

# Quantum energies of solitons with different topological charges

N. Graham<sup>a)</sup>, H. Weigel<sup>b)</sup>

<sup>a)</sup>*Department of Physics, Middlebury College Middlebury, VT 05753, USA*

<sup>b)</sup>*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Physics Department,  
Stellenbosch University, Matieland 7602, South Africa*

The vacuum polarization energy is the leading quantum correction to the classical energy of a soliton. We study this energy for two-component solitons in one space dimension as a function of the soliton's topological charge. We find that both the classical and the vacuum polarization energies are linear functions of the topological charge with a small offset. Because the combination of the classical and quantum offsets determines the binding energies, either all higher charge solitons are energetically bound or they are all unbound, depending on model parameters. This linearity persists even when the field configurations are very different from those of isolated solitons, and would not be apparent from an analysis of their bound state spectra alone.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Solitons (or solitary waves) are solutions to non-linear wave equations with a localized energy density and which thus have a particle interpretation. Typically solitons fall into topological sectors characterized by integer charges with an infinite energy barrier between different sectors. The classical energy of solitons grows with these topological charges: often models have a lower, so-called Bogomolny-Prasad-Sommerfield (BPS) bound that is linear in the (absolute value of the) topological charge [1, 2]. Field configurations with higher topological charges fall into the same topological sector as equally many widely separated solitons with unit charge. The stability of the former is then decided by the energy balance when comparing configurations with (almost) equal classical energies.

These classical energies have quantum corrections. On the absolute scale they should be small for a consistent model, but they may be important for the energy balance. Because these corrections emerge from a quantum field theory calculation, only renormalizable models can be considered. Unfortunately, renormalizable models with exact static solitons of different topological charges are very rare. Recently we have computed the one-loop quantum corrections to BPS vortices in scalar electrodynamics [3]. In this model the numerics are very intricate and therefore only winding number up to four was considered. Within that range, the quantum correction was essentially linear in the topological charge, with a small offset. There are many renormalizable (at least to one loop) soliton models in one space dimension, but most of them allow only a unit topological charge. The sine-Gordon model is an exception, but its static classical multi-charge solutions merely consist of single charge configurations that do not interact. In a recently proposed [4] two-field generalization of the sine-Gordon model, however, a second field produces the necessary attraction between the single charge configuration so that multi-charge solutions can emerge as a single bound lump. We will investigate this model to compute the leading quantum corrections to the energies of the configurations of the higher charge solutions and determine their binding energies.

Similar extensions of the  $\phi^4$  and  $\phi^6$  kink models have also recently been proposed [5]. However, they have a limited range of integer topological charges and we will thus not consider them here.

## II. THE MODEL AND ITS SOLITON SOLUTIONS

Using dimensionless variables and parameters, the Lagrangian of our model reads (note that scalar fields in  $D = 1 + 1$  are dimensionless in natural units) [4],

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{m^2}{v^2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi_i \partial^\mu \phi_i - (1 - \cos \phi_1) - \frac{\mu_1^2}{8} \left( 1 - \frac{2\phi_2}{\mu_2} - \cos \frac{\phi_1}{2} \right)^2 \right], \quad (1)$$

for the scalar fields  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$ . Here  $m$  is the physical mass of  $\phi_1$  such that the associated dimensionless mass is one. Furthermore  $v$  is a dimensionless model parameter such that the allowed physical vacua are  $\langle \phi_1 \rangle = 2\pi m/v$  with integer  $m$ . The overall factor has no effect on the classical dynamics, but is a relative weight for the one-loop quantum corrections because it enters the relation between the canonical momenta and the field velocities in canonical quantization. After taking that factor into account, it suffices to work with the expression in square brackets. The first potential term is taken from the sine-Gordon model and the second describes the interaction between the two scalar fields  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$ . Hence the coupling constant  $\mu_1$  determines the strength of that interaction while  $\mu_2$  sets the scale for  $\phi_2$ .

Denoting time derivatives by dots and spatial derivatives by primes, the field equations obtained from Eq. (1) are

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\phi}_1 - \phi_1'' &= -\sin \phi_1 - \frac{\mu_1^2}{8} \left( 1 - \frac{2\phi_2}{\mu_2} - \cos \frac{\phi_1}{2} \right) \sin \frac{\phi_1}{2} \\ \ddot{\phi}_2 - \phi_2'' &= \frac{\mu_1^2}{2\mu_2} \left( 1 - \frac{2\phi_2}{\mu_2} - \cos \frac{\phi_1}{2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Vacuum solutions, constant fields for which the right-hand-sides of Eq. (2) vanish and that minimize the field potential, come in two types, both labeled by an integer  $n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{A :} & \quad \phi_1 = (4n + 2)\pi & \text{and} & \quad \phi_2 = \mu_2 & \text{with} & \quad n = 0, 1, \dots \\ \text{B :} & \quad \phi_1 = 4n\pi & \text{and} & \quad \phi_2 = 0 & \text{with} & \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

As in Ref. [4], we take the boundary conditions such that both fields vanish at negative spatial infinity and assume any of the vacua from Eq. (3) at positive infinity. We can then assign the topological charge

$$N = \frac{\phi_1(\infty) - \phi_1(0)}{2\pi} = \begin{cases} 2n + 1 = 1, 3, 5, \dots & \text{for case A} \\ 2n = 2, 4, 6, \dots & \text{for case B.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

