A. Yadav and D.A. Browne

Department of Physics and Astronomy, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803{4001

W e present a general method of analyzing the in uence of nite size and boundary elects on the dynamics of localized solutions of non-linear spatially extended systems. The dynamics of localized structures in in nite systems involve solvability conditions that require projection onto a G oldstone mode. Our method works by extending the solvability conditions to nite sized systems, by incorporating the nite sized modications of the G oldstone mode and associated nonzero eigenvalue. We apply this method to the special case of non-equilibrium domain walls under the in uence of D inchlet boundary conditions in a parametrically forced com plex G inzburg Landau equation, where we exam ine exotic nonuniform domain wall motion due to the in uence of boundary conditions.

PACS num bers: 82.40.-g,05.70.Ln

### I. IN TRODUCTION

M odels of non-linear spatially extended system s exhibit a variety of spatial and tem poral pattern form ing phenom ena. A subclass of these patterns are spatially bcalized structures [1] that include pulses, solitons, fronts, and dom ain walls. The standard analysis of these localized structures assumes that, on large length and time scales, they can be treated as \coherent objects" [1], with e ective parameters like position, and velocity attributed to them . A perturbative expansion about this isolated coherent ob ject pro le is then used to understand its response to external forces, interaction with other localized structures [2, 3], noise, or internal instabilities [4, 5]. Perturbative calculations reduce the original nonlinear problem to a series of linear problem s that require consistency criteria known as solvability conditions for their solution. Typically, the solution of a linear equation L = , requires the orthogonality of to the zero modes , ie., (;) = 0, in the null space of the adjoint hom ogeneous problem  $L^{y} = 0$ .

O fien, the sym metries in a particular system are responsible for the zero modes of the operators obtained after a perturbative expansion. For instance, since a localized structure pro le and the same pro le translated in nitesim ally are both solutions of the underlying nonlinear equation, the di erence of the two pro les provides a zero (neutral or G oldstone) mode. Strictly, the zero mode is the derivative of the localized structure pro-

le, and the underlying sym metry is translation invariance. Zero modes extracted from sym metry arguments may then be employed straightforwardly into solvability integrals.

The argument above, based on translational invariance, works if the system size is in nite. For a bcalized structure near a system boundary, due to the relevant boundary conditions that have to be imposed there, the localized structure solution and its in nitesim ally translated counterpart are no longer solutions of the same equation. Hence, translational invariance is broken. Therefore, in this case, one has to contend, not only with the incorporation of the boundary data into the solvability condition, but also the appropriate treatment of broken translation invariance.

M ost treatm ents of localized structures follow analyticaltechniques that fall in the realm of moving boundary approximations [6]. A common feature to these approxim ations, for instance, in excitable waves [7], or bistable fronts [8, 9, 10], is the separation of the description of the localized structure into an \inner region" and \outer region". The inner region, characterized by short spatial scales and fast time scales, captures the internal dynam ics of the localized structure. In contrast, the dynam ics of the localized structure as a whole is captured by the long spatial and time scales comprising the outer problem. The solvability integrals in moving boundary type approximations occur in the inner problem. Since it is the elds in the outer region that mediate the interaction with the boundary [11, 12], the boundary data is not incorporated into solvability conditions arising in the inner problem. There are ample situations however, where it may not be possible to have separate inner and outer regions of a localized structure by manipulating relevant system parameters [14]. In such cases, the boundary data must be directly incorporated into the solvability condition.

In this paper, through an appropriately chosen adjoint operator  $L^{y}$  de ned for the sem i-in nite system (localized structure near a boundary), we develop techniques that not only include the boundary data into the solvability condition, but also directly incorporate the e ects of broken translational invariance into it. We accomplish this by extending the de nition of the G oldstonem ode to include the possibility that the corresponding eigenvalue be non-zero, with its magnitude dependent on how close the localized structure is to the boundary. This leads further to a modil ed solvability criteria.

As a case study, we develop our techniques in the context of reaction-di usion systems and apply it to non-equilibrium domain walls (fronts) found in bistable regimes. In bistable reaction-di usion systems, fronts

E lectronic address: yadav@ phys.lsu.edu

connecting the two hom ogeneous steady states can undergo a bifurcation, called a front bifurcation, where a stationary Ising front loses stability to two counterpropagating Bloch fronts[14]. This bifurcation can be regarded as an internal instability of the Ising front, the localized structure about which a perturbative expansion is carried out to obtain the propagating Bloch wall solution. This bifurcation, also known as the Ising-Bloch bifurcation, has been observed in several systems, like chem ical reactions [4, 15, 16] and also in liquid crystals [17, 18].

In a recent work [12], we examined the in uence of boundaries on Ising-B loch fronts in a FitzH ugh-N agum o (FHN) reaction di usion model. We were able to derive order param eter equations (OPE) for front dynam ics, where the fronts were perturbed by the imposition of D irichlet and possibly other boundary conditions at the boundaries. This derivation for the two component FHN m odel required restrictive assum ptions about the relative size of the fronts for the two concentration elds, allow ing for the use of m oving boundary approxim ation like singular perturbation methods detailed in [8, 9]. These singular perturbation techniques are quite versatile, predicting exotic phenom ena like front reversal, trapping, and oscillation at the boundary. However, as observed earlier, we wish to exam ine the e ects of boundary data on localized structures, where moving boundary type approximations are not applicable, and the explicit incorporation of boundary data in a solvability condition is required.

In the next section we discuss the extension of the solvability condition to incorporate boundary data and broken translational invariance via the extension of the Goldstonem ode in a generic system exhibiting a localized structure. In Sec. III, we describe the modi cation of the slow manifold of a generic Ising-B loch front due to boundary e ects. In Sec. IV, we apply our method of solvability condition extension to study the e ects of nite size and D irichlet boundary conditions on the dynam ics of Ising-Bloch fronts in a param etrically forced complex Ginzburg Landau equation (CGLE) [5, 14]. An important reason behind this choice is its experim ental context, m odeling Ising-B loch fronts in Liquid crystals subjected to rotating magnetic elds [17, 18]. Liquid crystal system s are ideal candidates to study boundary e ects, as lateral boundary conditions may be imposed in a controlled manner by appropriate electric elds [19]. Another experim ental test bed is presented R ef. [20], in the form of coupled non-linear electrical oscillators, where the application of boundary conditions requires a minor and straightforward variation of the original circuit. In Sec. V we discuss in detail the implications of the derived order param eter equations for the param etrically forced CGLE. In Sec. VI we present our conclusions.

