A simple model of quantization: an approach from chaos
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Abstract. There is a paradigm in Quantum Mechanics that explains quantization through normal vibration modes called Eigenstates that arise from Schrödinger wave equation. In this contribution we propose an alternative methodology of quantization by using basic concepts of mechanics and chaos from which a Toy Model is built.

1. Motivation

Let us assume that a pair of particles interact with quantum noise [3][11] such that they are perturbed in the form of kicks [1][10] and besides, these particles attract each another due to a central force. The Lagrangian that describes this phenomenon consists of one term associated to the central force acting on the total mass of the system and the Ansatz that models the complex interaction between the quantum noise and the particles:

\[
\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \left(m \dot{r}^2 + m r^2 \dot{\theta}^2\right) - V(r) - K \theta \sin(\Omega + \xi \dot{\theta}) \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(t - jT). \tag{1}
\]

Where \( j \in \mathbb{Z}, -\pi \leq \Omega \leq \pi \) and, \( K, \xi \) are parameters that will be defined later on, and \( T \) is the perturbation period.

From Euler-Lagrange equations [4] we have

\[
\frac{d}{dt} (m \dot{r}) - m r \dot{\theta}^2 + \frac{\partial}{\partial r} V(r) + \varepsilon(K, \xi(m, r), T) = 0, \tag{2}
\]

\[
\frac{d}{dt} (mr^2 \dot{\theta}) + K \sin(\Omega + \xi \dot{\theta}) \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(t - jT) = 0 \tag{3}
\]

with \( \varepsilon(K, \xi(m, r), T) \ll \frac{\partial}{\partial r} V(r) \).

Let us assume that \( r \) is a constant, thus from equation (3) we have

\[
\dot{\theta} = -\frac{K}{mr^2} \sin(\Omega + \xi \dot{\theta}) \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(t - jT) \tag{4}
\]

\[
\dot{\theta}_{j+1} = \dot{\theta}_j - \frac{K}{mr^2} \sin(\Omega + \xi \dot{\theta}_j). \tag{5}
\]

Taking the fixed points [5] in (5), \( \dot{\theta}_{j+1} = \dot{\theta}_j = \dot{\theta}^* \)

\[
\sin(\Omega + \xi \dot{\theta}^*) = 0.
\]

Thus, the fixed points are

\[
\dot{\theta}_n^* = \frac{n \pi - \Omega}{\xi} \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{6}
\]

In order to obtain the stable fixed points we take [5]

\[
|f'(\dot{\theta}^*)| < 1 \tag{7}
\]

where

\[
f'(\dot{\theta}^*) = 1 - \frac{K \xi}{mr^2} \cos(\Omega + \xi \dot{\theta}^*). \tag{8}
\]

Taking the \( n \) even stable fixed points in equation (6) we have

\[
\dot{\theta}_n^* = \frac{2n \pi - \Omega}{\xi} \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{9}
\]

and from (7), (8) and (9):
Taking \( \frac{K\xi}{mr^2} = 2\pi\mu_0 \) and \( 0 < \mu_0 < \frac{1}{\pi} \) we can write equation (9) as:

\[
\dot{\theta}_n^* = \frac{(2n\pi - \Omega)K}{2\pi\mu_0 mr^2} \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}.
\]  

(11)

Now, if \( \Omega = 0 \) and \( K = \mu_0 H \) in equation (11) then

\[ L_n = nH \]

2. Experimental consequences

An interesting consequence from the stability condition is that, if \( K = \mu_0 \hbar \) in (10) where \( \hbar \) is the Planck’s constant, and taking \( r \) as in Bohr’s model \([7][8][9]\) \[ r^2 = \frac{n^4\hbar^4}{m^4c^2} \] where \( k \) is the Coulomb constant, we obtain

\[
0 < \frac{2\pi\mu_0 Rc}{n^4\xi} < 1
\]

(12)

where \( R = 1.0972 \times 10^7 \text{ m}^{-1} \) is the Rydberg’s constant, \( c \) is the speed of light, which leads to \( Rc \sim 10^{15} \text{ Hz} \) and \( \nu_c = \frac{1}{\xi} \).

