In [6], the following term has been introduced (*the hopping coefficient*)

$$w_{\ell, r} = \int_{D(0, a)} \mathbf{v}_0(x) \mathbf{u}_h(x+z) \mathbf{u}_h(x) e^{i\frac{Lxz}{2h}} dx, \quad (5.1)$$

where \mathbf{u}_h is the positive ground state of the single well operator $\mathcal{L}_h^{\text{sw}}$ (see Theorem 1.1), and $z = (L, 0)$. In the framework of [12] (see also [11]), $w_{\ell, r}$ can be derived by a reduction to an interaction matrix.

Assuming the condition (1.17), the following holds by [6, Eq. (1.10) & (1.12)]

$$e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} 2|w_{\ell, r}|, \quad (5.2)$$

so the magnitude of the tunneling effect is given by $w_{\ell, r}$.

Estimating the hopping coefficient $w_{\ell, r}$ being interesting on its own [18], the sharp estimates of $w_{\ell, r}$ which we provide in Propositions 5.1, 5.4 and in Sec. 6 do not require the assumption $L > 4(a + \sqrt{|v_0^{\text{min}}|})$ in (1.17). It appears that the foregoing condition is only used to vindicate the asymptotics in (5.2), and relaxing it is definitely an interesting task.

As pointed out in [6], the oscillatory complex phase in the expression of $w_{\ell, r}$ is behind the difficulties in dealing with this term. Fortunately, as observed in [6], it is possible to rule out the oscillatory complex phase by using special functions. Recall that the ground state $\mathbf{u}_h(x) = u_h(|x|)$ is a radial function and $a = a(\mathbf{v}_0)$ is introduced in (1.2).

Proposition 5.1 (Bounds on $w_{\ell, r}$). *We have $w_{\ell, r} \in \mathbb{R}$, and there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that, for all $h \in (0, 1]$, we have*

$$|w_{\ell, r}| \leq c_2 \int_0^a |v_0(r)| u_h(L-r) u_h(r) r dr.$$

Furthermore, if $v_0 \leq 0$, then for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, there exists $c_\varepsilon > 0$ such that, for all $h \in (0, 1]$, we have

$$|w_{\ell, r}| \geq c_\varepsilon \int_0^a e^{-\frac{(1-\varepsilon)Lr}{2h}} |v_0(r)| u_h(\sqrt{(L-r)^2 + 2\varepsilon Lr}) u_h(r) r dr.$$

The proof of Proposition 5.1 relies on the tricky representation, in Lemma 5.2 below, of the function u_h , defining the radial ground state \mathbf{u}_h . It is obtained in [6], but with the expansion of u_h in Theorem 1.1, we can describe the coefficients in a sharper manner than in [6].

With $a = a(\mathbf{v}_0)$ in (1.2), $d(\cdot)$ in (1.16) and $\mathbf{a}_0(\cdot)$ in (1.15), we introduce the two constants

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathbf{v}_0) &= \frac{a}{4} \sqrt{a^2 + 4|v_0^{\min}|} + \frac{|v_0^{\min}|}{2} \ln \frac{(\sqrt{a^2 + 4|v_0^{\min}|} + a)^2}{4|v_0^{\min}|} - d(a) \\ m(\mathbf{v}_0) &= \mathbf{a}_0(0) \sqrt{\frac{2a|v_0^{\min}|}{\pi}} \frac{(a^2 + 4|v_0^{\min}|)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{a^2 + 4|v_0^{\min}|} + a}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

Lemma 5.2. *The function u_h , defining the ground state \mathbf{u}_h in Theorem 1.1, has the following representation, valid for $\rho \geq a$,*

$$u_h(\rho) = C_h \exp\left(-\frac{\rho^2}{4h}\right) \int_0^{+\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{\rho^2 t}{2h}\right) t^{\alpha-1} (1+t)^{-\alpha} dt, \quad (5.4)$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2h} |v_0^{\min}| - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{1 + 2v_0''(0)} - 1 \right) + \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2}) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \frac{1}{2h} |v_0^{\min}|, \quad (5.5)$$

and

$$C_h \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} C_h^{\text{asy}} := \mathbf{m}(v_0) h^{-1} \exp\left(\frac{F(\mathbf{v}_0)}{h}\right). \quad (5.6)$$

Proof. The representation in (5.4) is obtained in [6, Eq. (2.9)], with

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2h} e^{\text{sw}}(h). \quad (5.7)$$

The asymptotics in (5.5) now follows from (1.13) in Theorem 1.1. So we still have to determine the constant C_h , by matching (5.4) with the expansion of $u_h(\rho)$ in Theorem 1.1. In fact, by (1.15) and (1.16), we have

$$u_h(a) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \mathbf{a}_0(0) h^{-1/2} e^{-\frac{d(a)}{h}},$$

where $\mathbf{a}_0(0)$ is given in (1.14).

On the other hand, by the method of Laplace approximation [6, Eq. (2.12)], the representation in (5.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} u_h(a) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} C_h \sqrt{\frac{2\pi h}{|v_0^{\min}|(1 + 2t_*(a))}} (1 + t_*(a)) e^{-\frac{\eta(a)}{h}}, \\ t_*(a) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{1 + \frac{4}{a^2} |v_0^{\min}|} - 1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\eta(a) = \frac{1}{4}(1 + 2t_*(a))a^2 + \frac{|v_0^{\min}|}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_*(a)} \right).$$

Consequently, we have

$$C_h \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \frac{\sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|(1 + 2t_*(a))}}{\sqrt{2\pi}(1 + t_*(a))} h^{-1} e^{-\frac{d(a) - \eta(a)}{h}}$$

which eventually yields (5.6). ■

Proof of Proposition 5.1. We start by expressing the integral (5.1) in polar coordinates

$$w_{\ell,r} = \int_0^a r v_0(r) u_h(r) \left(\int_0^{2\pi} K_h(r, \theta) d\theta \right) dr, \quad (5.8)$$

where

$$K_h(r, \theta) = u_h \left(\sqrt{r^2 + L^2 + 2Lr \cos \theta} \right) e^{\frac{iLr \sin \theta}{2h}}.$$

Coming back to (5.8), the integral of K_h with respect to θ is computed in [6, Prop. 5.1] by using (5.4) as follows

$$\int_0^{2\pi} K_h(r, \theta) d\theta = C_h \exp \left(-\frac{r^2 + L^2}{4h} \right) \int_0^{+\infty} G_h(r, t) dt, \quad (5.9)$$

where

$$G_h(r, t) = \exp \left(-\frac{(r^2 + L^2)t}{2h} \right) t^{\alpha-1} (1+t)^{-\alpha} I_0 \left(\frac{Lr \sqrt{t(t+1)}}{h} \right) \quad (5.10)$$

and $z \mapsto I_0(z) := J_0(iz)$ is the modified Bessel's function of order 0.

The advantage of the formula in (5.9) is the absence of the oscillatory complex term and moreover, the integrand G_h is a positive function.