# 2

### II. GOLDSTONE MODES AND SOLVABILITY CRITERIA

Consider a general non-linear PDE,

$$\partial_t U = LU + N (U); \tag{1}$$

where U (x;t) is the solution vector, L are the linear terms, and N (U) are the non-linear terms. Let  $U_0(x)$  be a stationary localized solution of Eq. (1), with the asymptotic behavior U (x) ! 0;x ! 1. In principle,  $U_0(x)$  also encompasses uniform ly translating localized structures, which are stationary in a co-m oving fram e.

D ue to translational invariance in the system, one has A (x) = U<sub>0x</sub>, the derivative with respect to x of the localized structure pro le, as the zero eigenvalue (neutral or G oldstone) m ode of the operator  $\$ = L + N^{0}(U_{0})$ . A lso, it is reasonable to expect that due to translational invariance  $\$^{y}$  has a corresponding zero eigenvector, given by the solution of  $\$^{y}A^{y} = 0$ . A detailed discussion of this issue m ay be found in [13] and the references therein.

W hile examining the stability of  $A = U_{0x}$  to perturbations, which may include a small external perturbation p(U;x) added onto Eq. (1), one obtains,

$$[L + N^{0}(U_{0})] U = f;$$
  

$$f = \theta_{t}(U) f N^{00}(U_{0})(U)^{2} = 2 + p(U_{0};x)$$
  

$$+ p^{0}(U_{0};x) U + p^{00}(U_{0};x)(U)^{2} = 2 + O[(U)^{3}]g;(2)$$

where U is the small deviation from the localized structure pro le. Realizing that the operator  $= L + N^{0}(U_{0})$  has a G oldstone mode, the solvability of Eq. (2) requires,

$$(f; A^{y}) = 0:$$
 (3)

The brackets indicate an inner product or the projection of the dynam ical terms f onto the G oldstone m ode (its corresponding adjoint) A<sup>y</sup>. Equation. (3) represents the generic response of a localized structure to a wide variety ofperturbations, both internal and external. From an inform aland intuitively appealing point of view, the G oldstone m ode with its associated zero eigenvalue is a slow (relevant) m ode, which coupled with other slow m odes in the system, should dom inate the dynam ics. The projection in Eq. (3) is a form all prescription to capture this slow dynam ics.

Let a localized structure be located near a boundary at x = 1, with the origin xed at the position of the localized structure. A lthough,  $A^y$  is still a solution of  $S^{y}A^{y} = 0$  in this case, it does not assume the hom ogeneous boundary value  $A^{y}(1) = 0$ . Consequently,  $A^{y}$  is no longer the zero eigenvector of the adjoint hom ogeneous problem in the sem i- nite interval [1;1]. However, we still expect  $A^{y}$  to play a central role in the dynamics of the localized structure, all be it in a slightly modied form  $A_{1}^{y} = A^{y} + A_{1}^{y}$ . The subscript 1 denotes the proximity of the localized structure to the boundary, and  $A_{1}^{y}$  is a proximity dependent correction to  $A^{y}$ . We require that in the limit 1! 1,  $A_{1}^{y}$ !  $A^{y}$ , and  $A_{1}^{y}$ ! 0. This requirement is reasonable on physical grounds. The slow dynamics of the localized structure far away from the boundary involves  $A^{y}$  as a relevant constituent by virtue of it being a slow mode. As the localized structure gradually nears the boundary, we still expect  $A^{y}$ , in its modiled form  $A_{1}^{y}$ , to be the relevant (slow) constituent of the dynamics.

 $A_1^{\gamma}$  may be determined in two possible ways. Firstly, we may extract  $A_1^{\gamma}$  as the solution of

$$\$^{y}A_{1}^{y} = 0; A_{1}^{y}(1) = 0; A_{1}^{y}(1) = 0;$$
 (4)

with the implication that  $A_1^y = A^y + A_1^y$  is still a zero eigenvector in the nite system . Or we may extract  $A_1^y$  as a solution of

$$\$^{y}A_{1}^{y} = \ _{l}A_{1}^{y}; A_{1}^{y}(1) = 0; A_{1}^{y}(1) = 0;$$
 (5)

Thus, as the localized structure gradually closes in on a boundary, the zero eigenvector  $A^{y}$  is modiled to  $A_{1}^{y}$ , and the zero eigenvalue gradually migrates away from zero, assuming the value 1. Hence, as l! 1, 1! 0, and  $A_{1}^{y}$ ! A.

The rst scenario is easily discarded using uniqueness arguments. If Eq. (4) is obeyed, then  $A_1^{y}$  should obey,  $\$^{y} A_{1}^{y} = 0$ ;  $A_{1}^{y}$ ( 1) =  $A^{y}$ ( 1);  $A_{1}^{y}$ (1) = 0, with the unique solution  $A_1^{Y} = A^{Y}$ . Therefore, since  $A_1^y = A^y + A_1^y$ , Eq. (4) only has the trivial solution  $A_1^{y} = 0$  (the uniqueness of hom ogeneous and inhom ogeneous problem s involving linear di erential operators on sem i-in nite intervals can be proved by a transform ation that takes the sem i-in nite interval into a nite interval, follow ed by the utilization of theorem s on uniqueness available for nite intervals. We provide a proof in Appendix A for the CGLE that is studied in detail in later sections. M oreover, such a transform ation m ay also be applied to operators with an asymptotic structure sim ilar to that of the CGLE). This leads us to conclude that the modi cation of A<sup>y</sup> in a nite system is appropriately represented by Eq. (5).

For arbitrary functions u (not the eld U in Eq. (1)) and v, and using integration by parts, we have,

$$(\$ u;v) = (u;\$^{y}v) + v(b)u_{x}(b) v(a)u_{x}(a)$$
  
+  $v_{x}(a)u(a) v_{x}(b)u(b);$  (6)

where we assume for simplicity that \$ is a reactiondi usion type operator comprised of second order di erential terms only. x = a and x = b are arbitrary boundary points. If needed, one may evaluate surface terms for m ore general operators using integration by parts.