Table 1 \( n \) vs \( \frac{2Rc}{n^4} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( \frac{2Rc}{n^4} ) [Hz]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>( 6.580 \times 10^{15} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>( 4.112 \times 10^{14} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>( 8.123 \times 10^{13} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>( 2.570 \times 10^{13} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>( 1.053 \times 10^{13} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>( 5.077 \times 10^{12} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>( 2.740 \times 10^{12} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>( 1.606 \times 10^{12} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>( 1.003 \times 10^{12} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>( 6.580 \times 10^{11} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>( 4.494 \times 10^{11} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>( 3.173 \times 10^{11} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>( 2.304 \times 10^{11} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>( 1.713 \times 10^{11} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 \( \dot{\theta} \) vs \( K \)

These periodic points follow an order established by Sharkovskii’s theorem \([2]\):

\[
3 < 5 < 7 < \cdots < 2 \cdot 3 < 2 \cdot 5 < 2 \cdot 7 < \cdots < 2^N \cdot 3 < 2^N \cdot 5 < 2^N \cdot 7 < \cdots < 8 < 4 < 2 < N \in \mathbb{N}
\]

If \( \xi(m, r) \) is a constant then \( e(K, \xi(m, r), T) \) must be zero.

3. Fixed points of \( M \) period: an interesting observation

We can scale the system to a convenient scale, if in equation (5) we take \( \Omega = 0 \), \( \xi = 2\pi \text{ [s]} \), \( mr^2 = 1 \text{ [kg \cdot m^2]} \) and \( H = 1 \text{ [J \cdot s]} \) we have

\[
\dot{\theta}_{j+1} = \dot{\theta}_j - K \sin(2\pi\dot{\theta}_j)
\]

in this case \( K = \mu_0 \), and \( 0 < K < \frac{1}{\pi} \).

If we increase \( K \) beyond period one we obtain the following stable period cascades \([6]\) (see Figure 1). This diagram is also known as a bifurcation diagram.\(^1\)

\[^1\] Bifurcation diagrams were first discovered by Robert May.
Let us consider the following subset

\[
... < 2 \cdot 3 < 2 \cdot 5 < 2 \cdot 7 < \cdots < 2 < 1 = \cdots < 6 < 10 < 14 < \cdots < 2 < 1
\]

which coincidentally emerges in the range of energies of the different chemical elements (see Figures 2 and 3). Thus, to analytically calculate these periods is necessary to estimate the compositions for each corresponding period \([5] \), \( f^M = x \), i.e.:

\[
f^6 = f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f
\]

\[
f^{10} = f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f
\]

\[
f^{14} = f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f \circ f
\]

\[
: \quad f^2 = f \circ f
\]

for which would exist \( K_{s-f dp} \) or \( \mu_{s-f dp} \) to be determined.

These fixed points of higher periods may, for example, propagate through the energy levels according to the following modified equation from Bohr’s model

\[
E = \frac{mk^2Z^2e^4}{2\hbar^2(n \pm \Omega_{s-f dp} \pm \zeta_{s-f dp})^2}
\]

where \( \Omega_{s-f dp} \) and \( \zeta_{s-f dp} \) would be related to the fixed points of periods \( 2, \ldots, 14, 10, 6 \) possibly to the sub-level \( s, \ldots, f, d, p \).

4. Discussion and Conclusions

Even so, it would be necessary to take into account relativistic effects, and extra dimension factors as well as the effects of the spin of the electron as is currently carried out by modern quantum mechanics to describe the fine-structure; however this represents a simplified model.

In this work we present a methodology based on basic concepts of stability to quantize the angular moment. It was also shown that, in order for this model to be stable, it is sufficient condition that the model is immersed in noise with the same

Figure 3 Sharkovskii’s order

Figure 2 Energy levels
frequency of that of the background radiation frequency and, that the order of the energy levels agree with the order given by Sharkovskii’s theorem. Finally, we can apply this methodology to other scales.

5. Acknowledgments

Moisés Domínguez Espinosa would like to express his deepest appreciation to Dr. Luis de la Peña for his comments to improve the quality of this work. Also thanks UNAM, Facultad de Ciencias for the support received.

References


