

Localization at threshold in non-commutative space

Pulak Ranjan Giri*

Theory Division, Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, 1/AF Bidhannagar, Calcutta 700064, India

(Dated: June 21, 2024)

The ground state energy of a scale symmetric system usually does not possess any lower bound, thus making the system quantum mechanically unstable. Self-adjointness and re-normalization techniques usually provide the system a scale and thus making the ground state bounded from below. We on the other hand use non-commutative quantum mechanics and exploit the non-commutative parameter Θ as a scale for a scale symmetric system. The resulting Hamiltonian for the system then allows an unusual bound state at the threshold of the energy, $E = 0$. The existence of bound state at threshold for systems with inverse-square potential can be regarded as the confirmation of spacial non-commutativity. Apart from the Hamiltonian \hat{H} we also compute the other two generators of the $so(2,1)$ algebra, the dilation \hat{D} and the special conformal generator \hat{K} in the non-commutative space. The $so(2,1)$ algebra is not closed in the non-commutative space, but the limit $\Theta \rightarrow 0$ smoothly goes to the $so(2,1)$ algebra restoring the conformal symmetry. We also discuss the system for large non-commutative parameter.

PACS numbers: 03.65.-w, 02.40.Gh, 03.65.Ta

The study of physics in non-commutative spacetime [1, 2] or only in non-commutative space [3, 4, 5] has now become an independent field of research work. It was started with the work of Snyder [6, 7], where Electromagnetic theory is considered in non-commutative spacetime. It is a well known fact that the co-ordinates of a plane become non-commutative when the quantum mechanical system in a magnetic field (perpendicular to plane) background is supposed to confine in lowest Landau level. However the non-commutativity was happened to be present in theoretical physics before the concept of non-commutativity in space-time or in space co-ordinates was introduced. For example, the canonically conjugate operators like co-ordinate x^i and its conjugate momenta p^i are non-commutative $[x^i, p^i] = i\hbar$, which leads to the uncertainty principle $\Delta x^i \Delta p^i \geq \hbar/2$ in quantum mechanics. On the other hand although the different momentum components do commute, it is known that the components of a generalized momenta in the background magnetic field, $\mathbf{B} = (B^1, B^2, B^3)$, do not commute, $[P^i, P^j] = i\epsilon^{ijk} B^k$.

Non-commutativity and its effect is studied in diverse fields starting from Quantum Field Theory [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14], String theory [15, 16, 17, 18] to quantum mechanics [19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38]. In quantum mechanical context several models are studied in non-commutative space. The list includes harmonic oscillator [39], Hydrogen atom problem [40, 41], Zeeman effect and Stark [40] effect. Even the effect of non-commutative space is studied for a general central potential and solutions are obtained in large non-commutative limit [3]. It is known that usually the inclusion of spacetime non-commutativity destroys the Lorentz invariance of a system, sometimes the the

commutative limit of a non-commutative theory is not well defined.

The present letter is concerned with a scale invariant system in non-commutative space. In particular we consider a particle on a plane ($2D$) with an inverse square potential [42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48]. The importance of the inverse square potential in theoretical physics can be understood from the huge research works carried out so far, which in some stage can be described by an inverse square potential. Starting from molecular physics [46], atomic physics [44, 46], black hole physics to mathematical physics, its presence is investigated in great detail. It shows that inverse square potential possesses bound state solution due to the scaling anomaly caused by quantization. In that case a scale is introduced by some means, which may be self-adjoint extension [49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57] or re-normalization [58].

On the other hand assuming space to be non-commutative, we in this letter exploit the non-commutativity as a scale and then study the system. The scale symmetry of the system is thus explicitly violated by the non-commutative parameter, Θ , dependent terms in the Taylor series expansion of any observable. Considering inverse square potential in the non-commutative space results to a new problem, which falls under an interesting class of potentials $V_\mu = g/r^\mu$, $\mu > 2$ [59]. It is known that the system with a potential V_μ possesses bound state solutions with energy $E = 0$. According to our standard notion $E = 0$ serves as a border line between negative energy bound states and positive energy scattering states. But the fact that this notion is not always true was shown by J. Daboul and M. M. Nieto in [60], where they argued that for potentials which asymptotically goes to zero from above $V_\mu = 0$ line, may exhibit localized states at $E = 0$. See a comment also [61].

