

Quasi-harmonic spectra from branched Hamiltonians

Aritra Ghosh^{1*}, Bijan Bagchi[†], A. Ghose-Choudhury[‡],
 Partha Guha[#], Miloslav Znojil[§]

^{*}School of Basic Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology Bhubaneswar,
 Khurda 752050, Odisha, India

[†]Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Calcutta,
 Kolkata 700009, West Bengal, India

[‡]Department of Physics, Diamond Harbour Women's University,
 D.H. Road, Sarisha 743368, West Bengal, India

[#]Department of Mathematics, Khalifa University of Science and Technology,
 Main Campus, P.O. Box - 127788, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

[§]Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, University of Hradec Králové,
 Rokitanského 62, 50003 Hradec Králové, Czech Republic

Email: aritraghosh500@gmail.com

Abstract

We revisit the canonical quantization to assess the spectrum of the modified Emden equation $\ddot{x} + kx\dot{x} + \omega^2x + \frac{k^2}{9}x^3 = 0$, which is an isochronous case of the Liénard-Kukles equation. While its classical isochronicity and canonical quantization, leading to polynomial solutions with an exactly-equispaced spectrum have been discussed earlier, including in the recent paper [Int. J. Theor. Phys. 64, 212 (2025)], the present study focuses on the quantization of its branched Hamiltonians. For small k , we show numerically that the resulting energy spectrum is no longer perfectly harmonic but only approximately equispaced, exhibiting quasi-harmonic behavior characterized by deviations from uniform spacing. Our numerical results are precisely validated by analytical calculations based on perturbation theory.

¹**Present Address:** School of Physics and Astronomy, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, New York 14623, USA

1 Introduction

Oscillators whose period of oscillation is independent of the energy or amplitude are called isochronous systems [1]. For rational potentials, the following two are the only ones that support isochronous oscillations throughout the accessible region of phase space [2]:

$$V_1(x) = \frac{\omega^2 x^2}{2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.1)$$

$$V_2(x) = Ax^2 + \frac{B}{x^2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (1.2)$$

with $\omega, A, B > 0$. While $V_1(x)$ is the familiar harmonic potential, leading to the linear dynamics, $V_2(x)$ is called the isotonic potential [3], whose equation of motion is the Ermakov-Pinney equation [4]. If a nonlinear dynamical system cannot be derived from a constant-mass Hamiltonian with potential V_1 or V_2 , a standard way to check for isochronicity is to seek a map to the harmonic-oscillator equation [5, 6], sometimes via a nonlocal transformation [7].

A generic family of systems which is of much interest in the theory of dynamical systems is the family of Liénard equations

$$\ddot{x} + f(x)\dot{x} + g(x) = 0, \quad (1.3)$$

for appropriate functions $f(x)$ and $g(x)$. Such a system is generally not derivable from a standard Hamiltonian written as the sum of a kinetic energy and a potential. The linearization of the system (1.3) to the form $\ddot{X} + \omega^2 X = 0$ directly leads to the isochronicity condition [7] (see [8, 9] for discussions on linearization to free-particle dynamics)

$$g(x) = \omega^2 x + \frac{1}{x^3} \left[\int_0^x x' f(x') dx' \right]^2, \quad (1.4)$$

and one particular case is $f(x) = kx$ and $g(x) = \omega^2 x + \frac{k^2}{9} x^3$, giving the system $\ddot{x} + kx\dot{x} + \omega^2 x + \frac{k^2}{9} x^3 = 0$, whose isochronicity is well known [10, 11]. The generic isochronicity condition (1.4) was known from earlier treatments as well [12, 13]. It may be mentioned that the equation $\ddot{x} + kx\dot{x} + \omega^2 x + \frac{k^2}{9} x^3 = 0$ is called the modified Emden equation [8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18].

A tempting conjecture for isochronous systems is that their quantum spectra are equi-spaced [19]. This holds for the potentials (1.1) and (1.2), and for isochronous systems whose Schrödinger equations can be mapped to those with these potentials by a suitable change of variable [20, 21, 22, 23] (see [24, 25, 26] for related potentials); however, the correspondence does not hold in general [27]. The aim of the present paper is to follow up on the recent development [22] to expose new insights on isochronous Liénard systems with a focus on branched Hamiltonians. We shall demonstrate that in contrast to the unbranched case yielding an exactly-equispaced spectrum [21, 22], the branched Hamiltonians produce quasi-harmonic level spacings that cluster around 2ω , along with small deviations.

