

# Asymptotic Matching the Self-Consistent Expansion to Approximate the Modified Bessel Functions of the Second Kind

Chanania Steinbock and Eytan Katzav

Racah Institute of Physics, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem 9190401, Israel

E-mail: [chanania.steinbock@mail.huji.ac.il](mailto:chanania.steinbock@mail.huji.ac.il)

**Abstract.** The self-consistent expansion (SCE) is a powerful technique for obtaining perturbative solutions to problems in statistical physics but it suffers from a subtle problem – too much freedom! The SCE can be used to generate an enormous number of approximations but distinguishing the superb approximations from the deficient ones can only be achieved after the fact by comparison to experimental or numerical results. Here, we propose a method of using the SCE to a priori obtain uniform approximations, namely asymptotic matching. If the asymptotic behaviour of a problem can be identified, then the approximations generated by the SCE can be tuned to asymptotically match the desired behaviour and this can be used to obtain uniform approximations over the entire domain of consideration, without needing to resort to empirical comparisons. We demonstrate this method by applying it to the task of obtaining uniform approximations of the modified Bessel functions of the second kind,  $K_\alpha(x)$ .

**Keywords:** Self-Consistent Expansion, Modified Bessel Functions of the Second Kind, Asymptotic Matching, Perturbative Expansions, Partition Functions, Special Functions

Submitted to: *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*

## 1. Introduction

Perturbative techniques play a major role in many areas of physics though such methods are often limited to problems where a well-defined small parameter can be found [1, 2]. In typical many-body systems, such small parameters are often lacking requiring the application of sophisticated resummation techniques such as resummation by Padé approximant [1, 3] or the infamous renormalisation group [4]. Though such techniques can be extremely powerful, there are well known situations where such resummation techniques simply have no access to the strong nonlinear coupling regime. For instance, it is well established that the renormalisation group has no access to the strong coupling regime of the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang (KPZ) equation describing surface growth at *any* order [5].

While perturbative techniques are ubiquitous in physics, applications to pure mathematics also abound. For instance, characterisation of the asymptotic behaviour of the so called “special functions” has been a cornerstone of mathematics over the last two centuries [6–9]. One of the goals of this paper will be to demonstrate how the techniques developed by physicists for studying many-body systems can be used to gain insight into approximating such functions.

The self-consistent expansion (SCE) is a powerful technique in statistical physics for obtaining perturbative expansions of many-body interacting systems. First developed by Schwartz and Edwards to investigate the KPZ equation for surface growth [10], it has since been applied to a number of problems in statistical physics, including generalisations of the KPZ equation [11–19], turbulence [20], wetting fronts and fracture [21–24], the XY-model [25] and fluctuating elastic sheets [26–28]. The basic idea of the method is that when performing a perturbative expansion of any particular system, one will always have various degrees of freedom in the selection of the zeroth order system. By a posteriori selecting the zeroth order system in a manner which is self-consistent with the approximation order, one can obtain superb and even convergent expansions for systems whose ordinary perturbative expansions are known to diverge [29, 30].

Ironically, one subtle limitation of the SCE is the enormous freedom in how one self-consistently determines the zeroth order system. In practice, it seems that convergence of the perturbative expansion can be obtained by appropriately modifying the self-consistent criteria simultaneously with the order of the expansion being considered [29, 30] but there is no a priori way of knowing to what extent the self-consistent criteria should be modified. As such, the SCE provides the practitioner with a huge family of approximations but no way of determining which approximations are excellent and which are deficient. Aside from comparison with experimental or numerical results, there is little which can be done to determine the validity of any given approximation.

One approach to resolving this issue is described in [31], where it is suggested that the quality of various sets of approximations can be assessed by considering

their variance, that is, the extent to which the different approximations vary from each other. A set consisting of mostly good approximations will have a relatively small variance while a set containing bad approximations will tend to have a larger variance as it is unlikely for bad approximations to all be bad in the same way. As Tolstoy begins *Anna Karenina*, “All happy families are alike; each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way” [32]. This approach adopts another level of self-consistent reasoning, which is needed when facing very little or no analytical information about the system. In the very few cases where a systematic comparison against an external reference can be made [30, 31], this idea can be verified, however experience teaches that hard and analytically intractable problems may challenge such expectations. For instance, conditionally convergent series show that series can converge but not to the expected value, a well-known example being the Taylor expansion of the function  $\exp(-1/x^2)$  around  $x = 0$  which is well defined yet converges to 0 everywhere.

Here, we propose a different approach to this problem, namely asymptotic matching. It is often the case that the full system under consideration can be solved in various asymptotic limits [1]. If the approximations provided by the SCE can be forced to match up with these asymptotic solutions, one immediately greatly improves the likelihood that uniform approximations will be achieved over the entire domain under investigation.

In this paper, we demonstrate how to apply this method of asymptotic matching the SCE to obtain novel uniform approximations of the modified Bessel functions of the second kind. The Bessel functions and their modified variants are important functions in mathematics and physics, appearing frequently in the context of wave propagation and oscillations [7, 9]. Despite this, the series representations of the modified Bessel function of the second kind  $K_\alpha(x)$  are only asymptotic, thereby sharply limiting their range of applicability. While classical techniques such as hyperasymptotics may be able to extract insight from the divergent character of these series [33–37] and novel techniques based on AI are still preliminary [38], series expansions which are manifestly convergent and exhibit uniform convergence are of substantial value. Some recent work has had limited success at deriving an approximation by imposing the desired asymptotic behaviours to an exponential ansatz in an ad hoc manner [39]. Here, we show how the method of asymptotically matching the SCE can be used to systematically obtain extremely precise uniform approximations of these functions.

While classical asymptotic matching, such as boundary layer theory, involves finding an interval over which both large and small asymptotics hold such that they can be stitched together [1], the approach we will use here does not require the determination or identification of such an interval. Instead, conceptually, the SCE will be used to generate families of approximations over the entire positive real axis. From these families, the approximations with the correct large and small asymptotics will be selected. This has the added advantage of making the method

extremely intuitive and straight-forward to use.

In Sec. 2, we recap the known asymptotic properties of the modified Bessel functions and describe their limitations. In Sec. 3, we demonstrate how the problem of obtaining uniform approximations of  $K_\alpha(x)$  can be converted into a classic problem in statistical physics of determining the partition function of a particle trapped in a potential well under thermal equilibrium. This is followed by an application of the SCE with asymptotic matching to obtain uniform approximations of  $K_\alpha(x)$ . In Sec. 4, the obtained approximations are compared with the exact result and a discussion of the method and its limitations appears in Sec. 5.

## 2. The Modified Bessel Functions

The modified Bessel functions are defined by considering solutions  $y(x)$  to the second order linear ODE [9]

$$x^2 \frac{d^2 y}{dx^2} + x \frac{dy}{dx} - (x^2 + \alpha^2) y = 0. \quad (1)$$

As a linear second order ODE, the solutions to such an equation are linearly spanned by two independent solutions, commonly denoted  $I_\alpha(x)$  and  $K_\alpha(x)$ , known as the modified Bessel functions of the first and second kind respectively. A series solution defines  $I_\alpha(x)$  as

$$I_\alpha(x) = \left(\frac{x}{2}\right)^\alpha \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4^k k! \Gamma(\alpha + k + 1)} x^{2k}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\Gamma(z)$  denotes the Gamma function [9]. In turn,  $K_\alpha(x)$  can be defined by the series solution

$$K_\alpha(x) = \frac{\pi I_{-\alpha}(x) - I_\alpha(x)}{2 \sin(\alpha\pi)}, \quad (3)$$

if  $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Z}$ , or by


$$K_n(x) = \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{2} \left[ \left. \frac{\partial I_\alpha(x)}{\partial \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=n} + \left. \frac{\partial I_\alpha(x)}{\partial \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=-n} \right], \quad (4)$$

if  $\alpha = n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Note that  $K_\alpha(x)$  diverges as  $x$  tends to 0. In particular,  $K_\alpha(x) \sim x^{-\alpha}$  as  $x \rightarrow 0$ .

