The interaction time of a packet with a potential barrier

Andrea Begliuom in fa and Luciano Bracciato

(a) D ipartim ento di F isica dell'Universita, piazza Torricelli 2, I-56126 P isa, Italy.
(b) Istituto N azionale di F isica Nucleare, sezione di P isa, Italy.

Abstract

W e study the evolution of a wave packet in pinging onto a one dimensional potential barrier. The transmission and rejection times discussed in the literature for stationary states do not correspond to the times required for the emergence of a transmitted or a rejected packet. We propose new de nitions for the interaction (dwell) time and the transmission and rejection times which are suitable for packets and the terms actual time evolution of the packet.

PACS num bers: 03.65 B z,73.40 G k

I. IN TRODUCTION

The tunneling of a particle beyond a potential barrier is one of the simplest e ects predicted by Q uantum M echanics where the con ict between classical and quantum pictures is most striking. A lthough it has been studied since the early days of Q uantum M echanics [1], the debate is still open as to what should be m eant for tunneling time (see refs. [2]-[4] for extensive review s).

It could be objected that in a proper quantum formulation of the problem there is no room for such a concept, all that we can ask being the probability of detecting the particle beyond the barrier or of having it re ected by the potential. W e feel, how ever, that this is an extrem e view. It is legitim ate, for example, to think of an ensemble of system s prepared in a given initial state, for which the times are measured when a detector located in front or beyond the barrier reveals the arrival of the particle (in order not to disturb the state, we think of separate experim ents form easuring the arrival and the exit times). Know ledge of the initial state (i.e. the wave function at time t = 0) should enable us to determ ine which is the di erence between the average exit time and the average arrival time. This di erence could be regarded as the average tunneling time. While we do not advocate the above de nition as the de nition of the tunneling time, we insist that the wave function contains in plicitly the information as to the time that in the average the particle spends in the potential barrier. The problem with the determ ination of this average time is that, the process being intrinsically non-classical, it is not possible to look for a quantum counterpart of a classical observable, whose average value on the state of the particle should be interpreted as the tunneling time. On the other hand, a clearer view about the tunneling time is urged also by current experiments on sem i-conductor devices [5] and evanescent waves [6], where observation of superlum inal velocity has sometimes been claim ed.

M ost of the approaches to the problem of tunneling time deal with stationary states. The particle is in an eigenstate of the H am iltonian, and the tunneling time $_{\rm T}$, as well as the rejection time $_{\rm R}$ and the dwell time $_{\rm D}$, are functions of its energy E, or momentum k = 2m E = h. A loo those who envisage wave packets (see [3], [7], [8]) use packets which are so narrow in energy as to allow the monochrom atic approximation to hold. We have preferred to investigate the time evolution of a wave packet with a spread in energy which forbids this approximation. The packet impinges onto the barrier and is partially rejected and partially transmitted. It is constructed as a Gaussian superposition of eigenstates centered around a value E lower than the height V₀ of the barrier. We observe the evolution of the packet at times $_{\rm T}$ (E), $_{\rm R}$ (E) and $_{\rm D}$ (E) after it has reached the barrier.

A libough the tim e t_{in} when the packet "reaches the barrier" is not sharply de ned, due to the interference of the higher energy components, which reach the barrier earlier and are partially rejected, with the lower energy incoming components, we indicate the above mentioned times $_T$ (E), $_R$ (E) and $_D$ (E) de nitely do not correspond to the times required for the packet to emerge from the barrier. The uncertainty in t_{in} is not such as to alter this conclusion. It can be argued that the transmitted packet is centered around an energy E_T higher than E, whereas the rejected packet is centered around an energy E_R lower than E, but also the times $_T$ (E $_T$) or $_R$ (E $_R$) are by no means representative of the times required to see the rejected packet or the transmitted packet. The conclusion seem s to be that the tunneling times de ned for stationary states with energy E are not meaningful for the evolution of a wave packet having E as average energy.