The function $I_0(z)$ has the following asymptotic for large z [20, Eq. (9.3.14)],

$$I_0(z) \underset{z \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \frac{e^z}{\sqrt{2\pi z}}. \quad (5.11)$$

Furthermore, I_0 can be represented as a convergent series with positive terms

$$I_0(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{(\frac{1}{4}z^2)^k}{(k!)^2} \quad (z \in \mathbb{R}).$$

In particular, I_0 grows exponentially as follows

$$\frac{c_1}{\sqrt{2\pi z + 1}} e^z \leq I_0(z) \leq \frac{c_2}{\sqrt{2\pi z + 1}} e^z \leq c_2 e^z \quad (z \in \mathbb{R}_+), \quad (5.12)$$

where c_1, c_2 are positive constants.
We introduce

$$\begin{aligned} F(r) &= \int_0^{+\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{(r^2 + L^2)t}{2h}\right) t^{\alpha-1}(1+t)^{-\alpha} \exp\left(\frac{Lr\sqrt{t(t+1)}}{h}\right) dt \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{(L-r)^2 t}{2h}\right) t^{\alpha-1}(1+t)^{-\alpha} \exp\left(\frac{Lr}{h} \frac{\sqrt{t}}{\sqrt{t} + \sqrt{t+1}}\right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, for all $t > 0$, we have

$$0 \leq \frac{\sqrt{t}}{\sqrt{t} + \sqrt{t+1}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$$

hence

$$F(r) \leq F_2(r) \quad (5.13)$$

where

$$F_2(r) = e^{\frac{Lr}{2h}} \int_0^{+\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{(L-r)^2 t}{2h}\right) t^{\alpha-1}(1+t)^{-\alpha} dt.$$

Collecting (5.9), (5.12) and (5.13), we get by (5.4)

$$\int_0^{2\pi} K_h(r, \theta) d\theta \leq c_2 u_h(L-r). \quad (5.14)$$

Let us now bound $\int_0^{2\pi} K_h(r, \theta) d\theta$. Given an arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, it results from (5.12) that there exists a constant $c_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$I_0(z) \geq c_\varepsilon e^{(1-\varepsilon)z} \quad (z \in \mathbb{R}_+). \quad (5.15)$$

We now introduce,

$$\begin{aligned} F^\varepsilon(r) &= \int_0^{+\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{(r^2 + L^2)t}{2h}\right) t^{\alpha-1}(1+t)^{-\alpha} \exp\left(\frac{(1-\varepsilon)Lr\sqrt{t(t+1)}}{h}\right) dt \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{(L-r)^2 t}{2h}\right) t^{\alpha-1}(1+t)^{-\alpha} \exp\left(\frac{Lr}{h}((1-\varepsilon)\sqrt{t(t+1)} - t)\right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, for all $t > 0$, we have

$$(1-\varepsilon)\sqrt{t(t+1)} - t \geq (1-\varepsilon)t - t = -\varepsilon t$$

hence

$$F^\varepsilon(r) \geq F_1^\varepsilon(r) \quad (5.16)$$

where

$$F_1^\varepsilon(r) = \int_0^{+\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{((L-r)^2 + 2\varepsilon Lr)t}{2h}\right) t^{\alpha-1}(1+t)^{-\alpha} dt.$$

Collecting (5.9), (5.15) and (5.16), we get by (5.4)

$$\int_0^{2\pi} K_h(r, \theta) d\theta \geq c_\varepsilon e^{-\frac{(1-\varepsilon)Lr}{2h}} u_h(\sqrt{(L-r)^2 + 2\varepsilon Lr}).$$

Recalling that $0 < r < a$, we get further

$$\int_0^{2\pi} K_h(r, \theta) d\theta \geq c_\varepsilon e^{-\frac{(1-\varepsilon)La}{2h}} u_h(\sqrt{(L-r)^2 + 2\varepsilon Lr}).$$

■

5.2 WKB approximation

Using (1.15) and Proposition 5.1 (with $\varepsilon = 1$), we get,

$$c_1 w_{\ell,r}^{0,-} + \mathcal{O}(M_h^-) \leq |w_{\ell,r}| \leq c_2 w_{\ell,r}^{0,+} + \mathcal{O}(M_h^+), \quad (5.17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\ell,r}^{0,+} &= h^{-1} \int_0^a |v_0(r)| a_0(L-r) a_0(r) \exp\left(-\frac{d(r) + d(L-r)}{h}\right) r dr, \\ w_{\ell,r}^{0,-} &= h^{-1} \int_0^a |v_0(r)| a_0(L+r) a_0(r) \exp\left(-\frac{d(r) + d(L+r)}{h}\right) r dr. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} M_h^+ &= \int_0^a |v_0(r)| \exp\left(-\frac{d(r) + d(L-r)}{h}\right) r dr, \\ M_h^- &= \int_0^a |v_0(r)| \exp\left(-\frac{d(r) + d(L+r)}{h}\right) r dr. \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

The remainder terms M_h^\pm are easily controlled as follows.

Proposition 5.3. *We have*

$$M_h^+ = \mathcal{O}(e^{-S_a/h}) \quad \text{and} \quad M_h^- = \mathcal{O}(e^{-S_0/h}).$$

Proof. By (4.4) and (4.3),

$$\min_{0 \leq r \leq a} (d(r) + d(L-r)) = S_a \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{0 \leq r \leq a} (d(r) + d(L+r)) = S_0$$

where S_a and S_0 are introduced in (1.21) and (4.1) respectively. Hence

$$M_h^+ \leq e^{-S_a/h} \int_0^a |v_0(r)| r dr$$

and

$$M_h^- \leq e^{-S_0/h} \int_0^a |v_0(r)| r dr.$$

■

We move now to the control of the leading terms, $w_{\ell,r}^{0,\pm}$, in (5.17).

Proposition 5.4. *There exist constants $h_0, C > 0$ such that, for all $h \in (0, h_0]$, we have*

$$w_{\ell,r}^{0,+} \leq Ch^{-1}e^{-S_a/h}$$

and

$$w_{\ell,r}^{0,-} \geq \frac{h}{C}e^{-S_0/h}.$$

Proof. The bound on $w_{\ell,r}^{0,+}$ follows in a straightforward manner, as for the bound on M_h^+ in Proposition 5.3. Concerning $w_{\ell,r}^{0,-}$, the function $\psi_*(r) = d(r) + d(L+r)$ is monotone increasing and

$$S_0 = \psi_*(0) = \min_{0 \leq r \leq \eta} \psi_*(r), \quad \psi'_*(0) = \sqrt{\frac{L^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} > 0.$$

By Laplace's approximation,

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\ell,r}^{0,-} &\underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} e^{-S_0/h} \int_0^a |v_0(0)| a_0(L) a_0(0) \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{\frac{L^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} r}{h}\right) r dr \\ &= \frac{h^2}{\frac{L^2}{4} - v_0^{\min}} e^{-S_0/h}. \end{aligned}$$

■

Collecting (5.17), Propositions 5.3 and 5.4, we get

Proposition 5.5. *There exist constants $h_0, \tilde{C} > 0$ such that, for all $h \in (0, h_0]$, we have*

$$\frac{h}{\tilde{C}} \exp\left(-\frac{S_0}{h}\right) \leq |w_{\ell,r}| \leq \tilde{C} h^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{S_a}{h}\right).$$

By inserting the estimates in Proposition 5.5 into (5.2), we finish the proof of (1.20) in Theorem 1.2. So we still have to prove (1.23) which follows from the following proposition.

Proposition 5.6. *If $v_0 < 0$ on $D(0, a)$, then*

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} (h \ln |w_{\ell,r}|) \geq -\hat{S}, \quad (5.19)$$

where \hat{S} is introduced in (1.24).

Proof. We use Proposition 5.1 with $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and we replace u_h by its WKB approximation using (1.15). Eventually we get

$$|w_{\ell,r}| \geq c_\varepsilon w_{\ell,r}^\varepsilon - C_\varepsilon M_h^\varepsilon, \quad (5.20)$$

where $c_\varepsilon, C_\varepsilon > 0$ are independent of h ,

$$w_{\ell,r}^\varepsilon = h^{-1} \int_0^a |v_0(r)| a_0(\sqrt{(L-r)^2 + 2\varepsilon Lr}) a_0(r) \exp\left(-\frac{g(r,\varepsilon)}{h}\right) r dr,$$

$$M_h^\varepsilon = \int_0^a |v_0(r)| \exp\left(-\frac{g(r,\varepsilon)}{h}\right) r dr$$

and $g(r,\varepsilon)$ is introduced in (4.7). We can rewrite (5.20) as follows

$$h|w_{\ell,r}| \geq c_\varepsilon \int_0^a |v_0(r)| (a_0(\sqrt{(L-r)^2 + 2\varepsilon Lr}) a_0(r) - C_\varepsilon^* h) \exp\left(-\frac{g(r,\varepsilon)}{h}\right) r dr \quad (5.21)$$

where $C_\varepsilon^* = C_\varepsilon/c_\varepsilon$.

