arXiv:nlin/0408022v2 [nlin.CD] 12 Oct 2005

Divergence of the Chaotic Layer Width and Strong Acceleration of the Spatial Chaotic Transport in Periodic Systems Driven by an Adiabatic ac Force

S.M. Soskin,[1,2,*] O.M. Yevtushenko,[2] and R. Mannella[3]

[1] *Institute of Semiconductor Physics, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 03028 Kiev, Ukraine*
[2] *Abdus Salam ICTP, 34100 Trieste, Italy*
[3] *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pisa, 56127 Pisa, Italy*

We show for the first time that a *weak* perturbation in a Hamiltonian system may lead to an arbitrarily *wide* chaotic layer and *fast* chaotic transport. This *generic* effect occurs in any spatially periodic Hamiltonian system subject to a sufficiently slow ac force. We explain it and develop an explicit theory for the layer width, verified in simulations. Chaotic spatial transport as well as applications to the diffusion of particles on surfaces, threshold devices and others are discussed.

PACS numbers: 05.45.Ac, 05.45.Pq, 05.40.-a, 66.30.-h

The basic chaotic formation in perturbed Hamiltonian systems is [1, 2, 3, 4] a chaotic layer associated with a separatrix of the unperturbed (integrable) Hamiltonian system. Even in the simplest case, when the unperturbed Hamiltonian system is one-dimensional while the perturbation is time-periodic, both the transport within the layer [4, 5, 6] and its structure on the Poincaré section [3, 4, 6], relating to the homoclinic tangle, are very complicated. At the same time, the boundaries of the layer are well defined [3] as the last invariant curves which limit the layer from above and below in the energy scale, and may be accurately found in numerical simulations [3]. For both theory and applications, one of the most important characteristics of the layer is its width in energy [1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9] or in related quantities [4, 10, 11]. It might be assumed that, if the perturbation is very *weak*, then the layer should necessarily be *narrow*. This natural assumption seems to be supported by numerous examples (e.g. [1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]). However, we show in the present Letter that the situation may drastically differ (Fig. 1) in a rather general case, namely for any *spatially periodic* system [12] driven by a *slow ac force*: the upper energy boundary of the layer *diverges* as the frequency of the force goes to zero. We explain this, develop a theory and verify it by simulations. We also demonstrate that the chaotic transport in space may be very fast in the adiabatic case, on sufficiently long time-scales, and discuss some applications.

Before moving on to the detailed consideration, we comment on the relation to [10]. It is shown in [10] that, for a system with adiabatically slowly pulsating parameters, the homoclinic tangle covers most of the range swept by the instantaneous separatrix. If the pulsation of parameters in [10] were weak, the range swept would be *narrow*. Our system essentially differs from that considered in [10] (our perturbation is not parametric) so the result of [10] cannot be directly applied to it. If nevertheless the result of [10] were formally generalized to our system, it would give that the homoclinic tangle in the adiabatic limit covered the whole phase space, thus hinting at a divergence of the chaotic layer width.




FIG. 1: (a). The trajectory in the stroboscopic (for $t = n2\pi/\omega_f$ with $n = 0, 1, 2, ...$) Poincaré section for the system (1) with $\omega_0 = 1$, $h = 0.01$, $\omega_f = 0.01$ and initial conditions $(p(0) = 0, q(0) = \pi)$. Number of points is 20000. For the sake of compactness, we map all points onto the interval $[-\pi, \pi[$: $q \to q - 2\pi[(q + \pi)/(2\pi)]$. This mapping does not affect the energy $E \equiv p^2/2 + U_0(q)$ and, hence, neither the chaotic layer width. (b). Spectral dependence of the maximum E_{max} of the energy E in the chaotic layer ($\omega_0 = 1, h = 0.01$).

Periodic systems and ac forces are widespread in nature. An archetypal example [1] is a pendulum driven by a weak single-harmonic ac force:

$$\begin{aligned} &\dot{q} = p, \qquad \dot{p} = -dU_0/dq - h\omega_0^2 \sin(\omega_f t) \equiv -dU/dq, \\ &U_0 \equiv U_0(q) = -\omega_0^2 \cos(q), \\ &U \equiv U(q,t) = U_0(q) + qh\omega_0^2 \sin(\omega_f t), \qquad h \ll 1. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

To get some insight into the physical origin of the phenomenon, and to obtain a qualitative explanation of Fig. 1, we first consider the *strong* adiabatic limit

$$\epsilon \equiv \omega_f/(h\omega_0) \ll 1, \tag{2}$$

a much wider range of ω_f will be considered afterwards.

