Scattering a particle by a one-dimensional \( \delta \)-potential barrier: asymptotic superselection rule
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Abstract. It is shown that in the problem of scattering a particle by a one-dimensional \( \delta \)-potential barrier there is an asymptotic superselection rule, according to which all observables and characteristic times can be determined only for the transmission and reflection subprocesses of this scattering process with a one-sided incidence of a particle on the barrier. For each subprocess, the stationary states as well as non-stationary scattering states with left and right Gaussian asymptotes are presented in analytical form.

PACS: 03.65.−w; 03.65.Nk; 03.65.Xp; 03.65.Ta

1. Introduction

At first glance, the standard quantum mechanical model (SQM) of scattering a particle by a one-dimensional \( \delta \)-potential barrier, widely presented in the physical and mathematical literature (see, for example, [1, 2]), gives an internally consistent and comprehensive description of this quantum process. However, it is not. Yes, this model provides a complete information on the scattering parameters of this scattering process. Moreover, it is fully in agreement with the modern quantum theory. In particular, in agreement with the modern theory of self-adjoint extensions of symmetric operators (see, e.g., [3] and also Section 4 in [4]) and the theorem on the irreducibility of the Schrödinger representation, the SQM states that in this scattering problem the position and momentum operators are self-adjoint and the formal Hamiltonian with the \( \delta \)-potential has a self-adjoint extension; in agreement with the stationary scattering theory [5, 6], it states that in this scattering problem there exists a strong limit.

But these two statements contradict each other: the former assumes the regularity of the Weyl form of the position operator, while the latter assumes the opposite. Indeed, the second statement assumes that, in the limits \( t \to \mp \infty \), the mathematical expectations of this operator tend to \( -\infty \) and \( +\infty \) for the left and right asymptotes, respectively (note that the expectation values of the momentum operator remain bounded in the limits \( t \to \mp \infty \)). This means that the unboundedness (and, thus, discontinuity) of the position operator plays a key role in this scattering problem,
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making it wrongful to use the regular Weyl representation (see [7]) in the SQM. It will be demonstrated here with the help of analytical expressions found for time-dependent scattering states with the Gaussian left and right asymptotes. Thus, the short list in [7] (see also [8]) of one-particle quantum problems with non-regular Weyl representations must be extended.

2. Stationary scattering states

Let us consider the $\delta$-potential $V(x) = W\delta(x)$ where $W > 0$ (there are no bound states). According to the SQM, the stationary Schrödinger equation can be written as

$$\hat{H}_{\text{tot}} \Psi_{\text{tot}}(x, k) \equiv -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2 \Psi_{\text{tot}}(x, k)}{dx^2} + W\delta(x) \Psi_{\text{tot}}(x, k) = E \Psi_{\text{tot}}(x, k); \quad (1)$$

where $k = \sqrt{2mE/\hbar}$; $E$ is the particle energy; the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{tot}}$ corresponds to the self-adjoint extension $H_{\kappa,0}$ of the symmetrical operator $\hat{H} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ analyzed in [1]. The corresponding boundary conditions, according to [1], are

$$\Psi_{\text{tot}}(0^+) = \Psi_{\text{tot}}(0^-), \quad \Psi'_{\text{tot}}(0^+) - \Psi'_{\text{tot}}(0^-) = 2\kappa \Psi_{\text{tot}}(0^-); \quad (2)$$

hereinafter, $\kappa = mW/\hbar^2$ and $f(0^+) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} f(\pm \epsilon)$ for any function $f(x)$; the prime denotes a derivative.

There are other two self-adjoint extensions of the operator $\hat{H}$ in the SQM. However, they are considered there as special cases corresponding to $\kappa = 0$ and $\kappa = \infty$ and, unlike $H_{\kappa,0}$, play the secondary role in this model. An intrigue is that in our approach we face with the opposite situation. We show that, in fact, these two special cases have no relation to $\kappa = 0$ and $\kappa = \infty$ and, unlike $H_{\kappa,0}$, play a key role (see Section 7) in the description of this scattering process.

The eigenvalues of the operator $\hat{H}_{\text{tot}}$ are doubly degenerate and lie in the domain $E \geq 0$. Thus, the general solution to the equation (1) with the boundary conditions (2) can be written as a linear superposition of two linearly independent particular solutions. As such, functions

$$\Psi_{\text{tot}}^L(x, k) = \begin{cases} e^{ikx} + A_{\text{ref}}(k)e^{-ikx}, & x < 0 \\ A_{\text{tr}}(k)e^{ikx}, & x > 0 \end{cases}$$

$$\Psi_{\text{tot}}^R(x, k) = \begin{cases} A_{\text{tr}}(k)e^{-ikx}, & x < 0 \\ e^{-ikx} + A_{\text{ref}}(k)e^{ikx}, & x > 0 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