The article is organized in the following fashion: First, we consider the well known inverse square interaction

*Electronic address: pulakranjan.giri@saha.ac.in

on a plane and shown how it changes when the co-ordinates of the plane become non-commutative. Second, we deal with localization of the system we considered in previous discussion, at threshold of the particle energy, $E = 0$. Third, we discuss the system for large non-commutativity, i.e., Θ large, and then we conclude.

First, we consider a quantum mechanical system on a plane with inverse square potential $V = \alpha r^{-2}$, α is a constant parameter. Inverse square potential is important both in theoretical physics and experimental physics. It may arise in molecular physics, when the fermions are scattered by the vapor of polar molecules. It has application in atomic physics and black hole physics. From theoretical point of view this potential V carries interesting properties. For example, system with potential V possesses conformal symmetry, generated by three operators; Hamiltonian H , Dilatation generator D and conformal generator K . In $2D$ co-ordinate space the representation of the three generators are (unit used $2m = \hbar = 1$)

$$H = \mathbf{p}^2 + \alpha r^{-2}, \quad (1)$$

$$D = Ht - (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r})/4, \quad (2)$$

$$K = Ht^2 - (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r})t/2 + \mathbf{r}^2/4, \quad (3)$$

which is known to form the $so(2,1)$ algebra [62]

$$[D, H] = -iH, \quad [D, K] = iK, \quad [H, K] = 2iD. \quad (4)$$

It is to be noted that due to the scale symmetry of the system, described by the Hamiltonian H , there is no lower bound for the bound state of the system. This system is thus usually unstable. But it is known that due to scaling anomaly the system may have a finite bound state thus making the system physically meaningful from the bound state point of view. The usual technique for providing the system a scale are self-adjoint extension and re-normalization. We however study the system in non-commutative space and exploit the scale Θ involved in the non-commutative space $(\widehat{x}_1, \widehat{x}_2)$. The standard commutator algebra

$$[x_i, x_j] = 0, \quad [p_i, p_j] = 0, \quad [x_i, p_j] = i\delta_{ij}, \quad (5)$$

defined over the phase space is modified due to the non-commutative scale Θ as

$$[\widehat{x}_i, \widehat{x}_j] = 2i\epsilon_{ij}\Theta, \quad [\widehat{p}_i, \widehat{p}_j] = 0 \quad [\widehat{x}_i, \widehat{p}_j] = i\delta_{ij}, \quad (6)$$

where $\epsilon_{12} = -\epsilon_{21} = 1$, $\epsilon_{11} = \epsilon_{22} = 0$. Assuming that $\lim_{\Theta \rightarrow 0} [\widehat{x}_i, \widehat{x}_j] \rightarrow [x_i, x_j]$ is defined, one can get a realization of the non-commutative phase-space co-ordinates $(\widehat{x}_1, \widehat{x}_2, \widehat{p}_1, \widehat{p}_2)$ in terms of standard co-ordinates

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{x}_1 &= x_1 - \Theta p_2, & \widehat{x}_2 &= x_2 + \Theta p_1 \\ \widehat{p}_1 &= p_1, & \widehat{p}_2 &= p_2 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The $so(2,1)$ generators are supposed to get modified, where all co-ordinates and momentum in Eqs. (1)-(3) will be replaced by corresponding non-commutative

counterpart $(\widehat{x}_1, \widehat{x}_2, \widehat{p}_1, \widehat{p}_2)$. Note that the introduction of non-commutative co-ordinates remove the singularity of the observables. Keeping up to first order term in Θ in the Taylor series expansion the generators become [63]

$$\widehat{H} = H + \Theta 2\alpha r^{-4} L_z \quad (8)$$

$$\widehat{D} = D + \Theta 2\alpha r^{-4} L_z t \quad (9)$$

$$\widehat{K} = K + \Theta (2\alpha t^2 r^{-4} - 1/2) L_z \quad (10)$$

Now the new commutators, formed by the the generators by keeping only first order in Θ terms,