The static soliton equations are

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1'' &= \sin \phi_1 + \frac{\mu_1^2}{8} \left( 1 - \frac{2\phi_2}{\mu_2} - \cos \frac{\phi_1}{2} \right) \sin \frac{\phi_1}{2} \\ \phi_2'' &= -\frac{\mu_1^2}{2\mu_2} \left( 1 - \frac{2\phi_2}{\mu_2} - \cos \frac{\phi_1}{2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

When the soliton approaches a vacuum of type A, the parameterization  $\phi_1 = \bar{\phi}_1 + (2n + 1)\pi$  and  $\phi_2 = \bar{\phi}_2 + \frac{\mu_2}{2}$  shows that both  $\bar{\phi}_i$  are odd functions of the coordinate. Then the initial conditions at  $x \sim 0$  are

$$\phi_1(x) \sim (2n + 1)\pi + ax \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2(x) \sim \frac{\mu_2}{2} + bx. \quad (6)$$

The asymptotic behavior as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  for the type A boundary conditions is

$$\phi_1(x) \sim (4n+2)\pi + Ae^{-x} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2(x) \sim \mu_2 + Be^{-\mu_0 x} \quad \text{where} \quad \mu_0 = \min\left(2, \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}\right). \quad (7)$$

The parameters  $a$ ,  $b$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  will be tuned in a shooting method such that  $\phi_i$  and  $\phi'_i$  are continuous functions. That is, for an initial guess of these parameters we numerically integrate Eq. (5) both from  $x = 0$  to an intermediate matching point  $x_m \gg 0$  and from  $x_{\max} \gg x_m$  to  $x_m$ . We then apply a Newton algorithm for the parameters to obtain continuous functions at  $x_m$ .

When the soliton interpolates between two vacua of type B, the parameterizations  $\phi_1 = \bar{\phi}_1 + 2n\pi$  and  $\phi_2 = \bar{\phi}_2$  are consistent with taking  $\bar{\phi}_1$  and  $\bar{\phi}_2$  to be odd and even functions, respectively. Hence we can solve the static equations on the half-line  $x \geq 0$  with the initial conditions around  $x \sim 0$

$$\phi_1(x) \sim 2n\pi + ax \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2(x) \sim b + \mathcal{O}(x^2). \quad (8)$$

In this case the large  $x$  asymptotic behavior is found to be

$$\phi_1(x) \sim 4n\pi + Ae^{-x} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2(x) \sim Be^{-\mu_0 x}. \quad (9)$$

Again  $a$ ,  $b$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  will be tuned to construct the soliton.

Finding solutions to Eqs. (5) requires delicate choices of the numerical parameters (mainly  $x_m$  and  $x_{\max}$ ). So it is advisable to store them together with the parameters from the shooting method, especially for higher topological charges; those configurations are quite wide, and one has to find the coefficients  $A$  and  $B$  in Eqs. (6) and (8) to high precision, because the exponential is tiny for very large  $x$  but its product with these coefficients must be of  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ . Numerical solutions for the profile functions have already been presented in Ref. [4]. Here we will focus on the structure of solutions for higher topological charges, as shown in Figures 1 and 2 for different values of the model parameter  $\mu_2$  and in Figures 3 and 4 of various values of  $\mu_1$ .

For larger topological charges, the profile function  $\phi_2$  shows that the solitons resemble distinct unit charge sine-Gordon solitons when  $\mu_2$  is small, but they turn into single lumps in which the solitons sit on top of each other when  $\mu_2$  is large. On the other hand, the profiles show only little variation with  $\mu_1$ .

Numerical results for the classical energy

$$E_{\text{cl}}^{(N)} = \int_0^\infty dx \left[ \phi_1'^2 + \phi_2'^2 + 2(1 - \cos \phi_1) + \frac{\mu_1^2}{4} \left( 1 - \frac{2\phi_2}{\mu_2} - \cos \frac{\phi_1}{2} \right)^2 \right] \quad (10)$$

are listed in Table I for a set of model parameters, a subset of which was also considered in Ref. [4]. We agree with their results and numerical fit for  $(E_{\text{cl}}^{(N)} - NE_{\text{cl}}^{(1)})/NE_{\text{cl}}^{(1)}$ , where  $E_{\text{cl}}^{(1)}$  is the energy of a single soliton. For comparison we note that the classical energy of the sine-Gordon soliton is  $E^{\text{sG}} = 8$  for the present units. Derrick's theorem [6] implies that the derivative and non-derivative components should contribute equally in the above integral. This has been used as the main criterion to validate the solutions.

The main effect of the  $\phi_2$  field is to stabilize the multi-sine-Gordon profile  $\phi_1$ . Without that second field, the multi-sine-Gordon configurations would split up into single solitons with infinite separation. This effect can also be seen from the classical energy: Taking the  $\phi_1$  profile for  $N = 4$  and setting  $\mu_1 = 0$  and  $\phi_2' = 0$  yields an energy of 57.7, while the exact classical energy is only moderately larger at 66.7.

