arXiv:2301.01112v1 [quant-ph] 3 Jan 2023

Time-Optimal Transport of a Harmonic Oscillator: Analytic Solution

Gerhard C. Hegerfeldt[1]

[1] *Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Göttingen, Friedrich-Hund-Platz 1, D-37077 Göttingen, Germany*

Motivated by the experimental transport of a trap with a quantum mechanical system modeled as a harmonic oscillator (h.o.) the corresponding classical problem is investigated. Protocols for the fastest possible transport of a classical h.o. in a wagon over a distance d are derived where both initially and finally the wagon is at rest and the h.o. is in its equilibrium position and also at rest. The acceleration of the wagon is assumed to be bounded. For fixed oscillator frequency Ω it is shown that there are in general three switches in the acceleration and for special values of Ω only one switch. In the latter case the optimal transport time is $T_{\rm abs}$, that of a wagon without oscillator. The optimal transport time and the switch times are determined. It is shown that in some cases it is advantageous to go *backwards* for a while. In addition a time-dependent $\Omega(t)$, bounded by $\Omega_\pm$, is allowed. In this case the behavior depends sensitively on $\Omega_\pm$ and is spelled out in detail. In particular, depending on $\Omega_\pm$, $T_{\rm abs}$ may be obtained in continuously many ways.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

Adiabatic processes may serve to transform an initial state of a system to a proscribed final state. Such processes, however, are very slow and, in principle, infinitely slow. Protocols for speeding up the time development have been introduced in the past, with numerous applications in quantum optics [1–22] and to classical systems, e.g. cranes [23]. These methods include 'shortcuts to adiabadicity' (STA) [1–10], 'counterdiabatic' approaches [11–13] and the 'fast-forward' approach [15–18]. In general the above mentioned protocols yield a speed-up, but not necessarily the fastest possible time development. Other methods are combinations with control theory [24–26], cf. e.g. [19, 27, 28]. While a time development as fast as possible is often desired, other considerations like robustness and further conditions may prolong the resulting time duration.

A particular example is the efficient transport of ultra cold atoms and ions by moving the confining trap. An atom or ion in a harmonic trap can be treated to good approximation as a quantum harmonic oscillator. For harmonic traps efficient protocols have been investigated with STA and the invariant-based inverse engineering method to obtain transitionless evolutions under imposed constraints, faster than by an adiabatic process [6, 28]. It is therefore natural to ask how fast the transport of a quantum harmonic oscillator can be made. This depends of course on the particular question one is interested in, for example a time-optimal transport a a harmonic oscillator under additional conditions.

Insight for the quantum case may be obtained by asking the same question for a classical harmonic oscillator. Therefore in this paper the time-optimal transport of a classical harmonic oscillator will be investigated.

Consider a classical one-dimensional harmonic oscillator (h.o.) without friction in the center of a long wagon, such as depicted in Fig. 1 where a small mass m is attached to a spring on the wagon. When the wagon is accelerated the h.o. will start to perform oscillations. In this case the frequency Ω of the h.o. depends on the spring constant and on m.

The problem to be investigated is the following:

(i) Initially the wagon is at rest and the h.o. is in its equilibrium position, also at rest.

(ii) Then the wagon undergoes an acceleration $a(t)$, where $a(t)$ can vary between $\pm a_{\max}$, until it has traveled a prescribed distance d.

(iii) Upon arrival at the end point the system should again be in its initial state, i.e. the wagon should be at rest, and the h.o. should again be in its equilibrium position and at rest.

The questions to be answered here are: Is this achievable, and if so what is the shortest time possible? Can this time be further lowered by allowing the h.o. frequency Ω to be time dependent, i.e. $\Omega(t)$? Both questions will be answered in the affirmative.




FIG. 1: Oscillating mass m attached to a spring in an accelerated wagon

The plan of the paper is as follows. First, in Section II, a fixed oscillator frequency will be considered, examples will be given and a complete solution of the problem and an explicit protocol for fixed Ω will be formulated. In Section III detailed proofs are provided. In Section IV the case of a time-dependent oscillator frequency is treated where $\Omega(t)$ satisfies $\Omega_- \le \Omega(t) \le \Omega_+$, with arbitrary $\Omega_\pm$. The results and protocols will be seen to depend critically on the particular choice of $\Omega_\pm$. Finally, in Section V the results are summarized and discussed.

II. OPTIMAL PROTOCOL FOR FIXED OSCILLATOR FREQUENCY

We consider a classical one-dimensional harmonic oscillator on a long wagon. The position of the h.o. (i.e. mass point) relative to the wagon center will be denoted by $x_{\rm h}$ and the position of the wagon center in the external rest frame by $x_{\rm w}$. When the wagon is accelerated with acceleration $a(t)$, the mass point additionally experiences the corresponding inertial force $-ma$ in the rest frame of the wagon so that one has

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x}_{\rm h} &= -\Omega^2 x_{\rm h} - a \\ \ddot{x}_{\rm w} &= a \ . \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

It is assumed that $a(t)$ can vary between $\pm a_{\max}$.

Example 1. With no h.o. present, to move a wagon a distance d in shortest time, with initial and final velocity equal to zero, it is optimal to accelerate with $a_{\max}$ for half the distance and then decelerate with $-a_{\max}$ [25] (cf. solid line in Fig.2). The corresponding time $T_{\rm abs}(d)$, $T_{\rm abs}^2 = 4\,d/a_{\max}$, can at most be achieved, but not undercut, if a h.o. in the wagon is to be initially and finally at rest in its equilibrium position.

Example 2. For special 'resonant values' of Ω this time can indeed be achieved, e.g. for

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &= n\,\Omega_{\rm res}(d) \ , \qquad n = 1, 2, \cdots \\ \Omega_{\rm res}(d) &= \sqrt{4\pi^2 a_{\max}/d} = 4\pi/T_{\rm abs} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

To see this consider $n = 1$. Initially, the wagon and h.o. are at rest. Upon accelerating the wagon by $a_{\max}$ the h.o. experiences, in the wagon frame, the additional inertial force $-ma$ and starts to move to the left. During the time $T_{\rm abs}/2$ it has just performed a single oscillation, has returned to its initial position in the wagon and is at rest relative to the wagon. In this instant, the acceleration of the wagon is reversed, the h.o. starts moving to the right and at a further time duration of $T_{\rm abs}/2$ is back at rest at the initial position, with the wagon at rest and having traveled the distance d. For $n > 1$ one has correspondingly more oscillations.

For fixed Ω a protocol to obtain the unique optimal transport time is constructed as follows.

(i) For given d determine the unique optimal time $t_{\rm f}$ by the equation

$$d = \frac{1}{4} a_{\max}\, t_{\rm f}^2 \left[1 - \frac{8}{(\Omega\, t_{\rm f})^2} \left(\arccos(\cos^2(\Omega\, t_{\rm f}/4))\right)^2\right] . \tag{3}$$

(ii) With wagon and oscillator at rest at $t = 0$, accelerate with $a_{\max}$ until time $\frac{1}{2}t_{\rm f} - t_1$ where t_1, $0 \le \Omega t_1 \le \pi/2$, is given by

$$t_1 = \frac{1}{\Omega} \arccos(\cos^2(\Omega\, t_{\rm f}/4)) \ . \tag{4}$$

(iii) Decelerate with $-a_{\max}$ until time $\frac{1}{2}t_{\rm f}$.
(iv) Accelerate with $a_{\max}$ until time $\frac{1}{2}t_{\rm f} + t_1$.




