

On the localized and delocalized modes in kink-antikink interactions: a toy model

Carlos E. S. Santos,^{1,*} João G. F. Campos,^{2,†} and Azadeh Mohammadi^{1,‡}

¹*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Recife - PE - 50670-901, Brazil*

²*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Maranhão, São Luís - MA - 65080-805, Brazil*

This study deals with a piecewise ϕ^2 scalar field theory in $(1+1)$ dimensions. The scalar field potential is designed with a triple-well shape, engendering kink solutions with asymmetric square-well linearized potentials. Thus, the localized and delocalized modes in this model can be obtained analytically in terms of transcendental equations. This allows us to explore kink-antikink and antikink-kink collisions with any desired number of localized and delocalized modes. We obtain new scenarios of resonance windows suppression, shedding light on the role of higher excited modes in kink scattering.

I. INTRODUCTION

Topological defects play an important role throughout most, if not all, physical areas. They are intimately connected to the phenomena of phase transition and spontaneous symmetry breaking [1]. In this picture, they can be understood as the place where the field reaches a symmetric local maximum configuration in order to respect its boundary arrangement. These defects appear in various contexts, including superconducting materials [2, 3], optical phenomena [4–8], dilaton gravity models [9, 10], early universe inflationary models [11], electronic structure in cis/trans polyacetylene [12, 13], and magnetic skyrmions, which are topological solitons in chiral magnetic materials [14–16]. In liquid crystals, for instance, the topological defect manifests as disclinations in the nematic phase [17–20].

Perhaps the simplest topological defects are kinks, solutions of $(1+1)$ dimensional field theories. Interactions between kinks have been extensively studied since the pioneering works of Campbell et al. [21–23]. These interactions can result in various outcomes. Most commonly, a kink-antikink pair either reflects to infinity or annihilates, forming a slowly decaying bion. However, in many cases, the interaction can lead to a transient bound state where the pair repeatedly collides before eventually

*Electronic address: carlos.santanasantos@ufpe.br

†Electronic address: joao.gfc@ufma.br

‡Electronic address: azadeh.mohammadi@ufpe.br

reflecting off to infinity. These brief bound states happen for intervals of initial velocity called resonance windows. The well-known resonant energy exchange mechanism between translational and vibrational modes explains this phenomenon. It was described for the first time in Ref. [22]. It states that the energy exchange occurs between the kinetic and oscillational bound modes of each kink involved in the process. In the last decades, spectral phenomena, such as resonance windows, have been investigated in a wide range of models. One can mention sine-gordon-like models [23–28], polynomial models [29–38], models with logarithmic potentials [39, 40], wobbling kink collisions [41–43], and models with impurities [44–46].

Another intriguing spectral phenomenon in kink interactions is the appearance of the so-called spectral walls [47, 48]. These walls act as a “barrier” to the motion of an excited kink, arising when its excitation reaches the threshold between discrete modes and continuum states. Interestingly, the phenomenon also appears in the presence of and mediated by fermions [49]. Similarly, it was demonstrated in Ref. [50] that fermions can also mediate the energy exchange mechanism. Recently, a more comprehensive theoretical understanding of spectral phenomena has predominantly been achieved through the collective coordinates approach [51].

Interestingly, many exceptions to Campbell’s resonant energy exchange mechanism have been found. Perhaps the most remarkable one is observed in the ϕ^6 model [52]. The authors showed that, although there are no vibrational modes for each defect separately, there are resonance windows due to delocalized bound excitations stored in the internal region between a pair of kinks. Therefore, it will be interesting for the present study to divide the resonance windows into two categories: the ones generated by localized modes and those generated by delocalized modes.

One more exception to the resonance exchange mechanism was obtained in Ref. [53]. The authors showed that quasinormal modes can mediate resonance windows, but only if the decay rate is low. Then, in Ref. [54], the authors identified the same phenomenon considering a piecewise ϕ^2 model, which allowed for the analytical treatment of quasinormal modes. Scalar field theories with piecewise potentials can serve as effective laboratories for studying more complex realistic models, offering opportunities for analytical analysis that may not be feasible in realistic scenarios. Examples in the literature include the scattering between signum-Gordon oscillons [55] and the scattering of kinks in coreless potentials [56, 57]. They also appear as the limit of some families of polynomial potentials [58].

In the present work, we generalize the model designed in Ref. [54] with a piecewise ϕ^2 toy model to the one with a triple-well shape potential and asymmetric kink solutions. It allows us to control the number of localized and delocalized modes in kink interactions. These modes can be determined

by solving transcendental equations derived from the Schrödinger-like stability equation. In this fashion, it is possible to conduct an in-depth analysis of the resonance window phenomenon.

The remaining sections are organized as follows. Section 2 describes our toy model. In Section 3, we derive the linearized potentials for kinks and antikink-kink pairs and analytically determine the bound energy spectrum for both localized and delocalized modes in terms of transcendental equations. Section 4 presents the analysis of our numerical scattering results. Finally, we present and discuss our concluding remarks in Section 5. We work with natural units throughout the paper.

II. THE MODEL

Let us consider the following scalar field theory in $(1 + 1)$ dimensions

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - V(\phi). \quad (\text{II.1})$$

Similarly to Ref. [54], the potential $V(\phi)$ is a piecewise ϕ^2 function. In the current case, it is given by

$$V(\phi) = \begin{cases} \frac{A^2}{2} \phi^2, & 0 < \phi < \phi_1, \\ -\frac{B^2}{2} (\phi - \phi_0)^2 + V_+, & \phi_1 < \phi < \phi_2, \\ \frac{C^2}{2} (\phi - \lambda)^2, & \phi > \phi_2. \end{cases} \quad (\text{II.2})$$

The potential for negative ϕ is defined by enforcing even parity. Well-behaved kinks are obtained by ensuring the continuity of the potential and its derivative at the boundaries of each domain. The resulting potential, shown in Fig. 1, consists of a triple-well structure similar to the ϕ^6 model [52]. There are eight free parameters in this theory, $A, B, C, \phi_0, V_+, \lambda, \phi_1$ and ϕ_2 . The continuity conditions lead to four relations listed in Appendix A. Thus, only four parameters are independent, which we choose to be A, B, C , and ϕ_0 . Then, we work with dimensionless variables by virtue of the following rescaling $x^\mu \rightarrow B^{-1} \phi_0^{-1} x^\mu$ and $\phi \rightarrow \phi_0 \phi$. Redefining the constants sets $B = 1$ and $\phi_0 = 1$ effectively. Therefore, A and C are the only remaining free parameters.

