

# Constructing Solvable Models of Vector Non-linear Schrödinger Equation with Balanced Loss and Gain via Non-unitary transformation

Pijush K. Ghosh\*

*Department of Physics, Siksha-Bhavana, Visva-Bharati University, Santiniketan, PIN 731 235, India.*

(Dated: September 9, 2021)

We consider vector Non-linear Schrödinger Equation(NLSE) with balanced loss-gain(BLG), linear coupling(LC) and a general form of cubic nonlinearity. We use a non-unitary transformation to show that the system can be exactly mapped to the same equation without the BLG and LC, and with a modified time-modulated nonlinear interaction. The nonlinear term remains invariant, while BLG and LC are removed completely, for the special case of a pseudo-unitary transformation. The mapping is generic and may be used to construct exactly solvable autonomous as well as non-autonomous vector NLSE with BLG. We present an exactly solvable two-component vector NLSE with BLG which exhibits power-oscillation. An example of a vector NLSE with BLG and arbitrary even number of components is also presented.

The NLSE finds application in many diverse branches of modern science, including optics[1–3], Bose-Einstein Condensation(BEC)[4], plasma physics[5], gravity waves[6] and  $\alpha$ -helix protein dynamics[7]. The homogeneous and autonomous NLSE with cubic nonlinearity is integrable in  $1 + 1$  dimensions admitting soliton solutions[1]. The NLSE has a rich mathematical structure[2] and considered as one of the important examples in the field of integrable and exactly solvable models. Several generalizations of NLSE have been considered over the years to describe and model various emerging physical phenomenon[3, 4, 8–13]. For example, the study on homogeneous and autonomous NLSE paved the way for a better understanding of wave-propagation in non-linear media in the context of optics[3]. Similarly, investigations on inhomogeneous and non-autonomous NLSE[3, 13] became relevant after the experimental realizations of BEC[4]. With the emergence of Parity-Time( $\mathcal{PT}$ ) symmetric theory[14] and its growing relevance in optics and other areas, study on generalized NLSE has been further diversified into several directions[15]. A few active areas of research in the context of  $\mathcal{PT}$  symmetric theory are NLSE with  $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric confining complex potential[16], non-local NLSE[17, 18], NLSE with BLG[15, 19–24].

The central focus of this article is on NLSE with BLG in which the components of a vector NLSE are subjected to loss and gain such that the net flow out of the system is zero, i.e. the loss and gain are balanced. A particular class of NLSE with constant[19] as well as time-dependent[20] BLG has been investigated earlier. In the terminology of optics, the nonlinear interaction contains both self-phase modulation as well as cross-phase modulation terms. The system has been investigated from the viewpoint of solitons, modulational instability,  $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetry breaking, exceptional points etc. and the relevant results are nicely reviewed in Ref. [15]. All these investigations are mostly based on numerical and approx-

imate methods. Integrable and/or exactly solvable NLSE with BLG are still elusive. Within this background, we investigate a more general class of NLSE with BLG which contains terms related to four-wave mixing in addition to self-phase and cross-phase modulation terms. We present a generic method to investigate such systems analytically leading to exact solutions under certain conditions.

We show that the BLG and LC terms may be removed completely from a class of NLSE with BLG via a non-unitary transformation with its effect manifested in the time-dependence of the nonlinear term. The non-unitary transformation may be viewed as a gauge transformation involving complex scalar gauge potential. A real scalar potential corresponds to the vanishing loss-gain terms and the two systems become gauge-equivalent, since the non-unitary transformation reduces to a unitary transformation in this limit. The power-spectra and other observables have same time-dependence for both the cases. However, for a non-vanishing imaginary part of the complex scalar potential, the original and the mapped systems are not gauge equivalent and the observables have different time-dependence. We show that exact and analytical solutions of a class of non-autonomous vector NLSE with specified time-dependence may be found by mapping it to solvable autonomous system via non-unitary transformations. The time-dependence of observables of these two systems are different due to the non-unitary nature of the transformation that connects them. There is a special class of non-unitary transformation, namely pseudo-unitary[25] transformation, for which the NLSE with BLG can be mapped to the same NLSE without the loss-gain terms. The nonlinear term remains invariant under pseudo-unitary mapping, thereby, a given (non-)autonomous system is mapped to (non-)autonomous system. This allows to construct exactly solvable models of NLSE with BLG by mapping them to known solvable models of NLSE. We present a few examples of NLSE with BLG in detail to exemplify the general result.

The vector NLSE is introduced in terms of a  $N$ -component complex scalar field  $\Psi$  and its hermitian ad-

---

\* pijushkanti.ghosh@visva-bharati.ac.in

joint  $\Psi^\dagger$  as,

$$i \left( I \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + iA \right) \Psi = -\frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial x^2} - \delta (\Psi^\dagger M \Psi) \Psi \quad (1)$$

where  $I$  is the  $N \times N$  identity matrix and  $\delta$  is a real parameter. The  $N \times N$  non-hermitian matrix  $A$  is decomposed in terms of two hermitian matrices  $B$  and  $C$  as  $A = B + iC$  with the condition that  $C$  is a traceless diagonal matrix. The loss-gain terms in Eq. (1) are described by the term  $-iC\Psi$ , while the LC among different field-components are governed by  $B\Psi$ . The  $N \times N$  hermitian and non-singular matrix  $M$  does not depend on complex scalar fields and Eq. (1) describes a coupled cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with BLG. The space-time modulation of the nonlinear strengths may be incorporated via explicit space-time dependence of  $M$ .