For the localized structure a = 1 and b = 1. We invoke Eq. (5) and substitute  $v = A_1^y$ ,  $u = U_1$  (the subscript 1 denotes that U is now considered in a nite system) in Eq. (6), to obtain,

$$(\$ \quad U_1; A_1^{y}) = (f; A_1^{y}) = (U_1; A_1^{y}) + A_{1x}^{y} (1) \quad U_1(1)$$
  
 
$$A_{1x}^{y} (1) \quad U_1(1):$$
 (7)

This is the sought after nite system extension of the solvability criteria Eq. (3). Also, as l! 1, Eq. (7) reduces to  $(f;A^{y}) = 0$ . Since \$ is obtained by linearizing about the localized structure  $U_{0}(x)$ ,  $U_{1}(1)$  is simply the dimension of  $U_{0}(1)$ , where U(1) is the Dirichlet boundary value imposed on eld U, the solution of Eq. (1).

The extension Eq. (7), tailored to incorporate nonhom ogeneous D irichlet boundary conditions on the eld U, is not unique. For instance, one may consider the effects of non-hom ogeneous N eum ann boundary conditions on the eld U by requiring that  $A_1^{V}$  obeys

$$\$^{y}A_{1}^{y} = \_{l}A_{1}^{y}; A_{lx}^{y} (1) = 0; A_{lx}^{y} (1) = 0:$$
 (8)

Here, the derivatives, rather than  $A_1^Y$  itself, assume zero values at the boundary. Furtherm ore, an extension  $A_1^Y$  for a general set of hom ogeneous boundary conditions, with hom ogeneous D irichlet and N eum ann boundary conditions as special cases, may also be developed. Next, we apply the techniques and criteria developed so far to analyze non-equilibrium Ising-B loch fronts, as the fronts interact with the system boundary.

# III. BOUNDARY EFFECTS IN A GENERIC IS IN G-BLOCH SYSTEM

Ising-B loch fronts provide an interesting arena to apply the methods developed in the last section. A long with the usual Goldstone mode associated with translational invariance, the slow manifold for Ising-Bloch fronts also includes a spatially localized slow mode responsible for the Ising-Bloch bifurcation [5, 21, 22]. Chirality preserving stationary Ising fronts [14], bifurcate into a pair of chirality broken, counter-propagating B loch fronts. The slow manifold for Ising-Bloch fronts comprised of the Goldstone and chirality breaking modes, manifests itself in the form of order parameter equations (OPE) [4, 5, 22] for the order param eters, front velocity and front position. The front velocity is a measure of the e ects of the chirality breaking mode. The Goldstone mode captures front translations by in nitesim al changes in the front position, the other order parameter. We seek the coupling between these order parameters induced by the boundary data and broken translational invariance.

A generic Ising front denoted by  $U_0(x)$ , gives the Goldstone mode  $U_{0x}$ . Close to the Ising-Bloch bifurcation threshold, propagating Bloch wall solutions are regarded as perturbations of the stationary Ising wall solution [14]. The front velocity c controls the strength of these perturbations. Therefore, expanding the deviation U in powers of c, we have,

$$U_{\rm b} = U_0 + U$$
  
= U\_0 + c U\_1 + c<sup>2</sup> U\_2 + c<sup>3</sup> U\_3 + ::; (9)

with the perturbed B loch wall solution  $U_b$ .

For convenience we transform into a frame of reference moving along with the B loch wall. This transform ation amounts to  $(U_t(U)) + (U_t(U)) - (U_{0x} + U_x)$ . Invoking Eq. (2) and substituting into it the expansion of U, while at the same time disregarding the in uence of any external perturbation p(U;x), we obtain,

N  $_2$  and N  $_3$  represent the coe cients of second order and third order velocity terms respectively.

Equating terms which are storder in velocity c in Eq. (10), we obtain,

$$U_1 + U_{0x} = 0$$
: (11)

This means that \$ has a double zero eigenvalue at the Ising-Bloch bifurcation threshold [5, 22]. Therefore, along with the zero Goldstone mode, we have another eigenvalue that passes through zero at the bifurcation. The Goldstone mode  $U_{0x}$  and the generalized eigenvector  $U_1$  obtained from Eq. (11), span the slow manifold. The chirality breaking mode is then constructed as a linear combination of these two modes [5].

Employing the projection criteria Eq. (3) for an Ising-B both front close to the bifurcation threshold, i.e., the solvability of Eq. (10), results in,

$$( U_1; A^{y}) \mathcal{Q}_t c = c (U_{0x}; A^{y}) + c^2 ( U_{1x} + N_2; A^{y}) + c^3 ( U_{2x} + N_3; A^{y}) +$$

This is the generic OPE for the velocity of Ising-B loch fronts close to the bifurcation threshold. The particular form of the inner products in Eq. (12) is system specied. If one assumes further symmetries in the system, for example U ! U, inner products that are coeccients of even powers of the velocity in Eq. (12) vanish, resulting in the normal form of a pitchfork bifurcation. The inner product ( $U_{0x}$ ;  $A^{y}$ ) in Eq. (12) controls the distance from the Ising-B loch bifurcation threshold, where for consistency (Ising-B loch bifurcation is a pitchfork) it is further required that ( $U_{0x}$ ;  $A^{y}$ )  $c^{2}$ ,  $C_{tc}$   $c^{3}$  [5, 22]. Hence, all the term s in Eq. (12) are of size  $c^{3}$ .

W e invoke the extended solvability criteria Eq. (7) to evaluate the e ects of boundary data on the dynam ics of Ising-B loch fronts. For generic Ising-B loch fronts interacting with boundaries where D irichlet data is present, the extended solvability criteria assumes the form,

$$( U_{11}; A_1^{Y}) @_t c = c (U_{0x}; A_1^{Y}) + c^2 ( U_{11x} + N_2; A_1^{Y}) + c^3 ( U_{21x} + N_3; A_1^{Y}) + _1 (c U_{11} + c^2 U_{21} + c^3 U_{31} + _1^{Y}) + A_{1x}^{Y} ( 1) U_1 ( 1) A_{1x}^{Y} (1 ) U_1 (1 ): (13)$$

In contrast to earlier works [4, 5, 22] focused on the e ects of external perturbations, p(U;x), on the slow manifold, the constituent m odes of the slow manifold require appropriate m odi cations in order to capture the e ects arising

due to con nem ent by boundaries. W hile, the modi cation of the adjoint G oldstone mode A<sup>y</sup> to A<sup>y</sup><sub>1</sub> is generic to any con ned localized structure, or alternatively, a localized structure being considered in the vicinity of system boundaries, the modi cation of the generalized eigenvector  $U_1$  to  $U_{11}$  is a unique characteristic of Ising-B loch fronts.

