

The Color-Flavor Transformation and a New Approach to Quantum Chaotic Maps

M R Zirnbauer*

Abstract

The color-flavor transformation is a mathematical result that has applications to problems as diverse as lattice gauge theory, random network models, and dynamical systems. Several variants are described, and an outline of the proof is given. It is then shown how to use the transformation to set up a field theoretic formalism for quantum chaotic maps.

1 Introduction

Building on the supersymmetric field theory of disordered conductors and the lessons learned from it, Andreev et al. [1] have recently proposed a fresh and, I think, exciting approach to quantum Hamiltonian systems the classical dynamics of which is chaotic (see the contribution of B.D. Simons to these proceedings). To introduce the subject of my talk, I wish to hint at another intriguing analogy, which links quantum chaotic and disordered systems with the low energy chiral sector of quantum chromodynamics (QCD).

Let me start by recalling that the low energy degrees of freedom of QCD are particle-hole excitations, namely quark-antiquark states that are called mesons (or pions). The effective field theory governing the mesons and the interactions between them is known to be a nonlinear σ model. Similarly, the long wave length degrees of freedom of a disordered conductor are particle-hole like excitations, namely diffusion modes, whose interactions are described again by a field theory of the nonlinear σ model type. This analogy at the superficial or phenomenological level has a firm basis in the modeling of the systems. Indeed, in the strong coupling limit of lattice QCD the nonabelian gauge field seen by the quarks is represented by matrices placed on the links of the lattice and drawn at random from the gauge group $SU(N)$. Similarly, in models of two-dimensional electrons in a strong magnetic field, random unitary matrices modeling the disorder potential are assigned to the links of a directed network.

A mathematical physicist will then ask how the reduction from random unitary matrices on links to a nonlinear σ model is achieved. The first point of this talk is to report the recent discovery of a reduction scheme which is *nonperturbative* and circumvents the traditional use of diagrammatic techniques to resum the leading terms in a perturbation expansion. The new approach is based on an identity that transforms a certain class of integrals over the gauge group $U(N)$ into integrals over the corresponding mesonic or “flavor” degrees of freedom. Taking the terminology from QCD, I call this identity the *color-flavor transformation*.

Because of the associated gain in efficiency, the color-flavor transformation most naturally applies to cases such as QCD in the large- N limit, where the number of colors is big and the number of flavors small. However, the transformation promises nontrivial applications also in other cases. It offers, in particular, the possibility of constructing a supersymmetric field theory of quantized symplectic maps. More precisely, it allows to express $U(1)$ phase averaged products of the Green’s functions of such a map as integrals over nonlinear σ model fields. The latter presentation appears particularly well suited for extracting the universal behavior that is expected on the basis of the Bohigas-Giannoni-Schmit conjecture [2], stating that the spectral statistics of quantum chaotic systems in the universal limit is Wigner-Dyson.

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität zu Köln, Germany. email: zirn@thp.Uni-Koeln.de.

2 Color-Flavor Transformation

I'll start with a simple equation that motivates and illustrates the general form of the transformation. If ψ_0, ψ_1 are complex fermionic sources, the following statement is immediate:

$$\int_0^{2\pi} da \exp\left(\bar{\psi}_1 e^{ia} \psi_0 + \bar{\psi}_0 e^{-ia} \psi_1\right) = 2\pi (1 + \bar{\psi}_1 \psi_0 \bar{\psi}_0 \psi_1) = \pi \int_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{dz d\bar{z}}{(1 + \bar{z}z)^3} \exp\left(z \bar{\psi}_1 \psi_1 - \bar{z} \bar{\psi}_0 \psi_0\right) .$$

The first equality sign does the integral over a (the ‘‘random gauge field’’), and the second organizes the quartic term into bilinears ($\bar{\psi}_1 \psi_0 \bar{\psi}_0 \psi_1 = -\bar{\psi}_1 \psi_1 \times \bar{\psi}_0 \psi_0$), which are sent back to the exponent by integrating over the complex numbers.