Given that ω_f is small, the system may be considered as moving in the quasi-stationary "wash-board" potential U with slope $h\omega_0^2 \sin(\omega_f t)$. The absolute value of the slope is $\sim h\omega_0^2$ for most of the time while its sign is positive during odd half-periods of the perturbation, changing to the opposite one in the even half-periods. If the system is initially at the top of the potential barrier, then, owing to the condition (2), even a small slope

$\sim h\omega_0^2$ is sufficient to accelerate it during the first half-period up to a negative velocity of *large* absolute value. In the second half-period, the slope changes its sign, resulting in a braking effect, so that the velocity returns close to zero at the end of the period. Assuming that the maximum of the kinetic energy $\mathcal{K} \equiv p^2/2$ greatly exceeds the spatial modulation of $U(q,t)$,

$$\mathcal{K}_{max} \gg \omega_0^2, \tag{3}$$

one may neglect the term $U_0(q)$ in $U(q,t)$ while describing the major part of the trajectory (namely, when $\mathcal{K} \gg \omega_0^2$) during the first period of perturbation: the equations of motion reduce to those of a free particle driven by the time-periodic force, which are solved exactly:

$$q(t) = A + \left(B - \frac{h\omega_0^2}{\omega_f}\right) t + \frac{h\omega_0^2}{\omega_f^2} \sin(\omega_f t),$$
$$p(t) \equiv \dot{q} = B - \frac{h\omega_0^2}{\omega_f}(1 - \cos(\omega_f t)), \tag{4}$$

where $A = q(0)$ and $B = p(0)$.

For the given initial state ($p(0) = 0, q(0) = \pi$), $B = 0$ so that the velocity (4) oscillates from 0 to $-2h\omega_0^2/\omega_f$ while the kinetic energy $\mathcal{K} \equiv p^2/2$ oscillates from 0 to

$$\mathcal{K}_{max} = 2h^2\omega_0^4/\omega_f^2 \equiv 2\omega_0^2/\epsilon^2, \qquad \epsilon \ll 1. \tag{5}$$

Eq. (5) confirms the validity of the assumption (3), and the maximum of the energy does diverge as $\omega_f \to 0$.

But Eqs. (4),(5) do not explain chaos in the system. Like in other cases [1, 2, 3, 4], the chaos onset in our system is related to the motion near the unperturbed separatrix. Its rigorous treatment is complicated (cf. the conventional adiabatic case [10]) but is not essential for the quantity of main interest in our paper, i.e. for the chaotic layer *width*: the width is determined mainly by the "regular" parts of the chaotic trajectory (described by (4)). So, we describe the chaos onset just qualitatively.

Define $h_n \equiv h_n(\omega_f)$ as the value of h for which the system starting from the top of the barrier ($p(0) = 0, q(0) = \pi$) arrives in the end of the first period of the perturbation $t^{(1)} \equiv 2\pi/\omega_f$ at the top of the nth barrier i.e. $\dot{q}(t^{(1)}) = 0$, $q(t^{(1)}) = \pi - 2\pi n$ where n is a large positive integer. If $h = h_n$, the velocity of the system at the instant when it passed the previous (i.e. $(n-1)$st) barrier top can be shown to be $-\dot{q}_c$ with $\dot{q}_c \sim \sqrt{h\omega_f\omega_0 \ln(\omega_0/(h\omega_f))} \ll \omega_0$.

