

Quantum Tunneling in the Wigner Representation

M. S. MARINOV AND BILHA SEGEV

Department of Physics, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology

Haifa 32000, Israel

February 1996

Abstract

Time dependence for barrier penetration is considered in the phase space. An asymptotic phase-space propagator for nonrelativistic scattering on a one - dimensional barrier is constructed. The propagator has a form universal for various initial state preparations and local potential barriers. It is manifestly causal and includes time-lag effects and quantum spreading. Specific features of quantum dynamics which disappear in the standard semi-classical approximation are revealed. The propagator may be applied to calculation of the final momentum and coordinate distributions, for particles transmitted through or reflected from the potential barrier, as well as for elucidating the tunneling time problem.

PACS number: 03.65.Nk

1 Introduction

Observable properties of quantal systems, like energy levels and transition probabilities are mostly related to stationary states. Meanwhile, the time dependence of physical processes is also described by quantum theory and may be of considerable interest. An important class of effects is various barrier penetration (tunneling) processes. The transition probabilities are usually obtained by means of the time-independent (energy) methods, in particular, in the semi-classical approximation (see e. g. in Ref.[1, 2]). As soon as one gets the complete solution in the energy representation, the time evolution is obtained straightforwardly, in principle, in terms of the inverse Laplace transform. However, the evaluation of the large-time asymptotics may be an intricate job. A source of the trouble is in the very statement of the problem. If we insist that the particle was on one side of the barrier in the beginning, the state cannot be described by the plane wave, which is the eigen-state of the momentum operator. Thus the initial energy is never free of an uncertainty. The uncertainty may be made smaller if the particle is de-localized in space, so one has to start far enough from the barrier, and to detect the result long enough after the start in order to be sure that the particle has left the potential domain completely. It is clear, however, that the problem needs a special theoretical analysis.

The time dependence of tunneling processes has been attracting attention for decades. A controversial question is that of the tunneling time and the effect of causality on the particle propagation [3]-[11]. New experimental techniques enable detailed measurements performed on a photon wave packet transmitted through an optical analog of a quantum potential barrier[12]-[17]. There are some theoretical concerns on the validity of the semi-classical approximation in processes, like tunneling, which have no classical counterparts, because the effect of quantal fluctuations must get a proper account. Therefore a consistent time-dependent formalism for tunneling is hardly redundant.

Barrier penetration processes and their time dependence were investigated by numerical, experimental, and analytic methods in a number of works, e.g.[18]-[28]. The literature contains specific examples of barriers and wave-packet shapes. Our purpose was to consider a general case, with no assumptions on the initial state preparation, neither on the form of the (local) potential barrier. Barrier penetration is described sometimes by means of the imaginary time method[29]-[33]. In the present approach, the process is described in real space-time, even though we exploit analytical properties in the complex energy plane, especially for causality arguments.

The method applied here is an investigation of the time evolution of the Wigner phase-space distribution[34]. In this way, we can consider any initial state, not necessarily pure, which is important for applications to experiments. Besides, cumbersome oscillations of the wave functions are not involved. The Wigner function was used successfully in many problems of quantum theory, and its properties were considered, e.g. in [35]-[44]. Caruthers and Zachariasen, in their review of quantum collision theory with phase-space distributions[35] considered cross sections for scattering processes in three dimensions, inclusive reactions within a second quantization approach, inclusive multi-particle production processes in the ultrarelativistic domain and many other processes but discussed neither quantum jumps, nor barrier penetration. Various other approaches have been tried recently[45]-[49] to describe quantum dynamics in terms of the Wigner function. In scattering problems, the time evolution of the Wigner function was considered mainly within the semi-classical approximation[50]-[53]. As was shown by Berry[54], the semi-classical approximation for stationary Wigner functions describing bound states is given by the Airy function, its spread from the classical δ -function being the first-order quantum effect. Propagation of wave packets was discussed in a number of works; it was shown in particular that the spreading in the coordinate is not a specific quantal effect[55]. Within the semi-classical approximation the quantal features of the long-time evolution was attributed to the interference between amplitudes corresponding to different classical paths[56]. Our point is to emphasize the difference between the genuine quantum dynamics and the semi-classical approximation for classically forbidden processes where no classical paths exist, so quantum dynamics is not reduced just to a smearing around classical paths, or to an interference between them.

The Wigner function was applied to tunneling by Balazs and Voros[57] for parabolic potential barrier. The equivalence of Wigner's integro-differential equation to Liouville's classical equation is in an apparent conflict to tunneling for that potential. The puzzle is solved as soon as it is realized that the initial Wigner function cannot be chosen arbitrarily, if the potential does not vanish asymptotically. Physically available states

correspond to Wigner distributions extended in the momentum, so real classical trajectories transport the particle above the barrier. The Wigner function for the parabolic potential was constructed explicitly, and the transmission and reflection coefficients were obtained, within a qualitative picture of tunneling where the difference between classical and quantum mechanics lies mainly in the initial state preparation.

For sufficiently broad incident momentum distributions, the classical paths enable the particle to overcome the barrier, and the semi-classical approach can be used indeed[58, 59]. If the barrier potential is localized, the incident wave packet (or the Wigner function) can be prepared with an arbitrarily definite energy, and no classical paths would be responsible for the tunneling. In that situation the barrier penetration must be a result of an essential difference between the quantum and classical dynamics.

Purely quantal effects and their role in scattering processes have been also considered in the phase space formalism. In the “Wigner-trajectory” approach each phase-space point in the initial Wigner distribution is propagating along a definite trajectory[7, 60, 61]. If the third and higher-orders derivatives of the potential vanish, the Wigner trajectories coincide with the classical paths. Otherwise, the Wigner trajectories are defined with a modified “quantum” potential and are not classical. For a system in an energy eigen-state (i.e. in the stationary barrier problem), the time-shift invariance implies that the trajectories are the “equi-Wigner curves” which are lines of constant values of the Wigner function. That approach seems rather problematic. The effective ‘potential’ may be singular, the Liouville theorem is violated, and quantum jumps[62, 63] can hardly be included. In another approach, quantum corrections to classical dynamics are interpreted as finite momentum jumps between classical paths[62]. Negative quasi-probabilities appear in the calculation, which distinguish the quantum treatment from the classical theory. The phase-space points are smeared to finite domains and do not propagate along continuous trajectories.

We consider the phase-space evolution kernel[64], which is the fundamental solution of the dynamical equation for the Wigner function. In classical theory, the evolution kernel is the fundamental solution of the Liouville equation and equals the δ -function restricted to classical trajectories. In the semi-classical approximation one can get the Airy function. For the barrier penetration, an explicit expression is obtained and it is shown that it is not reduced to the semi-classical approximation. From this point of view, the barrier penetration is an essentially quantal process.

