

Impossibility of the ground-state total angular momentum taking any value

I. V. Komarov* and R. Tarrach

Departament d'Estructura i Constituents de la Matèria, Universitat de Barcelona,[†] Barcelona, Spain

(Received 4 January 1989)

We prove that for any nonrelativistic rotationally invariant two-particle quantum system whose interaction is velocity independent the total angular momentum of the ground state is bounded by the sum of the spins; i.e., $j_{\max} = s_1 + s_2$.

There are basic (and old) questions in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics which, surprisingly, seem to not have been answered in its 60-plus years of existence. A survey of the literature and an oral sampling indicate that one of them is the following: what are the possible ground-state total angular momentum values j of a system of two particles of spin s_1 and s_2 ? It is known that if the interaction is velocity-dependent j can take any value. We therefore restrict ourselves to velocity-independent potentials. For $s_1 = s_2 = 0$ one knows the answer: due to the centrifugal barrier $l=0$ and thus $j=0$. For $s_1=0, s_2=\frac{1}{2}$ the answer is $j=\frac{1}{2}$.¹ For $s_1=s_2=\frac{1}{2}$ the answer is, restricting oneself to parity and time-reversal invariant interactions, $j=0, 1$.¹ One might think that this is what one expects for $l=0$ but, of course, neither is l a good quantum number nor, as shown in Ref. 1, does the ground state necessarily have a component with $l=0$. Indeed, the ground state can be a pure $l=1$ state.

In this paper we do three things. We streamline the proof of Ref. 1 very much by working in a suitable basis. We extend the proof for $s_1=s_2=\frac{1}{2}$ to any type of velocity-independent interactions. The result remains the same: $j=0$ or 1 . And, most importantly, we generalize the proof to any values of the spin of the particles. The result is $j_{\max} = s_1 + s_2$.

Consider the most general rotationally invariant Hamiltonian describing the velocity-independent interaction between two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ particles,

$$H = p_r^2 + \frac{\mathbf{L}^2}{r^2} + V_c(r) + V_\sigma(r) A_\sigma + V_T(r) A_T + V_p(r) A_p + V_s(r) A_s + V_d(r) A_d, \tag{1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_s &= (\mathbf{S}_1 + \mathbf{S}_2) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}} \equiv \mathbf{S} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}} \equiv S_r = \mathbf{J} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}, \\ A_\sigma &= \mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2 = (2S^2 - 3)/4, \\ A_T &= 3\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}} \mathbf{S}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}} - \mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2 = (3S_r^2 - S^2)/2, \\ A_p &= \mathbf{S}_1 \times \mathbf{S}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}, \\ A_d &= (\mathbf{S}_1 - \mathbf{S}_2) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

with $\mathbf{S}_i = \sigma_i/2$. No parity or time-reversal invariance has been assumed. Consider the set of mutually commuting operators

$$\mathbf{J}^2, J_3, \mathbf{S}^2, S_r \tag{3}$$

with common eigenstates

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}^2 |j, m; s, h\rangle &= j(j+1) |j, m; s, h\rangle, \quad j=0, 1, 2, \dots \\ J_3 |j, m; s, h\rangle &= m |j, m; s, h\rangle, \quad m \in [-j, j] \\ \mathbf{S}^2 |j, m; s, h\rangle &= s(s+1) |j, m; s, h\rangle, \quad s=0, 1 \\ S_r |j, m; s, h\rangle &= h |j, m; s, h\rangle, \\ &h \in [-s, s], \quad j > 0, \quad h=0, \quad j=0. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

As

$$[H, \mathbf{J}^2] = [H, J_3] = 0 \tag{5}$$

it is enough to consider the m -independent matrix elements

$$\langle j, m; s', h' | H | j, m; s, h \rangle = \langle j, m; s, h | H | j, m; s', h' \rangle^* \tag{6}$$

which for $j > 0$ correspond to a 4×4 and for $j=0$ to a 2×2 matrix. Now, the five operators given in (2) form a closed algebra. Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} [S_r, A_d] &= 0, \\ [S_r, A_p] &= 0, \\ [\mathbf{S}^2, A_d] &= 4i A_p, \\ [\mathbf{S}^2, A_p] &= -i A_d, \\ [A_p, A_d] &= i(S_r^2 - \mathbf{S}^2 + 1). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The important point is that \mathbf{J}^2 commutes with all these operators and does not appear in the algebra. In fact, it cannot. Thus the matrix elements of these operators are j independent (with the proper choice of phases). Let us see this explicitly.