While such series for  $K_\alpha(x)$  are useful if  $x$  is small, for large values of  $x$ ,  $K_\alpha(x)$  is characterised by a decaying asymptotic behaviour

$$K_\alpha(x) \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2x}} e^{-x}. \quad (5)$$

Denoting a truncation of Eqs. (3) or (4) after  $m$  terms by  $K_\alpha(x)_{x=0}^{(m)}$ , any truncation after a finite number of terms is unable to capture this decay and thus these series




**Figure 1.** (a) The modified Bessel function  $K_1(x)$  (solid) compared with its first few small  $x$  approximations,  $K_1(x)_{x=0}^{(m)}$  where  $m$  denotes the order at which the series is truncated, given by Eq. (4) (dashed). (b) The relative error of each approximation  $\left|K_1(x) - K_1(x)_{x=0}^{(m)}\right|/K_1(x)$ . The approximations become increasingly accurate for small  $x$  but are simply never able to approximate well the large  $x$  decaying tail.

expansions are of limited use for large  $x$ . Fig. 1 demonstrates this failure for a typical value of  $\alpha$ , namely  $\alpha = 1$ .

More generally, for large values of  $x$ ,  $K_\alpha(x)$  has the known asymptotic expansion [9]

$$K_\alpha(x) \sim \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2x}} e^{-x} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{a_k(\alpha)}{x^k}, \quad (6)$$



**Figure 2.** (a) The modified Bessel function  $K_1(x)$  (solid) compared with its first few large  $x$  approximations,  $K_1(x)_{x=\infty}^{(m)}$  where  $m$  denotes the order at which the series is truncated, given by Eq. (6) (dashed). (b) The relative error of each approximation  $\left| K_1(x) - K_1(x)_{x=\infty}^{(m)} \right| / K_1(x)$ . The approximations become increasingly accurate for large  $x$  but are simply never able to approximate well the small  $x$  behaviour.

where

$$a_k(\alpha) = \frac{(4\alpha^2 - 1^2)(4\alpha^2 - 3^2) \dots [4\alpha^2 - (2k - 1)^2]}{8^k k!}, \quad (7)$$

however while such an expansion is useful for large  $x$ , Fig. 2 shows how truncations after  $m$  terms,  $K_\alpha(x)_{x=\infty}^{(m)}$ , are unable to capture the small  $x$  behaviour described by Eqs. (3) and (4) in the case of  $\alpha = 1$ , which is again a typical value for  $\alpha$ . Accordingly, a uniform series expansion, valid for both large and small  $x$  would certainly be of interest.

### 3. $K_\alpha(x)$ and Statistical Mechanics

In the canonical ensemble of statistical mechanics, a system governed by Hamiltonian  $H(u)$  in thermal equilibrium with a heat reservoir at temperature  $T$  is fully characterised by its partition function

$$Z = \int du e^{-\beta H(u)}, \quad (8)$$

where the integral is over all possible values  $u$  can take and  $\beta = 1/k_B T$  ( $k_B$  denotes Boltzmann's constant) [40, 41]. Further, if  $\mathbb{F}$  denotes some observable, the expectation of  $\mathbb{F}$ , denoted  $\langle \mathbb{F} \rangle$ , is given by

$$\langle \mathbb{F} \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int du \mathbb{F}(u) e^{-\beta H(u)}. \quad (9)$$

In the current context, the temperature  $T$  will play no role and thus without loss of generality, we set  $\beta = 1$  from here on out. When such integrals cannot be carried out exactly, perturbation theory provides straight-forward techniques for approximating them. For instance, suppose that the Hamiltonian  $H(u)$  has the form

$$H(u) = H_0(u) + \Lambda H_1(u), \quad (10)$$

where  $\Lambda$  is nominally small. Then the partition function  $Z$  can be expanded in powers of  $\Lambda$  by

$$Z = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Lambda^n \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \int du [H_1(u)]^n e^{-H_0(u)}, \quad (11)$$

while the expectation value  $\langle \mathbb{F} \rangle$  can be expanded in powers of  $\Lambda$  by

$$\langle \mathbb{F} \rangle = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \Lambda^j \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j!} \langle H_1^j \rangle_0 \right]^m \left[ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Lambda^n \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \langle \mathbb{F} H_1^n \rangle_0 \right]. \quad (12)$$

Here,  $\langle \mathbb{F} \rangle_0$  denotes an expectation taken with respect to  $H_0(u)$ , ie.

$$\langle \mathbb{F} \rangle_0 = \frac{\int du \mathbb{F}(u) e^{-H_0(u)}}{\int du e^{-H_0(u)}}. \quad (13)$$

Explicitly, the first few terms in this series expansion for  $\langle \mathbb{F} \rangle$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbb{F} \rangle &= \langle \mathbb{F} \rangle_0 - \Lambda [\langle \mathbb{F} H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle \mathbb{F} \rangle_0 \langle H_1 \rangle_0] + \\ &+ \Lambda^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} [\langle \mathbb{F} H_1^2 \rangle_0 - \langle \mathbb{F} \rangle_0 \langle H_1^2 \rangle_0] - [\langle \mathbb{F} H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle \mathbb{F} \rangle_0 \langle H_1 \rangle_0] \langle H_1 \rangle_0 \right) + O(\Lambda^3). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Let us now consider the following integral representation of the modified Bessel function of the second kind [9]

$$K_\alpha(x) = \int_0^\infty du e^{-x \cosh u} \cosh(\alpha u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^\infty du e^{-x \cosh u - \alpha u}. \quad (15)$$

Under the identification

$$H(u) = x \cosh u + \alpha u, \quad (16)$$

Eq. (15) is the partition function of a system with a single degree of freedom governed by the Hamiltonian  $H(u)$ . More precisely, the modified Bessel function of the second kind  $K_\alpha(x)$  is nothing other than the partition function of an overdamped particle trapped in an asymmetric hyperbolic potential well in thermal equilibrium. We will use this observation to obtain uniform series approximations for  $K_\alpha(x)$ .

To study this system, we use the self-consistent expansion (SCE). We begin by considering the zeroth order quadratic Hamiltonian

$$H_0(u) = \frac{(u - \xi)^2}{2\sigma^2} + h_0, \quad (17)$$

where  $\xi$ ,  $\sigma$  and  $h_0$  are functions of  $x$  and  $\alpha$  which denote location, scaling and “ground state” parameters and which are yet to be determined and will be fixed self-consistently in the continuation. Then we can write our Hamiltonian  $H(u)$  given by Eq. (16) in the form of Eq. (10) by setting

$$H_1(u) = x \cosh u + \alpha u - \frac{(u - \xi)^2}{2\sigma^2} - h_0 \quad (18)$$

with  $\Lambda = 1$ . Though in principle,  $\Lambda$  should be small, the self-consistent determination of  $\xi$ ,  $\sigma$  and  $h_0$  will ensure that  $\Lambda H_1(u)$  contributes only at higher orders and thus setting  $\Lambda = 1$  will pose no problems. We nevertheless keep  $\Lambda$  in our equations for book-keeping purposes.