2 Hamiltonian aspects

Our aim is to study Liénard systems to assess their quantum spectra. The formal procedure of canonical quantization requires one to know the Hamiltonian of the system as a function of the canonical variables x and p . While it is not immediately clear whether the system (1.3) can be derived from a Lagrangian or Hamiltonian function, it has been shown earlier [11, 28] (see also, [21, 22, 29]) that should $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ satisfy the so-called Chiellini condition

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{g(x)}{f(x)} \right) + \ell(\ell+1)f(x) = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

with ℓ being a real constant, an analytical form of the Lagrangian can be found. As a matter of fact, two distinct roots for ℓ can result in two distinct forms of Lagrangians, each of which can give rise to equation (1.3). One can thus find the corresponding Hamiltonian functions. Straightforward manipulations (see [21, 22, 29] for details) reveal that the associated Lagrangians are

$$L(x, \dot{x})_\ell = \frac{\ell^2}{(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)} \left(\dot{x} - \frac{g(x)}{\ell f(x)} \right)^{\frac{2\ell+1}{\ell}} \implies p = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{x}} = \left(\frac{\ell}{\ell+1} \right) \left(\dot{x} - \frac{g(x)}{\ell f(x)} \right)^{\frac{\ell+1}{\ell}}. \quad (2.2)$$

First, let us note that $\ell = 0, -1, -\frac{1}{2}$ are to be excluded. Second, let us also note that if $\frac{\ell}{\ell+1}$ is not an integer, solving for \dot{x} as a function of p will lead to roots or branches. The Hamiltonian functions are

$$H_\ell = \frac{g(x)}{\ell f(x)} p + \frac{\ell}{2\ell+1} \left(\frac{\ell+1}{\ell} p \right)^{\frac{2\ell+1}{\ell+1}}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\{x, p\} = 1$ for the canonical Poisson bracket. If branching is present due to non-integral $\frac{\ell}{\ell+1}$, it must also be taken into account. It is convenient to define a rescaled momentum $\tilde{p} = \frac{\ell+1}{\ell} p$, allowing us to express the Hamiltonian (2.3) as

$$H_\ell = \frac{g(x)}{(\ell+1)f(x)} \tilde{p} + \frac{\ell}{2\ell+1} \tilde{p}^{\frac{2\ell+1}{\ell+1}}, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\{x, \tilde{p}\} = \frac{\ell+1}{\ell}$.

Remark: The system of our interest, which is $\ddot{x} + kx\dot{x} + \omega^2 x + \frac{k^2}{9}x^3 = 0$, is a special case of the Kukles family of equations

$$\ddot{x} + (\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 x + \alpha_2 x^2)\dot{x} + (\beta_1 x + \beta_2 x^2 + \beta_3 x^3) = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

for real constants $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$, and β_3 . It satisfies the Chiellini condition (2.1) for appropriate choices of the underlying parameters. However, it can be shown (see Appendix (A)) that the only Liénard system with polynomial coefficients which is isochronous, i.e., satisfies the condition (1.4) and also satisfies the Chiellini condition (2.1) (that is, admits a Hamiltonian description) is the modified Emden equation $\ddot{x} + kx\dot{x} + \omega^2 x + \frac{k^2}{9}x^3 = 0$ [11], whose quantum aspects have been demonstrated in [21, 22] (see also, the preceding work [30]). No other polynomial choices for the functions $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ can satisfy the conditions (1.4) and (2.1) simultaneously if $\omega > 0$.

