## Quantum comets

- (1969-79) Chirikov standard map:
$\bar{p}=p+K \sin x, \bar{x}=x+\bar{p} \quad(\mathrm{~K}=1.1)$
- (1979) Quantum map (kicked rotator): $\bar{\psi}=e^{-i \hat{p}^{2} / 2 \hbar} e^{-i K / \hbar \cos \hat{x}} \psi$ (Chirikov group 1981-1987): Anderson or dynamical localization
- (1974) Microwave ionization of hydrogen/Rydberg atoms (Bayfield-Koch experiment, Yale), quantum localization of chaos: theory (1983-1990), experiment Koch, Bayfield, Walther (1988-91)
- (1986-90) Kepler map, Halley comet: Petrosky, Chirikov-Vecheslavov, DS, Shevchenko
- (2009-16) Dark matter capture: Khriplovich, DS, Lages, Rollin + Heggie (1975)


## Microwave ionization of hydrogen/Rydberg atoms

Bayfield, Koch PRL (1974) - experiments at Yale:

Hydrogen principle quantum number $n_{0} \approx 66$, microwave $\omega / 2 \pi=9.9 \mathrm{GHz}$, field amplitude $\epsilon \approx 10 \mathrm{~V} / \mathrm{cm}$ being smaller than static ionization border $\epsilon_{\text {st }} \approx 30 \mathrm{~V} / \mathrm{cm} ; N_{l} \approx 76$ photons are required for atom ionization Hamiltonian (in atomic units):
$H(p, r)=p^{2} / 2-1 /|r|-\epsilon r \cos \omega t$ Classical description/scaling :
$\omega_{0}=\omega n_{0}{ }^{3} \approx 0.43$,
$\epsilon_{0}=\epsilon n_{0}{ }^{4} \approx 0.03<0.13$
Right (1986): Ionization probability as a function of $\omega_{0}$ (numerics: dashed classical; full - quantum)


## Kepler map

variation of energy and phase on one orbital period
Classical hydrogen atom in 1d (1983-1987)
$\bar{N}=N+k \sin \phi$
$\bar{\phi}=\phi+2 \pi \omega(-2 \omega \bar{N})^{-3 / 2}$
$N=-1 / 2 \omega n^{2}=E / \hbar \omega$ is photon number, $\phi=\omega t$ at perihelion;
valid for distance at perihelion $q=l^{2} / 2<(1 / \omega)^{2 / 3}$
linearization of equation for phase near resonant values $\bar{\phi}-\phi=2 \pi m$ gives $\bar{\phi}=\phi+T \bar{N} ; T=6 \pi \omega^{2} n_{0}{ }^{5}$ Chirikov standard map with $K=k T=\epsilon_{0} / \epsilon_{c}$; chaotic, diffisive ionization for $\epsilon_{0}>\epsilon_{c}=1 /\left(49 \omega_{0}^{1 / 3}\right)$;
 diffusion rate $D=k^{2} / 2$

## Quantum Kepler map and photonic localization

Classical hydrogen atom in 1d (1983-1987)
Operator commutator $[\hat{N}, \hat{\phi}]=-i$ in $\bar{N}=N+k \sin \phi$, $\bar{\phi}=\phi+2 \pi \omega(-2 \omega \bar{N})^{-3 / 2}$ or $\bar{\psi}=e^{-i H_{0}} \hat{P} e^{-i k \cos \hat{\phi}} \psi$
$\hat{H}_{0}=2 \pi\left[-2 \omega\left(N_{0}+\hat{N}_{\phi}\right)\right]^{-1 / 2}$,
$N_{0}=-1 /\left(2 \omega n_{0}^{2}\right)=-N_{l}$,
$\hat{N}_{\phi}=-i \partial / \partial \phi$.
quantum localization of diffusion (like Anderson localization (1958) in disordered solids)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \ell_{\phi}=D=k^{2} / 2=3.33 \epsilon^{2} / \omega^{10 / 3} \\
& f_{N} \propto \exp \left(-2\left|N-N_{0}\right| / \ell_{\phi}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$