The NLSE in Eq. (1) may be obtained from the Lagrangian density,

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{i}{2} [\Psi^\dagger M (D_0 \Psi) - (D_0 \Psi)^\dagger M \Psi] - \frac{\partial \Psi^\dagger}{\partial x} M \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x} + \frac{\delta}{2} (\Psi^\dagger M \Psi)^2 + \Psi^\dagger F_1 \Psi \quad (2)$$

where the operator  $D_0 := I \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + iA$  has formal resemblance with the temporal component of covariant derivative with non-hermitian gauge potential  $A$  and the anti-hermitian matrix  $F_1 := \frac{1}{2} (A^\dagger M - MA)$ . The hermitian adjoint of Eq. (1) does not describe the equation satisfied by  $\Psi^\dagger$  for  $F_1 \neq 0$ , rather it describes the equation obeyed by  $\Psi^\dagger$  of a system whose Lagrangian density is  $\mathcal{L}^*$ , i.e. complex conjugate of  $\mathcal{L}$ . This is because  $\mathcal{L}$  is complex for  $F_1 \neq 0$ . The equation satisfied by  $\Psi^\dagger$  has to be derived directly by using the Euler-Lagrange equation for  $\mathcal{L}$ . The conjugate momenta corresponding to  $\Psi$  and  $\Psi^\dagger$  are  $\Pi_\Psi = \frac{i}{2} \Psi^\dagger M$  and  $\Pi_{\Psi^\dagger} = -\frac{i}{2} M \Psi$ , respectively. The Hamiltonian density  $\mathcal{H}$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{L}$  has the form,

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{\partial \Psi^\dagger}{\partial x} M \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x} - \frac{\delta}{2} (\Psi^\dagger M \Psi)^2 + \Psi^\dagger M A \Psi$$

The effect of the BLG is contained in the mass term  $\Psi^\dagger M A \Psi$ , which in general is complex-valued and becomes real-valued only for  $F_1 = 0$ , i.e. for a  $M$ -pseudo-hermitian  $A$ . The Hamiltonian is real-valued for the same condition, since the first two terms are real-valued irrespective of a pseudo-hermitian  $A$ . Consequently, a quantized Hamiltonian  $\int dx \mathcal{H}$  is non-hermitian without the pseudo-hermiticity condition and is expected to be hermitian for  $F_1 = 0$  with suitable quantization condition. In general, the energy  $E = \int dx dt \mathcal{H}$  may not have a lower bound leading to collapse of the wave-function  $\Psi$ . However,  $E \geq 0$  for a  $M$ -pseudo-hermitian  $A$  with a positive-definite  $M$  and semi-positive-definite  $A$ .

We use a non-unitary transformation relating  $\Psi$  with a  $N$ -component complex scalar field  $\Phi$  as follows,

$$\Psi(t, x) = U(t) \Phi(t, x), \quad U(t) = e^{-iAt} \quad (3)$$

which when substituted in Eq. (1) results in the equation,

$$i \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x^2} - \delta (\Phi^\dagger G \Phi) \Phi, \quad G = U^\dagger M U \quad (4)$$

The time-dependent non-unitary transformation removes the loss-gain and the LC terms by modifying the nonlinear interaction. The nonlinear term remains unchanged due to the transformation if and only if  $G = M$ , i.e.  $U$  is pseudo-unitary[25] with respect to  $M$  or equivalently  $A$  is  $M$ -pseudo-hermitian,

$$U^\dagger M U = M \Leftrightarrow A^\dagger = M A M^{-1} \quad (5)$$

The pseudo-hermiticity of  $A$  can also be derived by expanding  $G(t)$  in powers of  $t$  with the identification of  $F_0 = M$ ,

$$G(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(it)^n}{n!} F_n, \quad F_{n+1} = A^\dagger F_n - F_n A$$

The condition  $G = M$  leads to  $F_1 = 0$ , i.e.  $A$  is  $M$ -pseudo-hermitian. *The first important result is that Eq. (1) with  $M$ -pseudo-hermitian  $A$  can be mapped to the same equation without the loss-gain and the LC terms as given in Eq. (4).* Further, if the transformed equation (4) with  $G = M$  is exactly solvable, solutions for Eq. (1) can be obtained by using the pseudo-unitary transformation.

The second important result concerns the case for which  $A$  is neither hermitian nor  $M$ -pseudo-hermitian or equivalently  $U$  is neither unitary nor pseudo-unitary. The matrix  $M$  for a non-unitary  $U$  may be chosen to be time-dependent such that Eq. (1) is necessarily non-autonomous, while Eq. (4) is autonomous. We choose the matrix  $M$  in terms of real parameters  $\alpha_j$  as,

$$M(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{N^2-1} \alpha_j [U^\dagger(-t) \lambda_j U(-t)] \quad (6)$$

where the constant matrices  $\lambda_j$  denote a suitable basis for expanding  $M$  and  $G$  with  $\lambda_0$  being the identity matrix. The matrix  $G$  for the choice of  $M$  in Eq. (6) has the form  $G = \sum_j \alpha_j \lambda_j$  and Eq. (4) reduces to integrable Manakov system[8] of coupled vector NLSE for  $G = \alpha_0 \lambda_0$ , which may be realized by choosing all  $\alpha_j = 0$  except  $\alpha_0$ . The solution of the non-autonomous equation (1) may be found from the solution of Eq. (4) by using the non-unitary transformation. Various integrable and/or solvable generalizations of Manakov systems are known[9–12]. The parameters  $\alpha_j$  may be chosen appropriately to find solvable non-autonomous system with BLG and LC corresponding to these known solvable models. There is an useful duality relation between  $M$  and  $G$ . The matrix  $M(t)$  in Eq. (6) is time-dependent for a constant  $G$ . If  $M$  is chosen as time-independent  $M = \sum_j \alpha_j \lambda_j$ , then  $G$  becomes time-dependent  $G(t) = M(-t)$  where  $M(t)$  is given by Eq. (6).