It is more interesting to view the classical energies as functions of the topological charge as shown in Figure 5. Essentially we find a linear dependence with a small offset and only small deviations, for low topological charges ( $N \leq 3$ ) and for scenarios when the solitons form lumps. As we move




FIG. 1: Profiles for  $N = 11$ : left panel  $\phi_1$ ; right panel  $\phi_2$  normalized to  $\mu_2$ . Here  $\mu_1 = 2.0$




FIG. 2: Profiles for  $N = 12$ :  $\phi_1$  (left panel) and  $\phi_2$  normalized to  $\mu_2$  (right panel). Here  $\mu_1 = 2.0$ .

towards isolated solitons, we approach the limit  $E_{\text{cl}}^{(N)} \rightarrow 8N$ . The corresponding (negative) binding energies

$$\Delta E_{\text{cl}}^{(N)} = E_{\text{cl}}^{(N)} - NE_{\text{cl}}^{(1)} \quad (11)$$

are shown in Figure 6. For the sets of model parameters considered we find that  $\Delta E_{\text{cl}}^{(N)}$  decreases monotonically with the topological charge, so that the higher charge solutions are stable against decay into isolated solitons with the same total charge. Furthermore we observe that the (negative) gradient of this decrease is larger for cases that have more compact soliton profiles.




FIG. 3: Profiles for  $N = 11$ :  $\phi_1$  (left panel) and  $\phi_2$  normalized to  $\mu_2$  (right panel). Here  $\mu_2 = 6.1$ .




FIG. 4: Profiles for  $N = 12$ :  $\phi_1$  (left panel) and  $\phi_2$  normalized to  $\mu_2$  (right panel). Here  $\mu_2 = 6.1$ .

$\mu_2$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
4.0	9.28	18.42	27.57	36.72	45.87	55.03	64.18	73.33	82.48	91.63	100.78	109.93
6.1	10.24	19.44	28.95	38.37	47.82	57.26	66.71	76.14	85.59	95.03	104.47	113.92
8.0	11.14	19.99	29.81	39.24	48.83	58.35	67.90	77.44	86.99	96.53	106.07	115.62

TABLE I: The classical energy as a function of the topological charge  $N$  (top line) for  $\mu_1 = 2$ .




FIG. 5: The classical energy, Eq. (10), for  $\mu_1 = 2.0$  and several values of  $\mu_2$  (left panel) and for  $\mu_2 = 6.1$  and several values of  $\mu_1$  (right panel). The dashed line shows the classical energy,  $8N$ , of  $N$  isolated sine-Gordon solitons.




FIG. 6: The classical binding energy, Eq. (11), for  $\mu_1 = 2.0$  and several values of  $\mu_2$  (left panel) and for  $\mu_2 = 6.1$  and several values of  $\mu_1$  (right panel).

We conclude this section by mentioning that there is a significant variation of  $E_{\text{cl}}^{(N)}$  with  $\mu_1$ , even though the profiles are not too sensitive to that parameter. This variation arises from the  $\mu_1^2$  factor in Eq. (10). However, the (almost) linear dependence on  $N$  was also observed for all considered values of  $\mu_1$ .

### III. WAVE EQUATIONS

We linearize the field equations, Eq. (2), by the ansatz

$$\phi_i(x, t) = \phi_i^{(s)}(x) + \eta_i(x)e^{-i\omega t} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2. \quad (12)$$

The superscripts refer to the soliton solutions constructed above and we have omitted the frequency argument for the small amplitude fluctuations  $\eta_i(x)$ . The wave equations for these fluctuations can be written as

$$\eta_i'' = -\omega^2 \eta_i + M_{ij} \eta_j + V_{ij} \eta_j \quad (13)$$

with the mass and potential matrices given by [4]

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\mu_1^2}{\mu_2^2} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad V = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \phi_1^{(s)} - 1 - \frac{\mu_1^2}{\mu_2} \left[ \mu_2 \cos \phi_1^{(s)} - (\mu_2 - 2\phi_2^{(s)}) \cos \frac{\phi_1^{(s)}}{2} \right] & -\frac{\mu_1^2}{4\mu_2} \sin \frac{\phi_1^{(s)}}{2} \\ -\frac{\mu_1^2}{4\mu_2} \sin \frac{\phi_1^{(s)}}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

There is no explicit dependence on the topological charge  $N$  because it is fully encoded in the potential  $V$ . Therefore we will not add the label  $N$  to the solutions of Eq. (13), but that dependence is understood in what follows.

The case when  $\phi_1^{(s)}/2$  is an even multiple of  $\pi$  and  $\phi_2^{(s)} = 0$  obviously has  $V_{11} = 0$ . In the other case when  $\phi_1^{(s)}/2$  is an odd multiple of  $\pi$  and  $\phi_2^{(s)} = \mu_2$  yields  $\mu_2 + (\mu_2 - 2\mu_2) = 0$  for the expression in square brackets contained in  $V_{11}$ . Hence we have equal masses not only at positive and negative spatial infinity but also for the two cases of even and odd topological charges, because in either scenario the potential matrix vanishes asymptotically.

For case A (odd topological charges), spatial reflections impose

$$\phi_1^{(s)}(-x) = 2(2n+1)\pi - \phi_1^{(s)}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2^{(s)}(-x) = \mu_2 - \phi_2^{(s)}(x). \quad (15)$$

