NON-GAUSSIAN WAVES IN ŠEBA’S BILLIARD
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Abstract. The Šeba billiard, a rectangular torus with a point scatterer, is a popular model to study the transition between integrability and chaos in quantum systems. Whereas such billiards are classically essentially integrable, they may display features such as quantum ergodicity [9] which are usually associated with quantum systems whose classical dynamics is chaotic. Šeba proposed that the eigenfunctions of toral point scatterers should also satisfy Berry’s random wave conjecture, which implies that the semiclassical moments of the eigenfunctions ought to be Gaussian.

We prove a conjecture of Keating, Marklof and Winn who suggested that Šeba billiards with irrational aspect ratio violate the random wave conjecture. More precisely, in the case of diophantine tori, we construct a subsequence of eigenfunctions of essentially full density and show that its semiclassical moments cannot be Gaussian.

1. Introduction

Šeba’s billiard, a rectangular billiard $M$ with irrational aspect ratio and a Dirac mass placed in its interior, is a popular model in the field of Quantum Chaos to investigate the transition between chaos and integrability in quantum systems. The model was originally proposed by Petr Šeba in 1990 [12] and has since attracted much attention in the literature [11, 9, 10, 8, 2, 3, 15, 16, 4, 5, 6, 7]. Although, the Dirac mass only affects a measure zero subset of trajectories in phase space and thus has essentially no effect on the classical dynamics, Šeba argued that the wave functions of the associated quantized billiard may display similar features as quantum systems which are classically chaotic.

In particular, Šeba conjectured that the wave functions should obey Berry’s random wave model [1], i.e. be well approximated by a superposition of monochromatic random waves as the eigenvalue tends to infinity. A consequence of this conjecture is that the value distribution of the wave functions should converge to a standard Gaussian in this limit. In particular, denoting an $L^2$-normalized (real) wave function with eigenvalue $\lambda$ by $\psi_\lambda$, one expects
that the moments of $\psi_\lambda$ converge to the Gaussian moments as $\lambda \to \infty$:

$$
\mathbb{E}(\psi_\lambda^p) = \int_M \psi_\lambda^p d\mu \to \begin{cases} (p-1)!!, & \text{if } 2|p \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
$$

Šeba calculated the value distribution for high energy wave functions and found seemingly strong numerical evidence for a Gaussian value distribution in line with Berry’s predictions. Later Keating, Marklof and Winn cast doubt on Šeba’s conjecture when they showed that quantum star graphs, a model known to be similar in behaviour to Šeba’s billiard, did indeed violate the random wave model \cite{8, 3}.

In this paper we put this matter to rest by showing that for a Šeba billiard with diophantine aspect ratio (note that this condition holds generically), already the fourth moment of the wave functions cannot be Gaussian. In fact we can find a subsequence of arbitrarily high density such that the moment stays bounded away from the Gaussian moment as the eigenvalue tends to infinity. Our results are valid in the strong coupling regime.

1.1. Background. Before we state the results, let us recall the mathematical definition of Šeba’s billiard. In this paper we will mainly focus on periodic boundary conditions (the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions is treated in the Appendix) and thus deal with a flat 2-torus $T^2 = \mathbb{R}^2 / L$, where $L = \mathbb{Z}(a,0) \oplus \mathbb{Z}(0,1/a)$ for some $a > 0$ such that $a^4$ is a diophantine number. The formal Schrödinger operator associated with a Dirac mass placed at the point $x_0 \in T^2$ is given by

$$
-\Delta + \alpha \delta_{x_0}.
$$

This formal operator may be associated with a one-parameter family of self-adjoint extensions of the restricted positive Laplacian $-\Delta|_{C_0^\infty(T^2 - \{x_0\})}$. For the details of this theory we refer the reader to the introduction and appendix of the paper \cite{11}. We adopt the notation of this paper and refer to the self-adjoint extensions as $-\Delta_\varphi$, where $\varphi \in (-\pi, \pi)$ is the extension parameter.

One of the key features of the spectral theory of the operator $-\Delta_\varphi$ is that it represents a rank-one perturbation of the Laplacian. That is, for each Laplace eigenspace the perturbation “tears off” a new eigenvalue, and the spectrum of $-\Delta_\varphi$ therefore consists of two parts: the “old” and the “new” eigenvalues. The multiplicity of each old eigenvalue is reduced by one and the corresponding eigenspace is just the co-dimension one subspace of Laplace eigenfunctions which vanish at $x_0$. This part of the spectrum is therefore not affected by the presence of the Dirac mass. On the other hand, the new part of the spectrum “feels” the presence of the scatterer and the value distribution associated with the set of “new eigenfunctions” will be the focus of this paper.
The new eigenvalues interlace with the old Laplace eigenvalues and the associated eigenfunctions are just Green’s functions which have the following $L^2$-expansion:

$$G_\lambda(x, x_0) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{L}} e^{i\langle \xi, x-x_0 \rangle} / |\xi|^2 - \lambda.$$

The new eigenvalues interlace with the Laplace eigenvalues and can be determined as the solutions of a spectral equation \[11\]. There is in fact another quantization condition — known as a strong coupling quantization — which is considered more relevant in the physics literature and requires a renormalization of the self-adjoint extension parameter $\varphi$ as the eigenvalue $\lambda$ increases. This leads to a different spectral equation. Details are for instance discussed in the papers \[14, 13\].

1.2. Results. Let us denote by $g_\lambda = G_\lambda / \|G_\lambda\|_2$ the $L^2$-normalized new eigenfunctions. The following theorem is our main result and shows that the semi-classical 4th moment of Šeba’s billiard is not Gaussian. This implies that the value distribution of the wave functions does not converge to a Gaussian distribution in the limit as the eigenvalue tends to infinity — a contradiction to Berry’s random wave model.