Consider h *slightly smaller* than h_n. For any t, $-\dot{q}(t)$ on the regular part of the trajectory is slightly smaller than that for $h = h_n$. Hence, the velocity on the true trajectory becomes zero slightly to the right of the nth barrier top slightly before $t^{(1)}$, i.e. the trajectory *reflects* from the right slope of the nth barrier and $\dot{q}(t^{(1)}) > 0$. The new round of acceleration to the left starts only after the next reflection (from the left slope of the $(n-1)$st barrier) i.e. with a small delay Δt_1 with respect to $t^{(1)}$:

$$\Delta t_1 \sim \omega_0^{-1} \ln(\omega_0^2/\dot{q}_c^2) \sim \omega_0^{-1} \ln(\omega_0/(h\omega_f)) \ll \omega_f^{-1}. \tag{6}$$

This new round of acceleration-braking is described by Eq. (4) with B determined by the condition $p(2\pi/\omega_f + \Delta t_1) = 0$, i.e. $B = (\omega_0/\epsilon)(1 - \cos(\omega_f \Delta t_1)) > 0$.

Consider h *slightly larger* than h_n. For any t, $-\dot{q}(t)$ is slightly larger than that for $h = h_n$ on the regular part of the trajectory. Hence, at $t^{(1)}$, the system arrives slightly to the left of the top of the nth barrier while moving to the left and with an energy close to the top of the barrier level. When the coordinate of the system approaches the vicinity of the top of the next (i.e. $(n+1)$st) barrier of $U(q,t)$, the latter becomes sufficiently lower than the top of the nth barrier and the system passes over it rather than reflects. Thus, the second round of acceleration-braking is described by Eq. (4) with $B \equiv \dot{q}(t^{(1)})$ being negative with a small absolute value.

At the end of the second acceleration-braking round, the system may again either pass over a barrier or reflect from it and even pass in the backward direction for a few periods of the potential. In the latter case, the new acceleration-braking round is additionally delayed with respect to the perturbation by some time Δt_2: this round is described by (4) with yet a larger positive $B = (\omega_0/\epsilon)(1 - \cos(\omega_f[\Delta t_1 + \Delta t_2])) > 0$. As time goes on, the process of reflection develops and, on long time-scales, the delay due to the reflections is *accumulated*. So, B gradually growes in average until it gets close to $B_{max} \equiv 2\omega_0/\epsilon$, then gradually decreases in average until it gets close to 0, etc. The sequence of reflections/passings is random unless $h = h_n$, but even in this case the sequence is random if the initial state is shifted from the top of the barrier. As reflections/passings and intervals Δt_i are random, variations of B are random too: so, the trajectory is *chaotic* on large time-scales.

Note also that the action $I \equiv (2\pi)^{-1} \oint p \, \mathrm{d}q$ [16], conventionally [4, 10, 11] chosen as the lowest-order adiabatic invariant, is *not conserved* for motion above the barrier in our system: on the major part of a trajectory, $K \gg \omega_0^2$ and hence $I \approx p$ while $|p|$ varies in a *wide* range (from 0 to $\sim \omega_0/\epsilon$, for the chaotic trajectory). The correct lowest-order *adiabatic invariant* for our system is

$$\tilde{I} = I + \frac{h\omega_0^2}{\omega_f}(1 - \cos(\omega_f t)). \tag{7}$$

To the lowest order in ϵ, $\tilde{I}$ coincides with the integration constant B of (4) on the major part of the trajectory [17]. So, the chaotic layer width in $\tilde{I}$ is the same as in B, i.e. equal to $B_{max} \equiv 2h\omega_0^2/\omega_f$, *diverging* as $\omega_f \to 0$.

Let us consider the problem of the layer width in a more general case, when Eq. (2) may not be satisfied. As explained above, the trajectory that can both pass over a barrier and reflect from it is chaotic. But the strong

inequality (3) for $\mathcal{K}_{max}$ may not hold now (cf. Eq. (5)) so the term U_0 in U cannot be neglected even on regular parts of the chaotic trajectory. Let the adiabatic approximation be still valid (the explicit condition is derived in Eq. (18)). As h is small, the turning point of the chaotic trajectory is situated near the *top* of a potential barrier:

$$p(t_s) = 0, \qquad q(t_s) \approx \pi - 2\pi m, \tag{8}$$

where m is integer and t_s is one of instants when $p = 0$.