With

$$(\mu_2 - 2\phi_2^{(s)}) \cos \frac{\phi_1^{(s)}}{2} \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow -x} (\mu_2 - 2\mu_2 + 2\phi_2^{(s)}) \cos \left[ \pi - \frac{\phi_1^{(s)}}{2} \right] = (-\mu_2 + 2\phi_2^{(s)}) (-1) \cos \frac{\phi_1^{(s)}}{2}$$

it is obvious that  $V_{11}(-x) = V_{11}(x)$ . Furthermore

$$\sin \frac{\phi_1^{(s)}}{2} \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow -x} \sin \left[ \pi - \frac{\phi_1^{(s)}}{2} \right] = \sin \frac{\phi_1^{(s)}}{2}$$

is also symmetric. Hence soliton configurations with odd topological charges induce a symmetric scattering problem. That is, for positive parity both  $\eta_1$  and  $\eta_2$  are symmetric functions of the coordinate, while for negative parity both fluctuations are anti-symmetric functions. For case B (even topological charges), spatial reflections impose

$$\phi_1^{(s)}(-x) = 4n\pi - \phi_1^{(s)}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2^{(s)}(-x) = \phi_2^{(s)}(x), \quad (16)$$

which straightforwardly shows that again  $V_{11}(-x) = V_{11}(x)$ . On the other hand

$$\sin \frac{\phi_1^{(s)}}{2} \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow -x} \sin \left[ 2n\pi - \frac{\phi_1^{(s)}}{2} \right] = -\sin \frac{\phi_1^{(s)}}{2}$$

leads to  $V_{12}(-x) = -V_{12}(x)$ , *i.e.* even topological charges come with a skew-symmetric scattering problem. Here  $\eta_1$  and  $\eta_2$  are respectively symmetric and anti-symmetric functions for positive parity, and vice versa for negative parity.

We apply an adaptive step size control when numerically integrating Eq. (13), both for the bound and scattering states. Since the soliton is only known at discrete values of the coordinate, this requires a numerically costly interpolation algorithm.

#### IV. BOUND STATES

Although we do not require the bound states explicitly for our calculation, they can be of use in analyzing properties of the classical background, particularly in distinguishing between isolated solitons and combined lumps. To construct the bound state wavefunctions it is again sufficient to only consider the half-line  $x \geq 0$ . The boundary conditions at  $x \rightarrow \infty$  are the same for all parities and topological charges. Bound states require  $\eta_i' = -\kappa_i \eta_i$ , where  $\kappa_i$  is the (imaginary) wavenumber associated with the bound state energy  $\omega_b = \sqrt{1 - \kappa_1^2} = \sqrt{\mu^2 - \kappa_2^2}$ . We only consider cases with  $\mu_1 < \mu_2$  and therefore the threshold mass is given by  $\mu = \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}$ . Since the fluctuation equations are linear and the potential matrix vanishes at spatial infinity, we may write the linearly independent solutions for sufficiently large  $x_{\max}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_1^{(1)}(x_{\max}) &= 1, & \eta_1^{(1)'}(x_{\max}) &= -\sqrt{1 - \omega_b^2} & \text{and} & & \eta_2^{(1)}(x_{\max}) &\equiv 0 \\ \eta_2^{(2)}(x_{\max}) &= 1, & \eta_1^{(2)'}(x_{\max}) &= -\sqrt{\mu^2 - \omega_b^2} & \text{and} & & \eta_1^{(2)}(x_{\max}) &\equiv 0. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

However, for the boundary conditions at  $x = 0$  we have to distinguish between a number of cases. For odd  $N$  the positive parity channel has

$$\eta_1^{(3)}(0) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_2^{(4)}(0) = 1, \quad (18)$$

while the negative parity channel has

$$\eta_1^{(3)'}(0) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_2^{(4)'}(0) = 1. \quad (19)$$

For even  $N$  we impose mixed conditions. They read

$$\eta_1^{(3)}(0) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_2^{(4)'}(0) = 1, \quad (20)$$

for the positive parity channel and

$$\eta_1^{(3)'}(0) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_2^{(4)}(0) = 1, \quad (21)$$

for the negative parity channel. Functions and derivatives that are not explicitly listed in Eqs. (18)-(21) are set to zero at  $x = 0$ . The above boundary conditions ensure that the wavefunctions are regular when integrating to a common matching point  $x_m \in [0, x_{\max}]$ . We then have to construct linear combinations such that the wavefunctions and their first derivatives are continuous at  $x_m$ . Such continuous combinations exist when the determinant of

$$D(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_1^{(1)} & \eta_1^{(2)} & \eta_1^{(3)} & \eta_1^{(4)} \\ \eta_2^{(1)} & \eta_2^{(2)} & \eta_2^{(3)} & \eta_2^{(4)} \\ \eta_1^{(1)'} & \eta_1^{(2)'} & \eta_1^{(3)'} & \eta_1^{(4)'} \\ \eta_2^{(1)'} & \eta_2^{(2)'} & \eta_2^{(3)'} & \eta_2^{(4)'} \end{pmatrix}_{x=x_m} \quad (22)$$

$\mu_2 = 12.0$		$\mu_2 = 10.0$		$\mu_2 = 8.0$		$\mu_2 = 3.5$	
$\omega$	$\omega/\mu$	$\omega$	$\omega/\mu$	$\omega$	$\omega/\mu$	$\omega$	$\omega/\mu$
0.102	0.613	0.100	0.501	0.095	0.378	0.030	0.053
0.129	0.773	0.148	0.739	0.171	0.684	0.058	0.101
-	-	0.190	0.950	0.182	0.728	0.080	0.140
-	-	0.194	0.972	0.204	0.816	0.094	0.165
-	-	-	-	0.235	0.938	0.101	0.177
0.052	0.315	0.051	0.255	0.048	0.192	0.015	0.027
0.149	0.894	0.147	0.737	0.139	0.557	0.045	0.079
0.151	0.904	0.166	0.832	0.185	0.740	0.070	0.122
-	-	-	-	0.220	0.880	0.088	0.154
-	-	-	-	0.224	0.895	0.098	0.172

TABLE II: Bound state energies for  $N = 11$  and  $\mu_1 = 2.0$ . The top and bottom brackets are positive and negative parity, respectively. The zero mode in the positive parity channel is not explicitly listed.

