Asymptotic superselection rule for the completed process of scattering a
particle on a one-dimensional potential barrier

N. L. Chuprikov
Tomsk State Pedagogical University,
634041, Tomsk, Russia
(Dated: July 9, 2019)

It is shown that two basic theses of the modern quantum scattering theory – the irreducibility of the Schrödinger representation and the existence of asymptotically free dynamics – are incompatible with each other in the case of scattering a particle on a one-dimensional (1D) potential barrier. The first implies that the localization region of scattering states is always connected, and it excludes asymptotically free dynamics – the theorem about the irreducibility of the Schrödinger representation (we rephrased here Reed and Simon [2], p.1) which is based on the theorem about the existence of asymptotically free dynamics or, equivalently, to prove the existence of asymptotically free dynamics – are incompatible with each other in the case of scattering a particle on a one-dimensiona (1D) potential barrier. The theorem about the existence of asymptotically free dynamics occurs when any arbitrarily small potential V(x) is turned on. That is, the quantum theory of a 1D scattering “cannot be considered as a branch of perturbation theory”.

This theory should distinguish between two types of 1D scattering processes – uncompleted and completed. In the first case, the localization region of a particle state is connected at all stages of scattering, including the limits t → ±∞, in a connected spatial region. Thus, it does not involve the existence of asymptotically free dynamics. On the contrary, the first theorem, involving the existence of asymptotically free dynamics, implies that in the 1D case this dynamics occurs within a disconnected spatial region (in our problem it is the sum of two disjoint intervals (−∞, −a) and (a, ∞) that lay on different sides of the barrier). And what is important, in the one-dimensional case, turning of a connected region of free dynamics into a disconnected region of asymptotically free dynamics occurs when any potential V(x) is turned on. That is, the quantum theory of a 1D scattering “cannot be considered as a branch of perturbation theory”.

This theory should distinguish between two types of 1D scattering processes – uncompleted and completed. In the first case, the localization region of a particle state is connected at all stages of scattering, including the limits t → ±∞. The irreducible Schrödinger representation is a proper base for description of the uncompleted process which does not imply the existence of asymptotically free dynamics. On the contrary, in the second case, the region of localization of particle states at t → ±∞ is disconnected. As a consequence, the thesis about the existence of asymptotically free dynamics becomes relevant, while the irreducible Schrödinger representation (and the assumption about the self-adjointness of the operator H in the whole state space) becomes inapplicable. As will be shown below on the basis of exact solutions to the Schrödinger equation for the δ-function potential, the limits (1) and (2) exist only for the com-

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

Let the Hamiltonian \( \hat{H} \) describe the process of scattering a particle on a 1D potential barrier \( V(x) \) which is nonzero in the x interval \([-a, a]\); it is supposed that there are no bound states. Our main goal is to show that modern quantum scattering theory does not describe adequately this process.

According to this theory (see, e.g., [1, 2]) the initial particle state \( \psi_0 \) uniquely determines the scattering state \( \Psi = e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar} \psi_0 \), as well as its in-asymptote \( \psi_\text{in} = \hat{\Omega}_- \psi_0 \) and out-asymptote \( \psi_\text{out} = \hat{\Omega}_+ \psi_0 \) among which it “interpolates”; here \( \hat{\Omega}_\pm = \lim_{t \to \mp \infty} e^{i\hat{H}_0 t/\hbar} e^{-i\hat{H}_0 t/\hbar} \) are Möller wave operators; \( \hat{H}_0 \) is the free one-particle Hamiltonian. In this connection the main task of this theory is to prove the existence of scattering states with asymptotically free dynamics or, equivalently, to prove the existence of strong limits

\[
\lim_{t \to -\infty} \left\| e^{-i\hat{H}_t/\hbar} \psi_0 - e^{-i\hat{H}_t/\hbar} \psi_\text{in} \right\| = 0 \quad (1)
\]

\[
\lim_{t \to +\infty} \left\| e^{-i\hat{H}_t/\hbar} \psi_0 - e^{-i\hat{H}_t/\hbar} \psi_\text{out} \right\| = 0. \quad (2)
\]

As is known (see p. 17 in [2]), this was made with the assumption that \( \hat{H} \) is a self-adjoint operator in the space of scattering states. Thus, ultimately, this theory “can be viewed as a branch of perturbation theory” (we rephrased here Reed and Simon [2], p.1) which is based on the theorem about the existence of asymptotically free dynamics and the theorem about the irreducibility of the Schrödinger representation.

