

Reflection–transmission quantum Yang–Baxter equations

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

2005 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 38 3431

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/38/15/013>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 171.66.16.66

The article was downloaded on 02/06/2010 at 20:09

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

Reflection–transmission quantum Yang–Baxter equations

V Caudrelier¹, M Mintchev², E Ragoucy¹ and P Sorba¹

¹ LAPTH, 9, Chemin de Bellevue, BP 110, F-74941 Annecy-le-Vieux cedex, France

² INFN and Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pisa, Via Buonarroti 2, 56127 Pisa, Italy

E-mail: caudrelier@lapp.in2p3.fr, mintchev@df.unipi.it, ragoucy@lapp.in2p3.fr and sorba@lapp.in2p3.fr

Received 26 January 2005

Published 30 March 2005

Online at stacks.iop.org/JPhysA/38/3431

Abstract

We explore the reflection–transmission quantum Yang–Baxter equations, arising in factorized scattering theory of integrable models with impurities. The physical origin of these equations is clarified and three general families of solutions are described in detail. Explicit representatives of each family are also displayed. These results allow us to establish, for the first time, a direct relationship with the different previous works on the subject and make evident the advantages of the reflection–transmission algebra as a universal approach to integrable systems with impurities.

PACS numbers: 11.10.Kk, 11.55.Ds

1. Introduction

Quantum mechanics and quantum field theory with point-like impurities have recently attracted much attention in relation to the rapid progress of condensed matter physics with defects. Integrable systems with impurities represent in this context a relevant testing ground for the basic theoretical ideas and also have some direct physical applications.

In the present paper, we are concerned with those universal features of integrable systems with impurities in 1+1 spacetime dimensions, which are captured by the reflection–transmission quantum Yang–Baxter equations (QYBEs), following factorized scattering theory. Our first goal below is to describe the origin and the present status of these equations. In the next section, we sketch the derivation of the reflection–transmission QYBEs from first principles, namely physical unitarity and the reflection (boundary) QYBE, familiar from the case of a purely reflecting boundary. Afterwards we briefly describe the concept of reflection–transmission (RT) algebra, which is based on the reflection–transmission QYBEs and has been introduced in [1]. Section 2 collects and presents, from a slightly different angle, those results of [1] which are needed in the present paper for describing the scattering data. This issue

is crucial for the applications and represents the second goal of this work. In section 3 we establish three general families of admissible scattering data, discussing their basic properties. Among others, these families are the simplest and also look the most natural ones from the physical point of view. Section 4 is devoted to some concrete examples, which illustrate the general setting. The results of section 3 allow us to compare, for the first time, the existing two approaches to factorized scattering with impurities, displaying the advantages of the RT algebra framework. This comparison is done in the last section, which also presents our conclusions and indicates some further developments in the subject.

2. Reflection–transmission QYBEs

The method of factorized scattering [2] is a powerful tool for studying both the mathematical structure and the physical properties of integrable quantum systems in 1+1 dimensions. The main ingredient of this method is the two-body scattering matrix

$$\{\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}^{\beta_1\beta_2}(\chi_1, \chi_2) : \alpha_1, \dots, \beta_2 = 1, \dots, N; \chi_1, \chi_2 \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Here N is the number of internal degrees of freedom, whereas $\chi \in \mathbb{R}$ parametrizes the dispersion relation of the asymptotic particles. In order to construct from (2.1) a consistent total scattering operator, the two-body matrix \mathcal{S} must satisfy

$$\mathcal{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)\mathcal{S}_{13}(\chi_1, \chi_3)\mathcal{S}_{23}(\chi_2, \chi_3) = \mathcal{S}_{23}(\chi_2, \chi_3)\mathcal{S}_{13}(\chi_1, \chi_3)\mathcal{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2), \quad (2.2)$$

which is the celebrated quantum Yang–Baxter equation (QYBE). One can associate [3–11] with \mathcal{S} an algebra \mathcal{A}_S with identity $\mathbf{1}$, whose generators $\{a^{*\alpha}(\chi), a_\alpha(\chi)\}$ satisfy

$$a_{\alpha_1}(\chi_1)a_{\alpha_2}(\chi_2) - \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_2\alpha_1}^{\beta_2\beta_1}(\chi_2, \chi_1)a_{\beta_2}(\chi_2)a_{\beta_1}(\chi_1) = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

$$a^{*\alpha_1}(\chi_1)a^{*\alpha_2}(\chi_2) - a^{*\beta_2}(\chi_2)a^{*\beta_1}(\chi_1)\mathcal{S}_{\beta_2\beta_1}^{\alpha_2\alpha_1}(\chi_2, \chi_1) = 0, \quad (2.4)$$

$$a_{\alpha_1}(\chi_1)a^{*\alpha_2}(\chi_2) - a^{*\beta_2}(\chi_2)\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_1\beta_2}^{\beta_1\alpha_2}(\chi_1, \chi_2)a_{\beta_1}(\chi_1) = 2\pi\delta(\chi_1 - \chi_2)\mathbf{1}\delta_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_2}. \quad (2.5)$$