are usually taken, which describe a particle incident on the barrier from the left and right, respectively; here $A_{\text{tr}}(k) = k/(k + i\kappa)$, $A_{\text{ref}}(k) = -i\kappa/(k + i\kappa)$. The quantities $T(k) = |A_{\text{tr}}(k)|^2 = k^2/(k^2 + \kappa^2)$ and $R(k) = |A_{\text{ref}}(k)|^2 = \kappa^2/(k^2 + \kappa^2)$ represent the transmission and reflection coefficients, respectively. As is seen, $T(0) = 0$. Therefore the functions $\Psi_{\text{tot}}^L(x, k)$ and $\Psi_{\text{tot}}^R(x, k)$ are identically zero for $k = 0$. Thus, the ground states are not involved in the construction of (non-stationary) scattering states – there are no particles with zero momentum in the quantum (one-particle) ensemble of particles incident on the barrier.
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For the parity (spatial inversion) operator $\hat{P}$ we have
\[
\hat{P}\Psi^L_{\text{tot}}(x, k) = \Psi^L_{\text{tot}}(-x, k) = \Psi^R_{\text{tot}}(x, k), \quad \hat{P}\Psi^R_{\text{tot}}(x, k) = \Psi^R_{\text{tot}}(-x, k) = \Psi^L_{\text{tot}}(x, k).
\]
This reflects the fact that the operator $\hat{H}_{\text{tot}}$ is formally invariant under the action of the operator $\hat{P}$. However, in reality, this scattering process does not possess this symmetry. Let us first show this for basic states.

3. Ground states

So, since the energy spectrum in this scattering problem is not point-like, there should be two nontrivial solutions of the equation (1) satisfying the boundary conditions (2) for $E = 0$. At first glance, such solutions are functions
\[
\phi_1(x) = \begin{cases} 
1; & x < 0 \\
1 + 2\kappa x; & x > 0
\end{cases}, \quad \phi_2(x) = x; \quad x \in (-\infty, \infty).
\]
But in fact, none of them can fulfill this role. And the main reason is that at $E = 0$ the probability of passing a particle through the barrier is zero. Thus, if a particle with such an energy was initially located to the left (right) of the barrier, then the probability of its detection to the right (left) of the barrier is zero. Therefore, as two independent solutions for $E = 0$, one should consider the functions
\[
\phi_L(x) = \begin{cases} 
x; & x < 0 \\
0; & x > 0
\end{cases}, \quad \phi_R(x) = \begin{cases} 
0; & x < 0 \\
x; & x > 0
\end{cases}, \quad (4)
\]
which do not depend on $\kappa$.

The peculiarity of these two solutions is that they cannot be considered as two independent particular solutions of the same differential equation defined on the whole $x$-axis. Indeed, if we assume the opposite, then it will be found that the Wronskian of these two solutions is equal to zero. But this means that these two solutions cannot serve as two independent solutions of the same equation on the whole $x$-axis, and we arrive at a contradiction. Thus, the functions (4) are actually solutions of two different Schrödinger equations given on the different semi-axes of the $x$ axis. As a consequence, the $P$-symmetry is broken in these ground states: $\hat{P}\phi^L(x) \neq \phi^R(x), \hat{P}\phi^R(x) \neq \phi^L(x)$. As will be shown in Sections 5 and 6, non-stationary scattering states do not possess this symmetry too.

4. On the existence of asymptotically free dynamics

Scattering states for a particle incident on the barrier from the left can be written in the form
\[
\Psi^L_{\text{tot}}(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} A(k, t)\Psi^L_{\text{tot}}(x, k)dk; \quad (5)
\]
where \( A(k, t) = A_{in}(k) \exp[i(ka - E(k)t/\hbar)] \); the nonstationary real function \( A_{in}(k) \) is such that the norm of the left asymptote

\[
\Psi_{in}^L(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} A(k, t)e^{ikx}dk
\]

is equal to one: \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |A_{in}(k)|^2dk = 1 \). At the initial instant of time \( t = 0 \), the maximum of the wave packet \( \Psi_{in}^L(x, t) \) is located at the point \( x = -a \). Accordingly, for a particle incident on the barrier from the right

\[
\Psi_{tot}^R(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} A(k, t)\Psi_{tot}^R(x, k)dk.
\]

In this case, the norm of the right in-asymptote \( \Psi_{in}^R(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} A(k, t)e^{-ikx}dk \) is equal to one, and its maximum is at the point \( x = +a \).

According to the SQM (see \( 1, 5 \)), there is a strong limit in this scattering problem, and therefore the norms of the wave packets \( \Psi_{tot}^R(x, t) \) and \( \Psi_{tot}^L(x, t) \) must also be equal to one. But is it? Let us check this property for the state \( 5 \):

\[
\langle \Psi_{tot}^L | \Psi_{tot}^L \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [A(k', t)]^*A(k, t)I(k', k)dk'dk;
\]

\[
I(k', k) = \lim_{X \to \infty} \tilde{I}(X, k', k);
\]

\[
\tilde{I}(X, k', k) = \frac{-2(k'k + \kappa^2) + ik'(k' - k)}{(k' - i\kappa)(k + i\kappa)} \sin[(k' - k)X] - \frac{i\kappa(k' - k + 2i\kappa)}{(k' - i\kappa)(k + i\kappa)} \sin[(k' + k)X]
\]

\[
+ \frac{2\kappa}{(k' - i\kappa)(k + i\kappa)} \left[ \sin^2\left(\frac{Xk' + k}{2}\right) - \sin^2\left(\frac{Xk' - k}{2}\right) \right].
\]