**Theorem 1.1.** Consider a 2-torus with diophantine aspect ratio. Given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ there exists a subsequence of density $1 - \epsilon$ and a constant $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that for $\lambda$ large we have

$$1 - o(1) \leq \mathbb{E}(g_\lambda^4) \leq 3 - C_\epsilon + o(1).$$

2. Approximating the 4th moment

2.1. $L^4$ convergence. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be an irrational rectangular unimodular lattice and consider the 2-torus $\mathbb{T}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2 / \mathcal{L}$. Fix $\lambda > 0$ a new eigenvalue. We define $c_\lambda(\xi) := (|\xi|^2 - \lambda)^{-1}$ and we take $L = L(\lambda)$ to be an increasing function such that $L \to +\infty$ as $\lambda \to +\infty$.

The following expansion for the Green’s function holds in the $L^2$-sense:

$$G_\lambda(x) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{L}} c_\lambda(\xi) e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot x}$$

(without loss of generality we may assume that $x_0 = 0$.) Our aim is, first of all, to show that this expansion also holds in the $L^4$-sense. We thus introduce the truncated Green’s function

$$G_\lambda^T(x) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{L}, |\xi| \leq T} c_\lambda(\xi) e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot x}, \quad T = T(\lambda) \geq 10\lambda^{1/2},$$

and, therefore, we have to prove that $G_\lambda^T$ converges in $L^4(\mathbb{T}^2)$, as $T \to \infty$.

We will achieve this by showing that $G_\lambda^T$ is Cauchy in $L^4(\mathbb{T}^2)$. To this end, we will obtain a bound on the $L^4$-norm of the difference $G_\lambda^{2T} - G_\lambda^T$. Letting

$$A(T) := \{v \in \mathcal{L} : |v| \in [T, 2T]\}$$
we then have (recall $T \geq 10\lambda^{1/2}$, which implies that $c_{\lambda}(v) > 0$ for $v \in A(T)$)

\begin{equation}
\int_{T^2} |G^{2T}_\lambda(x) - G^{T}_\lambda(x)|^4 \, dx = \sum_{v_1,v_2,v_3 \in A(T), \sum_{i=1}^4 v_i = 0} \prod_{i} c_{\lambda}(v_i) \\
\ll \sum_{v_1,v_2,v_3,v_4 \in A(T), \sum_{i=1}^4 v_i = 0} \frac{1}{|v_1|^2|v_2|^2|v_3|^2|v_4|^2} \\
\ll \frac{1}{T^8} \cdot |\{v_1,v_2,v_3,v_4 \in A(T) : \sum_{i=1}^4 v_i = 0\}|
\end{equation}

and, since $v_4 = -\sum_{i=1}^3 v_i$, we find that the number of 4-tuples is at most $|A(T)|^3 \ll (T^2)^3$, and thus the above is

$$\ll \frac{1}{T^2}.$$ 

Hence

$$\|G^{2T}_\lambda - G^{T}_\lambda\|_4 \ll T^{-1/2}$$

and, similarly,

$$\|G^{k+1T}_\lambda - G^{kT}_\lambda\|_4 \ll 2^{-k/2}T^{-1/2}$$

which implies for any integers $p > q$

$$\|G^{pT}_\lambda - G^{qT}_\lambda\|_4 \ll T^{-1/2} \sum_{k=q}^{p-1} 2^{-k/2} \ll T^{-1/2}2^{-q/2}.$$ 

This then implies, by a telescopic summation, that $(G^{2T}_\lambda)_q$ is a Cauchy sequence and therefore converges to a limit in $L^4$ as $q \to \infty$. An argument similar to the one used above shows that if $T \in [2^kT, 2^{k+1}T]$ then $\|G^{kT}_\lambda - G^{T}_\lambda\|_4 \ll T^{-1/2}2^{-k/2}$, and thus $(G^{T}_\lambda)_T$ is also a Cauchy sequence.

In particular, we have

\begin{equation}
\|G\|_4^4 = \sum_{v_1,v_2,v_3 \in \mathcal{L}} c_{\lambda}(v_1)c_{\lambda}(v_2)c_{\lambda}(v_3)c_{\lambda}(v_1 + v_2 - v_3).
\end{equation}

2.2. **Further truncations.** Let $A(\lambda, L)$ denote the annulus

$$A(\lambda, L) := \{v \in \mathcal{L} : |v|^2 \in [\lambda - L, \lambda + L]\}$$

We introduce the Green’s function truncated to lattice points inside the annulus $A(\lambda, L)$

\begin{equation}
G_{\lambda,L}(x, x_0) = \sum_{\xi \in A(\lambda,L)} c_{\lambda}(\xi)e(\xi \cdot (x - x_0)), \quad c_{\lambda}(\xi) := \frac{1}{|\xi|^2 - \lambda}.
\end{equation}