$\mu_2 = 12.0$		$\mu_2 = 10.0$		$\mu_2 = 8.0$		$\mu_2 = 3.5$	
$\omega$	$\omega/\mu$	$\omega$	$\omega/\mu$	$\omega$	$\omega/\mu$	$\omega$	$\omega/\mu$
0.094	0.565	0.092	0.461	0.087	0.348	0.028	0.049
0.147	0.880	0.163	0.817	0.168	0.672	0.054	0.094
-	-	0.179	0.893	0.183	0.730	0.075	0.131
-	-	-	-	0.218	0.873	0.090	0.158
-	-	-	-	0.232	0.926	0.099	0.173
0.048	0.289	0.047	0.234	0.044	0.176	0.014	0.024
0.128	0.768	0.136	0.680	0.128	0.514	0.041	0.072
0.138	0.830	0.147	0.735	0.170	0.682	0.065	0.114
-	-	0.186	0.930	0.200	0.799	0.084	0.146
-	-	-	-	0.205	0.820	0.095	0.167
-	-	-	-	0.232	0.930	0.101	0.177

TABLE III: Same as Tab. II for  $N = 12$ .

vanishes. We have made explicit the dependence on the single particle energy  $\omega$  that arises from solving Eq. (13) with the boundary condition, Eq. (17). We then scan this determinant for  $\omega \in [0, \mu]$  and identify the bound state energies from  $\det[D(\omega_j)] = 0$ . The numerical results are corroborated by varying  $x_m$  and  $x_{\max}$  in appropriate intervals.

The standard sine-Gordon soliton only has a single bound state, the translational zero mode. Hence for cases with wide solitons ( $\mu_2$  small) we expect  $N$  bound states (one of which is again the translational zero mode<sup>1</sup>) near zero energy. As  $\mu_2$  increases, these energy eigenvalues should increase as well. A bit surprisingly, the bound states do not necessarily alternate between positive and negative channels. However, the number of bound states in the latter never exceeds that in the former (including the zero mode in the counting).

In Tables II and III we present some representative data for the bound state energies. Indeed their absolute values increase as the soliton becomes more compact. However, the main effect is the decrease of the threshold energy  $\mu$  so that bound states disappear into the continuum. The structure of the bound state spectrum significantly changes with  $\mu_2$ . Eventually, when  $\mu_2$  is tuned such that large  $N$  soliton is merely a lump, only the zero mode in the positive parity channel will remain bound.

<sup>1</sup> Numerical error often causes that zero mode to be found at  $\omega_0 \approx 10^{-3}i$ .



## V. VACUUM POLARIZATION ENERGY

We now turn to our main objective: calculating the leading quantum corrections to these solitons' classical energies. This is the vacuum polarization energy (VPE), computed as the renormalized sum of the shift in the zero-point energies

$$E_{\text{VPE}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \left[ \omega_k - \omega_k^{(0)} \right] + E_{\text{CT}}. \quad (23)$$

The  $\omega_k$  are the energy eigenvalues in Eq. (13) and  $\omega_k^{(0)}$  are their counterparts for  $V \equiv 0$ . The counterterm contribution implements the renormalization. We follow the spectral methods approach [7] which is based on two important features. First, the continuum part of the sum in Eq. (23) is expressed as momentum integral weighted by the change in the density of states induced by the soliton. This weight is written in terms of the scattering data associated with Eq. (13). Second, these scattering data are expanded in powers of  $V$  and the leading terms of that expansion are subtracted under the momentum integral to render it finite. These subtractions are added back in the form of Feynman diagrams, which are combined with  $E_{\text{CT}}$  to yield finite expressions. This approach is particularly efficient when continuing the scattering problem for the momentum  $k$  as defined by the dispersion relation  $\omega = \sqrt{k^2 + \mu^2}$  to the imaginary axis  $k = it$  with real  $t \in [\mu, \infty]$ , in which case the bound states no longer enter explicitly. Ref. [8] gives a recent review of spectral methods while a number of obstacles for the real momentum formulation has been recently analyzed in Ref. [9].

Here we will refer to and follow Ref. [10] for the application of the spectral method to a two component theory with different masses. In the notation of that reference, odd topological charges give rise to a symmetric scattering problem while that for even charges is skew-symmetric. The central component of the calculation is the computation of the Jost matrix from the differential equation

$$Z''(t, x) = 2Z'(t, x)D(t) + [M^2, Z(t, x)] + V(x)Z(t, x) \quad \text{with} \quad D(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{t} & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

and  $\tilde{t} = \sqrt{t^2 - \mu^2 + 1}$ , which is the (analytically continued) momentum of the heavier field. The other matrices are defined in the context of Eq. (13). This differential equation arises from applying the linear differential operator from Eq. (13) to the matrix

$$\eta(x) = Z(t, x) \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\tilde{t}x} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-tx} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The columns of this matrix refer to the scattering channel and the rows to the two fields. Eq. (24) is solved subject to the boundary condition  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} Z(t, x) = \mathbb{1}$  and subsequently the Jost matrices