The elements $\{a^{*\alpha}(\chi), a_\alpha(\chi)\}$ are interpreted as creators and annihilators of asymptotic particles. The QYBE (2.2) ensures the associativity of \mathcal{A}_S and, applying (2.3) twice, one deduces the consistency relation

$$\mathcal{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)\mathcal{S}_{21}(\chi_2, \chi_1) = \mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I}, \quad (2.6)$$

known as *unitarity*. Moreover, requiring that the mapping

$$I : a^{*\alpha}(\chi) \mapsto a_\alpha(\chi), \quad I : a_\alpha(\chi) \mapsto a^{*\alpha}(\chi), \quad (2.7)$$

generate an involution in \mathcal{A}_S (i.e., I extends as an antilinear antihomomorphism on \mathcal{A}_S), one gets the so-called *Hermitian analyticity* condition

$$\mathcal{S}_{12}^\dagger(\chi_1, \chi_2) = \mathcal{S}_{21}(\chi_2, \chi_1), \quad (2.8)$$

where the dagger stands for the Hermitian conjugation³. We stress that by combining (2.6) and (2.8), which are assumed throughout the paper, one deduces the *physical* unitarity

$$\mathcal{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)\mathcal{S}_{12}^\dagger(\chi_1, \chi_2) = \mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} \quad (2.9)$$

of the two-body scattering matrix. Following the already standard terminology, in what follows we refer to \mathcal{A}_S as the Zamolodchikov–Faddeev (ZF) algebra.

The above framework has been successfully generalized [13–18] to the case when a purely reflecting boundary is present in the space. Describing the process of particle reflection from

³ More general involutions in \mathcal{A}_S and the relative Hermitian analyticity conditions have been studied in [12].

the boundary by a reflection matrix $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^\beta(\chi)$, Cherednik [13] discovered in the early 1980s that \mathcal{R} must satisfy the following *reflection* QYBE,

$$\mathcal{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)\mathcal{R}_1(\chi_1)\mathcal{S}_{21}(\chi_2, -\chi_1)\mathcal{R}_2(\chi_2) = \mathcal{R}_2(\chi_2)\mathcal{S}_{12}(\chi_1, -\chi_2)\mathcal{R}_1(\chi_1)\mathcal{S}_{21}(-\chi_2, -\chi_1), \tag{2.10}$$

in order to have consistent factorized scattering. In analogy with (2.6), (2.8) one also requires unitarity

$$\mathcal{R}(\chi)\mathcal{R}(-\chi) = \mathbb{I} \tag{2.11}$$

and Hermitian analyticity

$$\mathcal{R}^\dagger(\chi) = \mathcal{R}(-\chi), \tag{2.12}$$

which imply the physical unitarity

$$\mathcal{R}(\chi)\mathcal{R}^\dagger(\chi) = \mathbb{I}. \tag{2.13}$$

Let us mention in passing that the ZF algebra \mathcal{A}_S has a counterpart \mathcal{B}_S in the boundary case [19]. Instead of describing \mathcal{B}_S now, we will obtain it later on as a special case of the more general structure, discussed below.

It is quite natural at this stage to consider instead of the purely reflecting boundary an impurity (defect), which both reflects and transmits. In addition to $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^\beta(\chi)$, one will also have in this case a transmission matrix $\mathcal{T}_\alpha^\beta(\chi)$. Quantum mechanical potential scattering theory (see, e.g., [20]) suggests substituting (2.11) by

$$\mathcal{T}(\chi)\mathcal{T}(\chi) + \mathcal{R}(\chi)\mathcal{R}(-\chi) = \mathbb{I}, \tag{2.14}$$

$$\mathcal{T}(\chi)\mathcal{R}(\chi) + \mathcal{R}(\chi)\mathcal{T}(-\chi) = 0, \tag{2.15}$$

where \mathcal{T} satisfies the Hermitian analyticity condition

$$\mathcal{T}(\chi) = \mathcal{T}^\dagger(\chi). \tag{2.16}$$

Due to (2.12), (2.16), $\mathcal{T}(\chi)\mathcal{T}(\chi)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\chi)\mathcal{R}(-\chi)$ are non-negative Hermitian matrices which are simultaneously diagonalizable because of (2.14). The corresponding eigenvalues $\lambda_i(\chi)$ and $\mu_i(\chi)$ satisfy

$$0 \leq \lambda_i(\chi) \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq \mu_i(\chi) \leq 1, \quad \lambda_i(\chi) + \mu_i(\chi) = 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \tag{2.17}$$

Obviously, non-trivial transmission occurs if and only if $\mu_i(\chi) < 1$ (or equivalently $\lambda_i(\chi) > 0$) for some $i = 1, \dots, N$.

Following [21, 1], our goal now is to uncover the algebraic structure which models the mechanism of reflection and transmission in integrable systems with impurities. It is natural to expect that in addition to Cherednik’s reflection QYBE (2.10), \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{T} satisfy some *transmission* and *reflection–transmission* QYBEs as well. The most direct way to derive these equations is to solve the unitarity constraints (2.14), (2.15), expressing \mathcal{T} in terms of \mathcal{R} , and use afterwards (2.10). Solving (2.14), we consider below the positive square root $\sqrt{\mathbb{I} - \mathcal{R}(\chi)\mathcal{R}(-\chi)}$ of the non-negative Hermitian matrix $\mathbb{I} - \mathcal{R}(\chi)\mathcal{R}(-\chi)$. More precisely, in the basis in which $\mathbb{I} - \mathcal{R}(\chi)\mathcal{R}(-\chi)$ is diagonal we take diagonal $\sqrt{\mathbb{I} - \mathcal{R}(\chi)\mathcal{R}(-\chi)}$, whose elements are the positive square roots $\sqrt{1 - \lambda_i}$. The latter are well defined in view of (2.17) and we set