\footnote{We denote by $f \ll g$ that there exists a constant $C > 0$ s.t. $f \leq Cg$.}
We have the following lemma which shows that $G_{\lambda,L}$ approximates $G_{\lambda}$ in $L^4(\mathbb{T}^2)$ as $\lambda \to \infty$. In fact it suffices to take $L$ to be any growing function of $\lambda$ which tends to infinity.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let $L = L(\lambda)$ be any increasing function that tends to infinity with $\lambda$. There exists a full density subsequence of new eigenvalues such that

$$\|G_{\lambda} - G_{\lambda,L}\|_4 \ll L^{-1/12+o(1)}.$$  

**Proof.** Let $A_+ = A_+(\lambda,L)$ denote the set $\{v \in \mathcal{L} : |v|^2 > \lambda + L\}$ and by $A_- = A_-(\lambda,L)$ the disk $\{v \in \mathcal{L} : |v|^2 < \lambda - L\}$. We begin by noting that

$$\|G_{\lambda} - G_{\lambda,L}\|_4^4 = \sum_{v_1,\ldots,v_4 \in A_+ \cup A_- : \sum_{i=1}^4 v_i = 0} \prod_{i=1}^4 \frac{1}{|v_i|^2 - \lambda};$$

writing $G_{\lambda} - G_{\lambda,L} = \sum_{v \in A_+} \sum_{v \in A_-}$ and using the $L^4$ triangle inequality we can treat large and small $v$ separately. We begin by showing that

$$\sum_{v_1,\ldots,v_4 \in A_+ \cup A_- : \sum_{i=1}^4 v_i = 0} \prod_{i=1}^4 \frac{1}{|v_i|^2 - \lambda}$$

is small (for most $\lambda$) given that $L$ grows as a small power of $\lambda$. Up to a bounded combinatorial factor, we may after reordering terms assume that $|v_{i+1}|^2 - \lambda \geq |v_i|^2 - \lambda > 0$ for $i = 1,2,3$, hence $|v_4|^2 - \lambda \geq \prod_{i=1}^3 (|v_i|^2 - \lambda)^{1/3}$; on noting that $v_4$ is determined by $v_1,v_2,v_3$, it is enough to show that

$$\prod_{i=1}^3 \left( \sum_{|v_i|^2 \geq \lambda + L} \frac{1}{(|v_i|^2 - \lambda)^{4/3}} \right) = o(1).$$

In particular, it is enough to show that $\sum_{|v|^2 \geq \lambda + L} \frac{1}{(|v|^2 - \lambda)^{4/3}} = o(1)$; which in turn reduces to showing that

$$\sum_{2\lambda \geq |v|^2 \geq \lambda + L} \frac{1}{(|v|^2 - \lambda)^{4/3}} = o(1)$$

(to see this, use Weyl’s law and partial summation to bound the contribution from $v$ such that $|v|^2 > 2\lambda$.)

Now, given an integer $k \geq 0$, let $M(k)$ denote the number of eigenvalues in the interval $[k,k+1)$, or equivalently, the number of lattice points $v$ such that $|v|^2 \in [k,k+1)$. We consider the sum over all eigenvalues $\lambda \in (T/2,T)$, and show that the mean is small. More precisely,

$$\sum_{T/2 < \lambda < T} \sum_{2\lambda \geq |v|^2 \geq \lambda + L} \frac{1}{(|v|^2 - \lambda)^{4/3}} \ll \sum_{\lambda \geq k \geq L} M(l) \sum_{l \leq T} \sum_{\lambda \geq k \geq L} \frac{M(l+k)}{k^{4/3}}$$

which, using the same argument as in the proof of [10 Lemma 3] is

$$\ll \sum_{\lambda \geq k \geq L} \frac{1}{k^{4/3}} \sum_{l \leq T} M(l)M(k+l) \ll \sum_{\lambda \geq k \geq L} \frac{1}{k^{4/3}} \sum_{l \leq T} M(l)^2 \ll L^{-1/3}T.$$
Hence, using Chebychev’s inequality, for most $\lambda \in (T/2, T)$ we find that
\[
\sum_{v \in \mathcal{L}: |v|^2 \geq \lambda + L} \frac{1}{(|v|^2 - \lambda)^{4/3}} \ll L^{-1/3+o(1)}.
\]
A similar argument shows that, for most $\lambda \in (T/2, T)$,
\[
\sum_{v \in \mathcal{L}: |v|^2 \leq \lambda - L} \frac{1}{(|v|^2 - \lambda)^{4/3}} \ll L^{-1/3+o(1)}
\]
and hence the $L^4$ norm is $\ll L^{-1/12+o(1)}$.

\[\square\]

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

One finds (cf. the $L^2$ expansion of the Green’s function, eq. (3.22), p. 770, in [11], and note that we have to omit the factor $1/4\pi^2$, since our lattice is unimodular) that

\[
\|G_\lambda\|_2^2 = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{L}} \frac{1}{(|\xi|^2 - \lambda)^2} = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} + \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{r(n)}{(n-\lambda)^2},
\]
where $r(n)$ is the multiplicity of the Laplace eigenvalue $n$ and
\[\mathcal{N} = \{ n_0 = 0 < n_1 < n_2 < \cdots \}\]
denotes the set of distinct Laplace eigenvalues.

Also (cf. (2.2)),
\[
\|G_\lambda\|_4^4 = \sum_{\xi,\eta \in \mathcal{L}} \frac{1}{(|\xi|^2 - \lambda)(|\eta|^2 - \lambda)(|\xi|^2 - \lambda)(|\eta|^2 - \lambda)}.
\]

3.1. The sequence $\Lambda_g$. We refer the reader to sections 6 and 7 of the paper [11] and recall that $\theta < 1/3$ denotes the best known exponent in the error term for the circle problem (due to Huxley). Adopting the notation of this paper we let $\delta \in \left(0, \frac{2}{3}(\frac{1}{2} - \theta)\right)$ and define
\[
S(\lambda) = \bigcup_{0 \neq \zeta \in \mathcal{L} \atop |\zeta| < \lambda^{\delta/2}} S_\zeta,
\]
where we define for any $\zeta \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{0\}$ the set of solutions to a certain diophantine inequality (cf. eq. (6.1), p. 773, in [11])
\[
S_\zeta := \{ \eta \in \mathcal{L} \mid |\langle \eta, \zeta \rangle| \leq |\eta|^{2\delta} \}.
\]
We will show that the set of “good” eigenvalues
\[
\Lambda_g = \{ \lambda \in \Lambda \mid A(\lambda, \lambda^\delta) \cap S(\lambda) = \emptyset \}.
\]
is of full density in Λ. In fact we can show
\[ \{ \lambda \in \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_g \mid \lambda \leq X \} \ll X^{1-\delta_0} \]
for \(\delta_0 = \frac{1}{2} - \theta - \frac{2}{3}\delta > 0\).