This has prompted us to look for another determ ination of the times $_{\rm T}$, $_{\rm D}$ and $_{\rm R}$ which take into account the actual behaviour of the wave packet. As for $_{\rm D}$, we de ne it as the time integral of the probability P₂(t) of noting the particle within the barrier region,

$$_{D} = \sum_{t_{2}}^{Z_{+1}} P_{2}(t) dt$$
 (1)

this de nition being unsensitive to the time t_2 when the particle begins to interact with the barrier, provided it is earlier than the time when the packet in pinges onto the barrier. Thus, $_D$ can be regarded as the total interaction time. As for $_T$, we de neit as a weighted sum of every time interval t, the weight being the fraction of the transmitted packet which at time thas not yet been transmitted. The denition for $_R$ is similar. The trouble with these denitions is that there is still a problem with the time when the integral over t begins. In principle, the packet is interacting with the barrier since time t = 0, but the contribution of the earlier times, when the particle has not yet arrived onto the barrier, to $_T$ should be negligible.

W hile there is no objective way of determ ining the time when the interaction between the particle and the potential starts, we observe that a shifting of t_2 in eq. (1) a ects $_{\rm D}$, whose value decreases with increasing t_2 . On the other hand any determ ination of $_{\rm D}$ entails a given accuracy . For the lower integration limit in the denitions of $_{\rm T}$ and $_{\rm R}$ we choose the value $t_{\rm L}$ such that ${}^{\rm R}_{t_2} P_2$ (t) dt equals . The meaning of this choice is that we have a nite time resolution , and we neglect those time intervals which contribute to the interaction time less than . We note how ever that the time dependence of the probability P_2 (t) and of the analogous probabilities of noting the particle beyond the barrier (P_3 (t)) and in front of it (P_1 (t)) when the packet in pinges onto the barrier is su ciently steep so that the choice of $t_{\rm L}$ does not really a ect $_{\rm T}$ and $_{\rm R}$ in a substantial way. The values we nd (with ' 0:01) for $_{\rm T}$, $_{\rm R}$ and $_{\rm D}$ are de nitely di erent from the values of $_{\rm T}$ (E), $_{\rm R}$ (E) and $_{\rm D}$ (E) and are in agreement with the actual time evolution of the packet.

We have also examined the behaviour of the probabilities $P_i(t)$ for large t. These probabilities have an exponential tail e^{t} , with the same time constant (depletion time) for each probability. The value of is determined by the position of the poles of the transmission coecient D (k) in the complex k plane, and is independent of the details of the wave packet.

In conclusion, we not that the tunneling times proposed in the literature for stationary states are not meaningful for the actual time evolution of a wave packet. The time lapse from the rst contact of the packet with the barrier to its emergence beyond the barrier, although not so sharply de nable, is de nitely dierent from the tunneling times proposed for stationary states.

In section 2 we de ne the problem and build the packet whose time evolution is discussed in section 3. In section 4 we present the de nitions of $_{\rm D}$, $_{\rm T}$ and $_{\rm R}$ and in section 5 we discuss the depletion time. Section 6 is devoted to the conclusions.

II.THE WAVE PACKET

W e consider a one dim ensional problem , the H am iltonian being

$$H = \frac{p^2}{2m} + V (x)$$
 (2)

$$V(x) = \begin{cases} {}^{8} \\ < \\ V_{0} \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ (\dot{x}\dot{j} > d) \end{cases}$$
(3)

We use units such that h = 1. The eigenfunctions $_k$ of the Ham iltonian (2) are well known (see Appendix). We consider the evolution of a wave packet built as a Gaussian superposition of the functions $_k$, in pinging onto the barrier:

$$(x;t) = a(k)_{k}(x) e^{ik^{2}t=2m} dk$$
 (4)

where the coe cients a (k) are

$$a(k) = \frac{2^{2}}{4^{3}} e^{(k \cdot k_{av})^{2}} e^{ikx_{0}}$$
(5)

 k_{av} is the average m om entum, and x_0 is the coordinate of the peak of the packet at t = 0. We choose the parameters involved in the problem as follows:

$$m = 1$$
 $k_{av} = 9.9$ $= \frac{p_{-}}{2}$ $x_0 = 15$ $d = 2$ $V_0 = 50$ ($k_0 = 10$) (6)

The packet (4) is G aussian also in x (g. 1). The reason why the peak of the packet is located so far from the left edge of the barrier at time t = 0 is to have an identi cation of t_{in} as sharp as possible. W ith a packet starting nearer to the barrier, the G aussian form of the packet would be immediately lost, due to the interference of the incom ing and re ected components of the packet.