However, these two theorems become incompatible with each other, when they are applied to the 1D scattering process. Indeed, the second theorem implies that scattering states are localized at all stages of scattering, including the limits \( t \to \mp \infty \), in a connected spatial region. Thus, it does not involve the existence of asymptotically free dynamics.

In this connection the main task of this theory is to prove the existence of scattering states with asymptotically free dynamics – the uncompleted scattering process. Indeed, the second theorem implies that scattering states are localized at all stages of scattering, including the limits \( t \to \mp \infty \), in a connected spatial region. Thus, it does not involve the existence of asymptotically free dynamics – the theorem about the irreducibility of the Schrödinger representation.
completed scattering process which is regulated by an asymptotic superselection rule.

II. UNCOMPLETED AND COMPLETED SCATTERING PROCESSES

Let $V(x) = W \cdot \delta(x)$ where $W > 0$. It is easy to show that the stationary solution $\Psi(x,k)$ of the Schrödinger equation, for a particle incident on the barrier from the left, has the form

$$\Psi(x,k) = \begin{cases} e^{ikx} + A_{ref}(k)e^{-ikx}; & x < 0 \\ A_{tr}(k)e^{ikx}; & x > 0 \end{cases}$$ (3)

$$A_{tr}(k) = \frac{k(k - i\kappa)}{k^2 + \kappa^2}, \quad A_{ref}(k) = -\frac{\kappa(k + ik)}{k^2 + \kappa^2},$$

where $\kappa = mW/\hbar^2$, $k$ is the wave number; $m$ is the particle mass. Let us assume that $c = 1/\sqrt{2\pi}$ and write the non-stationary solution $e^{-iHt/\hbar}\psi_0$ as

$$\Psi(x,t) = c \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(k)\Psi(x,k)e^{-iE(k)t/\hbar}dk,$$

where $E = \hbar^2k^2/(2m)$ is the particle energy; the complex-valued function $\mathcal{A}(k)$ to obey the condition $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\mathcal{A}(k)|^2dk = 1$ is determined by the initial state $\psi_0(x)$ (it is assumed that the "center of mass" of the wave packet $\psi_0(x)$ is located far enough from the barrier, to the left of it). The irreducible Schrödinger representation implies that the function $\mathcal{A}(k)$ should belong to the Schwartz space because on these 'physical' states the position and momentum operators are both self-adjoint. Usually, the Gauss function is used.

Let $\mathcal{A}(k) = (2L^2/\pi)^{1/4}\exp[-L^2(k-k_0)^2 + ikx_0]$, where $L > 0$ and $k_0 > 0$, $x_0 - a \gg L$. The in-asymptote $\Psi_{in}(x,t)$ is $e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}\psi_0(x)$, the scattering state $\Psi(x,t)$ can be written in the form

$$\Psi_{in}(x,t) = c \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(k)e^{ikx-E(k)t/\hbar}dk,$$ (4)

and its out-asymptote $\Psi_{out}(x,t) = e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}\psi_0 - \Psi_{in}(x,t)$.

$$\Psi_{out}(x,t) = \Psi_{tr}^{out}(x,t) + \Psi_{ref}^{out}(x,t),$$ (5)

where

$$\Psi_{tr}^{out}(x,t) = c \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(k)A_{tr}(k)e^{ikx-E(k)t/\hbar}dk,$$

$$\Psi_{ref}^{out}(x,t) = c \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(k)A_{ref}(k)e^{-ikx+E(k)t/\hbar}dk.$$

Let us now return to Exp. (1) and find the function $\Delta_{in}(x,t) = e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}\psi_0 - e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}\psi_{in}$. In doing so we have to take into account that the in-asymptote (1) and scattering state $\Psi(x,t)$ are localized, in the limit $t \to -\infty$, far to the left of the barrier. In this case the function $\Psi(x,t)$ contains not only this asymptote ("incident wave packet"), but also the contribution of the "reflected" wave packet – its "tail" which moves, at this stage, toward the barrier. As a result, given that $A_{ref}(-k) = A_{ref}^*(k)$ and $E(-k) = E(k)$, for $x < 0$ at this stage we get

$$\Psi(x,t) = \Psi_{in}(x,t) +$$

$$c \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(-k)A_{ref}^*(k)e^{i[kx-E(k)t/\hbar]}dk.$$ (6)