Further, given that \( \lim_{X \to \infty} \frac{\sin(kX)}{k} = \pi\delta(k) \) and \( x\delta(x) = 0 \), we get

\[
I(k', k) = \frac{-2(k'k + \kappa^2) + ik'(k' - k)}{(k' - i\kappa)(k + i\kappa)} \pi\delta(k' - k) - \frac{2i\kappa(k' - k + k)}{(k' - i\kappa)(k + i\kappa)} \pi\delta(k' + k)
\]

\[
= 2\pi\delta(k' - k) - \frac{2\pi i\kappa}{k + i\kappa} \delta(k' + k).
\]

Thus,

\[
\langle \Psi_{tot}^L | \Psi_{tot}^L \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [A_{in}(k)]^2dk - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} A_{in}(-k)A_{in}(k)e^{2ika} \frac{i\kappa}{k + i\kappa}dk
\]

\[
= \langle \Psi_{in}^L | \Psi_{in}^L \rangle + \kappa \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} A_{in}(-k)A_{in}(k) \frac{k\sin(2ka) - \kappa\cos(2ka)}{k^2 + \kappa^2}dk;
\]

here we took into account that \( A_{in}(-k)A_{in}(k) \) is an even real function. A similar situation arises in the case of the state \( 7 \).

From \( 9 \) it follows that the norms of the wave packets \( \Psi_{tot}^R(x, t) \) and \( \Psi_{tot}^L(x, t) \) coincide with each other if \( A_{in}(-k)A_{in}(k) = 0 \). In its turn, this property is satisfied if \( A_{in}(k) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}) = C_0^\infty(-\infty, 0) \oplus C_0^\infty(0, \infty) \), where \( C_0^\infty(-\infty, 0) \) and \( C_0^\infty(0, \infty) \) are the subspaces of infinitely differentiable functions which are identically zero on the semi-axes \([0, \infty)\) and \((-\infty, 0]\), respectively; besides, they tend to zero, as \( |k| \to 0 \),
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faster than \(|k|^n\), while for \(|k| \to \infty\) faster than \(1/|k|^n\); \(n\) is a positive integer. In the coordinate representation, the wave packets \(\Psi_{tot}^L(x, t)\) and \(\Psi_{tot}^R(x, t)\) form in the Hilbert space \(\mathcal{H}_{tot}\) the Schwartz subspace \(\mathcal{S}_{tot}\) of (nonstationary) scattering states. In the limits \(t \to -\infty\) and \(t \to +\infty\), these scattering states coincide with the corresponding in- and out-asymptotes.

As for the Gaussian function \(A_{in}(k) \equiv A_G(k) = c e^{-L^2(k-k_0)^2}\) (nonzero for all \(k\) in the interval \((-\infty, \infty)\)) which is usually used in the analysis of the one-dimensional scattering problem, then, strictly speaking, there is no strong limit in this case; \(c = \frac{4}{\sqrt{2\pi} L}\). The integral in (9) is now nonzero:

\[
\langle \Psi_{tot}^L | \Psi_{tot}^L \rangle = \langle \Psi_{in}^L | \Psi_{in}^L \rangle - \sqrt{2\pi} \kappa L \text{erfc} \left( \frac{2\kappa L^2 + a}{\sqrt{2L}} \right) e^{2L^2(k_0^2 - k^2) + 2\kappa a}.
\]

(10)

Strictly speaking, the wave function \(\Psi_{tot}^L(x, t)\) with the Gaussian left in-asymptote can be regarded as a scattering state only in the limiting cases \(a\kappa \sim L\kappa \sim k_0/\kappa \to \infty\) (in this case, \(A_G(k)\) is in fact zero for \(k < 0\)). If the quantities \(a\kappa\), \(L\kappa\) and \(k_0/\kappa\) are large enough, then \(A_G(k)\) is approximately zero for \(k < 0\) and, in this case too, we will refer to these states as scattering states. For other values of these quantities, the asymptotically free quantum dynamics of the states \(\Psi_{tot}^L(x, t)\) with Gaussian in-asymptotes does not exist. That is, one of the main provisions of the SQM, concerning the existence of the strong limits when \(t \to \mp \infty\), is incorrect in the general case. Moreover, as will be shown below, the SQM does not adequately describe this scattering process even when these strong limits exist.

5. On the “purity” of (time-dependent) scattering states

According to the SQM, each scattering state has one in-asymptote and one out-asymptote, and these asymptotes cannot be related to other scattering states. It is said that in this case the condition of asymptotic completeness is satisfied. However, our analysis of the asymptotic behavior of scattering states, carried out within the framework of the nonstationary scattering theory, shows that this condition is violated.

Consider the state \(\Psi_{tot}^L(x, t)\) with the Gaussian function \(A_{in}(k)\) for which the interference term in (11) is negligible. The advantage of making use of such states compared to scattering states with functions \(A_{in}(k)\) from the space \(C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}\{0}\)} is that in this case the wave function \(\Psi_{tot}^L(x, t)\) can be found in analytical form.