To see this, observe that the complement of \(\Lambda_g\), i.e. the set of “bad”
eigenvalues which we denote by \(\Lambda_b\), is of the form
\[ \Lambda_b = \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_g = \bigcup_{0 \neq \zeta \in \mathcal{L} \mid \zeta < \lambda^{\delta/2}} B_{\zeta} \]
where \(B_{\zeta} = \{ \lambda \in \Lambda \mid A(\lambda, \lambda^\delta) \cap S_{\zeta} \neq \emptyset \}\). Here we used
\[ \lambda \notin \Lambda_g \Leftrightarrow A(\lambda, \lambda^\delta) \cap S(\lambda) \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow \bigcup_{0 \neq \zeta \in \mathcal{L} \mid \zeta < \lambda^{\delta/2}} (A(\lambda, \lambda^\delta) \cap S_{\zeta}) \neq \emptyset \]
which is equivalent to
\[ \exists \zeta \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{0\} : |\zeta| < \lambda^{\delta/2} \text{ and } A(\lambda, \lambda^\delta) \cap S_{\zeta} \neq \emptyset \]
which is again equivalent to
\[ \lambda \in \bigcup_{0 \neq \zeta \in \mathcal{L} \mid \zeta < \lambda^{\delta/2}} B_{\zeta}. \]

We recall the bound (6.4) in [11], namely that
\[ |\{ \lambda \in B_{\zeta} \mid \lambda \leq X \}| \leq \frac{X^{1/2+\theta+\delta}}{|\zeta|} \]
and apply this to see
\[ |\{ \lambda \in \Lambda_b \mid \lambda \leq X \}| \leq X^{1/2+\theta+\delta} \sum_{0 \neq \zeta \in \mathcal{L} \mid \zeta < \lambda^{\delta/2}} \frac{1}{|\zeta|} \ll X^{1/2+\theta+3\delta/2} = X^{1-\delta_0} \]
for \(\delta_0 = \frac{1}{2} - \theta - \frac{2}{3}\delta > 0\) (we stress that in the proof of this bound only the condition \(\delta < \frac{\theta}{3(\frac{1}{2} - \theta)}\) is required).

3.2. Diagonal solutions. We begin with the following Lemma which shows that if \(\lambda \in \Lambda_g\), then \(A(\lambda, L)\) contains only lattice points that are reasonably well-spaced. Recall that \(a^2\) is the aspect ratio of the lattice \(\mathcal{L}\).

**Lemma 3.1.** Let \(1 \leq \lambda \in \Lambda_g\) and \(L < \frac{1}{2} \min(a, 1/a) \lambda^{3/2}\). If \(\xi\) and \(\eta\) are two distinct lattice points belonging to \(A(\lambda, L)\), then \(|\xi - \eta| \geq \lambda^{\delta/2}\).

**Proof.** To see this, put \(\beta = \eta - \xi\) and suppose for contradiction that \(|\beta| = |\eta - \xi| < \lambda^{\delta/2}\). As \(\lambda \in \Lambda_g\), and \(\xi \in A(\lambda, L)\) we find that
\[ ||\xi|^2 - \lambda| = ||\eta - \beta|^2 - \lambda| < L \]
and after multiplying out we obtain
\[ ||\eta|^2 - \lambda + |\beta|^2 - 2 \langle \eta, \beta \rangle | < L. \]
Now, since $|\beta| < \lambda \delta/2$ and $\eta \in A(\lambda, L)$, it follows

$$2|\langle \eta, \beta \rangle| < ||\eta||^2 - \lambda + |\beta|^2 + L \leq ||\eta||^2 - \lambda + |\beta|^2 + L < 2L + \lambda \delta$$

and, since our assumption implies $L < \frac{1}{4} \lambda \delta/2$,

$$|\langle \eta, \beta \rangle| < L + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \delta < \frac{1}{4} \lambda \delta/2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \delta < \frac{3}{4} \lambda \delta \leq (\frac{3}{4})^{1-\delta} ||\eta||^2 \leq ||\eta||^2,$$

where we used $\lambda \leq ||\eta||^2 + L < ||\eta||^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda$ and therefore $\lambda \leq \frac{4}{3} ||\eta||^2$.

This shows that $A(\lambda, \lambda \delta) \cap S \neq \emptyset$, for some $\beta \neq 0$ such that $|\beta| < \lambda \delta/2$, which in turn implies $A(\lambda, \lambda \delta) \cap S \neq \emptyset$. This, however, is a contradiction to $\lambda \in \Lambda_g$. So it follows that $|\beta| \geq \lambda \delta/2$. □

The following key Lemma will be used in the computation of the fourth moment.