$$F_S(t) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} [Z(t, x) - Z'(t, x)D^{-1}(t)] \quad \text{and} \quad F_A(t) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} Z(t, x) \quad (25)$$

are extracted. For the symmetric scattering problem (case A) we next compute the Jost function

$$\nu_A(t) = \ln \det [F_S(t)F_A(t)] \quad (26)$$

and find the vacuum polarization energy for odd  $N$

$$E_{\text{VPE}}^{(N)} \equiv \int_{\mu}^{\infty} \frac{dt}{2\pi} \frac{t}{\sqrt{t^2 - \mu^2}} \left[ \nu_A(t) - \nu^{(1)}(t) \right] + E_{\text{FD}} + E_{\text{CT}} = \int_{\mu}^{\infty} \frac{dt}{2\pi} \frac{t}{\sqrt{t^2 - \mu^2}} \left[ \nu_A(t) - \nu^{(1)}(t) \right]. \quad (27)$$

$N$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
$\mu_2 = 4.0$	-0.303	-0.549	-0.805	-1.061	-1.317	-1.574	-1.830	-2.084	-2.343	-2.600	-2.857	-3.113
$\mu_2 = 6.1$	-0.297	-0.487	-0.713	-0.930	-1.152	-1.371	-1.594	-1.810	-2.036	-2.257	-2.478	-2.700
$\mu_2 = 8.0$	-0.295	-0.459	-0.684	-0.882	-1.095	-1.301	-1.511	-1.719	-1.927	-2.137	-2.347	-2.555

TABLE IV: The vacuum polarization energy as a function of the topological charge  $N$  and the scale  $\mu_2$ . The other parameter is always  $\mu_1 = 2.0$ . The cases  $\mu_2 = 4.0$  and  $\mu_2 = 6.1$  are also considered in Ref. [4] for  $N = 1$  and  $N = 2$  only.

We have rendered the (imaginary) momentum integral finite by subtracting the Born approximation (recall that  $V_{22}(x) = 0$  in this model)

$$\nu^{(1)}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t^2 - \mu^2 + 1}} \int_0^\infty dx V_{11}(x) \quad (28)$$

and adding it back as a Feynman diagram. In the no-tadpole scheme, that full diagram (not just its ultraviolet divergent part) is canceled by the counterterm. For case B with skew parity, we replace the Jost matrices above by [10]

$$F_\pm(t) = [P_\pm F_S(t) D_\mp(t) + P_\mp F_A(t) D_\pm^{-1}(t)] , \quad (29)$$

with projectors  $P_+ = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $P_- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and factor matrices  $D_+(t) = \begin{pmatrix} -\tilde{t} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $D_-(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -t \end{pmatrix}$ . From these expressions we finally compute the appropriate Jost function for imaginary momenta

$$\nu_B(t) \equiv \ln \det [F_+(t) F_-(t)] , \quad (30)$$

which then replaces  $\nu_A(t)$  in Eq. (27) for even  $N$ . The first-order Born approximation is not modified since it does not involve off-diagonal elements of the potential matrix.

In Table IV we present numerical results for the VPE, choosing parameters to include some of those considered in Ref. [4]. The arxiv version of that reference gives VPEs for  $N = 1$  and  $N = 2$  and two values of  $\mu_2$ :  $-0.302$  ( $\mu_2 = 4.0$ ) and  $-0.297$  ( $\mu_2 = 6.1$ ) for  $N = 1$ . For the other case,  $N = 2$  those authors list  $-0.547$  and  $-0.486$ . Certainly, within potential numerical errors these results are consistent with the corresponding data in Table IV. This result provides a check of the skew parity procedure, since taking  $\nu_A(t)$  for case B incorrectly yields  $-0.522$  and  $-0.452$ . The approach of Ref. [4] is based on an expression from Ref. [11], which starts from Hermitian operators  $H^2$  and  $H_0^2$  with eigenvalues  $\omega_k^2$  and  $\omega_k^{(0)2}$ , respectively. These operators are related as  $H^2 = H_0^2 + V$  so that the VPE with the no-tadpole condition is<sup>2</sup>

$$E_{CCG} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \left( \omega_k - \omega_k^{(0)} \right) \Big|_{\text{no tadp.}} = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[ H - H_0 - \frac{V}{2H_0} \right] = -\text{tr} \left[ \frac{(H - H_0)^2}{4H_0} \right]. \quad (31)$$

The evaluation of the trace requires the Fourier transforms of all eigenmodes of the scattering problem, Eq. (13) and a subsequent sum/integral over all modes. It is thus susceptible to numerical inaccuracies which may grow as the soliton gets wider, making it more difficult to carry out the calculation for higher charges. Considering only  $N = 1$  and  $N = 2$  does not allow for a general statement on the charge dependence of the quantum corrections.

<sup>2</sup> The same expression for the VPE was obtained in Ref. [12] using a different and quite intricate formalism. In Refs. [4, 11, 12] the no-tadpole scheme is referred to as normal-ordering.




FIG. 7: Vacuum polarization energies for various model parameters. The dashed lines refer to the case of  $N$  isolated single sine-Gordon solitons.