According to Eq. (11), we can expand  $K_\alpha(x)$  as

$$K_\alpha(x) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sigma^2 e^{-h_0} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Lambda^n \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \mathcal{I}_n(x, \alpha; \xi, \sigma, h_0), \quad (19)$$

where we have used the change in variables  $v = (u - \xi) / \sigma$  to simplify the integrals to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_n(x, \alpha; \xi, \sigma, h_0) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \times \\ &\times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv e^{-v^2/2} \left[ x \cosh(\sigma v + \xi) - \frac{1}{2}v^2 + \alpha\sigma v + (\alpha\xi - h_0) \right]^n. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

If the sum in Eq. (19) is truncated such that the highest power of  $\Lambda$  is  $m$ , we call the resulting expression an  $m^{\text{th}}$  order approximation of  $K_\alpha(x)$  and denote this by  $K_\alpha(x)^{(m)}$ . Though explicit expressions for general  $\mathcal{I}_n$  can be written with the aid of the multinomial theorem, such expressions are overly long and cumbersome for our purposes. In practice, particular  $\mathcal{I}_n$  can be calculated fairly quickly as they



are needed. The first few  $\mathcal{I}_n$  are given by

$$\mathcal{I}_0 = 1, \quad (21)$$

$$\mathcal{I}_1 = xe^{\sigma^2/2} \cosh(\xi) + \left( \alpha\xi - h_0 - \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_2 = & \frac{1}{2}x^2e^{2\sigma^2} \cosh(2\xi) + 2x \left[ \left( \alpha\xi - h_0 - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right] e^{\sigma^2/2} \cosh(\xi) + \\ & + 2x\alpha\sigma^2e^{\sigma^2/2} \sinh(\xi) + \left[ \left( \alpha\xi - h_0 - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 + \alpha^2\sigma^2 + \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

We now turn to the task of selecting  $h_0$ ,  $\xi$  and  $\sigma$ . The SCE prescribes that these parameters be chosen in such a manner so that zeroth order approximations be in some sense close to the exact result. For instance, if we set  $\mathcal{I}_1 = 0$  by choosing

$$h_0 = xe^{\sigma^2/2} \cosh(\xi) + \alpha\xi - \frac{1}{2}, \quad (24)$$

then it is clear from Eqs. (19) and (22) that the zeroth order approximation  $K_\alpha(x)^{(0)}$ , will be exact up to first order, i.e.

$$K_\alpha(x)^{(0)} = K_\alpha(x)^{(1)}. \quad (25)$$

In general, one can ensure that the first  $m$  corrections to  $K_\alpha(x)$  vanish by selecting  $h_0$  such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^m \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \mathcal{I}_n = 0 \quad (26)$$

though we will not need to resort to this here.

In previous works, the location and scaling parameters,  $\xi$  and  $\sigma$ , are typically self-consistently determined by demanding that various moments calculated at lowest order  $\langle u^k \rangle_0$  be exact. Here, we take a similar approach though with slightly greater flexibility. To determine  $\xi$  and  $\sigma$  in a self-consistent manner, let us try to ensure that the zeroth order *moment generating function*  $\langle e^{uz} \rangle_0$  of our system is exact up to first order. According to Eq. (14), this will be the case if

$$\langle e^{uz} H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle e^{uz} \rangle_0 \langle H_1 \rangle_0 = 0. \quad (27)$$

Since

$$\langle e^{uz} \rangle_0 = e^{\frac{\sigma^2}{2}z^2 + \xi z}, \quad (28)$$

$$\langle H_1 \rangle_0 = \mathcal{I}_1 = xe^{\sigma^2/2} \cosh(\xi) + \left( \alpha\xi - h_0 - \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e^{uz} H_1(u) \rangle_0 = & e^{\frac{\sigma^2}{2}z^2 + \xi z} \left[ xe^{\sigma^2/2} \cosh(\sigma^2 z + \xi) - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}z^2 + \right. \\ & \left. + \alpha\sigma^2 z + \left( \alpha\xi - h_0 - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

we find that  $\langle e^{uz} \rangle_0$  will be exact up to first order if

$$0 = xe^{\sigma^2/2} [\cosh(\sigma^2 z + \xi) - \cosh(\xi)] - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} z^2 + \alpha \sigma^2 z. \quad (31)$$

As the right-hand side of this equation is a function of  $z$ , no particular choice of  $\xi$  and  $\sigma$  can force it to vanish identically for all  $z$ . We can however force the right-hand side to vanish at two particular points  $z_1$  and  $z_2$ . Let us suppose we have selected these points. Using the trigonometric identity

$$\cosh(A + B) - \cosh(B) = 2 \sinh\left(\frac{A}{2}\right) \sinh\left(\frac{A}{2} + B\right), \quad (32)$$

we immediately find that

$$\xi = -\sinh^{-1} \left[ \frac{(2\alpha - z_i) z_i \sigma^2 e^{-\sigma^2/2}}{4x \sinh\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_i\right)} \right] - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_i. \quad (33)$$

where  $i = 1, 2$ . In essence, this constitutes two equations for the two unknowns  $\xi$  and  $\sigma$  in terms of  $z_1$  and  $z_2$ . Given  $\sigma$ , this equation immediately gives us  $\xi$  and since this equation holds for both  $z_1$  and  $z_2$ , this equation also gives us an implicit equation for  $\sigma$

$$\begin{aligned} \sinh^{-1} \left[ \frac{(2\alpha - z_1) z_1 \sigma^2 e^{-\sigma^2/2}}{4x \sinh\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_1\right)} \right] + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_1 &= \\ &= \sinh^{-1} \left[ \frac{(2\alpha - z_2) z_2 \sigma^2 e^{-\sigma^2/2}}{4x \sinh\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_2\right)} \right] + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_2. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Applying  $\sinh$  to both sides allows us to write this equation without needing to resort to inverse hyperbolic functions as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(2\alpha - z_1) z_1 \sigma^2}{\tanh\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_1\right)} + \sqrt{(4x)^2 \sinh^2\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_1\right) e^{\sigma^2} + [(2\alpha - z_1) z_1 \sigma^2]^2} &= \\ = \frac{(2\alpha - z_2) z_2 \sigma^2}{\tanh\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_2\right)} + \sqrt{(4x)^2 \sinh^2\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_2\right) e^{\sigma^2/2} + [(2\alpha - z_2) z_2 \sigma^2]^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

We can choose  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  however we want. Suppose we choose some value for  $z_2$  and then take  $z_2 \rightarrow 0$ . Then our expressions for  $\xi$  and  $\sigma$  simplify substantially and we obtain

$$\xi = -\sinh^{-1} \left[ \frac{\alpha}{x} e^{-\sigma^2/2} \right] = -\ln \left[ \frac{\alpha}{x} e^{-\sigma^2/2} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{\alpha^2}{x^2} e^{-\sigma^2}} \right] \quad (36)$$

and

$$\frac{(2\alpha - z_1) z_1 \sigma^2}{\tanh\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_1\right)} + \sqrt{(4x)^2 \sinh^2\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_1\right) e^{\sigma^2} + [(2\alpha - z_1) z_1 \sigma^2]^2} = 4\alpha. \quad (37)$$