The Euler-Lagrange equation for the theory is

$$\partial_{tt} \phi - \partial_{xx} \phi = -\frac{dV}{d\phi}. \quad (\text{II.3})$$

For static field configurations, one obtains the first-order Bogomol'nyi–Prasad–Sommerfield (BPS) equation as follows

$$\frac{d\phi_K(x)}{dx} = \pm \sqrt{2V(\phi_K)}. \quad (\text{II.4})$$




Figure 1: (a) Piecewise ϕ^2 potential with three minima. (b) Profiles for all kinks and antikinks of our theory (four topological sectors). Parameters are $A^2 = 3$ and $C^2 = 4$.

There are four topological sectors, two kinks and two antikinks, in the theory as shown in Fig. 1. We show the kink sectors by $(-1, 0)$, $(0, 1)$ and the antikinks by $(0, -1)$, $(1, 0)$. Then, we arrive at the following kink profile

$$\phi_K(x) = \begin{cases} e^{Ax}, & x < x_1, \\ \phi_0 + K \sin[B(x - x_1) + \theta_0], & x_1 < x < x_2, \\ \lambda + (\phi_2 - \lambda)e^{-C(x-x_2)}, & x > x_2. \end{cases} \quad (\text{II.5})$$

in $(0, 1)$ sector. There are four extra parameters in eq. II.5, K , θ_0 , x_1 and x_2 . We fix them by requiring continuity of the kink function and its derivative at the points $x = x_1$ and $x = x_2$. The relations are listed in Appendix A. Thus, only A and C remain as free parameters.

III. STABILITY EQUATION

The stability of the kinks in our model can be obtained by studying perturbation of the form $\phi(x, t) = \phi_K(x) + \eta(x)e^{-i\omega t}$. Then, we arrive at the following Schrödinger-like equation

$$\left[-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + U(x) \right] \eta(x) = \omega^2 \eta(x). \quad (\text{III.1})$$




Figure 2: (a) Linearized potential for a single kink. (b) Linearized potential for antikink-kink pairs. Parameters are $A^2 = 3$, $C^2 = 6$.

The linearized potential $U(x)$ is given by

$$U(x) = \left. \frac{d^2 V(\phi)}{d\phi^2} \right|_{\phi=\phi_K(x)} = \begin{cases} A^2, & x < x_1, \\ -1, & x_1 < x < x_2, \\ C^2, & x > x_2. \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.2})$$

We have constructed a potential with only quadratic functions in order to obtain the asymmetric square-well stability potential, as depicted in Fig. 2(a).

We can utilize tools from canonical quantum mechanics to solve the Schrödinger-like stability equation. The linearized potential in eq. III.2 possesses three types of solutions: localized bound modes with $0 \leq \omega^2 < A^2$, half-localized modes with $A^2 < \omega^2 < C^2$ and scattering modes with $\omega^2 > C^2$. At this point, we are interested in the localized modes. Thus, we begin by defining the momenta as $k_1^2 = A^2 - \omega^2$, $k_2^2 = 1 + \omega^2$ and $k_3^2 = C^2 - \omega^2$. By applying the continuity conditions for the field and its first derivative, we derive transcendental equations for the energy spectrum. These equations are given by

$$\tan(k_2 L) = \frac{k_2(k_1 + k_3)}{k_2^2 - k_1 k_3}. \quad (\text{III.3})$$

After solving for ω , the analytical expression for the corresponding bound modes can be found in Appendix B. In Fig. 2(a), one can also see the profiles of the corresponding bound solutions for the fixed values $A^2 = 3$, $C^2 = 6$, for example. The number of vibrational shape modes, obtained by solving the above transcendental equation, eq. III.3, numerically, is shown in Fig. 3 as a function




Figure 3: Number of bound modes for an asymmetric square well. The dashed line represents the number of localized modes when $A = C$.

of the free parameters A and C . As expected, it increases with both parameters.

It is interesting to take the limit that $C \rightarrow \infty$, as a consistency check. In such a case, the linearized potential becomes a semi-infinite square well. Its eigenvalues are well-known, being described by the following transcendental equation

$$\tan(k_2 L) = -\frac{k_2}{k_1}, \quad (\text{III.4})$$

which agrees with our previous calculation if we set $k_3 \rightarrow \infty$.

We are also interested in delocalized modes, which are modes that exist in the linearized potential generated by a kink-antikink (or antikink-kink) pair. In our toy model, the profile consists of two asymmetric square wells, as shown in Fig. 2(b). In such a scenario, the delocalized modes can be obtained analytically. They are defined as bound solutions with $A^2 < \omega^2 < C^2$. If $A^2 > C^2$, the inner barrier becomes higher than the outer ones, and no delocalized modes can exist.

Again, considering the continuity condition and redefining $k_1^2 = \omega^2 - A^2$, one arrives at the following transcendental equations

$$\begin{aligned} \tan\left(\frac{k_1 D}{2}\right) &= \frac{\frac{k_3}{k_1} - \frac{k_2}{k_1} \tan(k_2 L)}{1 + \frac{k_3}{k_2} \tan(k_2 L)}, \\ \tan\left(\frac{k_1 D}{2}\right) &= \frac{\frac{k_1}{k_2} \left[1 + \frac{k_3}{k_2} \tan(k_2 L)\right]}{\tan(k_2 L) - \frac{k_3}{k_2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.5})$$

for even and odd delocalized modes, respectively. Once the frequency ω is computed, the analytical expression of the corresponding bound mode can be obtained as described in Appendix B. In

Fig. 2(b), the delocalized modes of the presented potential for the fixed values $A^2 = 3$, $C^2 = 6$ are also shown. Moreover, the values of ω^2 as a function of $D/2$ for several values of A^2 and C^2 are shown in Figs. 7, 9 and 12.

Transcendental equations for delocalized modes could also be derived by a novel approach suggested in [59], connecting kink and antikinks' half-localized modes, $\eta(x)$, to kink-antikink delocalized modes imposing the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial \eta(x - D/2)}{\partial x} \right|_{x=0} &= 0, \\ \left. \frac{\partial^2 \eta(x - D/2)}{\partial x^2} \right|_{x=0} &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.6})$$

for even and odd modes, respectively. In general, the method gives a good approximation for delocalized modes only when the kink and antikink are separated enough. Interestingly, in our case, applying the conditions (III.6) on the half-localized modes given in Appendix B for $A^2 < \omega^2 < C^2$ gives the exact results (III.5) for even and odd delocalized modes.