Why isn't ψ_0 paired with ψ_1 , and $\bar{\psi}_0$ with $\bar{\psi}_1$? The answer is that in the form given, the scheme permits the following remarkable generalization:

$$\int_{U(N)} dU \exp\left(\bar{\psi}_{1\mu}^i U^{ij} \psi_{0\mu}^j + \bar{\psi}_{0\nu}^j \bar{U}^{ij} \psi_{1\nu}^i\right) = \int_{\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}} d\mu_N(Z, \bar{Z}) \exp\left(\bar{\psi}_{1\mu}^i Z_{\mu\nu} \psi_{1\nu}^i - \bar{\psi}_{0\nu}^j \bar{Z}_{\mu\nu} \psi_{0\mu}^j\right) ,$$

which deals with the case of n ‘‘flavors’’ ($\mu, \nu = 1, \dots, n$), and N ‘‘colors’’ ($i, j = 1, \dots, N$) transforming according to the vector representation of the gauge group $U(N)$. The integration measure dU on the left-hand side is the Haar measure of $U(N)$. Summation over repeated indices is always assumed. The integral on the right-hand side is over all complex $n \times n$ matrices Z , with adjoint $Z^\dagger{}_{\nu\mu} = \bar{Z}_{\mu\nu}$, and

$$d\mu_N(Z, \bar{Z}) = \text{const} \times \text{Det}(1 + Z^\dagger Z)^{-2n-N} \prod_{\mu, \nu=1}^n dZ_{\mu\nu} d\bar{Z}_{\mu\nu} .$$

The geometric content behind this expression is that the matrix Z parameterizes the compact symmetric space $M = U(2n)/U(n) \times U(n)$, and the $U(2n)$ -invariant volume form on M pulls back to the integration measure $d\mu_0(Z, \bar{Z})$.

Note that the above formula is justifiably called the *color-flavor transformation*. On the left-hand side the flavor degrees of freedom are uncoupled, and color interacts through the gauge group element $U \in U(N)$. On the right-hand side, the roles have been reversed: now it is the color degrees of freedom that enter multiplicatively, while flavor interacts by the ‘‘mesonic field’’ Z .

The integral on the left-hand side is of the type encountered in lattice gauge theory with dynamical fermions. I claim that by using the color-flavor transformation one can in fact verify that large- N quantum chromodynamics in the strong coupling limit is equivalent to a weakly coupled theory of mesons [3]. Whether the scheme can be adapted to deal with the weak coupling (or asymptotically free) limit of QCD is under investigation.

The above formula is just one out of a large number of variants:

1. A similar formula holds for *bosonic* sources ϕ instead of the fermionic ψ . To get the bosonic version, one simply makes the formal replacements $N \rightarrow -N$ and $\bar{Z} \rightarrow -\bar{Z}$, and restricts the domain of integration by requiring $1 - Z^\dagger Z > 0$. [These steps imply that M is replaced by its noncompact analog $U(n, n)/U(n) \times U(n)$.] Convergence of all integrals now requires $N \geq 2n$.
2. In Ref. [4] a supersymmetric version with n bosonic (B) and n fermionic (F) flavors was proved. More generally, the color-flavor transformation exists also for $n_B \neq n_F$ bosonic and fermionic flavors, as long as $N \geq 2(n_B - n_F)$.
3. The gauge group $U(N)$ can be replaced by any one of the compact Lie groups $O(N)$ or $Sp(N)$. For $Sp(N)$ a supersymmetric version of the transformation formula was given in Ref. [4], and the case $SO(N)$ will be discussed below.
4. One can also pass from groups to symmetric spaces, that is to say a color-flavor transformation exists for all random matrix models based on one of the large families of Riemannian symmetric spaces of the compact type. As an example, consider the set of symmetric unitary matrices S , which is isomorphic to $U(N)/O(N)$. The trick that works in this case is to use the canonical projection $U(N) \rightarrow U(N)/O(N)$ by $U \mapsto UU^T =: S$, in conjunction with the Gaussian integral

$$\exp\left(\bar{\psi}^i S^{ij} \psi^j\right) = \int \exp\left(-\bar{\Psi}^k \Psi^k + \bar{\psi}^i U^{ik} \Psi^k + \bar{\Psi}^k U^{jk} \psi^j\right) .$$

Since the invariant measures match under projection, this relates the integral over S to an integral over $U \in U(N)$, with the number of flavors doubled.