Let \(A_{in}(k) \equiv A_G(k)\) in (5). Then, taking into account (3), we obtain

\[
\Psi_{tot}^L(x, t) = \begin{cases} 
\Psi_{in}^L(x, t) - i\kappa G(-x, t); & x < 0 \\
\Psi_{in}^L(x, t) - i\kappa G(x, t); & x > 0 
\end{cases}
\]

(11)

where \(\Psi_{in}^L(x, t)\) is an in-asymptote (see Exp. (6)), and

\[
G(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} A(k, t) e^{i(kx + a)} dk;
\]

(12)
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$\Psi_{\text{in}}(x,t)$ is the wave function that describes a free particle:

$$\Psi_{\text{in}}(x,t) = \frac{c}{\sqrt{2(L^2 + ibt)}} \exp \left(\frac{-(x + a)^2 + 4ik_0L^2(x + a - bk_0t)}{4(L^2 + ibt)}\right); \quad (13)$$

$b = \hbar/(2m)$. The integral $G(x,t)$ can be found as a solution to the equation

$$\frac{\partial G(x,t)}{\partial x} = \kappa G(x,t) + i\Psi_{\text{in}}(x,t)$$

which follows from (12). It can be shown that

$$G(x,t) = -ic\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \text{erfc}\left(\frac{x + a - 2iL^2k_0}{2\sqrt{L^2 + ibt}} + \kappa\sqrt{L^2 + ibt}\right) e^{L^2(\kappa - ik_0)^2 + ib\kappa^2 t + \kappa(x+a)}. \quad (14)$$

For what follows, we also need the integral

$$F(x,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} A(k,t) \frac{e^{ik(x+a)}}{k - i\kappa} dk. \quad (15)$$

It is easy to show that

$$F(x,t) = ic\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \text{erfc}\left(\frac{x + a - 2iL^2k_0}{2\sqrt{L^2 + ibt}} + \kappa\sqrt{L^2 + ibt}\right) e^{L^2(\kappa + ik_0)^2 + ib\kappa^2 t - \kappa(x+a)}. \quad (15)$$

Now we have, in analytical form, not only the scattering state (11) itself and its in-asymptote (13), but also its out-asymptote which represents a superposition

$$\Psi_{\text{out}}(x,t) = \Psi_{\text{out}}^L(x,t) + \Psi_{\text{out}}^R(x,t) \quad (16)$$

of the left and right asymptotes $\Psi_{\text{out}}^L(x,t)$ and $\Psi_{\text{out}}^R(x,t)$,

$$\Psi_{\text{out}}^L(x,t) = -i\kappa G(-x,t), \quad \Psi_{\text{out}}^R(x,t) = \Psi_{\text{in}}(x,t) - i\kappa G(x,t), \quad (17)$$

localized in the non-intersecting spatial regions lying on the opposite sides of the barrier. According to the SQM, only one scattering state is associated with this asymptote — the state (11). But this is not the case.

Let us consider the family of the stationary states

$$\Psi_{\lambda}(x,k) = \Psi_{\text{tot}}^L(x,k) + (e^{i\lambda} - 1)\tilde{\Psi}(x,k) \quad (18)$$

with different values of the parameter $\lambda$, where

$$\tilde{\Psi}(x,k) = \begin{cases} \frac{k^2}{k^2 + \kappa^2}e^{ikx}, & x < 0 \\ \frac{\kappa}{k + \kappa}e^{ikx} + \frac{i\kappa}{k + \kappa}e^{-ikx}, & x > 0 \end{cases}$$

The corresponding scattering states associated with the Gaussian function $A_G(k)$ are

$$\Psi_{\lambda}(x,t) = \Psi_{\text{tot}}^L(x,t) + (e^{i\lambda} - 1)\tilde{\Psi}(x,t), \quad (19)$$

where

$$\tilde{\Psi}(x,t) = \begin{cases} \Psi_{\text{in}}(x,t) - \frac{i\kappa}{2}[G(x,t) - F(x,t)]; & x < 0 \\ \Psi_{\text{in}}(x,t) - i\kappa G(x,t) + \frac{i\kappa}{2}[G(-x,t) + F(-x,t)]; & x > 0 \end{cases}$$

They have the out-asymptotes (coinciding at $\lambda = 0$ with the out-asymptote (16))

$$\Psi_{\text{out}}(x,t;\lambda) = \Psi_{\text{out}}^L(x,t) + e^{i\lambda}\Psi_{\text{out}}^R(x,t), \quad (20)$$
localized, in the limit \( t \to \infty \), in the disjoint spatial regions lying on the opposite sides of the barrier. Due to this property, the mean value of any operator, calculated for the out-asymptote \((20)\), does not depend, in the limit \( t \to \infty \), on the phase \( \lambda \).

To demonstrate this property, we calculated the average value \( \langle x \rangle \) of the position operator for the state \( \Psi(x, t; \lambda) \) at \( \lambda = 0 \), \( \lambda = \pi/2 \) and \( \lambda = \pi \). Numerical calculations were carried out for \( L = 50 \text{Å}, a = 200 \text{Å}, k_0 = \kappa = 8.64 \times 10^6 \text{cm}^{-1} \), when the interference term in \((10)\) is negligible. The calculation results are shown in Fig. 1.