For practical calculations, it is worth rewriting this equation in a form which doesn't involve the square root. Ultimately, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ (4x)^2 \sinh^2 \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_1 \right) e^{\sigma^2} - (4\alpha)^2 \right] \sinh^2 \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_1 \right) = \\ = (2\alpha - z_1) z_1 \sigma^2 \left[ (2\alpha - z_1) z_1 \sigma^2 - 4\alpha \sinh(\sigma^2 z_1) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

While this equation is still not analytically solvable for  $\sigma$ , we can fairly easily determine how  $\sigma$  behaves for large and small values of  $x$ , under the choice that  $z_1$  itself doesn't depend on  $x$ . In particular, for large  $x$ , we find that  $\sigma^2$  decays

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{x} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{2x} + \frac{9 - 2(z_1^2 - 4\alpha z_1 + 6\alpha^2)}{24x^2} + O(x^{-3}) \right] \quad (39)$$

while for small values of  $x$ , we find that  $\sigma^2$  either tends to a constant or diverges logarithmically depending on the choice of  $z_1$ . Explicitly, we have

$$\sigma^2 \sim \begin{cases} \sigma_0^2 + O(x^2) & z_1 < 2\alpha \\ -\frac{2}{2\alpha+1} \ln\left(\frac{x}{2\alpha}\right) & z_1 = 2\alpha \\ -\frac{1}{z_1+1} \ln\left[-\frac{z_1+1}{2\alpha z_1(z_1-2\alpha)} \frac{x^2}{\ln\left(\frac{z_1+1}{2\alpha z_1(z_1-2\alpha)} x^2\right)}\right] & z_1 > 2\alpha \end{cases}, \quad (40)$$

where  $\sigma_0^2$  is determined by the non-trivial solution to the equation

$$(2\alpha - z_1) z_1 \sigma_0^2 = 2\alpha \left( 1 - e^{-\sigma_0^2 z_1} \right), \quad (41)$$

which can be written in terms of the Lambert- $W$  function [9] as

$$\sigma_0^2 = \frac{1}{z_1} \left[ W\left(-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha - z_1} \exp\left(-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha - z_1}\right)\right) + \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha - z_1} \right]. \quad (42)$$

Note that for  $0 < z_1 < 2\alpha$ , the primary branch  $W_0$  is used while for  $z_1 < 0$ , the secondary branch  $W_{-1}$  must be used instead.

With these expressions in hand, the large  $x$  behaviour of  $\xi$  and  $h_0$  immediately follow as

$$\xi = -\frac{\alpha}{x} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{2x} - \frac{4\alpha^2 - 9}{24x^2} + \frac{z_1^2 - 4\alpha z_1 + 12\alpha^2 - 8}{24x^3} + O(x^{-4}) \right] \quad (43)$$

and

$$h_0 = x \left[ 1 - \frac{4\alpha^2 + 1}{8x^2} - \frac{z_1^2 - 4\alpha z_1 - 2}{24x^3} + O(x^{-4}) \right], \quad (44)$$

while their small  $x$  behaviour follows as

$$\xi \sim \ln\left(\frac{x}{2\alpha}\right) + \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\sigma_0^2 & z_1 < 2\alpha \\ -\frac{1}{2\alpha+1} \ln\left(\frac{x}{2\alpha}\right) & z_1 = 2\alpha \\ -\frac{1}{2(z_1+1)} \ln\left[-\frac{z_1+1}{2\alpha z_1(z_1-2\alpha)} \frac{x^2}{\ln\left(\frac{z_1+1}{2\alpha z_1(z_1-2\alpha)} x^2\right)}\right] & z_1 > 2\alpha \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

and

$$h_0 \sim \alpha \ln \left( \frac{x}{2\alpha} \right) + \alpha - \frac{1}{2} - \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2}\alpha\sigma_0^2 & z_1 < 2\alpha \\ \frac{\alpha}{2\alpha+1} \ln \left( \frac{x}{2\alpha} \right) & z_1 = 2\alpha \\ \frac{\alpha}{2(z_1+1)} \ln \left[ -\frac{z_1+1}{2\alpha z_1(z_1-2\alpha)} \frac{x^2}{\ln \left( \frac{z_1+1}{2\alpha z_1(z_1-2\alpha)} x^2 \right)} \right] & z_1 > 2\alpha \end{cases} . \quad (46)$$

These expressions are sufficient to determine the leading order behaviour of our approximations for  $K_\alpha(x)$ .

Beginning with the large  $x$  behaviour, we find that the integrals  $\mathcal{I}_n$  behave as

$$\mathcal{I}_n \sim C_n \frac{1}{x^n}, \quad (47)$$

where the  $C_n$  are just numbers which happen to be given by

$$C_n = \left( -\frac{1}{4} \right)^n \sum_{\ell=0}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \left( -\frac{3}{2} \right)^\ell \sum_{j=0}^{2\ell} \binom{2\ell}{j} \frac{(2j)!}{j!} \left( -\frac{1}{6} \right)^j, \quad (48)$$

$$= i\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \left( -\frac{1}{4} \right)^n \sum_{\ell=0}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \left( -\frac{3}{2} \right)^\ell U \left( \frac{1}{2}, 2\ell + \frac{3}{2}, -\frac{3}{2} \right). \quad (49)$$

In the latter expression,  $U(a, b, z)$  denotes the confluent hypergeometric function [9] and note that despite the presence of the imaginary factor  $i$ , the  $C_n$  are completely real. Accordingly, for large  $x$ , the leading order behaviour of  $K_\alpha(x)^{(m)}$  is just given by the pre-factor of Eq. (19) and thus we find that at *any* order  $m$

$$K_\alpha(x)^{(m)} \sim \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sigma_0^2 e^{-h_0} \sim \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2x}} e^{-x}. \quad (50)$$

Comparing this result with Eq. (5), we find that at the very least, our approximations capture the leading order large  $x$  asymptotic behaviour of  $K_\alpha(x)$ .

For small  $x$ , matters are more complicated as the leading order behaviour depends on our choice of  $z_1$  and all the  $\mathcal{I}_n$  also contribute at leading order such that the leading order behaviour of  $K_\alpha(x)^{(m)}$  depends on both  $m$  and  $z_1$ . For  $z_1 < 2\alpha$  however, we can write

$$K_\alpha(x)^{(m)} \sim \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sigma_0^2 \left( \frac{2\alpha}{x} \right)^\alpha e^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha\sigma_0^2 - \alpha + \frac{1}{2}} \left[ 1 + \sum_{n=2}^m \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \mathcal{I}_n \right], \quad (51)$$

where we have made use of the fact that our choice of  $h_0$  ensures that  $\mathcal{I}_1 = 0$ . On the other hand, according to Eqs. (3) and (4),  $K_\alpha(x)$  has the leading order small  $x$  behaviour

$$K_\alpha(x) \sim \frac{1}{2} \Gamma(\alpha) \left( \frac{2}{x} \right)^\alpha. \quad (52)$$

We thus find that our approximations will match the asymptotic small  $x$  behaviour if  $z_1$  and  $m$  are selected such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\Gamma(\alpha) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}\sigma_0^2\alpha^\alpha e^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha\sigma_0^2-\alpha+\frac{1}{2}} \left[ 1 + \sum_{n=2}^m \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \mathcal{I}_n(x \rightarrow 0) \right]. \quad (53)$$

For any approximation order  $m$ , we can use this equation to determine  $z_1$ . If there exists a  $z_1$  which satisfies this equation, then the approximation  $K_\alpha(x)^{(m)}$  with this value of  $z_1$  will be asymptotically valid for both large and small  $x$  and thus will describe a uniform approximation of  $K_\alpha(x)$  over all values of  $x$ . It is important to appreciate however that there is no guarantee that this equation will have a solution for  $z_1$ . In such cases, higher order terms are needed.