FIG. 2: Typical wagon velocities for the acceleration alternating between± 1. Solid curve: No oscillator present and Example 2 with resonant Ω. Dashed and dotted curves: General Ω. For the dotted curve the wagon velocity becomes partially negative, i.e. the wagon moves *backwards* for some time.

(v) Finally decelerate with $-a_{\max}$ until time $t_{\rm f}$.

Typical wagon velocities are depicted in Fig. 2. At the end the wagon is obviously at rest. The oscillator may perform several oscillations. That finally it is also again at rest and in its equilibrium position will be shown at the end of this section. In the next section it will be shown that $t_{\rm f}$ is indeed the unique optimal time. The above protocol has a certain symmetry; there may, or may not, be other, nonsymmetric, protocols which lead to the same unique optimal time.

Note that $t_1 = 0$ if $\Omega\, t_{\rm f} = 4n\pi$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots$, which recovers Example 2 with $t_{\rm f} = T_{\rm abs}$. If $t_1 > \frac{1}{4}t_{\rm f}$ the wagon velocity temporarily becomes negative (dotted curve in Fig. 2), i.e. then it is advantageous to go *backwards* for a while. From Eqs. (3, 4) this is seen to happen if

$$\Omega^2 < \frac{1}{4}\,\Omega_{\rm res}(d)^2, \tag{5}$$

i.e. for small oscillator frequency. However, it can easily be shown that the backward motion will not go back as far as the original starting position of the wagon.

If one plots d as a function of $t_{\rm f}$ in Eq.(3) then $t_{\rm f}$ as a function of d is given by reflecting it at the diagonal. In dimensionless scaled variables, the solid curve in Fig. 3 displays $\Omega\, t_{\rm f}$ as a function of d/d_Ω where $d_\Omega = 4\pi^2 a_{\max}\,\Omega^{-2}$ is the distance for which Ω is resonant, i.e. $\Omega_{\rm res}(d_\Omega) = \Omega$. The dashed curve is the corresponding $T_{\rm abs}(d)$. Note that at $d/d_\Omega = n^2, n = 1, 2, \cdots$ the two transport times coincide, which is again Example 2.

For fixed d, one can also obtain $t_{\rm f}$ as a function of Ω from Eq. (3). In dimensionless scaled variables the result is plotted in Fig. 4. It is seen that $t_{\rm f}$ diverges for $\Omega \to 0$. This can be made more explicit by expanding Eq. (3) in terms of $\Omega\, t_{\rm f}$. A short calculation gives, in dimensionless




FIG. 3: Solid curve: Optimal transport time $t_{\rm f}$ as a function of distance d in units of $d_\Omega = 4\pi^2 a_{\rm max}\,\Omega^{-2}$, for fixed Ω. Dashed curve: $T_{\rm abs}(d)$ (without oscillator). For $d/d_\Omega = 1,\ 2^2,\ \cdots$ the times coincide.

scaled variables,

$$t_{\rm f}/T_{\rm abs}(d) \approx \{6/\pi^2\}^{1/4}\,(\Omega/\Omega_{\rm abs}(d))^{-1/2}. \qquad (6)$$

Replacing 6 by 5.3 in Eq.(6) one obtains an excellent approximation for $t_{\rm f}/T_{\rm abs}(d)$ in the range $0.05 \le \Omega/\Omega_{\rm abs}(d) \le 0.7$.




FIG. 4: Fixed d: Optimal transport time $t_{\rm f}$ in units of $T_{\rm abs}(d)$ as a function of Ω in units of $\Omega_{\rm abs}(d)$.

Protocol evaluation. For the oscillator time-development Eq. (1) has to be evaluated with $a = \pm a_{\rm max}$. This is conveniently done in the complex plane. With

$$z = x_{\rm h} + {\rm i}\,\Omega^{-1}\dot{x}_{\rm h} \pm a_{\rm max}/\Omega^2 \qquad (7)$$

one finds $\dot{z} = -{\rm i}\Omega\, z$ and thus $z(t) = \exp[-{\rm i}\Omega(t-t_0)\, z(t_0)$. Hence

$$x_{\rm h}(t) + {\rm i}\,\Omega^{-1}\dot{x}_{\rm h}(t) = \exp[-{\rm i}\Omega(t-t_0)] \qquad (8)$$
$$\cdot\,(x_{\rm h}(t_0) + {\rm i}\,\Omega^{-1}\dot{x}_{\rm h}(t_0) \pm a_{\rm max}/\Omega^2) \mp a_{\rm max}/\Omega^2.$$

In the complex plane the right-hand side corresponds to a clock-wise rotation of $x_{\rm h}(t_0) + {\rm i}\,\Omega^{-1}\dot{x}_{\rm h}(t_0)$ by the angle $\Omega(t-t_0)$ around the point $-a_{\rm max}/\Omega^2$ and $a_{\rm max}/\Omega^2$, respectively.

In the protocol one starts with $x_{\rm h}(0) = 0$ and $\dot{x}_{\rm h}(0) = 0$ and rotates clock-wise around $-a_{\rm max}/\Omega^2$, then around $a_{\rm max}/\Omega^2$, then again around $-a_{\rm max}/\Omega^2$ and finally around $a_{\rm max}/\Omega^2$. Analytically this gives for the




FIG. 5: Time-development of $x_{\rm h}$ in complex phase-space for $\Omega = 1$, $a_{\rm max} = 1$, $d = 2.82\,\pi^2$, $t_{\rm f} = 3.41\,\pi$, and $t_1 = .205\,\pi$. Starting at the origin, i.e. equilibrium position and at rest, there is first a rotation around -1, then around 1, then around -1 and finally again around 1, back to the origin.

first two rotations

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_1 &\equiv x_{\rm h}(t_{\rm f}/2 - t_1) + {\rm i}\,\Omega^{-1}\dot{x}_{\rm h}(t_{\rm f}/2 - t_1)\\ &= \exp[-{\rm i}\Omega(t_{\rm f}/2 - t_1)]\, a_{\rm max}/\Omega^2 - a_{\rm max}/\Omega^2\\ \zeta_2 &\equiv x_{\rm h}(t_{\rm f}/2) + {\rm i}\,\Omega^{-1}\dot{x}_{\rm h}(t_{\rm f}/2)\\ &= \exp[-{\rm i}\Omega t_1](\zeta_1 - a_{\rm max}/\Omega^2) + a_{\rm max}/\Omega^2. \qquad (9)\end{aligned}$$

$x_{\rm h}(t_{\rm f}/2)$ is the real part of ζ_2 and one finds

$$\begin{aligned}x_{\rm h}(t_{\rm f}/2) &= 2\,a_{\rm\,max}/\Omega^2\,(\cos^2(\Omega\,t_{\rm f}/4)) - \cos(\Omega\,t_1))\\ &= 0 \qquad (10)\end{aligned}$$

by Eq. (4), i.e. ζ_2 lies on the imaginary axis. The corresponding trajectories in the complex plane correspond

to the two curves in the left half-plane in Fig. 5. By the symmetry of the protocol the next two steps give the two curves in the right half-plane where the last one ends again at the origin. This follows of course also analytically. Hence after the final step the oscillator is again at rest in its equilibrium position. Thus the protocol satisfies the initial and final conditions.

III. PROOF OF OPTIMALITY FOR FIXED Ω

First the equivalent *converse* problem will be considered: Finding the longest distance d for a given time duration t_f under the conditions (i) - (iii) in Section I and a corresponding protocol.