3 Canonical quantization of the branched Hamiltonians

The nonlinear Liénard system $\ddot{x} + kx\dot{x} + \omega^2x + \frac{k^2}{9}x^3 = 0$ satisfies the isochronicity condition (1.4) and also admits the Chiellini condition (2.1) for $\ell = -1/3, -2/3$, leading to analytical forms of the Hamiltonian functions [11, 21, 22, 29]. For both $\ell = -1/3$ and $\ell = -2/3$, the two classes of Hamiltonians are expressible in the generic form [21, 22, 29, 30, 31, 32]

$$H = \frac{x^2}{2m(p)} + V(p), \quad (3.1)$$

for appropriate functions $m(p)$ and $V(p)$. Thus it appears as if the roles of position and momentum have become interchanged, accompanied by the appearance of a momentum-dependent mass. The formal procedure of canonical quantization requires careful ordering of the kinetic-energy-like operator due to the fact that position and momentum do not commute in quantum mechanics. To this end, let us apply the ordering strategy due to von Roos [33], giving the general form of a Hermitian ordering as

$$\hat{T} = \frac{1}{4} \left[m^\alpha(\hat{p}) \hat{x} m^\beta(\hat{p}) \hat{x} m^\gamma(\hat{p}) + m^\gamma(\hat{p}) \hat{x} m^\beta(\hat{p}) \hat{x} m^\alpha(\hat{p}) \right], \quad (3.2)$$

where (α, β, γ) are the ambiguity parameters satisfying the constraint $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = -1$. Using the canonical quantization (we will take $\hbar = 1$): $\hat{p} = p$ and $\hat{x} = i\frac{d}{dp}$, the kinetic-energy-like operator acting on a time-independent wavefunction as $\hat{T}\psi(p)$ is given by [21, 22]

$$\hat{T} = -\frac{1}{2m(p)} \left[\frac{d^2}{dp^2} - \frac{m'(p)}{m(p)} \frac{d}{dp} + \frac{\beta + 1}{2} \left(2\frac{m'(p)^2}{m(p)^2} - \frac{m''(p)}{m(p)} \right) + \alpha(\alpha + \beta + 1) \frac{m'(p)^2}{m(p)^2} \right], \quad (3.3)$$

where the primes denote differentiation with respect to p . There are two different forms of $m(p)$ and $V(p)$ that can describe the system under consideration [22]. One of them (that for $\ell = -2/3$) admits a singular momentum-dependent-potential profile whose time-independent Schrödinger equation can be mapped to that of a particle with constant mass in the isotonic potential (1.2) [21, 22]. As a result, the spectrum is equispaced and the eigenfunctions are expressible using associated Laguerre polynomials [3]. The other form of the Hamiltonian (that for $\ell = -1/3$) is the branched pair [21, 22, 29]

$$H^\pm = -3p \left(\frac{kx^2}{9} + \frac{\omega^2}{k} \right) \mp \sqrt{-2p}, \quad p < 0, \quad (3.4)$$

where the two signs before the square root originate from the generalized velocity being a multivalued function of p [29]. Defining $\tilde{p} = -2p > 0$ and using the expression (3.3), the time-independent Schrödinger equation $(\hat{T} + V(\hat{p}))\psi = E\psi$ is given by

$$\tilde{p} \frac{d^2\psi_\pm(\tilde{p})}{d\tilde{p}^2} + \frac{d\psi_\pm(\tilde{p})}{d\tilde{p}} + \frac{\alpha(\alpha + \beta + 1)}{\tilde{p}} \psi_\pm(\tilde{p}) + \frac{3}{2k} (E - V^\pm(\tilde{p})) \psi_\pm(\tilde{p}) = 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Let us now assess this further.

3.1 Possibility of a polynomial solution

Performing a change of variable as $\tilde{p} = (k/24)\xi^2$ and writing $\phi_{\pm}(\xi) = \sqrt{\xi}\psi_{\pm}(\xi)$, we can transform the above-mentioned equation to the following form [22]:

$$-\frac{d^2\phi_{\pm}(\xi)}{d\xi^2} + \left[\frac{\omega^2(\xi \mp \xi_0)^2}{64} + \frac{\epsilon - \frac{1}{4}}{\xi^2} - \frac{k}{24\omega^2} \right] \phi_{\pm}(\xi) = \frac{E}{4} \phi_{\pm}(\xi), \quad \xi_0 = \sqrt{\frac{k}{6}} \frac{4}{\omega^2}, \quad (3.6)$$

with $\xi > 0$ and $\epsilon = -4\alpha(\alpha + \beta + 1) = 4\alpha\gamma$. Thus one gets the effective potentials

$$V_{\text{eff}}^{\pm}(\xi) = \frac{\omega^2(\xi \mp \xi_0)^2}{64} + \frac{\epsilon - \frac{1}{4}}{\xi^2} - \frac{k}{24\omega^2}, \quad \xi > 0, \quad (3.7)$$