III.EVOLUTION OF THE PACKET

We have studied the evolution of the packet in order to verify to what extent the de nitions of the tunneling time proposed for stationary problems are meaningful for a wave packet. More precisely, we have tested whether the phase times $^{\rm ph}$ [7] or the times proposed by Buttiker $^{\rm B}$ [9] (which turn out to be deeply connected with the times proposed within other approaches, see for [2]-[4] a review) do represent the lapse of time which the packet spends in the barrier. To this purpose, it is necessary to mark the time $t_{\rm in}$ when the packet begins to interact with the barrier, and the time $t_{\rm n}$ when a transmitted (rejected) packet appears. The comparison of $t_{\rm n}$ $t_{\rm n}$ with $^{\rm ph}$ and $^{\rm B}$ calculated for significant values of the energy will show that $^{\rm ph}$ and $^{\rm B}$ are not significant for a wave packet.

We observe the shape of the packet as it moves towards the potential barrier. As long as it is far enough, its shape is quite similar to the initial shape; when it approaches the left edge of the barrier it begins to become blurred (g. 2) due to the interference between the incoming and the rejected components. There is a time interval in which the interference phenom enon is dominant, but a rejected packet is still absent. The peak of a rejected packet appears a time to after the blurring of the incoming packet. A bit later, we see the emergence of a transmitted packet beyond the barrier.

For the time t_{in} when the packet begins to interact with the barrier we assume the time when the blurred shape can be macroscopically observed. As for the time t_n , we have two possibilities: the time when the rejected packet appears ($t_{n,R}$) or the time when the peak of the transmitted packet appears ($t_{n,T}$). It is clear from the above that neither t_{in} nor $t_{n,R}$ ($t_{n,T}$) are sharply dened. In the units we have chosen, each of them can be determined only within an error t' 0:1.

By inspection of the graphs representing the rejected and the transmitted packet respectively (see gs. 2a and g2b), we get

$$t_{in}$$
 ' 0.9 $t_{n,R}$ ' 1.9 $t_{n,T} = 2.7$ (7)

For the times $_{\rm R}$ and $_{\rm T}$ it follows

The error on the above values can be assessed to be of order 0.2.

We compare the above times with the times $^{\rm ph}$ and $^{\rm B}$. These are functions of the momentum k, so we must decide which momentum to consider. We consider the average momentum $k_{\rm av}$ and the average momenta $k_{\rm R}$ and $k_{\rm T}$ of the rejected and transmitted components respectively. These latter are calculated to be

$$k_{\rm R} = 9:696; k_{\rm T} = 10:327$$
 (9)

Incidentally, this shows, as previously noted [4], that a potential barrier acts as an accelerator: the transmitted wave packet has an average momentum larger than the incoming one. The opposite holds for the rejected packet.

In table 1 we present the dwell tim est^{ph;D} and t^{B;D} calculated for $k = k_{av}$, k_R and k_T , together with the rejection tim et^{B;R} calculated for k_{av} and k_R and the transmission tim et^{B;T} calculated for k_{av} and k_T . We see that the dwell times t^{ph;D} and t^{B;D} are denitely shorter than the tunneling time $_T$ reported in (8). The same holds for the rejection times t^{B;R} calculated for k_{av} and k_R . As for the transmission time t^{B;T}, we see that the value corresponding to k_{av} is longer, whereas the value corresponding to k_T is shorter. We conclude that the tunneling times found for stationary problem s are not useful to describe the evolution of a packet.

IV.DEFINITION OF $_{\rm D}$, $_{\rm T}$ AND $_{\rm R}$

So far de nitions of the time that the particle interacts with the potential (the so called dwell time $_{\rm D}$) and of the transmission ($_{\rm T}$) and rejection ($_{\rm R}$) times have been given mainly for stationary problems. Even the authors who have dealt with wave packets considered packets which were so narrow in energy that the relevant times could be considered to be functions (k) of the momentum, as in the stationary case. In this section we propose de nitions of $_{\rm D}$, $_{\rm T}$ and $_{\rm R}$ which are suitable for a wave packet.