In Section 2 the phase-space propagator (the evolution kernel) is defined, and some of its properties are given. Section 3 shows the relation between the time evolution and the S -matrix formalism in the momentum representation. The large-time asymptotics for the space-time propagator is derived in Section 4. The result is an integral representation in terms of scattering amplitudes. The exact result for the narrow potential barrier is presented in Section 5. The semi-classical approximation is considered in Section 6, and its validity is discussed. Some technical aspects are considered in Appendix: the accuracy of the large-time asymptotics, the transition probability for Gaussian states, and the exact result for the \cosh^{-2} potential barrier.

The units used in the paper are $\hbar = 1$, and $2m = 1$ for the particle mass.

2 The phase-space propagator

In general, any quantum state is described by a density matrix $\hat{\rho}$, which can be represented by its matrix elements, say, in the coordinate representation, $\langle q'|\hat{\rho}|q\rangle$, or by its Weyl symbol (the Wigner function[34]) $\rho(x)$, where $x \equiv (q, p)$,

$$\rho(q, p) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle q + \frac{\eta}{2} | \hat{\rho} | q - \frac{\eta}{2} \rangle e^{-i p \eta} d\eta. \quad (1)$$

For a given Hamiltonian \hat{H} , the evolution operator $\hat{U}(t) \equiv \exp(-i\hat{H}t)$ determines the time evolution of the state: $\hat{\rho}_t = \hat{U}(t)\hat{\rho}_0\hat{U}^\dagger(t)$. Respectively, the time evolution of the Wigner function is given by an integral kernel, i.e. the phase-space propagator,

$$\rho_t(x) = \int L_t(x, x_0) \rho_0(x_0) dx_0. \quad (2)$$

Here $dx = dqdp$, and L_t is a real dimensionless function which satisfies the following identities,

$$\begin{aligned} L_t(q, p; q_0, p_0) &= L_{-t}(q_0, -p_0; q, -p), \\ \int dx L_t(x, x_0) &= 1 = \int dx_0 L_t(x, x_0), \\ L_{t_1+t_2}(x, x_0) &= \int dx' L_{t_2}(x, x') L_{t_1}(x', x_0) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In order to handle experimental data, one may introduce an *acceptance function* $\zeta(x)$, characterizing the apparatus, so that the probability to detect the system described by $\rho(x)$ would be

$$w_\zeta = \int \zeta(x) \rho(x) dx. \quad (4)$$

Thus the probability to detect the system at a time t after it was prepared in the state given by $\rho_0(x)$ is

$$w_\zeta(t) = \int \int \zeta(x) L_t(x, x_0) \rho_0(x_0) dx_0 dx. \quad (5)$$

The quasi-distributions $\rho(x)$ and $\zeta(x)$ are normalizable and satisfy a set of conditions owing to the positive definiteness of the density matrix, for instance,

$$\int [\rho(x)]^2 dx \leq \left[\int \rho(x) dx \right]^2. \quad (6)$$

Other conditions are more intricate. Qualitatively, the distributions cannot be localized to domains of areas less than $2\pi\hbar$ by the order of magnitude. The functions are not necessarily positive everywhere, but the domains of negativity must be small enough.

The *phase-space propagator* L_t is expressed in terms of the matrix elements of $\hat{U}(t)$, e.g. the coordinate (or momentum) propagators, as follows from (1),

$$\begin{aligned} L_t(q, p; q_0, p_0) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\eta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\eta_0 e^{i(p\eta - p_0\eta_0)} \langle q - \frac{\eta}{2} | \hat{U} | q_0 - \frac{\eta_0}{2} \rangle \overline{\langle q + \frac{\eta}{2} | \hat{U} | q_0 + \frac{\eta_0}{2} \rangle} \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\sigma \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\sigma_0 e^{i(q\sigma - q_0\sigma_0)} \langle p + \frac{\sigma}{2} | \hat{U}(t) | p_0 + \frac{\sigma_0}{2} \rangle \overline{\langle p - \frac{\sigma}{2} | \hat{U}(t) | p_0 - \frac{\sigma_0}{2} \rangle}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

For any Hamiltonian, quadratic in x , $\rho_t(x)$ is the solution of the *classical* Liouville equation. In that case the classical equations of motion are linear, as well as the Heisenberg equations. The solution is linear: $x = R_t x_0$, where R_t is an x -independent matrix, and $L_t(x; x_0) = \delta(x - R_t x_0)$. In particular, for the nonrelativistic free motion one has

$$L_t(q, p; q_0, p_0) = \delta(p - p_0)\delta(q - vt - q_0), \quad (8)$$

where $v = p/m$ is the particle velocity.

For non-linear systems, effects specific for quantum dynamics result in deviations of L_t from the δ -function.

3 Time dependence in the momentum representation

As soon as the Hamiltonian \hat{H} has no explicit time dependence, the evolution operator can be written as the Laplace transform of the resolvent:

$$\hat{U}(t) \equiv e^{-it\hat{H}} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_\infty} \hat{G}_\varepsilon e^{-it\varepsilon} d\varepsilon \quad , \quad \hat{G}_\varepsilon \equiv (\hat{H} - \varepsilon)^{-1} . \quad (9)$$

where Γ_∞ is the usual integration contour in the complex ε -plane, running above the real axis.

We shall consider a nonrelativistic particle of mass $m = 1/2$ scattered from a localized one-dimensional and time-independent potential barrier. The Hamiltonian is $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{V}$, where $\hat{H}_0 = \hat{p}^2$ is the kinetic energy operator. The basis of the normalized momentum eigen-states $|k\rangle$ will be used, so

$$\hat{H}_0|k\rangle = k^2|k\rangle, \quad \langle k|k_0\rangle = \delta(k - k_0). \quad (10)$$

Introducing the transition operator \hat{T}_ε , one has

$$\hat{G}_\varepsilon = \hat{G}_\varepsilon^{(0)} - \hat{G}_\varepsilon^{(0)}\hat{T}_\varepsilon\hat{G}_\varepsilon^{(0)} \quad , \quad \hat{G}_\varepsilon^{(0)} \equiv (\hat{H}_0 - \varepsilon)^{-1}. \quad (11)$$