It is also instructive to take the limit $C \rightarrow \infty$ in the kink-antikink linearized equation. By doing so, one obtains an infinite square well with a perturbation at its center. If the energy level is high enough, the perturbation becomes negligible. In this limit, we have an infinite square-well plus corrections in powers of A^2 , yielding a simple form for the delocalized modes frequencies

$$\omega^2 = \frac{n^2 \pi^2}{(D + 2L)^2} - 1 + A^2 \left[\frac{D}{D + 2L} - \frac{1}{n\pi} \sin \left(\frac{n\pi D}{D + 2L} \right) \right] + \mathcal{O}(A^4). \quad (\text{III.7})$$

In the following sections, we are interested in analyzing kink-antikink and antikink-kink collisions for several values of A^2 and C^2 . By probing configurations in this parameter space, we will be able to study scattering scenarios where distinct numbers of localized and delocalized modes are available.

IV. KINK-ANTI-KINK AND ANTI-KINK-KINK COLLISIONS

Now, let us analyze the kink-antikink (and antikink-kink) collisions for our toy model. The kink-antikink scattering is achieved by solving the field equation with the following initial condition

$$\phi(x, 0) = \phi_K(\gamma(x + X_0)) + \phi_{\bar{K}}(\gamma(x - X_0)) - 1, \quad (\text{IV.1})$$

$$\dot{\phi}(x, 0) = -\gamma v \left[\phi'_K(\gamma(x + X_0)) - \phi'_{\bar{K}}(\gamma(x - X_0)) \right]. \quad (\text{IV.2})$$

where v is the initial velocity, $\gamma(v)$ is the Lorentz factor and the subscripts K and \bar{K} refer to the kink and antikink solutions, respectively. On the other hand, the antikink-kink initial conditions are

$$\phi(x, 0) = \phi_{\bar{K}}(\gamma(x + X_0)) + \phi_K(\gamma(x - X_0)), \quad (\text{IV.3})$$

$$\dot{\phi}(x, 0) = -\gamma v \left[\phi'_{\bar{K}}(\gamma(x + X_0)) - \phi'_K(\gamma(x - X_0)) \right]. \quad (\text{IV.4})$$

The details of our numerical algorithm can be found in Appendix C.

To obtain the same number of delocalized modes for kink-antikink and antikink-kink scenarios, we will swap the parameters A and C . In other words, we will compute kink-antikink collisions with parameters $(A, C) = (p_1, p_2)$ with $p_1 > p_2$. Then, we will repeat the simulations for antikink-kink collisions with $(A, C) = (p_2, p_1)$. To avoid ambiguities, we emphasize that we are referring to kinks and antikinks in $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$ sectors.

We are interested in whether resonance windows exist in our family of models. Whenever they are present, the frequency of the resonant mode will be obtained by the following relation [22]

$$\omega T = 2\pi n + \delta \quad (\text{IV.5})$$

with T being the time between collisions, n the resonance window number and δ a constant parameter in the interval $[0, 2\pi)$. Then, the relative error between the numerical frequency and the analytical solutions of the localized modes is defined as

$$\delta\omega = \frac{|\omega_{\text{theoretical}} - \omega_{\text{collision}}|}{\omega_{\text{theoretical}}}. \quad (\text{IV.6})$$

It will allow us to identify the resonant localized mode among the spectrum. For delocalized modes, a graphical construction will be presented.

The allowed scattering outputs are shown in Fig. 4. They consist of bion formation, multi-bounce windows, and reflection. However, unlike antikink-kink collisions, the kink-antikink interaction permits sector change. This means that, at each bounce, the kinks re-emerge in the opposite sector rather than the same one. Notably, in a two-bounce window, the sector change occurs twice. This behavior is characteristic of models with multiple sectors.

A. $(A^2, C^2) = (8/3, 8/3)$

The most common resonance scenario is the case where there is one localized mode and no delocalized mode. In our model, this can be achieved by fixing $A^2 = C^2 = 8/3$, for instance. In such a case, the linearized potential in Fig. 2(a) is a symmetric well.




Figure 4: Bion formation in (a) an kink-antikink, and (b) a antikink-kink collision. Two-bounce window for (c) a kink-antikink, and (d) an antikink-kink collision. Reflection for (e) a kink-antikink, and (f) an antikink-kink collision. Parameters are $A^2 = C^2 = 8/3$.

In Fig. 5, we depict the field at the collision center as a function of time and initial velocities v_0 . The kink-antikink ($K\bar{K}$) scenario is on the left, and the antikink-kink on the right ($\bar{K}K$). The color map is interpreted as follows. Each bounce can be seen as an abrupt change of color in (a) and marked lines in (b). If separation occurs, the color reaches a fixed value when followed




Figure 5: Field at the collision center as a function of time and v_0 . Kink-antikink collisions are depicted in (a) and antikink-kink collisions in (b). Parameters are $A^2 = C^2 = 8/3$.

vertically. The reflection region is characterized by a large range of v_0 where the field acquires a dark blue color after a single bounce and may contain small two-bounce regions accumulating on its edge.

The antikink-kink scattering output corresponds precisely to the collisions obtained in Ref. [54] because the stability potential in the two models coincides, and also there is no sector switching. Kink-antikink collisions, on the other hand, exhibit sector switching, so they do not behave as the model designed in Ref. [54], even for symmetric parameters. The simulations show that the resonance windows are narrower compared to the antikink-kink case, a pattern that will be observed in subsequent sections. For our toy model, kink-antikink and antikink-kink collisions behave identically at the linear level. They both have the same stability potential. In this sense, we have constructed a setup where the only difference between the two is whether sector switching is allowed. Therefore, the narrower windows for kink scattering with sector switching suggest that resonance windows may be less robust in this scenario.

According to theoretical calculations, the vibrational mode frequency is equal to $\omega_T = 1.533$. On the other hand, the numerically measured frequencies are $\omega_{\bar{K}K} = 1.500$ and $\omega_{K\bar{K}} = 1.499$. As expected, the theoretical and numerical frequencies agree closely, with only a two percent relative error. It is important to mention that small differences between measured and theoretical values are expected due to the complexity of the phenomenon we are modeling.




Figure 6: Field at the collision center as a function of time and v_0 . Kink-antikink collisions are depicted in (a) and antikink-kink collisions in (b). Parameters are $A^2 = 1.5$ and $C^2 = 7$.

B. $(A^2, C^2) = (1.5, 7)$

Now, we can consider a case without a localized mode but containing delocalized modes, which can be achieved by fixing $A^2 = 1.5$ and $C^2 = 7$. Resonant behavior via delocalized modes was first described in the ϕ^6 model [52]. Here, we construct a similar scenario where resonance windows can occur via the excitation of delocalized modes. In Fig. 6, we show the field at the collision center as a function of time and initial velocity. In both cases, resonance windows are observed, although they are narrower in the kink-antikink scenario as before. Our toy model not only replicates the resonant structure observed in antikink-kink collisions, similar to the ϕ^6 model, but also reveals a resonant structure in kink-antikink collisions, provided that the meson masses of the two vacua are swapped.