which resemble the isotonic potential but with shifted centers when $\xi_0 \neq 0$. The special case $\epsilon = \frac{1}{4}$ that arises for $\alpha = \gamma = -\frac{1}{4}$ and $\beta = -\frac{1}{2}$ was studied in the earlier work [22], in which case the centrifugal term vanishes, leading to some simplification. The corresponding effective potentials that read

$$V_{\text{eff}}^{\pm}(\xi) = \frac{\omega^2(\xi \mp \xi_0)^2}{64} - \frac{k}{24\omega^2}, \quad \xi > 0, \quad (3.8)$$

resemble the harmonic potential but with the boundary condition that the wavefunctions must vanish at $\xi = 0$ (and additionally at $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ as required for normalizability). This condition severely restricts the possibility of obtaining polynomial solutions in terms of the Hermite polynomials. However, as shown in [22], if the following condition holds:

$$H_n\left(\sqrt{\frac{\omega\xi_0^2}{8}}\right) = 0, \quad (3.9)$$

for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$(\phi_{\pm})_n(\xi) \sim e^{-\frac{\omega}{16}(\xi \mp \xi_0)^2} H_n\left(\sqrt{\frac{\omega}{8}}(\xi \mp \xi_0)\right) \quad (3.10)$$

is one bound-state solution. Since the zeros of Hermite polynomials are simple and do not repeat across n , the above-mentioned condition can be satisfied at most by only one value of n , meaning that there is at most one bound state expressible via a Hermite polynomial.

4 Non-polynomial solutions and energy quantization

Let us now move beyond the existing results to assess the quantum mechanics dictated by the branched Hamiltonians H_{\pm} that lead to the effective potentials (3.7). While for the case $\epsilon = \frac{1}{4}$, the possibility of polynomial truncation was studied in [22] and pointed out in the previous section, we will now revisit the eigenproblem (3.6) subject to the Dirichlet boundary condition $\phi_{\pm}(0) = 0$, along with $\lim_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} \phi_{\pm}(\xi) = 0$. In what follows, we shall take k to be small, where the extent of smallness will be quantified in Sec. (5).

4.1 $\epsilon = \frac{1}{4}$

For $\epsilon = \frac{1}{4}$, the eigenproblem (3.6) reduces to

$$-\frac{d^2\phi_{\pm}(\xi)}{d\xi^2} + \frac{\omega^2(\xi \mp \xi_0)^2}{64}\phi_{\pm}(\xi) = \lambda\phi_{\pm}(\xi), \quad \lambda = \frac{E}{4} + \frac{k}{24\omega^2}. \quad (4.1)$$

Fig. (1) shows the corresponding effective potentials. The general square-integrable solution of




Figure 1: Effective potentials $V_{\text{eff}}^{\pm}(\xi)$ for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{4}$.

the displaced oscillator is given by the parabolic cylinder functions [34] as

$$\phi_{\pm}(\xi) = D_{\mu} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\omega}{4}}(\xi \mp \xi_0) \right), \quad \mu = \frac{E}{\omega} + \frac{k}{6\omega^3} - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (4.2)$$

The boundary condition $\phi_{\pm}(0) = 0$ enforces following the transcendental quantization:

$$D_{\mu} \left(\mp \sqrt{\frac{\omega}{4}}\xi_0 \right) = 0, \quad E_n = \omega \left(\mu_n + \frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{k}{6\omega^2}. \quad (4.3)$$

Unlike the full-line harmonic oscillator admitting solutions with both even and odd parity, or the half-line harmonic oscillator admitting only solutions with odd parity (both cases admit equispaced spectra), here the fact that the center at ξ_0 does not coincide with the boundary at $\xi = 0$ destroys parity symmetry. The spectrum can be evaluated by solving equation (4.1) numerically and the first six eigenvalues are shown in Table (1). These energies agree within numerical tolerance with those obtained by numerically solving the transcendental condition (4.3). The spectrum is approximately equispaced with a spectral spacing $\simeq 2\omega$.