**Figure 1.** Dependence of \( \langle x \rangle \) on \( t \) for \( L = 50 \text{Å}, a = 200 \text{Å}, k_0 = \kappa = 8.64 \times 10^6 \text{cm}^{-1} \): \( \lambda = 0 \) – solid line, \( \lambda = \pi/2 \) – dotted line, \( \lambda = \pi \) – dashed line.

As is seen, beginning with \( t \approx 300 \text{fs} \) the average value of the particle coordinate for the \( \lambda \)-dependent scattering state \((18)\) ceases to depend on \( \lambda \). And this results from the fact that, beginning with this instant of time the family \((18)\) of scattering states reaches the family \((20)\) of out-asymptotes, in which the left and right out-asymptotes \( \Psi_{\text{out}}^L(x, t) \) and \( \Psi_{\text{out}}^R(x, t) \) are localized in the non-intersecting spatial regions lying on the opposite sides of the barrier. It is evident that in this case the mean value of any other Hermitian operator also ceases to depend on the phase \( \lambda \). That is, in the limit \( t \to \infty \), the family of the out-asymptotes \((20)\) represents actually a single out-asymptote, which is common for all scattering states from the family \( \Psi_{\lambda}(x, t) \) (see Exp. \((19)\)).

Thus, the phase \( \lambda \) is non-observable in \((20)\). Besides, it is valid the relation

\[
\langle x \rangle_{\text{out}} = \langle T \rangle \cdot \langle x \rangle_{\text{out}}^R + \langle R \rangle \cdot \langle x \rangle_{\text{out}}^L,
\]

where

\[
\langle x \rangle_{\text{out}}^R = \frac{\langle x \rangle_{\text{out}}^R}{\langle x \rangle_{\text{out}}^R}, \quad \langle x \rangle_{\text{out}}^L = \frac{\langle x \rangle_{\text{out}}^L}{\langle x \rangle_{\text{out}}^L}, \quad \langle T \rangle = \frac{\langle T \rangle}{\langle T \rangle}, \quad \langle R \rangle = \frac{\langle R \rangle}{\langle R \rangle};
\]

here \( \langle T \rangle \) and \( \langle R \rangle \) are, respectively, the transmission and reflection coefficients. A similar situation arises for the family of states \( \Psi_{\text{tot}}^L(x, t) + e^{i\lambda} \Psi_{\text{tot}}^R(x, t) \), which have a common \( in \)-asymptote \( \Psi_{\text{in}}^L(x, t) + e^{i\lambda} \Psi_{\text{in}}^R(x, t) \) with the non-observable phase \( \lambda \). Thus (see, for
example, the definition 4 in [9], this in-asymptote as well as the out-asymptote [20] should be considered as mixed vector states.

6. Asymptotic superselection rule

All this means that in the given scattering problem the Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{tot}} \), in the limit \( t \to -\infty \), is a direct sum of the subspaces \( \mathcal{H}^L_{\text{in}} \) and \( \mathcal{H}^R_{\text{in}} \) built, respectively, from the left and right in-asymptotes \( \Psi^L_{\text{in}}(x,t) \) and \( \Psi^R_{\text{in}}(x,t) \); while, in the limit \( t \to +\infty \), the space \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{tot}} \) is a direct sum of the subspaces \( \mathcal{H}^L_{\text{out}} \) and \( \mathcal{H}^R_{\text{out}} \) consisting of the left and right out-asymptotes \( \Psi^L_{\text{out}}(x,t) \) and \( \Psi^R_{\text{out}}(x,t) \), respectively:

\[
\mathcal{H}^\text{tot}_{\text{in}} \equiv \mathcal{H}_{\text{tot}} \bigg|_{t \to -\infty} = \mathcal{H}^L_{\text{in}} \oplus \mathcal{H}^R_{\text{in}}, \quad \mathcal{H}^\text{tot}_{\text{out}} \equiv \mathcal{H}_{\text{tot}} \bigg|_{t \to +\infty} = \mathcal{H}^L_{\text{out}} \oplus \mathcal{H}^R_{\text{out}}. \tag{21}
\]

More correctly, these asymptotes belong to the corresponding Schwartz subspaces:

\[
\Psi^L_{\text{in}} \in \mathcal{S}^L_{\text{in}} \subset \mathcal{H}^L_{\text{in}}, \quad \Psi^R_{\text{in}} \in \mathcal{S}^R_{\text{in}} \subset \mathcal{H}^R_{\text{in}}, \quad \Psi^L_{\text{out}} \in \mathcal{S}^L_{\text{out}} \subset \mathcal{H}^L_{\text{out}}, \quad \Psi^R_{\text{out}} \in \mathcal{S}^R_{\text{out}} \subset \mathcal{H}^R_{\text{out}}. \tag{22}
\]

We have to stress that the Schwartz subspaces \( \mathcal{S}^L_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}^R_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}^L_{\text{out}} \) and \( \mathcal{S}^R_{\text{out}} \) are invariant under the action of the position and momentum operators. The matrix elements of the position operator (and any other observable) between the subspaces \( \mathcal{S}^L_{\text{in}} \) and \( \mathcal{S}^R_{\text{in}} \), as well as between the subspaces \( \mathcal{S}^L_{\text{out}} \) and \( \mathcal{S}^R_{\text{out}} \), equal to zero:

\[
\langle \Psi^L_{\text{in}} | x | \Psi^R_{\text{in}} \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \Psi^L_{\text{out}} | x | \Psi^R_{\text{out}} \rangle = 0.
\]

This means that there is an asymptotic superselection rule in the model (see, for example, [10]).