The resonant frequency obtained from the numerical simulations are $\omega_{K\bar{K}} = 1.371$ and $\omega_{\bar{K}K} = 1.381$. To evaluate whether such values agree with the resonant energy exchange mechanism via the excitation of delocalized modes, we present the analytical delocalized modes frequencies as a function of the separation between the kinks in Fig. 7. As vertical lines, we plot the maximum distance between the kinks in the numerical simulations of the first four bounce windows. The horizontal lines mark the measured frequency. The lowest is the only delocalized mode compatible with the measured frequency in the range delimited by the vertical lines. Therefore, our results agree with the current understanding of the phenomenon.




Figure 7: Spectrum of delocalized modes as a function of the interkink half-separation for (a) kink-antikink and (b) antikink-kink configurations. Parameters are $A^2 = 1.5$ and $C^2 = 7$. Delocalized modes exist only in the exhibited range, which is $A^2 < \omega^2 < C^2$.




Figure 8: Field at the collision center as a function of time and v_0 . Kink-antikink collisions are depicted in (a) and antikink-kink collisions in (b). Parameters are $A^2 = 2.5$ and $C^2 = 6.125$.

C. $(A^2, C^2) = (2.5, 6.125)$

Let us also investigate the scenario containing one localized as well as some delocalized modes by fixing the parameters $A^2 = 2.5$ and $C^2 = 6.125$. The scattering output is summarized in Fig. 8. As before, resonance windows are observed, with the kink-antikink case exhibiting narrower windows.




Figure 9: Spectrum of delocalized modes as a function of the interkink half-separation for (a) kink-antikink and (b) antikink-kink configurations. Parameters are $A^2 = 2.5$ and $C^2 = 6.125$. Delocalized modes exist only in the exhibited range, which is $A^2 < \omega^2 < C^2$.

The theoretical frequency of the localized mode is $\omega_T = 1.563$. Furthermore, the frequency of delocalized mode as a function of $D/2$ is shown in Fig. 9. Recall that they obey $A^2 < \omega^2 < C^2$. The interkink distance for the first four bounce windows is also marked as vertical lines. The frequencies should be compared with the associated measured frequencies $\omega_{\bar{K}K} = 1.528$ and $\omega_{K\bar{K}} = 1.501$. For the localized frequency, the associated relative errors are $\delta\omega_{\bar{K}K} = 2.1\%$ and $\delta\omega_{K\bar{K}} = 4.0\%$. Although the delocalized modes begin at $A \simeq 1.581$, the odd delocalized modes cannot be excited due to the even symmetry of the initial conditions. Thus, the measured frequency should be compared to the frequency of the lowest even delocalized mode. These frequencies, however, are significantly different from the measured values. Therefore, the localized mode is responsible for the resonant structure, and the presence of a delocalized mode may be insufficient to disrupt the resonant behavior in this scenario.

D. $(A^2, C^2) = (6.05, 6.05)$

The present subsection explores the scenario with two localized and no delocalized modes. The parameters are symmetrically set to $A^2 = C^2 = 6.05$, leading to the following theoretical frequencies $\omega_{T_1} = 1.678$ and $\omega_{T_2} = 2.457$. The scattering output is summarized in Fig. 10, following the same format as previous subsections. In both scenarios, kink-antikink and antikink-kink collisions, the




Figure 10: Field at the collision center as a function of time and v_0 . Kink-antikink collisions are depicted in (a) and antikink-kink collisions in (b). Parameters are $A^2 = C^2 = 6.05$.

resonance windows are mostly suppressed. This result is consistent with the literature, which indicates that resonance windows are suppressed when more than one localized vibrational mode is present [60]. However, there are a few exceptions to this picture. For instance, resonance windows were identified in Ref. [61] when two vibrational modes were present. The authors developed a model with a free parameter that increases the number of vibrational modes when adjusted. In such a model, the resonance windows exist when a second vibrational mode appears, but only within a narrow range of parameters near that point. Moreover, the authors in Ref. [62] found resonance windows with more than a single localized mode.

Although we found very few resonance windows, we were able to locate many false resonance windows in the antikink-kink scenario. False resonance windows are intervals of initial velocities around local maxima in the time between bounces, where the kinks acquire a significant amount of energy from the vibrational mode at the second bounce but not enough to completely separate. We measured the corresponding resonant frequency as $\omega_{\bar{K}K} = 1.588$, with a relative error of $\delta\omega_{\bar{K}K} = 5.2\%$ compared to the lowest vibrational mode. In the kink-antikink scenario, even false resonance windows were absent, consistent with the windows being narrower whenever present.

Therefore, our simulations confirm that resonance windows tend to be suppressed when two localized vibrational modes are present. Consistently with Refs. [61, 62], our results also suggest that this suppression occurs gradually rather than abruptly with the appearance of a second mode.




Figure 11: Field at the collision center as a function of time and v_0 . Kink-antikink collisions are depicted in (a) and antikink-kink collisions in (b). Parameters are $A^2 = 1.5$ and $C^2 = 9.0$.

E. $(A^2, C^2) = (1.5, 9.0)$

The next scenario contains parameters $A^2 = 1.5$ and $C^2 = 9.0$ with no localized mode. It leads to a larger set of delocalized modes for typical kink-antikink (and antikink-kink) separations between bounces. The scattering output is depicted in Fig. 11 and the delocalized mode frequencies as a function of $D/2$ is shown in Fig. 12. Both are in the same format as before.

Somewhat surprisingly, the windows are mostly suppressed in the kink-antikink case. As the windows are more fragile in this scenario, they were suppressed by the presence of extra delocalized modes. Therefore, we conclude that windows suppression may also occur via the presence of delocalized modes. For antikink-kink collisions, we identify resonance windows, as is generally expected. The measured frequency is $\omega_{\bar{K}K} = 1.358$. Once more, we measure the largest interkink distance at the first four resonance windows. In that range of interkink distances, the numerical frequency is indeed compatible with the lowest delocalized mode.