Now we assume that $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, where ε_0 is the constant in Proposition 4.3. Pick $r_\varepsilon \in (0, a)$ such that

$$S(\varepsilon) := \inf_{0 < r < a} g(r,\varepsilon) = g(r_\varepsilon,\varepsilon).$$

We choose $\eta_0 \in (0, a)$ sufficiently small such that, for all $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$ and $r \in I_\eta := (-\eta + r_\varepsilon, r_\varepsilon + \eta) \subset (0, a)$, we have

$$g(r,\varepsilon) \leq S(\varepsilon) + m_\varepsilon \eta$$

where m_ε is independent of η . By the same considerations, we have (after choosing η_0, h_0 small and taking $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$ and $h \in (0, h_0)$)

$$a_0(\sqrt{(L-r)^2 + 2\varepsilon Lr}) a_0(r) - C_\varepsilon^* h > m_\varepsilon^* > 0$$

where m_ε is independent of h and η .

Now we write,

$$|h w_{\ell,r}^\varepsilon| \geq K_\varepsilon(\eta) \exp\left(-\frac{S(\varepsilon) + m_\varepsilon \eta}{h}\right),$$

where

$$K_\varepsilon(\eta) = c_\varepsilon m_\varepsilon^* \int_{I_\eta} |v_0(r)| r dr.$$

The hypothesis $v_0 < 0$ in $D(0, a)$ ensures that $K_\varepsilon(\eta) > 0$. Consequently

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} (h \ln |h w_{\ell,r}|) \geq -S(\varepsilon) + m_\varepsilon \eta$$

Sending η to 0 then ε to 0, we get

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} (h \ln |h w_{\ell,r}|) \geq -\hat{S},$$

where we used that $\hat{S} = S(0)$ by Proposition 4.2. ■

Remark 5.7. *The upper bound in Proposition 5.5 continues to hold if we relax the assumption on the sign of \mathbf{v}_0 and assume instead that*

$$v_0 < \frac{L(L-2a)}{4}$$

which ensures the validity of (4.4).

Remark 5.8 (Reduction to an interaction matrix). *In [6], the asymptotics (5.2) holds for $v_0 \leq 0$ and $L > 4(a + \sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|})$. We can derive (5.2) by using the approach of reduction to an interaction matrix like in [12] (see [11] or [5]). That is the subject of the work [10] (see also [9]) which yields*

$$e_2^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) - e_1^{\mathbf{v}_0}(h) = 2|w_{\ell,r}| + \mathcal{O}(e^{-2\tilde{S}/h}), \quad (5.22)$$

where \tilde{S} is a constant satisfying $0 < \tilde{S} < 2\hat{S}$ and \hat{S} is introduced in (1.24).

6 The tunneling asymptotics

6.1 Towards the proof of the main theorem.

Recall the constant $a = a(\mathbf{v}_0)$ in (1.2) and let us assume that $\mathbf{v}_0 < 0$ in $D(0, a)$ (i.e. $v_0(r) < 0$ for $0 \leq r < a$). With Proposition 5.6 in hand, we can compute the leading term in the hopping coefficient $w_{\ell,r}$ introduced in (5.1). This will follow through a sequence of reductions justified in the following lemmas.

We will make use of the following consequence of Proposition 5.6. Recall the constant \hat{S} in (1.24). Then, by Proposition 5.6, we have

$$\forall p \in \mathbb{R}, \forall A > \hat{S}, h^p e^{-A/h} \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{=} o(|w_{\ell,r}|). \quad (6.1)$$

Moreover, for all $\eta \in (0, a)$, let us introduce

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\eta) := C_h \int_{\eta}^a r |v_0(r)| |u_h(r)| \exp\left(-\frac{r^2 + L^2}{4h}\right) \left(\int_{\eta}^{+\infty} G_h(r, t) dt\right) dr,$$

where C_h is introduced in Lemma 5.2 and G_h is introduced in (5.10). The next lemma establishes that $|w_{\ell,r}|$ can be approximated by $\mathcal{W}_1(\eta)$ uniformly with respect to $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, where η_0 is a sufficiently small constant.

Lemma 6.1. *There exist constants $\eta_0 \in (0, a)$, $A(\eta_0) > \hat{S}$ and $h_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$ and $h \in (0, h_0]$, we have*

$$||w_{\ell,r}| - \mathcal{W}_1(\eta)| \leq e^{-A(\eta_0)/h}.$$

In particular, for all $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$,

$$|w_{\ell,r}| \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \mathcal{W}_1(\eta).$$

Proof. Consider $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$ where $0 < \eta_0 < a$. By (5.8) and (5.9) we write

$$|w_{\ell,r}| = \mathcal{W}_1(\eta) + \mathcal{R}_1(\eta) + \mathcal{R}_2(\eta)$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_1(\eta) = \int_0^\eta r |v_0(r)| u_h(r) \left(\int_0^{2\pi} K_h(r, \theta) d\theta \right) dr, \quad (6.2)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_2(\eta) = C_h \int_\eta^a r |v_0(r)| u_h(r) \exp\left(-\frac{r^2 + L^2}{4h}\right) \left(\int_0^\eta G_h(r, t) dt \right) dr. \quad (6.3)$$

Using (5.14), we have

$$0 \leq \mathcal{R}_1(\eta) \leq \mathcal{R}_1(\eta_0) \leq c_2 \int_0^{\eta_0} r |v_0(r)| u_h(r) u_h(L-r) dr.$$

Arguing as in Proposition 5.4, and using the monotonicity of the function φ_* in (4.5), we have

$$\int_0^{\eta_0} r |v_0(r)| u_h(r) u_h(L-r) dr = \mathcal{O}(h^{-1} e^{-S_{\eta_0}/h})$$

where $S_{\eta_0} = \varphi_*(\eta_0)$ and depends continuously on η_0 so that $\lim_{\eta_0 \rightarrow 0} S_{\eta_0} = S_0$; here S_0 is introduced in (4.1). By Proposition 4.2, we choose η_0 sufficiently small such that $S_{\eta_0} > \hat{S}$. This proves that $\mathcal{R}_1(\eta_0) = \mathcal{O}(h^{-1} e^{-S_{\eta_0}/h}) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{=} o(|w_{\ell,r}|)$, by (6.1).

Let us now prove that $\mathcal{R}_2(\eta) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{=} o(|w_{\ell,r}|)$. Using (5.10) and (5.12), we write for $0 < t < \eta < \eta_0 < a$,

$$G_h(r, t) = \mathcal{O}(e^{c_0 \sqrt{\eta}/h}) C_h \exp\left(-\frac{(r^2 + L^2)t}{2h}\right) t^{\alpha-1} (1+t)^{-\alpha}$$

where $c_0 = \sqrt{a} + 1$. Inserting this into the expression of $\mathcal{R}_2(\eta)$, we get by (5.4),

$$\mathcal{R}_2(\eta) = \mathcal{O}(e^{c_0 \sqrt{\eta}/h}) \int_\eta^a r |v_0(r)| u_h(r) u_h(\sqrt{L^2 + r^2}) dr.$$

Arguing as in Proposition 5.4 and observing that

$$\min_{\eta < r < a} d(r) + d(\sqrt{L^2 + r^2}) = d(\eta) + d(\sqrt{L^2 + \eta^2}) > S_0$$

we get

$$\mathcal{R}_2(\eta) = \mathcal{O}(h^{-1} e^{c_0 \sqrt{\eta}/h} e^{-S_0/h}).$$

Finally, by Proposition 4.2, we choose η_0 sufficiently small so that, $S_0 - c_0 \sqrt{\eta_0} > \hat{S}$ and we conclude by Proposition 5.4 that $\mathcal{R}_2(\eta) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{=} o(|w_{\ell,r}|)$, for all $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$.