$$\mathcal{T}(\chi) = \tau(\chi)\sqrt{\mathbb{I} - \mathcal{R}(\chi)\mathcal{R}(-\chi)}, \tag{2.18}$$

where the τ -function obeys

$$\bar{\tau}(\chi) = \tau(\chi), \quad \tau(\chi)^2 = 1, \quad \tau(-\chi) = -\tau(\chi), \tag{2.19}$$

following from (2.14)–(2.16). If one assumes in addition that τ is continuous for $\chi \neq 0$, one finds that

$$\tau(\chi) = \pm\varepsilon(\chi), \tag{2.20}$$

with ε being the sign function. Adopting the representation (2.18) and the reflection QYBE (2.10), one can prove [1] the following statement.

Proposition. *Let \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{T} satisfy Hermitian analyticity (2.12, 2.16), unitarity (2.14, 2.15) and the reflection QYBE (2.10). Then \mathcal{T} defined by (2.18) and \mathcal{R} obey the transmission QYBE*

$$\mathcal{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)\mathcal{T}_1(\chi_1)\mathcal{S}_{21}(\chi_2, \chi_1)\mathcal{T}_2(\chi_2) = \mathcal{T}_2(\chi_2)\mathcal{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)\mathcal{T}_1(\chi_1)\mathcal{S}_{21}(\chi_2, \chi_1) \tag{2.21}$$

and the reflection–transmission QYBE

$$\mathcal{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)\mathcal{T}_1(\chi_1)\mathcal{S}_{21}(\chi_2, \chi_1)\mathcal{R}_2(\chi_2) = \mathcal{R}_2(\chi_2)\mathcal{S}_{12}(\chi_1, -\chi_2)\mathcal{T}_1(\chi_1)\mathcal{S}_{21}(-\chi_2, \chi_1) \tag{2.22}$$

as well.

Remark. The precise determination of the square root we are taking in (2.18) is essential. The point is that $\mathbb{I} - \mathcal{R}(\chi)\mathcal{R}(-\chi)$ has in general infinitely many square roots—a standard phenomenon [22, 23] in matrix theory. Let us consider, for instance, the square roots of the form

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\chi) = U(\chi)\mathcal{T}(\chi)U(\chi)^{-1}, \tag{2.23}$$

where \mathcal{T} is given by (2.18) and $U(\chi)$ is some invertible matrix obeying

$$U(\chi)\mathcal{R}(\pm\chi) = \epsilon\mathcal{R}(\pm\chi)U(-\chi) \quad \text{with} \quad \epsilon = \pm 1. \tag{2.24}$$

Then one can show that $\{\mathcal{R}, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}\}$ also satisfy relations (2.10), (2.14), (2.15) and (2.21), (2.22), but now with \mathcal{S} replaced by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2) = U_1(\chi_1)U_2(\chi_2)\mathcal{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)U_1(\chi_1)^{-1}U_2(\chi_2)^{-1}. \tag{2.25}$$

Note that $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is unitary and obeys the Yang–Baxter equation. If $U(\chi)$ is in addition unitary ($U(\chi)^\dagger = U(\chi)^{-1}$), $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ satisfies (2.16) as well. Thus we get essentially the same RT algebra, $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ being related to \mathcal{S} by the ‘gauge’ transformation (2.25).

Other types [22, 23] of square roots obey more complicated ‘twisted’ versions of equations (2.21) and (2.22). Postponing the study of the latter to the future, we focus in this paper on the subset of roots satisfying (2.21) and (2.22). The above proposition simply states that \mathcal{T} , corresponding to the positive square root of $\mathbb{I} - \mathcal{R}(\chi)\mathcal{R}(-\chi)$, belongs to this subset.

Equations (2.21) and (2.22) have the same structure as (2.10), except for some sign changes in the arguments of \mathcal{S} with obvious kinematical interpretation. They are essential for the reconstruction [1] of the reflection–transmission (RT) algebra $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{S}$ —the analogue of $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{S}$ when impurities are present. It turns out that in addition to $\{a^{*\alpha}(\chi), a_\alpha(\chi)\}$, $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{S}$ involves $2N^2$ defect generators $\{t_\alpha^\beta(\chi), r_\alpha^\beta(\chi)\}$, which describe the particle interaction with the impurity and modify the right-hand side of the exchange relation (2.5) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\alpha_1}(\chi_1)a^{*\alpha_2}(\chi_2) - a^{*\beta_2}(\chi_2)\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_1\beta_2}^{\beta_1\alpha_2}(\chi_1, \chi_2)a_{\beta_1}(\chi_1) \\ = 2\pi\delta(\chi_1 - \chi_2)\left[\delta_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_2}\mathbf{1} + t_{\alpha_1}^{\beta_2}(\chi_1)\right] + 2\pi\delta(\chi_1 + \chi_2)r_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_2}(\chi_1). \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

Relations (2.3), (2.4) remain invariant. Finally, for defining $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{S}$ one must add the exchange relations among $\{t_\alpha^\beta(\chi), r_\alpha^\beta(\chi)\}$ themselves and with $\{a^{*\alpha}(\chi), a_\alpha(\chi)\}$. Since these relations will be of no use in this paper, we omit them, referring, for the explicit form of the complete set of constraints imposed on the generators of $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{S}$, to [1]. The boundary algebra $\mathcal{B}_\mathcal{S}$, mentioned

above, is obtained from \mathcal{C}_S by setting $t_\alpha^\beta(\chi) = 0$. The interplay between the three algebras \mathcal{A}_S , \mathcal{B}_S and \mathcal{C}_S has been investigated in [24, 25].