The momentum propagator is now given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle k|\hat{U}(t)|k_0\rangle &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_\infty} \langle k|\hat{G}_\varepsilon|k_0\rangle e^{-it\varepsilon} d\varepsilon \\ &= \delta(k - k_0)e^{-itk^2} - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_\infty} d\varepsilon e^{-it\varepsilon} \frac{\langle k|\hat{T}_\varepsilon|k_0\rangle}{(k^2 - i\gamma - \varepsilon)(k_0^2 - i\gamma - \varepsilon)} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The infinitesimal positive quantity γ is introduced here to specify the integral near the poles due to the free propagators. The integration contour Γ_∞ is deformed to run around the positive real axis, as the exponential vanishes in the lower half-plane and $\langle k|\hat{T}_\varepsilon|k_0\rangle$ has singularities only for the real values of ε corresponding to physical energy values. The kinematic poles are isolated, leaving an integral along the real positive axis

$$\begin{aligned} \langle k|\hat{U}(t)|k_0\rangle &= \exp\left[-\frac{i}{2}t(k^2 + k_0^2)\right] \left[\delta(k - k_0) - \frac{e^{it\xi}}{2\xi} \langle k|\hat{T}_\varepsilon|k_0\rangle \Big|_{\varepsilon=k^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{e^{-it\xi}}{2\xi} \langle k|\hat{T}_\varepsilon|k_0\rangle \Big|_{\varepsilon=k_0^2} - J_t(k, k_0) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\xi = \frac{1}{2}(k_0^2 - k^2)$ and

$$J_t(k, k_0) = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{p.v.} \int_{\varepsilon_0}^{\infty} d\varepsilon e^{-it[\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2}(k^2 + k_0^2)]} \frac{\text{Im}[\langle k | \hat{T}_\varepsilon | k_0 \rangle]}{(\varepsilon - k^2)(\varepsilon - k_0^2)}, \quad (14)$$

and ε_0 is a threshold energy value. (With no bound states $\varepsilon_0 = 0$, otherwise it is the lowest bound-state energy.) At two zeroes of the integrand denominator the integral is taken in the sense of its principal value.

In order to calculate explicitly the time-dependent propagator for a given potential, the transition operator matrix elements for this potential should be known on and off the energy shell. For scattering problems, one needs the large-time asymptotics, where the matrix elements are reduced to the energy shell because of the known fact of the theory of distributions,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{i\xi t} / \xi = i\pi \delta(\xi). \quad (15)$$

The integral in (14) vanishes, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, because $\text{Im}[\langle k | \hat{T}_\varepsilon | k_0 \rangle]$ is smooth and the integral is converging. In general, $J_t = O(t^{-1/2})$. (The proof is given in Appendix A.)

The result is expressed in terms of a unitary 2×2 matrix S

$$\langle k | \hat{U}(t) | k_0 \rangle \asymp e^{-i\kappa^2 t} 2\kappa \delta(k^2 - k_0^2) S_{\nu\nu_0}, \quad SS^\dagger = I, \quad (16)$$

where $\kappa = |k| = |k_0|$, I is the unit 2×2 matrix and $\nu = k/\kappa = \pm 1$. The S -matrix elements are related to elements of the \hat{T}_ε -operator on the energy shell $\kappa^2 \equiv \varepsilon$,

$$S_{\nu\nu_0}(\kappa) = \delta_{\nu\nu_0} - \frac{i\pi}{\kappa} \langle \nu\kappa | \hat{T}_\varepsilon | \nu_0\kappa \rangle. \quad (17)$$

These are the probability amplitudes for transmission through and reflection from the potential region. The amplitudes can be expressed in terms of two analytical functions $a(\kappa)$ and $b(\kappa)$,

$$S(\kappa) = \frac{1}{a} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & b \\ -\bar{b} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |a|^2 - |b|^2 = 1. \quad (18)$$

These functions are defined for $\text{Re } \kappa > 0$ by the asymptotics of the solution of the stationary Schrödinger equation,

$$y_-(q) \asymp \begin{cases} \hat{p}^2 y + V(q)y = \kappa^2 y, \\ e^{-i\kappa q}, & q \rightarrow -\infty, \\ ae^{-i\kappa q} + be^{i\kappa q}, & q \rightarrow +\infty. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

The functions $a(\kappa)$ and $b(\kappa)$ have the analytical continuation to the left half-plane by

$$a(-\bar{\kappa}) = \overline{a(\kappa)}, \quad b(-\bar{\kappa}) = \overline{b(\kappa)}. \quad (20)$$

The analytical properties of these functions in the complex κ -plane have been investigated previously[65]. It was shown, in particular, that for any finite-range and positive potential they can be expressed in terms of two entire functions $\alpha(\varepsilon)$ and $\beta(\varepsilon)$,

$$a(\kappa) \equiv 1 - \alpha(\varepsilon)/2i\kappa, \quad b(\kappa) \equiv \beta(\varepsilon)/2i\kappa. \quad (21)$$

Thus the only singularities of $S(\kappa)$ are poles due to zeroes of $a(\kappa)$ which are all in the lower half of the κ -plane. Moreover, α and β are bounded for $\text{Im } \kappa > 0$, so that $\lim a = 1$ and $\lim b = 0$, as $|\kappa| \rightarrow \infty$ in the upper half-plane. If the potential has an exponential decrease as $q \rightarrow \pm\infty$, the functions α and β may have infinite series of poles. Besides, for symmetric barriers, where $V(-q) = V(q)$, one has a real $\beta(\varepsilon)$ and purely imaginary $b(\kappa) = -b(-\kappa)$.

4 The large-time asymptotics

In order to get the large time asymptotics for the phase-space propagator, we set the amplitudes from (16) into Eq. (6). Using the following property of the δ -function

$$2|k|\delta(k^2 - k_0^2) = \delta(k - k_0) + \delta(k + k_0), \quad (22)$$

one gets the following result

$$L_t(q, p; q_0, p_0) \asymp \delta(p - p_0)\mathcal{T}(p_0, r_+) + \delta(p + p_0)\mathcal{R}(p_0, r_-) + \frac{2}{\pi} \text{Re} \left[\frac{b(p_0 - p)}{a(p_0 - p)a(p_0 + p)} e^{2i(q_0 p - q p_0) + 4i p p_0 t} \right]. \quad (23)$$

Here $r_{\pm} = q_0 + 2p_0 t \mp q$; i.e the differences between the free classical trajectory and actual positions of the transmitted particle (r_+) and reflected from $q = 0$ particle (r_-). The first two terms describe transmission and reflection from the potential barrier. The third term represents an interference between transmitted and reflected waves and is responsible for quantum fluctuations at the barrier region. It is irrelevant for large t , if the wave packet was prepared in free space with a narrow momentum distribution.