Looking closely at the foregoing bounds on $\mathcal{R}_1(\eta)$ and $\mathcal{R}_2(\eta)$, we have in fact proved the following. If we select A such that

$$\hat{S} < A < \min(S_{\eta_0}, S_0 - c_0\sqrt{\eta_0})$$

then there exists $h_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$,

$$0 \leq \mathcal{R}_1(\eta) + \mathcal{R}_2(\eta) \leq e^{-A/h}.$$

■

For all $\eta \in (0, a)$, we introduce

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\eta) := C_h^{\text{asy}} \int_{\eta}^a r |v_0(r)| a_0(r) \exp\left(-\frac{d(r)}{h} - \frac{r^2 + L^2}{4h}\right) \left(\int_{\eta}^{+\infty} G_h(r, t) dt\right) dr,$$

where C_h^{asy} is introduced in (5.6), G_h is introduced in (5.10) and a_0 is introduced in Proposition 3.3. We will prove that $\mathcal{W}_1(\eta)$ in Lemma 6.1 can be approximated by $h^{-1/2}\mathcal{W}_2(\eta)$, uniformly with respect to $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$.

Lemma 6.2. *Let η_0 be as introduced in Lemma 6.1. There exist constants $h_0, M > 0$ such that, for all $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$ and $h \in (0, h_0]$, we have*

$$|\mathcal{W}_1(\eta) - h^{-1/2}\mathcal{W}_2(\eta)| \leq Mh^{1/2}\mathcal{W}_2(\eta) + \left|1 - \frac{C_h^{\text{asy}}}{C_h}\right| \mathcal{W}_1(\eta)$$

where $\mathcal{W}_1(\eta)$ is as in Lemma 6.1.

Proof. By Lemma 6.1, it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{W}_1(\eta) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} h^{-1/2}\mathcal{W}_2(\eta)$ (and estimate the remainder terms). We write

$$g_{\eta}(r) = \int_{\eta}^{+\infty} G_h(r, t) dt, \quad \delta_h(r) = e^{d(r)/h} u_h(r) - h^{-1/2} a_0(r)$$

and

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\eta) = h^{-1/2}\mathcal{W}_2(\eta) + \mathcal{R}_1(\eta) + \mathcal{R}_2(\eta)$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_1(\eta) = (C_h - C_h^{\text{asy}}) \int_{\eta}^a r |v_0(r)| u_h(r) g_{\eta}(r) \exp\left(-\frac{r^2 + L^2}{4h}\right) dr,$$

$$\mathcal{R}_2(\eta) = C_h^{\text{asy}} \int_{\eta}^a r |v_0(r)| \delta_h(r) g_{\eta}(r) \exp\left(-\frac{d(r)}{h} - \frac{r^2 + L^2}{4h}\right) dr.$$

Notice that

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\eta) = C_h \int_{\eta}^a r |v_0(r)| u_h(r) g_{\eta}(r) \exp\left(-\frac{r^2 + L^2}{4h}\right) dr.$$

Consequently

$$\mathcal{R}_1(\eta) = \left(1 - \frac{C_h^{\text{asy}}}{C_h}\right) \mathcal{W}_1(\eta) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{=} o(\mathcal{W}_1(\eta)).$$

As for $\mathcal{R}_2(\eta)$, by (1.15), $|\delta_h| = \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2})$, and since $a_0(\cdot) > 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\eta) \geq \mathcal{W}_2^0(\eta) := \mathfrak{m}_0 C_h^{\text{asy}} \int_{\eta}^a r |v_0(r)| g_{\eta}(r) \exp\left(-\frac{d(r)}{h} - \frac{r^2 + L^2}{4h}\right) dr$$

where

$$\mathfrak{m}_0 = \min_{0 \leq r \leq a} a_0(r) > 0.$$

Consequently,

$$|\mathcal{R}_2(\eta)| = \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2} \mathcal{W}_2^0(\eta)) = \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2} \mathcal{W}_2(\eta)).$$

■

We give a finer approximation of the hopping coefficient $|w_{\ell,r}|$ in (5.1), by replacing G_h in the definition of $\mathcal{W}_2(\eta)$ (see Lemma 6.2) by its approximation at infinity. At this level, unlike Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2, our estimates are no more uniform with respect to $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, where η_0 is introduced in Lemma 6.1. Consider*

$$\mathcal{W}_3(\eta) := C_h^{\text{asy}} \int_{\eta}^a r |v_0(r)| a_0(r) \exp\left(-\frac{d(r)}{h} - \frac{r^2 + L^2}{4h}\right) \left(\int_{\eta}^{+\infty} G_h^{\text{asy}}(r, t) dt\right) dr,$$

where C_h^{asy} is introduced in (5.6),

$$G_h^{\text{asy}}(r, t) = \sqrt{h} \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{(r^2 + L^2)t}{2h} + \frac{Lr\sqrt{t(t+1)}}{h} - \alpha \ln\left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right)\right)}{(2\pi Lr)^{1/2} t^{5/4} (t+1)^{1/4}}$$

and α is introduced in (5.5). Then, we have

$$|w_{\ell,r}| \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} h^{-1/2} \mathcal{W}_3(\eta).$$

Proof. By Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2, it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{W}_2(\eta) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \mathcal{W}_3(\eta)$. By (5.10), we observe that

$$G_h(r, t) = \frac{1}{t} I_0\left(\frac{Lr\sqrt{t(t+1)}}{h}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{(r^2 + L^2)t}{2h} - \alpha \ln\left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right)\right).$$

By (5.11), for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $z_0 > 0$ such that

$$\forall z \geq z_0, \quad \left|I_0(z) - \frac{e^z}{\sqrt{2\pi z}}\right| < \epsilon \frac{e^z}{\sqrt{2\pi z}}.$$

In particular, there exists $h_0 = h_0(\eta, \epsilon) > 0$ such that,

$$\forall r, t \geq \eta, \forall h \in (0, h_0], |G_h(r, t) - G_h^{\text{asy}}(r, t)| < \epsilon G_h^{\text{asy}}(r, t).$$

Writing

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\eta) = \mathcal{W}_3(\eta) + \mathcal{R}(\eta)$$

we get, for all $h \in (0, h_0]$,

$$|\mathcal{R}(\eta)| \leq \epsilon \mathcal{W}_3(\eta)$$

which yields that $\mathcal{R}(\eta) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{=} o(\mathcal{W}_3(\eta))$. ■

In our next step we get a new asymptotics from Lemma 6.3 by replacing α by its approximation in (5.5). Recall that by (5.5)

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \frac{\alpha_0}{h}, \\ \alpha_0 &= \alpha_0^{\text{main}} + \mathcal{O}(h^{3/2}), \\ \alpha_0^{\text{main}} &= \frac{|v_0^{\text{min}}|}{2} - \frac{h}{2} \left(\sqrt{1 + 2v_0''(0)} - 1 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Inserting this into $G_h^{\text{asy}}(r, t)$ in Lemma 6.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} G_h^{\text{main}}(r, t) &= \sqrt{\frac{h}{2\pi Lr}} g_0(t) \exp \left(-\frac{(r^2 + L^2)t}{2h} + \frac{Lr\sqrt{t(t+1)}}{h} - \frac{|v_0^{\text{min}}| \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right)}{2h} \right) \\ g_0(t) &= \frac{1}{t^{5/4}(t+1)^{1/4}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{1+2v_0''(0)}-1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, where η_0 is introduced in Lemma 6.1. Consider*

$$\mathcal{W}_4(\eta) := C_h^{\text{asy}} \int_{\eta}^a r |v_0(r)| a_0(r) \exp \left(-\frac{d(r)}{h} - \frac{r^2 + L^2}{4h} \right) \left(\int_{\eta}^{+\infty} G_h^{\text{main}}(r, t) dt \right) dr,$$

where C_h^{asy} is introduced in (5.6), G_h^{main} in (6.5) and α_0^{main} in (6.4).