**Lemma 3.2.** Let $\lambda \in \Lambda_g$, $\lambda \delta/2 > 2$ and $L < \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \min(a, 1/a) \lambda \delta/2$. Let $\xi, \eta \in A(\lambda, L)$, and assume that $\xi \neq \eta$ are fixed. The equation

$$(3.3) \quad \xi - \eta = \eta' - \xi', \quad \xi', \eta' \in A(\lambda, L)$$

has only the trivial solutions

$$(3.4) \quad (\xi', \eta') = \begin{cases} (\eta, \xi) \\ (-\xi, -\eta) \end{cases}.$$

**Proof.** We define the annulus centered at $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$A(\omega) = A(\omega, L) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid ||x - \omega||^2 - \lambda < L \}$$

and denote $A = A(0)$, $B = A \cap L$. Let $\eta, \xi \in B$ and denote $\beta = \eta - \xi$.

We consider the set

$$(3.5) \quad S(\beta) = \{ (\eta', \xi') \in B \times B \mid \eta' - \xi' = \beta \}$$

and prove that

$$S(\beta) = \{ (\eta, \xi), (-\xi, -\eta) \}.$$

First of all we have from Lemma 3.1 that $|\xi - \eta|, |\xi + \eta| \geq \lambda \delta/2$. Also note that any element $(\eta', \xi')$ of $S(\beta)$ satisfies

$$\lambda - L < |\eta'|^2 < \lambda + L$$

and

$$\lambda - L < |\xi|^2 = |\eta' - \beta|^2 < \lambda + L$$

and thus $\eta'$ is constrained to lie in $A \cap A(\beta) \cap L$. Rotate $A$ around the origin such that $\beta$ is horizontal.

**Two connected components.** The set

$$A \cap A(\beta) =: D(\eta) \cup D(-\xi)$$

is the union of two approximate parallelograms containing $\eta$ and $-\xi$ respectively (cf. Figure 1.) To see that the intersection of the two annuli cannot have a single connected component, we let $R = \sqrt{\lambda + L}$, $r = \sqrt{\lambda - L}$
and note that the case of a single connected component is equivalent to the inequality

$$\sqrt{\lambda - L} = r \leq \frac{1}{2} |\beta|.$$  

Suppose, for a contradiction, that this inequality holds. Then

$$\frac{1}{4} |\beta|^2 + \frac{1}{4} |\xi + \eta|^2 = \frac{1}{4} |\xi - \eta|^2 + \frac{1}{4} |\xi + \eta|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} (|\xi|^2 + |\eta|^2) \leq R^2 = \lambda + L.$$  

These two inequalities imply, on recalling our assumption $L < \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} \min(a, 1/a) \lambda^{\delta/2},$

$$\frac{1}{4} |\eta + \xi|^2 \leq \lambda + L - \frac{1}{4} |\beta|^2 \leq 2L < \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{\delta/2}$$

and thus $|\eta + \xi| < \sqrt{2} \lambda^{\delta/4}$. But, as we saw above, our assumption $\lambda \in \Lambda_g$ implies $|\eta + \xi| \geq \lambda^{\delta/2}$, which contradicts the assumption $\lambda^{\delta/2} > 2$.

Finding the solutions. We introduce coordinates $x, y$ such that the annulus $\mathcal{A}$ is centered at $(x, y) = (0, 0)$ and $\mathcal{A}(\beta)$ is centered at $(|\beta|/2, 0)$. We compute the coordinates of the vertices $\omega_1, \omega_2, \nu_1, \nu_2$ of $\mathcal{D}(\eta)$ in order to calculate the distances $h = |\omega_1 - \omega_2|$ and $w = |\nu_1 - \nu_2|$ (cf. Figure 1).
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**Figure 1.** The intersection of the two annuli $\mathcal{A}(0)$ and $\mathcal{A}(\beta)$. In order to calculate the diameter of the approximate parallelogram $\mathcal{D}(\eta)$ with the vertices $\omega_1, \omega_2, \nu_1, \nu_2$ we have applied a rotation and introduced cartesian coordinates $x, y$ such that $\beta = (0, |\beta|)$ in these new coordinates.
We aim for a bound on the diameter of $\mathcal{D}$ which is smaller than the minimal distance between two lattice points, so that $\mathcal{D}$ may contain at most one lattice point. To this end, we observe that $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{R} = [x_-, x_+] \times [y_L, y_R]$, where $x_-, x_+$ are the $x$-coordinates of the points $\nu_1, \nu_2$ and $y_L, y_R$ are the $y$-coordinates of the points $\omega_1, \omega_2$. We then bound the diameter of $\mathcal{R}$.

By solving the equations
\[x^2 + y^2 = r_1^2, \quad (x - |\beta|)^2 + y^2 = r_2^2\]
for the cases $r_1 = r, R$ and $r_2 = r, R$, we obtain
\[\omega_1 = \left( \frac{1}{2} |\beta|, y_r \right), \quad \omega_2 = \left( \frac{1}{2} |\beta|, y_R \right)\]
where $y_r = \sqrt{r^2 - \frac{1}{4}|\beta|^2}$ and $y_R = \sqrt{R^2 - \frac{1}{4}|\beta|^2}$. It follows that
\[h = |\omega_1 - \omega_2| = y_R - y_r = \sqrt{R^2 - \frac{1}{4}|\beta|^2} - \sqrt{r^2 - \frac{1}{4}|\beta|^2}\]
and therefore (recall $R = \sqrt{\lambda + L}$ and $r = \sqrt{\lambda - L}$)
\[h = \frac{R^2 - r^2}{\sqrt{R^2 - \frac{1}{4}|\beta|^2} + \sqrt{r^2 - \frac{1}{4}|\beta|^2}} = \frac{2L}{\sqrt{\lambda + L - \frac{1}{4}|\beta|^2} + \sqrt{\lambda - L - \frac{1}{4}|\beta|^2}}.\]