Table 1: First six eigenvalues from direct numerical solution for $\omega = 10$, $k = 1$, and $\epsilon = \frac{1}{4}$.

n	E_n^+	E_n^-
0	14.77286544	15.18436212
1	34.65936779	35.27686069
2	54.57419677	55.34619560
3	74.50319290	75.40394802
4	94.44103893	95.45445609
5	114.38507520	115.49988822

4.2 $\epsilon \neq \frac{1}{4}$

With $\epsilon \neq \frac{1}{4}$, the inverse-square term remains non-zero and equation (3.6) can be expressed as

$$-\frac{d^2\phi_{\pm}(\xi)}{d\xi^2} + \left[\frac{\omega^2(\xi \mp \xi_0)^2}{64} + \frac{\epsilon - \frac{1}{4}}{\xi^2} \right] \phi_{\pm}(\xi) = \lambda \phi_{\pm}(\xi), \quad \lambda = \frac{E}{4} + \frac{k}{24\omega^2}. \quad (4.4)$$

Fig. (2) shows the corresponding effective potentials. For $\xi_0 \neq 0$, the above equation cannot




Figure 2: Effective potentials $V_{\text{eff}}^{\pm}(\xi)$ for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$.

be exactly reduced to a confluent-hypergeometric form because the singular term ξ^{-2} and the displaced harmonic term $(\xi \mp \xi_0)^2$ have different centers. The solution must therefore be obtained numerically, subject to the physical boundary conditions

$$\phi_{\pm}(\xi) \sim \xi^{\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\epsilon}} \quad (\xi \rightarrow 0), \quad \phi_{\pm}(\xi) \sim e^{-\frac{\omega}{16}(\xi \mp \xi_0)^2} \quad (\xi \rightarrow \infty). \quad (4.5)$$

The first three eigenfunctions (up to an overall sign and normalization) for the two branches (+ and -) have been displayed in Figs. (3) and (4). The spectrum can be evaluated numerically




Figure 3: Eigenfunctions $(\phi_+)_n(\xi)$ for $n = 0, 1, 2$, taking $\omega = 10$, $k = 1$, and $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$. The corresponding eigenvalues read $E_0^+ \simeq 16.85$, $E_1^+ \simeq 36.75$, and $E_2^+ \simeq 56.68$.

and the first six eigenvalues are shown in Table (2). The levels are thus approximately equi-

Table 2: First six eigenvalues from direct numerical solution for $\omega = 10$, $k = 1$, and $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$.

n	E_n^+	E_n^-
0	16.84868053	17.29250939
1	36.75113362	37.38995201
2	56.67606076	57.46485124
3	76.61285412	77.52785010
4	96.55723877	97.58322724
5	116.50700377	117.63319363

paced with the spacing $\simeq 2\omega$. It is worth emphasizing that for general ϵ , the wavefunctions can be expressed using a generalized Frobenius series which does not generally truncate and the Dirichlet boundary condition $\phi_{\pm}(0) = 0$ then leads to a transcendental quantization condition whose numerical solution gives the energies listed in Tables (1) and (2) within numerical tolerance. Based on the numerical spectrum for the parameters tested, a linear fit can be suggested in the form

$$E_n^{\pm} \simeq \omega(2n + \delta_{\pm}), \quad (4.6)$$

for constants δ_+ and δ_- . This is a good estimate of the low-lying spectrum.




Figure 4: Eigenfunctions $(\phi_-)_n(\xi)$ for $n = 0, 1, 2$, taking $\omega = 10$, $k = 1$, and $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$. The corresponding eigenvalues read $E_0^- \simeq 17.29$, $E_1^- \simeq 37.39$, and $E_2^- \simeq 57.46$.

5 Perturbation theory for small anharmonic corrections

In this section, we will treat the anharmonicity parameter k perturbatively. To this end, let us note that the eigenproblem (3.6) can be expressed as

$$-\frac{d^2\phi_{\pm}}{d\xi^2} + \left[\frac{\omega^2\xi^2}{64} + \frac{\epsilon - \frac{1}{4}}{\xi^2} \mp \sqrt{\frac{k}{6}}\frac{\xi}{8} \right] \phi_{\pm} = \frac{E}{4}\phi_{\pm}, \quad (5.1)$$