Figure 7 shows the resulting vacuum polarization energies as functions of the winding number  $N$ , Eq. (4). Like the classical energies, these are essentially straight lines, with small deviations for low  $N$  and large  $\mu_2$ , *i.e.* when the solitons sit on top of each other. This time, however, the straight lines have a negative slope. More importantly, we do not see any correlation between the bound state spectrum and this linear dependence. Regardless of whether the model parameters yield many strongly bound modes or only a few loosely bound ones, the functional dependence of  $E_{\text{VPE}}^{(N)}$  is very similar. We consider this result to be a consequence of Levinson's theorem [13], which may have the interpretation that a state passing the threshold has compensating effects on the bound state and continuum contributions to the VPE. For comparison, we may consider the bound state contribution  $E_{\text{b.s.}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_j^{\text{b.s.}} (\omega_j - \mu)$  to the VPE, which is explicitly included only for the real momentum formulation. Taking, for example,  $N = 12$  and  $\mu_1 = 2.0$ , this quantity changes drastically from  $-3.055$  to  $-0.223$  when going from  $\mu_2 = 3.5$  to  $\mu_2 = 12.0$ . On the other hand the total VPE only changes from  $-3.305$  to  $-2.437$ . In one case the bound states give a reasonable approximation to the VPE, but in the other their contribution is off by an order of magnitude. Even though  $E_{\text{b.s.}}$  is not exactly the bound state contribution in the trace of Eq. (31), this short analysis corroborates that the bound state spectrum alone is not necessarily a reliable approximation to the VPE.

## VI. DISCUSSION

As can be seen from Eq. (1), the Lagrange density scales with  $\frac{m^2}{v^2}$ . Hence the classical energy scales like  $\frac{m}{v^2}$ . On the other hand, the energy eigenvalues scale with  $m$  and so does the VPE. To one loop, the total energy in a given topological sector is therefore proportional to

$$E_{\text{tot}}^{(N)} = E_{\text{cl}}^{(N)} + v^2 E_{\text{VPE}}^{(N)}. \quad (32)$$

For the one-loop approximation to be reliable, the magnitude of the first term should be substantially larger than that of the second. The numerical results from the previous sections suggest that this inequality is still reasonably well fulfilled for values as large as  $v^2 = \mathcal{O}(10)$ . However, when we consider the (negative) binding energy

$$E_{\text{bind}}^{(N)} = E_{\text{tot}}^{(N)} - N E_{\text{tot}}^{(1)} = \left[ E_{\text{cl}}^{(N)} - N E_{\text{cl}}^{(1)} \right] + v^2 \left[ E_{\text{VPE}}^{(N)} - N E_{\text{VPE}}^{(1)} \right]. \quad (33)$$

the classical and one-loop contributions may be of similar magnitude.<sup>3</sup> It is therefore meaningful to study  $E_{\text{bind}}^{(N)}$  as a function of the loop-counting parameter  $v^2$ .

<sup>3</sup> In BPS models, the first term typically vanishes.




FIG. 8: The one-loop binding energies, Eq. (33) parameterized by the loop-counting parameter  $v^2$  for  $\mu_1 = 2.0$  while  $\mu_2 = 4.0$  (left panel) and  $\mu_2 = 8.0$  (right panel). Note the different scale for the  $y$ -axis in the two cases.

In the previous sections we have seen that both  $E_{\text{cl}}^{(N)}$  and  $E_{\text{VPE}}^{(N)}$  are essentially linear functions of  $N$ . This implies that when  $E_{\text{bind}}^{(2)} < 0$  we also have that  $E_{\text{bind}}^{(N)} < 0$  for  $N > 2$  except for very specific values of  $v^2$  that are sensitive to the small deviation from linearity.

Fig. 8 shows the total (negative) binding energies. The VPE decreases the binding and eventually with a sufficiently large  $v^2$  the multi-soliton configurations become unbound. For  $\mu_2 = 4.0$  the limiting value is about  $v_c^2 = 2.7$ , while for  $\mu_2 = 8.0$  it is substantially larger at  $v_c^2 = 19$  ( $\mu_1 = 2.0$ ) in both cases. As in the classical case, the more compact (larger  $\mu_2$ ) the soliton, the stronger the binding. Indeed, these numerical experiments suggest that large single mode binding energies are correlated with small soliton binding energies, because for larger  $\mu_2$  and fixed  $v^2$  the classical energy becomes more dominant.

Due to the small offset in the linear behavior of the energies, for loop counting parameters in the close vicinity of  $v_c^2$  it may occur that solitons with moderate topological charges are unstable while those with a larger one are stable, but those binding energies are tiny.

Finally we compare this toy model with chiral soliton models [14], such as the Skyrme model [15], which treat baryons as solitons in an effective meson theory. Taking model parameters that are extracted from the meson properties, the lowest soliton mass exceeds the nucleon mass by about 30% or more [16]. It has been suggested that quantum corrections resolve that disagreement [17]. However, these models are not renormalizable (they even have quartic divergences) and so quantum corrections are ambiguous because assumptions about the un-matched counterterms are needed.<sup>4</sup> Yet we can adopt that viewpoint in our model and adjust  $v^2$  to give a 20% reduction to the ground state energy, *i.e.*  $E_{\text{tot}}^{(1)} \approx 0.8E_{\text{cl}}^{(1)}$ , which would still be considered valid in the one-loop approximation. Taking again  $\mu_1 = 2.0$ , the resulting values are  $v^2 \approx 6.1$  for  $\mu_2 = 4.0$  and  $v^2 \approx 7.6$  for  $\mu_2 = 8.0$ . Not surprisingly, the higher charge solitons become unbound in the former case but remain bound in the latter. Even though this consideration does not lead to a decisive conclusion, it shows that quantum corrections should be relevant for multi-baryon solitons [19] in the Skyrme model. On the other hand, our results do not support the argument put forward in Ref. [20] that quantum corrections could energetically favor  $N$  isolated unit charge solitons over a single soliton of charge  $N$  when the latter has fewer than  $N$  times as many zero modes (or strongly bound single particle modes) as the unit charge soliton.<sup>5</sup> Our model finds such a bound state scenario for large  $\mu_2$  when the compact soliton is not destabilized by quantum corrections due to the effects of the continuum.