Furthermore, by symmetry we have
\[\nu_1 = (x_-, y_\nu), \quad \nu_2 = (x_+, y_\nu)\]
for some $y_\nu > 0$ and $x_\pm = \frac{1}{2} |\beta| \pm \Delta_\nu$ for some $\Delta_\nu > 0$. We then have
\[|\nu_1 - \nu_2| = 2\Delta_\nu.\]

In order to determine $\Delta_\nu$ we solve the system of equations
\[x_-^2 + y_\nu^2 = r^2, \quad x_+^2 + y_\nu^2 = R^2\]
which implies
\[x_+^2 - x_-^2 = R^2 - r^2.\]
It follows that $2|\beta|\Delta_\nu = R^2 - r^2 = 2L$. In summary, using that $|\beta| = |\eta - \xi| \geq \lambda^{\delta/2}$, we find that
\[h = \frac{2L}{\sqrt{\lambda + L - \frac{1}{4}|\beta|^2} + \sqrt{\lambda - L - \frac{1}{4}|\beta|^2}} \quad \text{and} \quad w = \frac{2L}{|\beta|} < \frac{2L}{\lambda^{\delta/2}},\]
respectively. Now, since $0 < L < \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} \min(a, 1/a) \lambda^{\delta/2}$, it follows that $w < \min(a, 1/a) / \sqrt{2}$ and
\[h \leq \frac{2L}{\sqrt{R^2 - \frac{1}{4}|\beta|^2}} \leq \frac{4L}{\lambda^{\delta/2}} < \frac{\min(a, 1/a)}{\sqrt{2}},\]
since $\frac{1}{4}|\beta|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|\xi + \eta|^2 = \frac{1}{2}(|\xi|^2 + |\eta|^2) \leq R^2$ and $|\xi + \eta| \geq \lambda^{\delta/2}$.

It follows that $\text{diam } \mathcal{D}(\eta) \leq \text{diam } \mathcal{R}(\eta) = \sup_{x,y \in \mathcal{R}(\eta)} |x - y| \leq \sqrt{2} \max\{w, h\} < \min(a, 1/a)$ and, therefore, $\eta$ is the only lattice point in $\mathcal{D}(\eta)$. 
By symmetry it follows that $D(-\xi)$ also contains only the lattice point $-\xi$. This proves the claim. \hfill $\square$

3.3. Evaluating the fourth moment. Recall the truncated Green’s function

\begin{equation}
G_{\lambda,L}(x,x_0) = \sum_{\xi \in A(\lambda,L)} c_\lambda(\xi) e(\xi \cdot (x-x_0)), \quad c_\lambda(\xi) = \frac{1}{|\xi|^2 - \lambda}.
\end{equation}

We evaluate the $L^4$-norm of the truncated Green’s function in terms of its $L^2$-norm.

**Lemma 3.3.** Let $\lambda \in \Lambda_g$ and $L < \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} \min(a,1/a)\lambda^{\delta/2}$. Then

\begin{equation}
\mathbb{E} \left( \frac{G_{\lambda,L}^4}{\|G_{\lambda,L}\|_2^4} \right) = 3 - 2 \sum_{\xi \in A(\lambda,L)} c_\lambda(\xi)^4.
\end{equation}

**Proof.** Let

\[ a_\xi = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{|\xi|^2 - \lambda}, & \text{if } ||\xi|^2 - \lambda| < L \\
0, & \text{otherwise;}
\end{cases} \]

and clearly $a_\xi = a_{-\xi}$. Now

\begin{equation}
\|G_{\lambda,L}\|_4^4 = \sum_{\xi_1,\xi_2,\eta_1,\eta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^2} a_{\xi_1} a_{\xi_2} a_{\eta_1} a_{\eta_2}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= \sum_{0=\xi_1 - \eta_1 = \eta_2 - \xi_2} a_{\xi_1} a_{\xi_2} a_{\eta_1} a_{\eta_2}
+ \sum_{\beta \neq 0} a_{\xi_1} a_{\xi_2} a_{\eta_1} a_{\eta_2}.
\end{equation}

The first sum can be rewritten as

\begin{equation}
\sum_{\xi_1,\xi_2} a_{\xi_1}^2 a_{\xi_2}^2 = \|G_{\lambda,L}\|_2^4.
\end{equation}

With regard to the second sum let us consider the solutions of the equation

$\eta_2 - \xi_2 = \beta$

where

$0 \neq \beta = \xi_1 - \eta_1$

and

$\xi_1, \xi_2, \eta_1, \eta_2 \in A(\lambda,L)$.

\footnote{Recall that $\mathbb{E}(f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x)dx$.}
Our assumption that $\lambda \in \Lambda_g$, together with Lemma 3.4, implies that the only solutions are of the form

$$\begin{cases} (\xi_1, \eta_1) \\ (-\xi_1, -\eta_1) \end{cases}$$

Hence, we can rewrite the second sum as

$$2 \sum_{\xi, \eta, \xi \neq \eta} a_\eta^2 a_\xi^2 = 2 \|G_{\lambda,L}\|_2^4 - 2 \sum_\xi a_\xi^4.$$ 

The result follows.

We have the following Lemma which shows that the 4th moment cannot be Gaussian, unless the Laplace spectrum has unbounded multiplicities.

**Lemma 3.4.** Given $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ there exists a subsequence of new eigenvalues of density $1 - \epsilon$ and a constant $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that we have

$$\frac{\sum_{\xi \in A(\lambda,L)} c_\lambda(\xi)^4}{\|G_{\lambda,L}\|_2^4} \geq C_\epsilon.$$ 

**Proof.** There exists a subsequence of new eigenvalues (cf. [10], in particular the remarks after Lemma 4.2) of density $1 - \epsilon$ such that a positive proportion of the $L^2$-norm is captured by a finite set of frequencies in the sense that

$$\sum_n \frac{r_L(n)}{(n - \lambda)^2} \approx \epsilon \sum_{|n - \lambda| \leq 3} \frac{r_L(n)}{(n - \lambda)^2}$$

and, as $\lambda \to \infty$ along this subsequence, that $|\{n \mid |n - \lambda| \leq 3\}|$ remains bounded.