Then, we have

$$|w_{\ell, r}| \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} h^{-1/2} \mathcal{W}_4(\eta).$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.3, it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{W}_3(\eta) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \mathcal{W}_4(\eta)$. Notice that

$$G_h^{\text{asy}}(r, t) = G_h^{\text{main}}(r, t) \exp \left(\frac{\alpha_0^{\text{main}} - \alpha_0}{h} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right) \right)$$

and there exist $h_0 = h_0(\eta) > 0$ and $C_0 > 0$ such that,

$$\forall h \in (0, h_0], \forall t \geq \eta, 0 \leq \frac{\alpha_0^{\text{main}} - \alpha_0}{h} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right) \leq C_0 h^{1/2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right).$$

This proves that $G_h^{\text{asy}}(r, t) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} G_h^{\text{main}}(r, t)$ uniformly with respect to $(r, t) \in [\eta, a] \times [\eta, +\infty)$. This yields

$$\mathcal{W}_3(\eta) - \mathcal{W}_4(\eta) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{=} o(\mathcal{W}_4(\eta)).$$

■

6.2 A real phase and its minimum

Using the expression of C_h^{asy} in (5.6), we get by Lemma 6.4

$$\mathcal{W}_4(\eta) = \frac{\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v}_0)}{\sqrt{2\pi h}} \int_{\eta}^a \sqrt{r} |v_0(r)| a_0(r) \int_{\eta}^{+\infty} g_0(t) \exp\left(-\frac{\Psi(r, t) - F(\mathbf{v}_0)}{h}\right) dt dr \quad (6.6)$$

where $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v}_0)$, $F(\mathbf{v}_0)$ are introduced in (5.3), $g_0(t)$ is introduced in (6.5) and

$$\Psi(r, t) := d(r) + \frac{r^2 + L^2}{4}(2t + 1) + \frac{|v_0^{\min}|}{2} \ln\left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right) - Lr\sqrt{t(t+1)}. \quad (6.7)$$

The Laplace like integral on the right hand side of (6.6) can be more precisely estimated in the limit $h \rightarrow 0$ once we know the infimum of Ψ over $(\eta, a] \times (\eta, +\infty)$ of $\Psi(r, t)$, which is the aim of the following proposition.

Proposition 6.5. *If $L > 2a$, then*

$$\Psi^{\min} := \inf_{(r, t) \in [0, a] \times \mathbb{R}_+} \Psi(r, t) < \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \Psi(0, t).$$

Furthermore, if $v_0 < 0$ on $[0, a)$, then Ψ has a unique minimum, (a, t_a) , on $(0, a] \times \mathbb{R}_+$.

The proof of Proposition 6.5 relies on the following two lemmas.

Lemma 6.6. *Assume that $L > 2a$. Let $(r_0, t_0) \in (0, L) \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Then (r_0, t_0) is a critical point of Ψ if, and only if, the following two conditions hold:*

1.

$$t_0 = t(r_0, L, v_0^{\min}) := \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + s(r_0, L, v_0^{\min})} - \frac{1}{2} \quad (6.8)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} s(r_0, L, v_0^{\min}) &:= \frac{2|v_0^{\min}|(L^2 + r_0^2) + L^2 r_0^2}{2(L^2 - r_0^2)^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{L^2 - r_0^2} \sqrt{\frac{(2|v_0^{\min}|(L^2 + r_0^2) + L^2 r_0^2)^2}{4(L^2 - r_0^2)^2} - |v_0^{\min}|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

2. r_0 is a solution of

$$d'(r_0) + r_0 \sqrt{s(r_0, L, v_0^{\min}) + \frac{1}{4}} - L \sqrt{s(r_0, L, v_0^{\min})} = 0. \quad (6.10)$$

Lemma 6.7. *Let $r_0 \in (0, L)$. Then, r_0 is a solution of (6.10) if, and only if, $v_0(r_0) = 0$.*

Proof of Proposition 6.5.

Step 1. The function $\Psi(r, t)$ depends continuously on $(r, t) \in [0, a] \times \mathbb{R}_+$ and, using the inequality $\sqrt{t(t+1)} \leq t + \frac{1}{2}$, we have for all $(r, t) \in [0, a] \times \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\Psi(r, t) \geq |v_0^{\min}| \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{t} \right) + \frac{(L-a)^2}{4},$$

and

$$\Psi(r, t) \geq \frac{L(L-2a)}{2}t + \frac{L(L-2a)}{4}.$$

Hence, $\Psi^{\min} > 0$ and there exist $\tau, T > 0$ such that, for all $r \in [0, a]$ and $t \in (0, \tau] \cup [T, +\infty)$, we have $\Psi(r, t) > \Psi^{\min}$. Thus, the minimum of Ψ is attained in $[0, a] \times (\tau, T)$.

Moreover, the minimum of Ψ can not be attained at $(0, t_0)$ with $t_0 \in (\tau, T)$ since

$$\partial_r \Psi(0, t_0) = -L \sqrt{t_0(t_0+1)} < 0.$$

Step 2. Pick $(r_0, t_0) \in (0, a] \times \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\Psi(r_0, t_0) = \Psi^{\min}$. If $r_0 < a$ then (6.10) holds, and by Lemma 6.7, we get that $v_0(r_0) = 0$. This is impossible if we impose the hypothesis $v_0 < 0$ on $[0, a)$, hence we have

$$r_0 = a \text{ and } t_0 = t(a, L, v_0^{\min}),$$

where $t(a, L, v_0^{\min})$ is introduced in (6.8). ■

Proof of Lemma 6.6.

Step 1. Let $(r_0, t_0) \in (0, L) \times \mathbb{R}_+$. We will prove that

$$\partial_t \Psi(r_0, t_0) = 0 \iff t_0 = t(r_0, L, v_0^{\min}) \quad (6.11)$$

where $t_0(r_0, v_0^{\min})$ is introduced in (6.8).

Starting with

$$\partial_t \Psi(r_0, t) := \frac{r_0^2 + L^2}{2} - \frac{|v_0^{\min}|}{2t(t+1)} - \frac{Lr_0(2t+1)}{2\sqrt{t(t+1)}} \quad (6.12)$$

we get

$$\partial_t \Psi(r_0, t) = \frac{1}{2s} g(s),$$

where $s = t^2 + t > 0$ and

$$g(s) = (L^2 + r_0^2)s - |v_0^{\min}| - Lr_0\sqrt{s}\sqrt{4s+1}.$$

The equation $g(s) = 0$ reads

$$(L^2 + r_0^2)s - |v_0^{\min}| = Lr_0\sqrt{s(4s+1)}. \quad (6.13)$$

This implies that a zero \hat{s} of g necessarily satisfies

$$(L^2 + r_0^2)\hat{s} - |v_0^{\min}| > 0. \quad (6.14)$$

This also implies by taking the square on both sides of (6.13),

$$(L^2 - r_0^2)^2 \hat{s}^2 - (2(L^2 + r_0^2)|v_0^{\min}| + L^2 r_0^2) \hat{s} + |v_0^{\min}|^2 = 0, \quad (6.15)$$

which has two positive solutions

$$s_{\pm} = \frac{2|v_0^{\min}|(L^2 + r_0^2) + L^2 r_0^2}{2(L^2 - r_0^2)^2} \pm \frac{1}{L^2 - r_0^2} \sqrt{\frac{(2|v_0^{\min}|(L^2 + r_0^2) + L^2 r_0^2)^2}{4(L^2 - r_0^2)^2} - |v_0^{\min}|^2}.$$

Notice that, if $g(\hat{s}) = 0$, then

$$g'(\hat{s}) = \frac{(L^2 - r_0^2)^2}{(L^2 + r_0^2)\hat{s} - |v_0^{\min}|} \left(\hat{s} - \frac{2(L^2 + r_0^2)|v_0^{\min}| + L^2 r_0^2}{2(L^2 - r_0^2)^2} \right).$$

Assuming that s_{\pm} are zeros of g , we get

$$g'(s_{\pm}) = \pm \frac{L^2 - r_0^2}{(L^2 + r_0^2)s_{\pm} - |v_0^{\min}|} \sqrt{\frac{(2|v_0^{\min}|(L^2 + r_0^2) + L^2 r_0^2)^2}{4(L^2 - r_0^2)^2} - |v_0^{\min}|^2}. \quad (6.16)$$

At this stage we know, since $g(0) < 0$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} g(s) = +\infty$, that g has at least one zero and at most two zeroes which belong to $\{s_-, s_+\}$. Suppose that s_- is a zero of g , then we obtain by (6.14) and (6.16) that $g'(s_-) < 0$. This leads to a contradiction (or g should have another zero $< s_-$). Hence the unique zero of g is s_+ .