3 Outline of Proof

I'll sketch the general strategy at the example of bosonic sources ϕ_μ^i in the fundamental representation of the gauge group $\text{SO}(N)$. In this case, the claim is

$$\int_{\text{SO}(N)} dO \exp\left(\bar{\phi}_\mu^i O^{ij} \phi_\mu^j\right) = \int_D d\mu_N(Z, \bar{Z}) \exp\left(\bar{\phi}_\mu^i Z_{\mu\nu} \bar{\phi}_\nu^i + \text{c.c.}\right).$$

The mesonic integral here runs over the set D of all complex *symmetric* $n \times n$ matrices Z with $1 - \bar{Z}Z > 0$, and the integration measure is

$$d\mu_N(Z, \bar{Z}) = \text{const} \times \text{Det}(1 - \bar{Z}Z)^{N-n-1} \prod_{\mu \leq \nu} dZ_{\mu\nu} d\bar{Z}_{\mu\nu}.$$

The domain D is diffeomorphic to the noncompact symmetric space $\text{Sp}(n, \mathbb{R})/\text{U}(n)$.

For the purpose of proving the present version of the color-flavor transformation, it is convenient to quantize the classical sources: $\phi_\mu^i \rightarrow b_\mu^i, \bar{\phi}_\mu^i \rightarrow \bar{b}_\mu^i$, where b, \bar{b} are operators that satisfy the canonical boson commutation relations $[b_\mu^i, \bar{b}_\nu^j] = \delta^{ij} \delta_{\mu\nu}$ and act in a Fock space with vacuum $b_\mu^i |0\rangle = 0$. The set of all single-boson operators $bb, \bar{b}\bar{b}$, and $\bar{b}b + b\bar{b}$ (indices omitted), define a representation of the symplectic Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sp}(nN, \mathbb{C})$ on Fock space. Two prominent subalgebras are $\mathfrak{sp}(n, \mathbb{C})$ generated by the color singlet operators $b_\mu^i b_\nu^i, \bar{b}_\mu^i \bar{b}_\nu^i$ and $\bar{b}_\mu^i b_\nu^i + b_\mu^i \bar{b}_\nu^i$, and $\mathfrak{so}(N, \mathbb{C})$ generated by the flavor singlet operators $\bar{b}_\mu^i b_\mu^j - \bar{b}_\mu^j b_\mu^i$. The latter subalgebra is the maximal subalgebra in $\mathfrak{sp}(nN, \mathbb{C})$ that commutes with the former, and vice versa.

Now we consider two types of coherent state:

$$|\phi\rangle = \exp\left(\phi_\mu^i \bar{b}_\mu^i\right) |0\rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad |Z\rangle = \exp\left(\bar{b}_\mu^i Z_{\mu\nu} \bar{b}_\nu^i\right) |0\rangle.$$

Their overlap is

$$\langle\phi|Z\rangle = \exp\left(\bar{\phi}_\mu^i Z_{\mu\nu} \bar{\phi}_\nu^i\right).$$