Symmetry. Consider some given t_f and d. In the following it is convenient to let time run from $-\frac{1}{2}t_\mathrm{f}$ to $\frac{1}{2}t_\mathrm{f}$. Let x_h and x_w satisfy Eqs. (1) for some $a(t)$ and the boundary conditions at $\pm\frac{1}{2}t_\mathrm{f}$. Then $\frac{1}{2}(x_\mathrm{h}(t)-x_\mathrm{h}(-t))$ and $\frac{1}{2}(x_\mathrm{w}(t)-x_\mathrm{w}(-t)+d)$ satisfy Eqs. (1) with $a(t)$ replaced by $\frac{1}{2}(a(t)-a(-t))$ and the same boundary conditions. Hence without loss of generality one can assume that x_h and a are *anti-symmetric* while $\dot{x}_\mathrm{h}$ and $\dot{x}_\mathrm{w}$ are *symmetric* under time reversal.

Scaled variables. We go over to dimensionless scaled variables. We choose some fixed length unit d_0 and put

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_0^2 &= a_\mathrm{max}/d_0 & \omega &= \Omega/\Omega_0 \\ \tau &= \Omega_0 t & u(\tau) &= a(t)/a_\mathrm{max} \\ \xi_1(\tau) &= x_\mathrm{h}(t)/d_0 & \xi_2(\tau) &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\xi_1(\tau) \\ \xi_3(\tau) &= x_\mathrm{w}(t)/d_0 & \xi_4(\tau) &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\xi_3(\tau) \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

so that $u(\tau)$ can vary between -1 and 1. Then one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\xi}_1 \equiv \frac{d^2}{d\tau^2}\xi_1 &= -\omega^2\xi_1 - u(\tau) \\ \ddot{\xi}_3 &= u(\tau)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

For fixed Ω and a suitable d_0 one can assume $\Omega_0 = \Omega$ and then $\omega = 1$.

Pontryagin Maximum (or Minimum) Principle (PMP) [24–26]. This is a far-reaching generalization of the calculus of variations and regarded as a milestone in control theory. A simple example is a car moving in shortest time from standstill at A to standstill at B, under the only condition that the time-dependent acceleration resp. deceleration (the 'control') is bounded, but not necessarily continuous.

The PMP serves to determine necessary conditions for an optimal control function $u^*(t)$ (or possibly several control functions) which minimizes a given cost function J of the form $J = \int_0^T L(u(\tau),...)d\tau$, where L is a function of the control $u(\tau)$ and some state functions ξ_i and their derivatives. For the present distance-optimal control problem, one can take $L = \xi_4$ since $J = \int_0^T \dot{\xi}_3 d\tau$ is the (scaled) distance. To minimize it, the PMP considers a control Hamiltonian H_c,

$$H_c = -L + p_1\dot{\xi}_1 + p_2\dot{\xi}_2 + p_3\dot{\xi}_3 + p_4\dot{\xi}_4, \tag{13}$$

where one inserts $\dot{\xi}_i$ from Eqs. (11-12) and where the adjoint states p_i are Lagrange multipliers which can not all be identically zero. Then, for an extremal control $u(\tau) = u*(t)$, Hamilton's equations

$$\dot{p}_i = -\partial H_c/\partial\xi_i, \qquad \dot{\xi}_i = \partial H_c/\partial p_i \tag{14}$$

hold. For almost all $-\tau_\mathrm{f}/2 \le \tau \le \tau_\mathrm{f}/2$, the function $H_c(p_i(t),\xi_i(t),u(t))$ attains its maximum at $u(t) = u^*(t)$, and $H_c = \mathrm{const}$. For simplicity we omit the asterisk on u^*. Inserting for $\dot{\xi}_i$, H_c becomes

$$H_c = -\xi_4 + p_1\xi_2 + p_2(-\omega^2\xi_1 - u) + p_3\xi_4 + p_4 u\ . \tag{15}$$

From the term $(p_4 - p_2)\,u$ it follows that for a maximum one has to choose $u(\tau) = 1$ if $p_4 - p_2 > 0$ and -1 if $p_4 - p_2 < 0$. When $p_4 - p_2 = 0$, or more precisely, when $p_4 - p_2$ changes sign, there is a switch from ±1 to ∓1 in u. Hamilton's equations become

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}_1 &= \omega^2 p_2, & \dot{p}_2 &= -p_1 \\ \dot{p}_3 &= 0, & \dot{p}_4 &= -p_3 + 1 \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The solutions are

$$\begin{aligned} p_2(\tau) &= A\cos\tau + B\sin\omega\tau, & p_1 &= -\dot{p}_2 \\ p_3 &= c_3, & p_4 &= (-c_3+1)\,\tau + c_4 \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where A, B, c_3, and c_4 are constants. If $p_4 - p_2 \equiv 0$ in some extended interval, then $p_4 = p_2 \equiv 0$, by linear independence. Therefore it is not possible to have $u \equiv 0$ and $\xi_4 \equiv const$ in some extended interval so that there are only isolated switches. Hence, by anti-symmetry of u, there is a switch at $\tau = 0$, i.e. $-p_2(0) + p_4(0) = 0$, and thus $A = c_4$. By the boundary conditions on ξ_i at $\pm\tau_\mathrm{f}/2$ only the terms containing u remain in H_c which by antisemitic of u lead to two equations and to

$$A\,(\cos(\omega\tau_\mathrm{f}/2) - 1) = 0\ . \tag{18}$$

Thus either $A = 0$ or $\omega\tau_\mathrm{f} = 4\pi n$. In the latter case the situation is analogous to Example 2, i.e. the h.o. can perform $2n$ complete oscillations and the optimal distance is the same as without oscillator. We can therefore assume $A = c_4 = 0$. For $\omega\tau_\mathrm{f} \neq 4\pi n$ there are at least two switches of u and therefore $B \neq 0$ since otherwise $-c_3 + 1 = 0$, $c_3 = 1$, and $\xi_4 \equiv \mathrm{const}$. The explicit values of B and c_3 are not needed, they can in principle be calculated at the end; it suffices to discuss the cases $B < 0$ and $B > 0$.

Note: From the remark after Eq. (15) it follows that $u(\tau) = 1$ when the line $p_4(\tau)$ lies *above* the sine curve $p_2(\tau)$ and $u(\tau) = -1$ when it lies *below*.

Case $B < 0$. (i) Single switch for $\tau < 0$, at $-\tau_1$, say. Then the line $p_4(\tau)$, denoted by L_1 in Fig. 6, intersects with the -sine curve $p_2(\tau)$ once.

The analog of Eqs. (9) for $\xi + \mathrm{i}\omega^{-1}\dot{\xi}$ in the scaled variables, now with initial time -$\tau_\mathrm{f}/2$ and final time 0 yields

$$\xi_1(0) = \cos(\omega\tau_\mathrm{f}/2) - 2\cos(\omega\tau_1) + 1. \tag{19}$$

From the anti-symmetry of ξ_1 one has $\xi_1(0) = 0$, and from this one obtains

$$\cos\omega\tau_1 = \cos^2(\omega\tau_\mathrm{f}/4) \tag{20}$$

with $-\pi/2\omega < -\tau_1 < 0$. Thus line L_1 in Fig. 6 is typical in this case, while line L_2 is not possible.




FIG. 6: Case $B < 0$. With $\omega = 1$. L_1 and L_2 denote possible lines for $p_4(\tau)$. Their intersections with $p_2(\tau)$ (-sine curve) are possible switching points. In regions where $p_4(\tau)$ is above $p_2(\tau)$ one has acceleration, otherwise deceleration. Only L_1 with a single switch is optimal.

(ii) If there are two or more switches for $\tau < 0$, e.g. if $p_4(\tau)$ is given by line L_2 in Fig. 6, then the last deceleration period before $\tau = 0$ is longer than $\pi/2\omega$. Hence the total acceleration time is less than in (i) and the distance traveled by the wagon during τ_f is less than that in (i). Hence for $B < 0$ there is only a single switch for $\tau < 0$.