Before moving on to the results, it is worth tying up a few loose ends. First, note that the correct small  $x$  asymptotic behaviour is only obtained for  $z_1 < 2\alpha$ . For  $z_1 \geq 2\alpha$ , the additional logarithmic corrections which enter  $\sigma^2$ ,  $\xi$  and  $h_0$ , as described in Eqs. (40), (45) and (46), introduce additional  $x$  dependence which deviates from the correct asymptotic behaviour. Accordingly, only the first lines of these equations are relevant. Second, above, we set  $z_2 \rightarrow 0$  almost arbitrarily and it turned out that this was sufficient to guarantee that the large  $x$  behaviour of our approximations are asymptotically correct. Had this failed, a more general though less analytically tractable approach could have been taken in which both  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  are simultaneously varied to asymptotically match our approximations with the exact result. Additionally, there is another subtlety worth pointing out here. Eq. (31) is satisfied identically for  $z = 0$  thus it would seem that setting  $z_2 = 0$  provides no additional constraint on  $\langle e^{uz} \rangle$ . Despite this, Eqs. (36) and (38) are clearly not tautologies, even after taking the limit  $z_2 \rightarrow 0$ . To understand this, we need to reexamine Eq. (27). Trivially, this equation is satisfied for  $z = 0$  which is simply a statement that the normalisation of the underlying probability distribution is already exact up to first order. Indeed, by our definitions, any zeroth order Hamiltonian will result in a properly normalised underlying distribution and thus the normalisation will be exact at *all* orders. On the other hand, if we differentiate Eq. (27)  $k$  times with respect to  $z$  and substitute in  $z = 0$ , we obtain

$$\langle u^k H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle u^k \rangle_0 \langle H_1 \rangle_0 = 0, \quad (54)$$

i.e. Eq. (27) can be used to obtain constraints on the moments  $\langle u^k \rangle$  of our system. Comparing this constraint for  $k = 1$  with our results described above, we find that taking  $z_2 \rightarrow 0$  is equivalent to imposing

$$\langle u H_1 \rangle_0 - \langle u \rangle_0 \langle H_1 \rangle_0 = 0 \quad (55)$$

on our system, that is, taking  $z_2 \rightarrow 0$  is equivalent to demanding that not only Eq. (31) be satisfied at  $z = 0$  but also its first derivative and this is equivalent to imposing that the zeroth order expectation of the mean  $\langle u \rangle_0$  be exact up to

first order. This explains why setting  $z_2 \rightarrow 0$  is nontrivial and goes some way to accounting for its success at capturing the large  $x$  asymptotic behaviour, as imposing that the zeroth order first moment or ‘‘centre of mass’’ be exact up to first order is a reasonable preliminary expectation of any physically motivated theory.

#### 4. Results

Let’s simplify and recap our main findings. We expect that the modified Bessel function of the second kind  $K_\alpha(x)$  can be approximated up to  $m^{\text{th}}$  order by

$$K_\alpha(x)^{(m)} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sigma^2 \left(\frac{\alpha}{x}\right)^\alpha \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{x^2}{\alpha^2} e^{\sigma^2}}\right)^\alpha \times \\ \times e^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\alpha\sigma^2 - \sqrt{\alpha^2 + x^2 e^{\sigma^2}}} \left[1 + \sum_{n=2}^m \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \mathcal{I}_n(x, \alpha)\right], \quad (56)$$

where the  $\mathcal{I}_n$  are integrals given by

$$\mathcal{I}_n(x, \alpha) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv e^{-v^2/2} \left[ \sqrt{\alpha^2 + x^2 e^{\sigma^2}} \left( e^{-\sigma^2/2} \cosh(\sigma v) - 1 \right) + \right. \\ \left. - \alpha e^{-\sigma^2/2} \sinh(\sigma v) - \frac{1}{2}v^2 + \alpha\sigma v + \frac{1}{2} \right]^n \quad (57)$$

and  $\sigma$  is a function of  $x$  and  $\alpha$  defined implicitly by the equation

$$\left[ (4x)^2 \sinh^2\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_1\right) e^{\sigma^2} - (4\alpha)^2 \right] \sinh^2\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_1\right) = \\ = (2\alpha - z_1) z_1 \sigma^2 \left[ (2\alpha - z_1) z_1 \sigma^2 - 4\alpha \sinh(\sigma^2 z_1) \right]. \quad (58)$$

To solve this equation for  $\sigma$ , a choice needs to be made for  $z_1$  and if possible, it should be chosen so as to ensure that

$$\Gamma(\alpha) = \sqrt{2\pi\sigma_0^2} \alpha^\alpha e^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha\sigma_0^2 - \alpha + \frac{1}{2}} \left[ 1 + \sum_{n=2}^m \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \mathcal{I}_n(x=0, \alpha) \right]. \quad (59)$$


Here,  $\sigma_0$  simply denotes  $\sigma(x \rightarrow 0)$  and can be written explicitly in terms of the Lambert- $W$  function as

$$\sigma_0^2 = \frac{1}{z_1} \left[ W_{-1} \left( -\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha - z_1} \exp \left( -\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha - z_1} \right) \right) + \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha - z_1} \right]. \quad (60)$$

(This is just Eq. (42) with a specific choice of the branch of  $W$ .)

For instance, suppose we are interested in the second order approximation ( $m = 2$ ). Since

$$\mathcal{I}_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left[ x^2 \left( e^{\sigma^2} - 1 \right)^2 + 2\alpha^2 \left( e^{\sigma^2} - 1 \right) + 1 \right] - \sigma^2 \left[ \alpha^2 + \sqrt{\alpha^2 + x^2 e^{\sigma^2}} \right], \quad (61)$$



**Figure 3.**  $z_1$  as a function of  $\alpha$ , as determined by Eq. (59). For each value of  $m$ ,  $z_1(\alpha)$  can be seen to be a slowly varying sigmoid function over 6 orders magnitude of  $\alpha$ . The black dots indicates the Padé approximant given by Eq. (63) and can be seen to closely approximate the dashed red line corresponding to the  $m = 2$  case.

Eq. (59) requires that we select  $z_1$  such that

$$\Gamma(\alpha) = \sqrt{2\pi\sigma_0^2}\alpha^\alpha e^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha\sigma_0^2 - \alpha + \frac{1}{2}} \left[ \frac{5}{4} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 (e^{\sigma_0^2} - 1) - \frac{1}{2}(\alpha + 1)\alpha\sigma_0^2 \right], \quad (62)$$

where  $\sigma_0$  is given in terms of  $\alpha$  and  $z_1$  by Eq. (60). For any given  $\alpha$ , this equation can be solved numerically however it is worth appreciating that its solution for  $z_1$  as a function of  $\alpha$  is just some sort of sigmoid function. In particular, approximating the gamma function with Stirling's formula, one can obtain a simple Padé approximation [3] of this function

$$z_1(\alpha) = -\frac{396949 + 892620\alpha}{1012625 + 4284576\alpha}, \quad (63)$$

which well approximates  $z_1$  for all  $\alpha \geq 10^{-3}$ , as can be seen in Fig. 3. For large  $\alpha$ ,  $z_1(\alpha)$  just tends to the constant  $-5/24$ .