The first four commutators of (7) imply, in a simplified notation,

$$\begin{aligned} (h' - h) \langle s' h' | A_d | s h \rangle &= 0, \\ [s'(s'+1) - s(s+1)] \langle s' h' | A_d | s h \rangle &= 4i \langle s' h' | A_p | s h \rangle, \\ (h' - h) \langle s' h' | A_p | s h \rangle &= 0, \\ [s'(s'+1) - s(s+1)] \langle s' h' | A_p | s h \rangle &= -i \langle s' h' | A_d | s h \rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

from which it follows that there is only one independent nonvanishing matrix element

$$\langle 10|A_d|00\rangle = 2i\langle 10|A_p|00\rangle, \quad (9)$$

The last commutator of (7) finally leads to

$$|\langle 10|A_d|00\rangle| = 1 \quad (10)$$

so that absorbing the possible j -dependent phase of the matrix element (9) into $|j, m; 0, 0\rangle$ no j dependence enters through the spin part of H . Thus the whole j dependence comes from L^2 . It is not difficult to study the matrix elements of L^2 in the basis (3). This is best done with the help of

$$\begin{aligned} [L^2, S^2] &= 0, \\ [S_r, [S_r, L^2]] &= L^2 - J^2 - S^2 + 2S_r^2, \\ [L^2, [L^2, S_r]] &= 2\{L^2, S_r\}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

which imply

$$\begin{aligned} [s'(s'+1) - s(s+1)]\langle s'h'|L^2|sh\rangle &= 0, \\ [(h'-h)^2 - 1]\langle s'h'|L^2|sh\rangle & \\ &= [-j(j+1) - s(s+1) + 2h^2]\delta_{s,s'}\delta_{h,h'}, \\ (h+h')\langle s'h'|L^2|sh\rangle - 2\langle s'h'|L^2S_rL^2|sh\rangle & \\ &= 2(h+h')\langle s'h'|L^2|sh\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

From here one readily obtains the only nonvanishing matrix elements

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 00|L^2|00\rangle &= j(j+1), \\ \langle 1h|L^2|1h\rangle &= j(j+1) + 2 - 2h^2, \\ |\langle 1h\pm 1|L^2|1h\rangle|^2 &= 2j(j+1). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Thus, with a particular choice of phases of, say, $|j, m; 1, 1\rangle$ and $|j, m; 1, 0\rangle$ and the ordering $|00\rangle$, $|11\rangle$, $|10\rangle$, and $|1-1\rangle$, we find for $j > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} H_j &= p_r^2 + V_c + \frac{j(j+1)}{r^2} + \frac{V_\sigma}{4} \\ &+ \begin{pmatrix} -V_\sigma & 0 & V_d + i\frac{V_p}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{V_T + V_s}{2} & \frac{\sqrt{2j(j+1)}}{r^2} & 0 \\ V_d - i\frac{V_p}{2} & \frac{\sqrt{2j(j+1)}}{r^2} & \frac{2}{r^2} - V_T & \frac{\sqrt{2j(j+1)}}{r^2} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{2j(j+1)}}{r^2} & \frac{V_T - V_s}{2} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

from which it follows, using the Hellmann-Feynman theorem,² that

$$H_1 < H_2 < H_3 < \dots \quad (15)$$

This is seen immediately from the derivative of H_j with respect to j ,

$$H'_j = \frac{2j+1}{r^2} + \frac{2j+1}{\sqrt{2j(j+1)}} \frac{1}{r^2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (16)$$

which is non-negative (recall $j > 0$) for $j = 1$ and positive for $j > 1$ because

$$(H'_j)_{ii} \geq \sum_{k (\neq i)} |(H'_j)_{ki}|, \quad j \geq 1 \quad (17)$$

with strict noninequality for $j > 1$.³

One can extend this proof to any spin. Consider two particles of spin s_1 and s_2 . The Hamiltonian will be more

complicated than in (1), as products of spin matrices do not linearize as for spin $\frac{1}{2}$. Still, there is only a finite number of spin-dependent operators and they can all be written as monomials in S_r , S^2 , A_d , and A_p . Thus, the generalization of (7) to arbitrary spins suffices for generating the whole algebra