Case $B > 0$. From Fig. 7 this is case $B < 0$ reflected at the τ axis, with $u = \pm 1$ interchanged and thus positive wagon distances for $B < 0$ now become negative. But there might also be negative distances for $B < 0$, corresponding to positive distances for $B > 0$, and therefore a more detailed discussion is required. Here we use $\omega = 1$.

(i) Single switch for $\tau < 0$: As for $B < 0$ there is only a single solution for fixed τ_f, and this is the corresponding optimal backward motion, with $p_4(\tau)$ typically given by L_3 in Fig. 7.

(ii) Exactly two switches for $\tau < 0$. Typical for this would be lines L_4 and L_5 in Fig. 7, with switches at $-\tau_2 < -\tau_1 < 0$, say.

a) Case $\tau_2 - \tau_1 > \pi/2$.

From Fig. 7 one easily finds $\dot{\xi}_3(0) = \tau_\mathrm{f}/2 - 2(\tau_2 - \tau_1) < \tau_\mathrm{f}/2 - \pi$ while, from case $B < 0$, $\dot{\xi}_{3\mathrm{opt}} \geq \tau_\mathrm{f}/2 - \pi$ since here the switching point lies to the right of $-\pi/2$. Hence in case $B < 0$ the distance is larger.

b) Case $\tau_2 - \tau_1 < \pi/2$.

This will be shown to be incompatible with the boundary conditions on the h.o.. One has $\xi_1(0) = 0$, by anti-symmetry, while $\dot{\xi}_1(0) \equiv \lambda$ is unknown. Reversing the time development from $\tau = 0$ to $\tau = -\tau_2$ one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
&\xi_1(-\tau_1) + \mathrm{i}\dot{\xi}_1(-\tau_1) = \exp[-\mathrm{i}\tau_1]\{\mathrm{i}\lambda + 1\} - 1 \\
&\xi_1(-\tau_2) + \mathrm{i}^{-1}\dot{\xi}_1(-\tau_2) = \\
&\exp[\mathrm{i}(-\tau_1 + \tau_2)]\{\xi_1(-\tau_1) + \mathrm{i}\dot{\xi}_1(-\tau_1) - 1\} + 1 \\
&= \exp[\mathrm{i}(-\tau_1 + \tau_2)\{\exp[\mathrm{i}\tau_1](\mathrm{i}\lambda + 1) - 2\} + 1
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Since this must lie on the circle around -1 passing through 0, upon adding 1 the rhs becomes a number of modulus 1:

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &= |\exp[\mathrm{i}(-\tau_1 + \tau_2)]\{\exp[\mathrm{i}\tau_1](\mathrm{i}\lambda + 1) - 2\} + 2| \\
&= |\mathrm{i}\lambda + 1 - 2\exp[-\mathrm{i}\tau_1] + 2\exp[-\mathrm{i}\tau_2]|
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Hence the modulus of the real part,

$$|1 - 2\cos\tau_1 + 2\cos\tau_2|, \tag{23}$$

must be less than, or equal to, 1. However, from Fig. 7, one has $-3\pi/2 < -\tau_1 < -\pi$ and so $\cos\tau_1 < 0$. For $-2\pi < -\tau_2 < -3\pi/2$ one has $\cos\tau_2 > 0$ while for $-3\pi/2 < -\tau_2 < -\pi$ one has $-2\cos\tau_1 + 2\cos\tau_2 > 0$. Hence the bracket in Eq. (23) is larger than 1, a contradiction. Thus this case can not occur.

(iii) Three or more switches for $\tau < 0$: A typical line is L_5 in Fig. 7. From Fig.7 it is evident that the area under the curve (i.e. distance) decreases.




FIG. 7: Case $B > 0$. With $\omega = 1$. L_3, L_4 and L_5 denote possible lines for $p_4(\tau)$. Their intersections with $p_2(\tau)$ (sine curve) are possible switching points. Dashed: $\dot{\xi}_3$ with 2 intersection points $-\tau_1$ and $-\tau_2$. Dotdashed: $\dot{\xi}_{3\mathrm{opt}}$ from case $B < 0$. For $\tau_2 - \tau_1 > \pi/2$ one has $\dot{\xi}_{\mathrm{opt}} > \dot{\xi}$. L_3 is typical for the optimal backwards motion.

As a consequence, case $B > 0$ is not possible and case $B < 0$ (i) gives the unique optimal distance for given τ_f and fixed ω in scaled variables. This distance is easily calculated to be $\tau_f^2/4 - 2\tau_1^2$, with τ_1, $0 \le \tau_1 \le \pi/2$, given by Eq. (20). In the original variables one has

$$d = \frac{1}{4} a_{\max} t_f^2 - 2 a_{\max} t_1^2. \tag{24}$$

Going back to the original problem one obtains the protocol of Section II.

IV. PROTOCOLS FOR TIME-DEPENDENT OSCILLATOR FREQUENCY

In this case one allows in addition to $a(t)$ also $\Omega(t)$ to be time-dependent and seeks a minimal transport time t_f for a distance d under the condition that the wagon is initially and finally at rest and the oscillator is at rest in its equilibrium position. This situation is more complicated. If there are no bounds on Ω then for $\Omega \to \infty$ one obtains the absolute minimal time as without oscillator. Therefore, in addition to $|a(t)| \le a_{\max}$ one imposes bounds

$$0 \le \Omega_- \le \Omega(t) \le \Omega_+ < \infty. \tag{25}$$

If a 'resonant value' from Eq. (2) lies in this interval then, from Example 2, one chooses this value for Ω and then obtains the absolute minimal time.

Distance optimization. Again we first consider the equivalent problem of finding a protocol that maximizes the distance d for given time t_f and let time run from $-\frac{1}{2}t_f$ to $\frac{1}{2}t_f$. We will seek solutions that satisfy the same symmetry properties as in Section III, i.e. we assume that $\Omega(t)$ is *symmetric*.

The same scaled variables as in Eq. (11) are used. Introducing

$$u_1(\tau) \equiv \omega^2(\tau) \tag{26}$$

as a second control variable, Eq. (12) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\xi}_1 \equiv \frac{d^2}{d\tau^2}\xi_1 &= -u_1(\tau)\xi_1 - u(\tau) \\ \ddot{\xi}_3 &= u(\tau)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

The condition on $\Omega(t)$ becomes $\omega_-^2 \le u_1(\tau) \le \omega_+^2$. The control Hamiltonian for the PMP now reads

$$H_c = -\xi_4 + p_1\xi_2 + p_2(-u_1\xi_1 - u) + p_3\xi_4 + p_4 u\ . \tag{28}$$

As before it follows that for a maximum one has to choose $u(\tau) = 1$ if $p_4 > p_2$ and -1 if $p_4 < p_2$. When $p_4 - p_2 = 0$, or more precisely, when $p_4 - p_2$ changes sign, there is a switch from ± 1 to ∓ 1 in u. Similarly, $u_1 = \omega_+^2$ if $p_2\xi_1 < 0$, and $u_1 = \omega_-^2$ if $p_2\xi_1 > 0$. A switch occurs when $p_2\xi_1$ changes sign.