This implies

$$\left( \sum_{|n - \lambda| \leq L} \frac{r_L(n)}{(n - \lambda)^2} \right)^2 \ll \epsilon \left( \sum_{|n - \lambda| \leq 3} \frac{r_L(n)}{(n - \lambda)^2} \right)^2$$

$$\ll |\{n \mid |n - \lambda| \leq 3\}| \sum_{|n - \lambda| \leq 3} \frac{r_L(n)}{(n - \lambda)^4}$$

$$\ll \sum_{|n - \lambda| \leq L} \frac{r_L(n)}{(n - \lambda)^4} = \sum_{\xi \in A(\lambda,L)} a_\xi^4,$$

where we used Cauchy-Schwarz and the fact that the multiplicities $r_L(n)$ are bounded.

It is a simple consequence of the Lemma above that if the multiplicities in the unperturbed Laplace spectrum are bounded, as is the case for Šeba’s billiard in the irrational aspect ratio case, then one can construct an essentially full density subsequence of new eigenvalues such that the 4th moment
does not converge to the Gaussian 4th moment, as the eigenvalue tends to infinity.

**Corollary 3.5.** Denote by $g_{\lambda, L}$ the $L^2$-normalized, truncated new eigenfunctions for a point scatterer on an irrational torus with Diophantine aspect ratio. Assume $L < \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} \min(a, 1/a)\lambda^{3/2}$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $C_\epsilon > 0$ and a subsequence of density $1 - \epsilon$ such that

$$1 \leq \mathbb{E}(g_{\lambda, L}^4) \leq 3 - 2C_\epsilon$$

as $\lambda \to \infty$ along said subsequence.

**Proof.** We recall that there exists a full density subsequence $\Lambda_g$ such that for $\lambda \in \Lambda_g$ we have

$$\frac{\|G_{\lambda, L}\|_4^4}{\|G_{\lambda, L}\|_2^4} = 3 - 2\sum_{\xi \in A(\lambda, L)} c_\lambda(\xi)^4 \frac{\|G_{\lambda, L}\|_4^4}{\|G_{\lambda, L}\|_2^4}. $$

We also note

$$\sum_{\xi \in A(\lambda, L)} c_\lambda(\xi)^4 \leq \left( \sum_{\xi \in A(\lambda, L)} c_\lambda(\xi)^2 \right)^2 = \|G_{\lambda, L}\|_2^4. $$

At the same time Lemma [3.4] shows that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $C_\epsilon > 0$ and a subsequence of density $1 - \epsilon$ such that

$$1 \geq \frac{\sum_{\xi \in A(\lambda, L)} c_\lambda(\xi)^4}{\|G_{\lambda, L}\|_2^4} \geq C_\epsilon$$

More precisely, if we take $\lambda$ belonging to the intersection of the two subsequences (a subsequence of density $1 - 2\epsilon$) we have

$$1 \leq \mathbb{E}(g_{\lambda, L}^4) \leq 3 - 2C_\epsilon. $$

□

In order to conclude the proof of the theorem we need the following approximation.

**Lemma 3.6.** Suppose that $L = L(\lambda)$ is an increasing function that grows at least as a small power of $\lambda$ (within the constraints of Corollary 3.5). There exists a full density subsequence $\{\lambda_k\}_k$ of $\{\lambda_j\}_j$ s.t.

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\|G_{\lambda_k, L}\|_4^4}{\|G_{\lambda_k, L}\|_2^4} = 0. $$

**Proof.** Recall $\mathbb{E}(g_{\lambda, L}^4) = \|G_{\lambda_k, L}\|_4^4/\|G_{\lambda_k, L}\|_2^4$.

Since $\|G_{\lambda_k, L}\|_4/\|G_{\lambda_k, L}\|_2$ is bounded (from both above and below by Corollary 3.5), it is sufficient to show that

$$\frac{\|G_{\lambda_k, L}\|_4^4}{\|G_{\lambda_k, L}\|_2^4} \to 0. $$
We have
\[
\frac{\|G_{\lambda_{jk}} - G_{\lambda_{jk},L}\|_4}{\|G_{\lambda_{jk},L}\|_2^2} \leq \frac{1}{\|G_{\lambda_{jk}}\|_2} \left( \|G_{\lambda_{jk}}\|_4 - \|G_{\lambda_{jk},L}\|_4 \right) + \frac{1}{\|G_{\lambda_{jk}}\|_2} \left( \|G_{\lambda_{jk},L}\|_4^2 - \|G_{\lambda_{jk},L}\|_2^2 \right)
\]
(3.12)
and if we recall that, up to extraction of a sparse subsequence, \(\|G_{\lambda_{jk}}\|_2 \gg \epsilon \lambda^{-\epsilon}\), as well as Corollary 3.5 and finally the reverse triangle inequality
\[
|\|f\|_p - \|g\|_p| \leq \|f - g\|_p, \quad p = 2, 4,
\]
then we obtain the bound
\[
\ll \epsilon \lambda^\epsilon \left\{ \|G_{\lambda_{jk}} - G_{\lambda_{jk},L}\|_4 + \|G_{\lambda_{jk}} - G_{\lambda_{jk},L}\|_2 \right\}
\ll \lambda^\epsilon \left\{ L^{-1/12 + o(1)} + L^{-1/2 + o(1)} \right\} \to 0, \quad \text{as } \lambda \to \infty,
\]
where we used that \(L\) grows as a small power of \(\lambda\), as well as Lemma 2.1 as well as
\[
\|G_{\lambda_{jk}} - G_{\lambda_{jk},L}\|_2^2 = \sum_{\|\xi\|^2 - \lambda_{jk} \geq L} \frac{1}{(|\xi|^2 - \lambda_{jk})^2} \ll L^{-1 + o(1)}.
\]
\[
\square
\]
If we take \(\lambda\) belonging to the intersection of the subsequences of Corollary 3.5 and Lemma 3.6 (which constitutes a subsequence of density \(1 - \epsilon\)), then we have for \(\lambda\) sufficiently large
\[
\|g_\lambda\|_4^4 - \|g_{\lambda,L}\|_4^4 = o(1)
\]
and
\[
\|g_{\lambda,L}\|_4^4 \in [1, 3 - 2C_\epsilon].
\]
Hence, it follows (recall \(E(g_\lambda^4) = \|g_\lambda\|_4^4\))
\[
1 - o(1) \leq E(g_\lambda^4) \leq 3 - 2C_\epsilon + o(1).
\]