The functions representing the transmission and reflection probabilities are given by the Fourier integrals

$$\mathcal{T}(p_0, r_+) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{e^{-i\sigma r_+} d\sigma}{a(\frac{1}{2}\sigma + p_0)a(\frac{1}{2}\sigma - p_0)}, \quad (24)$$

$$\mathcal{R}(p_0, r_-) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{b(\frac{1}{2}\sigma + p_0)b(\frac{1}{2}\sigma - p_0)e^{-i\sigma r_-} d\sigma}{a(\frac{1}{2}\sigma + p_0)a(\frac{1}{2}\sigma - p_0)} + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{2p_0}^{+\infty} \frac{B(p_0, \sigma) d\sigma}{a(\frac{1}{2}\sigma + p_0)a(\frac{1}{2}\sigma - p_0)}, \quad (25)$$

where

$$B(p_0, \sigma) \equiv [b(\frac{1}{2}\sigma + p_0) + b(-\frac{1}{2}\sigma - p_0)][b(\frac{1}{2}\sigma - p_0)e^{-i\sigma r_-} + b(-\frac{1}{2}\sigma + p_0)e^{i\sigma r_-}]. \quad (26)$$

The result is obtained in the following way. We assume that $p_0 > 0$, so L_t gets contributions from 3 segments in the σ -axis, which are proportional to products of the S -matrix

elements, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma \in & \quad (-\infty, -2p_0) \quad (-2p_0, 2p_0) \quad (2p_0, +\infty) \\
\mathcal{T} \propto & \quad S_{--}\overline{S_{++}} \quad S_{++}\overline{S_{++}} \quad S_{++}\overline{S_{--}} \\
\mathcal{R} \propto & \quad S_{-+}\overline{S_{+-}} \quad S_{+-}\overline{S_{+-}} \quad S_{+-}\overline{S_{-+}}
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

The arguments are $p + \frac{1}{2}\sigma$ in the first factor and $p - \frac{1}{2}\sigma$ in the second factor. The S -matrix is given in Eq. (18), and the complex conjugation is taken on the real axis by means of Eq. (20), inverting the signs of the arguments. Thus the integral is given in terms of analytical functions with the general properties determined by the Schroedinger equation.

Evidently, L_t is real and respects the reciprocity principle:

$$L_t(x, x_0) = L_{-t}(x_0, x). \tag{28}$$

Note that the result is translationally invariant; namely, for $q \rightarrow q - c$ the quantities r_+ and $a(\kappa)$ remain invariant, while $r_- \rightarrow r_- - 2c$ and $b(\kappa) \rightarrow b(\kappa)e^{2i\kappa c}$. The second integral in \mathcal{R} vanishes, if $V(q) \equiv V(-q)$, since in that case $b(\kappa) = -b(-\kappa)$ and $B(p, \sigma) \equiv 0$. The total transmission and reflection probabilities (for a given initial momentum p) are given by integration

$$\begin{aligned}
T(p) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathcal{T}(p, r) dr = |a(p)|^{-2}, \\
R(p) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \mathcal{R}(p, r) dr = |b(p)/a(p)|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

The integral representations in Eqs. (24-25) are manifestly causal. It is proven[65] that the only singularities are due to zeroes of $a(\kappa)$, which are all in the lower complex half-plane for $V(q) \geq 0$. If $r_+ < 0$, i.e. if q is ahead of the free propagation coordinate, the exponent for $\text{Im } \sigma > 0$ is decreasing, so the integration contour may be deformed to the upper half plane and the only contribution would be from ∞ where $a \rightarrow 1$, leading to $\mathcal{T} = \delta(r_+)$, as in free motion (8). For $r_+ \geq 0$, the integral can be evaluated by means of residues in the lower half plane. Each zero of $a(\kappa)$ gives rise to a pair of poles in the integrand of (24) and (25). Thus \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{R} can be expressed as a sum over the S -matrix singularities. The transmission propagator is given by,

$$\mathcal{T}(p, r_+) = \delta(r_+) - \theta(r_+) \sum_n \text{Re} \{ A_n(p) \exp[i2r_+(p - \kappa_n)] \}, \tag{30}$$

where κ_n are zeroes of $a(\kappa)$ and $A_n(p)$ are determined by the corresponding residues, $\theta(r)$ is the step function ($= 0$ for $r < 0$ and $= 1$ for $r > 0$). Two examples are given below: the δ -potential barrier (Section 5) and the modified Pöschl-Teller potential (Appendix C). In general, contributions from purely imaginary poles have the form of that for the δ -barrier, Eq. (33). The functional dependence on the lag distance r_+ is universal, though A_n and κ_n depend on the potential. As $\text{Im } \kappa_n < 0$, the second term in $\mathcal{T}(p, r_+)$ is an exponentially decreasing and oscillating function of r_+ . It partly cancels contributions from the δ -function to the integrals for probabilities, so the effect of the barrier is to remove parts of the freely propagating wave packet.

5 Narrow potential barrier

Let us consider the δ -potential barrier

$$V^\delta(q) = v_0\delta(q), \quad (31)$$

for which the S -matrix elements are given by

$$a^\delta(\kappa) = 1 - v_0/2i\kappa, \quad b^\delta(\kappa) = v_0/2i\kappa. \quad (32)$$

There is one pair of poles in the integrands in (24) and (25), and the integrals are calculated by the residue theorem, leading to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}^\delta(p, r_+) &= \delta(r_+) - \theta(r_+)2v_0\sqrt{1 + (v_0/4p)^2}e^{-v_0r_+} \cos(2pr_+ + \gamma) \\ \mathcal{R}^\delta(p, r_-) &= \theta(r_-)\frac{v_0^2}{2p}e^{-v_0r_-} \sin(2pr_-), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $\gamma = \arctan(v_0/4p)$. The total transmission probability is

$$T(p) = 1 - \frac{v_0^2}{v_0^2 + 4p^2}.$$

The δ -potential has a simple explicit solution also off the energy shell,

$$\langle k|\hat{T}_\varepsilon^\delta|k_0\rangle = \frac{v_0}{2\pi(1 + v_0/2\sqrt{-\varepsilon})}, \quad (34)$$

independently of k and k_0 . Thus one can evaluate the non-asymptotic time dependence of Eq. (14),

$$\begin{aligned} J_t^\delta(k, k_0) &= \frac{v_0^2}{4\pi\sqrt{-it}}e^{\frac{i}{2}t(k^2+k_0^2)} \left[\frac{W(\frac{1}{2}v_0\sqrt{-it})}{(k^2 + \frac{1}{4}v_0^2)(k_0^2 + \frac{1}{4}v_0^2)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{k^2 - k_0^2} \left(\frac{W(\sqrt{it}k^2)}{k^2 + \frac{1}{4}v_0^2} - \frac{W(\sqrt{it}k_0^2)}{k_0^2 + \frac{1}{4}v_0^2} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where $W(z)$ is a function related to the probability integral[66]

$$W(z) = zw(z) \equiv ze^{-z^2} (1 - \operatorname{erf}(-iz)) \asymp \frac{i}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2z^2} + O(z^{-4}) \right) \quad (36)$$

In the large-time asymptotics, for $t \gg \max\{v_0^{-2}, k_0^{-2}, k^{-2}\}$, J_t^δ vanishes as $t^{-3/2}$, more rapidly than in the general case since the transition matrix elements in Eq. (34) are insensitive to separation from the energy shell (cf. Appendix A). The result is

$$J_t^\delta = \frac{\exp[\frac{i}{2}(k^2 + k_0^2)t]}{2(i\pi t)^{3/2}k^2k_0^2} + O(t^{-5/2}). \quad (37)$$

As can be shown by means of the double Fourier transform in k and k_0 , the expression in Eq. (35) agrees with the evolution kernel for the δ -potential in the coordinate representation, obtained previously[20].