\mathcal{C}_S is an infinite algebra and from its formal definition it is not obvious at all that it has an operator realization. For this reason, the Fock representation $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}_S)$ has been constructed in [1] explicitly in terms of (generally unbounded) operators acting on a suitable dense domain of a Hilbert space. In the construction of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}_S)$ one needs an involution in \mathcal{C}_S , which is obtained by extending (2.7) to the reflection and transmission generators according to

$$I : r_\alpha^\beta(\chi) \mapsto r_\beta^\alpha(-\chi), \quad I : t_\alpha^\beta(\chi) \mapsto t_\beta^\alpha(\chi). \tag{2.27}$$

Hermitian analyticity (2.12), (2.16) ensures the consistency of this extension. We would also like to recall that $\{t_\alpha^\beta(\chi), r_\alpha^\beta(\chi)\}$ condense in the vacuum state $\Omega \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}_S)$, i.e.,

$$\langle t_\alpha^\beta(\chi) \rangle_\Omega = T_\alpha^\beta(\chi), \quad \langle r_\alpha^\beta(\chi) \rangle_\Omega = \mathcal{R}_\alpha^\beta(\chi). \tag{2.28}$$

This direct relationship between reflection–transmission generators and amplitudes is crucial for the physical interpretation.

The Fock representation $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}_S)$ is useful in several respects. From the scattering data $\{S, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}\}$ one can reconstruct [1] in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}_S)$ the total scattering operator, which is unitary as expected. Remarkably enough, $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}_S)$ also applies in the construction of off-shell interacting quantum fields. An instructive example in this respect is the non-linear Schrödinger (NLS) model (the non-relativistic φ^4 -theory) with a point-like impurity in 1+1 dimensions. This system is investigated in [26, 27], where the exact off-shell operator solution is constructed in terms of the representation $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}_S)$ of an appropriate RT algebra \mathcal{C}_S . Recently, this solution has been generalized [28] to the case of the $GL(N)$ -invariant NLS model, where inequivalent Fock representations $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}_S)$ implement a mechanism of spontaneous symmetry breaking.

Let us mention finally that \mathcal{C}_S also admits finite temperature representations. In contrast to the Fock vacuum, the cyclic state of such representations is not annihilated by $a_\alpha(\chi)$ and models a thermal bath, keeping the system in equilibrium at fixed (inverse) temperature β . A finite temperature representation of \mathcal{C}_S is introduced in [29], where some applications to the statistical mechanics of systems with impurities are also discussed.

Summarizing, the RT algebra admissible scattering data $\{S, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}\}$ must satisfy the QYBEs (2.2), (2.10), (2.21), (2.22), unitarity (2.6), (2.14), (2.15) and Hermitian analyticity (2.8), (2.12), (2.16). The relevant issue at this point is the classification of admissible triplets. This is a hard theoretical problem, which has not yet been solved even in the case of the QYBE (2.2) alone. Fortunately, however, some classes of admissible scattering data $\{S, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}\}$ are known. They are the subject of our discussion in the next sections.

3. RT algebra admissible data $\{S, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}\}$

Let us fix first of all the physical setting. We will study a system with a single impurity in \mathbb{R} . Since the impurity divides \mathbb{R} into two disconnected parts \mathbb{R}_\pm , we take $N = 2n$ and split the index α as follows, $\alpha = (\xi, i)$. Here $\xi = \pm$ indicates the half-line where the asymptotic particle is created or annihilated and $i = 1, \dots, n$ labels the ‘isotopic’ type. We emphasize that the results of the present paper are valid for any dispersion relation

$$E = E(\chi), \quad p = p(\chi), \tag{3.1}$$

between the particle energy E and momentum p . In particular, it is instructive to keep in mind the conventional relativistic

$$E(\chi) = m \cosh(\chi), \quad p(\chi) = m \sinh(\chi), \tag{3.2}$$

and non-relativistic

$$E(\chi) = \frac{m\chi^2}{2} + U, \quad p(\chi) = m\chi, \quad (3.3)$$

relations, with m being the particle mass and U some constant. We observe that Lorentz and Galilean transformations of the vector (E, p) are implemented in both (3.2) and (3.3) by translations $\chi \mapsto \chi + \alpha$. Therefore the scattering matrix \mathcal{S} is Lorentz (Galilean) invariant provided that it depends on χ_1 and χ_2 only through the difference $\chi_1 - \chi_2$.