Indeed, as shown in Fig. 3, at any order  $m$ , whenever Eq. (59) has a solution for  $z_1$ , it tends to be some sort of sigmoid function, varying between two distinct values for large and small  $\alpha$ . As these values turn out to be negative, only the first line of Eqs. (40), (45) and (46), corresponding to  $z_1 < 2\alpha$ , are ever relevant, which is consistent with the previously noted requirement for asymptotic matching to be possible. This also justifies the explicit use of the branch  $W_{-1}$  in Eq. (60). With this function  $z_1(\alpha)$  in hand, Eq. (58) can be used to numerically obtain the function  $\sigma(x, \alpha)$  which can then be substituted into Eq. (56) to obtain an  $m^{\text{th}}$  order approximation for  $K_\alpha(x)$ .

Since solving Eq. (59) for  $z_1(\alpha)$  and Eq. (58) for  $\sigma(x, \alpha)$  entails finding the solutions to highly nonlinear equations, for practical purposes, it is worth briefly outlining robust numerical methods to achieve this. To determine  $z_1(\alpha)$ , it is in fact more convenient to use Eq. (59) to define a nonlinear function of  $\sigma_0 = \sigma(x \rightarrow 0, \alpha)$

$$f(\sigma_0) = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_0^2\alpha^\alpha e^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha\sigma_0^2 - \alpha + \frac{1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} - \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{n=2}^m \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \mathcal{I}_n(x=0, \alpha)}, \quad (64)$$

such that the solution to Eq. (59) is simply the root of this function. The advantage of defining  $f(\sigma_0)$  in this manner is that for any  $\alpha$  and  $m$ ,  $f(\sigma_0)$  is simply a sigmoid function in  $\sigma_0$  and thus never grows so large that numerical methods break down. Indeed, any ordinary bisection method, starting on the interval  $[0, 1/\alpha]$  can be used to rapidly and accurately obtain the root of  $f(\sigma_0)$ . With  $\sigma_0(\alpha)$  in hand, one can now use the relationship given by Eq. (41) to find a solution for  $z_1(\alpha)$ . By approximating the function

$$g(z_1) = \sigma_0^2 z_1 (2\alpha - z_1) - 2\alpha \left(1 - e^{-\sigma_0^2 z_1}\right), \quad (65)$$

as a cubic polynomial around  $z_1 = 0$ ,

$$g(z_1) \approx - \left[ \frac{1}{3} \alpha \sigma_0^4 z_1 + (1 - \alpha \sigma_0^2) \right] \sigma_0^2 z_1^2, \quad (66)$$

it immediately becomes apparent that the nontrivial root of  $g(z_1)$  must lie inside the interval  $\left[-3(1 - \alpha \sigma_0^2) / (\alpha \sigma_0^4), \alpha + W_{-1}(-\alpha \sigma_0^2 e^{-\alpha \sigma_0^2}) / \sigma_0^2\right]$  and thus here too, an ordinary bisection method can be used to reliably obtain  $z_1(\alpha)$  with any level of precision desired.


Once  $z_1(\alpha)$  and  $\sigma_0(\alpha)$  have been obtained, either using the method just described or the approximation given in Eq. (63), which is valid for  $m = 2$ , together with Eq. (60), the function  $\sigma(x, \alpha)$  needs to be obtained from Eq. (58). Though we cannot write an explicit expression for  $\sigma(x, \alpha)$  in terms of  $x$ , we can trivially write the inverse relationship

$$x = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha^2 e^{-\sigma^2}}{\sinh^2\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_1\right)} + \frac{e^{-\sigma^2} (2\alpha - z_1) z_1 \sigma^2}{16 \sinh^4\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} z_1\right)} [(2\alpha - z_1) z_1 \sigma^2 - 4\alpha \sinh(\sigma^2 z_1)]}. \quad (67)$$

Plotting this function over the domain  $\sigma \in (0, \sigma_0]$ , one finds that this is a monotonically decreasing function of  $\sigma$  and is thus invertible. Accordingly, it is easy to determine  $\sigma(x, \alpha)$  by using this equation to calculate  $x$  as a function of  $\sigma$  and then inverting the result. Note that this inversion does not require solving an equation (not even algebraic).


Fig. 4 compares the first few of these approximations for  $K_1(x)$  with the exact function. In contrast with Figs. 1(a) and 2(a), Fig. 4(a) shows that these





**Figure 4.** (a) The modified Bessel function  $K_1(x)$  (solid) compared with the first few approximations given by the SCE,  $K_1(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(m)}$  (dashed). (b) The relative error of each approximation. The approximations are uniformly accurate over all orders of magnitude.

approximations accurately capture the behaviour of  $K_1(x)$  over all orders of magnitude! Indeed, as can be seen from Fig. 4(b), the maximum error of the approximations anywhere is roughly 1%. Furthermore, for large  $x$ , even the lowest order approximation,  $K_1(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(2)}$ , is more precise than the first few asymptotic expansions shown by Fig. 2(b) and higher order approximations rapidly outclass the asymptotic expansions. On the other hand, for small  $x$ , while the correct asymptotic behaviour of our approximations is achieved by design, the error in the approximation is not necessarily reduced by taking higher orders. Accordingly, for small  $x$ , the lowest order approximation shown  $K_1(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(2)}$  is as good as the highest




**Figure 5.** The relative error of the second order SCE approximations  $K_\alpha(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(2)}$ . (a)  $\alpha \in \{1, 1/2, 1/4, 1/8\}$ . (b)  $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 4, 8\}$ . The SCE is able to approximate  $K_\alpha(x)$  for any  $\alpha > 0$  though it performs substantially better for larger  $\alpha$ .

and it is reasonable to conjecture that this behaviour extends to all higher orders. This indicates that unlike the case for large  $x$ , asymptotically matching the SCE for small  $x$  is only sufficient to capture the leading order behaviour. Higher order corrections are not automatically matched as appears to be the case for large  $x$ .

It is also worth mentioning that we have only showed even order approximations of the form  $K_1(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(m)}$  because for odd  $m$ , Eq. (59) simply does not have a real solution for  $z_1$  and thus small  $x$  asymptotic matching is impossible.


Similar results are obtained for other values of  $\alpha$  and, for the case of  $m = 2$ , there is no noticeable difference between using Eq. (63) to approximate  $z_1$  versus finding the root of Eq. (65). Fig. 5 shows the relative error,



**Figure 6.** The maximum relative error of  $K_\alpha(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(m)}$  as a function of  $\alpha$  (note the x-axis is also logarithmic). For every  $m$ , the maximum error is seen to rapidly shrink with increasing  $\alpha$  indicating that all the approximations are better for large  $\alpha$ . Additionally, one observes a cross-over around  $\alpha \approx 1.68$ . For values of  $\alpha$  larger than this, the maximum relative error decreases as the order  $m$  is increased and thus increasing the order of the approximation uniformly improves the quality of the approximation. In contrast, for values of  $\alpha$  smaller than this value, the maximum relative error increases and thus while higher orders may improve the accuracy of the large  $x$  tail of  $K_\alpha(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(m)}$  (as seen in Fig. 4), they cannot uniformly improve the approximation everywhere.

