

## Comment on “Breathers and kink-antikink nucleation”

Peter Hänggi, Fabio Marchesoni

### Angaben zur Veröffentlichung / Publication details:

Hänggi, Peter, and Fabio Marchesoni. 1996. “Comment on ‘Breathers and kink-antikink nucleation’.” *Physical Review Letters* 77 (4): 787. <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.77.787>.



## Comment on “Breathers and Kink-Antikink Nucleation”

In a recent Letter [1] Büttiker and Christen (BC) computed the kink-antikink pair nucleation rate for the overdamped sine-Gordon (SG) theory

$$\gamma \phi_t - c_0^2 \phi_{xx} + \omega_0^2 \sin \phi = -F + \zeta(x, t), \quad (1)$$

where  $\zeta(x, t)$  is a zero mean-valued Gaussian noise with  $\langle \zeta(x, t) \zeta(x', t') \rangle = 2\gamma kT \delta(x - x') \delta(t - t')$  and  $F$  denotes a constant external drive with  $F \ll \omega_0^2$ . In the BC approach a thermal pair is deemed fully nucleated after the kink-antikink partners drift or diffuse a *phenomenological distance*  $s_0$  apart, with  $s_0$  much larger than the kink (antikink) size  $d = c_0/\omega_0$ , but much smaller than the equilibrium kink (antikink) free path  $1/n_0$ , with  $n_0 = (2E_0/\pi kTd^2)^{1/2} \exp(-E_0/kT)$  and  $E_0 = 8\omega_0 c_0$ . As a consequence, BC nucleation rate  $\Gamma_{BC}$  and lifetime  $\tau_{BC}$  are given by [1]

$$\Gamma_{BC} = 2n_0/\tau_{BC} = (4\omega_0^2/\pi \gamma s_0) \exp(-2E_0/kT), \quad (2)$$

and depend explicitly on the otherwise undetermined cutoff length  $s_0$ .

In order to help readers to compare the BC result with prior calculations by the present authors [2,3], we feel compelled to comment as follows

(i) From a statistical mechanical viewpoint, the kink (antikink) density  $n_0(T)$  is a well-defined equilibrium observable [4], no matter what the damping regime (or the thermalization mechanism) of Eq. (1). Let us set initial conditions  $\phi_t(x, 0) = \phi(x, 0) = 0$  in Eq. (1) and define the kink (antikink) lifetime  $\tau$  as the time constant for the kink (antikink) density to grow from 0 at  $t = 0$  up to its equilibrium value  $n_0(T)$ . Such a nonequilibrium definition of  $\tau$  is sound (at least for small  $F$  values [2]) and does not depend on any *ad hoc* cutoff length. This property is all the more valid for equilibrium  $n_0(T)$  fluctuations.

(ii) The *ad hoc* cutoff length  $s_0$  of Ref. [1] might be motivated, indeed, by the operational definition of kink (antikink), e.g., in a digital simulation [5]. The question then arises whether a finite nucleation rate  $\Gamma$  can be obtained for  $s_0 \rightarrow \infty$ , this limit being required by the mathematical definition of nucleated pair. In contrast with BC result (2), we proved [2] that a *natural* cutoff length  $n_0^{-1}[1 + \sqrt{1 + (F/F_c)^2}]^{-1}$ , with  $F_c = kTn_0/2\pi$ , comes about in a dilute gas of kinks and antikinks at thermal equilibrium [4]. Accordingly, for the weakly driven regime [with the rate  $\Gamma_0$  of Eq. (20) in Ref. [2]],  $s_0 = kT/2\pi F$ ; for the purely diffusive regime [with the rate  $\Gamma_D$  of Eq. (19) in Ref. [2]],  $s_0 = 1/2n_0$ —for numerical evidence see [5]. The physical interpretation of  $s_0$  in these two regimes is revealing. In the absence of a drive,  $1/2n_0$  is the average kink-antikink separation (mean free path), whereas  $kT/2\pi F$  is the kink-antikink distance when the drift dominates over diffusion.

(iii) The definition of  $s_0$  in Ref. [1] leads to mistaking a “standard breather” solution [6],  $\phi_B(x, t) = 4\text{tg}^{-1}[(q/\omega) \sin \omega t / \text{ch} q x]$  for a nucleated pair [7]. The unperturbed solution  $\phi_B$  represents a kink-antikink bound state with total energy  $2E_0\sqrt{1 - \omega^2/\omega_0^2}$ , where kink and antikink oscillate, crossing each other with angular frequency  $\omega$ , such that  $\omega^2 + q^2 c_0^2 = \omega_0^2$ . Because the amplitude of such oscillations diverges for  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ , we can define a value  $\omega_s$  of  $\omega$  so that for  $\omega \leq \omega_s$  the breather width exceeds the kink width  $d$ . At low temperature, the nucleation rate of standard breathers with  $\omega \leq \omega_s$  is [7]

$$\Gamma_B = (4\omega_s^2/\pi \gamma d_s) \exp(-2E_0/kT), \quad (3)$$

with  $d_s = c_0/\omega_s$ . Not surprisingly,  $\Gamma_B$  coincides with  $\Gamma_{BC}$  after substituting  $s_0$  in Eq. (2) with the effective breather length  $d_s(\omega_0^2/\omega_s^2)$ . A certain ambiguity in the definition of the SG degrees of freedom is thus introduced by BC, which was consistently ruled out in the earlier literature [5–7]. In passing, we notice that the space-time plot for the time evolution of an overdamped standard breather may well resemble the closed loops (bubbles), hand-drawn in Fig. 1 of Ref. [1].

In conclusion, the consistent use of the dilute gas approximation yields a stationary kink nucleation rate [2], where the prefactor is uniquely defined as a function of both the temperature  $T$  and the external drive  $F$ .

P. Hänggi

Institut für Physik, Universität Augsburg  
Memmingerstrasse 6, D-86135 Augsburg, Germany

F. Marchesoni

Department of Physics, Harvard University  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Received 10 October 1995

[S0031-9007(96)00582-0]

PACS numbers: 11.10.Lm, 11.10.Kk

- [1] M. Büttiker and T. Christen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1895 (1995).
- [2] P. Hänggi, F. Marchesoni, and P. Sodano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 2563 (1988).
- [3] F. Marchesoni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 2394 (1994); Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem. **95**, 353 (1991).
- [4] J.F. Currie, J.A. Krumhansl, A.R. Bishop, and S.E. Trullinger, Phys. Rev. B **22**, 477 (1980).
- [5] A.I. Bochkarev and Ph. de Forcrand, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 2337 (1989); M. Alford, H. Feldman, and M. Gleiser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1645 (1992).
- [6] R. Rajaraman, *Soliton and Instantons* (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1982); G. Eilenberger, *Solitons* (Springer, Berlin, 1983).
- [7] Here, the breather solution is advocated only to approximate the profile of the nucleating pair, its contribution to the overdamped SG dynamics being negligible [D.W. McLaughlin and A.C. Scott, Phys. Rev. A **18**, 1652 (1978)]. The explicit calculation of  $\Gamma_B$  follows immediately from K. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 2214 (1986).