Depending on whether $u_1 = \omega_+^2$ or $u_1 = \omega_-^2$, Hamilton's equations in the respective τ intervals become

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}_1 &= \omega_\pm^2\, p_2, & \dot{p}_2 &= -p_1 \\ \dot{p}_3 &= 0, & \dot{p}_4 &= -p_3 + 1. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Between switches of u_1 the solutions are of the form

$$p_2(\tau) = A_\pm \cos\omega_\pm\tau + B_\pm \sin\omega_\pm\tau = C_\pm \sin(\omega_\pm\tau - \varphi_\pm) \tag{30}$$

$$p_1 = -\dot{p}_2, \quad p_3 = c_3, \quad p_4 = (-c_3 + 1)\,\tau + c_4$$

where c_3, c_4, $C_\pm$ are constants, and $A_\pm$, $B_\pm$, $\varphi_\pm$ are constants which may dependent on the respective interval. If $p_2(\tau) \equiv 0$ in some interval then it is zero everywhere because it cannot be joined continuously to the a nonzero p_2 from Eq. (30).

Since $\omega(\tau)$ is symmetric there must be intervals of equal length with $\omega(\tau) = \omega_+$ directly to the left and right of $\tau = 0$ (or ω_- intervals, but this will not be optimal as shown later). Hence one must have $\varphi_+ = 0$ in this interval since then there are switches in $\omega(\tau)$ at $\tau = \pm\pi/\omega_+$ because $p_2\xi_1$ vanishes there. It also vanishes at $\tau = 0$ but does not change sign because of anti-symmetry of ξ_1 and p_2 so that ω has no switch at $\tau = 0$ although u does. Thus p_2 is of the form

$$p_2(\tau) = B_+ \sin(\omega_+\tau) \tag{31}$$

in the interval $-\pi/\omega_+ \le \tau \le \pi/\omega_+$.

To the left of $\tau = -\pi/\omega_+$ there is an interval with ω_-, then again an ω_+ interval and so on, and similarly to the right of $\tau = \pi/\omega_+$. Since $p_2(\tau)$ is differentiable different parts of p_2 have to be joined accordingly. This yields an anti-symmetric p_2 as typically displayed in Fig. 8.




FIG. 8: Solid: $p_2(\tau)$ with symmetric $\omega_\pm$ sequence. Dashed: $p_4(\tau)$.

The procedure for the determination of τ_1 uses the time-development of ξ_1 and depends on the interval in which $\frac{1}{2}\tau_f$ lies. This will be exemplified for $\frac{1}{2}\tau_f \le \pi/\omega_+ + \pi/\omega_-$.When $\frac{1}{2}\tau_f \le \pi/\omega_+$ the situation is the same as in Section III and τ_1 is given by Eq. (20), with ω replaced by ω_+.

When $\pi/\omega_+ < \frac{1}{2}\tau_{\rm f} \leq \pi/\omega_+ + \pi/\omega_-$ we calculate $\xi_1(\tau_{\rm f}/2)$ and $\dot{\xi}_1(\tau_{\rm f}/2)$ from $\xi_1(0)$ and $\dot{\xi}_1 0)$. By antisymmetry one has $\xi_1(0) = 0$ and we put $\dot{\xi}_1(0) = \lambda$, the exact value of which will not be needed. Using Eq. (8) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_1 &\equiv \xi_1(\tau_1) + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\omega_+}\dot{\xi}_1(\tau_1) \\
&= \exp[-\mathrm{i}\omega_+(\tau_1 - 0)](\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\omega_+}\lambda + \frac{1}{\omega_+^2}) - \frac{1}{\omega_+^2} \\
\eta_2 &\equiv \xi_1(\pi/\omega_+) + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\omega_+}\dot{\xi}_1(\pi/\omega_+) \\
&= \exp[-\mathrm{i}\omega_+(\frac{\pi}{\omega_+} - \tau_1)]\{\Re\eta_1 + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\omega+}\omega_+\Im\eta_1 - \frac{1}{\omega_+^2}\} + \frac{1}{\omega_+^2} \\
\tilde{\eta}_3 &\equiv \xi_1(\tau_{\rm f}/2) + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\omega_-}\dot{\xi}_1(\tau_{\rm f}/2) \\
&= \exp[-\mathrm{i}\omega_-(\tau_{\rm f}/2 - \frac{\pi}{\omega_+})]\{\Re\eta_2 + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\omega_-}\omega_+\Im\eta_2 - \frac{1}{\omega_-^2}\} + \frac{1}{\omega_-^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

By the boundary conditions at $\frac{1}{2}\tau_{\rm f}$ one has $\tilde{\eta}_3 = 0$, and thus

$$0 = \Re\eta_2 + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\omega_-}\omega_+\Im\eta_2 - \frac{1}{\omega_-^2} + \exp[\mathrm{i}\omega_-(\tau_{\rm f}/2 - \frac{\pi}{\omega_+})]\frac{1}{\omega_-^2}. \tag{33}$$

Taking the real part of this one obtains after a short calculation

$$\cos[\omega_+\tau_1] = \frac{\omega_+^2}{2\omega_-^2}\{1 + \cos(\omega_-\tau_{\rm f}/2 + \frac{\omega_+ - \omega_-}{\omega_+}\pi)\}. \tag{34}$$

The l.h.s. cannot exceed 1, while the r.h.s. becomes 1 for $\tau_{\rm f} = \tau_{\rm opt}$ where

$$\tau_{\rm opt}/2 = \frac{\pi}{\omega_+} + \frac{\pi}{\omega_-} - \frac{2}{\omega_-}\arccos[\frac{\omega_-}{\omega_+}], \tag{35}$$

which lies between π/ω_+ and $\pi/\omega_+ + \pi/\omega_-$. Then $\tau_1 = 0$ and the distance becomes the absolute optimum for this particular $\tau_{\rm f} = \tau_{\rm opt}$.

Example 3. Let $\omega_- = \omega_+/2$. Then Eq. (35) yields $\tau_{\rm opt}/2 = \frac{5}{3}\pi/\omega_+$ and the distance d/d_0 becomes $\frac{1}{4}\tau_{\rm opt}^2$. If one considered only ω_+ and the corresponding $\tau_{\rm opt}$, one would have $\omega_+\tau_1 = \arccos[3/4] \neq 0$ and the distance would be less.

How to proceed when the r.h.s. of Eq. (34) is larger than 1? To answer this question we recall that p_2 has also the trivial solution $p_2(\tau) \equiv 0$. Then there are no restrictions on the choice of $\omega(\tau)$. If one decreases ω_+ on the r.h.s of Eq. (34) to ω_- the r.h.s. becomes less or equal to 1. Hence there must be an intermediate ω, denoted by $\tilde{\omega}_+$, such that the r.h.s becomes 1. Hence if one uses $[\omega_-, \tilde{\omega}_+]$ instead of $[\omega_-, \omega_+]$ one gets a solution for τ_1, namely $\tau_1 = 0$, so that the sequence ω_- and $\tilde{\omega}_+$ gives the largest distance for the given $\tau_{\rm f}$. This means going over to a sub-interval $[\omega_-, \tilde{\omega}_+]$ of $[\omega, \omega_+]$ optimizes the distance in this case. There are many sub-intervals with the same property, as seen further below.