By using standard results from Lie group theory, one shows that the operator P defined by

$$P = \int_D d\mu_N(Z, \bar{Z}) |Z\rangle\langle Z|$$

projects Fock space onto the unique subspace that contains the vacuum and carries an irreducible unitary group action $O \mapsto T_O := \exp\left(\bar{b}_\mu^i (\ln O)^{ij} b_\mu^j\right)$ of $\text{SO}(N)$. An alternative implementation of P is by the Haar integral

$$P = \int_{\text{SO}(N)} dO T_O.$$

With these tools in hand, the color-flavor transformation is simply proved by the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D d\mu_N(Z, \bar{Z}) \exp\left(\bar{\phi}_\mu^i Z_{\mu\nu} \bar{\phi}_\nu^i + \text{c.c.}\right) &= \int_D d\mu_N(Z, \bar{Z}) \langle\phi|Z\rangle\langle Z|\phi\rangle \\ = \langle\phi|P|\phi\rangle &= \int_{\text{SO}(N)} dO \langle\phi|T_O|\phi\rangle = \int_{\text{SO}(N)} dO \exp\left(\bar{\phi}_\mu^i O^{ij} \phi_\mu^j\right). \end{aligned}$$

4 Application to Quantum Maps

On a symplectic manifold (M, ω) of dimension $2d$ consider a symplectic map $\chi : M \rightarrow M$. Quantization will turn χ into a unitary operator U on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_N of finite dimension $N = (2\pi\hbar)^{-d} \int_M \omega^{\wedge d}$. It is then interesting to ask what one can say about the correlations between the eigenvalues $e^{i\theta_\mu}$ ($\mu \in \{1, \dots, N\}$) of the quantum ‘‘map’’ U when the classical map χ is chaotic.

An informative statistic is the *pair correlation function* C . Its value on a testfunction $f : \text{U}(1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined to be

$$C[f] = \frac{2\pi}{N^2} \sum_{\mu, \nu=1}^N f(e^{i(\theta_\mu - \theta_\nu)}) - \int_0^{2\pi} f(e^{i\theta}) d\theta.$$

Given the Fourier expansion $f(e^{i\theta}) = (2\pi)^{-1} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{f}_l e^{il\theta}$, the pair correlation function can be written in the equivalent form

$$C[f] = \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Re} \tilde{f}_l \left| \operatorname{Tr} U^l \right|^2.$$

In the physics literature one usually considers a related object, the so-called two-level correlation function R_2 , which is obtained by evaluating C on the δ -distribution $\delta_r = (2\pi)^{-1} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{il(\theta-r)}$ centered at $r = 2\pi s/N$:

$$R_2(s) = C[\delta_{2\pi s/N}] = \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \cos(2\pi sl/N) \left| \operatorname{Tr} U^l \right|^2.$$

For chaotic systems, very little is known about $R_2(s)$ (and other correlation functions) from a rigorous standpoint. There exists, however, a conjecture by Bohigas, Giannoni and Schmit [2], stating that the correlation functions for $N \rightarrow \infty$ tend to a universal limit given by random-matrix theory. In particular, the two-level correlation function of chaotic systems with broken time-reversal symmetry is predicted to be

$$R_2(s) = \delta(s) - \frac{\sin^2 \pi s}{\pi^2 s^2}.$$

It is a challenging and longstanding problem in mathematical physics to specify the precise conditions on the quantum map U under which this conjecture holds true.

How does the color-flavor transformation come in here? To that end, consider the generating function

$$\Omega_U(\alpha_+, \beta_+; \alpha_-, \beta_-) = \frac{\operatorname{Det}(1 - \beta_+ U) \operatorname{Det}(1 - \beta_- U^\dagger)}{\operatorname{Det}(1 - \alpha_+ U) \operatorname{Det}(1 - \alpha_- U^\dagger)},$$

where α_\pm, β_\pm are complex numbers, and take an average over the unit circle S^1 in \mathbb{C} :

$$\hat{\Omega}_U(\dots) = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\varphi}{2\pi} \Omega_{\exp(i\varphi)U}(\dots).$$