Simpli cations to the slow manifold Eq. (13) are made (10) by the following observations. Consider the term ,  $f_0 =$  $_{1}$  (c  $U_{11}$ + c<sup>2</sup>  $U_{21}$ + c<sup>3</sup>  $U_{31}$ +  $\frac{y}{1}$  And the right hand side of Eq. (13). The inner product  $f_1 = \frac{1}{2} (C U_{11}; A_1^{Y})$  has the largest contribution since it involves the st power of the velocity c. Now, as mentioned before, all terms should be of size c<sup>3</sup>, a requirem ent in posed for the Ising-B loch bifurcation to be a pitchfork. Therefore,  $f_1$  $_{1}C$   $C^{3}$ , implying  $_1$   $c^2$ . Moreover, the size of  $_1$  is controlled by the distance of the Bloch fronts from the boundary. If the front is far away from the boundary, that is, if  $0 (c^3)$ , then  $f_1$  $0 (c^4)$ , and its contribution to 1 Eq. (13) can be neglected. As the front moves towards the boundary, so that  $1 c^2$ , then  $f_1 c^3$  contributes to Eq. (13), and the ensuing front dynam ics. If the front gets too close to the boundary, i.e., 1 c, then  $f_1 c^2$ , and the scaling requiring that all the term s be of size  $c^3$ breaks down. In other words, if 1 c, the e ects of the boundary are too strong for them to be accurately considered as small perturbations on the dynam ics of Ising-Bloch fronts. Consequently, the size of 1 serves as a measure of the strength of the boundary perturbation. (12) In light of the present discussion, Eq. (13) simpli es to

$$( U_{11}; A_{1}^{y}) @_{t}c = c (U_{0x}; A_{1}^{y}) + c^{2} ( U_{11x} + N_{2}; A_{1}^{y}) + c^{3} ( U_{21x} + N_{3}; A_{1}^{y}) + _{1} (c U_{11}; A_{1}^{y}) + A_{1x}^{y} ( 1) U_{1} ( 1):$$
(14)

The surface terms at in nity contribute zero, since by construction  $A_1^y(1) = 0$ .

# IV. BOUNDARY EFFECTS IN THE PARAM ETRICALLY FORCED CGLE

The CGLE reads,

QF = (+i)F  $\frac{1}{2}F + F + Q^{2}xF + : (15)$ 

E quation. (15) and its generalizations [3, 5, 14] have been thoroughly analyzed in the context of the Ising-B loch bifurcation. The eld F m ay be regarded as the am plitude of di usively coupled auto oscillators that oscillate above the H opfbifurcation threshold determ ined by the param – eter . represents the strength of param etric forcing at twice the natural frequency, and is the detuning. The param eter , which m odels forcing at the natural frequency of the system, breaks the (F ! F) symmetry. A s a result, the pitchfork norm alform of the Ising-B loch bifurcation for = 0 unfolds into a saddle node for a non-zero .

We brie y recount the results of [5] concerning the dynam ics of Ising-Bloch fronts in the param etrically forced CGLE valid for an in nite system. This lays down the fram ew ork for the subsequent consideration of nite system sizes and boundary e ects.

For = 0 and in the bistable regined determined by the constraints,  $j j < ... > \frac{p}{2} \frac{2}{2}^{2}$ , Eq. (15) possesses a stationary Ising wall solution  $F_{I} = \frac{p}{2}$  tanh ( =2X)e<sup>i</sup>. Here =  $+\frac{p}{2} \frac{2}{2}$  and is obtained by solving sin (2) = =. B both wall solutions of Eq. (15) are then obtained as a perturbation to the Ising wall,

$$F_{b}(x;t) = {}^{p} - [tanh(x) + u(x;t) + iw(x;t)]e^{i};$$
 (16)

where the space-time scaling t = =2,  $x = \stackrel{p - - 2}{=} 2X$  is introduced by the authors, resulting in,

For clarity and continuation of the conventions used in the previous sections, we stress the following points. Firstly, we recognize that  $U = fu; wg^{T}$ . Secondly, U obeys

which when compared with Eq. (2), leads to the realization that  $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{P}} = \mathbb{N}^{(0)}(\mathbb{U}_0)(\mathbb{U}_0)^2 = 2 + \mathbb{O}[(\mathbb{U}_0)^3]$ . Thirdly, \$ is obtained by linearizing about the solution  $\mathbb{U}_0(\mathbf{x})$ . In the present case the stationary solution is the Ising wall  $F_{\mathrm{I}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbb{P}^{-1}}{\mathrm{tanh}(\mathbf{x})}e^{i}$ , and  $\mathbb{U}_0(\mathbf{x}) = \mathrm{tanh}(\mathbf{x})$ , where the constant factor  $e^{i}$  should be dropped if the perturbation  $\mathbb{U} = \mathrm{fu}; wg^{\mathrm{T}}$  is de ned through Eq. (16).

For the speci c case of the parametrically forced CGLE, one has [5],

$$U_{1} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & \frac{8}{3} I_{11}(x) & I_{12}(x) \\ 4 & 5 \\ \frac{8}{9} \operatorname{sech}(x) & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{3} + \begin{pmatrix} 2 & \frac{8}{9} \operatorname{sech}^{2}(x) \\ 0 \\ 18 \end{pmatrix}$$
  
and 
$$A^{y} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & \frac{9(c_{0})}{c_{0}} \operatorname{sech}^{2}(x) \\ 5 \\ \operatorname{sech}(x) \end{pmatrix}^{3} + \begin{pmatrix} 18 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 18 \end{pmatrix}$$

Substituting these vectors into Equation. (12) gives [5],

$$\theta_{t}c = \frac{27(c_{c})c}{4^{2}}c \qquad \frac{8}{9}^{2} + 0.36c^{3}: (19)$$

Eq. (19) possesses three stationary states, two counterpropagating B loch walls and a stationary Ising wall. These steady states exchange stability via the Ising-B loch bifurcation at the critical bifurcation parameter  $3_c = \frac{1}{9} \frac{9^2 + 2}{2}$ . The components of the vectors  $U = c U_1 + c^2 U_2 + ::, U_0$  and  $A^y$ , in an in nite system, exponentially decay to zero as one moves away from the front both to the left and to the right. This signi es that Ising and B loch walls are localized structures that are not in uenced by boundary conditions in posed on either boundary su ciently far away. Furtherm ore, no explicit dependence on x in Eq. (19) indicates translational invariance, a residue of in nite system size.