In the case $\pi/\omega_+ + \pi/\omega_- < \tau_{\rm f}/2 \leq \pi/\omega_+ + \pi/\omega_- + \pi/\omega_+$, i.e. if one starts with ω_+, switches to ω_-, and to ω_+ before $\tau = 0$, i.e. a sequence $+-+|+-+$ in Fig. 8, then η_1 and η_2 in Eq. (32) remain unchanged while in η_3 one replaces $\tau_{\rm f}/2$ by $\pi/\omega_+ + \pi/\omega_-$ and there is an additional η_4,

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_3 &= -\Re\eta_2 + 2/\omega_-^2 - \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\omega_-}\omega_-\Im\eta_2 \\
\eta_4 &\equiv \xi_1(\tau_{\rm f}/2) + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\omega_+}\dot{\xi}_1(\tau_{\rm f}/2) \\
&= \exp[-\mathrm{i}\omega_+(\tau_{\rm f}/2 - \pi/\omega_+ - \pi/\omega_-)] \\
&\qquad \{\Re\eta_3 + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\omega_+}\omega_-\Im\eta_3 + \frac{1}{\omega_+^2}\} - \frac{1}{\omega_+^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

The condition $\eta_4 = 0$ now gives

$$\cos\omega_+\tau_1 = \frac{\omega_+^2}{\omega_-^2} - 1 + \frac{1}{2}\{1 + \cos(\omega_+\tau_{\rm f}/2 - \frac{\omega_+ - \omega_-}{\omega_-}\pi)\}. \tag{37}$$

For complete $\omega_\pm$ intervals the exponentials in Eqs. (32) and (36) equal -1 and using this the results are easily generalized. In particular, for the $\omega_\pm$ sequence $-+-+|+-+-$ one obtains

$$\cos(\omega_+\tau_1) = \frac{\omega_+^2}{\omega_-^2} - 1 + \frac{\omega_+^2}{2\omega_-^2}\{1 + \cos(\omega_-\tau_{\rm f}/2 - 2\pi\frac{\omega_-}{\omega_+})\}. \tag{38}$$

Time optimization. These results will now be applied to the original problem in which a distance, now denoted by d_0, is fixed and the shortest transport time for given $\Omega_\pm$ is sought. If this d_0 is taken for the definition of the scaled variables, d_0 becomes $\xi_3(\tau_{\rm f}/2) = 1$. The absolutely shortest possible time, $\tau_{\rm abs}$, and corresponding $\omega_{\rm res}$ is then, by Example 2, given by

$$\tau_{\rm abs} = 2 \qquad\qquad \omega_{\rm res} = 2\pi. \tag{39}$$

From Fig. 2 the distance traveled in time $\tau_{\rm f}$ is $\frac{1}{4}\tau_{\rm f}^2 - 2\tau_1^2$ and if $\tau_{\rm f}$ is to be optimal it must satisfy

$$1 = \frac{1}{4}\tau_{\rm f}^2 - 2\tau_1^2 \tag{40}$$

where $\tau_{\rm f} = \tau_{\rm f}(\omega_-, \omega_+)$. For given $\omega_\pm$ one obtains τ_1 from Eqs. (20, 34, 37) and generalizations thereof, depending on in which interval the as yet unknown $\tau_{\rm f}/2$ lies. If $\omega_{\rm res}$ or an integer multiple n thereof lies in $[\omega_-,\ \omega_+]$ one chooses $\omega(\tau) \equiv n\omega_{\rm res}$ and obtains the absolute optimal $\tau_{\rm abs}$. Different case of increasing complexity will now be discussed.

Case: $\omega_- = 0$, $0 < \omega_+ < 2\pi$ and the distance 1. If the spring constant is 0 then in the lab frame the mass point m travels free of force and in the the wagon frame under the inertial force. It can happen that it is optimal

to start with ω_-. Then m initially remains at rest in the lab frame until a switch to ω_+ occurs. If the time development starts with ω_+ there can be no switch to ω_- because the associated time interval π/ω_- is infinite. Hence in this case the results of Section II and III apply. From Fig. 4 it is seen that $\tau_{\rm f}$ decreases with increasing $\omega_+ < 2\pi$. Since $\tau_{\rm f}/2 \leq \pi/\omega_+$ one has, for optimality, $\tau_{\rm f} = 2\pi/\omega_+$ and $\tau_1 = 0$, by Eqs. (3,4). From Eq. (40) one then obtains $\tau_{\rm f}^2 = 4$ so that in this case one must have $\omega_+ = \pi/\sqrt{2} \equiv \tilde{\omega}_+$. Thus if $\omega_+ > \tilde{\omega}_+$ one starts with $\omega_- = 0$ and then there is a switch to ω_+ at some later time. In this case Eq. (34) holds for τ_1 and it becomes 0 for $\tau_{\rm f} = \tau_{\rm opt}$ given by Eq. (35). Taking the limit $\omega_- \to 0$ one finds $\tau_{\rm opt} = (2\pi + 4)/\omega_+$. This must equal $\tau_{\rm abs} = 2$ which gives $\omega_+ = \pi + 2 \equiv \omega_{\rm abs}$. From this value of ω_+ on one obtains the absolute time minimum. The optimal time as a function of ω_+ is displayed in Fig. 9.

Protocol. This depends on ω_+ and is as in Section II when $\omega_+ \leq \tilde{\omega}_+$. When $\tilde{\omega}_+ < \omega_+ \leq \omega_{\rm abs}$ one determines $\tau_{\rm f}$ and τ_1 from Eqs. (37) and (40), starts with $\omega_- = 0$ for the time duration $-\pi/\tilde{\omega}_+ + \tau_{\rm f}/2$ and with $u = 1$, then switches to ω_+ and continues for the time $-\tau_1 + \pi/\tilde{\omega}_+$, then switches to $u = -1$ for the time τ_1 and continues by symmetry, resp. anti-symmetry. When $\omega_{\rm abs} = 2 + \pi < \omega_+ \leq \omega_{\rm res}$ one chooses the protocol for $\omega_+ = \omega_{\rm abs}$.




FIG. 9: Shortest transport time $t_{\rm f}$ for fixed distance d_0, $\Omega_- = 0$ and $0 \leq \Omega_+/\Omega_{\rm res}(d_0) \leq 1$. Dotted: $t_{\rm f}$ for fixed Ω_+ without switch in Ω. Solid: $\Omega_+/\Omega_{\rm res}(d_0) > \sqrt{2}/4$; initially $\Omega(t) \equiv 0$ and then a switch to Ω_+. For $1/2 + 1/\pi \leq \Omega_+/\Omega_{\rm res}(d_0) \leq 1$ one has $T_{\rm abs}(d)$. The switch in Ω can thus lead to a shorter transport time than for Ω_+ alone.

Case: $0 < \omega_- < \omega_+ < \omega_{\rm res} = 2\pi$. As in the preceding case, only ω_+ is relevant if $\omega_+ \leq \tilde{\omega}_+ = \pi/\sqrt{2}$. Then $\tau_{\rm f}(\omega_-, \omega_+)/2 \leq \pi/\omega_+$ and is independent of ω_-. This is the upper close meshed region in Fig. 10. For $\omega_+ > \tilde{\omega}_+$ there are on the l.h.s. of Fig. 8 two or more alternating $\omega_\pm$'s for the time development. If there are two, one starts with ω_-, and the initial time $-\tau_{\rm f}/2$ satisfies $\pi/\omega_+ \leq \tau_{\rm f}/2 \leq \pi/\omega_+ + \pi/\omega_-$. In this case Eqs. (40) and (34) apply. If the l.h.s. of Eq. (34) is less or equal to 1 then one can determine τ_1 and $\tau_{\rm f}(\omega_-, \omega_+)$, displayed by the coarse meshed region in Fig. 10. Putting $\cos[\omega_+\tau_1] = 1$ one obtains with $\tau_{\rm f} = \tau_{\rm abs} = 2\pi$ from Eq. (34) the boundary curve at the bottom of the coarse meshed surface which borders the region denoted by $T_{\rm abs}$. In this region there is no solution for τ_1. As before, here the solution $p_2(\tau) \equiv 0$ can be used and then there are no restrictions on $\omega(\tau)$. If one starts from the point $\{\omega_-, \omega_+\}$ and first decreases ω_+ until one hits the boundary curve and then similarly increases ω_- one obtains the end points of an arc on the boundary curve. Every point $\{\hat{\omega}_-, \hat{\omega}_+\}$ on this arc satisfies $\{\omega_- \leq \hat{\omega}_- \leq \hat{\omega}_+ \leq \omega_+\}$ and yields $\tau_{\rm abs}$. Thus there is again an improvement over the single ω_+ case.