The transformation in Eq. (3) may be used to remove the loss-gain terms completely even for  $\text{Tr}(C) \neq 0$ ,

i.e. the case of unbalanced loss-gain. However, the non-unitary matrix  $U$  and hence,  $\Psi$  necessarily contains a term growing/decaying in time for  $\text{Tr}(C) \neq 0$ . In general, the  $N \times N$  matrices  $B$  and  $C$  may be expressed as generators of  $SU(N)$  in the fundamental representation as,

$$B = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ (i \neq j^2-1)}}^{N^2-1} \beta_i \lambda_i, C = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=2}^N \beta_{i^2-1} \lambda_{i^2-1}, \quad j = 2, \dots, N,$$

where  $\text{Tr}(\lambda_i \lambda_j) = 2\delta_{ij}$ ,  $\lambda_{i^2-1}$  are diagonal and consequently,  $\text{Tr}(B) = \text{Tr}(C) = 0$ . We now replace  $A$  by  $\tilde{A} = B + i(C + \beta_0 I)$ ,  $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $I$  is the  $N \times N$  identity matrix. The loss-gain is now unbalanced for  $\beta_0 \neq 0$ , since  $\text{Tr}(\tilde{C}) = \text{Tr}(C + \beta_0 I) = N\beta_0$ . The non-unitary matrix  $\tilde{U} := e^{-i\tilde{A}t} = e^{\beta_0 t} U$  and  $U$  may be expressed in terms of  $N$  eigenvalues  $e_j$  of  $A$  as[26],

$$U = I \frac{1}{N} K - i \sum_{j=1}^{N^2-1} \lambda_j \frac{\partial K}{\partial(t\beta_j)}, \quad K(\beta, t) = \sum_{j=1}^N e^{ie_j t}$$

with the condition  $\sum_{j=1}^N e_j = 0$ , since  $\text{Tr}(A) = 0$ . The eigenvalues  $e_j$  are functions of the parameters  $\beta_j$  and  $U$  is periodic in time in a region in the parameter space for which all  $e_j$ 's are real. The condition  $\sum_{j=1}^N e_j = 0$  implies that a common factor of the form  $e^{-\beta_0 t}$  can not be taken out of the matrix  $U$  to cancel the multiplicative term  $e^{\beta_0 t}$  appearing in  $\tilde{U}$  and still making  $\tilde{U}$  periodic in time. This leads to unbounded/decaying solution  $\Psi$  for any periodic or soliton solution  $\Phi$  of Eq. (4). Thus, an unbalanced gain-loss in the system leads to growing and decaying solutions for  $\beta_0 > 0$  and  $\beta_0 < 0$ , respectively. This is the reason for restricting the discussions to the case of balanced loss-gain only.

There are previous studies[15, 19, 21–24, 27–33] to remove BLG and/or the LC terms from Eq. (1) through appropriate transformations and under certain reductions of the original equation. The transformations for all these cases are necessarily unitary, while the transformation used in this article is non-unitary. This is a major difference —systems related by unitary transformation are gauge equivalent, while the same can not be claimed for systems related by non-unitary transformation. This is manifested in the result that the power of the standard Manakov system  $P_\Phi = \Phi^\dagger \Phi$  is different from the power  $P_\Psi = \Psi^\dagger \Psi$  of Manakov system with BLG, although they are connected via a non-unitary transformation. In particular,  $P_\Psi = \Psi^\dagger \Psi = \Phi^\dagger (U^\dagger U) \Phi \neq P_\Phi$  and  $P_\Psi$  will be calculated explicitly to highlight this feature for the examples considered in this article. Similarly, one can show that the time-dependence of other observables like square of the width of the wave-packet  $I_1 = \int dx x^2 P_\Psi$  and its speed of growth  $I_2 = -i \int dx \left( \Psi^\dagger \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \Psi^\dagger}{\partial x} \Psi \right)$  are different for systems connected via non-unitary or pseudo-unitary transformation. Unitary transformations have been used in physics in different contexts, particularly in

the context of field theory, for past several decades. It seems that the pseudo-unitary invariance of a Hamiltonian system and its use to construct exact solution have not been considered earlier. Further, the non-unitary mapping to remove the BLG and the LC terms is exact and unlike the previous investigations[15, 19, 21–24, 28], no reduction of the original equation is considered. Thus, the mapping proposed in this article is new compared to the existing methods to remove BLG and/or LC terms via appropriate transformations.