We focus in this section on block-diagonal \mathcal{S} -matrices

$$\mathcal{S}(\chi_1, \chi_2) = \begin{pmatrix} S^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_2) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & S^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_2) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & S^{-+}(\chi_1, \chi_2) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & S^{--}(\chi_1, \chi_2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.4)$$

each block being an $n^2 \times n^2$ matrix in the isotopic space. The QYBE for \mathcal{S} generates eight equations for its blocks. One has

$$S_{12}^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_2)S_{13}^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_3)S_{23}^{++}(\chi_2, \chi_3) = S_{23}^{++}(\chi_2, \chi_3)S_{13}^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_3)S_{12}^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_2), \quad (3.5)$$

$$S_{12}^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_2)S_{13}^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_3)S_{23}^{+-}(\chi_2, \chi_3) = S_{23}^{+-}(\chi_2, \chi_3)S_{13}^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_3)S_{12}^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_2), \quad (3.6)$$

$$S_{12}^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_2)S_{13}^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_3)S_{23}^{+-}(\chi_2, \chi_3) = S_{23}^{+-}(\chi_2, \chi_3)S_{13}^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_3)S_{12}^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_2), \quad (3.7)$$

$$S_{12}^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_2)S_{13}^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_3)S_{23}^{--}(\chi_2, \chi_3) = S_{23}^{--}(\chi_2, \chi_3)S_{13}^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_3)S_{12}^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_2), \quad (3.8)$$

the remaining four equations following from (3.5)–(3.8) with the exchange $+ \leftrightarrow -$. We will call the latter the mirror counterparts of (3.5)–(3.8). All of these equations have the structure of a QYBE. We stress, however, that apart from (3.5) and its mirror counterpart, the other four equations involve different matrices in the isotopic space and are therefore not genuine QYBEs. Similar equations appear in the context of the quartic algebras introduced by Freidel and Maillet [30].

Taking \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{T} of the form

$$\mathcal{R}(\chi) = \begin{pmatrix} R^+(\chi) & 0 \\ 0 & R^-(\chi) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{T}(\chi) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & T^+(\chi) \\ T^-(\chi) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.9)$$

Hermitian analyticity (2.12), (2.16) and unitarity (2.14), (2.15) imply

$$[R^\pm]^\dagger(\chi) = R^\pm(-\chi), \quad [T^\pm]^\dagger(\chi) = T^\mp(\chi), \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$T^\pm(\chi)T^\mp(\chi) + R^\pm(\chi)R^\pm(-\chi) = \mathbb{I}, \quad (3.11)$$

$$T^\pm(\chi)R^\mp(\chi) + R^\pm(\chi)T^\pm(-\chi) = 0, \quad (3.12)$$

respectively. Moreover, from the QYBEs (2.10), (2.21), (2.22) one infers

$$S_{12}^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_2)R_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}^{++}(\chi_2, -\chi_1)R_2^+(\chi_2) = R_2^+(\chi_2)S_{12}^{++}(\chi_1, -\chi_2)R_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}^{++}(-\chi_2, -\chi_1), \quad (3.13)$$

$$S_{12}^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_2)R_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}^{+-}(\chi_2, -\chi_1)R_2^-(\chi_2) = R_2^-(\chi_2)S_{12}^{+-}(\chi_1, -\chi_2)R_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}^{+-}(-\chi_2, -\chi_1), \quad (3.14)$$

$$S_{12}^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}^{+-}(\chi_2, \chi_1)T_2^+(\chi_2) = T_2^+(\chi_2)S_{12}^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}^{--}(\chi_2, \chi_1), \quad (3.15)$$

$$S_{12}^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}^{--}(\chi_2, \chi_1)T_2^-(\chi_2) = T_2^-(\chi_2)S_{12}^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}^{+-}(\chi_2, \chi_1), \quad (3.16)$$

$$S_{12}^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}^{+-}(\chi_2, \chi_1)R_2^+(\chi_2) = R_2^+(\chi_2)S_{12}^{++}(\chi_1, -\chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}^{+-}(-\chi_2, \chi_1), \quad (3.17)$$

$$S_{12}^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}^{--}(\chi_2, \chi_1)R_2^-(\chi_2) = R_2^-(\chi_2)S_{12}^{+-}(\chi_1, -\chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}^{--}(-\chi_2, \chi_1) \quad (3.18)$$

and their mirror analogues obtained by $+ \leftrightarrow -$ in (3.13)–(3.18). Some solutions of the above equations are described in the next section.

In order to keep the discussion as simple as possible, we concentrated above on triplets $\{S, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}\}$ of the form (3.4), (3.9), but more general admissible scattering data can be analysed along the same lines.

4. Some families of scattering data

Different classes of solutions of equations (3.5)–(3.8) determine different families of admissible scattering data. We concentrate on three of them, which proved to be fundamental in the understanding of the physical content of RT algebras. Indeed, the type I family answers the long-standing question of the relationship between RT algebras and the approach to impurities in integrable systems followed in [31–33]. It shows that the RT algebra framework is more general and reproduces the content of [31–33] as a very special case. This is at the heart of the discussion of the next section. Our concern with the type II family is to exhibit a case where one can implement Lorentz invariance in the bulk scattering matrix, keeping non-trivial transmission. After presenting the general family, we show an explicit example where this is realized. Finally, the type III family is an important class of data since it involves the first example of interacting, exactly solvable and integrable quantum field model with impurity [26–28].

We turn now to the detailed description of families I–III.