If there were a third, preceding, interval, i.e. with ω_+, then $\tau_{\rm f}(\omega_-, \omega_+)/2 > \pi/\omega_+ + \pi/\omega_-$ and $\tau_{\rm f}$ would thus be larger than that with only two periods. Hence a third period does not occur. By a similar calculation, interchanging ω_+ and ω_- leads to a larger transport time.

Protocol: When $\omega_+ \leq \tilde{\omega}_+ = \pi/\sqrt{2}$ one proceeds with ω_+ as in Section II. When $\omega_+ > \tilde{\omega}_+$ one determines $\tau_{\rm f}(\omega_-, \omega_+)$ and τ_1 from Eqs. (34) and (40), provided a solution for τ_1 exists. Then one has an $\omega_\pm$ sequence of the form $-+|+-$ and thus one starts with $u = 1$ and ω_- from time $-\tau_{\rm f}/2$ to time $-\pi/\omega_+$ where one switches to ω_+. Then one continues until time $-\tau_1$, where one switches to $u = -1$ and continues to $\tau = 0$ where there is a switch back to $u = 1$. For $\tau > 0$ one continues by symmetry, resp. anti-symmetry. When there is no solution for τ_1, i.e when the point $\{\omega_-, \omega_+\}$ lies in the region denoted by $T_{\rm abs}$ in Fig. 10, then one can choose a protocol for any point on the above arc. This will yield $\tau_{\rm abs}$ and in this case the protocol is not unique.

Case: $\omega_{\rm res} = 2\pi \leq \omega_- < \omega_+ < 2\,\omega_{\rm res}$. Arguing as before, one has $+-+|+-+$ and $-+-+|+-+-$ as possible $\omega_\pm$ sequences. To the first sequence Eq. (37) applies and to the second Eq. (38). One now solves Eq. (40) together with Eq. (37) for $\tau_{\rm f}$ under the condition that$\tau_{\rm f}/2$ lies in the last ω_+ interval. In Fig. 11 this gives the left surface outside of which there is no solution for τ_1. In a similar way one obtains the right surface for the second sequence. On the boundary curve at the bottom one has $\tau_{\rm abs}$ and the curve is obtained from $\cos(\omega_+\tau_1) = 1$. The two $\omega_\pm$ sequences are separated by the dashed curve under the surface. This curve is obtained by putting $\tau_{\rm f}/2 = 2\pi/\omega_+ + \pi/\omega_-$ in Eqs. (37, 40). Its end point on the boundary curve is given by $\{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2}, 1 + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2}\}\,\omega_{\rm res}$ and on the diagonal by $\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{34}\,\omega_{\rm res}$.

In the region denoted by $T_{\rm abs}$ there is no solution for τ_1. Again one can choose any point $\{\hat{\omega}_-, \hat{\omega}_+\}$ on the arc constructed as before to obtain $\tau_{\rm abs}$. Reversing the sequence to $-+-|-+-$ leads to larger transport times.

Protocol: If for a given $\{\omega_-, \omega_+\}$ one has $\omega_- \leq (\frac{1}{2} +$




FIG. 10: Shortest transport time $t_{\rm f}$ for fixed distance d_0 and $0 \le \Omega_-/\Omega_{\rm res}(d_0) \le \Omega_+/\Omega_{\rm res}(d_0) \le 1$. For $\Omega_+/\Omega_{\rm res}(d_0) \le \pi/\sqrt{2}$ there is only Ω_+ and no switch (close meshed region). For $\{\Omega_-, \Omega_+\}$ in the region denoted by $T_{\rm abs}$ at the r.h.s. one has the shortest time $T_{\rm abs}$. The intersection of the surface with the front plane is the curve of Fig. 9 and that with the diagonal plane is the left part of the curve of Fig. 4 until 1.




FIG. 11: Shortest transport time $t_{\rm f}$ for fixed distance d_0 and $1 \le \Omega_-/\Omega_{\rm res}(d_0) \le \Omega_+/\Omega_{\rm res}(d0) \le 2$. The left side of the surface belongs to an $\Omega_\pm$ sequence $+-+|+-+$, the right side to $-+-+|+-+-$, separated by the dashed line in the bottom plane. For $\{\Omega_-, \Omega_+\}$ in the region denoted by $T_{\rm abs}$ one obtains the shortest time $T_{\rm abs}$ by going over to a point on the boundary corresponding to a sub-interval of $[\Omega_-, \Omega_+]$.

$\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2})\,\omega_{\rm res}$ or if a solution for τ_1 in Eq. (37) exists, one has a sequence $+-+|+-+$, from Fig. 11. If a solution exists the protocol is analogous to the previous case above. If not, one picks a point $\{\hat\omega_-, \hat\omega_+\}$ on the arc on the boundary curve, as before, and uses the protocol for this point with $\tau_{\rm f} = \tau_{\rm abs}$. Otherwise, one has a sequence $-+-+|+-+-$ and the procedure is analogous.

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Protocols for the fastest possible transport of a classical harmonic oscillator (h.o.) over a distance d have been derived where both initially and finally everything is at rest, i.e. the position of the h.o. is at rest and the h.o. is in its equilibrium position and also at rest. The acceleration $a(t)$ is assumed to satisfy $-a_{\rm max} \le a(t) \le a_{\rm max}$.

First, with fixed h.o. frequency Ω, for the shortest transport time the optimal acceleration alternates between $\pm a_{\rm max}$. It was shown that one starts with $a_{\rm max}$ and that there are three switches or, for special values $\Omega = n\Omega_{\rm res}(d) = 2\pi n\sqrt{a_{\rm max}/d}$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots$, only one switch. The switch times were determined.

The dependence of the shortest transport time, denoted by $t_{\rm f}$, on d, Ω and $a_{\rm max}$ was found, cf. Figs. 3 and 4. The optimal time $t_{\rm f}$ is proportional to $1/\sqrt{a_{\rm max}}$, diverges for $\Omega \to 0$ and, not surprisingly, for $\Omega \to \infty$ converges to $T_{\rm abs}(d) = 2\sqrt{d/a_{\rm max}}$, the optimal time for a wagon without h.o.. The function $t_{\rm f}(d)$ approaches $T_{\rm abs}(d)$ for large d. Surprisingly, sometimes it is advantageous to go *backwards* for a while, but not as far back as the initial position.

Second, in addition to $a(t)$ a time-dependent $\Omega(t)$ satisfying $\Omega_- \le \Omega(t) \le \Omega_+$ was considered. In this case the behavior of $t_{\rm f}$ depends sensitively on $\Omega_\pm$. If $n\,\Omega_{\rm res}(d)$ lies in the interval $[\Omega_-, \Omega_+]$ for some n then choosing $n\,\Omega_{\rm res}(d)$ will give the minimal time $T_{\rm abs}(d)$.