At this stage $\Psi(x,t) = 0$ for $x > 0$, and $\Delta_{in}(x,t)$ reads as

$$c \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(-k)A_{ref}^*(k)e^{i[kx-E(k)t/\hbar]}dk; \quad x < 0$$

$$0; \quad x > 0$$ (7)

Consequently,

$$\lim_{t \to -\infty} \|\Delta_{in}(x,t)\|^2 = \kappa^2 \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathcal{A}(-k)^2}{k^2 + \kappa^2}dk.$$ (8)

When $t \to +\infty$ the wave packets $\Psi_{ref}^{out}(x,t)$ and $\Psi_{out}(x,t)$, forming the out-asymptote $\Psi_{out}$ (see (6)), are localized far from the barrier to the left and to the right of it, respectively. In this limit, this asymptote is defined as follows: for $x < 0$

$$\Psi_{out} = c \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(k)A_{ref}(k)e^{-i[kx+E(k)t/\hbar]}dk +$$

$$c \int_{-\infty}^{0} \mathcal{A}(k)A_{tr}(k)e^{i[kx-E(k)t/\hbar]}dk;$$ (9)

for $x > 0$

$$\Psi_{out} = c \int_{-\infty}^{0} \mathcal{A}(k)A_{ref}(k)e^{-i[kx+E(k)t/\hbar]}dk$$

$$+ c \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(k)A_{tr}(k)e^{i[kx-E(k)t/\hbar]}dk.$$ (10)

At the same time, for the scattering state $\Psi(x,t)$, at this stage, we have: for $x < 0$

$$\Psi = c \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(k)A_{ref}(k)e^{-i[kx+E(k)t/\hbar]}dk +$$

$$c \int_{-\infty}^{0} \mathcal{A}(k)e^{i[kx-E(k)t/\hbar]}dk;$$ (11)

for $x > 0$

$$\Psi = c \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(k)A_{tr}(k)e^{i[kx-E(k)t/\hbar]}dk.$$ (12)

Thus, $\Delta_{out}(x,t) = e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}\psi_0 - e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}\psi_{out}$ (see Exp. (2)) reads at this stage as

$$-c \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(-k)A_{ref}^*(k)e^{-i[kx+E(k)t/\hbar]}dk; \quad x < 0$$

$$c \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(-k)A_{ref}^*(k)e^{i[kx-E(k)t/\hbar]}dk; \quad x > 0$$
Nonzero contributions to these expressions and to Exp. 4 are associated with the “tails” of the incident, transmitted and reflected wave packets. The “tail” in Exp. 4 is located to the left of the barrier and moves toward the barrier; a nonzero contribution in 13 consists of two “tails” located on different sides of the barrier and moving away from it. It is easy to show that
\[
\lim_{t \to +\infty} \|\Delta_{\text{out}}(x, t)\|^2 = 2\kappa^2 \int_0^\infty \frac{|\mathcal{A}(-k)|^2}{k^2 + \kappa^2} \, dk. \quad (13)
\]

So, for the Gaussian function \(\mathcal{A}(k)\) the limits 1 and 2 are not equal to zero! In this case, the region of localization of the particle states is connected at all times, including the limit \(t \to \infty\).

Strictly speaking, in this case, no division onto the transmitted and reflected particles takes place in this limit. This means that scattering states that correspond to the irreducible Schrödinger representation have no asymptotically free dynamics. This is a distinctive feature of the uncompleted scattering process.

A completely different situation, for a particle incident on the barrier from the left, arises when the function \(\mathcal{A}(k)\) belongs to the Schwarz subspace \(C_0^\infty(0, \infty)\) of functions to be nonzero in the interval \((0, \infty)\), and for a particle incident on the barrier from the right it belongs to the Schwarz subspace \(C_0^\infty(-\infty, 0)\) of functions to be non-zero in the interval \((-\infty, 0)\). The subspaces \(C_0^\infty(-\infty, 0)\) and \(C_0^\infty(0, \infty)\) consist of infinitely differentiable functions that tend to zero, along with their first derivatives, faster than any degree of \(1/|x|\) when \(|x| \to \infty\), and faster than any power of \(x\) when \(x \to 0\).