$$[\widehat{D}, \widehat{H}] = -i\widehat{H} - \Theta 2i\alpha r^{-4} L_z, \quad (11)$$

$$[\widehat{D}, \widehat{K}] = i\widehat{K} + \Theta (2i\alpha t^2 r^{-4} + i/2) L_z, \quad (12)$$

$$[\widehat{K}, \widehat{H}] = -2i\widehat{D} - \Theta 4i\alpha t r^{-4} L_z, \quad (13)$$

are not closed. Note that the scale symmetry is explicitly broken by the term $\Theta 2\alpha r^{-4} L_z$ in Eq. (8). Note that the commutative limit $\Theta \rightarrow 0$ restores the $so(2,1)$ algebra, namely Eqs. (11) - (13) reduce to Eq. (4). In the next section we discuss the bound state property of the system at threshold.

Second, we now discuss the system described by the Hamiltonian \widehat{H} . Since we are interested in the localization properties at the threshold $E = 0$, the Schrödinger eigenvalue equation becomes

$$(\mathbf{p}^2 + \alpha r^{-2} + \Theta 2\alpha r^{-4} L_z) \psi = 0 \quad (14)$$

where ψ is a simultaneous eigenstate of \widehat{H} and L_z , with eigenvalues 0 and m respectively. The $so(2)$ symmetry (rotation about z axis) is intact even in non-commutative space. Eq. (14) is separable in polar co-ordinates (r, ϕ) . The angular eigen-function is $\Phi = \exp(im\phi)$, with eigenvalue equation $L_z \Phi = m\Phi$. The ansatz $\psi = R(r)\Phi$ with a further similarity transformation $R(r) = \chi(r)/\sqrt{r}$ reduces Eq. (14) to a $1D$ equation

$$\left(-\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{4m^2 + 4\alpha - 1}{4r^2} + \frac{2\Theta\alpha m}{r^4} \right) \chi(r) = 0 \quad (15)$$

The localized solution of (15) apart from normalization constant is

$$R(r) = J_{\sqrt{m^2 + \alpha}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{-2\Theta\alpha m}}{r} \right), \quad (16)$$

where the constraint $\sqrt{m^2 + \alpha} > 1$ [59] needs to be satisfied in order the solution to be normalizable, which is found from the normalization constant.

Third, the solution for generic central potential $V(r)$ for large non-commutativity, i.e., Θ large, is solved in [3]. Our inverse square potential is a special case of [3] for Θ large, where now $V(r) = \alpha r^{-2}$. Now the Hamiltonian H in non-commutative space becomes

$$\widehat{H} = \mathbf{p}^2 + \alpha (\Theta^2 \mathbf{p}^2 + r^2 - 2\Theta L_z)^{-1} \quad (17)$$

In order to solve the system with Hamiltonian (17), it is useful to first solve the system with Hamiltonian $H_\Theta = \Theta^2 \mathbf{p}^2 + r^2 - 2\Theta L_z$ in Schwinger representation. The annihilation operators [39]

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{a}_+ &= (x_1 - ix_2) + \Theta(ip_1 + p_2), \\ \widehat{a}_- &= (ix_1 - x_2) - \Theta(p_1 + ip_2),\end{aligned}\quad (18)$$

satisfy the commutation relation

$$[\widehat{a}_+, \widehat{a}_+^\dagger] = [\widehat{a}_-, \widehat{a}_-^\dagger] = 4\Theta, \quad (19)$$

with all the other commutations among the creation and annihilation operators being zero. In this representation the number operators

$$\widehat{n}_+ = \widehat{a}_+^\dagger \widehat{a}_+, \quad \widehat{n}_- = \widehat{a}_-^\dagger \widehat{a}_-, \quad (20)$$

satisfy the eigenvalue equation

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{n}_+ |n_+, n_-\rangle &= n_+ |n_+, n_-\rangle, \quad n_+ = 0, 4\Theta, 8\Theta, 12\Theta, \dots \\ \widehat{n}_- |n_+, n_-\rangle &= n_- |n_+, n_-\rangle, \quad n_- = 0, 4\Theta, 8\Theta, 12\Theta, \dots\end{aligned}\quad (21)$$