F. $(A^2, C^2) = (7.0, 9.5)$ **and** $(A^2, C^2) = (7.0, 12.0)$

In this section, we consider the cases with parameters $(A^2, C^2) = (7.0, 9.5)$ and $(A^2, C^2) = (7.0, 12.0)$. Both contain a set of two localized modes as well as some delocalized modes, with the second case containing a larger set. For kink-antikink collisions, resonance windows are mostly suppressed. Such a result is expected, given that they were also absent for the case with two




Figure 12: Spectrum of delocalized modes as a function of the interkink half-separation for (a) kink-antikink and (b) antikink-kink configurations. Parameters are $A^2 = 1.5$ and $C^2 = 9.0$. Delocalized modes exist only in the exhibited range, which is $A^2 < \omega^2 < C^2$.




Figure 13: Field at the collision center as a function of time and v_0 . We consider antikink-kink collisions with parameters (a) $(A^2, C^2) = (7.0, 9.5)$ and (b) $(A^2, C^2) = (7.0, 12.0)$.

localized modes shown in sec. IV D. The remaining scattering output, corresponding to antikink-kink collisions, is shown in Fig. 13.

For $(A^2, C^2) = (7.0, 9.5)$, the theoretical localized frequencies are $\omega_{T_1} = 1.697$, $\omega_{T_2} = 2.624$ and the delocalized modes start to appear above $\sqrt{7}$, i.e., approximately 2.646. We were able to find a few resonance windows and many false ones. The numerically measured frequency is




Figure 14: Field at the collision center as a function of time and v_0 . Kink-antikink collisions are depicted in (a) and antikink-kink collisions in (b). Parameters are $A^2 = 2.7$ and $C^2 = 9.5$.

$\omega_{\bar{K}K} = 1.563$. Compared with the lowest localized mode, the relative error equals $\delta\omega_{\bar{K}K} = 7\%$. At this point, it is important to emphasize a general feature of kink-antikink (and antikink-kink) collisions; the measured frequency corresponds to the lowest vibrational mode available whenever resonance windows are present, whether true or false.

For $(A^2, C^2) = (7.0, 12.0)$, just a few resonance windows are present. Moreover, we were not able to locate false resonance windows, indicating that the resonant structure is mostly suppressed due to the energy exchange with the extra modes.

G. $(A^2, C^2) = (2.7, 9.5)$

Finally, we fix $A^2 = 2.7$ and $C^2 = 9.5$. It corresponds to another scenario where the single kink contains a localized mode, and kink pairs contain some delocalized modes. The usual scattering output is shown in Fig. 14. In the kink-antikink scenario, resonance windows are absent. On the one hand, such a result is expected because the resonance windows are more fragile than the ones in the antikink-kink case. On the other hand, we observe that delocalized modes can surprisingly suppress resonance windows generated by localized modes.

For antikink-kink collisions, the shape mode frequency is $\omega_T = 1.596$, while the delocalized modes start to appear above $\sqrt{2.7}$, i.e., approximately 1.643. The resonant structure in these collisions persists and is characterized by a frequency of $\omega_{\bar{K}K} = 1.548$. The error relative to the lowest vibrational mode is $\delta\omega_{\bar{K}K} = 3\%$. On the other hand, the lowest even delocalized mode

frequency is quite far from the numerically measured frequency. Therefore, our results reinforce the notion that the lowest vibrational mode primarily governs the appearance of resonance windows.

V. CONCLUSION

In this study, we designed a piecewise ϕ^2 toy model with a triple-well potential. Such construction leads to an asymmetric square-well potential for linearized perturbations around the kink solutions. Consequently, we could manipulate the number of localized and delocalized modes in kink collisions by adjusting the model's free parameters, A and C . Furthermore, the frequencies were analytically determined using transcendental equations.

We explored many spectral scenarios for kink-antikink and antikink-kink collisions, with and without sector changing, respectively. Some of them were previously unexplored in the literature. Resonant behavior was observed in certain cases, while it was mostly suppressed in others. Across all scenarios studied, sector-changing collisions exhibited narrower resonance windows. Notably, the resonant frequency consistently aligned with the lowest available vibrational mode.

For delocalized resonant behavior, the numerically measured delocalized frequency consistently matched with the lowest delocalized mode in the range of measured interkink distance. As the value of the largest interkink distance varied significantly between different bounce windows, it reinforces the necessity of constructing a collective coordinate model with dynamical delocalized modes rather than frozen ones to achieve a more realistic picture of resonant behavior from delocalized modes.

Collisions involving a single vibrational mode, whether localized or delocalized, exhibited a rich structure of resonance windows. Adding extra modes, even delocalized ones, can partially or entirely suppress this resonant structure. Specifically, resonance windows are narrower and more easily suppressed in kink-antikink collisions. In contrast, the antikink-kink scenario is more robust and remains unaffected by additional delocalized modes in certain cases. Other combinations are possible, as varying the parameters A and C allows for a wide range of scenarios.

An interesting continuation of the present work is to analyze differences in radiation production between kink-antikink collisions with and without sector switching. Our toy model offers a perfect setup to analyze this issue, given that we can choose between allowing sector switching or not while keeping all linear features of the model fixed. To the best of our knowledge, it is the only model in the literature exhibiting such a feature. This could be achieved by measuring the amount of radiation that reaches the boundary at infinity after the kinks interact.

According to the standard resonance energy exchange mechanism, resonance windows appear

because translational energy is converted into vibrational energy and vice-versa whenever the kinks reemerge after multiple bounces. In this work, we drew a more general picture, namely that energy is redistributed among all possible modes at each bounce. The frequent occurrence of resonance windows suggests that higher frequency modes are only weakly excited, if at all, in general. However, our results indicate that when multiple localized modes, and sometimes multiple delocalized ones, are present, they can be significantly excited, suppressing any resonant behavior. Deriving equations that describe how energy is redistributed among all modes at each bounce would advance Campbell's original description to a more comprehensive framework. Progress in this direction has been made through the study of wobbling kink collisions [41] and the inclusion of several degrees of freedom in the collective coordinate formalism of kink interactions [63–66].

Acknowledgements

JGFC acknowledges financial support from Fundação de Amparo a Ciência e Tecnologia do Estado de Pernambuco (FACEPE), grant no. BFP-0013-1.05/23. AM acknowledges financial support from Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), Grant no. 309368/2020-0. CESS and AM also acknowledge financial support from Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES). Part of the simulations presented here were performed in the supercomputer SDumont at the Brazilian agency LNCC (Laboratório Nacional de Computação Científica).