$|(K_\alpha(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(2)} - K_\alpha(x))/K_\alpha(x)|$ , of the second order SCE approximation  $K_\alpha(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(2)}$  for various  $\alpha$ . In both subfigures, the dotted red lines denote the relative error of  $K_1(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(2)}$  and can be used as a reference. Though the SCE is clearly seen to be able to approximate  $K_\alpha(x)$  for any  $\alpha > 0$ , it is also clear that it performs far better for large  $\alpha$  than for small  $\alpha$ . Indeed, Fig. 6 shows the maximum relative error of each approximation as a function of  $\alpha$  and for every order  $m$ , we find that the relative error of  $K_\alpha(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(m)}$  is more tightly bounded as  $\alpha$  is increased. This figure also makes it apparent that higher orders can in fact be used to uniformly improve the approximations but only if  $\alpha$  is sufficiently large. For small  $\alpha$ , the lowest order approximation,  $m = 2$ , is optimal for *uniformly* bounding the relative error but this ceases to be the case once  $\alpha$  exceeds roughly  $\sim 1.68$ . Note however that if one is only interested in large values of  $x$ , then, as shown in Fig. 4, higher orders can be used to obtain better approximations, even for small values of  $\alpha$ .

Let us finish this section with a brief consideration of the convergence properties of our approximations on the complex plane. Though our primary goal has been to uniformly approximate  $K_\alpha(x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , it is interesting and important to understand whether our approximation scheme generalises to complex values  $x \in \mathbb{C}$ . The power series and asymptotic expansions discussed in the introduction



**Figure 7.**  $K_1(x)$  and  $K_1(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(2)}$  as functions of  $x \in \mathbb{C}$  (note that we only show the right half-plane  $\text{Re}(x) > 0$ ). In the upper two figures, the hue corresponds to complex argument,  $\arg K_1(x)$ , while the brightness corresponds to its magnitude,  $|K_1(x)|$ . The low order approximation  $K_1(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(2)}$  can be seen to qualitatively capture the behaviour of  $K_1(x)$  over the entire right half-plane. The relative error between the approximation  $K_1(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(2)}$  and  $K_1(x)$  is shown in the lower figure and can be seen to rapidly decrease as one moves away from the origin in all directions.

[Eqs. (2), (3), (4) and (6)] are in fact valid over the entire complex plane, with the exception of the negative real axis where a branch cut occurs, but the integral representation of  $K_\alpha(x)$  given by Eq. (15) only converges for  $x \in \mathbb{C}$  when  $\text{Re}(x) > 0$ , ie. the right half-plane [9]. Since our entire approximation scheme is based on approximating this integral representation, it would be surprising for our approximation to be able to approximate  $K_\alpha(x)$  outside of the right half-plane. Since the auxiliary functions  $z_1(\alpha)$  and  $\sigma_0^2(\alpha)$  only depend on  $\alpha$  and the order of the approximation  $m$ , these quantities remain the same regardless of whether  $x$  is real or complex. On the other hand, the function  $\sigma^2(x, \alpha)$  given implicitly by

Eq. (67) must necessarily become complex as  $x$  acquires a non-vanishing imaginary part. Further, when we allow  $x$  and  $\sigma^2(x, \alpha)$  to take on complex values, Eq. (67) no longer becomes one-to-one and thus Eq. (67) can no longer be simply inverted to obtain  $\sigma^2$  as a function of  $x$ . Despite having several solutions, Eq. (67) has only one solution that can be considered a continuous generalisation of the solution on the real axis and thus Eq. (67) can be solved numerically using initial values close to the solution for  $\sigma^2(x, \alpha)$  on the real axis. While this works for all  $x \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\text{Re}(x) > 0$ , this solution ceases to be accessible once  $\text{Re}(x) < 0$  and thus, as expected, our approximations are unable to describe  $K_\alpha(x)$  in the left half-plane.

Fig. 7 shows a complex representation of  $K_1(x)$  and the second order approximation  $K_1(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(2)}$  over the right half-plane, as well as the relative error between them. In the top row, the hue corresponds to the complex arguments,  $\arg K_1(x)$  and  $\arg K_1(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(2)}$ , while the brightness corresponds to the magnitudes,  $|K_1(x)|$  and  $|K_1(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(2)}|$ . As can be seen, the approximation  $K_1(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(2)}$  qualitatively captures the behaviour of  $K_1(x)$  over the entire right half-plane. The plot in the second row shows the relative error between the exact function and the approximation and, like in the purely real case, we find that the relative error rapidly decreases as  $|x|$  becomes large. Similar results are obtained for approximations  $K_\alpha(x)_{\text{SCE}}^{(m)}$  with higher orders  $m$  and for other values  $\alpha$ . Accordingly, we find that even though our approximations were designed to approximate  $K_1(x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , they are not particularly limited by such assumptions.

## 5. Discussion

We have shown that asymptotic matching of the SCE can produce superb uniform approximations of the modified Bessel functions of the second kind  $K_\alpha(x)$ . Indeed, it is reasonable to suspect that this kind of asymptotic matching should be generically successful and thus highly valuable whenever such asymptotic results are known. The success of the application of a technique from statistical physics to the task of approximating a “special function” also demonstrates the substantial range of applicability of such methods.

It is worth drawing attention to the moment generating function formalism used in this paper. Previous applications of the SCE have tended to focus on imposing that the zeroth order moments  $\langle u^k \rangle_0$  be exact up to some order [29, 30]. In principle, we could have used the same approach and then attempted to modify the moment order  $k$  to obtain the desired asymptotic behaviour. This however is challenging as  $k$  is typically discrete and it is unlikely that integer  $k$  will manage to produce the desired asymptotic behaviour. In [30], this limitation is circumvented by first assuming that  $k$  is an (even) integer and then simply generalising the resultant expressions to any  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ . While it is unclear why this should be legal, such an approach could certainly have been used here though the

additional complication introduced by requiring two such constraints for the two free parameters  $\xi$  and  $\sigma$  would make the equations substantially more involved than in that case. Instead, we have chosen to introduce a new formalism of focusing on the moment generating function  $\langle e^{uz} \rangle$ . In particular, we have attempted to impose that the zeroth order approximation of this function of  $z$  be exact up to first order. Since

$$\langle e^{uz} \rangle_0 = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \langle u^k \rangle_0 z^k, \quad (68)$$

imposing that this expression be exact up to first order at some point  $z_1$  is equivalent to imposing that a particular linear combination of all the moments  $\langle u^k \rangle_0$  be exact up to first order. The task of deciding which linear combination to select can then be performed by demanding the desired asymptotic matching. It is important to appreciate how this approach is simultaneously simpler and less arbitrary than the previously used approaches of directly targeting the moments  $\langle u^k \rangle$ . Additionally, as pointed out just before Eq. (54), the resultant equations for the moment generating function  $\langle e^{uz} \rangle$  can easily be converted into equations for the moments  $\langle u^k \rangle$  by mere repeated differentiation. Accordingly, nothing is lost by first considering the expansion of the moment generating function, even if one ultimately settles on using the moments themselves.

Despite its great success, there is also much to learn from the limitations of the method. The most glaring limitation of our results is that for small  $x$ , taking higher orders provides no additional benefit over the lowest order approximation when  $\alpha \lesssim 1.68$ . That is, the asymptotic matching provides superb approximations but, at least under these circumstances, the quality of these approximations is “frozen” for small  $x$ . The origin of this behaviour is undoubtedly the fact that in the limit of  $x \rightarrow 0$ , the Hamiltonian given by Eq. (16) ceases to be bounded and thus our “partition function”, given by Eq. (15), becomes singular. As such, while we suspect that this is not a generic feature of the method, it is also likely not unique to this problem. Accordingly, for problems which have this frozen characteristic, additional techniques need to be introduced to “unfreeze” the quality of the approximations. One very natural suggestion is to use Eq. (26) to ensure that the zeroth order approximation for  $K_\alpha(x)$  is exact up to say  $m^{\text{th}}$  order instead of just first order. Alternatively, Eq. (12) could be used to ensure that the zeroth order moment generating function  $\langle e^{uz} \rangle_0$  be exact up to higher orders. While both of these suggestions are likely to succeed at unfreezing the quality of the approximations, they suffer from the original problem that asymptotic matching was supposed to solve, namely too much freedom! As before, it is not a priori obvious which of these new approximations will succeed and thus one must again resort to comparison with empirical results. We thus consider such a resolution to be unsatisfactory. Developing an approach capable of unfreezing such approximations without resorting to comparisons with empirical results is thus left as an open question for study.