Right: $n_{0}=100, \epsilon_{0}=0.04, \omega_{0}=3$ (open circles - 1d Schrodinger eq., black circles - the quantum Kepler map, straight line - theory)

## Delocalization transition

$$
\ell_{\phi}>N_{l}=1 /\left(2 \omega n_{0}^{2}\right)=n_{0} / 2 \omega_{0}
$$

or
$\epsilon_{0}>\epsilon_{q}=\omega_{0}^{7 / 6} /\left(6.6 n_{0}\right)^{1 / 2}=0.4 \omega^{1 / 6} \omega_{0}$
Right: ionization threshold $\epsilon_{0}$ vs $\omega_{0}$ for Koch (1988) experiment at 36 GHz (open circles), $45 \leq n_{0} \leq 80, n_{l}=90$; quantum Kepler map (full circles); dashed/dotted curve quantum/classical Kepler map theory; interaction time 100 microwave periods (no fit parameters).


Physica A 163, 205 (1990)
1d Kepler map gives a good description of real ionization of 3d atom

## Kepler map for comets

## Petrosky Phys. Lett. A (1986)

a planet on a 2d circular orbit (radius $r_{p}=1$, planet velocity $v_{p}=1$ ) around a star at mass ratio $\mu=m_{p} / M$, comet perihelion distance $q \gg r_{p}$
Comet dynamics is described by the Kepler map
$\bar{w}=w+F \sin x, \bar{x}=x+w^{-3 / 2}$
$w=v^{2}$ is comet rescaled energy; $x$ is planet phase divided by $2 \pi$
$F \approx 2 \mu q^{-1 / 4} \exp \left(-0.94 q^{3 / 2}\right)$
Petrosky (1986); Chirikov-Vecheslavov
(BINP 1986) - (A\&A 1989)
kick function from 46 times at perehelion for Halley comet


Fig. 1. The full perturbation of comet Halley vs. Jupiter's phase
F-kick function for Halley comet from Chirikov-Vecheslavov: diffusive ionization in time $t_{l} \sim T_{J}\left(2 / F^{2}\right) \sim 10^{7}$ years

## Chaotic Halley comet

## Chirikov-Vecheslavov (1986-1989)

Comet dynamics is described by the Halley (modified Kepler) map
$\bar{w}=w+F(x), \bar{x}=x+w^{-3 / 2}$

Main contribution from Jupiter, Saturn Chaotic diffusion, average ionization time is approximately $10^{7}$ years

More about kick function: Rollin, Haag, Lages Phys. Let. A 379, 1017 (2015)


Fig. 3a and b. Phase trajectory of map (3) in the STA (6). Initial conditions (crosses) $w_{1}=0.29164 ; x_{1}=0$ (in 1986, see Table 1): a Jupiter's perturbation only, $N=1.510^{5}$ iterations; b perturbation by both Jupiter and Saturn, $N=4000$

## Chaotic autoionization of molecular Rydberg states

Rydberg electron interaction with charged rotation core rotating dipole + Coulomb interaction (atomic units)
$H=\left(p_{x}{ }^{2}+p_{y}{ }^{2}\right) / 2-1 / r+d(x \cos \omega t+y \sin \omega t) / r^{3}$
that is approximately
$H=\left(p_{x}{ }^{2}+p_{y}{ }^{2}\right) / 2-\left[(x+d \cos \omega t)^{2}+(y+d \sin \omega t)^{2}\right]^{-1 / 2}$
Exact Kramers-Henneberger transformation gives Hamiltonian of excited hydrogen atom in a circular polarized microwave field with effective $\epsilon=d \omega^{2}$
$H=\left(p_{x}{ }^{2}+p_{y}^{2}\right) / 2-1 / r-\omega m+d \omega^{2} r \cos \psi$
where $\psi$ conjugated to momentum $m$ is the polar angle between direction to electorn and field direction in the rotating frame.