For such functions, the limits 3 and 13 are equal to zero! As a consequence, with \(\mathcal{A}(k)\) that belongs to one of these subspaces (or represents a superposition of functions from these two subspaces, when it describes a bi-directional incidence of a particle on the barrier), any scattering state indeed interpolates among the corresponding in- and out-asymptotes, since in the limits \(t \to \mp\infty\) it converges in norm to these asymptotes.

In this case, unlike the previous one, we deal with the completed scattering process. When \(t \to \mp\infty\), the scattering state describes a free particle moving far from the barrier. At these two stages, the localization region of scattering states is disconnected (in the limit \(t \to -\infty\), this situation arises in the scattering problem with a bi-directional incidence of a particle on the barrier): in the \(k\)-representation, its localization region is the union of the disjoint open intervals \((-\infty, 0)\) and \((0, \infty)\), lying on different sides of the point \(k = 0\); in the \(x\)-representation, it is the union of the disjoint open intervals \((-\infty, -a)\) and \((a, \infty)\), lying on different sides of the barrier. For the \(\delta\)-potential this region is the union of the intervals \((-\infty, 0)\) and \((0, \infty)\).

In these two limits, the state space \(H\) (which does not contain bound states) can be written as follows: in the limit \(t \to -\infty\)
\[
H = H_{\text{in}} = H_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}} \oplus H_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}},
\]
where \(H_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}\) and \(H_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}\) are the subspaces of scattering states that converge in this limit to the corresponding left and right in-asymptotes, respectively (or, briefly, the “subspaces of left and right in-asymptotes”); in the limit \(t \to +\infty\)
\[
H = H_{\text{out}} = H_{\text{out}}^{\text{left}} \oplus H_{\text{out}}^{\text{right}},
\]
where \(H_{\text{out}}^{\text{left}}\) and \(H_{\text{out}}^{\text{right}}\) are the subspaces of left and right out-asymptotes, respectively.

In this case, 'physical states' in all four subspaces are presented by wave functions belonging to one of the subspaces \(C_0^\infty(\infty, -a)\) and \(C_0^\infty(a, \infty)\) in the \(x\)-representation, and to one of the subspaces \(C_0^\infty(-\infty, 0)\) and \(C_0^\infty(0, \infty)\) in the \(k\)-representation. Below, for each of these subspaces of \(H\), considered in the limits \(t \to \mp\infty\), we present the corresponding subspaces of physical states in \(x\)- and \(k\)-representations, respectively:
\[
\begin{align*}
C_0^\infty(-\infty, -a), \quad C_0^\infty(0, \infty) : & \quad H_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}} \\
C_0^\infty(\infty, a), \quad C_0^\infty(-\infty, 0) : & \quad H_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}} \\
C_0^\infty(-\infty, -a), \quad C_0^\infty(-\infty, 0) : & \quad H_{\text{out}}^{\text{left}} \\
C_0^\infty(\infty, a), \quad C_0^\infty(0, \infty) : & \quad H_{\text{out}}^{\text{right}}.
\end{align*}
\]

In each limit, the corresponding subspaces are not just orthogonal to each other (as being localized in disjoint spatial regions), they are also invariant with respect to the actions of the coordinate and momentum operators of the particle (in the \(x\)-representation \(\hat{x} = x, \hat{p} = -i\hbar \frac{d}{dx}\)). That is, in the limits \(t \to \mp\infty\), these operators act reducibly in \(H\), which is reflected in the relations 11 and 15. For \(t \to -\infty\) (\(t \to +\infty\)) the operators \(\hat{x}\) and \(\hat{p}\) are self-adjoint in the subspaces \(H_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}\) and \(H_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}\) (\(H_{\text{out}}^{\text{left}}\) and \(H_{\text{out}}^{\text{left}}\)).

Now it remains to fix three interconnected properties of the completed scattering process, which indicate (see, for example, 3) the existence of an asymptotic superselection rule that limits the action of the superposition principle in this quantum process.