W e now calculate  $A_1^{\,y}$  and the associated value of  $_1.A_1^{\,y}$  satis es the boundary conditions  $A_1^{\,y}(\ 1)=0, A_1^{\,y}(1)=0$  (how ogeneous problem ), since we wish to exam ine the in uence of D irichlet boundary conditions on U (nonhom ogeneous problem ). C lose to the bifurcation threshold determ ined by the magnitude of  $_c$ , the operator S $^{\,y}$  has the form

$$= \$_{1}^{y} + ( c) \$_{2}^{y}:$$
(20)

The operator  $\$_2^y$  is a perturbative correction to the operator  $\$_1^y$ , since  $_c$   $c^2$ . Hence, we rest exam ine  $\$_1^y$  the dom inant term in  $\$^y$ .

The operators D<sub>1</sub> and D<sub>2</sub> populate the diagonals of  $\$_1^y$ , and possess zero eigenvectors given by  $Z_1 = \operatorname{sech}^2(x)$  and  $Z_2 = \operatorname{sech}(x)$  respectively, in an in nite system. These eigenvectors satisfy the constraint of being zero at positive and negative in nity. Im agine a traveling B loch front su ciently distant from the boundary, where D irichlet boundary conditions are imposed. The front does not sense the boundary and the condition  $D_1Z_1 = D_2Z_2 = 0$ holds. This is because the solutions  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  exponentially approach zero on either side of the front. As the front closes in on the boundary, such that it is barely able to sense it ( $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  have small nite values at the boundary), the eigenvectors  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  are modi ed to Z<sub>11</sub> and Z<sub>21</sub> by constraining them to have zero values at the boundary. Meanwhile, in a sem i-in nite or nite dom ain, the only solutions to  $D_1Z_{11} = D_2Z_{21} = 0$  which have a zero value at both boundaries are the trivial solutions  $Z_{11} = Z_{21} = 0$  (uniqueness arguments). Hence, requiring that the solutions Z<sub>11</sub>(Z<sub>21</sub>) are only slight m odi cations of  $Z_1$  ( $Z_2$ ) and are not trivial zero solutions dem ands that these solutions obey  $D_1Z_{11} = 1_1Z_{11}$  and  $D_2 Z_{21} = 2_1 Z_{21}$ .

Figure.1 (a) shows the plot of  $Z_1$  in grey, where the left boundary is at a nite distance 1 from the peak.  $Z_1$  has a

nite nonzero value at the boundary. We require that the modi ed eigenvector  $Z_{11}$  have a zero value at the boundary and not be all that di erent from  $Z_1$  elsewhere. We make the ansatz that this can be accomplished by subtracting from  $Z_1$  its image to the left of the boundary. Therefore, we have,  $Z_{11} = \operatorname{sech}^2(x)$  such<sup>2</sup> (x + 21). Figure 1 (b) shows a good agreem ent between our guess and the actual num erically evaluated  $Z_{11}$ . This is so because in the asymptotic lim it exp 2x >> 1,  $D_1 = \mathbb{Q}_x^2$  4, and the image is approximately a zero eigenvector of this operator in the same lim it.

Introducing in ages into a sem i-in nite problem is by no means a coincidence. Im ages are a common occurrence whenever boundary data is involved. For the extension  $A_1^y$  (correspondingly  $Z_{11}$  and  $Z_{21}$ ) to assume a zero value at the boundary, the introduction of the im age becomes a natural necessity. Furthermore, we wish to stress that the concept of im ages is quite general in its utility. Extensions of G oldstone modes can be readily obtained for other system s, with linear operators having sim ilar properties of exponential decay asymptotics.

An upper bound,  $_{11}$ , on the eigenvalue  $_{11}$ , is easily obtained by a variational principle, given by,

$$j_{11}j < j''_{11}j = (Z_{11}; D_1Z_{11}) = (Z_{11}; Z_{11}):$$
 (21)

A more re ned variational guess of  $Z_{11}$  may be made by introducing an extra parameter  $a_1$ . Consequently, we have  $Z_{11} = \exp(a_1x)$  [sech<sup>2</sup> (x) sech<sup>2</sup> (x + 21)]. Manipulation of this parameter provides a better guess of the change in shape of the peak in the actual modi-

ed eigenvector Z<sub>11</sub>. Figure. 2 (a) com pares the num erical and variationally calculated eigenvalues as a function of the distance l of the front from the boundary. The dashed curve represents the num erically calculated eigenvalues of  $D_1$ . The thin curve depicts the variationally calculated eigenvalues with  $Z_{11} = \operatorname{sech}^2(x)$  sech<sup>2</sup> (x + 21). The squares signify a better variational calculation of the eigenvalues using  $Z_{11} = \exp(a_1 x)$  [sech<sup>2</sup> (x) sech<sup>2</sup> (x + 21)]. An improved guess of  $Z_{21}$ , and eigenvalue  $_{21}$  for the operator D  $_2$ , sim ilarly involves taking  $Z_{12} = \exp(a_2 x)$  [sech (x) sech (x + 21)]. Depicted in Fig. 2(b) are the eigenvalues  $_{21}$ , num erically calculated (dashed curve), variationally calculated with respective guesses  $Z_{21} = \operatorname{sech}(x)$ sech (x + 21) (thin line), and  $Z_{21} = \exp(a_2 x)$  [sech (x) sech(x + 21)] (squares).