To define the corresponding superselection operator, let us consider the operator \( \theta(\hat{x}) \) (see, for example, pp. 39 and 40 in [11]) of projection onto a subspace of functions localized on the semi-axis \((0, \infty)\) on the \( x \)-axis; here \( \theta(x) \) is the Heaviside function. Let \( \hat{S} = \theta(\hat{x}) - \theta(-\hat{x}) \).

Then, in the problem \( \hat{S}\psi(x,t) = s\psi(x,t) \), we have \( s = 1 \) and \( s = -1 \) when the eigenfunction \( \psi(x,t) \) is not equal to zero in the region \( x > 0 \) and \( x < 0 \), respectively. Thus, the left asymptotes \( \Psi^L_{\text{in}} \) and \( \Psi^L_{\text{out}} \) from the subspaces \( \mathcal{S}^L_{\text{in}} \) and \( \mathcal{S}^L_{\text{out}} \) are eigenfunctions of the operator \( \hat{S} \) corresponding to its eigenvalue \( s = -1 \), while the right asymptotes \( \Psi^R_{\text{in}} \) and \( \Psi^R_{\text{out}} \) from the subspaces \( \mathcal{S}^R_{\text{in}} \) and \( \mathcal{S}^R_{\text{out}} \) are eigenfunctions corresponding to the eigenvalue \( s = +1 \).

It is evident that this operator commutes with the position and momentum operators on states from these subspaces. Thus, \( \hat{S} \) is a superselection operator acting in \( \mathcal{H}^\text{tot}_{\text{in}} \) and \( \mathcal{H}^\text{tot}_{\text{out}} \). In this case, the subspaces \( \mathcal{H}^L_{\text{in}} \) and \( \mathcal{H}^L_{\text{out}} \) are their coherent eigen-sectors corresponding to the eigenvalue \(-1\), while \( \mathcal{H}^R_{\text{in}} \) and \( \mathcal{H}^R_{\text{out}} \) are coherent eigen-sectors corresponding to the eigenvalue \(+1\).

According to the asymptotic superselection rule, any in-asymptote of the scattering process with a two-sided incidence of a particle on the barrier is a mixed vector state; the process itself is a 'mixture' of two coherently developing scattering processes with the left- and right-sided incidence of a particle on the barrier. No observable can
be introduced for this process. In turn, each of these two “one-sided” scattering processes crosses the boundaries of the coherent sectors, as well. Thus, no observable can be defined for them, too. The position and momentum operators, as well as the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{tot}}$, cannot be regarded as self-adjoint operators in this scattering problem. This also applies to the $\hat{P}$ parity operator: this symmetry is actually broken on the scattering states $\Psi_{\text{tot}}^L(x,t)$ and $\Psi_{\text{tot}}^R(x,t)$. As will be shown below, each of the ‘one-sided’ scattering processes results from the imposition of two “pure” coherent subprocesses — the transition subprocess and the reflection subprocess, – which can be endowed with observables (and characteristic times).

7. Self-adjoint extensions associated with the ‘periodic’ and Dirichlet boundary conditions

Let us now consider the presented in [1] two “special cases” of self-adjoint extensions of the operator $\hat{H}$. One of them involves the ‘periodic’ boundary conditions

$$\psi(0^+) = \psi(0^-), \quad \psi'(0^+) = \psi'(0^-).$$

The corresponding (self-adjoint) Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$ (see [1]) will be also denoted by $\hat{H}_{\text{tr}}$:

$$\hat{H}_{\text{tr}} = \hat{H}_0 = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2}; \quad \text{Dom}(\hat{H}_0) = \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mathbb{R}).$$

It is evident that $\hat{H}_0 \neq \lim_{\kappa \to 0} H_{\kappa,0}$ because $\text{Dom}(H_{\kappa,0}) \neq \text{Dom}(\hat{H}_0)$ at any arbitrary small value of $\kappa > 0$. For a free particle, two independent solutions of the corresponding stationary Schrödinger equation are

$$\Psi_{\text{tr}}^L(x,k) = e^{ikx}, \quad \Psi_{\text{tr}}^R(x,k) = e^{-ikx}, \quad x \in (-\infty, \infty).$$

Another “special case” is associated with the Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$\psi(0^+) = \psi(0^-) = 0.$$ 