subject to the Dirichlet boundary condition $\phi_{\pm}(0) = 0$, and $\lim_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} \phi_{\pm}(\xi) = 0$. For $k = 0$, the problem corresponds to the isotonic oscillator and can be exactly solved, leading to an equispaced spectrum. For small k , therefore, one can treat k perturbatively to quantify anharmonic corrections that make the spectrum quasi-harmonic. For perturbative control of the eigenproblem (5.1), the linear term $\mp\sqrt{k/6}(\xi/8)$ must remain much smaller than both the quadratic confinement and the unperturbed level spacing. In order of magnitude, this requires $k \ll \frac{3\omega^3}{n_{\max} + \sqrt{\epsilon}}$ if n_{\max} is the largest quantum number that one cares about. To begin, let us note that when $k = 0$, branching does not apply and the exact solutions are [3]

$$\phi_n(\xi) = N_n \xi^{\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\epsilon}} e^{-\frac{\omega \xi^2}{16}} L_n^{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \left(\frac{\omega \xi^2}{8} \right), \quad N_n = \sqrt{\frac{2(\omega/8)^{\sqrt{\epsilon}+1} n!}{\Gamma(n + \sqrt{\epsilon} + 1)}}, \quad (5.2)$$

$$E_n^{(0)} = \omega(2n + \sqrt{\epsilon} + 1). \quad (5.3)$$

The orthogonality of these solutions directly follows from that of the associated Laguerre polynomials [34]. One immediately notes a spectral spacing of 2ω . It may be noted that the $k = 0$

limit is singular in the classical Hamiltonian (3.4) but can be taken in the Schrödinger equation (5.1). Employing the standard time-independent perturbation theory [35], the first-order correction ($\sim \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})$) to the spectrum is given by

$$(\Delta E)_n^\pm = \mp \sqrt{\frac{k}{24}} \int_0^\infty \xi \phi_n(\xi)^2 d\xi. \quad (5.4)$$

Using the analytical form of $\phi_n(\xi)$ quoted above, we can express the integral as

$$\int_0^\infty \xi \phi_n(\xi)^2 d\xi = \left(\frac{\omega}{8}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{n!}{\Gamma(n + \sqrt{\epsilon} + 1)} \int_0^\infty t^{\sqrt{\epsilon} + \frac{1}{2}} e^{-t} L_n^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(t)^2 dt, \quad (5.5)$$

where $t = (\omega/8)\xi^2$. Thus, using the hypergeometric expansion [34]

$$L_n^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{(-n)_j}{(\sqrt{\epsilon} + 1)_j} \frac{t^j}{j!}, \quad (5.6)$$

where $(a)_j$ is the Pochhammer symbol, integrating term-by-term gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty t^{\sqrt{\epsilon} + \frac{1}{2}} e^{-t} L_n^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(t)^2 dt &= \sum_{j=0}^n \sum_{l=0}^n \frac{(-n)_j (-n)_l}{(\sqrt{\epsilon} + 1)_j (\sqrt{\epsilon} + 1)_l} \frac{1}{j! l!} \int_0^\infty t^{\sqrt{\epsilon} + \frac{1}{2} + j + l} e^{-t} dt \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^n \sum_{l=0}^n \frac{(-n)_j (-n)_l}{(\sqrt{\epsilon} + 1)_j (\sqrt{\epsilon} + 1)_l} \frac{\Gamma(\sqrt{\epsilon} + \frac{3}{2} + j + l)}{j! l!}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Substituting the result (5.7) into the expression (5.5) gives the final form which goes as

$$\int_0^\infty \xi \phi_n(\xi)^2 d\xi = \left(\frac{\omega}{8}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{n!}{\Gamma(n + \sqrt{\epsilon} + 1)} \sum_{j=0}^n \sum_{l=0}^n \frac{(-n)_j (-n)_l}{(\sqrt{\epsilon} + 1)_j (\sqrt{\epsilon} + 1)_l} \frac{\Gamma(\sqrt{\epsilon} + \frac{3}{2} + j + l)}{j! l!}. \quad (5.8)$$

Therefore we have now found the corrected energies of the branched partners as given by

$$E_n^{\pm, (1)} = \omega(2n + \sqrt{\epsilon} + 1) \mp \sqrt{\frac{k}{24}} \left(\frac{\omega}{8}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{n!}{\Gamma(n + \sqrt{\epsilon} + 1)} \sum_{j=0}^n \sum_{l=0}^n \frac{(-n)_j (-n)_l}{(\sqrt{\epsilon} + 1)_j (\sqrt{\epsilon} + 1)_l} \frac{\Gamma(\sqrt{\epsilon} + \frac{3}{2} + j + l)}{j! l!}. \quad (5.9)$$

Taking $\omega = 10$, $k = 1$, and $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$, the first six eigenvalues are displayed in Table (3) and are in good agreement with those presented in Table (2). This demonstrates that perturbation theory up to $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})$ is quite accurate for such parameter choices in describing the low-lying spectrum.