We present an example of a two-component NLSE to elucidate the general results by choosing,

$$G = \sum_{j=0}^3 \alpha_j \sigma_j \quad (7)$$

where  $\sigma_0$  is the  $2 \times 2$  identity matrix and  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$  denote the Pauli matrices with  $\sigma_3$  being diagonal. The terms in  $\Phi^\dagger G \Phi$  in Eq. (4) has standard physical interpretation. In particular, in the terminology of optics, terms containing  $\alpha_0$  and  $\alpha_3$  are related to self-phase and cross-phase modulations, while terms which include  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$  describe the effect of four-wave mixing. Eq. (4) for the above choice of  $G$  is integrable for any values of the real parameters  $\alpha_j$ [11]. The celebrated Manakov system[8] of two coupled NLSE is obtained for  $\alpha_3 = 0, \alpha \equiv \alpha_1 + i\alpha_2 = 0$ , while  $\alpha_0 = 0, \alpha = 0$  correspond to Zakharov-Schulman system[9].

The non-hermitian matrix  $A$  in Eq. (1) is chosen as,

$$A = \beta_1 \sigma_1 + \beta_2 \sigma_2 + i\Gamma \sigma_3 \quad (8)$$

The real constants  $\beta_{1,2}$  linearly couple two components of  $\Psi$ , while  $\Gamma$  measures the loss-gain strength. The matrix  $A$  is  $M$ -pseudo-hermitian for the conditions,

$$\alpha_3 = 0, \quad \frac{\alpha_0}{|\alpha|} = \frac{|\beta|}{\Gamma} \sin(\theta_\alpha - \theta_\beta) \quad (9)$$

for which  $G = M$  is time-independent, where  $\alpha = |\alpha| e^{i\theta_\alpha}$  and  $\beta \equiv \beta_1 + i\beta_2 = |\beta| e^{i\theta_\beta}$ . The matrix  $M$  with  $\alpha_3 = 0$  is positive definite for  $\alpha_0 > |\alpha|$  and the second condition of Eq. (9) is consistent for the choice  $|\beta| > |\Gamma|$  with  $0 < \theta_\alpha - \theta_\beta < \pi$  for  $\Gamma > 0$  and  $\pi < \theta_\alpha - \theta_\beta < 2\pi$  for  $\Gamma < 0$ . The matrix  $M$  can be rewritten after imposing the condition of pseudo-hermiticity as,

$$M = \frac{|\alpha||\beta|}{\Gamma} \sin(\theta_\alpha - \theta_\beta) \sigma_0 + \alpha_1 \sigma_1 + \alpha_2 \sigma_2 \quad (10)$$

The NLSE in Eq. (1) with  $\delta = 1$  is solvable for  $A$  and  $M$  given by Eqs. (8) and (10), respectively. The non-unitary operator  $U$  connecting  $\Psi$  and  $\Phi$  may be expressed as a  $2 \times 2$  matrix in terms of the parameter  $\theta \equiv \sqrt{|\beta|^2 - \Gamma^2}$ ,

$$U = \sigma_0 \cos(\theta t) - \frac{iA}{\theta} \sin(\theta t) \text{ for } \theta \neq 0 \quad (11)$$

The parameter  $\theta$  becomes purely imaginary for  $\Gamma^2 > |\beta|^2$  and the periodic functions change to the corresponding

hyperbolic functions. Consequently, a bounded solution for  $\Phi$  will correspond to an unbounded solution for  $\Psi$  in the long time behaviour. This is true for  $\theta = 0$  also for which  $U$  has a linear time-dependence. The loss-gain parameter is restricted within the range  $-|\beta| < \Gamma < |\beta|$  so that time-dependence of  $U$  is periodic. It may be noted that this is also one of the consistency conditions for  $A$  to be  $M$ -pseudo-hermitian with a positive-definite  $M$ .

The solution of Eq. (4) for  $\delta = 1$  and  $G = M$  given by Eq. (10) has the expression[11],

$$\Phi = \sqrt{\frac{2}{C}} \kappa W \operatorname{sech}[\kappa(x - vt)] e^{i(\frac{v^2}{2} - \omega t)} \quad (12)$$

where  $\omega = \frac{v^2}{4} - \kappa^2$ ,  $C = W^\dagger M W$  and  $W$  is an arbitrary two-component constant complex vector. The semi-positivity of  $M$  ensures that the constant  $C$  is semi-positive. The constants  $v, \omega, \kappa$  correspond to the velocity, propagation constant and amplitude, respectively for the one soliton solution  $\Phi$ . The power  $P_\Psi$  for the loss-gain system oscillates with time,

$$P_\Psi = \frac{2\kappa^2 W^\dagger W}{|C|} \operatorname{sech}^2[\kappa(x - vt)] N(t)$$

$$N(t) = 1 + N_1 \sin^2(\theta t) + N_2 \sin(2\theta t) \quad (13)$$

where  $N_1 = \frac{2\Gamma}{\theta^2}(\Gamma + \frac{-\beta_2 C_1 + \beta_1 C_2}{C_0})$ ,  $N_2 = \frac{\Gamma C_3}{\theta C_0}$  and  $C_j = W^\dagger \sigma_j W$ ,  $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$ . The power-oscillation vanishes for no loss-gain in the system, i.e.  $\Gamma = 0$ . The condition  $N(t) \geq 0 \forall t$  may be implemented in several ways by choosing the integration constants and parameters appropriately. For example, the constant  $N_2$  vanishes if the two components of the complex vector  $W$  are chosen as  $W_0 e^{i\theta_{W_j}}$ ,  $j = 1, 2$  such that they differ only in phases. Further, fixing  $\theta_{W_1} = \theta_{W_2} + \theta_\beta + (n+1)\pi$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the constant  $N_1 = \frac{2\Gamma^2}{\theta^2}$  becomes semi-positive definite. The power oscillation may be visualized in the plots of  $P(x, t) = \frac{|C|}{2\kappa^2 W^\dagger W} P_\Psi$  in Fig. 1 with the above choices of constants and parameters for  $\kappa = v = |\beta| = 1$  and three values of  $\Gamma = 0.1, 0.9, 0.99$ . The amplitude and time-period of oscillation grows as  $\Gamma$  is increased and approaches  $\beta$ . The peak of the power-oscillation amplifies approximately by 10 times as  $|\beta|$  is increased by .09. The solution becomes unbounded for  $\Gamma \geq |\beta|$ . The loss-gain parameter  $\Gamma$  may be used as a controlling parameter for power-oscillation.