This yields, by (6.12), that $\partial_t \Psi(r_0, t) = 0$ if, and only if, t satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} t^2 + t &= s_+(r_0, L, v_0^{\min}) \\ &:= \frac{2|v_0^{\min}|(L^2 + r_0^2) + L^2 r_0^2}{2(L^2 - r_0^2)^2} + \frac{1}{L^2 - r_0^2} \sqrt{\frac{(2|v_0^{\min}|(L^2 + r_0^2) + L^2 r_0^2)^2}{4(L^2 - r_0^2)^2} - |v_0^{\min}|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.17)$$

Solving the previous equation, we end up with a unique positive solution

$$t_0 := t_+(r_0, L, v_0^{\min}) = -\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + s_+(L, r_0, v_0^{\min})}.$$

This proves (6.11).

Step 2.

Assume now that $t_0 = t_+(r_0, L, v_0^{\min})$ and let us now prove that,

$$\partial_r \Psi(r_0, t_0) = 0 \iff r_0 \text{ satisfies (6.10)}. \quad (6.18)$$

If the partial derivative

$$\partial_r \Psi(r, t) = d'(r) + \frac{r}{2}(2t+1) - L\sqrt{t(t+1)} \quad (6.19)$$

vanishes, then

$$t = \hat{t}_\pm := -\frac{L^2 - r^2 - 2rd'(r)}{2(L^2 - r^2)} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{L^2 - r^2 - 2rd'(r)}{2(L^2 - r^2)}\right)^2 + \frac{(d'(r) + \frac{r}{2})^2}{L^2 - r^2}}.$$

Observing that $\hat{t}_- \hat{t}_+ = -\frac{(d'(r) + \frac{r}{2})^2}{L^2 - r^2} < 0$ for $0 < r < L$, we ignore the negative solution and consider

$$\hat{t}_+(r, L, v_0) := -\frac{L^2 - r^2 - 2rd'(r)}{2(L^2 - r^2)} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{L^2 - r^2 - 2rd'(r)}{2(L^2 - r^2)}\right)^2 + \frac{(d'(r) + \frac{r}{2})^2}{L^2 - r^2}}. \quad (6.20)$$

Moreover, fixing $r \in (0, L)$, $f(t) := d'(r) + \frac{r}{2}(2t+1) - L\sqrt{t(t+1)}$ is > 0 for $t = 0$ and its limit is equal to $-\infty$ as $t \rightarrow -\infty$, so it must vanish at some $t > 0$. Therefore, we conclude that $\partial_r \Psi(r, t)$ vanishes on $(0, L) \times \mathbb{R}_+$ if, and only if $t = \hat{t}_+(r, L, v_0^{\min})$.

By (6.11), (r_0, t_0) is a critical point of $\Psi(r, t)$ if, and only if,

$$t_0 = \hat{t}_+(r_0, L, v_0) = t_+(r_0, L, v_0^{\min}). \quad (6.21)$$

We will prove that (6.21) holds if, and only if (6.8) and (6.10) hold. Firstly, notice that $t_0 = t_+(r_0, L, v_0^{\min})$ is just (6.8) and $\hat{t}_+(r_0, L, v_0) = t_+(r_0, L, v_0^{\min})$ is the same as

$$\begin{aligned} r_0 d'(r_0) + (L^2 - r_0^2) \sqrt{\left(\frac{L^2 - r_0^2 - 2r_0 d'(r_0)}{2(L^2 - r_0^2)}\right)^2 + \frac{(d'(r_0) + \frac{r_0}{2})^2}{L^2 - r_0^2}} \\ = (L^2 - r_0^2) \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + s(r_0, L, v_0^{\min})}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.22)$$

hence (6.21) is equivalent to assuming that (6.8) and (6.22) both hold.

Secondly, if (6.22) holds, then we can rewrite it in the form

$$\begin{aligned} (L^2 - r_0^2) \sqrt{\left(\frac{L^2 - r_0^2 - 2r_0 d'(r_0)}{2(L^2 - r_0^2)}\right)^2 + \frac{(d'(r_0) + \frac{r_0}{2})^2}{L^2 - r_0^2}} \\ = (L^2 - r_0^2) \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + s(r_0, L, v_0^{\min})} - r_0 d'(r_0), \end{aligned}$$

and after taking the squares we obtain

$$\left(d'(r_0) + r_0 \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + s(r_0, L, v_0^{\min})}\right)^2 - L^2 s(r_0, L, v_0^{\min}) = 0,$$

which eventually yields the relation in (6.10). Conversely, if (6.8) and (6.10) hold, it is straightforward to check that, for $0 < r_0 < L$, we have

$$(L^2 - r_0^2) \sqrt{s(r_0, L, v_0^{\min}) + \frac{1}{4}} - r_0 d'(r_0) > L(L - r_0) \sqrt{s(r_0, L, v_0^{\min})} > 0,$$

and consequently (6.22) holds. ■

Proof of Lemma 6.7.

Let r be a solution of (6.10) and $s = s(r, L, v_0^{\min})$. Notice that, with

$$\mu = |v_0^{\min}|,$$

(6.9) reads as follows

$$(L^2 - r^2)^2 s = \mu(L^2 + r^2) + \frac{L^2 r^2}{2} + 2Lr \sqrt{\left(\frac{r^2}{4} + \mu\right) \left(\frac{L^2}{4} + \mu\right)}. \quad (6.23)$$

We write (6.10) in the following form

$$d'(r) = L\sqrt{s} - r\sqrt{s + \frac{1}{4}}$$

then we take the square and get

$$v_0(r) + \mu = (L^2 + r^2)s - 2Lr\sqrt{s\left(s + \frac{1}{4}\right)}.$$

After a rearrangement we have

$$v_0(r) + \mu - (L^2 + r^2)s = -2Lr\sqrt{s\left(s + \frac{1}{4}\right)}.$$

Taking the square, we obtain the following equation,

$$(v_0(r) + \mu)^2 + (L^2 + r^2)^2 s^2 - 2(v_0(r) + \mu)(L^2 + r^2)s = 4L^2 r^2 s^2 + L^2 r^2 s.$$

Rearranging the terms, we write the previous equation in the form

$$(L^2 - r^2)^2 s^2 - 2\left((v_0(r) + \mu)(L^2 + r^2) + \frac{L^2 r^2}{2}\right)s + (v_0(r) + \mu)^2 = 0.$$

Multiplying by $(L^2 - r^2)^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & ((L^2 - r^2)^2 s)^2 - 2 \left(v_0(r)(L^2 + r^2) + \mu(L^2 + r^2) + \frac{L^2 r^2}{2} \right) (L^2 - r^2)^2 s \\ & \quad + (v_0(r) + \mu)^2 (L^2 - r^2)^2 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.24)$$