Conditions of applicability:
$d<a_{\text {core }}<q=r_{\text {min }}=l^{2} / 2<r_{\omega}=1 / \omega^{2 / 3}$;
$r_{\omega} \gg a_{\text {core }}$ (core size) for $\omega \ll 1 / a_{\text {core }}^{3 / 2}$
Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 1818 (1994)

## Kepler map for rotating dipole

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{N}=N+k \sin \phi \\
& \bar{\phi}=\phi+2 \pi \omega(-2 \omega \bar{N})^{-3 / 2} \\
& k \approx 2.6 d \omega^{1 / 3}\left[1+I^{2} / 2 n^{2}+1.09 / \omega^{1 / 3}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Chaotic diffusion, average ionization time is approximately
$t_{l} \approx N_{l}^{2} / D \approx 2 /\left[\left(2 n_{0} \omega^{2}\right) k^{2}\right]$
$D=k^{2} / 2$


FIG. 1. Comparison of the numerically computed values $\Delta N=\bar{N}-N$ (dots) obtained by solving the system (3) for $d n_{s}^{-2}=0.000625, \omega n_{s}^{3}=4, I / n_{s}=0.3, n_{0} / n_{s}=1.25$ and the theoretical curve $k \sin \Phi$ (full curve), with the value of $k$ taken from (6). The value $n_{\mathrm{f}}$ fixes the classical scale.

The map is approximate since the orbital momentum is only approximately concerved (e.g. Dvorak, Kribbel A\&A 227, 264 (1990))

## Kepler map for rotating dipole




The phase space $\left(E n_{0}^{2}, \phi\right)$ for the rotating dipole $d / n_{0}^{2}=0.000625, \omega n_{0}^{3}=4$, $I / n_{0}=0.3$, (a) - continuous equations, (b) - the Kepler map, initial energy is marked by arrow

## Kepler map for rotating quadrupole (planet/asteroid)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H=\left(p_{x}{ }^{2}+p_{y}{ }^{2}\right) / 2-0.5\left[(x-d \sin \omega t)^{2}+(y-d \cos \omega t)\right]^{-1 / 2} \\
& \quad-0.5\left[(x+d \sin \omega t)^{2}+(y+d \cos \omega t)\right]^{-1 / 2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$\bar{w}=w+A \sin 2 \phi$,
$\bar{\phi}=\phi+2 \pi \omega \bar{w}^{-3 / 2}$
$A \sim d^{2} \omega^{2} \sim \Delta Q \omega^{2}$
( $\Delta Q \sim a_{\text {core }}^{2} \sim d^{2}$ being quadrupole moment)
Chaos border
$\Delta Q / R^{2}>1 /\left(50 \omega_{0}{ }^{3}\right)$
where $\Delta Q$ is rotating part of the quadrupole of rigid body, $\omega_{0}$ is the ration between the quadrupole rotaion frequency and the satellite frequency. $q<r_{\omega}=1 / \omega^{2 / 3}$


FIG. 3. The dependence of the energy change $A$ on $d$ for the quadrupole case with $\omega n^{3}=5, I / n_{0}=0.6$.

## Capture of dark matter in the Solar system

Flow of dark matter particles (DMP): $f(v) d v=\sqrt{\frac{54}{\pi}} \frac{v^{2} d v}{u^{3}} \exp \left(-\frac{3}{2} \frac{v^{2}}{u^{2}}\right)$;
$\rho_{g} \approx 4 \cdot 10^{-25} \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}, u \approx 220 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$
Dimension argument:
$\Delta m_{p}=\rho_{g} T_{d}\langle\sigma v\rangle ;\langle\sigma v\rangle \sim \sqrt{54 \pi} \quad \frac{G^{2} m_{o} M}{u^{3}} ; \Delta m_{p} \sim \rho_{g} T_{d} \sqrt{54 \pi} \frac{G^{2} m_{\rho} M}{u^{3}}$
For $T_{d} \approx 4.5 \cdot 10^{9}$ years one gets $\Delta m_{p} \sim 10^{21} g$ for Jupiter, density $6 \cdot 10^{-22} \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ assuming $r_{p}$ volume. But in reality $T_{d} \sim 10^{7}$ years is given by diffusion escape time as for Halley comet.