Appendix A: Potential and kink parameters

Imposing the continuity condition on the potential yields to the following four relations

$$A^2 = B^2 \frac{(\phi_0 - \phi_1)}{\phi_1}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$V_+ = \frac{1}{2} B^2 [\phi_1(\phi_0 - \phi_1) + (\phi_0 - \phi_1)^2], \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\lambda = \frac{2V_+}{B^2(\phi_2 - \phi_0)} + \phi_0, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$C^2 = B^2 \frac{(\phi_0 - \phi_2)}{(\phi_2 - \lambda)}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Imposing the same condition on the kink profile leads to the following relations

$$K = \frac{\sqrt{2V_+}}{B}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\theta_0 = \sin^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{K} (\phi_1 - \phi_0) \right], \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$x_1 = \frac{1}{A} \ln \phi_1, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$x_2 = x_1 + \frac{1}{B} \sin^{-1} \left(\frac{\phi_2 - \phi_0}{K} \right) - \frac{\theta_0}{B}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Appendix B: Solutions of one and two asymmetric square-wells

In this appendix, we introduce the momenta as $k_1^2 = A^2 - \omega^2$, $k_2^2 = B^2 + \omega^2$, and $k_3^2 = C^2 - \omega^2$. Moreover, the square-well size is defined as $L = x_2 - x_1$. Once the vibrational mode frequency is obtained from the corresponding transcendental equation, we may express the asymmetric square-well localized modes as

$$\eta(x) = \begin{cases} Ge^{k_1(x-x_1)}, & x < x_1, \\ H_1 \sin[k_2(x-x_1)] + H_2 \cos[k_2(x-x_1)], & x_1 < x < x_2, \\ Ie^{-k_3(x-x_2)}, & x > x_2. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The constants are obtained by requiring continuity of η and its first derivative. They are

$$H_1 = \frac{k_1}{k_2} G, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$H_2 = G, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$I = G \left\{ \frac{k_1}{k_2} \sin[k_2(x_2-x_1)] + \cos[k_2(x_2-x_1)] \right\}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Here and in the following expressions, the parameters G can be fixed by requiring normalization of the modes.

Now, we make the following redefinition $k_1^2 = \omega^2 - A^2$. Then, the even delocalized are expressed as

$$\eta(x) = \begin{cases} G \exp \left[k_3 \left(x + \frac{D}{2} + L \right) \right], & x < -\frac{D}{2} - L, \\ H_1 \sin \left[k_2 \left(x + \frac{D}{2} \right) \right] + H_2 \cos \left[k_2 \left(x + \frac{D}{2} \right) \right], & -\frac{D}{2} - L < x < -\frac{D}{2}, \\ I \cos(k_1 x), & -\frac{D}{2} < x < \frac{D}{2}, \\ -H_1 \sin \left[k_2 \left(x - \frac{D}{2} \right) \right] + H_2 \cos \left[k_2 \left(x - \frac{D}{2} \right) \right], & \frac{D}{2} < x < \frac{D}{2} + L, \\ G \exp \left[-k_3 \left(x - \frac{D}{2} - L \right) \right], & x > \frac{D}{2} + L. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Requiring continuity of η and its first derivative, we obtain

$$H_1 = G \left[\frac{k_3}{k_2} \cos(k_2 L) - \sin(k_2 L) \right], \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$H_2 = G \left[\cos(k_2 L) + \frac{k_3}{k_2} \sin(k_2 L) \right], \quad (\text{B.7})$$

$$I = \frac{G}{\cos(k_1 D/2)} \left[\cos(k_2 L) + \frac{k_3}{k_2} \sin(k_2 L) \right]. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Likewise, the odd delocalized are expressed as

$$\eta(x) = \begin{cases} G \exp \left[k_3 \left(x + \frac{D}{2} + L \right) \right], & x < -\frac{D}{2} - L, \\ H_1 \sin \left[k_2 \left(x + \frac{D}{2} \right) \right] + H_2 \cos \left[k_2 \left(x + \frac{D}{2} \right) \right], & -\frac{D}{2} - L < x < -\frac{D}{2}, \\ I \sin(k_1 x), & -\frac{D}{2} < x < \frac{D}{2}, \\ H_1 \sin \left[k_2 \left(x - \frac{D}{2} \right) \right] - H_2 \cos \left[k_2 \left(x - \frac{D}{2} \right) \right], & \frac{D}{2} < x < \frac{D}{2} + L, \\ -G \exp \left[-k_3 \left(x - \frac{D}{2} - L \right) \right], & x > \frac{D}{2} + L. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Requiring continuity of η and its first derivative, we obtain the same expression for H_1 and H_2 , while the remaining constant is

$$I = -\frac{G}{\sin(k_1 D/2)} \left[\cos(k_2 L) + \frac{k_3}{k_2} \sin(k_2 L) \right]. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

The half-localized (or half-scattering) modes for an isolated kink obeying $A < \omega < C$ are as follows

$$\eta(x) = \begin{cases} G e^{ik_1(x-x_1)} + G^* e^{-ik_1(x-x_1)}, & x < x_1, \\ H_1 \sin[k_2(x-x_1)] + H_2 \cos[k_2(x-x_1)], & x_1 < x < x_2, \\ I e^{-k_3(x-x_1)}, & x > x_2, \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

where

$$H_1 = \left[-\sin(k_2 L) + \frac{k_3}{k_2} \cos(k_2 L) \right] I, \quad (\text{B.12})$$

$$H_2 = \left[-\cos(k_2 L) - \frac{k_3}{k_2} \sin(k_2 L) \right] I, \quad (\text{B.13})$$

$$G = \frac{1}{2} \left(H_2 - i \frac{k_2}{k_1} H_1 \right), \quad (\text{B.14})$$

$$G^* = \frac{1}{2} \left(H_2 + i \frac{k_2}{k_1} H_1 \right). \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Appendix C: Numerical Method

The partial differential field equation was solved utilizing a second-order finite differences scheme. Such methods are expected to handle discontinuities better than higher-order ones. The field is discretized as $\phi_{i,j} \equiv \phi(x = -L_{\text{box}} + i\delta x, t = j\delta t)$ with box size $2L_{\text{box}} = 600.0$ and periodic boundary conditions. In all simulations, we have utilized $\delta x = 10^{-2}$ and $\delta t = 10^{-3}$, leading to indices $i = 0, 1, \dots, 6 \times 10^4$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, 4 \times 10^5$. Then, the partial derivatives are computed as

$$\frac{\partial^2 \phi_{i,j}}{\partial t^2} \approx \frac{\phi_{i,j+1} - 2\phi_{i,j} + \phi_{i,j-1}}{(\delta t)^2}, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \phi_{i,j}}{\partial x^2} \approx \frac{\phi_{i+1,j} - 2\phi_{i,j} + \phi_{i-1,j}}{(\delta x)^2}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Additionally, damping proportional to a bump function was added to ensure that no radiation returns to the system. This function remains zero everywhere except at the boundaries, where it has a smooth bump shape. Our approach included conserving energy as a method to gauge the overall simulation accuracy, with all presented results exhibiting a maximum relative error of order 10^{-4} .