The corresponding self-adjoint extension of $\hat{H}$ will be denoted by $\hat{H}_{\text{ref}}$. Note, the boundary conditions [26] do not impose any restrictions on the derivatives $\psi'(0^+)$ and $\psi'(0^-)$, thereby totally disconnecting the physical processes in the $x$-intervals $(-\infty, 0)$ and $(0, \infty)$. Thus, $\hat{H}_{\text{ref}} \neq \lim_{\kappa \to \infty} H_{\kappa,0}$ because the boundary conditions [2] do not disconnect physical processes in these intervals even in the limit $\kappa \to \infty$. So,

$$\hat{H}_{\text{ref}} = \hat{H}_{\text{ref}}^L \oplus \hat{H}_{\text{ref}}^R,$$

and the eigenfunctions of the operators $\hat{H}_{\text{ref}}^L$ and $\hat{H}_{\text{ref}}^R$ are defined on the semi-axes $(-\infty, 0)$ and $(0, \infty)$, respectively. Solutions to the corresponding stationary Schrödinger equations are

$$\Psi_{\text{ref}}^L(x,k) = e^{ikx} - e^{-ikx}, \quad x < 0; \quad \Psi_{\text{ref}}^R(x,k) = e^{-ikx} - e^{ikx}, \quad x > 0.$$
8. Scattering states as coherent superpositions of transmission and reflection states

Let us now show that the state \( \Psi_{\text{tot}}^L(x, k) \) can be represented uniquely as a superposition of the functions \( \Psi_{\text{tr}}^L(x, k) \) and \( \Psi_{\text{ref}}^L(x, k) \). For this purpose, let us write the incident wave of the state \( \Psi_{\text{tot}}^L(x, k) \) as a superposition of two incident waves (with unknown amplitudes \( A_{\text{in}}^\text{tr}(k) \) and \( A_{\text{in}}^\text{ref}(k) \)) associated with the states \( \Psi_{\text{tr}}^L(x, k) \) and \( \Psi_{\text{ref}}^L(x, k) \). In this case, we will assume that \( A_{\text{in}}^\text{tr}(k) = |A_{\text{tr}}(k)|e^{i\mu(k)} \) and \( A_{\text{in}}^\text{ref}(k) = |A_{\text{ref}}(k)|e^{i\nu(k)} \), respectively. Real phases \( \mu \) and \( \nu \) obey the equation \( \sqrt{T(k)}e^{i\mu(k)} + \sqrt{R(k)}e^{i\nu(k)} = 1 \) which has two roots

\[
\nu(k) = \mu(k) - \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad \mu(k) = \pm \arctan \sqrt{\frac{R(k)}{T(k)}},
\]  

(29)

the corresponding amplitudes are

\[
A_{\text{in}}^\text{tr} = \sqrt{T} (\sqrt{T} \pm i\sqrt{R}) = \frac{k(k \pm i\kappa)}{k^2 + \kappa^2}, \quad A_{\text{in}}^\text{ref} = \sqrt{R} (\sqrt{R} \pm i\sqrt{T}) = \frac{\kappa(\kappa \mp i\kappa)}{k^2 + \kappa^2}.
\]

It is seen that \( A_{\text{in}}^\text{tr} = A_{\text{tr}} \) and \( A_{\text{in}}^\text{ref} = -A_{\text{ref}} \), for the lower sign; while \( A_{\text{in}}^\text{tr} = A_{\text{tr}}^* \) and \( A_{\text{in}}^\text{ref} = -A_{\text{ref}}^* \), for the upper sign. For both roots \( A_{\text{in}}^\text{tr} + A_{\text{in}}^\text{ref} = 1 \) and \( |A_{\text{in}}^\text{tr}|^2 + |A_{\text{in}}^\text{ref}|^2 = 1 \).

Considering only the amplitudes corresponding to the lower sign, it is easy to show that the function \( \Psi_{\text{tot}}^L(x, k) \) can be uniquely written as a superposition of the states \( \Psi_{\text{tr}}^L(x, k) \) and \( \Psi_{\text{ref}}^L(x, k) \). A similar superposition occurs for the state \( \Psi_{\text{tot}}^R(x, k) \):

\[
\Psi_{\text{tot}}^L(x, k) = A_{\text{in}}^\text{tr}(k)\Psi_{\text{tr}}^L(x, k) + A_{\text{in}}^\text{ref}(k)\Psi_{\text{ref}}^L(x, k);
\]

\[
\Psi_{\text{tot}}^R(x, k) = A_{\text{in}}^\text{tr}(k)\Psi_{\text{tr}}^R(x, k) + A_{\text{in}}^\text{ref}(k)\Psi_{\text{ref}}^R(x, k)
\]  

(30)

(the amplitudes \( A_{\text{in}}^\text{tr} \) and \( A_{\text{in}}^\text{ref} \), corresponding to the upper sign in the expression (29) appear in the relations complex conjugate to the relations (30)).