(i) Type I scattering data are determined by

$$\begin{aligned} S^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_2) &= S^{-+}(\chi_1, \chi_2) = \mathbb{I}, \\ S^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_2) &= S(\chi_1, \chi_2), \quad S^{--}(\chi_1, \chi_2) = \tilde{S}(\chi_1, \chi_2), \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where S and \tilde{S} are in general two different solutions of the QYBE. Bulk scattering matrices of type (4.1) appear in [34], where the so-called ‘folding trick’ for describing reflecting and transmitting impurities is attempted. It is instructive to see what are the implications of equations (3.13)–(3.18) and their mirror counterparts on \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{T} . One finds the following reflection,

$$S_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)R_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}(\chi_2, -\chi_1)R_2^+(\chi_2) = R_2^+(\chi_2)S_{12}(\chi_1, -\chi_2)R_1^+(\chi_1)S_{21}(-\chi_2, -\chi_1), \quad (4.2)$$

$$\tilde{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)R_1^-(\chi_1)\tilde{S}_{21}(\chi_2, -\chi_1)R_2^-(\chi_2) = R_2^-(\chi_2)\tilde{S}_{12}(\chi_1, -\chi_2)R_1^-(\chi_1)\tilde{S}_{21}(-\chi_2, -\chi_1), \quad (4.3)$$

transmission

$$T_1^+(\chi_1)\tilde{S}_{21}(\chi_2, \chi_1)T_2^-(\chi_2) = T_2^-(\chi_2)S_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1), \quad (4.4)$$

$$S_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1)T_2^+(\chi_2) = T_2^+(\chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1)\tilde{S}_{21}(\chi_2, \chi_1), \quad (4.5)$$

$$\tilde{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)T_1^-(\chi_1)T_2^-(\chi_2) = T_2^-(\chi_2)T_1^-(\chi_1)S_{21}(\chi_2, \chi_1), \quad (4.6)$$

and reflection–transmission equations

$$S_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1)R_2^+(\chi_2) = R_2^+(\chi_2)S_{12}(\chi_1, -\chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1), \quad (4.7)$$

$$T_1^+(\chi_1)\tilde{S}_{21}(\chi_2, \chi_1)R_2^-(\chi_2) = R_2^-(\chi_2)T_1^+(\chi_1)\tilde{S}_{21}(-\chi_2, \chi_1), \quad (4.8)$$

$$\tilde{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)T_1^-(\chi_1)R_2^-(\chi_2) = R_2^-(\chi_2)\tilde{S}_{12}(\chi_1, -\chi_2)T_1^-(\chi_1), \quad (4.9)$$

$$T_1^-(\chi_1)S_{21}(\chi_2, \chi_1)R_2^+(\chi_2) = R_2^+(\chi_2)T_1^-(\chi_1)S_{21}(-\chi_2, \chi_1). \quad (4.10)$$

Note finally that for invertible T^\pm equations (4.7)–(4.10) are equivalent to

$$S_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)R_2^+(\chi_2) = R_2^+(\chi_2)S_{12}(\chi_1, -\chi_2), \quad (4.11)$$

$$\tilde{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2)R_2^-(\chi_2) = R_2^-(\chi_2)\tilde{S}_{12}(\chi_1, -\chi_2). \quad (4.12)$$

Type I scattering data are remarkable because equations (4.2)–(4.10) represent a meeting point between the existing approaches to factorized scattering with impurities and allow us to compare them (see section 5).

Explicit type I solutions. An example [21] is given by the $GL(n)$ -invariant scattering matrices

$$S_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2) = \tilde{S}_{21}(\chi_2, \chi_1) = \frac{[s(\chi_1) - s(\chi_2)]\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} - igP_{12}}{s(\chi_1) - s(\chi_2) + ig}, \quad g \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (4.13)$$

where P_{12} is the standard flip operator and s is an *even* real-valued function. In this case, the complete classification of reflection and transmission matrices is given by

$$R^\pm(\chi) = \cos[\theta(\chi)] \exp[ip(\chi) \pm in(\chi)]\mathbb{I}, \quad (4.14)$$

$$T^\pm(\chi) = \sin[\theta(\chi)] \exp[\pm iq(\chi) \pm in(\chi)]U^{\pm 1}, \quad (4.15)$$

where U is a unitary matrix ($U^{-1} = U^\dagger$), q is *even* and θ , p and n are *odd* real-valued functions. The parity of s implies that S is not Lorentz (Galilean) invariant. According to [35], this is a general feature of type I solutions, following from (4.11), (4.12).

(ii) Type II scattering data are characterized by setting

$$S^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_2) = S^{+-}(\chi_1, \chi_2) = S^{-+}(\chi_1, \chi_2) = S^{--}(\chi_1, \chi_2) = S(\chi_1, \chi_2), \quad (4.16)$$

where S obeys the QYBE. As a consequence, equations (3.5)–(3.8) are also satisfied and one is left with equations (3.13)–(3.18) and their mirror counterparts. A general class of solutions of all these equations is given by the following matrices,

$$R^\pm(\chi) = \cos[\theta(\chi)] \exp[ip_\pm(\chi)]B(\chi), \quad (4.17)$$

$$T^\pm(\chi) = \sin[\theta(\chi)] \exp[\pm iq(\chi)]\mathbb{I}, \quad (4.18)$$

where θ , p_\pm and q are *odd* real-valued functions and B is a solution of the reflection QYBE relative to S and satisfies equations (2.11) and (2.12). This general procedure for deriving RT algebra scattering data $\{S, \mathcal{R}, T\}$ from purely reflecting data $\{S, B\}$ is very attractive because of the large amount of existing results concerning the doublet $\{S, B\}$.