<sup>4</sup> In Ref. [18] the winding number dependence of the VPE has been considered in the  $D = 2 + 1$ ,  $O(3)$  version of the Skyrme model. Though the ultraviolet divergence is only cubic, it is still not renormalizable.

<sup>5</sup> That conclusion emerged when truncating the trace in Eq. (31) to its bound state component. However, in  $D = 3 + 1$  the full trace is ultraviolet divergent [21].

## VII. CONCLUSION

We have considered an extension of the sine-Gordon model in  $1 + 1$  dimensions that has static soliton solutions with higher topological charges. Depending on the model parameters, these solitons emerge either as almost separated unit-charge configurations or as compact lumps with localized soliton profiles.

Our main objective has been to analyze the leading quantum corrections to the classical energies as a function of the topological charge. We have computed these corrections as the vacuum polarization energy (VPE), *i.e.* the renormalized sum of the energy shifts of the modes fluctuating about the soliton. This sum is ultraviolet divergent but in  $D = 1 + 1$  there is only a single divergent one-loop Feynman diagram. Within the no-tadpole renormalization scheme, that diagram is fully canceled by the counterterm. We have then applied spectral methods to compute the finite, non-perturbative VPE. These methods make use of scattering data for fluctuations about the soliton, in particular the Jost function analytically continued to imaginary momenta. This formalism is extremely efficient and numerically not more laborious than constructing the soliton itself.

A main result of our numerical studies is that both the classical energy and its leading quantum correction are essentially linear functions of the topological charge with a small offset. There are only minor deviations from linearity at small charges, even when the soliton appears as a single lump whose scattering properties are very different from those for a superposition of individual solitons. We have explicitly computed these energies for topological charges less than or equal to twelve. Since linearity is essentially exact for charges greater than or equal to six, we conjecture that the straight line can safely be extended beyond twelve.

For the binding energies we find that the VPE may destabilize classically stable solitons when the single soliton structure is favored. To destabilize compact solitons, the loop counting parameter must typically be taken so large that higher loop corrections cannot be omitted. However, for compact solitons the quantum corrections considerably reduce the binding energies even for small or moderate values of the loop counting parameter. We stress that it is the (small) offset that is relevant for binding, since a purely linear dependence of the energy on the winding number yields zero binding.

We have also explored the bound state spectrum of this scattering problem. Generally soliton lumps have fewer bound states than isolated solitons with the same total topological charge. Though the bound states energies vary with the structure of the soliton, the main cause is the decrease of the threshold as the soliton becomes more compact. The numerical results suggest that this spectrum on its own provides little information about the VPE, because it must be considered together with the continuum contribution.

## Acknowledgments

H. W. thanks F. G. Scholtz for clarifying comments on Ref. [20]. N. G. is supported in part by the National Science Foundation (NSF) through grant PHY-2205708. H. W. is supported in part by the National Research Foundation of South Africa (NRF) by grant 150672.

- 
- [1] E. B. Bogomolny, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **24**, 449 (1976).
  - [2] M. K. Prasad and C. M. Sommerfield, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **35**, 760 (1975).
  - [3] N. Graham and H. Weigel, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 076013 (2022).
  - [4] C. Halcrow, R. R. John, and A. N, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 065010 (2024), 2311.17805.
  - [5] C. Halcrow and E. Babaev, *SIGMA* **19**, 034 (2023).
  - [6] G. H. Derrick, *J. Math. Phys.* **5**, 1252 (1964).

- [7] N. Graham, M. Quandt, and H. Weigel, *Spectral Methods in Quantum Field Theory*, vol. 777, Lecture Notes Phys. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009).
- [8] N. Graham and H. Weigel, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **37**, 2241004 (2022).
- [9] D. A. Petersen and H. Weigel, *Symmetry* **17**, 13 (2024).
- [10] H. Weigel, M. Quandt, and N. Graham, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 036017 (2018).
- [11] K. E. Cahill, A. Comtet, and R. J. Glauber, *Phys. Lett. B* **64**, 283 (1976).
- [12] J. Evslin, *JHEP* **11**, 161 (2019).
- [13] G. Barton, *J. Phys. A* **18**, 479 (1985).
- [14] H. Weigel, *Chiral Soliton Models for Baryons*, vol. 743, Lecture Notes Phys. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008).
- [15] T. H. R. Skyrme, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **260**, 127 (1961).
- [16] S. Adkins, C. R. Nappi, and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys. B* **228**, 552 (1983).
- [17] F. Meier and H. Walliser, *Phys. Rept.* **289**, 383 (1997).
- [18] H. Walliser and G. Holzwarth, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 2819 (2000).
- [19] D. T. J. Feist, P. H. C. Lau, and N. S. Manton, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 085034 (2013).
- [20] F. G. Scholtz, B. Schwesinger, and H. B. Geyer, *Nucl. Phys. A* **561**, 542 (1993).
- [21] G. Holzwarth, *Nucl. Phys. A* **572**, 69 (1994).