Thus, as it follows from (30), the nonstationary scattering states \( \Psi_{\text{tot}}^L \) and \( \Psi_{\text{tot}}^R \) can be uniquely written as coherent superpositions

\[
\Psi_{\text{tot}}^L(x, t) = \Psi_{\text{tr}}^L(x, t) + \Psi_{\text{ref}}^L(x, t), \quad \Psi_{\text{tot}}^R(x, t) = \Psi_{\text{tr}}^R(x, t) + \Psi_{\text{ref}}^R(x, t),
\]  

(31)

where

\[
\Psi_{\text{tr}}^{L,R}(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(k, t)A_{\text{in}}^{L,R}(k)\Psi_{\text{tr}}^L(x, k)dk,
\]

\[
\Psi_{\text{ref}}^{L,R}(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(k, t)A_{\text{in}}^{L,R}(k)\Psi_{\text{ref}}^L(x, k)dk.
\]  

(32)

In particular, when \( \mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}(k) \equiv \mathcal{A}_G(k) \), then

\[
\Psi_{\text{in}}^{L,R}(x, t) = i\kappa G(x, t); \quad \Psi_{\text{ref}}^L(x, t) = \begin{cases} \kappa[G(x, t) - G(-x, t)]; & x < 0 \\ 0; & x > 0 \end{cases}
\]

Due to their mathematical properties, the wave functions \( \Psi_{\text{tr}}^L(x, t) \) and \( \Psi_{\text{ref}}^L(x, t) \) can be interpreted, respectively, as “transmission” and “reflection” states that describe the transmission and reflection subprocesses of the scattering process with the left-sided incidence of a particle on the barrier. Similarly, the wave functions \( \Psi_{\text{tr}}^R(x, t) \) and
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\( \Psi_{ref}^R(x,t) \) can be interpreted as "transmission" and "reflection" states that describe the transmission and reflection subprocesses of the scattering process with the right-sided incidence of a particle on the barrier. And, since asymptotes of these subprocesses, like asymptotes of the processes themselves, are described by the same free Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_0 \), they too "live" in the coherent sectors \( \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{out}} \) and \( \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{out}} \) (see Section 6).

It is important to stress that the transmission state \( \Psi_{tr}^L(x,t) \) is associated with the 'left-sided' scattering process, while \( \Psi_{tr}^R(x,t) \) describes the transmission subprocess of the 'right-sided' process. Thus, asymptotes of these transmission states belong in each of the limits \( t \to -\infty \) and \( t \to \infty \), to different subspaces in \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{tot}} \). Thus, any superposition of these states should be considered as a mixed vector state. And, similarly to the relation (27) for the reflection subprocess, for the transmission one we have

\[ \hat{H}_{tr} = \hat{H}_{tr}^{(k>0)} \oplus \hat{H}_{tr}^{(k<0)}, \]

where the Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_{tr}^{(k>0)} \) describes free wave packets built only from waves moving from left to right, and the Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_{tr}^{(k<0)} \) describes free wave packets consisting only of waves moving in the opposite direction; the former is associated with the left-sided incidence of a particle on the barrier, while the latter does with the right-sided.

Thus, if we assume that the states \( \Psi_{tr}^L \) and \( \Psi_{ref}^L \) form, respectively, the spaces \( \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{tr}} \) and \( \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{ref}} \), while \( \Psi_{tr}^R \) and \( \Psi_{ref}^R \) form, respectively, the spaces \( \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{tr}} \) and \( \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{ref}} \). Then, with taking into account the asymptotic superselection rule and (31), we obtain

\[ \mathcal{H}_{\text{tot}} = \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{tot}} \oplus \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{tot}}; \quad \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{tot}} = \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{tr}} \oplus \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{ref}}, \quad \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{tot}} = \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{tr}} \oplus \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{ref}}. \]  

(34)

The last two relations are the result of the fact that the asymptotes associated with the transmission and reflection subprocesses belong in the limit \( t \to +\infty \) to different coherent sectors:

\[ \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{tr}} \big|_{t \to -\infty} = \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{in}}, \quad \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{tr}} \big|_{t \to +\infty} = \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{out}}, \quad \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{tr}} \big|_{t \to -\infty} = \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{in}}, \quad \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{tr}} \big|_{t \to +\infty} = \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{out}}; \]

\[ \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{ref}} \big|_{t \to -\infty} = \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{in}}, \quad \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{ref}} \big|_{t \to +\infty} = \mathcal{H}^{L}_{\text{out}}, \quad \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{ref}} \big|_{t \to -\infty} = \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{in}}, \quad \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{ref}} \big|_{t \to +\infty} = \mathcal{H}^{R}_{\text{out}}. \]  

(35)

Thus, the scattering process with one-sided incidence of a particle on the barrier is the result of the superimposition of two coherent alternative subprocesses – the transmission (tunneling) subprocess and the reflection subprocess. In this case, the quantum (one-particle) ensemble of particles participating in the scattering process with the left-sided (or right-sided) incidence of a particle on the barrier, at each instant of time, is a statistical mixture of two subensembles - a subensemble passing through the barrier and the subensemble reflecting from it.

As it follows from (35), all asymptotes associated with the subprocesses (of a 'one-sided' scattering process) are pure vector states. This means that the very states that describe the subprocesses are pure states too. As a consequence, all observables and characteristic times can be determined namely for these two subprocesses. This property makes the self-adjoint extensions \( \hat{H}_{tr} \) and \( \hat{H}_{ref} \) more important in the quantum description of this scattering process than the operator \( \hat{H}_{tot} \) which is really not self-adjoint.
9. Conclusion

It is shown that in the problem of scattering a particle by a one-dimensional $\delta$-potential barrier, there is an asymptotic superselection rule, according to which all observables and characteristic times can be introduced only for the transmission and reflection subprocesses of the scattering process with a one-sided incidence of a particle on the barrier.
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