FIG. 1: (Color online) Plots of  $P(x, t)$  for  $\kappa = v = \beta = 1$  and three different values of  $\Gamma = 0.1, 0.9, 0.99$

We now discuss the situation where  $A$  is not  $M$ -pseudo-hermitian, and consequently, there is no restriction on the choice of the parameters  $\alpha_i$ 's as given in Eq. (9) and  $U(t)$  is not pseudo-unitary. The matrix  $M(t)$  corresponding to

$G$  and  $A$  given in Eqs. (7) and (8), respectively, may be evaluated by using Eq. (6) and substituting  $\lambda_j = \sigma_j$ . This leads to the expression,

$$\begin{aligned} M(t) = & \sigma_0 \left[ \alpha_0 + \frac{2\Gamma\eta}{\theta^2} \sin^2(\theta t) - \frac{\Gamma\alpha_3}{\theta} \sin(2\theta t) \right] + \sigma_1 \left[ \alpha_1 - \frac{2\beta_2\eta}{\theta^2} \sin^2(\theta t) + \frac{\beta_2\alpha_3}{\theta} \sin(2\theta t) \right] \\ & + \sigma_2 \left[ \alpha_2 + \frac{2\beta_1\eta}{\theta^2} \sin^2(\theta t) - \frac{\beta_1\alpha_3}{\theta} \sin(2\theta t) \right] + \sigma_3 \left[ \alpha_3 \cos(2\theta t) - \frac{\eta}{\theta} \sin(2\theta t) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where  $\eta \equiv \Gamma\alpha_0 - |\beta||\alpha| \sin(\theta_\alpha - \theta_\beta)$  and in the limit of  $M$ -pseudo-hermitian  $A$ , i.e. Eq. (9) holds, the result

$M = G$  is reproduced. The NLSE in Eq. (1) with the above  $M(t)$  and  $A$  in Eq. (8) is mapped via the non-

unitary transformation to the equation,

$$i \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = - \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial x^2} - \delta \sum_{j=0}^3 \alpha_j (\Phi^\dagger \sigma_j \Phi) \Phi, \quad (15)$$

which admits various exact analytical solutions. For the generic values of the parameters  $\alpha_i$ , the expressions for  $\Psi$  and  $P_\Psi$  are given by Eqs. (12) and (13), respectively, where the factor  $C$  in  $\Psi, P_\Psi$  is evaluated without the condition (9). The constant  $C$  is an overall multiplication factor and does not affect the physical behaviour of the system and can be chosen to be positive-definite for  $\alpha_0 \geq \sqrt{|\alpha|^2 + \alpha_3^2}$ . We present another solution by choosing  $\delta = 2, \alpha_3 = 1, \alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$  for which  $M(t)$  takes

the form,

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(2\theta t) - \frac{\Gamma}{\theta} \sin(2\theta t) & i \frac{\beta^*}{\theta} \sin(2\theta t) \\ -i \frac{\beta}{\theta} \sin(2\theta t) & -\cos(2\theta t) - \frac{\Gamma}{\theta} \sin(2\theta t) \end{pmatrix}$$

and Eq. (15) admits several exact solutions[37]. We consider the bright-dark one soliton solution,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1 &= a e^{i(\frac{vx}{2} - \omega_1 t)} \operatorname{sech}[\kappa(x - vt)] \\ \Phi_2 &= b e^{i(\frac{vx}{2} - \omega_2 t)} \tanh[\kappa(x - vt)] \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where  $\kappa^2 = a^2 + b^2$ ,  $\omega_1 = \frac{v^2}{4} + b^2 - a^2$  and  $\omega_2 = \frac{v^2}{4} + 2b^2$ . The solution  $\Psi$  of Eq. (1) for  $M(t)$  given above is obtained as  $\Psi = U\Phi$ , where  $U$  and  $\Phi$  are given by Eqs. (11) and (16), respectively. The power has the expression:

$$\begin{aligned} P_\Psi(x, t) &= \left[ 1 + \frac{2\Gamma^2}{\theta^2} \sin^2(\theta t) \right] \{ a^2 \operatorname{sech}^2[\kappa(x - vt)] + b^2 \tanh^2[\kappa(x - vt)] \} + \frac{\Gamma}{\theta} \sin(2\theta t) \{ a^2 - \kappa^2 \tanh^2[\kappa(x - vt)] \} \\ &\quad - \frac{4ab|\beta|\Gamma}{\theta^2} \sin^2(\theta t) \sin(\theta_\beta + \kappa^2 t) \{ \operatorname{sech}[\kappa(x - vt)] \tanh[\kappa(x - vt)] \} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

which is plotted in Fig. 2 for  $a = v = \beta = 1, b = .5$  and three different values of  $\Gamma = 0.1, 0.9, 0.99$ . The amplitude and time-period grows as  $\Gamma$  approaches  $\beta$  and the solution

becomes unbounded for  $\Gamma \geq \beta$ . There are other solutions of Eq. (16) leading to the same qualitative behaviour for  $P_\Psi$  which will not be pursued in this article.