$$\begin{aligned} [S_r, A_d] &= 0, \\ [S_r, A_p] &= 0, \\ [S^2, A_d] &= 4iA_p, \\ [S^2, A_p] &= i[s_1(s_1+1) - s_2(s_2+1)]S_r - i\{A_d, S^2\}/2, \\ [A_p, A_d] &= i[s_1(s_1+1) + s_2(s_2+1)] \\ &\quad - i(2S^2 - S_r^2 + A_d^2)/2. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Again, J^2 does not appear. The first four commutators lead to the following expressions for the only nonvanishing matrix elements of A_p and A_d :

$$\begin{aligned} \langle sh | A_d | sh \rangle &= \frac{s_1(s_1+1) - s_2(s_2+1)}{s(s+1)} h, \\ \langle s+1h | A_d | sh \rangle &= \frac{2i}{s+1} \langle s+1h | A_p | sh \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

With the help of (19) the last equation of (18) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} (2s+3) |\langle sh | A_d | s+1h \rangle|^2 - (2s-1) |\langle sh | A_d | s-1h \rangle|^2 \\ = 2[s_1(s_1+1) + s_2(s_2+1) - s(s+1)] + h^2 \\ - h^2 \left[\frac{s_1(s_1+1) - s_2(s_2+1)}{s(s+1)} \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

This allows an easy computation of $|\langle sh | A_d | s+1h \rangle|$ which of course is j independent.

Equations (11) and (12) hold for any values of s_1 and s_2 . They lead to the following generalization of (13):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle sh | \mathbf{L}^2 | sh \rangle &= j(j+1) + s(s+1) - 2h^2, \\ |\langle sh | \mathbf{L}^2 | sh-1 \rangle| \\ &= \sqrt{[j(j+1) - h(h-1)][s(s+1) - h(h-1)]}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Let us choose the states $|j, m; s, h\rangle$ with $h \neq -s$ such that the phase of $\langle sh | \mathbf{L}^2 | sh-1 \rangle$ is zero, so that the right-hand side of the second equation of (21) is the matrix element (not its modulus). There are now only $2s_2+1$ (with $s_1 \geq s_2$) states with unfixed phase left. This is not enough for fixing the phases of all $\langle sh | A_d | s+1h \rangle$ and thus to ensure that no j dependence creeps in through these phases. In order to solve this problem consider the double commutator

$$[\mathbf{L}^2, [\mathbf{L}^2, A_d]] = 2\{\mathbf{L}^2, A_d\}. \quad (22)$$

Using (21), with the above mentioned phase convention, one obtains from (22), after a certain amount of algebra,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle s+1h | A_d | sh \rangle &= \left[\frac{(s+1)^2 - h^2}{(s+1)^2 - (h-1)^2} \right]^{1/2} \\ &\times \langle s+1h-1 | A_d | sh-1 \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

which allows to fix the phases of all $\langle s+1h | A_d | sh \rangle$ in such a way that no j dependence enters by taking the phase of $\langle s+1-s | A_d | s-s \rangle$ to be zero. This requires an appropriate choice of the phase of the states $|j, m; s, -s\rangle$ for all $s < s_1 + s_2$. Incidentally all matrix elements of A_d can now be obtained from (20) and (23).

The upshot of this study is that all the j dependence is contained in (21). The final stages of the proof go through as before in (16) and (17). The equivalent to (17) now reads

$$1 \geq \frac{\sqrt{s(s+1) - h(h-1)}}{2\sqrt{j(j+1) - h(h-1)}} + \frac{\sqrt{s(s+1) - h(h+1)}}{2\sqrt{j(j+1) - h(h+1)}} \quad (24)$$

which holds for $j = s_1 + s_2$ and holds strictly for $j > s_1 + s_2$.

Thus $j_{\max} = s_1 + s_2$.

One of us (R.T.) would like to thank Alberto Galindo for pointing out that the proof was not complete. He has given recently a different proof of the same theorem (Ref. 3). This collaboration has taken place within the University of Barcelona–University of Leningrad exchange agreement. Financial support by CICYT (Spain) Contract No. AEN-88-0016 is acknowledged.

*Permanent address: Department of Computational Physics, University of Leningrad, Leningrad, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

†Mailing address: Faculty of Physics, Diagonal 647, 08028 Barcelona, Spain.

¹A. Galindo and R. Tarrach, Ann. Phys. (N.Y) **173**, 430 (1987).

²H. Hellmann, Acta Physicochim. URSS **6**, 913 (1935); R. P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. **56**, 340 (1939).

³A. Galindo, J. Phys. A **22**, L593 (1989).