III. SUPERPOSITION PRINCIPLE FOR THE COMPLETED PROCESS

Further, let \(\hat{A}\) be one of the operators \(\hat{x}\) and \(\hat{p}\).
Property (A): Transitions between $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}$, as well as between $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^{\text{right}}$, under the action of the operator $\hat{A}^n (n = 1, 2, \ldots)$ are impossible.

It follows from the fact that the spaces of physical states, $C^\infty(-\infty,-a)$ and $C^\infty(a,\infty)$, are invariant under the action of the operators $\hat{x}^n$ and $\hat{p}^n$ for any finite $n$. Thus, for any physical states $\Psi^{\text{left}}_{\text{in}}, \Psi^{\text{right}}_{\text{in}}, \Psi^{\text{left}}_{\text{out}}$ and $\Psi^{\text{right}}_{\text{out}}$ from the subspaces $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^{\text{left}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^{\text{right}}$, respectively, there are not only the orthogonality conditions

$$\langle \Psi^{\text{left}}_{\text{in}} | \Psi^{\text{right}}_{\text{in}} \rangle = 0,$$

but also the equalities

$$\langle \Psi^{\text{left}}_{\text{in}} | \hat{A}^n | \Psi^{\text{right}}_{\text{in}} \rangle = 0.$$  

Property (B): The superposition of any 'left state vector' from $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}$ and any 'right state vector' from $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}$ (as well as from $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^{\text{right}}$) is not a pure, but a mixed vector state.

For example, in the scattering problem with a bi-directional incidence of a particle on the barrier, its arbitrary in-asymptote is given by the vector

$$\Psi_{\text{in}} = \sqrt{W_{\text{left}}} \cdot \Psi_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}} + e^{i\alpha} \sqrt{W_{\text{right}}} \cdot \Psi_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}},$$  

(16)

$\alpha$ is a real constant; $W_{\text{left}} + W_{\text{right}} = 1, W_{\text{left}} > 0, W_{\text{right}} > 0$; $\Psi_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}$ and $\Psi_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}$ are unit vectors from $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}$, respectively. Then, taking into account the property (A), we obtain

$$\langle \Psi_{\text{in}} | \hat{A} | \Psi_{\text{in}} \rangle = W_{\text{left}} \cdot \langle \Psi_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}} | \hat{A} | \Psi_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}} \rangle + W_{\text{right}} \cdot \langle \Psi_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}} | \hat{A} | \Psi_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}} \rangle.$$  

(17)

That is, the "average value" of the operator $\hat{A}$, calculated for the whole quantum ensemble of scattering particles, is the sum of the average values (multiplied by the corresponding weights $W_{\text{left}}$ and $W_{\text{right}}$) of this operator for sub-ensembles of reflected and transmitted particles, moving in the disjoint spatial regions $(-\alpha, -a)$ and $(a, \alpha)$, respectively. It is important to emphasize that the Expr. (17) does not depend on $\alpha$, which is typical of classical (incoherent) superpositions. According to [3] (see p. 176) the property (17) indicates that the vector state (16) is decomposable and, thus, it represents a mixed state.

This mixed state should be distinguished from 'ordinary' mixed states, given by the density operator $\hat{\rho}$ when $\hat{\rho}^2 \neq \hat{\rho}$. Following [3, 4], we will call them 'mixed vector states', while indecomposable vector states from the subspaces $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^{\text{left}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^{\text{right}}$ will be called 'pure vector states'.

Property (C): There exists such an operator $\hat{T}$ that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^{\text{left}}, \mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^{\text{right}}$ are its eigenspaces to correspond its point spectrum.

Let

$$\hat{T} = \hat{P}_r - \hat{P}_l,$$

(18)

where $\hat{P}_r$ and $\hat{P}_l$ are the projection operators

$$\hat{P}_r = \theta(x-a), \quad \hat{P}_l = \theta(-x-a);$$

$\theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function. Obviously,

$$\hat{T} | \Psi_{\text{in, out}}^{\text{right}} \rangle = | \Psi_{\text{in, out}}^{\text{right}} \rangle, \quad \hat{T} | \Psi_{\text{in, out}}^{\text{left}} \rangle = -| \Psi_{\text{in, out}}^{\text{left}} \rangle.$$  

It is also obvious that, on these physical states, the operator $\hat{T}$ commutes with the operators $\hat{x}^n$ and $\hat{p}^n$ as well as with their commutators.