FIG. 2: (Color online) Plot of  $P_\Psi(x, t)$  for  $a = v = \beta = 1, b = .5, \theta_\beta = 0$  and three different values of  $\Gamma = 0.1, 0.9, 0.99$

The results can be generalized easily to multi-component vector NLSE with appropriate choice of the matrices  $A$  and  $M$  for  $N > 2$ . We denote  $A$  and  $M$  appearing in Eq. (1) for  $N = 2m$  as  $A_{2m}$  and  $M_{2m}$ , respectively. The matrix  $A_{2m}$  is chosen as  $A_{2m} = I_m \otimes A$ , where  $I_m$  is the  $m \times m$  identity matrix and the  $2 \times 2$  matrix  $A$  is given in Eq. (8). The NLSE in Eq. (1) with this specific  $A_{2m}$  describes pair-wise linear coupling as well as balancing of loss-gain between the  $(2i - 1)^{\text{th}}$  and  $(2i)^{\text{th}}$  components of  $\Psi$ , where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ . It should

be noted that the vector NLSE is simply  $m$ -copies of the system with two components for vanishing nonlinear interaction, i.e.  $\delta = 0$ . The nonlinear term  $(\Psi^\dagger M_{2m} \Psi)^2$  allows each component  $\Psi_i$  to interact with all other components, including self-interaction. We choose  $\delta \neq 0$  and appropriate  $M_{2m}$  such that the vector NLSE can not be expressed as  $m$ -copies of the two-component system.

The pseudo-unitary operator  $U_{2m}$  which connects  $2m$ -component fields  $\Psi$  and  $\Phi$  via the relation  $\Psi = U_{2m}\Phi$  is determined as  $U_{2m} := e^{-iA_{2m}t} = I_m \otimes U$ , where  $U$

is given by Eq. (11). The condition for periodic time-dependence of the matrix  $U_{2m}$  is the same as that of  $U$ , i.e.  $|\beta|^2 > \Gamma^2$ . We consider an autonomous NLSE (4) with  $G_{2m} = I_m \otimes G$  and a non-autonomous NLSE (1) with time-dependent  $M_{2m}(t)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{2m} &:= U_{2m}^\dagger(-t)G_{2m}U_{2m}(-t) \\ &= I_m \otimes M(t), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where  $M(t)$  is given by Eq. (14). Note that  $M_{2m}$  has the form given in Eq. (6) and following the general method prescribed in this article, the non-autonomous NLSE (1) is mapped to autonomous NLSE (4) by the non-unitary transformation  $\Psi = U_{2m}\Phi$ . The matrix  $A_{2m}$  is  $M_{2m}$ -pseudo-hermitian, whenever the condition (9) is satisfied, and in this limit  $G_{2m} = M_{2m}$  leading to the result that both the Eqs. (1) and (4) are autonomous. It is worth recalling that pseudo-hermitian operators play an important role in our understanding of non-hermitian quantum systems admitting entirely real spectra and unitary time-evolution. The appearance of pseudo-hermitian matrices in the context of classical system with BLG is an interesting coincidence.

The exact solution of Eq. (1) may be constructed via the non-unitary transformation provided Eq. (4) with  $G_{2m}$  is solvable. The NLSE (4) satisfied by  $\Phi_{2m}$  and  $G_{2m}$  can be brought to the canonical form of integrable Manakov-Zakharov-Schulman system by a unitary transformation followed by an appropriate scaling of the  $2m$  components of  $\Phi$ . In particular, the hermitian matrix  $G_{2m}$  is diagonalizable by a unitary transformation  $G_d = V^\dagger G_{2m} V$ , where the diagonal matrix  $G_d$  and the unitary matrix  $V$  are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} G_d &= I_m \otimes \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V = e^{i\frac{\xi_1}{2}I_m \otimes \sigma_3} e^{i\frac{\xi_2}{2}I_m \otimes \sigma_1}, \\ \lambda_i &= \alpha_0 + (-1)^{i+1} \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2}, \quad i = 1, 2 \\ \xi_1 &\equiv \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2} \right), \quad \xi_2 = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2}}{\alpha_3} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The matrix  $G_{2m}$  is block-diagonal and the unitary transformation describes a  $SU(2)$  rotation for each block in terms of the  $SU(2)$  generators  $\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$  —a rotation by an angle  $\xi_1$  around  $\sigma_3$  followed by a rotation around  $\sigma_1$  by an angle  $\xi_2$ . The  $2m$  eigenvalues of  $G_{2m}$  are  $\lambda_{1,2}$  and both  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are  $m$ -fold degenerate. In general, the eigenvalues  $\lambda_i$  can take positive as well as negative values and may be expressed as  $\lambda_i = \text{sgn}(\lambda_i)|\lambda_i|$ . However, the negative values of  $\lambda_i$  are not allowed for the case of  $M$ -pseudo-hermitian  $A$  for which  $M$  becomes time-independent and  $M = G$  due to the condition (9). This is because we demand entirely real eigenvalues of  $A$  in order to avoid any decaying and/or growing modes of  $\Psi$  via  $U = e^{-iAt}$ . The eigenvalues of the matrix  $M$  are required to be semi-positive definite in order to have an entirely real eigenvalues of the pseudo-hermitian matrix  $A$ . The condition  $\alpha_0 > |\alpha|$  ensures that the eigenvalues

$\lambda_i$  are positive-definite and the matrix  $M = G$  is non-singular. We take only positive values of  $\lambda_i$ , whenever both the Eqs. (1) and (4) are autonomous and  $M = G$ , otherwise allow positive as well negative values of  $\lambda_i$ .