It is straightforward to check that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\mu(L^2 + r^2) + \frac{L^2 r^2}{2} + 2Lr \sqrt{\left(\frac{r^2}{4} + \mu \right) \left(\frac{L^2}{4} + \mu \right)} \right)^2 + \mu^2 (L^2 - r^2)^2 \\ & = 2 \left(\mu(L^2 + r^2) + \frac{L^2 r^2}{2} \right) \left(\mu(L^2 + r^2) + \frac{L^2 r^2}{2} + 2Lr \sqrt{\left(\frac{r^2}{4} + \mu \right) \left(\frac{L^2}{4} + \mu \right)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

So, using (6.23), the above equation yields,

$$((L^2 - r^2)^2 s)^2 - 2 \left(\mu(L^2 + r^2) + \frac{L^2 r^2}{2} \right) (L^2 - r^2)^2 s + \mu^2 (L^2 - r^2)^2 = 0.$$

Inserting this into (6.24), we obtain

$$(L^2 - r^2)^2 v_0(r)^2 - 2(L^2 + r^2)(L^2 - r^2)^2 s v_0(r) + 2\mu(L^2 - r^2)^2 v_0(r) = 0.$$

If $v_0(r) \neq 0$, we get

$$v_0(r) = 2(L^2 + r^2)s - 2\mu$$

which is impossible since $v_0 \leq 0$ and the term on the right hand side above is positive, since we have by (6.23),

$$\begin{aligned} (L^2 + r^2)(L^2 - r^2)^2 s - (L^2 - r^2)^2 \mu &> \mu(L^2 + r^2)^2 - \mu(L^2 - r^2)^2 \\ &= 4\mu L^2 r^2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

■

Remark 6.8 (Global minimum of Ψ). *Collecting Lemmas 6.6 and 6.7, we see that the critical points of Ψ on $(a, L) \times \mathbb{R}_+$ constitute the set*

$$\mathcal{C} = \{(r, t) : a < r < L, t = t(r, L, v_0^{\min})\}.$$

Consequently, for all $L' \in (a, L)$,

$$\min_{(r,t) \in [a,L'] \times \mathbb{R}_+} \Psi(r, t) = \min \left(\inf_{t>0} \Psi(a, t), \inf_{t>0} \Psi(L', t), \inf_{r \in (a,L')} \Psi(r, t(r, L, v_0^{\min})) \right).$$

Moreover, for all $r \in (a, L)$, we have by Lemma 6.6,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dr} \Psi(r, t(r, L, v_0^{\min})) \\ & = \underbrace{\partial_r \Psi(r, t(r, L, v_0^{\min}))}_{=0} + (\partial_r t(r, L, v_0^{\min})) \underbrace{\partial_t \Psi(r, t(r, L, v_0^{\min}))}_{=0} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\Psi(r, t(r, L, v_0^{\min})) = \Psi(a, t(a, L, v_0^{\min})) = \Psi^{\min} \quad (a < r < L).$$

In particular, we have that

$$\min_{(r,t) \in [a, L-a] \times \mathbb{R}_+} \Psi(r, t) = \min \left(\Psi^{\min}, \inf_{t>0} \Psi(L-a, t) \right) = \Psi^{\min},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{\min} &= \Psi(L-a, t(L-a, L, v_0^{\min})) \\ &= d(L-a) + \frac{a^2}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + s} + L(L-a) \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + s} - \sqrt{s} \right) + \frac{|v_0^{\min}|}{2} \ln \frac{(\sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + s} + \frac{1}{2})^2}{s}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} s &= s(L-a, L, v_0^{\min}) \\ &= \frac{|v_0^{\min}|(L^2 + (L-a)^2) + L^2(L-a)^2}{a^2(2L-a)^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{2L(L-a)}{a^2(2L-a)^2} \sqrt{\frac{(L-a)^2}{4} + |v_0^{\min}|} \sqrt{\frac{L^2}{4} + |v_0^{\min}|}. \quad (6.25) \end{aligned}$$

Remark 6.9 (Application to limit cases). For $L > 2a$, let $t(a, L, v_0^{\min})$ and $s(a, L, v_0^{\min})$ be as introduced in (6.8) and (6.9) respectively.

1. Assuming a and v_0^{\min} are fixed and $L \rightarrow +\infty$, we have

$$t(a, L, v_0^{\min}) \sim s(a, L, v_0^{\min}) = \frac{|v_0^{\min}| + \frac{a^2}{2} + a\sqrt{\frac{a^2}{4} + |v_0^{\min}|}}{L^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{L^4}\right),$$

hence Proposition 6.5 yields

$$\Psi^{\min} = \frac{L^2}{4} + |v_0^{\min}| \ln L + \mathcal{O}(1).$$

2. Assuming L and v_0^{\min} are fixed and $a \rightarrow 0_+$, we get

$$s(a, L, v_0^{\min}) \sim \frac{|v_0^{\min}|}{L^2}, \quad t(a, L, v_0^{\min}) \sim \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{|v_0^{\min}|}{L^2}} - \frac{1}{2},$$

hence Proposition 6.5 yields

$$\Psi^{\min} = \frac{L}{4} \sqrt{L^2 + 4|v_0^{\min}|} + |v_0^{\min}| \ln \left(\frac{L \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{4|v_0^{\min}|}{L^2}} \right)}{2\sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|}} \right) + o(1).$$

6.3 Proof of main Theorem

We give here the proof of Theorem 1.4. We set

$$S(\mathbf{v}_0, L) = -F(\mathbf{v}_0) + \inf_{\substack{r \in [0, a] \\ t \in (0, +\infty)}} \Psi(r, t), \quad (6.26)$$

where $a = a(\mathbf{v}_0)$, $F(\mathbf{v}_0)$ is introduced in (5.3) and the function Ψ is introduced in (6.7). By Remark 6.8 we observe that

$$S(\mathbf{v}_0, L) = S_a + I(a, L, v_0^{\min}) \quad (6.27)$$

where S_a is introduced in (1.21),

$$I(a, L, v_0^{\min}) = \frac{a^2}{2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + s} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{|v_0^{\min}|}{a^2}} \right) + \frac{|v_0^{\min}|}{2} \ln \frac{|v_0^{\min}| \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + s + \frac{1}{2}} \right)^2}{a^2 s \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{|v_0^{\min}|}{a^2}} + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2} \quad (6.28)$$

and $s = s(L-a, L, v_0^{\min})$ is introduced in (6.25). It is easy to see that $a^2 s > |v_0^{\min}|$ so the term $I(a, L, v_0^{\min})$ is positive.

Let $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$, where $\eta_0 \in (0, a)$ is introduced in Lemma 6.1. So, by Lemma 6.4, it suffices to prove that,

$$h \ln \mathcal{W}_4(\eta) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} -S(\mathbf{v}_0, L). \quad (6.29)$$

The function v_0 vanishes to infinite order at $r = a$. By Proposition 6.5, we get

$$\mathcal{W}_4(\eta) \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{=} \mathcal{O} \left(e^{-\frac{S(\mathbf{v}_0, L)}{h}} \right), \quad (6.30)$$

from which it follows

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} (h \ln \mathcal{W}_4(\eta)) \leq -S(\mathbf{v}_0, L). \quad (6.31)$$

To prove a lower bound on $\mathcal{W}_4(\eta)$, pick an arbitrary $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and consider the set

$$I_\delta = \{(r, t) \in [0, a] \times [0, +\infty) : \Psi(r, t) \leq F(\mathbf{v}_0) + S(\mathbf{v}_0, L) + \delta\}.$$

By Proposition 6.5, there exists $\delta_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that, if $\delta < \delta_0$, then $I_\delta \subset [\eta, a] \times [\eta, +\infty)$. Since the integrand in the expression of $\mathcal{W}_4(\eta)$ is positive, we have the lower bound

$$\mathcal{W}_4(\eta) \geq \frac{\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{v}_0)}{\sqrt{2\pi h}} \left(\int_{I_\delta} \sqrt{r} |v_0(r)| a_0(r) g_0(t) dt dr \right) e^{-\frac{S(\mathbf{v}_0, L) + \delta}{h}}$$

from which we infer the lower bound

$$\liminf_{h \rightarrow 0} (h \ln \mathcal{W}_4(\eta)) \geq -S(\mathbf{v}_0, L) - \delta.$$

After sending δ to 0 we eventually get

$$\limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} (h \ln \mathcal{W}_4(\eta)) \geq -S(\mathbf{v}_0, L). \quad (6.32)$$

Collecting (6.31) and (6.32), we finish the proof of (6.29).