The properties (A)-(C) indicate that in the case of the completed process there is an asymptotic superselection rule (ASR), where $\hat{T}$ is a superselection operator; the role of superselection (coherent) sectors in the limit $t \to -\infty$ is played by the subspaces $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}$, while in the limit $t \to \infty$ they are the subspaces $\mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^{\text{left}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^{\text{right}}$. From here it follows the generalized superposition principle

- the superposition of any pure vector states from the same coherent sector is a pure vector state from this sector;
- the superposition of any pure vector state from the sector of left asymptotes and any pure vector states from the sector of right asymptotes is a mixed vector state.

This formulation of the superposition principle does not declare mixed vector states nonphysical. In this class of vector states it is only forbidden to consider dynamic variables and their functions as observables. This is the fundamental difference between mixed vector states and "ordinary" mixed states. In particular, the "average value" (17) of the operator $\hat{A}$ actually has no physical meaning.

So, from a mathematical point of view, the origin of the generalized superposition principle is related to the fact that in the case of the completed 1D process the state space $\mathcal{H}$, in the limits $t \to \mp \infty$, is reducible (recall once more that there are no bound states for the barrier considered); therefore the 'usual superposition principle' is valid only in the coherent sectors.

The ASR complements the list of known superselection rules (see [3, 8]), each implying that all coherent sectors of the state space are associated with the same particle (they correspond to the same electric charge, spin, mass, etc). The physical
IV. IN-ASYMPTOTES OF TRANSMITTED AND REFLECTED PARTICLES

So, according to the ASR, for a particle incident on the barrier from the left, the whole ensemble of particles taking part in the completed scattering process represents, in the limit $t \to -\infty$, a 'pure ensemble' of particles moving toward the barrier, while in the limit $t \to \infty$ it represents a mixture of two pure sub-ensembles: one of them consists of particles transmitted through the barrier, and another consists of particles reflected off it. Thus, this ensemble can be endowed with observables only in the limit $t \to \infty$ only. In the limit $t \to -\infty$ all observables can be defined only for its transmitted sub-ensemble and its reflected sub-ensemble, individually.

We must emphasize that in this closed system, the transformation of a pure quantum ensemble into a statistical mixture occurs due to its interaction with the barrier, rather than with the environment or some external random field. Thus, the individual dynamics of each sub-ensemble must be deterministic and, hence, should be traced at all stages of scattering. In particular, there should be such two in-asymptotes in the coherent sector $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}$ that one of them, $\Psi_{\text{left} \rightarrow \text{left}}$, has a cause-effect relationship with the out-asymptote $\Psi_{\text{out}}^{\text{left}}$ from the coherent sector $\mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}$, and another, $\Psi_{\text{left} \rightarrow \text{right}}(x, t)$, has a cause-effect relationship with $\Psi_{\text{out}}^{\text{right}}$ from the sector $\mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}^{\text{right}}$. Moreover, since the superposition $\Psi_{\text{out}}^{\text{left}} = \Psi_{\text{out}}^{\text{left}} + \Psi_{\text{out}}^{\text{right}}$ represents the out-asymptote [4], that describes the whole ensemble of particles, then the superposition $\Psi_{\text{left} \rightarrow \text{left}} + \Psi_{\text{left} \rightarrow \text{right}}$ should represent the in-asymptote [4] of the whole ensemble.

Our next step is to show, by the example of the $\delta$-potential, that these requirements uniquely determine the in-asymptotes $\Psi_{\text{left} \rightarrow \text{left}}$ and $\Psi_{\text{left} \rightarrow \text{right}}$. The search for them is similar to the solution of the inverse scattering problem and the scattering data presented by the out-asymptotes $\Psi_{\text{out}}^{\text{left}}(x, t)$ and $\Psi_{\text{out}}^{\text{right}}(x, t)$, we have to restore the shape of the barrier, but the shape of in-asymptotes of the transmitted and reflected sub-ensembles. And since this task needs to be solved in the general case, that is, for any function $\mathcal{A}(k)$ from $C_0^\infty(0, \infty)$, the search for the in-asymptotes $\Psi_{\text{left} \rightarrow \text{left}}(x, t)$ and $\Psi_{\text{left} \rightarrow \text{right}}(x, t)$ should be started with the analysis of the stationary scattering problem.