A scale transformation may be used to transform  $G_d$  to the diagonal form  $\eta = S^{-1}G_dS^{-1}$  with eigenvalues  $\pm 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &= I_m \otimes \begin{pmatrix} \text{sgn}(\lambda_1) & 0 \\ 0 & \text{sgn}(\lambda_2) \end{pmatrix}, \\ S &= I_m \otimes \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{|\lambda_1|} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{|\lambda_2|} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The NLSE (4) is transformed to a canonical form of integrable Manakov-Zakharov-Schulman system in terms of the field  $\tilde{\Phi} = S^{-1}V\Phi$  with  $2m$  components,

$$i \frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial t} = - \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial x^2} - \delta \left( \tilde{\Phi}^\dagger \eta \tilde{\Phi} \right) \tilde{\Phi}. \quad (21)$$

There are three distinct regions in the space of parameters:

- (i)  $\alpha_0 > |\alpha|$ : The matrix reduces to identity matrix, i.e.  $\eta = I_{2m}$  and Eq. (21) corresponds to the Manakov system of  $N$  coupled vector NLSE in a self-focusing medium.
- (ii)  $\alpha_0 < 0, |\alpha_0| > |\alpha|$ : The matrix  $\eta = -I_{2m}$  and Eq. (21) corresponds to the Manakov system of  $N$  coupled vector NLSE in a self-defocusing medium.
- (iii)  $-|\alpha| < \alpha_0 < |\alpha|$ : The matrix  $\eta$  corresponds to the mixed case with equal number of eigenvalues 1 and  $-1$ . This corresponds to generalized Zakharov-Schulman system.

There are various systematic procedures[34–36] to find exact solutions of Eq. (21) for all three cases discussed above and many analytical solutions have been discussed in the literature. The exact solutions of Eq. (21) may be used to construct exact solutions of Eq. (1) by using the relation,

$$\Psi = U_{2m} V S^{-1} \tilde{\Phi}. \quad (22)$$

We have already presented exact analytical expressions of  $\Psi$  for  $N = 2$ . Exact solutions of NLSE with BLG along with the time-dependence of different observables for  $N > 2$  will be presented in a separate publication.

To conclude, we have presented a generic method to remove loss-gain and LC terms from a vector NLSE by a time-dependent non-unitary transformation which imparts time-dependence to the nonlinear term. Further, if the generator of the transformation is pseudo-unitary, the non-linear term remains unchanged even though the loss-gain and LC terms are completely removed. The method is applicable to a class of vector NLSE with cubic non-linearity that is subjected to BLG and LC, and useful to construct solvable models. We have constructed an exactly solvable two-component NLSE with BLG and LC that exhibits power-oscillation. Exactly solvable models of NLSE with more than two components and subjected to BLG have also been constructed.

The inclusion of more generalized cubic nonlinear interaction in Eq. (1) may be achieved by replacing  $\Psi^\dagger M \Psi$

with  $K$ , where  $K$  is a  $N \times N$  hermitian matrix with elements  $[K]_{ij} = \Psi^\dagger H_{ij} \Psi$  and  $H_{ij}$  are  $N^2$  constant hermitian matrices of dimension  $N \times N$ . The Eq. (1) may or may not admit a Hamiltonian for a generic  $K$ . The matrix  $K$  can be re-expressed as  $[K]_{ij} = \Phi^\dagger (U^\dagger H_{ij} U) \Phi$ . The BLG and LC terms are completely removed by the non-unitary transformation at the cost of imparting time-dependence to the nonlinear term. If  $U$  is pseudo-unitary with respect to each matrix  $H_{ij}$ , then  $[K]_{ij} = \Phi^\dagger H_{ij} \Phi$  remains form invariant. The BLG and LC are removed by the pseudo-unitary transformation and the nonlinear term  $K\Psi$  is changed to  $U^{-1}KU\Phi$  with  $[K]_{ij} = \Phi^\dagger H_{ij} \Phi$ . The nonlinear term is time-independent and  $K\Psi \rightarrow K\Phi$  only if  $[K, U] = 0 \Rightarrow [K, A] = 0$ .

The results can be trivially generalized to higher spatial dimensions and/or by including a space-time depen-

dent inhomogenous term  $\lambda_0 V(x, t)\Psi$ . The time modulated gain-loss strength and LC can be implemented by replacing the non-hermitian matrix  $A$  with  $\tilde{A}(t) = \int dt A(t)$  in the definition of  $U(t)$  and for all subsequent steps. Investigations along these directions could be carried out by using the method prescribed in this article to explore a wide variety of physically interesting models with BLG.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by a grant (**SERB Ref. No. MTR/2018/001036**) from the Science & Engineering Research Board(SERB), Department of Science & Technology, Govt. of India under the **MATRICES** scheme.