This average over the spectral domain $S^1 \simeq U(1)$ of the unitary operator U corresponds to the energy averaging employed in the work of Andreev et al. [1] on Hamiltonian systems. It is an easy computation to show that the two-level correlation function can be extracted from $\hat{\Omega}_U$ by

$$R_2(s) = \frac{1}{2N^2} \operatorname{Re} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta \partial \theta'} \hat{\Omega}_U(e^{i\theta+2\pi is/N}, e^{-i\theta+2\pi is/N}; e^{-i\theta'}, e^{i\theta'}) \Big|_{\theta=\theta'=0}.$$

The starting point for setting up a field theoretic formalism for quantum maps is the following formula:

$$\Omega_U(\gamma_+; \gamma_-) = \int \exp \left(-\bar{\Psi}_+(1 - \gamma_+ \otimes U)\Psi_+ - \bar{\Psi}_-(1 - \gamma_- \otimes U^\dagger)\Psi_- \right),$$

which expresses Ω_U as a Gaussian integral over “supervectors” Ψ_\pm . Here $\gamma_\pm = \operatorname{diag}(\alpha_\pm, \beta_\pm)$ acts in a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded space $\mathbb{C}^{1|1}$, and Ψ_\pm are elements of what Berezin calls the Grassmann envelope of $\mathbb{C}^{1|1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$.

In the next step we do the phase average $\Omega_U \rightarrow \hat{\Omega}_U$, by applying the color-flavor transformation with $n = 1$ “colors” and $N = \dim \mathcal{H}_N$ “flavors”. (Note that we have switched notation $N \leftrightarrow n$ to emphasize the inequality $N \gg n$ in the present application of the transformation formula.) Then, on carrying out the Gaussian superintegral over $\Psi, \bar{\Psi}$ we get

$$\hat{\Omega}_U(\gamma_+; \gamma_-) = \int_{D_N} D\mu_N(Z, \tilde{Z}) \operatorname{SDet}(1 - \tilde{Z}Z) \operatorname{SDet} \left(1 - \tilde{Z}(\gamma_+ \otimes U)Z(\gamma_- \otimes U^\dagger) \right)^{-1}, \quad (1)$$

where SDet is the superdeterminant. The integration variables Z, \tilde{Z} are complex supermatrices,

$$Z = \begin{pmatrix} Z^{\text{BB}} & Z^{\text{BF}} \\ Z^{\text{FB}} & Z^{\text{FF}} \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{\mu, \nu=1}^N \sum_{\sigma, \tau=\text{B,F}} Z_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma\tau} E_{\sigma\tau} \otimes E_{\mu\nu},$$

and similar for \tilde{Z} , with the domain of integration D_N defined by $\tilde{Z}^{\text{FF}} = -Z^{\text{FF}\dagger}$, $\tilde{Z}^{\text{BB}} = Z^{\text{BB}\dagger}$, and $1 - Z^{\text{BB}\dagger}Z^{\text{BB}} > 0$. To describe the integration measure, let $G_N = \operatorname{GL}(2N|2N)$ and $H_N =$

$\text{GL}(N|N) \times \text{GL}(N|N)$, and define ϕ_N to be the map that takes Z, \tilde{Z} into the super coset space G_N/H_N by

$$\phi_N(Z, \tilde{Z}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & Z \\ \tilde{Z} & 1 \end{pmatrix} H_N .$$

Then $D\mu_N(Z, \tilde{Z})$ arises by pulling back via ϕ_N the G_N -invariant Berezin measure on G_N/H_N . It turns out that this Berezin measure is locally flat:

$$D\mu_N(Z, \tilde{Z}) = \prod_{\mu, \nu=1}^N dZ_{\mu\nu}^{\text{BB}} \wedge d\tilde{Z}_{\mu\nu}^{\text{BB}} \wedge dZ_{\mu\nu}^{\text{FF}} \wedge d\tilde{Z}_{\mu\nu}^{\text{FF}} \frac{\partial^4}{\partial Z_{\mu\nu}^{\text{BF}} \partial \tilde{Z}_{\mu\nu}^{\text{BF}} \partial Z_{\mu\nu}^{\text{FB}} \partial \tilde{Z}_{\mu\nu}^{\text{FB}}} + \dots .$$