6 Semi-classical approximation

In the semi-classical approximation one has the eikonal formula, for the transmission amplitude

$$a(\kappa) = \exp[iS(\kappa)], \quad S(\kappa) = \kappa \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[1 - \sqrt{1 - \kappa^{-2}V(q)} \right] dq. \quad (38)$$

For $\kappa^2 > V_0 \equiv \max[V(q)]$, S is real and $|a| = 1$, so the transmission is complete. Note that $S(-\kappa) = -S(\kappa)$, by virtue of the analytical continuation. Unlike the exact solution, the approximate function $a(\kappa)$ is not meromorphic, since $S(\kappa)/\kappa$ has a branch point at $\kappa^2 = V_0$.

The resulting transmission propagator is given by

$$\mathcal{T}(p, r) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty d\sigma \cos \left[\sigma r + S\left(p + \frac{\sigma}{2}\right) - S\left(p - \frac{\sigma}{2}\right) \right]. \quad (39)$$

The total transmission probability is obtained by integrating \mathcal{T} in r_+ . At large r_+ the vicinity of $\sigma = 0$ is dominating in the integral, so one can use the series expansion in the exponent. For $p^2 < V_0$,

$$S(p) + S(-p) = -2iI, \quad I \equiv \int \sqrt{V(q) - p^2} dq, \quad (40)$$

where the integral is on the segment where $V(q) > p^2$, I is real. That leads to the familiar semi-classical expression for the transmission probability, $T = \exp(-2I)$.

Unlike the integrated probability, the value of the propagator for a given r_+ needs a more careful treatment. Expanding the exponent around $\sigma = 0$ and retaining terms up to the order of σ^3 , one gets the Airy function for $\mathcal{T}(p, r_+)$. While adequate for classically allowed regions[54], as well as for large r_+ , this naive semi-classical approximation can not be valid everywhere. In particular, it violates causality in contrast to the results obtained from the exact quantum treatment.

Fairly accurate results in some domains in the (p_0, r_+) -plane are obtained in the framework of the WKB approach if the integral in Eq. (39) is calculated by the stationary-phase method. If the critical points of the integrand appear in the region where the semi-classical approximation is valid, one can make use of Eq. (38). Positions of the critical points are given by the equation

$$2r_+ + S'(\tfrac{1}{2}\sigma + p) + S'(\tfrac{1}{2}\sigma - p) = 0, \quad (41)$$

$$S'(\kappa) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[1 - \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{\kappa^2 - V(q)}} \right] dq.$$

The latter has a classical meaning for $\kappa^2 > V_0$; namely, $S'(\kappa) = -v(\tau_V - \tau_0)$, where $v \equiv 2\kappa$ is the initial particle velocity, τ_V and τ_0 are the times of flight in presence of the potential barrier and in free space. Hence Eq. (39) can be interpreted in the following way. Treating σ as a quantum fluctuation of the incident momentum, one can note that

r_+ equals to the lag due to the barrier, averaged between two classical trajectories, their mean momentum being equal to p . For positive r_+ , the critical points of the exponent may take place at real σ , and their positions depend on the magnitudes of r_+ and p .

At small r_+ the region of large $|\sigma|$ contributes substantially, and one use the high-energy asymptotics, where $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$, $a(\kappa) \asymp 1$, and

$$S(\kappa) \asymp \frac{w}{2\kappa}, \quad w \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} V(q) dq. \quad (42)$$

Let us consider the domain where

$$r_+ p \geq 1, \quad p/w \ll 1, \quad r_+ p^2/w \ll 1. \quad (43)$$

The inequalities mean that i) the domain is consistent with the uncertainty relation, ii) the process is a deep under-barrier tunneling, iii) the asymptotics of Eq. (40) can be used. The corresponding critical points are given by

$$\sigma_0^2 = 2w/r_+ \gg p^2. \quad (44)$$

The contribution from the pair of critical points is

$$\mathcal{T}(p, r_+) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \cos\left(r_+ \sigma + \frac{2w}{\sigma}\right) d\sigma \asymp \frac{(2wr_+)^{1/4}}{r_+ \sqrt{\pi}} \cos\left(2\sqrt{2wr_+} + \frac{\pi}{4}\right). \quad (45)$$

This result is quite different from the standard semi-classical approximation, which is hardly surprising, since the domain given by inequalities (43) is not dominating in tunneling as a whole, even though small r_+ represent the most rapid signal transport.

7 Summary and conclusion

The phase-space propagator for a general local one-dimensional potential barrier has a universal form; it is given by a sum over singularities of the S -matrix. It conserves energy, is manifestly causal and shows certain features specific for quantum theory.

At large times, the initial Wigner function is splitted into three parts: the reflected bundle, the transmitted bundle and a transient group which can be neglected if the incident particle was prepared with a narrow momentum distribution. The resulting probabilities have a momentum dependence, which causes the known effects, like dispersion and forward attenuation. Asymptotically, after the particle leaves the interaction region, the time evolution of the Wigner functions is just the coordinate translation with constant classical velocities. As different parts of the Wigner function are translated with different velocities, the evolution of the phase-space distribution goes on, and the actual experiment results may depend on the detector position, in particular on its distance from the barrier region.

The coordinate dependence of the propagators is universal for any local potential. The propagators are functions of the lag distance, which is the difference between the free motion and the current coordinate. At large lag distances, the probability has an

exponential decrease and is oscillating as a result of quantum interference effects. The decrease rate and the oscillation frequency are determined by positions of poles of the transition amplitudes in the complex energy plane. The coefficients and the phase shifts depend on details of the barrier shape and on the initial momentum. Of course, the phase-space propagator is not a δ -function. Each point in the initial Wigner function gives rise to disconnected domains in the final distribution. This is a purely quantal effect in the barrier penetration dynamics.

The standard semi-classical approximation can be used for evaluation of the total transmission probability, obtained by integration of the wave packet outside the potential domain. It is hardly adequate, however, for description of the process time dependence, since the analytical properties representing the causality in the energy representation are not maintained properly.