-
- [1] A. del Campo and W. H. Zurek. Universality of phase transition dynamics: Topological defects from symmetry breaking. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* 29(8), 1430018 (2014).
 - [2] T. Yanagisawa and I. Hase. Massless Modes and Abelian Gauge Fields in Multi-Band Superconductors. *J. Phys. Soc. Jap.* 82, 124704 (2013).
 - [3] T. Yanagisawa, I. Hase, and Y. Tanaka. Massless and quantized modes of kinks in the phase space of superconducting gaps. *Phys. Lett. A* 382(48), 3483 (2018).
 - [4] P. Couillet, L. Gil, and F. Rocca. Optical vortices. *Opt. Commun.* 73(5), 403 (1989).
 - [5] V. Pal, C. Tradonsky, R. Chriki, A. A. Friesem, and N. Davidson. Observing dissipative topological defects with coupled lasers. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 119, 013902 (2017).
 - [6] P. A. Brandão and S. B. Cavalcanti. Topological charge identification of partially coherent light diffracted by a triangular aperture. *Phys. Lett. A* 380(47), 4013 (2016).
 - [7] S. V. Suchkov, A. A. Sukhorukov, J. Huang, S. V. Dmitriev, C. Lee, and Y. S. Kivshar. Nonlinear switching and solitons in PT-symmetric photonic systems. *Laser Photonics Rev.* 10(2), 177 (2016).
 - [8] M. Ozisik, A. Secer, M. Bayram, M. Cinar, N. Ozdemir, H. Esen, and I. Onder. Investigation of optical soliton solutions of higher-order nonlinear Schrödinger equation having Kudryashov nonlinear refractive index. *Optik* 274, 170548 (2023).

- [9] Y. Zhong, F.-Y. Li, and X.-D. Liu. K-field kinks in two-dimensional dilaton gravity. *Phys. Lett. B* 822, 136716 (2021).
- [10] F. C. E. Lima and C. A. S. Almeida. Aspects of self-gravitating kink-like structures in 2D dilaton gravity. *Prog. Phys.* 71(12), 2300051 (2023).
- [11] T. W. B. Kibble. Some implications of a cosmological phase transition. *Phys. Rep.* 67(1), 183 (1980).
- [12] L. Ye, A. J. Freeman, D. E. Ellis, and B. Delley. Electronic structure of kink and kink-antikink defects in polyacetylene. *Phys. Rev. B* 40, 6285 (1989).
- [13] L. Bernasconi. Chaotic soliton dynamics in photoexcited trans-polyacetylene. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* 6(5), 908 (2015).
- [14] V. M. Kuchkin, B. Barton-Singer, F. N. Rybakov, S. Blügel, B. J. Schroers, and N. S. Kiselev. Magnetic skyrmions, chiral kinks, and holomorphic functions. *Phys. Rev. B* 102, 144422 (2020).
- [15] V. M. Kuchkin, N. S. Kiselev, F. N. Rybakov, and P. F. Bessarab. Tailed skyrmions - An obscure branch of magnetic solitons. *Front. Phys.* 11, 1171079 (2023).
- [16] L. R. Livramento, E. Radu, and Ya. Shnir. Solitons in the gauged Skyrme-Maxwell model. *Symmetry Integr. Geom.* 19, 42 (2023).
- [17] V. G. Kamenskii and S. S. Rozhkov. A new mechanism for the formation of solitons in a nematic liquid-crystal. *Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* 41(5), 206 (1985).
- [18] W. Hu, T. Zhang, Q. Guo, L. Xuan, and S. Lan. Nonlocality-controlled interaction of spatial solitons in nematic liquid crystals. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 89, 071111 (2006).
- [19] S. Pu, C. Hou, and K. Zhan. Rigid solitons in nematic liquid crystals. *Optik* 124(8), 701 (2013).
- [20] P. Panayotaros and T. R. Marchant. Solitary waves in nematic liquid crystals. *Physica D* 268, 106 (2014).
- [21] T. Sugiyama. Kink-Antikink Collisions in the Two-Dimensional ϕ^4 Model. *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 61(5), 1550 (1979).
- [22] D. K. Campbell, J. F. Schonfeld, and C. A. Wingate. Resonance Structure in Kink - Antikink Interactions in ϕ^4 Theory. *Physica D* 9(1), 1 (1983).
- [23] D. K. Campbell, M. Peyrard, and P. Sodano. Kink-antikink interactions in the double sine-gordon equation. *Physica D* 19(2), 165 (1986).
- [24] E. Belendryasova, V. A. Gani, A. M. Marjaneh, D. Saadatmand, and A. Askari. A new look at the double sine-gordon kink-antikink scattering. *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* 1205, 012007 (2019).
- [25] V. A. Gani and A. E. Kudryavtsev. Kink-antikink interactions in the double sine-gordon equation and the problem of resonance frequencies. *Phys. Rev. E* 60, 3305 (1999).
- [26] P. Dorey, A. Gorina, I. Perapechka, T. Romańczukiewicz, and Ya. Shnir. Resonance structures in kink-antikink collisions in a deformed sine-gordon model. *J. High Energ. Phys.* 9, 145 (2021).
- [27] R. Carretero-González, L. A. Cisneros-Ake, R. Decker, G. N. Koutsokostas, D. J. Frantzeskakis, P. G. Kevrekidis, and D. J. Ratliff. Kink-antikink stripe interactions in the two-dimensional sine-gordon equation. *Comm. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simulat.* 109, 106123 (2022).