(The dots indicate global anomalies.) By differentiating the supersymmetric integral for $\hat{\Omega}_U$ we obtain a formula for the two-level correlation function:

$$\begin{aligned} R_2(Nx/2\pi) &= \frac{\text{Re}}{2N^2} \int_{D_N} D\mu_N(Z, \tilde{Z}) \text{SDet}(1 - \tilde{Z}Z) \text{SDet}^{-1}(1 - e^{ix} \tilde{Z}Z_U) \\ &\quad \times \left(\text{Tr} Z_U \tilde{Z} (e^{-ix} - Z_U \tilde{Z})^{-1} \times \text{Tr} \tilde{Z} Z_U (e^{-ix} - \tilde{Z} Z_U)^{-1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + e^{ix} \text{Tr} Z_U \tilde{Z} (1 - e^{ix} Z_U \tilde{Z})^{-1} \Sigma_3 \tilde{Z} Z_U (1 - e^{ix} \tilde{Z} Z_U)^{-1} \right) , \end{aligned}$$

where $Z_U = (1 \otimes U)Z(1 \otimes U^\dagger)$ and $\Sigma_3 = \text{diag}(+1, -1) \otimes 1_N$.

While the steps done so far are exact and in fact rigorous, the formula for $R_2(s)$ looks preposterous at first sight. We have taken a simple looking expression and transformed it into a horribly complicated integral over a large supermatrix Z . What's the purpose? The answer is that our formula promises to be a good starting point for further analysis, at least for *chaotic* maps, by the following reasoning.

5 Zero Mode Approximation (heuristic)

The goal is to make a statement about $\hat{\Omega}_U$ or R_2 in the semiclassical limit. Drawing the inspiration from recent work of Andreev et al. [1], one might hope that for $\hbar \sim N^{-1/d} \rightarrow 0$, the integral (1) approaches a field integral that will lend itself to evaluation by the methods of quantum field theory. However, as it stands, there is not much ground for optimism. Because there exists nothing that inhibits short wave length fluctuations of the candidate field, the integral (1) is certain *not* to converge to any well-defined field theory. [Indeed, one can show that the integrand has $\sum_{n=0}^N \binom{N}{n}^2$ critical points, all of which contribute with comparable weight to $R_2(s)$ for small s . In the semiclassical limit these critical points correspond to point-like instantons placed on the periodic orbits of the map χ , and the would-be field theory looks like a dense gas of topological excitations.]

To make sense of the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, one has no choice but to introduce a *regulator*. The natural procedure is to inject a probabilistic component and do an ensemble average. Thus, we will abandon the ambition to treat an individual quantum map U and, instead, will average over a family of operators close to U , say

$$U_\xi = e^{i\xi^k X_k / \hbar} U ,$$

where X_1, \dots, X_r are Hermitian $N \times N$ matrices that arise from quantizing a set of Hamiltonian vector fields Ξ_1, \dots, Ξ_r , and the parameters ξ^1, \dots, ξ^r are identically distributed independent Gaussian random variables with zero mean and variance ϵ .

Substituting U_ξ for U in the expression for $\hat{\Omega}$ and taking the expected value, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E \left(\hat{\Omega}_{U_\xi}(\gamma_+; \gamma_-) \right) &= \int D\mu_N(Z, \tilde{Z}) \exp(-S) , \\ S &= -\ln E \left(\text{SDet}(1 - \tilde{Z}Z) \text{SDet}(1 - \tilde{Z}(\gamma_+ \otimes U_\xi)Z(\gamma_- \otimes U_\xi^\dagger))^{-1} \right) . \end{aligned}$$

The function S has a critical point at $Z = \tilde{Z} = 0$. For $\gamma_+ = \gamma_- = 1_2$ this point extends to a supermanifold G_1/H_1 of saddle points generated from $Z = \tilde{Z} = 0$ by the G_1 -action

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\mapsto g \cdot Z = (AZ + B)(CZ + D)^{-1} , \\ \tilde{Z} &\mapsto g \cdot \tilde{Z} = (C + D\tilde{Z})(A + B\tilde{Z})^{-1} , \end{aligned}$$

where $A = a \otimes 1_N$, $B = b \otimes 1_N$, etc. It is known from [1] that one gets the desired random matrix answer for chaotic maps if one approximates the integral over G_N/H_N by an integral over the saddle point manifold G_1/H_1 . Hence, the natural strategy is to try and justify this step, which is called the “zero mode approximation”.