From the Kepler map only DMP with $|w|<F \approx 5 m_{p} v_{p}{ }^{2} / M$ are captured with $q<r_{p}$. On infinity $q=\left(v r_{d}\right)^{2} / 2 G M$ and $q \sim r_{p}$ gives cross-section:
$\sigma \sim \pi r_{d}^{2} \sim 2 \pi G M r_{p} / v^{2} \sim 2 \pi r_{p}^{2}\left(v_{p} / v\right)^{2} \sim 2 \pi r_{p}^{2} M /\left(5 m_{p}\right) \gg \pi r_{p}^{2}$
(also Heggie MNRAS (1975))
Typical capture/escape velocity $v^{2} \sim 5 m_{p} v_{p}^{2} / M$; for Sun-Jupiter $v \sim 1 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ in agreement with numerics of A.Peter PRD (2009)

Khriplovich, DS Int. J. Mod. Phys. D (2009)

## Captured mass of dark matter in the Solar system

Capture process continues during time $T_{d} \approx 10^{7}$ years for Sun-Jupiter (Chirikov-Vecheslavov):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Delta m_{p} \sim \rho_{g} T_{d} \sqrt{54 \pi} \frac{G^{2} m_{\rho} M}{u^{3}} \\
& T_{d} \sim 1 / D \sim\left(M / m_{p}\right)^{2} \\
& \Delta m_{p} \sim \rho_{g} G^{2} M^{3} / m_{p} u^{3} \sim 10^{-14} M
\end{aligned}
$$

DMP density in vicinity of Earth-Jupiter:
$\rho_{E J} \sim 5 \cdot 10^{-29} \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3} \ll \rho_{g} \approx 4 \cdot 10^{-25} \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$
BUT
$\rho_{E J} \gg \rho_{\mathrm{gH}} \approx 1.4 \cdot 10^{-32} \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$
(4000 times enhancement at $u / v_{p}=17$
for galactic density in one kick range $0<|w|<w_{H}=F$ )
Global density enhancement is also possible at $u / v_{p}<1$.
=> SEE TALK of José Lages
Lages, DS MNRAS Lett (2013)

## Quantum effects for dark matter in binaries?

DMP energy change in number of photons
$\bar{w}=w+F(x), \bar{x}=x+\bar{w}^{-3 / 2}$
$\Delta E=m_{d} F v_{p}^{2}, \Delta N_{\phi}=m_{d} F v_{p}^{2} T_{p} / 2 \pi \hbar=k$
diffusion per period, localization:
$I_{\phi} \approx D \approx k^{2} / 2<N_{l}=m_{d} v_{p}^{2} T_{p} / 4 \pi$
with $v_{p}=r_{p} T / 2 \pi, v_{p}^{2}=2 M G / r_{p}$
This gives
$m_{d}<\hbar\left(M / m_{p}\right)^{2} /\left[6 c \sqrt{r_{S} r_{p}}\right]$,
$r_{S}=2 M G / c^{2}$ Schwarzschild radius
This gives for Sun-Jupiter
$m_{d}<2 \cdot 10^{-16} m_{e}$
This mass is too small and
thus quantum effects are not important for DMP ALL THIS
FROM 46 appearences of Halley comet

Table 1. Comet Halley's dynamics: perihelion pasage times (after Yeomans and Kiang, 1981)