- [28] V. A. Gani, A. M. Marjaneh, and D. Saadatmand. Multi-kink scattering in the double sine-gordon model. *Eur. Phys. J. C* 79, 620 (2019).
- [29] V. A. Gani, A. M. Marjaneh, and K. Javidan. Exotic final states in the φ^8 multi-kink collisions. *Eur. Phys. J. C* 81, 1124 (2021).
- [30] T. Romanczukiewicz. Interaction between kink and radiation in ϕ^4 model. *Acta Phys. Polon. B* 35, 523 (2004).
- [31] C. Adam, P. Dorey, A. G. Martín-Caro, M. Huidobro, K. Oles, T. Romanczukiewicz, Ya. Shnir, and A. Wereszczynski. Multikink scattering in the ϕ^6 model revisited. *Phys. Rev. D* 106, 125003 (2022).
- [32] S. Hoseinmardy and N. Riazi. Inelastic collision of kinks and antikinks in the ϕ^6 system. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* 25(16), 3261 (2010).
- [33] P. Dorey, A. Halavanau, J. Mercer, T. Romanczukiewicz, and Ya. Shnir. Boundary scattering in the ϕ^4 model. *J. High Energ. Phys.* 5, 107 (2017).
- [34] E. Belendryasova and V. A. Gani. Resonance phenomena in the ϕ^8 kinks scattering. *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* 934, 012059 (2017).
- [35] A. Saxena, I. C. Christov, and A. Khare. Higher-Order Field Theories: ϕ^6 , ϕ^8 and Beyond. In: P. Kevrekidis and J. Cuevas-Maraver. A Dynamical Perspective on the ϕ^4 Model. *Nonlinear Systems and Complexity* 26. Springer, Cham (2019).
- [36] A. Khare and A. Saxena. Kink solutions with power law tails. *Front. Phys.* 10, 992915 (2022).
- [37] D. Bazeia, J. G. F. Campos, and A. Mohammadi. Kink-antikink collisions in the ϕ^8 model: short-range to long-range journey. *J. High Energ. Phys.* 5, 116 (2023).
- [38] P. A. Blinov, T. V. Gani, and V. A. Gani. Deformations of kink tails. *Ann. Phys.* 437, 168739 (2022).
- [39] A. Khare and A. Saxena. Logarithmic potential with super-super-exponential kink profiles and tails. *Phys. Scr.* 95, 075205 (2020).
- [40] E. Belendryasova, V. A. Gani, and K. G. Zloshchastiev. Kink solutions in logarithmic scalar field theory: Excitation spectra, scattering, and decay of bions. *Phys. Lett. B* 823, 136776 (2021).
- [41] A. A. Izquierdo, J. Queiroga-Nunes, and L. M. Nieto. Scattering between wobbling kinks. *Phys. Rev. D* 103, 045003 (2021).
- [42] J. G. F. Campos and A. Mohammadi. Wobbling double sine-gordon kinks. *J. High Energ. Phys.* 9, 67 (2021).
- [43] A. Alonso-Izquierdo, L. M. Nieto, and J. Queiroga-Nunes. Asymmetric scattering between kinks and wobblers. *Comm. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simulat.* 107, 106183 (2022).
- [44] Y. S. Kivshar, Z. Fei, and L. Vázquez. Resonant soliton-impurity interactions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 67, 1177 (1991).
- [45] Y. Zhou, B. G. Chen, N. Upadhyaya, and V. Vitelli. Kink-antikink asymmetry and impurity interactions in topological mechanical chains. *Phys. Rev. E* 95, 022202 (2017).
- [46] M. Lizunova, J. Kager, S. de Lange, and J. van Wezel. Emergence of oscillons in kink-impurity interactions. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* 54, 315701 (2021).

- [47] C. Adam, K. Oles, T. Romanczukiewicz, and A. Wereszczynski. Spectral walls in soliton collisions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 122, 241601 (2019).
- [48] C. Adam, K. Oles, T. Romanczukiewicz, and A. Wereszczynski. Spectral walls in antikink-kink scattering in the ϕ^6 model. *Phys. Rev. D* 106, 105027 (2022).
- [49] J. G. F. Campos, A. Mohammadi, J. M. Queiruga, A. Wereszczynski, and W. J. Zakrzewski. Fermionic spectral walls in kink collisions. *J. High Energ. Phys.* 1, 71 (2023).
- [50] D. Bazeia, J. G. F. Campos, and A. Mohammadi. Resonance mediated by fermions in kink-antikink collisions. *J. High Energ. Phys.* 12, 85 (2022).
- [51] N. S. Manton, K. Oles, T. Romanczukiewicz, and A. Wereszczynski. Collective coordinate model of kink-antikink collisions in ϕ^4 theory. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 127, 071601 (2021).
- [52] P. Dorey, K. Mersh, T. Romanczukiewicz, and Ya. Shnir. Kink-antikink collisions in the ϕ^6 model. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 107, 091602 (2011).
- [53] P. Dorey and T. Romańczukiewicz. Resonant kink-antikink scattering through quasinormal modes. *Phys. Lett. B* 779, 117 (2018).
- [54] J. G. F. Campos and A. Mohammadi. Quasinormal modes in kink excitations and kink-antikink interactions: a toy model. *Eur. Phys. J. C* 80, 352 (2020).
- [55] F. M. Hahne, P. Klimas, J. S. Streibel, and W. J. Zakrzewski. Scattering of compact oscillons. *J. High Energ. Phys.* 1, 6 (2020).
- [56] F. M. Hahne and P. Klimas. Scattering of compact kinks. *J. High Energ. Phys.* 1, 67 (2024).
- [57] O. N. Karpíšek, L. Rafaj, and F. Blaschke. Scattering of kinks in coreless potentials. *ArXiv Preprint* 2407.14313 (2024).
- [58] X. Li and L. Long. Radiation-like Shock Waves in Kink Scattering. *ArXiv Preprint* 2407.14479 (2024).
- [59] L. Long and Y. Jiang. Solving the Spectral Problem via the Periodic Boundary Approximation in ϕ^6 Theory. *arXiv preprint* 2404.13310 (2024).
- [60] F. C. Simas, A. R. Gomes, K. Z. Nobrega, and J. C. R. E. Oliveira. Suppression of two-bounce windows in kink-antikink collisions. *J. High Energ. Phys.* 9, 104 (2016).
- [61] P. Dorey, A. Gorina, I. Perapechka, T. Romańczukiewicz, and Ya. Shnir. Resonance structures in kink-antikink collisions in a deformed sine-Gordon model. *J. High Energ. Phys.* 9, 145 (2021).
- [62] A. M. Marjaneh, F. C. Simas, and D. Bazeia. Collisions of kinks in deformed ϕ^4 and ϕ^6 models. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* 164, 112723 (2022).
- [63] F. Blaschke and O. N. Karpíšek. Mechanization of scalar field theory in 1+1 dimensions. *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* 10, 103A01 (2022).
- [64] S. Navarro-Obregón, L. M. Nieto, and J. M. Queiruga. Inclusion of radiation in the collective coordinate method approach of the ϕ^4 model. *Phys. Rev. E* 108, 044216 (2023).
- [65] C. Adam, D. Ciurla, K. Oles, T. Romanczukiewicz, and A. Wereszczynski. Relativistic moduli space and critical velocity in kink collisions. *Phys. Rev. E* 108, 024221 (2023).
- [66] L. Long, X. Li, Y. Jiang. A toy model to explain the missing bounce windows in the kink-antikink

collisions. *Phys. Lett. B* 854, 138736 (2024).