The numerical calculation of the eigenvalues  $_{11}$  and  $_{21}$  involved using a standard QR algorithm on the matrix obtained by a nite di erence approximation to the operators D<sub>1</sub> and D<sub>2</sub>. The grid spacing was adjusted until we obtained convergence. The eigenvectors were calculated using inverse iterations, with the number of iterations optimized for convergence.

The sst row in the matrix representation of the adjoint operator Eq. (20) consists only of the operator D<sub>1</sub>. Therefore, since  $\$^{y}A_{1}^{y} = \_{1}A_{1}^{y}$ , we immediately obtain  $_{1} = \_{11}$ . We recall that in the limit of in nite front distance from the boundary l! 1, we have  $A_{1}^{y}$ !  $A^{y}$ .



FIG.1: (a) Shows the plot of  $Z_1$ . The peak is at a distance of l = 2 from the boundary. (b) The squares represent the numerically obtained  $Z_{11}$ . The analytical guess  $Z_{11} = \operatorname{sech}^2(x) \quad \operatorname{sech}^2(x + 2l)$  is the solid line.

C om bining this asymptotic lim it constraint with the requirem ent that the sought after eigenvector has zero values at both boundaries, we obtain,

$$A_{1}^{y} = 4 \begin{array}{c} 2 & 3 \\ ( \circ ) & \circ \\ & Z_{11} \\ & & 5 \\ & & Z_{21} \end{array}$$
(22)

A more rigorous derivation involving a step by step consideration of the operators  $L_1^{\gamma}$  and  $L_2^{\gamma}$  in a perturbative scheme also yields Eq. (22).

W enow focus on incorporating the e ects of the D iridhlet boundary values  $X_b$  and  $Y_b$ , the values of the real and in aginary components of the eld F in Eq. (15), into the dynamics of fronts close to the boundary. B loch walls are perturbed Ising walls, with the perturbation



FIG. 2: (a) C om parison of variational and num erical calculations of  $_{11}$  (b) S im ilar com parison of  $_{21}$  calculated using num erical and variational techniques.

 $U_1$ . The boundary value of this perturbation  $U_1(1)$  is obtained by xing F (1) =  $X_b + iY_b$  and subtracting from it the value that the Ising wall assumes  $F_I(1) = P^-$  tanh (1)e<sup>i</sup>. Recalling Eq. (16), and  $U = fu; wg^T$ , we obtain,

$$U_{1}(1) = 4 \qquad (X_{b}\cos(1) + Y_{b}\sin(1)) = - + \tanh(1) = (Y_{b}\cos(1) - X_{b}\sin(1)) = - 5 = (Y_{b}\cos(1) - X_{b}\sin(1)) = - (23)$$

V. OPE

To extract a reduced description of the in uence of D irichlet boundary conditions on the motion of Ising-B loch fronts, we invoke Eq. (14), and substitute into it

the explicit form s of  $A_1^y$  and  $_1$  derived in the previous section. Consider the term  $f_1 = _1(c \ U_{11}; A_1^y)$  on the right hand side (RHS) of Eq. (14). For the CGLE, as seen in Eq. (22), the rst component of  $A_1^y$ , denoted by,  $A_{11}^y$ , is smaller by a factor of  $c^2$  than the second component  $A_{12}^y$ . This is so because  $_c$   $c^2$ . Hence, while evaluating  $f_1$ , we need only consider the inner product of the second component of the generalized eigenvector,  $U_{11}$ , denoted by  $U_{112}$ , and  $A_{12}^y$ . The generalized eigenvector  $U_1$  is known Eq. (19), and its nite system modi cation  $U_{112}$ .

to evaluate the inner product in  $f_1$ . To evaluate  $U_{112}$  we recall that  $Z_2 = \operatorname{sech}(x)$ , with  $D_2Z_2 = 0$ . The second component of  $U_1$ , is given by  $U_{12} = [8 = 9]$  sech (x). Hence,  $D_2 U_{12} = 0$ . In a conned system with the left boundary at x =l, Z<sub>2</sub> is modi ed to  $Z_{21} = \operatorname{sech}(x)$  sech (x + 21), requiring that the hom ogeneous boundary condition,  $Z_{21}(1) = 0$ , holds good. In the con ned system  $U_2$  is modi ed to  $U_{12}$ . However, to obtain  $U_{112}$ , the requirement that it obeys the inhomogeneous boundary condition c  $U_{112}$  ( 1) =  $U_{12}$  (1), since  $U_1 = c U_1 + 0 (c^2)$ , needs to be imposed. Therefore we construct  $U_{112}(x) = C U_{12}$ sech (x + 21), followed by imposing the inhom ogeneous boundary condition c  $U_{112}$  ( 1) =  $U_{12}$  ( 1), to evaluate . A fier doing so, we have,

c 
$$U_{112} = \frac{c8}{9} Z_{21} - \frac{U_{12}(1)}{sech(1)} sech(x + 21):$$
 (24)

We, nally have the ingredients to calculate all the inner products in Eq. (14). The bulk of the boundary in uence, we contend, is captured by the interplay of the term s,  $c(U_{0x}; A_1^{Y})$ ,  $_1(c \ U_{11}; A_1^{Y})$ , and the surface term  $A_{1x}^{Y}$  (1)  $U_1$  (1) in Eq. (14). Therefore, although, strictly speaking, the inner products containing higher order term s  $c^2$  ( $U_{11x} + N_2; A_1^{Y}$ ), and  $c^3$  ( $U_{21x} + N_3; A_1^{Y}$ ), in Eq. (14), should be evaluated in the nite domain [1;1], we approximate them by taking the inner product in the in nite interval [1;1].

Perform ing all the inner products in Eq. (14) and rearranging the term s, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_{t}c &= \frac{27(c_{c})c}{4^{2}}c + c_{1}c &= \frac{8}{9}^{2} + p^{2}c^{3} \\
&= \frac{9}{16} \tanh(1) \sec(1) U_{12}(1) \\
&+ \frac{81(c_{c})c}{4^{2}} \tanh(1) U_{11}(1) \\
&= \frac{9}{16} 2lco \sec(21);
\end{aligned}$$
(25)

In deriving Eq. (25) we have used  $Z_{11} = \operatorname{sech}^2(x)$ sech<sup>2</sup> (x + 21) and  $Z_{21} = \operatorname{sech}(x)$  sech (x + 21), where  $_1 = _{11}$  is given by Eq. (21), and p = 0.36 Eq. (19). Equation. (25) along with  $Q_t = c$  represents the coupling of the two degrees of freedom, front velocity c and position 1, by the in uence of D irichlet boundary conditions in posed at the boundary. As required, in the lim it of in nite front distance from the boundary Eq. (25) reduces to Eq. (19).