6 Discussion

The modified Emden equation $\ddot{x} + kx\dot{x} + \omega^2 x + \frac{k^2}{9}x^3 = 0$, quantized via the von Roos prescription, yields effective half-line oscillators, and a particular form of the Hamiltonian emphasized

Table 3: First six eigenvalues from (analytic) perturbation theory up to $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})$ with the parameter values $\omega = 10$, $k = 1$, and $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$.

n	$E_n^{+, (1)}$	$E_n^{-, (1)}$
0	16.856	17.286
1	36.750	37.392
2	56.668	57.474
3	76.603	77.539
4	96.549	97.593
5	116.503	117.639

in [21, 22] leads to exact solutions in terms of the associated Laguerre polynomials, accompanied by an equispaced spectrum. However, considering the branched Hamiltonians (3.4) which have been the main focus of this paper, one encounters (when k is small enough to be regarded as a perturbation for the first few levels) only approximate harmonic spacings between the levels – quasi-harmonic – with the spacings clustering around 2ω , along with small deviations. In the case $\epsilon \neq \frac{1}{4}$, the near-origin index $s = \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\epsilon}$ ensures regularity, while the shifted quadratic confinement prevents an exact confluent-hypergeometric reduction, accounting for the mild anharmonicity observed numerically; for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{4}$, the spectrum follows parabolic-cylinder quantization. These results clarify that isochronous classical behavior does not necessarily imply perfectly-harmonic quantum spectra.

Acknowledgements: A.G. thanks Akash Sinha for related discussions and also thanks the Ministry of Education, Government of India for financial support in the form of a Prime Minister’s Research Fellowship (ID: 1200454) during the initial stages of this study. A.G.C. and P.G. gratefully acknowledge discussions with Pepin Cariñena.

A Uniqueness of the system satisfying the conditions (1.4) and (2.1) when $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are polynomials

Let us consider situations in which $f(x)$ is a polynomial. It is easy to check that when $f(x)$ is a real constant, i.e., a monomial of degree zero, the conditions (1.4) and (2.1) are simultaneously satisfied for complex-valued ℓ , a case that we shall exclude. As for non-constant but polynomial $f(x)$, the following is true:

Proposition A.1 *Let $f(x)$ be a real polynomial and $I(x) = \int_0^x x' f(x') dx'$. Then the isochronicity condition (1.4) which is equivalent to*

$$g(x) = \omega^2 x + \frac{I(x)^2}{x^3}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

with fixed $\omega > 0$, is compatible with the Chiellini condition (2.1) if and only if $f(x) = kx$. In particular, no polynomial of degree ≥ 2 and no affine linear $kx + b$ with $b \neq 0$ works.

Proof – Let us begin by noting that the Chiellini condition (2.1) is equivalent to the following identity:

$$\frac{dg(x)}{dx}f(x) - g(x)\frac{df(x)}{dx} + \ell(\ell + 1)f(x)^3 = 0. \quad (\text{A2})$$

(1) *Exclusion of degrees $n \geq 2$:* Let $f(x) = a_n x^n + \dots$ with $n \geq 2$. Then the condition (A1) gives

$$I(x) = \frac{a_n}{n+2}x^{n+2} + \dots, \quad g(x) = \omega^2 x + \frac{a_n^2}{(n+2)^2}x^{2n+1} + \dots. \quad (\text{A3})$$

This form of $g(x)$ does not satisfy the condition (A2), as can be easily checked by substitution.

(2) *Feasible choice of $f(x)$:* Let $f(x) = kx + b$, so that

$$I(x) = \frac{k}{3}x^3 + \frac{b}{2}x^2, \quad g(x) = \frac{k^2}{9}x^3 + \frac{kb}{3}x^2 + \left(\omega^2 + \frac{b^2}{4}\right)x. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Substituting into (A2) and equating coefficients yields $\ell(\ell + 1) = -2/9$, and

$$b\left(\frac{b^2}{36} + \omega^2\right) = 0, \quad (\text{A5})$$

which forces $b = 0$.