Let $\mathcal{K}_n$ be the kinetic energy $\mathcal{K}$ at the instant t_n when the system crosses the coordinate of the top of the nth barrier of the auxiliary potential U, i.e.

$$q(t_n) \equiv q_n \approx \pi - 2\pi n, \qquad \mathcal{K}_n \equiv \frac{p^2(t_n)}{2}. \tag{9}$$

The coordinate of the next barrier top crossed by the system is

$$q_{n+\delta_n} \approx q_n - 2\pi\delta_n, \qquad \delta_n \equiv -\mathrm{sign}(p(t_n)). \tag{10}$$

In the adiabatic approximation, the change of $\mathcal{K}$ during the time $t_{n+\delta_n} - t_n$ is the following:

$$\mathcal{K}_{n+\delta_n} - \mathcal{K}_n \approx -(q_{n+\delta_n} - q_n) h\omega_0^2 \sin(\omega_f t_n). \tag{11}$$

The interval of time $t_{n+\delta_n} - t_n$ can be evaluated in the adiabatic approximation as follows

$$t_{n+\delta_n} - t_n \equiv \int_{q_n}^{q_{n+\delta_n}} \frac{\mathrm{d}q}{p} \tag{12}$$
$$\approx \int_{q_{n+\delta_n}}^{q_n} \frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\delta_n\sqrt{2(\mathcal{K}_n + \omega_0^2(1+\cos(q)))}} \approx \frac{2\sqrt{x}\mathrm{K}(x)}{\omega_0},$$
$$\mathrm{K}(x) \equiv \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{d\varphi}{\sqrt{1 - x\sin^2(\varphi)}}, \qquad x \equiv \frac{1}{1 + \mathcal{K}_n/(2\omega_0^2)}.$$

$\mathrm{K}(x)$ is the full elliptic integral of the 1st order [18].

Significant changes of $\mathcal{K}_n$ take place on the time scale ω_f^{-1} while the adiabatic condition means that

$$t_{n+\delta_n} - t_n \ll \omega_f^{-1}. \tag{13}$$

So, *discrete* changes of $\mathcal{K}_n \equiv \mathcal{K}(t_n)$ may be replaced by the *continuous* change of a function $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}(t_n)$ with derivative

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\tilde{\mathcal{K}}}{\mathrm{d}t_n} \approx \frac{\mathcal{K}_{n+\delta_n} - \mathcal{K}_n}{t_{n+\delta_n} - t_n}$$
$$\approx -\mathrm{sign}(p(t_n)) \frac{\pi h\omega_0^3\sqrt{1 + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}/(2\omega_0^2)}}{\mathrm{K}(1/(1 + \tilde{\mathcal{K}}/(2\omega_0^2)))} \sin(\omega_f t_n). \tag{14}$$

Separating variables, evaluating the resulting integrals and taking into account that, within the present simplified description of motion, $\mathrm{sign}(p)$ changes when $\tilde{\mathcal{K}} = 0$, we obtain the transcendental equation for $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$:

$$\frac{\mathrm{E}(x)}{\sqrt{x}} = 1 + \frac{\pi h}{4}\frac{\omega_0}{\omega_f}|\cos(\omega_f t_s) - \cos(\omega_f t_n)|, \tag{15}$$
$$\mathrm{E}(x) \equiv \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \mathrm{d}\varphi\, \sqrt{1 - x\sin^2(\varphi)}, \quad x \equiv \left(1 + \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}}{2\omega_0^2}\right)^{-1}.$$

Here, $\mathrm{E}(x)$ is a full elliptic integral of the 2nd order [18].

Due to the random-like changes of t_s, $\cos(\omega_f t_s)$ on long time-scales is densely distributed over the range $[-1, 1]$. Maximizing $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ with respect to t_s and t_n and taking into account that $E(t_n) \equiv \mathcal{K}(t_n) + U_0(q(t_n)) \approx \tilde{\mathcal{K}}(t_n) + \omega_0^2$, we finally obtain the transcendental equation for the upper energy boundary of the chaotic layer E_{max}:

$$\frac{\mathrm{E}(x)}{\sqrt{x}} = 1 + \frac{\pi h}{2}\frac{\omega_0}{\omega_f}, \qquad x \equiv \left(1 + \frac{E_{max} - \omega_0^2}{2\omega_0^2}\right)^{-1}. \tag{16}$$

E_{max} monotonously decreases from ∞ to ω_0^2 as $\omega_f/h\omega_0 \equiv \epsilon$ increases from 0 to ∞. Fig. 2 shows that Eq. (16) nicely describes the simulations in a wide range of ω_f.