We now exam ine the consequences of the coupling of the front velocity and position close to the boundary. Firstly, we report the ndings of our num erical simulations of Eq. (15), which is a system with in nite degrees of freedom. Secondly, we corroborate these ndings by solving the reduced, two degree of freedom OPE we have derived.

W e perform ed num erical sim ulations of Eq. (15), where B loch fronts were created at in nity (far from the boundaries) and launched towards a boundary. The velocity of these B loch fronts was chosen to be one of the steady states of Eq. (19) resulting in uniform front translation with this velocity until the fronts closed in on the boundary. Near the boundary, contingent upon the D irichlet boundary value in posed, the incom ing B loch fronts were either trapped or bounced back. B loch fronts that bounce evolve into the counter-propagating B loch fronts, as opposed to bouncing B loch fronts, evolve into nontrivial steady state solutions (See R ef.[12]) of the CG LE Eq. (15).

W e summarize our numerical observations of B loch front behavior as a function of the boundary conditions X<sub>b</sub> and Y<sub>b</sub> in Figure.3. This phase diagram in the plane of boundary values reveals a curve separating regions of bouncing and trapped fronts represented by diamonds. W e compare these results with the transition curve predicted by the reduced model Eq. (25), plotted as the dashed curve in Figure.3. The plots show a good agreement (within 0.5%) between the two transition curves. This is a striking result considering the fact that in calculating  $A_1^y$  and  $_1$  we have employed approximate vectors  $Z_{11}$  and  $Z_{21}$ .

B ouncing fronts gradually slow down as they near the boundary, attain zero velocity at a certain critical distance from it, and nally move away as the sign of the velocity ips. As we change the boundary values and get closer to the transition curve, bouncing fronts attain zero velocity at a much smaller critical distance from the boundary, until eventually right at the transition curve they reach the point of closest approach to the boundary. A swe cross the transition curve and move into the trapping region, approaching fronts no longer attain zero velocity close to the boundary, their velocity never ips sign, and hence they never bounce. The distance from the boundary of the point of closest approach depends on where exactly on the phase diagram the transition curve is crossed.

The agreem ent between the transition curves obtained from the full model Eq. (15) and the reduced model Eq. (25) is better when the point of closest approach is further away from the boundary. This is because, as detailed earlier, the vectors  $Z_{11}$  and  $Z_{21}$  are better approxim ations to the actual solutions of  $D_1Z_{11} = {}_{1}Z_{11}$  and



FIG.3: The transition curve for the full model Eq. (15) plotted using squares, the same curve obtained from the reduced OPE Eq. (25), plotted as a dashed line. Here, = 0.3, = 1.0, = 0.448.

 $D_2Z_{21} = {}_2Z_{21}$ , further away from the boundary. Consequently, a better guess of these vectors, valid close to the boundary, should in prove the agreem ent between the transition curves, even if, the point of closest approach is closer to the boundary. However, the approximate vectors we use are su cient for the purpose of establishing the usefulness of our general method that accounts for the broken translational invariance in a spatially nite system through the extension of solvability conditions. O ur method incorporates into it the eigenvalue 1, the most direct measure of broken translational invariance, which can be obtained accurately via a variational principle using relatively crude guesses for the eigenvectors.

We now, by examining Eq. (25) in more detail, extract the mechanism behind the transition from bouncing to trapped fronts as D irichlet boundary conditions are changed. Figure. 4 (a) shows the nullclines, invariant manifold, and trajectories of Eq. (25) inside the bouncing region of the phase diagram. A saddle, present at the point of intersection of the nullclines, controls the ows in this bouncing regime. Far away from the boundary, situated at x = 0 in the plot, the nullclines are three parallel straight lines that represent two counter-propagating B loch wall steady state solutions, and a stationary Ising wall solution of Eq. (19). The bouncing involves the B loch front initially owing towards the saddle. Thereupon, in uenced by the unstablem anifold, the front ow s away.

Figure. 4(b) still depicts ow s inside the bouncing region, but much closer to the transition curve. In this regin e bouncing and trapped fronts can coexist. The invariant manifolds dem arcate two basins, one of attraction





FIG. 4: (a) The plot deep inside the bouncing region, the nullclines are thin black curves, the thick curves correspond to the trajectories in the phase plane, and the invariant m anifolds are plotted as dashed lines. Here, = 0.3, = 1.0, = 0.448, X  $_{\rm b} = 1.116$ , and Y  $_{\rm b} = 0.4262$ . (b) P lot still in the bouncing region, but close to the transition curve. The same plotting scheme and parameters used, with boundary values X  $_{\rm b} = 1.112$ , Y  $_{\rm b} = 0.4262$ .

towards the boundary, and the other of repulsion away from it. Inside the repulsion basin all incoming Bloch fronts bounce with the same mechanism as in Fig. 4 (a). All the ows in the attraction basin are directed towards the system boundary, with no possibility of a bounce. Figure. 4 (b) shows both bouncing and trapped Bloch front trajectories in their respective basins. We reported on the the coexistence region in our numerical study of Eq. (15) in Ref.[12]. Here, we have provided an analytical explanation of this phenomena.

The ows in the trapping region close to the transition curve are shown in Figure. 5(a). Trapped Bloch fronts, created at in nity and on the upper branch of the

FIG.5: (a) P bt in the trapping region close to the transition curve. The same plotting scheme and parameters used, with boundary values  $X_{\rm b}$  = 1:11,  $Y_{\rm b}$  = 0:4262. (b) The plot deep inside the trapping region, the nullclines are thin black curves, the trajectory is the thick curve. Here, = 0:3, = 1:0, = 0:448, X<sub>b</sub> = 1:09, and Y<sub>b</sub> = 0:4262.

nullcline (corresponding to one of the steady states of Eq. (19)), lie inside the basin of attraction towards the boundary. Consequently, the transition from bouncing to trapped fronts is marked by the initial front velocity and position moving from the basin of repulsion (Fig. 4 (b)) to the basin of attraction (Figure. 5 (a)) as the boundary values are varied. Deep inside the trapping region the saddle no longer exists, and we have a sink instead (Fig. 5 (b)). All incoming B loch front trajectories end up at this sink.