Finally, in this paper, we have made use of an interesting comparison between an integral representation of the mathematical function  $K_\alpha(x)$  and the partition function  $Z$  describing the equilibrium properties of a single particle in a certain hyperbolic potential-well to develop fruitful insights into  $K_\alpha(x)$ . As a purely mathematical object, it is interesting to ask whether other insights from statistical physics could shed light on the properties of  $K_\alpha(x)$ . For instance, can the dynamical properties of a system governed by the Hamiltonian defined in Eq. (16) tell us anything interesting about the function  $K_\alpha(x)$ ? This too, we leave as an open question for contemplation.

## References

- [1] C. M. Bender and S. A. Orszag, *Advanced Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers I* (Springer, Berlin, 1999).
- [2] E. J. Hinch, *Perturbation Methods* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991).
- [3] G. A. Baker and P. Graves-Morris, *Padé Approximants: Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications, Vol. 59*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996).
- [4] W. D. McComb, *Renormalization Methods: A Guide for Beginners* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003).
- [5] K. J. Wiese, *On the perturbation expansion of the KPZ equation*, Journal of statistical physics **93**, 143 (1998).
- [6] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables* (Dover, New York, 1964).
- [7] N. N. Lebedev and R. A. Silverman, *Special Functions and Their Applications* (Prentice-Hall, N.J., 1965).
- [8] Y. L. Luke, *The Special Functions and Their Approximations* (Academic Press, New York, 1969).
- [9] F. W. J. Olver, A. B. Olde Daalhuis, D. W. Lozier, B. I. Schneider, R. F. Boisvert, C. W. Clark, B. R. Miller, B. V. Saunders, H. S. Cohl, and M. A. McClain, Eds., *NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions* (<https://dlmf.nist.gov/10>, 2023).
- [10] M. Schwartz and S. Edwards, *Nonlinear deposition: A new approach*, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **20**, 301 (1992).
- [11] M. Schwartz and S. F. Edwards, *Peierls-Boltzmann equation for ballistic deposition*, Phys. Rev. E **57**, 5730 (1998).
- [12] E. Katzav and M. Schwartz, *Self-consistent expansion for the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation with correlated noise*, Phys. Rev. E **60**, 5677 (1999).

- [13] E. Katzav and M. Schwartz, *Existence of the upper critical dimension of the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation*, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications **309**, 69 (2002).
- [14] M. Schwartz and S. Edwards, *Stretched exponential in non-linear stochastic field theories*, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications **312**, 363 (2002).
- [15] E. Katzav, *Self-consistent expansion for the molecular beam epitaxy equation*, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 032103 (2002).
- [16] E. Katzav, *Growing surfaces with anomalous diffusion: Results for the fractal Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation*, Phys. Rev. E **68**, 031607 (2003).
- [17] E. Katzav, *Self-consistent expansion results for the nonlocal Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation*, Phys. Rev. E **68**, 046113 (2003).
- [18] E. Katzav and M. Schwartz, *Numerical evidence for stretched exponential relaxations in the Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation*, Phys. Rev. E **69**, 052603 (2004).
- [19] E. Katzav and M. Schwartz, *Kardar–Parisi–Zhang equation with temporally correlated noise: A self-consistent approach*, Phys. Rev. E **70**, 011601 (2004).
- [20] S. F. Edwards and M. Schwartz, *Lagrangian statistical mechanics applied to non-linear stochastic field equations*, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications **303**, 357 (2002).
- [21] E. Katzav and M. Adda-Bedia, *Roughness of tensile crack fronts in heterogenous materials*, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **76**, 450 (2006).
- [22] E. Katzav, M. Adda-Bedia, M. Ben Amar, and A. Boudaoud, *Roughness of moving elastic lines: Crack and wetting fronts*, Phys. Rev. E **76**, 051601 (2007).
- [23] E. Katzav, M. Adda-Bedia, and B. Derrida, *Fracture surfaces of heterogeneous materials: a 2d solvable model*, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **78**, 46006 (2007).
- [24] E. Katzav and M. Adda-Bedia, *Stability and roughness of tensile cracks in disordered materials*, Physical Review E **88**, 052402 (2013).
- [25] M. S. Li, T. Nattermann, H. Rieger, and M. Schwartz, *Vortex lines in the three-dimensional XY model with random phase shifts*, Physical Review B **54**, 16024 (1996).
- [26] C. Steinbock, E. Katzav, and A. Boudaoud, *Structure of fluctuating thin sheets under random forcing*, Phys. Rev. Research **4**, 033096 (2022).
- [27] C. Steinbock and E. Katzav, *Dynamics of fluctuating thin sheets under random forcing*, Phys. Rev. E **107**, 025002 (2023).
- [28] C. Steinbock and E. Katzav, *Thermally driven elastic membranes are quasi-linear across all scales*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **56**, 215002 (2023).



- [29] M. Schwartz and E. Katzav, *The ideas behind the self-consistent expansion*, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment, P04023 (2008).
- [30] B. Remez and M. Goldstein, *From divergent perturbation theory to an exponentially convergent self-consistent expansion*, Phys. Rev. D **98**, 056017 (2018).
- [31] A. Cohen, S. Bialy, and M. Schwartz, *The self consistent expansion applied to the factorial function*, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications **463**, 503 (2016).
- [32] L. Tolstoy, *Anna Karenina* (Project Gutenberg, [www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/1399](http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/1399), 1998).
- [33] H. Segur, S. Tanveer, and H. Levine, *Asymptotics Beyond All Orders* (Springer, New York, 1991).
- [34] M. V. Berry and C. J. Howls, *Hyperasymptotics*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical and Physical Sciences **430**, 653 (1990).
- [35] M. V. Berry and C. J. Howls, *Hyperasymptotics for integrals with saddles*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical and Physical Sciences **434**, 657 (1991).
- [36] M. V. Berry, *Stokes' phenomenon; smoothing a victorian discontinuity*, Publications Mathématiques de l'IHÉS **68**, 211 (1988).
- [37] M. V. Berry, *Uniform asymptotic smoothing of Stokes's discontinuities*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences **422**, 7 (1989).
- [38] T. R. Rabemananjara, *Resummation and machine learning techniques*, PhD thesis (Univeristy of Milan, 2021).
- [39] D. I. Palade and L. M. Pomârjanschi, *Approximations of the Modified Bessel Functions of the Second Kind  $K_\nu$ . Applications in Random Field Generation*, Romanian Journal of Physics **68**, 108 (2023).
- [40] R. Balescu, *Equilibrium and Non-Equilibrium Statistical Mechanics* (Wiley, New York, 1975).
- [41] M. Plischke and B. Bergersen, *Equilibrium Statistical Physics*, 3rd ed. (World Scientific, Singapore, 2006).