The Hamiltonian H_Θ in the representation $|n_+, n_-\rangle$,

$$H_\Theta = \widehat{n}_+ + 2\Theta \quad (22)$$

satisfy the eigenvalue equation

$$H_\Theta |n_+, n_-\rangle = E_\Theta |n_+, n_-\rangle, \quad (23)$$

with $E_\Theta = n_+ + 2\Theta$. The eigenvalue of the Hamiltonian \widehat{H} in $|n_+, n_-\rangle$ basis is

$$\begin{aligned}E &= \langle n_+, n_- | \mathbf{p}^2 | n_+, n_- \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{n_+ + 2\Theta} \\ &= \frac{n_+ + n_- + 4\Theta}{4\Theta^2} + \frac{\alpha}{n_+ + 2\Theta}\end{aligned}\quad (24)$$

Note that the limit $\Theta \rightarrow 0$ can not be taken in (24). It should be noted that scale symmetry is broken for large non-commutativity also.

Finally, we considered particle interacting with inverse square potential in non-commutative space. The non-commutative correction (Θ small) to the Hamiltonian leads to a potential $2\Theta \alpha r^{-4} L_z$, which together with the inverse square potential αr^{-2} and the potential $-(1/4)r^{-2}$ coming from the kinetic term in $2D$ are capable of binding particle with energy $E = 0$. We show that the $so(2, 1)$ algebra in commutative space, which is responsible for conformal symmetry for such system is no longer closed in non-commutative space. But the limit $\Theta \rightarrow 0$ smoothly goes to the $so(2, 1)$ algebra. For large Θ the system is solved but this time the limit $\Theta \rightarrow 0$ can not be taken.

-
- [1] M. R. Douglas and N. A. Nekrasov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 977 (2001).
[2] X. Calmet and M. Selvaggi, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 037901 (2006).
[3] J. Gamboa, M. Loewe and J. C. Rojas, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 067901 (2001).
[4] J. Gamboa, F. Mendez, M. Loewe and J. C. Rojas, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A17**, 2555 (2002).
[5] B. Muthukumar and P. Mitra, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 027701 (2002).
[6] H. S. Snyder, Phys. Rev. **71**, 38 (1947).
[7] H. S. Snyder, Phys. Rev. **72**, 68 (1947).
[8] J. madore, S. Schraml, P. Schupp and J. Wess, Eur. Phys. J. **C16**, 161 (2000).
[9] X. Calmet, B. Jurco, P. Schupp, J. Wess and M. Wohlgenannt, Eur. Phys. J. **C23**, 363 (2002).
[10] R. Banerjee, S. Ghosh and T. Shreecharan, arXiv:0712.3631v1 [hep-th].
[11] A.P. Balachandran, T.R. Govindarajan and B. Ydri, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A15**, 1279 (2000).
[12] H. Falomir, J. Gamboa, J. Lopez-Sarrion, F. Mendez and A.J. da Silva, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 047701 (2006).
[13] J. Gamboa and J. Lopez-Sarrion, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 067702 (2005).
[14] J. M. Carmona, J. L. Cortes, J. Gamboa and F. Mendez, JHEP **0303**, 058 (2003).
[15] N. Seiberg, E. Witten, JHEP **9909**, 032 (1999).
[16] M. R. Douglas and C. M. Hull, JHEP **9802**, 008 (1998).
[17] C. Chu and P. Ho, Nucl. Phys. **B550**, 151 (1999).
[18] C. Chu and P. Ho, Nucl. Phys. **B568**, 447 (2000).
[19] P. A. Horvathy and M. S. Plyuschay, JHEP **0206**, 033 (2002).
[20] P. A. Horvathy, Ann. Phys. **299**, 128 (2002).
[21] P. A. Horvathy and M. S. Plyuschay, Phys. Lett. **B595**, 547 (2004).
[22] V. P. Nair and A. P. Polychronakos, Phys. Lett. **B505**, 267 (2001).
[23] L. Jonke and S. Meljanak, Eur. Phys. J. **C29**, 433 (2003).
[24] R. Banerjee, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A17**, 631 (2002).
[25] R. Banerjee, Eur. Phys. J. **C47**, 541 (2006).
[26] R. Banerjee and K. Kumar, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 045008 (2007).
[27] J. Gamboa, M. Loewe, F. Mendez and J. C. Rojas, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A16**, 2075 (2001).
[28] M. Chaichian, A. Demichev, P. Presnajder, M. M. Shekhar-Jabbari and A. Tureanu, Nucl. Phys. **B611**, 383 (2001).
[29] S. bellucci, A. Nersessian and C. Sochichiu, Phys. Lett. **B522**, 345 (2001).
[30] S. bellucci and A. Nersessian, Phys. Lett. **B542**, 295 (2002).
[31] G. D. Barbosa and N. Pinto-Neto, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 065014 (2004).
[32] C. Duval and P. A. Horvathy, J. Phys. **A34**, 10097 (2001).