References

- [1] F. Calogero, *Isochronous Systems*, Oxford University Press (2008).
- [2] O. A. Chalykh and A. P. Veselov, J. Nonlinear Math. Phys. **12** (Suppl. 1), 179 (2005).
- [3] Y. Weissman and J. Jortner, Phys. Lett. A **70**, 177 (1979).
- [4] R. M. Morris and P. G. L. Leach, arXiv:1510.08992.
- [5] M. Urabe, J. Math. Mech. **10**, 569 (1961).
- [6] P. Guha and A. Ghose Choudhury, Rev. Math. Phys. **25**, 1330009 (2013).
- [7] P. Guha and A. Ghose-Choudhury, Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys. **16**, 1950107 (2019).
- [8] S. N. Pandey, P. S. Bindu, M. Senthilvelan, and M. Lakshmanan, J. Math. Phys. **50**, 082702 (2009).
- [9] S. N. Pandey, P. S. Bindu, M. Senthilvelan, and M. Lakshmanan, J. Math. Phys. **50**, 102701 (2009).
- [10] V. K. Chandrasekar, M. Senthilvelan, and M. Lakshmanan, Phys. Rev. E **72**, 066203 (2005).
- [11] A. Ghose Choudhury and P. Guha, Discret. Cont. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B **22**, 2465 (2017).

- [12] M. Sabatini, *J. Diff. Eqns.* **152**, 467 (1999).
- [13] C. Christopher and J. Devlin, *J. Diff. Eqns.* **200**, 1 (2004).
- [14] V. K. Chandrasekar, S. N. Pandey, M. Senthilvelan, and M. Lakshmanan, *Chaos Solit. Fractals* **26**, 1399 (2005).
- [15] V. K. Chandrasekar, M. Senthilvelan, A. Kundu, and M. Lakshmanan, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **39**, 9743 (2006).
- [16] M. Lakshmanan and V. K. Chandrasekar, *Eur. Phys. J. Spec. Top.* **222**, 665 (2013).
- [17] A. K. Tiwari, A. D. Devi, R. G. Pradeep, and V. K. Chandrasekar, *Pramana* **85**, 789 (2015).
- [18] O. Mustafa, *Phys. Scr.* **98**, 125211 (2023).
- [19] J. F. Cariñena, A. M. Perelomov, and M. F. Rañada, *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **87**, 012007 (2007).
- [20] A. Ghose Choudhury and P. Guha, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **46**, 165202 (2013).
- [21] B. Bagchi, A. Ghose Choudhury, and P. Guha, *J. Math. Phys.* **56**, 012105 (2015).
- [22] B. Bagchi, A. Ghose-Choudhury, A. Ghosh, and P. Guha, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **64**, 212 (2025).
- [23] A. Ghosh, B. P. Mandal, and B. Bagchi, *J. Math. Phys.* **66**, 082101 (2025).
- [24] J. F. Cariñena, A. M. Perelomov, M. F. Rañada, and M. Santander, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41**, 085301 (2008).
- [25] C. Quesne, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41**, 392001 (2008).
- [26] G. Lévai, *Symmetry* **15**, 461 (2023).
- [27] J. Dorignac, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **38**, 6183 (2005).
- [28] M. C. Nucci and K. M. Tamizhmani, *J. Nonlinear Math. Phys.* **17**, 167 (2010).
- [29] B. Bagchi, A. Ghosh, and M. Znojil, *Symmetry* **16**, 860 (2024).
- [30] V. C. Ruby, M. Senthilvelan, and M. Lakshmanan, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45**, 382002 (2012).
- [31] B. Bagchi, S. Modak, P. K. Panigrahi, F. Ruzicka, and M. Znojil, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **30**, 1550213 (2015).
- [32] B. Bagchi, D. Ghosh, S. Modak, and P. K. Panigrahi, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **34**, 1950110 (2019).

- [33] O. von Roos, Phys. Rev. B **27**, 7547 (1983).
- [34] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions: With Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*, Dover Publications (1965).
- [35] C. M. Bender and S. A. Orszag, *Advanced Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers I: Asymptotic Methods and Perturbation Theory*, Springer (1999).