| n | Year | Perihelion passage, $t_{*}$ (JD) | Jupiter's <br> phase $X_{\text {. }}$ | Saturn's phase $Y_{n}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1986 | 2446470.9518* | 0 | 0. |
| 2 | 1910 | 2418781.6777 | 6.39083584 | 2.57350511 |
| 3 | 1835 | 2391598.9387 | 126647606 | 5.09993167 |
| 4 | 1759 | 2363592.5608 | 19.1287858 | 7.70290915 |
| 5 | 1682 | 2335655.7807 | 25.5767473 | 10.2994180 |
| 6 | 1607 | 2308304.0406 | 31.8896785 | 12.8415519 |
| 7 | 1531 | 2280492.7385 | 38.3086791 | 15.4263986 |
| 8 | 1456 | 2253022.1326 | 44.6490451 | 17.9795802 |
| 9 | 1378 | 2224686.1872 | 51.1891362 | 20.6131884 |
| 10 | 1301 | 2196546.0819 | 57.6840264 | 23.2285948 |
| 11 | 1222 | 2167664.3229 | 64.3500942 | 25.9129322 |
| 12 | 1145 | 2139377.0609 | 70.8789490 | 28.5420157 |
| 13 | 1066 | 2110493,4340 | 77.5454480 | 31.2265267 |
| 14 | 989 | 2082538.1876 | 839976717 | 33.8247519 |
| 15 | 912 | 2054365.1743 | 90.5001572 | 36.4432169 |
| 16 | 837 | 2026830.7700 | 96.8552482 | 39.0023280 |
| 17 | 760 | 1998788.1713 | 103.327633 | 41.6086720 |
| 18 | 684 | 1971164.2668 | 109.703382 | 44.1761014 |
| 19 | 607 | 1942837.9758 | 116.241244 | 46.8088124 |
| 20 | 530 | 1914909.6300 | 122687259 | 49.4045374 |
| 21 | 451 | 1885963.7491 | 129.368127 | 52.0948344 |
| 22 | 374 | 1857707.8424 | 135889745 | 54.7210039 |
| 23 | 295 | 1828915.8984 | 142.535083 | 57.3969935 |
| 24 | 218 | 1800819.2235 | 149.019949 | 60.0083634 |
| 25 | 141 | 1772638.9340 | 155.524114 | 62.6275046 |
| 26 | 66 | 1745189.4601 | 161.859602 | 65.1787221 |
| 27 | -11 | 1717323.3485 | 168.291253 | 67.7686629 |
| 28 | $-86$ | 1689863.9617 | 174.629030 | 70.3208017 |
| 29 | -163 | 1661838.0660 | 181.097560 | 729255932 |
| 30 | -239 | 1633907.6180 | 187.544060 | 75.5215136 |
| 31 | -314 | 1606620.0237 | 193.842186 | 78.0576857 |
| 32 | -390 | 1578866.8690 | 200.247766 | 80.6371280 |
| 33 | -465 | 1551414.7388 | 206.583867 | 83.1885924 |
| 34 | -539 | 1524318.3270 | 212837867 | 85.7069955 |
| 35 | -615 | 1496638.0035 | 219.226637 | 88.2796687 |
| 36 | -689 | 1469421.7792 | 225.505291 | 90.8092075 |
| 37 | -762 | 1442954.0301 | 231.617192 | 93.2691812 |
| 38 | -835 | 1416202.8066 | 237.791521 | 95.7555018 |
| 39 | -910 | 1388819.7203 | 244.111687 | 98.3005491 |
| 40 | -985 | 1361622.0640 | 250389054 | 100.828362 |
| 41 | - 1058 | 1334960.1638 | 256.542767 | 103.306381 |
| 42 | - 1128 | 1309149.3447 | 262.500045 | 105.705298 |
| 43 | -1197 | 1283983.7325 | 268.308406 | 108.044248 |
| 44 | - 1265 | 1259263.8959 | 274.013879 | 110.341767 |
| 45 | -1333 | 1234416.0059 | 279.748908 | 112.651187 |
| 46 | -1403 | 1208900.1811 | 285.638100 | 115.022687 |

- After Kalyuka et al., 1985

Effective periods for Jupiter 4332.653; for Saturn 10759.362 (days)

## Chaotic notes on resonant nonlinear interactions of asteroids

Chirikov, DS Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. (1982)

3d ocsillator Hamiltonian
$H=\left(p_{x}^{2}+p_{y}^{2}+p_{z}^{2}\right) / 2+\left(x^{2}+y^{2}+\right.$ $\left.z^{2}\right) / 2+\left(x^{2} y^{2}+x^{2} z^{2}+y^{2} z^{2}\right) / 2$ Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy (max Lyapunov exponent, $H \rightarrow 0$ ) $h / H=h_{R}=$ const
measure of chaos at $H \rightarrow 0$ about 50\%

+ Mulansky, Ahnert, Pikovsky, DS J. Stat. Phys. 145, 1256 (2011) chaos measure $\mu \sim \epsilon, \lambda \sim \epsilon^{1 / 2}$


FIG. 3. Same as in Fig. 2; $H_{R}=0.324, h_{R}=0.14$.