Sum m arizing, the nonuniform m otion of B loch fronts close to the boundary is governed by the xed point of Eq. (25), giving rise to bouncing, trapping, and coexistence of the two. W ell inside the bouncing region this xed point is a saddle. D eep into the trapping region the xed point changes into a sink.

# VI. CONCLUSION

W e have developed a generalm ethod of analyzing the in uence of broken translational invariance due to nite size and boundary e ects on the dynamics of localized solutions of generic non-linear spatially extended system s. W e apply our method to the special case of a bistable reaction-di usion system, where the localized solutions are fronts Eq. (25). The implementation of this method involves the extension of the in nite system size limit. solvability conditions, used to extract a reduced description of the in nite dimensional system, into solvability conditions that account for nite system size and boundary e ects. The extended solvability criteria works by naturally incorporating into it the concept of im ages. As a result, the method a ords a direct grasp of the broken translational invariance in a con ned system through the calculation of relevant eigenvalues.

In the special case of D irichlet boundary conditions im posed on the CGLE, we were able to provide mechanisms for B loch front trapping, bouncing and coexistence of the two at the boundary. This nonuniform front motion is a result of the coupling of the two degrees of freedom, front velocity and position, by the in uence of boundary conditions. We have explicitly derived this coupling by using our method of solvability condition extension. The role of other types of boundary conditions, either Neum ann or m ixed can be explored in a sim ilar fashion by constructing a suitable extension of the modi ed Goldstone mode. For example, exploring Neumann boundary conditions requires the extension to always have zero derivatives at the boundary. This can be accomplished in the CGLE or other system s by adding, rather than subtracting, the im age.

Finally, we comment on the generality of solvability condition extension. In any system, whenever it is possible to derive reduced dynamical equations through projections on the Goldstone mode, our method can be applied to obtain the nite size and boundary e ects in terms of the modi cations of these reduced dynamical equations.

### A cknow ledgm ents

This work was supported in part by NSF G rant No. D M R - 9710608 and by a Faculty Research G rant from the Louisiana State University o ce of Sponsered Research.

### APPENDIX A

For the CGLE, consider the operator D  $_1$  Eq. (17) in a sem i-in nite interval [ 1;1 ]. Using the transform ation t=1 e  $^{(l+x)}$ , the problem

$$D_{1}Y = [Q_{x}^{2} + 2 \quad 6 \tanh^{2}(x)]Y = 0;$$
  
Y (1) = 0; Y (1) = 0; (A1)

is transform ed to

$$\begin{bmatrix}
 \theta_t^2 & \frac{\theta_t}{(1 - t)} + \frac{2 + 6 \tanh^2 (1 + \ln (1 - t))}{(1 - t)^2} \end{bmatrix} Y = 0;$$
Y (0) = 0; Y (1) = 0: (A 2)

Equation. (A 2) has a regular singular point at t = 1, and thus has a unique solution. Sim ilar considerations apply to the operator  $D_2$ . Therefore, hom ogeneous or inhom ogeneous problem sinvolving the operators \$, which is comprised of the operators  $D_1$ , and  $D_2$ , should have unique solutions in a sem i-in nite dom ain. For operators that possess exponential decay asymptotics (true for a wide variety of m odels of physically occurring localized structures), a transform ation of the type used here, can always be found in order to prove the uniqueness.

- M.C.Cross and P.C.H ohenberg, Rev.M od.Phys.65, 851 (1993).
- [2] C. Elphick, E. Meron, E. A. Spiegel, SIAM. J. Appl. M ath. 50, 490 (1990).
- [3] C.Elphick, E.Meron, Phys. Lett. A. 230, 33 (1997).
- [4] A. Hagberg, E. Meron, I. Rubinstein, and B. Zaltzman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 427 (1996).
- [5] D.V.Skryabin, A.Yulin, D.M ichaelis, W.J.Firth, G. L.Oppo, U.Peschel, and F.Lederer, Phys. Rev. E. 64, 056618 (2001).
- [6] P.C.Fife, SIAM .J.Appl.M ath. 48, 506 (1988)
- [7] E.Meron, Phys. Rep. 218, 1 (1992).
- [8] H. Ikeda, M. M im ura, and Y. Nishiura, Nonl. Anal. TMA.13, 507 (1989).
- [9] A. Hagberg and E. Meron, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 2494 (1994).

- [10] A.Hagberg and E.Meron, Chaos 4, 477 (1994).
- [11] D. Haim, G. Li, Q. Ouyang, W. D. M cCommick, H. L. Swinney, A. Hagberg, and E. M eron, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 190 (1996).
- [12] A. Yadav, D. A. Browne, Phys. Rev. E. 70, 036218 (2004).
- [13] U. Ebert and W. van Saarbos, Phys. Rep. 337 139 (2000).
- [14] P. Coullet, J. Lega, B. Houchmanzadeh, and J. Lajzerowicz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 1352 (1990).
- [15] G.Haas, M.Bar, I.G.Kevrekidis, P.B.Rasmussen, H.-H.Rotermund, and G.Ertl, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 3560 (1995).
- [16] G. Li, Q. Ouyang, and H. L. Swinney, J. Chem. Phys. 105, 10830 (1996).
- [17] T.Frisch, S.Rica, P.Coullet, and J.M.Gilli, Phys.Rev.

Lett.72,1471 (1994).

- [18] S.Nasuno, N.Yoshimo, and S.Kai, Phys. Rev. E. 51, 1598 (1995).
- [19] Liquid crystals in complex geometries: formed by polymer and porous networks, Edited by Phillip Crawford and Slobodan Zumer, Taylor and Francis (1996).
- [20] M. Bode, A. Reuter, R. Schmeling and H. -G. Purwins, Phys. Lett. A. 185, 70 (1994).
- [21] D .M ichaelis, U .Peschel, F.Lederer, D.V.Skryabin, and W .J.Firth, Phys.Rev.E.63, 066602 (2001).
- [22] M.Bode, Physica.D.106, 270 (1997).