Explicit type II solutions. Taking, for instance,

$$S_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2) = \frac{(\chi_1 - \chi_2)\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} - igP_{12}}{\chi_1 - \chi_2 + ig}, \quad g \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (4.19)$$

the general solution of (3.13)–(3.18) can be parametrized according to

$$R^\pm(\chi) = \cos[\theta(\chi)] \exp[ip(\chi) \pm in(\chi)] \frac{\mathbb{I} + ia\chi U\mathbb{E}U^\dagger}{1 + ia\chi}, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (4.20)$$

$$T^\pm(\chi) = \sin[\theta(\chi)] \exp[\pm iq(\chi) \pm in(\chi)] \mathbb{I}, \quad (4.21)$$

where \mathbb{E} is a diagonal matrix which squares to \mathbb{I} and U , θ , p , q and n have the properties fixed in point (i).

The striking feature of type II data, which is manifest in the example (4.19)–(4.21), is the coexistence of non-trivial transmission with non-constant Lorentz (Galilean) invariant bulk scattering matrix. This is clearly possible because the data violate (4.7)–(4.10), in spite of the fact that all (3.5)–(3.18) are respected.

(iii) Type III scattering data are obtained by taking

$$S^{++}(\chi_1, \chi_2) = S^{+-}(\chi_1, -\chi_2) = S^{-+}(-\chi_1, \chi_2) = S^{--}(-\chi_1, -\chi_2) = S(\chi_1, \chi_2), \quad (4.22)$$

where S is a solution of the QYBE. The signs of the arguments in (4.22) are crucial for satisfying (3.6)–(3.8) and their mirror images. For deriving \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{T} one can proceed with the idea in point (ii). Take a solution B of the reflection QYBE relative to S and obeying equations (2.11) and (2.12) from the case of pure reflection. Then, using the properties of the previously introduced θ , p and q functions, one can easily verify that

$$R^\pm(\chi) = \cos[\theta(\chi)] \exp[ip(\chi)] B(\pm\chi), \quad (4.23)$$

$$T^\pm(\chi) = \sin[\theta(\chi)] \exp[\pm iq(\chi)] B(\pm\chi), \quad (4.24)$$

satisfy (2.12), (2.14)–(2.16), all (3.13)–(3.18) and their mirror counterparts.

Type III scattering data are inspired by the NLS model with point-like impurity, which has non-trivial bulk scattering but is nevertheless exactly solvable [26–28]. For the time being it is unique with these properties and provides therefore a valuable test for the whole RT algebra framework. Since the NLS model is well known to capture many of the universal properties of integrable system, we strongly believe that type III solutions are also relevant in a more general context.

Explicit type III solutions. As already mentioned, the NLS model provides an instructive example. The relative scattering data are parametrized by (4.22)–(4.24) with S defined by (4.19) and B given by [36]

$$B(\chi) = \exp[in(\chi)] \frac{\mathbb{I} + ia\chi U\mathbb{E}U^\dagger}{1 + ia\chi}, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (4.25)$$

where U and n are defined as above. Because of (4.22), S is not Lorentz (Galilean) invariant in spite of the fact that S preserves this symmetry. We refer to [26–28] for more details.

5. Remarks and conclusions

As already mentioned, the results of the present paper allow us to establish a direct relationship between the RT algebra framework and the approach previously developed in [31–33]. Extending his idea about purely reflecting boundaries (mirrors in his terminology), Cherednik introduced in [31, 32] the concept of purely transmitting defects (glasses). These ideas have been later independently generalized for impurities which both reflect and transmit by Delfino, Mussardo and Simonetti (DMS) in [33]. The scattering data of the DMS approach consist of a

bulk scattering matrix S and right (left) reflection and transmission matrices R^+ (R^-) and T^+ (T^-). As expected, S must satisfy the QYBE. Remarkably enough, the consistency relations imposed in [33] on R^\pm and T^\pm , precisely coincide with the special case (4.2)–(4.10) of type I scattering data, provided that

$$\tilde{S}_{12}(\chi_1, \chi_2) = S_{21}(\chi_2, \chi_1), \quad (5.1)$$

which, as easily verified, solves the QYBE as well. We conclude therefore that the systems discussed in [33] are fully described by type I data in the RT algebra framework. RT algebras are, however, significantly more general in the sense that they allow for a larger set of scattering data, still leading to a unitary scattering operator [1]. In fact, both type II and type III solutions are not covered by the DMS approach. This is why the physical example of the NLS model with impurity [26–28] cannot be treated along the lines of [33]: the corresponding scattering data satisfy the RT algebra reflection–transmission QYBE, but do not respect the DMS consistency conditions.

Summarizing, the concept of RT algebra has a richer structure and thus opens new possibilities. Among others, we would like to mention the type II solutions with both Lorentz (Galilean) invariant non-constant bulk scattering matrix and non-vanishing transmission matrix, which are forbidden [35] in the framework of [33]. It will be interesting in this respect to construct exactly solvable models, possessing such scattering data. Some recent developments in model-building with impurities can be found in [37–40].

Let us remark also that the scattering data discussed above, although essential for fixing the situation with respect to previous works and important because of their connection to physical situations, do not correspond to the most general ones. Indeed, in equation (3.4) the S -matrix is taken of block-diagonal form and the possibility of including non-diagonal parts needs further study.

In conclusion, the RT algebra approach to integrable systems with impurities is based on the reflection–transmission QYBEs (2.10), (2.21), (2.22). Keeping in mind that (2.21), (2.22) are deeply related to (2.10) by physical unitarity, this beautiful and compact set of equations is in our opinion extremely natural and deserves additional investigation.