We rst consider the probability P_2 (t) that at time t the particle is within the barrier region,

$$P_{2}(t) = \int_{a}^{Z} dx j (x;t)^{2}$$
(10)

and the analogous probabilities that at time t the particle is in front of the barrier (P_1 (t)) or beyond the barrier (P_3 (t)). O by bully, we have P_1 (t) + P_2 (t) + P_3 (t) = 1

The values of P_1 (t), P_2 (t) and P_3 (t) are reported in g. 4. P_1 and P_3 tend to asymptotic values which we call respectively R and T. They represent the probabilities that the particle is rejected or transmitted respectively. Obviously, R + T = 1.

Inspection of P_2 (t) show s that fort 0:75 the packet does not interact with the barrier, and the interaction reaches its maximum at t' 1:5. A fler this time the probability of nding the particle in the barrier region decreases with a tail which has an exponential shape. The interaction time should be the total time that the particle spends in the potential region. With this view, we propose the following (already deined as eq. (1)) as a de nition of D (see also ref. [10], [11] where a similar de nition is put forth):

$$D_{D} = \int_{t_{2}}^{Z_{+1}} P_{2}(t) dt$$

The meaning of eq. (1) is clear: every time interval dt is weighted with the probability P_2 (t) of nding the particle within the potential barrier. The dwell time is to be interpreted as the time the particle interacts with the potential regardless its fate. The de nition is independent of the choice of time t_2 , provided it is chosen earlier than the time the packet is significantly present in the barrier region. We can safely take $t_2 = 0$.

We de ne the transmission time $_{T}$ as the average time that it takes for the transmitted particles to emerge beyond the potential barrier. This time is given by the integral

$$I = \int_{t_3}^{Z_1} 1 \frac{P_3(t)}{T} dt$$
(11)

In the above de nition 1 P_3 (t)=T is the fraction of the transmitted packet which has not yet been transmitted at time t. We interpret this fact viewing this fraction as "being transmitted" at time t, so that any time interval dt contributes to the transmission time with a weight 1 P_3 (t)=T.

The trouble with this de nition is the lower integration limit t_3 , in that eq. (11) gives weight 1 also to the time intervals when the packet has not yet arrived in the potential region. But these time intervals are not to be considered as contributing to the transm ission time: what eq. (11) actually gives is the transm ission time starting from time t_3 .

The problem cannot be circum vented by any choice of time t_3 . In principle, t_3 should be the time when the particle begins to interact with the potential, but this time cannot be determined in any objective way. However, we can determ ine that time t such that the packet has spent in the potential region an amount of time starting from the time t = 0. This is the time t such that the integral of P_2 from t = 0 to t = t equals . Now, the transmission time $_T$ () reckoned from time t (such that the time spent in the barrier by the packet is equal to) is de ned unambiguously. On the other hand, the calculation of the dwell time $_{\rm D}$ (as well as any possible time measurement about the particle) is a ected by an error. If we choose to be the same as this error, the uncertainty on $_{\rm T}$ due to the choice of the lower integration limit can be considered of the same order as the time resolution we are able to attain. In conclusion, we put

$$_{T}() = P_{2}(x)dx \qquad 1 \qquad \frac{P_{3}(t)}{T} dt \qquad (12)$$

where (x) is the Heavyside step function. The lower integration limit in eq. (12) can be taken the same as in eq. (11).

A long these lines we de ne also the rejection time $_{\rm R}$ ():

$${}_{R}() = {}^{Z_{+infty}} {}^{Z_{t}} {}^{P_{2}(x)dx} 1 \frac{P_{1}(t)}{R}^{\#} dt$$
(13)

The interpretation of eq. (13) is straightforward. 1 P_1 (t)=R is the fraction of the rejected packet that at time t has not yet been rejected. This fraction is taken as the weight for any time interval dt. We note however that for times near the beginning of the interaction of the particle with the potential this weight can be negative. But the decrease of P_1 (t) is very sharp (see g. 4) and the contribution to the integral of the region where the weight is negative is sm all indeed.