In contrast to classical theory, individual phase-space trajectories cannot be traced in quantum theory. Both the the initial distribution and the detector acceptance have final supports, and the observed probabilities are obtained by integration. It is evident, however, that the principle of causality is not violated by quantum theory, and no information can be transported faster because of the barrier. The problem of the signal transport and the time delay is a subject of a forthcoming paper[67].

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to S. A. Gurvitz for his interest to this work. The support to the research from G. I. F. and the Technion V. P. R. Fund is gratefully acknowledged.

Appendix A

Off-energy-shell corrections in the large- t asymptotics

The transition operator of Eq. (11) has the following general property

$$\hat{T}_\varepsilon - \hat{T}_\varepsilon^\dagger = \hat{T}_\varepsilon[\hat{G}_\varepsilon^{(0)} - (\hat{G}_\varepsilon^{(0)})^\dagger]\hat{T}_\varepsilon^\dagger, \quad (46)$$

which leads, in particular to the S -matrix unitarity. Hence one has for the discontinuity of the matrix element in Eq. (14)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}\langle k|\hat{T}_\varepsilon|k_0\rangle &= \frac{\pi}{2\kappa}D(\kappa; k, k_0), \\ D(\kappa; k, k_0) &= \sum_{\nu=\pm 1} \langle k|\hat{T}_\varepsilon|\nu\kappa\rangle \overline{\langle k_0|\hat{T}_\varepsilon|\nu\kappa\rangle}, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $\kappa = \varepsilon^{1/2}$. As a function of κ , D is regular. Besides, it has the following general property of positive definiteness,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} D(\kappa; k, k_0) f(k) \overline{f(k_0)} dk_0 dk \geq 0, \quad (48)$$

for any integrable complex function $f(k)$. In particular, $D(\kappa; k, k) \geq 0$ for all k .

The “half-on-shell” transition amplitudes present here are expressed in terms of solutions of the Schrödinger equation (19) $y_{\pm}(x)$, satisfying the complimentary asymptotical conditions, as given in Ref.[65],

$$\begin{aligned} \langle k | \hat{T}_{\varepsilon} | \nu \kappa \rangle &= \frac{1}{8\pi\kappa a} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx e^{-i(k-\nu\kappa)x} \left\{ (\kappa^2 - k^2)(\eta'_+ \eta_- - \eta_+ \eta'_-) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + V(x) \left[((2 + \nu)\kappa - k)y_+(x)e^{-i\kappa x} + ((2 - \nu)\kappa + k)y_-(x)e^{+i\kappa x} \right] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where $\eta_{\pm}(x) \equiv y_{\pm}(x) - e^{\pm i\kappa x} \rightarrow 0$ for $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$. It is evident from the integral representation that the transition amplitudes are regular functions of κ , and they are proportional to κ at $k^2 = \kappa^2$. (Note that κa is finite at $\kappa = 0$.)

Finally, the off-energy-shell correction is given by the following equality (we assume, for simplicity that there are no bound states)

$$J_t(k, k_0) = \exp\left[\frac{i}{2}t(k^2 + k_0^2)\right] \text{p.v.} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-it\kappa^2} \frac{D(\kappa; k, k_0)d\kappa}{(\kappa^2 - k^2)(\kappa^2 - k_0^2)} \asymp O(t^{-1/2}). \quad (50)$$

The large- t asymptotics of the integral is determined by the behavior of D at $\kappa \rightarrow 0$.

Appendix B

Gaussian distributions

Let us consider, for example, the Gaussian initial phase-space distribution $\rho_0(q, p)$ and a similar detector acceptance function $\zeta(q, p)$. We shall assume, for simplicity, that they describe pure states which have the minimal uncertainties, allowed by the Heisenberg principle. The functions are

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(q, p) &= \exp[-(q - Q_0)^2/\lambda_0 - \lambda_0(p - P_0)^2] \quad , \\ \zeta(q, p) &= \exp[-(q - Q_d)^2/\lambda_d - \lambda_d(p - P_d)^2] \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where (Q_0, P_0) and (Q_d, P_d) are the most probable coordinate and momentum values for the initial wave packet and the detector, respectively; λ_0 and λ_d are the coordinate dispersions. If the wave packet was prepared with a fairly definite initial momentum P_0 , then λ_0 must be relatively large, while λ_d is small for a detector localized in space.

The probability to detect the particle at a time t is given by Eq. (5). For pure states the probability is expressed in terms of the transition amplitude.

$$w_{\zeta}(t) = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0\lambda_d)^{1/2} \exp\left[-\frac{\lambda_0\lambda_d}{\lambda_0 + \lambda_d}(P_0^2 + P_d^2)\right] |A + B|^2, \quad (52)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\kappa}{a(\kappa)} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_d)(\kappa - P_+)^2 - i\kappa(Q_- + \kappa t)\right], \\ B &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\kappa}{a(\kappa)} b(\kappa) \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_d)(\kappa - P_-)^2 - i\kappa(Q_+ + \kappa t)\right], \\ P_{\pm} &= (\lambda_0 P_0 \pm \lambda_d P_d)/(\lambda_0 + \lambda_d), \quad Q_{\pm} = Q_0 \pm Q_d. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Apparently, if the κ -dependence of $|a|$ is not strong, the region of $\kappa \approx P_+$ is the most substantial in the integral for the transmission amplitude $A(t)$. On the other hand, the amplitude vanishes in the large- t asymptotics except for times t given by the stationary phase condition,

$$vt = Q_d - Q_0 - d\varphi/d\kappa, \quad (54)$$

where $v = 2\kappa$ is the velocity in the substantial region, and $\varphi(\kappa) = \arg(a)$. Similar arguments can be applied to $B(t)$. (A more detailed discussion is given in Ref.[67].)

The probability in (52) is a sum of three terms, $w_\zeta = w_t + w_r + 2w_s$, corresponding to transmission, reflection and the transient interference, as in Eq. (23) for L_t . At large times t and the states localized outside the potential region (large Q_0 and Q_d), one of the amplitudes is exponentially smaller than the other one. As soon as $w_s^2 = w_t w_r$, the interference term can be neglected. In general one deals with mixed states, where $w_s^2 < w_t w_r$, so the interference is always negligible.

Appendix C

Modified Pöschl-Teller potential barrier

The modified Pöschl-Teller potential barrier,

$$V^{\text{PT}}(q) = \frac{v_0^2}{\cosh^2(q/s)}, \quad (55)$$

where v_0 and s are constants, is an example for a local potential barrier which enables an explicit solution and a test of the various approximations. The known solution[1] is

$$\begin{aligned} a^{\text{PT}}(\kappa) &= i \frac{[\Gamma(1 - i s \kappa)]^2}{s \kappa \Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + \omega + i s \kappa) \Gamma(\frac{1}{2} - \omega - i s \kappa)} \\ b^{\text{PT}}(\kappa) &= -i \frac{\cos \pi \omega}{\sinh \pi s \kappa}, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where $\omega = \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} - v_0^2 s^2}$; it is real if the barrier is narrow.