The Hessian of S at $Z = \tilde{Z} = 0$ (and, by G_1 -symmetry, everywhere else on the saddle point manifold) is given by the following combination of superdeterminants:

$$S^{(2)} = \text{STr} \tilde{Z} Z - E \left(\text{STr} \tilde{Z} U_\xi Z U_\xi^\dagger \right)$$

if $\gamma_+ = \gamma_- = 1_2$. From this we see that the stability of the saddle point manifold is determined by the spectrum of $1 - E(U_\xi \otimes U_\xi^\dagger)$. Prior to ensemble averaging the operator $1 - U_\xi \otimes U_\xi^\dagger$ has a large number N of zero modes (one for each eigenvector of U_ξ), and the single-zero-mode approximation fails. With ensemble averaging, the situation is much improved. One then expects $N - 1$ zero modes to become “massive” (leaving only a single massless mode), provided that (i) the classical map χ is mixing, (ii) the squares of the Hamiltonian vector fields $\Xi_1^2 + \dots + \Xi_r^2$ add up to produce an elliptic operator, and (iii) the parameter ϵ is taken to vary with \hbar as \hbar^α where $\alpha < 1$. [This conjecture comes from looking at the classical limit $1 - \exp(\epsilon \sum_i \Xi_i^2) \circ \chi^*$ of the operator $1 - E(U_\xi \otimes U_\xi^\dagger)$. Moreover, from power counting one estimates that, in order to achieve the desired mass gap, a positive value of the exponent α suffices, which means that all members of the ensemble converge to give the same classical dynamics in the limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$.]

Assuming the zero mode approximation to be justified, one arrives at an integral over a 2×2 supermatrix ζ :

$$E \left(\hat{\Omega}_{U_\xi}(\gamma_+; \gamma_-) \right) \simeq \int_{D_1} D\mu_1(\zeta, \tilde{\zeta}) \text{SDet}^N(1 - \tilde{\zeta}\zeta) \text{SDet}^{-N}(1 - \tilde{\zeta}\gamma_+\zeta\gamma_-).$$

This integral is independent of U and is easy enough to be worked out in closed form:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E \left(\hat{\Omega}_{U_\xi}(e^{ia_+/N}, e^{ib_+/N}; e^{-ia_-/N}, e^{-ib_-/N}) \right) = 1 - \frac{(a_+ - b_+)(a_- - b_-)}{(a_+ - a_-)(b_+ - b_-)} \left(1 - e^{i(b_+ - b_-)} \right).$$

For the two-level correlation function one obtains $E(R_2(s)) = \delta(s) - \sin^2(\pi s)/(\pi s)^2$, in agreement with the random-matrix conjecture by Bohigas, Giannoni, and Schmit.

Clearly, there are many details that need to be filled in here. Nonetheless, I believe the above approach to be promising and to have the potential of leading to rigorous theorems.

Acknowledgment. I would like to thank O. Agam and A. Altland for discussions. I especially thank S. Zelditch for making the suggestion to compose the map χ with a stochastic Hamiltonian flow.

References

- [1] A.V. Andreev, B.D. Simons, O. Agam, and B.L. Altshuler, Nucl. Phys. B **482**, 536 (1996).
- [2] O. Bohigas, M.J. Giannoni, and C. Schmit, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 1 (1984).
- [3] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **160**, 57 (1979).
- [4] M.R. Zirnbauer, J. Phys. A **29**, 7113 (1996).