In the case we have investigated we have found

$$_{\rm D} = 0.93$$
 (14)

In order to nd $_{\rm T}$ and $_{\rm R}$ we have xed = 10 2 $_{\rm D}$ ' 0.01. This yields

$$_{\rm T} = 3.39$$
 $_{\rm R} = 0.55$ (15)

Note that we have T ' 0:14, R ' 0:86. W ith this values and the results reported in eqs. 14 and 15 the conditional probability relation ([2], [11]

$$_{\rm D} = T_{\rm T} + R_{\rm R} \tag{16}$$

is fairly satis ed. Condition (16) would be identically satis ed if the lower limits where the integrands in eqs. (1), (12) and (13) start to di er from zero were the same. The fact that eq. (16) holds true with a fair accuracy, to within that value .01 which can be assessed as the accuracy of all our calculations, can be regarded as a support to the correctness of the de nitions of $_{\rm D}$, $_{\rm T}$ and $_{\rm R}$.

By inspecting table 1 we see that $_{\rm D}$ is denitely larger than $_{\rm ph,D}$ and $_{\rm B,D}$ evaluated for k = k_{av}. The dwell time $_{\rm D}$ looks a very reliable estimate of the interaction time. The discrepancy with the value found for stationary states con im s that the extrapolation to wave packet is untenable. As for $_{\rm T}$ and $_{\rm R}$, a comparison with the previously reported values of the rejection and transmission times derived by inspection of the wave packet evolution shows that $_{\rm T}$ and $_{\rm R}$ in eq. (15) are respectively longer and shorter. Thus, the discrepancy between the times in eq. (15) and the times derived within the stationary approach, for example the Buttiker times calculated for k = k_{av}, is even larger.

V.THE DEPLETION RATE

The tail of P_2 (t) can be described as an exponential curve with a time constant $_{dep}$:

$$P_2(t) = Ae^{t = dep}$$
 for large t (17)

By considering the values of P_2 for t > 30, we not that the exponential t is excellent, with

$$_{\rm dep} = 16:192$$
 (18)

and a correlation coe cient R = 0.9999883. The same time constant _{dep} rules the asymptotic behaviour of P_3 (t) and, due to probability conservation, of P_1 :

$$dep = 16:192$$
 R = 0:9999435

The value of $_{dep}$ is connected with the behaviour of the complex transmission coe cient D (k) in the complex plane. By explicitly writing P₂ (t) (see Appendix) we see that the only singularities are in the product u (k) u (p) in the denom inator, with

$$u(k) = \binom{2}{k} \sinh(2d) 2ik \cosh(2d)$$
 (19)

It is easy to see that if u(k) = 0, then u(k) = 0. Hence, a zero for u in k = x + iy, together with the zero in x if for u, will contribute to $P_2(t)$ with a term exp(2xyt=m). For large values of t, the term with xy negative and m inimum in absolute value will dom inate. The behaviour of P_2 will be as in eq. (17), with:

$$dep = m = 2j_{xyj}$$
(20)

The search for the pole with smallest $j_x y j$ value is discussed in the appendix. We nd x = 10.03, y = 3.0565 1³0, which yields _{dep} = 16.3087, in fair agreement with the value reported in eq. (18).

VI.CONCLUSIONS

We have studied the evolution of a wave packet which approaches a potential barrier. The time requested for the appearance of a transmitted ($_{\rm T}$) or a rejected ($_{\rm R}$) packet, reckoned from the moment the incoming packet begins to interact with the barrier, are denitely different from the values of $_{\rm T}$ and $_{\rm R}$ reported in the literature form onochromatic packets. We propose new denitions of $_{\rm D}$, $_{\rm T}$ and $_{\rm R}$ which are suitable for a packet and give results that t better the actual time evolution of the packet.

The probability of nding the particle within the barrier has an exponential tail whose time constant $_{dep}$ is determined by the behaviour of the stationary solutions in the complex momentum plane.

APPENDIX:

The stationary solutions of the Schroedinger equation with the Ham iltonian (2) are:

$$\sum_{k}^{8} e^{ikx} + A(k)e^{ikx} \quad \text{if } x < d$$

$$\sum_{k} (x) = \sum_{k} B(k)e^{x} + C(k)e^{x} \quad \text{if } x > d$$

$$\sum_{k} D(k)e^{ikx} \quad \text{if } x > d$$

where

$$A (k) = \frac{(^{2} + k^{2}) \sinh (2 d)}{u (k)} e^{2ikd}$$

$$B (k) = \frac{ik (+ik)}{u (k)} e^{ikd} e^{d}$$

$$C (k) = \frac{ik (-ik)}{u (k)} e^{ikd} e^{d}$$

$$D (k) = \frac{2ihk}{u (k)} e^{2ikd}$$

$$k = \frac{q}{k_{0}^{2}} \frac{k^{2}}{k^{2}}$$

 $u(k) = ({}^{2} k^{2}) \sinh(2 d) 2ik \cosh(2 d)$

The probability P_2 (t) is given by:

$$P_{2}(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=2}^{s} \sum_{j=1}^{z} \sum_{k=1}^{z} \sum_{k=1}^{z} \sum_{j=2}^{z} e^{i(k + a_{x})^{2}} e^{i(k + a_{x})^{2$$

$$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 4 (q + ip) (+ ik) \frac{1}{q} + \overline{q} + (q - ip) (+ ik) \frac{1}{q} + e^{2(-q)\overline{d}} \\ + \overline{q} + \overline{q} + (q - ip) (+ ik) \frac{1}{q} + \overline{q} + (q - ip) (+ ik) \frac{1}{q} + \overline{q} + \overline{q} \end{array}$$

where $q = \frac{q}{k_0^2 - p^2}$

The only singularities are in the factors u(k)u(p) in the denominator. In order to nd the zeroes of u(k) we note that if u(k) = 0, then

$${}^{2}_{4} \frac{\sin 2ik_{0}}{p} \frac{p}{1-z^{2}} {}^{3_{2}}_{5} = 4z^{2}$$
(A1)

with $z = k = k_0$. For an opaque barrier (i.e. $2k_0d$ 1) the solution for z has to be near z = 1. The values of the zeroes have been found by solving for z the relation

$$0 = u(z) ' u(z_0) + (z z_0) u^0(z_0)$$

and iterating, choosing di erent values of z_0 near 1. We have found as many di erent solutions as predicted by the Cemlib routine nzeros for a neighbourhood of z = 1. The value of _{dep} is given by that solution for which xy is negative and minimum in absolute value.

- [1] L.A.M ac Coll, 1932, Phys. Rev. 40, 621
- [2] E.H.Hauge and J.A.St vneng, 1989, Rev.M od. Phys. 61, 917
- [3] V S.O Ikhovsky and E. Recam i, 1992 Phys. Reports 214, 339
- [4] R. Landauer and Th.Martin, 1994, Rev. Mod. Phys. 66, 217
- [5] P.Gueret, E.M arclay and H.M eyer, 1988, Appl. Phys. Lett. 53, 1617P.Gueret, E.M arclay and H.M eyer, 1988, Solid State Comm. 68, 977

[6] A.Ranfagni, P.Fabeni, G.P.Pazzi and D.Mugnani, 1993, Phys. Rev. E 48, 1453

- [7] T.E.Hartm an, 1962, J.Appl. Phys. 33, 3427
- [8] K W H. Stevens, 1983, J. Phys. C 16, 3649

[9] M. Buttiker, 1983, Phys Rev B 27, 6178

- [10] S. Brouard, R. Sala and J.G. Muga, 1993, Europhys. Lett. 22, 159
 S. Brouard, R. Sala and J.G. Muga, 1994, Phys. Rev. A 49, 4312
- [11] C.R. Leavens and G.C. Aers, 1993, in Scanning Tunnelling M icroscopy III, edited by R.
 W iesendanger H.J.Guntherodt, (Springer New York), p. 105

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1 The Gaussian shape of the incoming packet for t = 0.

Figure 2a and 2b In (a) the wave packet at t = 0.9 and in (b) a zoom of the blurred region.

Figure 3a and 3b In (a) the relected packet that appears at t = 1.9. In (b) the rst transmitted peak that appears at t = 2.7.


F igure 4 P lots of P_1 (t), P_2 (t) and P_3 (t) as functions of t.


TABLE CAPTIONS


Table 1 The phase time and the Buttiker times evaluated in $k = \overline{k}; k_R; k_T$.

time	$k = k_{av}$	$k = k_R$	$k = k_T$
ph ; D	0.143	0.0843	1.011
B;D	0.140	0.079	1.008
В ; Т	2.357	-	1,248
Bu R	0.140	0.079	-


Table 1









X





 $|\psi/^2$



t