- 
- [1] V. E. Zakharov and A. B. Shabat, Sov. Phys. JETP **34**, 62 (1972).
  - [2] C. Sulem and P.-L. Sulem, The Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation: Self-Focusing and Wave Collapse (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999).
  - [3] G. P. Agrawal, Nonlinear Fiber Optics, 3rd ed. (Academic, San Diego, 2001); A. Hasegawa and Y. Kodama, Solitons in Optical Communications (Oxford University Press, New York, 1995); L. F. Mollenauer and J. P. Gordon, Solitons in Optical Fibers (Academic Press, Boston, 2006).
  - [4] L. P. Pitaevskii and S. Strinari, Bose-Einstein Condensation(Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003); Emergent Nonlinear Phenomena in Bose-Einstein Condensation: Theory and Experiment, edited by P. G. Kevrekidis, D. J. Frantzeskakis and R. Carretero-González(Springer, New York, 2008), Vol. 45.
  - [5] K. Mio, T. Ogino, K. Minami and S. Takeda, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **41**, 265(1976).
  - [6] K. Trulsen and K. B. Dysthe, Wave motion **24**, 281 (1996).
  - [7] S. Yomosa, Phys. Rev. A **27**, 2120 (1983).
  - [8] S. V. Manakov, Sov. Phys. JETP **38**, 248 (1974).
  - [9] V. E. Zakharov and E. I. Schulman, Physica D **4**, 270 (1982).
  - [10] T. Kanna, M. Lakshmanan, P. T. Dinda and N. Akhmediev, Phys. Rev. E **73**, 026604 (2006).
  - [11] D. -S. Wang, D. -J. Zhang and J. Yang, J. Math. Phys. **51**, 023510(2010).
  - [12] D. Sinha and P. K. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. E **91**, 042908(2015); Phys. Lett. A **381**, 124 (2017).
  - [13] H. H. Chen and C. S. Liu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37**, 693 (1976); V.N. Serkin, A. Hasegawa, T. L. Belyaeva, Phys. Rev. Lett **98**, 074102 (2007); J. Belmonte-Beitia, V. M. Perez-Garcia, V. Brazhnyi, Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simulat. **16**, 158 (1996).
  - [14] C. M. Bender, PT Symmetry in Quantum and Clasical Physics (World Scientific, 2018).
  - [15] V. V. Konotop, J. Yang and D. A. Zezyulin, Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 035002 (2016).
  - [16] Z. H. Musslimani, K. G. Makris, R. El-Ganainy and D. N. Christodoulides, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 030402(2008); Z. Shi, X. Jiang, X. Zhu and H. Li, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 053855(2011); B. Midya and R. Roychoudhury, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 045803(2013); A. Khare, S. M. Al-Marzoug and H. Bahlouli, Phys. Lett. A **376**, 2880(2012).
  - [17] M. J. Ablowitz and Z. H. Musslimani, Phys. Rev. Lett **110**, 064105 (2013).
  - [18] D. Sinha and P. K. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. E **91**, 042908 (2015); D. Sinha and P. K. Ghosh, Phys. Lett. A **381**, 124(2017).
  - [19] R. Driben and B. A. Malomed, Opt. Lett. **36**, 4323(2011); EPL **96**, 51001(2011).
  - [20] F. Kh. Abdullaev, V. V. Konotop, M. Ögren and M. P. Sørensen, Opt. Lett. **36**, 4566(2011).
  - [21] I. V. Barashenkov, S. V. Suchkov, A. A. Sukhorukov, S. V. Dmitriev and Y. S. Kivshar, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 053809(2012); I. V. Barashenkov, L. Baker and N. V. Alexeeva, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 033819 (2013).
  - [22] D. E. Pelinovsky, D. A. Zezyulin and V. V. Konotop, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **54**, 3920(2015); D. A. Zezyulin and V. V. Konotop, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **51**, 015206 (2018).
  - [23] N. V. Alexeeva, I. V. Barashenkov, A. A. Sukhorukov and Y. S. Kivshar, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 063837 (2012).
  - [24] J.-P. Dias, M. Figueira, V. V. Konotop and D. A. Zezyulin, Stud. Appl. Math. **133**, 422(2014).
  - [25] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. **45**, 932 (2004).
  - [26] D. Kusnezov, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 898(1995).
  - [27] R. Radhakrishnan and M. Lakshmanan, Phys. Rev. E. **60**, 2317 (1999).
  - [28] B. Deconinck, P. G. Kevrekidis, H. E. Nistazakis and D. J. Frantzeskakis Phys. Rev. A **70**, 063605 (2004).
  - [29] T. Kanna, M. Vijayajayanthi and M. Lakshmanan, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 013808(2007).
  - [30] H. E. Nistazakis, Z. Rapti, D. J. Frantzeskakis, P. G. Kevrekidis, P. Sodano, and A. Trombettoni, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 023635 ( 2008).
  - [31] T. Kanna, R. B. Mareeswaran, F. Tsitoura, H. E. Nistazakis and D. J. Frantzeskakis, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **46**, 475201 (2013).
  - [32] T. Kanna, R. B. Mareeswaran and F. G. Mertens, J. Phys. Comm. **1**, 045005 (2017).
  - [33] T. Kanna, A. A. Sheela and R. Babu Mareeswaran, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **52**, 375201 (2019).

- [34] I. Kay, and H. E. Moses, Journal of Applied Physics 27, 1503 (1956).
- [35] Y. Nogami and C. S. Wark, Phys. Lett. **A59**, 251(1976).
- [36] Q-Han Park and H. J. Shin, Phys. Rev. E **61**, 3093 (2000).
- [37] T. Kanna, E. N. Tsoy and N. Akhmediev, Phys. Lett. **A330**, 224 (2004).