**Appendix A. Dirichlet boundary conditions**

In [12] Šeba discussed irrational aspect ratio rectangles with Dirichlet boundary conditions rather than rectangular tori. In particular, this means that the wave functions and the spectrum depend on the position of the scatterer. We briefly discuss here how our results can easily be extended to this setting.

Let us denote the position of the scatterer by \(y\). The new eigenfunctions are then of the form
\[
G_\lambda(x) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{L}_+^+} c_\lambda(\xi) \psi_\xi(y) \psi_\xi(x)
\]
(A.1)
where $\psi_\xi(x) = \sin(2\pi \xi_1 x_1) \sin(2\pi \xi_2 x_2)$. We note that the summation can easily be written over $L$:

$$G_\lambda(x) = -\frac{1}{4} \sum_{\xi \in L} c_\lambda(\xi) \psi_\xi(y) \chi(\xi) e(\xi \cdot x)$$

and $\chi(\xi) = \text{sgn}(\xi_1) \text{sgn}(\xi_2)$.

In order to prove the analogue of Theorem 1.1 we require analogues of the argument for the $L^4$-convergence in section 2.1, as well as the Lemmas 2.1, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.6.

The arguments of section 2.1 and Lemma 2.1 work analogously because of the bound $|\psi_\xi(y)| \leq 1$.

The proof of Lemma 3.3 works exactly the same way, as it only depends on the structure of the set of lattice points in the annulus $A(\lambda, L)$. In the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions it yields

$$E\left( \frac{G_{\lambda,L}^4}{\|G_{\lambda,L}\|_2^4} \right) = 3 - 2 \sum_{\xi \in A(\lambda,L)} c_\lambda(\xi) \psi_\xi(y)^4 \frac{\|G_{\lambda,L}\|_2^4}{\|G_{\lambda,L}\|_2^4}$$

and

$$\|G_{\lambda,L}\|_2^2 = \sum_{\xi \in A(\lambda,L)} c_\lambda(\xi) \psi_\xi(y)^2$$

The analogue of Lemma 3.4 can then be readily obtained by replacing $r_L(n)$ with the function

$$r_L(n, y) = \sum_{|\xi|^2=n} \psi_\xi(y)^2 \leq r_L(n),$$

provided we can construct a (large density) subsequence of eigenvalues such that

$$\sum_{|n-\lambda| \leq 3} \frac{r_L(n)}{(n-\lambda)^4} \ll \sum_{|n-\lambda| \leq 3} \frac{r_L(n, y)}{(n-\lambda)^4}.$$

To do this, we define the “bad” set of eigenvalues

$$B = \{\lambda_k \in \Lambda' | \exists n \in \mathcal{N} : |n-\lambda_k| \leq 3, |\psi_\xi(y)| < \delta, |\xi|^2 = n\}$$

where $\Lambda'$ denotes the subsequence of eigenvalues such that $\#\{n | |n-\lambda_k| \leq 3\}$ remains bounded. For $\epsilon > 0$ we may construct $\Lambda'$ of density at least $1 - \epsilon$ such that $\#\{n | |n-\lambda_k| \leq 3\} \leq N(\epsilon)$.

We can now estimate the cardinality of the bad set, because for each $n \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $|\psi_\xi(y)| < \delta$ for $|\xi|^2 = n$ there exists only a finite number $K_\epsilon$ of $\lambda_k \in \Lambda'$ with $|\lambda_k - n| \leq 3$. At the same time

$$\#\{n \in \mathcal{N} | |\psi_\xi(y)| < \delta, |\xi|^2 = n\} = O(\delta T)$$

so that $|B| = O(\delta T K_\epsilon)$ and we can make $\delta$ small enough in terms of $\epsilon$ such that the subsequence of bad eigenvalues is of density less than $\epsilon$. So excluding the bad eigenvalues we obtain a subsequence of density at least $1 - 2\epsilon$. 

The proof of Lemma 3.6 however, requires a lower bound for $\|G_{\lambda,L}\|_2$. In fact, it was already pointed out in the appendix of [10] that for a generic position $y$, in the sense that the coordinates $y_1, y_2$ are irrational, there exists a subsequence of Laplace eigenvalues of arbitrarily high density such that for $|\xi|^2 = n$ we have $\lim \inf_{n \to \infty} |\psi_{\xi}(y)| > 0$. This yields the lower bound $\|G_{\lambda,L}\|_2 \gg \epsilon \lambda^{-\epsilon}$.
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