Namely, we have to present the arbitrary wave $e^{ikx - E(k)t/\hbar}$ of the in-asymptote [4] as a superposition $A_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}(k)e^{ikx - E(k)t/\hbar} + A_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}(k)e^{ikx - E(k)t/\hbar}$ where amplitudes $A_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}(k)$ and $A_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}(k)$ are unknown; the first wave should have a cause-effect relationship with the transmitted wave, and the second should be associated with the reflected one (see [3]):

$$A_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}(k)e^{ikx - E(k)t/\hbar} \Rightarrow A_{\text{tr}}(k)e^{ikx - E(k)t/\hbar}$$

$$A_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}(k)e^{ikx - E(k)t/\hbar} \Rightarrow A_{\text{ref}}(k)e^{-ikx - E(k)t/\hbar}$$

where

$$A_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}(k) + A_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}(k) = 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

This causal relationship implies that the probability density and the probability flux density in each pair of incident and outgoing waves must be equal at the point of their matching (it is evident that, in the case considered, this point is $x = 0$). This means, in particular, that

$$|A_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}(k)|^2 = |A_{\text{tr}}(k)|^2 = T(k),$$

$$|A_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}(k)|^2 = |A_{\text{ref}}(k)|^2 = R(k).$$

Thus, the amplitudes $A_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}}$ and $A_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}}$ can be written in the form $A_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}} = \sqrt{T}e^{i\alpha}$ and $A_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}} = \sqrt{R}e^{i\beta}$, where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are real. As a consequence, Eq. (20) takes the form

$$\sqrt{T}e^{i\alpha} + \sqrt{R}e^{i\beta} = 1.$$

It has two roots:

$$\beta = \alpha - \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad \alpha = \pm \arctan \frac{\sqrt{R(k)}}{T(k)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

The corresponding amplitudes are

$$A_{\text{in}}^{\text{left}} = \sqrt{T}(\sqrt{T} \pm i\sqrt{R}) = \frac{k(k \pm i\kappa)}{k^2 + \kappa^2},$$

$$A_{\text{in}}^{\text{right}} = \sqrt{R}(\sqrt{R} \mp i\sqrt{T}) = \frac{\kappa(k \mp i\kappa)}{k^2 + \kappa^2}.$$
For both roots
\[ A_{tr}^{\ast} + A_{in}^{\ast} = 1, \quad |A_{tr}|^2 + |A_{in}|^2 = 1. \]

Only the root which corresponds to the lower signs (in this case \( A_{tr} = A_{tr}^* \) and \( A_{in} = -A_{in}^* \)) is a physical solution. In this case, the incoming and outgoing waves in the first pair of waves in (19), describing the component passing through the barrier, are matched at the point \( x = 0 \) for any value of \( k \). Thus, we can introduce the stationary wave function \( \Psi_{tr}(x, k) \) which describes the transmitting component of the stationary solution (23),
\[
\Psi_{tr} = \begin{cases} 
A_{tr}(k)e^{ikx}, & x < 0 \\
A_{tr}(k)e^{-ikx}, & x > 0 ,
\end{cases}
\] (22)
as well as its reflecting component \( \Psi_{ref}(x, k) = \Psi(x, k) \) for any values of \( x \) and \( k \); both functions are continuous at the point \( x = 0 \); moreover, there are no reflected particles in the region \( x \geq 0 \).

For the root with upper signs we have \( A_{in} = A_{in}^* \) and \( A_{tr} = -A_{tr}^* \). With these amplitudes, the functions \( \Psi_{tr}(x, k) \) and \( \Psi_{ref}(x, k) \) as well as the corresponding probability densities are discontinuous at the point \( x = 0 \). Thus, this root has no physical meaning.

Finally, we have
\[
\Psi_{left\rightarrow right} = c \int_{0}^{\infty} A(k)A_{tr}(k)e^{i[kx-E(k)t]/\hbar}dk, \\
\Psi_{left\rightarrow left} = -c \int_{0}^{\infty} A(k)A_{ref}(k)e^{i[kx-E(k)t]/\hbar}dk;
\]
where \( A(k) \) is determined by the initial conditions, and \( A_{tr}(k) \) and \( A_{ref}(k) \) by the out-asymptotes. That is, these in-asymptotes are unambiguously reconstructed from the shape of the original wave packet and from the scattering data. On their basis, it is possible to investigate the asymptotic properties of sub-ensembles of transmitted and reflected particles in the limit \( t \rightarrow -\infty \).