Acknowledgments

MM would like to thank l'Université de Savoie for the financial support and LAPTH in Annecy for the kind hospitality. VC kindly acknowledges the financial support from INFN and the warm hospitality of the theory group in Pisa. Work supported in part by the TMR Network EUCLID: 'Integrable models and applications: from strings to condensed matter', contract no HPRN-CT-2002-00325.

References

- [1] Mintchev M, Ragoucy E and Sorba P 2003 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **36** 10407 (Preprint hep-th/0303187)
- [2] Yang C N 1967 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **19** 1312
- [3] Sklyanin E K 1979 *Sov. Phys. Dokl.* **24** 107
Sklyanin E K 1978 *Dokl. Akad. Nauk Ser. Fiz.* **244** 1337 (in Russian)
- [4] Karowski M and Weisz P 1978 *Nucl. Phys. B* **139** 455
- [5] Zamolodchikov A B and Zamolodchikov A B 1979 *Ann. Phys., NY* **120** 253
- [6] Faddeev L D, Sklyanin E K and Takhtajan L A 1980 *Theor. Math. Phys.* **40** 688
Faddeev L D, Sklyanin E K and Takhtajan L A 1979 *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **40** 194 (in Russian)
- [7] Grosse H 1979 *Phys. Lett. B* **86** 267
- [8] Honerkamp J, Weber P and Wiesler A 1979 *Nucl. Phys. B* **152** 266
- [9] Creamer D B, Thacker H B and Wilkinson D 1980 *Phys. Rev. D* **21** 1523

- [10] Faddeev L D 1980 *Sov. Sci. Rev. C* **1** 107
- [11] Davies B 1981 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **14** 2631
- [12] Liguori A, Mintchev M and Rossi M 1997 *J. Math. Phys.* **38** 2888
- [13] Cherednik I V 1984 *Theor. Math. Phys.* **61** 977
Cherednik I V 1984 *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **61** 35 (in Russian)
- [14] Sklyanin E K 1988 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **21** 2375
- [15] Kulish P P and Sasaki R 1993 *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **89** 741 (Preprint hep-th/9212007)
- [16] Ghoshal S and Zamolodchikov A B 1994 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **9** 3841
Ghoshal S and Zamolodchikov A B 1994 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **9** 4353 (Preprint hep-th/9306002)
- [17] Corrigan E, Dorey P E and Rietdijk R H 1995 *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **118** 143 (Preprint hep-th/9407148)
- [18] Fring A and Koberle R 1994 *Nucl. Phys. B* **421** 159 (Preprint hep-th/9304141)
- [19] Liguori A, Mintchev M and Zhao L 1998 *Commun. Math. Phys.* **194** 569 (Preprint hep-th/9607085)
- [20] Albeverio S, Gesztesy F, Hoegh-Krohn R and Holden H 1988 *Solvable Models in Quantum Mechanics* (New York: Springer)
- [21] Mintchev M, Ragoucy E and Sorba P 2002 *Phys. Lett. B* **547** 313 (Preprint hep-th/0209052)
- [22] Gantmacher F R 1959 *The Theory of Matrices* vol 1 (New York: Chelsea)
- [23] Higham N J 1987 *Linear Algebra Appl.* **88/89** 405
- [24] Mintchev M and Ragoucy E 2004 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37** 425 (Preprint math.qa/0306084)
- [25] Ragoucy E 2001 *Lett. Math. Phys.* **58** 249 (Preprint math.qa/0108221)
- [26] Caudrelier V, Mintchev M and Ragoucy E 2004 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37** L367 (Preprint hep-th/0404144)
- [27] Caudrelier V, Mintchev M and Ragoucy E 2004 Solving the quantum non-linear Schrodinger equation with delta-type impurity Preprint math-ph/0404047 (*J. Math. Phys.* at press)
- [28] Caudrelier V and Ragoucy E 2005 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **38** 2241 (Preprint math-ph/0411022)
- [29] Mintchev M and Sorba P 2004 *J. Stat. Mech.: Theor. Exp.* P07001 (Preprint hep-th/0405264)
- [30] Freidel L and Maillet J M 1991 *Phys. Lett. B* **262** 278
- [31] Cherednik I 1990 Notes on affine Hecke algebras: 1. Degenerated affine Hecke algebras and Yangians in mathematical physics Preprint BONN-HE-90-04
- [32] Cherednik I 1992 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **7** 109
- [33] Delfino G, Mussardo G and Simonetti P 1994 *Nucl. Phys. B* **432** 518 (Preprint hep-th/9409076)
- [34] Bajnok Z and George A 2004 From defects to boundaries Preprint hep-th/0404199
- [35] Castro-Alvaredo O A, Fring A and Gohmann F 2002 On the absence of simultaneous reflection and transmission in integrable impurity systems Preprint hep-th/0201142
- [36] Mintchev M, Ragoucy E and Sorba P 2001 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34** 8345 (Preprint hep-th/0104079)
- [37] Bowcock P, Corrigan E and Zambon C 2004 *J. High Energy Phys.* JHEP01(2001)056 (Preprint hep-th/0401020)
- [38] Corrigan E and Zambon C 2004 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37** L471 (Preprint hep-th/0407199)
- [39] Hallnäs M and Langmann E 2004 Exact solutions of two complementary 1D quantum many-body systems on the half-line Preprint math-ph/0404023
- [40] Hallnäs M, Langmann E and Paufler C 2004 Generalized local interactions in 1D: solutions of quantum many-body systems describing distinguishable particles Preprint math-ph/0408043