- [33] D. Karabali, V. P. Nair and A. P. Polychronakos, Nucl. Phys. **B627**, 565 (2002).
- [34] I. Dadić, L. Jonke and S. Meljanac, Acta Phys. Slov. **55**, 149 (2005).
- [35] A. Jellal, E. H. El Kinani and M. Schreiber, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A20**, 1515 (2005).
- [36] O. F. Dayi and A. Jellal, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4592 (2002); Erratum-ibid **45**, 827 (2004).
- [37] O. F. Dayi and A. Jellal, Phys. Lett. **A287**, 349 (2001).
- [38] A. Jellal, J. Phys. **A34**, 10159 (2001).
- [39] A. Kijanka and P. Kosinski, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 127702 (2004).
- [40] S. Bellucci and A. Yeranyan, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 085010 (2005).
- [41] M. Chaichian, M. M. Shekh-Jabbari and A. Tureanu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2716 (2001).
- [42] P. R. Giri, Phys. Rev. **A76**, 012114 (2007).
- [43] P. R. Giri, arXiv:0704.1725v2 [hep-th].
- [44] P. R. Giri, Int. J. Theor. Phys. (Online).
- [45] P. R. Giri, K. S. Gupta, S. Meljanac and A. Samsarov, hep-th/0703121, (submitted to Phys. Lett. A).
- [46] P. R. Giri, arXiv:0708.2969v1 [cond-mat.mtrl-sci].
- [47] H. E. Camblong, L. N. Epele, H. Fanchiotti and C. A. G. Canal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** 220402 (2001).
- [48] H. E. Camblong, C. R. Ordóñez, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 125013 (2003).
- [49] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness* (New York :Academic, 1975).
- [50] B. Basu-Mallick, P. K. Ghosh and K. S. Gupta, Nucl. Phys. **B659**, 437 (2003).
- [51] B. Basu-Mallick, P. K. Ghosh and K. S. Gupta, Phys. Lett. **A311**, 87 (2003).
- [52] K. S. Gupta, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A18**, 2355 (2003).
- [53] B. Basu-Mallick and K. S. Gupta, Phys. Lett. **A292**, 36 (2001).
- [54] D. Birmingham, K. S. Gupta and S. Sen, Phys. Lett. **B505**, 191 (2001);
- [55] K. S. Gupta and S. Sen, Phys. Lett. **B526**, 121 (2002).
- [56] S. Meljanac, A. Samsarov, B. Basu-Mallick and K. S. Gupta, Eur. Phys. J. **C49**, 875 (2007).
- [57] L. Feher, I. Tsutsui, T. Fulop, Nucl.Phys. **B715**, 713 (2005).
- [58] K. S. Gupta and S. G. Rajeev, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 5940 (1993).
- [59] A. J. Makowski and K. J. Gorska, Phys. Lett. **A362**, 26 (2007).
- [60] J. Daboul and M. M. Nieto, Phys. Lett. **A190**, 357 (1994).
- [61] S. A. Hojman and D. Nunez, Phys. Lett. **A209**, 385 (1995).
- [62] V. de Alfaro, S. Fubini and G. Furlan, Nuovo Cimento **34A**, 569 (1976).
- [63] S. Bellucci and A. Yeranyan, Phys. Lett. **B609**, 418 (2005).