Remark 6.10 (Amplitude of the tunneling). *Our proof of Theorem 1.4 above only yields an asymptotics for the phase of the hopping coefficient,*

$$\ln |w_{\ell,r}| \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} -S(\mathbf{v}_0, L). \quad (6.33)$$

The initial hope was that we could estimate the amplitude of $|w_{\ell,r}|$ by showing that the function Ψ in (6.7) has a unique non-degenerate minimum (r_, t_*) on $[0, a] \times (0, +\infty)$ such that $0 < r_* < a$; if it were the case, the method of Laplace approximation would yield*

$$|w_{\ell,r}| \underset{h \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \Upsilon(\mathbf{v}_0) h^{-p(\mathbf{v}_0)} e^{-S(\mathbf{v}_0, L)/h},$$

for some constants $\Upsilon(\mathbf{v}_0) > 0$ and $p(\mathbf{v}_0) \in \mathbb{R}$.

The next proposition compares the magnetic and non-magnetic tunneling asymptotics (see Remark 1.6).

Proposition 6.11. *We have $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \beta S(\beta^{-2} \mathbf{v}_0) = 2 \int_0^{L/2} \sqrt{v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho$.*

Proof. Knowing that $S_a \leq S(\mathbf{v}_0) \leq \hat{S}$ and replacing v_0 by $\beta^{-2} v_0$, we get that

$$S_a^\beta \leq S(\beta^{-2} \mathbf{v}_0) \leq \hat{S}^\beta$$

where (cf. (4.2) and (1.24))

$$\begin{aligned} S_a^\beta &= 2 \int_0^a \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + \beta^{-2}(v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min})} d\rho + \int_a^{L-a} \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} - \beta^{-2}v_0^{\min}} d\rho, \\ \hat{S}^\beta &= \inf_{0 < r < a} \left(\frac{Lr}{2} + \int_0^{L-r} \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + \beta^{-2}(v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min})} d\rho \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^r \sqrt{\frac{\rho^2}{4} + \beta^{-2}(v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min})} d\rho \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is then clear that

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \beta S_a^\beta = 2 \int_0^a \sqrt{v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho + \int_a^{L-a} \sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|} d\rho,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \beta \hat{S}^\beta &= \inf_{0 < r < a} \left(\int_0^{L-r} \sqrt{v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho + \int_0^r \sqrt{v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho \right) \\ &= 2 \int_0^a \sqrt{v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho + \int_a^{L-a} \sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|} d\rho. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \int_0^{L/2} \sqrt{v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho &= 2 \int_0^a \sqrt{v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho + 2 \int_a^{L/2} \sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|} d\rho \\ &= 2 \int_0^a \sqrt{v_0(\rho) - v_0^{\min}} d\rho + \int_a^{L-a} \sqrt{|v_0^{\min}|} d\rho. \end{aligned}$$

■

Acknowledgments

This work was initiated while the second author visited LMJL at the university of Nantes in November 2021 and February 2022. The authors would like to acknowledge the support from the Fédération de Recherche Mathématiques des Pays de Loire and Nantes Université. The first author benefits from the support of the French government “Investissements d’Avenir” program integrated to France 2030, bearing the following reference ANR-11-LABX-0020-01. The second author is partially supported by the Center for Advanced Mathematical Sciences (CAMS, AUB). The first author thanks M. Weinstein for enlightening discussions around the first version of [6]. The authors are thankful to S. Fournais, L. Morin and N. Raymond for pointing out an error appearing in the proof of a former version of Proposition 6.5, and to M.P. Sundqvist for the attentive reading and discussions.

References

- [1] J. Bellissard. C^* -Algebras in solid state physics: 2-D electrons in a uniform magnetic field, Operator algebras and applications, Vol. 2, 49–76, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 136, Cambridge Univ. Press (1988).
- [2] V. Bonnaillie-Noël, F. Hérau, N. Raymond. Purely magnetic tunneling effect in two dimensions. *Invent. Math.* 227(2), 745-793 (2022).
- [3] H.L. Cycon, R.G. Froese, W. Kirsch, and B. Simon. Schrödinger operators, with application to quantum mechanics and global geometry. Springer Study edition. Texts and Monographs in Physics. Springer-Verlag, (1987).
- [4] F. Daumer. Équations de Hartree-Fock dans l’approximation du tight-binding. *Helv. Phys. Acta* 67(3), 237-256 (1994).
- [5] M. Dimassi and J. Sjöstrand. Spectral Asymptotics in the Semi-Classical limit. London Mathematical Society. Lecture Note Series 268. Cambridge University Press (1999).
- [6] C. Fefferman, J. Shapiro, M. Weinstein. Lower bound on quantum tunneling for strong magnetic fields. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 54(1), 1105-1130 (2022). (see also arXiv:2006.08025v3).

- [7] S. Fournais and B. Helffer. Spectral methods in surface superconductivity. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications 77. Basel: Birkhäuser (2010).
- [8] S. Fournais, B. Helffer, A. Kachmar. Tunneling effect induced by a curved magnetic edge. R.L. Frank (ed.) et al., The physics and mathematics of Elliott Lieb. The 90th anniversary. Volume I. Berlin: European Mathematical Society (EMS). 315-350 (2022).
- [9] S. Fournais, L. Morin, and N. Raymond. Purely magnetic tunneling between radial magnetic wells. arXiv:2308.04315 (2023).
- [10] B. Helffer, A. Kachmar, M.P. Sundqvist. Flux and symmetry effects on quantum tunneling. arXiv:2307.06712 (2023).
- [11] B. Helffer. Semi-classical analysis for the Schrödinger operator and applications. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 1336, Berlin : Springer-Verlag (1988).
- [12] B. Helffer and J. Sjöstrand. Multiple wells in the semi-classical limit I. Communications in PDE 9 (4), 337-408 (1984).
- [13] B. Helffer and J. Sjöstrand. Effet tunnel pour l'équation de Schrödinger avec champ magnétique. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa, Vol XIV, 4, 625-657 (1987).
- [14] B. Helffer and J. Sjöstrand. Equation de Schrödinger avec champ magnétique et équation de Harper, Partie I Champ magnétique fort, Partie II Champ magnétique faible, l'approximation de Peierls. Lecture notes in Physics, No 345 (editors A. Jensen and H. Holden), 118-198 (1989).
- [15] H. Matsumoto. Semi-classical asymptotics of eigenvalues for Schrödinger operators with magnetic fields. J. Funct. Anal. 129, 168-190 (1995).
- [16] H. Matsumoto and N. Ueki. Spectral analysis of Schrödinger operators with magnetic fields. J. Funct. Anal. 140, 218-255 (1996).
- [17] A. Outassourt. Comportement semi-classique pour l'opérateur de Schrödinger à potentiel périodique. J. Funct. Anal. 72(1), 65-93 (1987).
- [18] J. Shapiro, M. Weinstein. Tight-binding reduction and topological equivalence in strong magnetic fields. Adv. Math. 403, Paper No. 108343, 70 pp. (2022).
- [19] B. Simon. Semiclassical analysis of low lying eigenvalues. I: Non-degenerate minima: Asymptotic expansions. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Sect. A 38, 295-308 (1983).
- [20] N.M. Temme. Asymptotic Methods for Integrals (Series in Analysis Book 6). WSPC, 2014.