If $\Omega_+ \le \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\Omega_{\rm res}$ then $\Omega(t) \equiv \Omega_+$, there is no switch in Ω, and Ω_- does not enter. Otherwise there are two alternatives if $\Omega_+ < \Omega_{\rm res}$:
(*i*) One starts with Ω_-, switches to Ω_+ and then back to Ω_-.
(*ii*) Or there are $\tilde\Omega_\pm$, depending on $\Omega_\pm$, with $\Omega_- \le \tilde\Omega_- \le \tilde\Omega_+ \le \Omega_+$ and one starts with $\tilde\Omega_-$, switches to $\tilde\Omega_+$ and then back to $\tilde\Omega_-$. In this case one obtains the minimal time $T_{\rm abs}(d)$. In the $\Omega_- - \Omega_+$ plane this happens for $\{\Omega_-, \Omega_+\}$ in a region, cf. Fig. 10.

If $n\,\Omega_{\rm res} < \Omega_- \le \Omega_+ < (n+1)\Omega_{\rm res}$ the situation is similarly involved and depicted for $n = 1$ in Fig. 11 .

The Pontryagin Maximum Principle was employed, first for constant Ω with $a(t)$ as a control variable, and then with $a(t)$ and $\Omega(t)$ as control variables. Symmetry

properties played an important role which were proved for constant Ω and assumed in an analogous form for time-dependent Ω.

One may also want to impose restrictions on the velocities $\dot{x}_{\rm w}$ and $\dot{x}_{\rm h}$ or on the relative displacement $x_{\rm h}$ of the h.o.. Within the PMP this may be formulated by means of Lagrangian multipliers. In [28] the relative displacement was assumed to be bounded and taken as the only control. However, in this case there are $\delta(t)$-like forces at the time of a switch acting on the h.o., and no oscillations occur.

The above results for constant Ω have immediate applications to cranes for small-angle oscillations of the payload where the the rope length l is constant. For time dependent $l(t)$ modifications are needed since $l(t)$ is not related to the frequency $\Omega(t)$ in the same way as the spring constant.

The harmonic oscillator considered here is an idealized system. However, it may serve as a benchmark for more realistic models, e.g. if the switches are short but smooth rather than instantaneous.

[1] D. Guéry-Odelin, A. Ruschhaupt, A. Kiely, E. Torrontegui, S. Martínez-Garaot and J.G. Muga, Shortcuts to adiabaticity: Concepts, methods, and applications, Rev. Mod. Phys. **91**, 045001 (2019).

[2] E. Torrontegui, S. Ibañez, S. Martínez-Garaot, M. Modugno, A. del Campo, D. Guéry-Odelin, A. Ruschhaupt, X. Chen, and J. G. Muga, Shortcuts to adiabaticity, Adv. At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **62**, 117 (2013).

[3] Yue Ban, Xi Chen, E. Torrontegui, E. Solano, and J. Casanova, Speeding up quantum perceptron via shortcuts to adiabaticity Scientific Reports volume **11**, Article number: 5783, (2021).

[4] N.N. Hegade, K. Paul, Yongcheng Ding, M. Sanz, F. Albarrán-Arriagada, E. Solano, and Xi Chen, Shortcuts to Adiabaticity in Digitized Adiabatic Quantum Computing, Phys. Rev. Applied **15**, 024038 (2021)

[5] J. G. Muga, X. Chen, A. Ruschhaupt, and D. Guéry-Odelin, Frictionless dynamics of Bose-Einstein condensates under fast trap variations, J. Phys. B **42**, 241001 (2009).

[6] X. Chen, A. Ruschhaupt, S. Schmidt, A. del Campo, D. Guéry-Odelin, and J. G. Muga, Fast Optimal Frictionless Atom Cooling in Harmonic Traps, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 063002 (2010).

[7] D. Guéry-Odelin, J. G. Muga, M. J. Ruiz-Montero, and E. Trizac, Exact Nonequilibrium Solutions of the Boltzmann Equation under a Time-Dependent External Force, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 180602 (2014).

[8] D. Guéry-Odelin and J. G. Muga, Transport in a harmonic trap: Shortcuts to adiabaticity and robust protocols, Phys. Rev. **A 90**, 063425 (2014).

[9] A. Ruschhaupt, X. Chen, D. Alonso, and J. G. Muga, Optimally robust shortcuts to population inversion in two-level quantum systems, New J. Phys. **14**, 093040 (2012).

[10] S. Martínez-Garaot, E. Torrontegui, X. Chen, M. Modugno, D. Guéry-Odelin, Shuo-Yen Tseng, and J. G. Muga, Vibrational Mode Multiplexing of Ultracold Atoms, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 213001 (2013).

[11] M. Demirplak and S. A. Rice, On the consistency, extremal, and global properties of counterdiabatic fields, J. Chem. Phys. **129**, 154111 (2008).

[12] M. V. Berry, Transitionless quantum driving, J. Phys. **A 42**, 365303 (2009).

[13] X. Chen, I. Lizuain, A. Ruschhaupt, D. Guéry-Odelin, and J. G. Muga, Shortcut to Adiabatic Passage in Two- and Three-Level Atoms, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 123003 (2010).

[14] E. Carolan, A. Kiely, and S. Campbell, Counterdiabatic control in the impulse regime Phys. Rev. **A 105**, 012605 (2022)

[15] S. Masuda and K. Nakamura, Fast-forward of adiabatic dynamics in quantum mechanics, Proc. R. Soc. **A 466**, 1135 (2010).

[16] S. Masuda and K. Nakamura, Acceleration of adiabatic quantum dynamics in electromagnetic fields, Phys. Rev. **A 84**, 043434 (2011).

[17] Katsuhiro Nakamura, Jasur Matrasulov, and Yuki Izumida, Fast-forward approach to stochastic heat engine, Phys. Rev. **E 102**, 012129 (2020).

[18] E. Torrontegui, S. Martínez-Garaot, A. Ruschhaupt, and J. G. Muga, Shortcuts to adiabaticity: Fast-forward approach, Phys. Rev. **A 86**, 013601 (2012).

[19] G.C. Hegerfeldt, Driving at the Quantum Speed Limit: Optimal Control of a Two-Level System, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 260501 (2013)

[20] E. Dionis and D. Sugny, Time-optimal control of two-level quantum systems by piecewise constant pulses, arXiv.2211.09167

[21] G.C. Hegerfeldt, High-speed driving of a two-level system, Phys. Rev. **A 90**, 032110 (2014).

[22] Xi Chen, Yue Ban, and G.C. Hegerfeldt, Time-optimal quantum control of nonlinear two-level systems, Phys. Rev. **A 94**, 023624 (2016)

[23] S. González-Resines, D. Guéry-Odelin, A. Tobalina, I. Lizuain, E. Torrontegui, and J.G. Muga, Invariant-Based Inverse Engineering of Crane Control Parameters, Phys. Rev. Applied **8**, 054008 (2017).

[24] L. S. Pontryagin, V. G. Boltyanskii, R. V. Gamkrelidze, and E. F. Mishchenko, *The Mathematical Theory of Optimal Processes*, Interscience (1962).

[25] L.M. Hocking, *Optimal control: an introduction to the theory with applications*, Clarendon Press (Oxford 1991)

[26] U. Boscain, M. Sigalotti, and D. Sugny, Introduction to the Pontryagin Maximum Principle for Quantum Optimal Control, PRX Quantum **2**, 030203 (2021)

[27] E. Torrontegui, I. Lizuain, S. González-Resines, A. Tobalina, A. Ruschhaupt, R. Kosloff, and J. G. Muga, Energy consumption for shortcuts to adiabaticity, Phys. Rev. **A 96**, 022133 (2017)

[28] Xi Chen, E. Torrontegui, D. Stefanatos, Jr-Shin Li, and J. G. Muga, Optimal trajectories for efficient atomic transport without final excitation, Phys. Rev. **A 84**, 043415 (2011).