

# Comment on "Exceptional points and double poles of the $S$ matrix"

C. Dembowski,<sup>1</sup> B. Dietz,<sup>1</sup> H.-D. Gräf,<sup>1</sup> H.L. Harney,<sup>2</sup>

A. Heine,<sup>1</sup> W. D. Heiss,<sup>3</sup> and A. Richter<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institut für Kernphysik, Technische Universität Darmstadt, D-64289 Darmstadt, Germany*

<sup>2</sup>*Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, D-69029 Heidelberg, Germany*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Stellenbosch, 7602 Matieland, South Africa*

(Dated: November 18, 2018)

## Abstract

In a recent paper [Phys. Rev. E **67**, 026204 (2003)], Rotter calculates the geometric phases that are picked up by the eigenvectors of a two-state quantum system when an exceptional point is encircled. In addition to the geometric phases observed by Dembowski *et al.* in a microwave cavity experiment [Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 787 (2001)], she finds a phase factor of  $i$ . We show that Rotters results are inconsistent.

PACS numbers: 05.45.Mt,03.65.Vf

In [1] an exceptional point (EP), i.e. a branch point singularity of fourth order [2], of a parametric dissipative microwave cavity has been observed experimentally by tracking the development of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the resonator while the EP is encircled. It has been found that along the closed loop around the EP the eigenvectors pick up geometrical phases in accordance with [2].

In a recent paper [3], Rotter criticizes this experiment and suggests the existence of an unobserved additional geometrical phase factor of  $i$ . This suggestion is inconsistent.

In [3], Rotter states in Eq. (24) her transformation scheme for the two eigenvectors,  $\tilde{\Phi}_1$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}_2$ , when an EP is encircled (denoted in [3] by the symbol ' $\rightarrow$ '):

$$\{\tilde{\Phi}_1, \tilde{\Phi}_2\} \rightarrow \{-i\tilde{\Phi}_2, +i\tilde{\Phi}_1\} \quad (1)$$

A second full surrounding with the same orientation gives according to Eq. (25) of [3]:

$$\{-i\tilde{\Phi}_2, +i\tilde{\Phi}_1\} \rightarrow \{+\tilde{\Phi}_1, +\tilde{\Phi}_2\} \quad (2)$$

By reversing this second loop, i.e. reading Eq. (2) from right to left, the transformation scheme for encircling an EP *with the opposite orientation* directly follows to be:

$$\{\tilde{\Phi}_1, \tilde{\Phi}_2\} \rightarrow \{-i\tilde{\Phi}_2, +i\tilde{\Phi}_1\} \quad (3)$$

In Eq. (27) of [3], Rotter states however, that encircling the EP with the orientation opposite to that of Eq. (2) yields:

$$\{\tilde{\Phi}_1, \tilde{\Phi}_2\} \rightarrow \{+i\tilde{\Phi}_2, -i\tilde{\Phi}_1\} \quad (4)$$

This contradicts her earlier result: Equations (3) and (4) are incompatible with each other.

Since Rotters statements are inconsistent we conclude that the additional phase factor of  $i$  as suggested in [3] and other articles of her [4] is not present.

- 
- [1] C. Dembowski, H.-D. Gräf, H.L. Harney, A. Heine, W.D. Heiss, H. Rehfeld and A. Richter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 787 (2001).  
[2] W.D. Heiss, M. Müller, and I. Rotter, Phys. Rev. E **58**, 2894 (1998); W.D. Heiss, Eur. Phys. J. D **7**, 1 (1999); Phys. Rev. E **61**, 929 (2000).  
[3] I. Rotter, Phys. Rev. E **67**, 026204 (2003).  
[4] I. Rotter, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 026217 (2002) and J. Okolowisc, M. Ploszajczak and I. Rotter, Phys. Rep. **374**, 271 (2003).