Note that the roots (21) are defined only through the transmission and reflection coefficients. Thus, the presented scheme of finding the in-asymptotes for the transmitted and reflected sub-ensembles can be applied to any 1D potential barrier \( V(x) \).

As for wave packets
\[
\Psi_{tr}(x, t) = c \int_{0}^{\infty} A(k)\Psi_{tr}(x, k)e^{-iE(k)t/\hbar}dk, \\
\Psi_{ref}(x, t) = c \int_{0}^{\infty} A(k)\Psi_{ref}(x, k)e^{-iE(k)t/\hbar}dk.
\]
that describe the transmitted and reflected sub-ensembles at all stages of this completed scattering process, their dynamics differs from the ‘ordinary’ quantum dynamics which is based on the irreducible Schrödinger representation. In case of this process, the Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \) is reducible in the limits \( t \rightarrow \mp \infty \). During this process the wave packet \( \Psi_{tr}(x, t) \) comes over from the coherent sector \( \mathcal{H}_{in} \) into the sector \( \mathcal{H}_{right} \), while the wave packet \( \Psi_{ref}(x, t) \) comes over from the sector \( \mathcal{H}_{in} \) into the sector \( \mathcal{H}_{left} \).

The difference between these two dynamics is manifested, in particular, in the fact that at the point \( x = 0 \), where the \( \delta \)-function is “nonzero”, the function \( \Psi(x, k) \) is not only continuous, but also satisfies the (linear complex) matching condition
\[
\frac{d\Psi}{dx} \bigg|_{x=+0} - \frac{d\Psi}{dx} \bigg|_{x=-0} = \frac{2mW}{\hbar^2} \Psi(0, k) \quad (24)
\]
which guarantees continuity at this point of the corresponding probability flux density. At the same time, the first derivatives of the (everywhere continuous) functions \( \Psi_{tr}(x, k) \) and \( \Psi_{ref}(x, k) \) satisfy at this point the (non-linear real) condition of the continuity of the probability flux density, but do not satisfy the (linear complex) condition (24).

As a consequence, the norm of the wave packet \( \Psi_{tr}(x, t) \) is not conserved when it crosses the point \( x = 0 \) (but \( ||\Psi_{left\rightarrow right}|| = ||\Psi_{right}|| \)). In this case, the norm of the wave packet \( \Psi_{ref}(x, t) \) is conserved during the whole scattering process. Ultimately, this is explained by the fact that \( \Psi_{ref}(0, t) = 0 \) for any \( t \).

V. CONCLUSION

It is shown that one has to distinguish two cardinally different processes of scattering a particle on a 1D potential barrier - uncompleted and completed. The former arises when the asymptotes of scattering states belong to the Schwarz space, that is, they are functions of a Gaussian type. The localization region of such asymptotes is connected even in the limits \( t \rightarrow \infty \); therefore it is not legitimate to speak of a ‘transmitted’ or ‘reflected’ particle – there is no asymptotically free dynamics in this case. The latter arises when, in the \( k \)-space, the Fourier-transform of these asymptotes belong to the space \( C_c^{\infty}(-\infty, 0) \bigcup C_c^{\infty}(0, \infty) \) of functions which are localized in the disconnected \( k \)-region: in contrast to the previous case, there is here asymptotically free dynamics, and it is quite legitimate to speak of a ‘transferred’ or ‘reflected’ particle.

In case of the uncompleted process one deals with the ‘usual’ quantum particle dynamics which
is described on the basis of the irreducible Schrödinger representation. At the same time, in case of the completed process, quantum particle dynamics is determined by the asymptotic super-selection rule which limits the action of the 'ordinary' superposition principle in this process. This dynamics implies a reducible Schrödinger representation, because all observables can be defined now only for the sub-ensembles of transmitted and reflected particles. In the limit $t \to -\infty$ all observables for these sub-ensembles can be measured indirectly. In fact, this type of the quantum dynamics of a closed one-particle system is the missing link between the 'ordinary' quantum particle dynamics and the classical particle dynamics.