The singularities of the transmission amplitude are simple poles at $s\kappa = -i(n + \frac{1}{2} \pm \omega)$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$. The phase-space propagator is given by an infinite sum of the residues. For large t the result is

$$\begin{aligned} L_t^{\text{PT}}(q, p; q_0, p_0) &\simeq \delta(p - p_0) \mathcal{T}^{\text{PT}}(r_+, p_0) + \delta(p + p_0) \mathcal{R}^{\text{PT}}(r_-, p_0), \\ \mathcal{T}^{\text{PT}}(r_+, p_0) &= \delta(r_+) + \theta(r_+) [\mathcal{F}_t(\nu, \omega) + \mathcal{F}_t(-\nu, \omega) + \mathcal{F}_t(\nu, -\omega) + \mathcal{F}_t(-\nu, -\omega)], \\ \mathcal{R}^{\text{PT}}(r_-, p_0) &= \theta(r_-) [\mathcal{F}_r(\nu, \omega) + \mathcal{F}_r(-\nu, \omega) + \mathcal{F}_r(\nu, -\omega) + \mathcal{F}_r(-\nu, -\omega)] \\ &\quad + \theta(-r_-) [\mathcal{F}_s(\nu, \omega) + \mathcal{F}_s(-\nu, -\omega)] \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where $\nu \equiv 2p_0 s$ and,

$$\mathcal{F}_t(\nu, \omega) = \frac{2\Gamma(2\omega)\Gamma(i\nu)\Gamma(i\nu + 2\omega)}{s\Gamma(-\frac{1}{2} + \omega)\Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + \omega)\Gamma(-\frac{1}{2} + i\nu + \omega)\Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + i\nu + \omega)} \times$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \exp[(i\nu + 2\omega - 1)\frac{r_+}{s}] {}_4F_3 \left[\begin{matrix} \frac{3}{2} - \omega, \frac{1}{2} - \omega, \frac{3}{2} - i\nu - \omega, \frac{1}{2} - i\nu - \omega \\ 1 - 2\omega, 1 - i\nu, 1 - i\nu - 2\omega \end{matrix} ; \exp(-2\frac{r_+}{s}) \right], \\
\mathcal{F}_r(\nu, \omega) &= \frac{-2\Gamma(2\omega)\Gamma(i\nu)\Gamma(i\nu + 2\omega)\Gamma(\frac{1}{2} - i\nu - \omega)}{s[\Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + \omega)]^2\Gamma(\frac{1}{2} - \omega)\Gamma(-\frac{1}{2} + \omega)\Gamma(-\frac{1}{2} + i\nu + \omega)} \times \\
& \exp[(i\nu + 2\omega - 1)\frac{r_-}{s}] {}_4F_3 \left[\begin{matrix} \frac{3}{2} - \omega, \frac{1}{2} - \omega, \frac{3}{2} - i\nu - \omega, \frac{1}{2} - i\nu - \omega \\ 1 - 2\omega, 1 - i\nu, 1 - i\nu - 2\omega \end{matrix} ; \exp(-2\frac{r_-}{s}) \right] \\
\mathcal{F}_s(\nu, \omega) &= 2v_0^2 s \frac{\Gamma(\frac{3}{2} + i\nu + \omega)\Gamma(\frac{3}{2} + i\nu - \omega)\Gamma(-1 - i\nu)}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + \omega)\Gamma(\frac{1}{2} - \omega)\Gamma(1 + i\nu)} \times \\
& \exp[(i\nu + 2)\frac{r_-}{s}] {}_4F_3 \left[\begin{matrix} \frac{3}{2} + \omega, \frac{3}{2} - \omega, \frac{3}{2} + i\nu + \omega, \frac{1}{2} + i\nu - \omega \\ 2, 1 + i\nu, 2 + i\nu \end{matrix} ; \exp(\frac{2r_-}{s}) \right]. \tag{58}
\end{aligned}$$

The ${}_4F_3$ are the generalized hypergeometric functions[68],

$${}_4F_3 \left[\begin{matrix} \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4 \\ \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \end{matrix} ; \zeta \right] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta^n (\xi_1)_n (\xi_2)_n (\xi_3)_n (\xi_4)_n}{n! (\lambda_1)_n (\lambda_2)_n (\lambda_3)_n}, \tag{59}$$

and $(\xi)_n \equiv \Gamma(\xi + n)/\Gamma(\xi)$. The series are convergent, as long as $|\zeta| < 1$.

For a wide barrier, ω is imaginary, and the series approach their radius of convergence as $s \rightarrow \infty$. Thus the integral representation is more practical than the series. For small momenta, $\kappa \ll v_0$, one gets:

$$\begin{aligned}
a^{\text{PT}}(\kappa) &\approx \exp[-\pi s(v_0 - \kappa) + iS(\kappa)], \tag{60} \\
S(\kappa) &= s\kappa \ln\left(\frac{v_0^2}{\kappa^2} - 1\right) + sv_0 \ln \frac{v_0 + \kappa}{v_0 - \kappa},
\end{aligned}$$

which is the semi-classical approximation (the integral in Eq. (38) is calculated). Now \mathcal{T} is given by the Airy function,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_{sc}^{\text{PT}} &\approx e^{-2\pi s(v_0 - p_0)} (3\varphi_3)^{-1/3} \text{Ai} \left[(3\varphi_3)^{-1/3} (r_+ - \varphi_1) \right], \tag{61} \\
\varphi_1 &= -s \ln \left(\frac{v_0^2}{p_0^2} - 1 \right), \quad \varphi_3 = \frac{sv_0^2(v_0^2 - 3p_0^2)}{12p_0^2(v_0^2 - p_0^2)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The appearance of the Airy function is typical for semi-classical Wigner's functions. As $s \rightarrow \infty$, the Airy function approaches the δ -function, corresponding to the classical propagation,

$$\mathcal{T}_c^{\text{PT}} \simeq e^{-2\pi s(v - p_0)} \delta \left[q_0 + 2p_0 t + s \ln \left(\frac{v_0^2}{p_0^2} - 1 \right) - q \right] \tag{62}$$

The additional term looks like an advance in time, violating causality, yet in fact it is an artifact of the naive semi-classical approximation.

In the opposite limit of a narrow barrier, i.e. small s , the series converges rapidly. If we set $s \rightarrow 0$, $v_0^2 s = \text{const}$, the δ -function discussed in Section 5 is reproduced. One has no problems with the causality in that approximation.