FIG. 2: Spectral dependence of the maximum energy in the chaotic layer ($\omega_0 = 1, h = 0.01$): circles, solid, dashed and dotted lines correspond respectively to simulations, the general formula (16), the asymptotes (5) and (17).

For $\epsilon \ll 1$, the root $(E_{max} - \omega_0^2)/\omega_0^2$ of Eq. (16) is large. So, $x \approx 2\omega_0^2/E_{max} \to 0$ while $\mathrm{E}(x \to 0) \to \pi/2$, and the solution of (16) reduces to the asymptote (5).

For $\epsilon \gg 1$, the root $(E_{max} - \omega_0^2)/\omega_0^2$ of Eq. (16) is small. Using the asymptote [18] for $\mathrm{E}(x \to 1)$, Eq. (16) can be reduced to the following asymptote for E_{max}:

$$\frac{E_{max} - \omega_0^2}{\omega_0^2} \approx \frac{32}{a\ln(a)}, \quad a \equiv \frac{8\epsilon}{\pi}, \quad \epsilon \gg 1. \tag{17}$$

Using the estimate (12) and the asymptote $\mathrm{K}(x \to 1) = 0.5\ln(16/(1-x))$ [18] and allowing for Eq. (17), we may express the adiabatic condition (13) explicitly:

$$\omega_f \ll \omega_0/\ln(1/h). \tag{18}$$

Let us discuss chaotic transport. For most physical applications, transport in coordinate is relevant. For sufficiently long time-scales, the chaotic trajectory provides large-scale displacements in *both* directions, unlike regular trajectories. Generally, the mean-square displacement for chaotic transport depends on time as [6]

$\langle (q(t)-q(0))^2\rangle = Dt^b$ with $0<b<2$ ($\langle ...\rangle$ means averaging of the initial conditions over the chaotic layer). The *larger* D and b are, the *faster* the transport is. It is suggested in [19], basing on numerical results, that $b\to 1$ as $\omega_f \to 0$. As for D, we suggest that it *strongly diverges*. Indeed, chaotic trajectories generally spend most of the time close to the boundaries of regions of regular motion [6]. In our case, it means that, for most of the time, the trajectory moves close to either the upper border of the chaotic layer, with the average velocity $v \approx h\omega_0^2/\omega_f$, or the lower border, with the average velocity $-v$. We call such regimes *acceleration-braking flights* (cf. Lévy flights [6, 20]), distinguishing them from the regime of diffusion across the layer. The duration t_f of the flight may be estimated from the analysis of the diffusion of B near the boundary of the layer. The diffusion constant for B may be roughly estimated as $D_B \sim \langle (\Delta B)^2\rangle/(2\pi/\omega_f)$ where $\langle (\Delta B)^2\rangle$ is the average squared change of B at the end of a driving period: $\langle (\Delta B)^2\rangle \sim B_{max}^2(\omega_f \Delta t_1)^4$. Then,

$$t_f \sim \frac{B_{max}^2}{D_B} \sim \omega_0^{-1}\frac{(\omega_0/\omega_f)^5}{\ln^4(\omega_0/(h\omega_f))}. \qquad (19)$$

Finally, D may be estimated as the ratio between the squared length of the flight l_f^2 and its duration t_f:

$$D \sim \frac{l_f^2}{t_f} \equiv v^2 t_f \sim \omega_0 h^2 \frac{(\omega_0/\omega_f)^7}{\ln^4(\omega_0/(h\omega_f))}. \qquad (20)$$

The above analysis provides intuitive arguments in favor of a strong acceleration of the chaotic transport in space as $\omega_f \to 0$, and simulations support this. Still, a thorough numerical study and a rigorous evaluation of $D(\omega_f)$ as well as a proof that $b(\omega_f \to 0) = 1$ are necessary.

Apart from purely dynamic phenomena, our work may have a strong impact on noise-induced phenomena: e.g. diffusion of particles on surfaces (see [13] and references therein), that plays an important role in many modern technologies involving self-assembled molecular-film growth, catalysis, and surface-bound nanostructures [21]. Numerous studies of atoms (e.g. [22]), organic molecules (e.g. [23]), and even metal clusters (e.g. [24]) show that the *long* jumps may play a dominant role in the diffusion: this means that the *damping is small*. If we add a weak ac drive, then transient chaos [2] arises in a region of phase space which approximately coincides with the chaotic layer developed for zero damping (cf. [7]). In the light of the present results, the latter means: if the driving is *adiabatic*, then, as soon as the noise activates the particle to the lower boundary of the layer (i.e. approximately to the barrier level), the further transport is provided by fast (compared to slow noise-induced diffusion) chaotic transport. Thus, even a *weak* drive may drastically increase the speed of the diffusion.

One more possible application concerns a *threshold* device (cf. [25]). If the device was based on a noise-driven spatially periodic system and switched at the energy level E_{th} significantly exceeding the barrier level U_b, then the addition of even a weak but sufficiently slow ac drive would give rise to a marked decrease of the activation energy - from E_{th} to U_b, thus leading to a drastic increase of the flux. This may also be used as a sensitive method to measure the amplitude/frequency of the drive.

In conclusion, we have discovered the divergence of the chaotic layer width and the related strong acceleration of the chaotic spatial transport in ac driven periodic systems in the adiabatic limit. The mechanism is a combination of acceleration-braking flights of high average kinetic energy and of small random changes of the adiabatic invariant near the separatrix. Applications to diffusion on surface and to threshold devices have been suggested.

---

* Physics Department, Lancaster University, UK

[1] G.M. Zaslavsky et al, *Weak Chaos and Quasi-Regular Patterns*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
[2] A.J. Lichtenberg and M.A. Liebermann, *Regular and Stochastic Motion*, Springer, New York, 1992.
[3] G.M. Zaslavsky, *Physics of Chaos in Hamiltonian systems*, Imperial Colledge Press, London, 1998.
[4] Y. Elskens and D. Escande, *Microscopic Dynamics of Plasmas and Chaos*, IoP, Bristol, 2003.
[5] V. Rom-Kedar, *Nonlinearity* **7**, 441 (1994).
[6] G.M. Zaslavsky, *Physics Reports* **371**, 461 (2002).
[7] S.M. Soskin et al, *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 051111 (2001).
[8] S.M. Soskin et al, *Physics Reports* **373**, 247 (2003).
[9] S.M. Soskin et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 174101 (2003).
[10] Y. Elskens and D.F. Escande, *Nonlinearity* **4**, 615 (1991).
[11] D.L. Bruhwiler and J.R. Cary, *Physica D* **40**, 265 (1989).
[12] The number of dimensions may exceed 1. The space may be real, as in crystalline surfaces [13] or 2D electron gas in a magnetic superlattice [9] or optical lattices [14], or it may be an angle for a pendulum [1, 2, 3], or the phase of the order parameter for a Josephson junction [15].
[13] J.M. Sancho et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 250601 (2004).
[14] R. Gommers et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 143001 (2005).
[15] A. Barone and G. Paterno, *Physics and Applications of the Josephson Effect*, Wiley, New York, 1982.
[16] For the motion above the barrier, $\oint$ means the integration over a relevant 2π range of q.
[17] Small changes of $\tilde{I}$ occur only when the separatrix is approached (cf. the conventional case [4, 10, 11]).
[18] M. Abramovitz and I. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, Dover, New York, 1970.
[19] R. Harrish et al, *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 046214 (2002).
[20] M.F. Shlesinger et al, *Nature* **363**, 31 (1993).
[21] G.E. Poirier and I.D. Pliant, *Science* **272**, 1145 (1996); T. Yokoyama et al, *Nature* **413**, 619 (2001); T. Ala-Nissila et al, *Adv. Phys.* **51**, 949 (2002).
[22] J. Ferron et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 166107 (2004).
[23] M. Schunack et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 156102 (2002).
[24] W.D. Ludtke and U. Landman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3835 (1999).
[25] N.G. Stocks, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2310 (2000).