References

- [1] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, "Quantum Mechanics", Pergamon, London, 1958.
- [2] L. Schiff, "Quantum Mechanics", McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968, Ch. 8,9.
- [3] M. Buttiker and R. Landauer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 1739 (1982).
- [4] C.R. Leavens and G.C. Aers, Phys. Rev. **B39**, 1202 (1989).
- [5] E.H. Hauge and J.A. Støvneng, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 917 (1989).
- [6] V.S. Olkhovsky and E. Recami, Phys. Rep. **214**, 339 (1992).
- [7] J.G. Muga, S. Brouard and R. Sala, Phys. Lett. **A167**,24 (1992).
- [8] R. Landauer and Th. Martin, Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 217 (1994).
- [9] A. M. Steinberg and R.Y. Chiao, Phys. Rev. **A49**, 3283 (1994).
- [10] D. Sokolovski, Phys. Rev. **A52**, R5 (1995).
- [11] A.M. Steinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2405 (1995).
- [12] A. Ranfagni, D. Mugnai, P. Fabeni, and G. P. Pazzi, Appl. Phys. Lett. **58**, 774 (1991).
- [13] A. Ranfagni, D. Mugnai, P. Fabeni, G. P. Pazzi, G. Naletto, and Sozzi, Physica **B175**, 283 (1991).
- [14] A. Ranfagni, D. Mugnai, P. Fabeni, G. P. Pazzi, G. Naletto, and Sozzi, Phys. Rev. **E48**, 1453 (1993).
- [15] A. Enders and G. Nimtz, Phys. Rev. **B47**, 9605 (1993).
- [16] A.M. Steinberg, P.G. Kwiat and R.Y. Chiao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 708 (1993).
- [17] Ch. Spielmann, R. Szipocs, A. Sting, and F. Krausz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 2308 (1994).
- [18] R.G. Winter, Phys. Rev. **123**, 1503 (1961).
- [19] N. Abu-Salby, D.J. Kouri, M. Baer and E. Pollak, J. Chem. Phys. **82**, 4500 (1985).
- [20] B. Gaveau and L.S. Schulman, J. Phys. **A19**, 1833 (1986).
- [21] W. Elberfeld and M. Kleber, Am. J. Phys. **56**, 154 (1988).
- [22] S.A. Gurvitz, Phys. Rev. **A38**, 1747 (1988).
- [23] W.-M. Suen and K. Young, Phys. Rev. **A43**, 1 (1991).
- [24] S. Baskoutas and A. Jannusis, J. Phys. **A25**, L1299 (1992).
- [25] T.O. de Carvalho, Phys. Rev. **A47**, 2562 (1993).

- [26] S. Albeverio, Z. Brzezniak and L. Dabrowski, J. Phys. **A27**, 4933 (1994).
- [27] M. Kleber, Phys. Rep. **236**, 331 (1994).
- [28] G. Garcia-Calderon, J.L. Mateos, and M. Moshinsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 337 (1995).
- [29] D.W. McLaughlin, J. Math. Phys. **13**, 1099 (1972).
- [30] M. S. Marinov and V. S. Popov, Fortschr. Phys. **25**, 373 (1977).
- [31] D. Sokolovski and L.M. Baskin, Phys. Rev. A. **36**, 4604 (1987).
- [32] W. Jaworski and D.M. Wardlaw, Phys. Rev. A. **43**, 5137 (1991).
- [33] H. Aoyama and T. Harano, Nucl. Phys. **B446**, 315 (1995).
- [34] E.P. Wigner, Phys. Rev. **40**, 749 (1932).
- [35] P. Carruthers and F. Zachariasen, Rev. Mod. Phys. **55**, 245 (1983).
- [36] M. Hillery, R.F. O'Connell, M.O. Scully, and E.P. Wigner, Phys. Rep. **106**, 121 (1984).
- [37] N.L. Balazs and B.K. Jennings, Phys. Rep. **104**, 347 (1984).
- [38] A. Peres, Physica Scripta **34**, 736 (1986).
- [39] W. Botermans and R. Malfiet, Phys. Rep. **198**, 115 (1990).
- [40] J. Aichelin, Phys. Rep. **202**, 233 (1991).
- [41] S. Abe and N. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. A. **45**, 520 (1992).
- [42] A. Bonasera, V. N. Kondratyev, A. Smerzi, and E. A. Remler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 505 (1993).
- [43] J. P. Bizarro, Phys. Rev. **A49**, 3255 (1994).
- [44] S. Mrowczynski, and B. Muller, Phys. Rev. **A50**, 7542 (1994).
- [45] A. Royer, Phys. Rev. **A43**, 44 (1991).
- [46] S.K. Ghosh and A.K. Dhara, Phys. Rev. **A44**, 65 (1991).
- [47] F.H. Molzahn and T.A. Osborn, Ann. Phys. **230**, 343 (1994).
- [48] H.-W. Lee, Phys. Rev. **A50** , 2746 (1994).
- [49] A. Smerzi, Phys. Rev. **A52** , 4365 (1995).
- [50] R. Jackiw and G. Woo, Phys. Rev. **D12**, 1643 (1975).
- [51] J.G. Muga and R.F. Snider, Phys. Rev. A. **45**, 2940 (1992).
- [52] T. M. Gould and E. R. Poppitz, Nucl. Phys. **B418**, 131 (1994).

- [53] P. Kasperkovitz and M. Peev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 990 (1995).
- [54] M. V. Berry, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. **287**, 237 (1977).
- [55] R. G. Littlejohn, Phys. Rep. **138**, 193 (1986).
- [56] M. Mallalieu and C.R. Stroud, Jr., Phys. Rev. **A49**, 2329 (1994).
- [57] N.L. Balazs and A. Voros, Ann. Phys. **199**, 123 (1990).
- [58] J.G. Muga, J. Phys. A. **24**, 2003 (1991).
- [59] A. Defendi and M. Roncadelli, Phys. Lett. **A187**, 289 (1994).
- [60] H.W. Lee and M.O. Scully, Found. of Phys. **13**, 61 (1983).
- [61] K.L. Jensen and F. A. Buot, Appl. Phys. Lett. **55**, 669 (1989).
- [62] E.A. Remler, Ann. Phys. **95**, 455 (1975).
- [63] B.M. Garraway and P.L. Knight, Phys. Rev. **A50**, 2548 (1994).
- [64] M. S. Marinov, Phys. Lett. **A153**, 5 (1991).
- [65] M. S. Marinov and B. Segev, “Analytical properties of scattering amplitudes in one-dimensional quantum theory”, J. Phys. A (to be published).
- [66] “Handbook of Mathematical Functions”, eds. M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, NBS, 1964.
- [67] M. S. Marinov and B. Segev, “On the concept of the tunneling time”, Technion, Haifa 1996.
- [68] L. J. Slater, “Generalized Hypergeometric Functions”, Cambridge University Press, 1966.