

Gauging non-Hermitian Hamiltonians

H. F. Jones[†]

Physics Department, Imperial College, London SW7 2AZ, UK

February 6, 2020

Abstract

We address the problem of coupling non-Hermitian systems, treated as fundamental rather than effective theories, to the electromagnetic field. In such theories the observables are not the \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{p} appearing in the Hamiltonian, but quantities \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{P} constructed by means of the metric operator. Following the analogous procedure of gauging a global symmetry in Hermitian quantum mechanics we find that a limited kind of gauge transformation in \mathbf{X} implies minimal substitution in the form $\mathbf{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{P} - e\mathbf{A}$. We discuss how the relevant matrix elements governing electromagnetic transitions may be calculated in the special case of the Swanson Hamiltonian, where the equivalent Hermitian Hamiltonian h is local, and in the more generic example of the imaginary cubic interaction, where H is local but h is not.

Introduction

Recent interest in Hamiltonians that are non-Hermitian but nonetheless have a real spectrum dates from the pioneering paper of Bender and Boettcher[1], which gave strong numerical and analytical evidence that the spectrum of the class of Hamiltonians

$$H = p^2 + m^2x^2 - (ix)^N \quad (1)$$

was completely real and positive for $N \geq 2$, and attributed this reality to the (unbroken) PT symmetry of the Hamiltonian. Subsequently a large number of PT -symmetric models were explored(see, e.g. [2]), and it was found that the phenomenon was rather general. The drawback that the

[†]e-mail: h.f.jones@imperial.ac.uk

natural metric on the Hilbert space, with overlap $\int \psi_i(-x)\psi_j(x)dx$, was not positive definite, was overcome by the realization[3] that one could construct an alternative, positive-definite metric involving the so-called C operator. The formalism was further developed by Mostafazadeh[4], building on earlier work by Scholtz et al.[5]. In particular he showed[6] that such a Hamiltonian H was related by a similarity transformation to an equivalent Hermitian Hamiltonian h . The key relation is the quasi-Hermiticity of H :

$$H^\dagger = \eta H \eta^{-1}, \quad (2)$$

where η is Hermitian and positive definite. η is related to the C operator by $\eta = CP$, and it is frequently extremely useful[7] to write it in the exponential form $\eta = e^{-Q}$. Occasionally η can be constructed exactly[8, 9, 10, 11], but more typically it can only be constructed in perturbation theory, for example for the ix^3 model[12].

From Eq. (2) we can immediately deduce that

$$h \equiv \rho H \rho^{-1}, \quad (3)$$

is Hermitian, where $\rho = e^{-\frac{1}{2}Q}$. Other operators A will also be observables, having real eigenvalues, if they are also quasi-Hermitian, i.e.

$$A^\dagger = \eta A \eta^{-1}, \quad (4)$$

and they again are related by the similarity transformation to Hermitian counterparts a :

$$A = \rho^{-1} a \rho. \quad (5)$$

The similarity transformation also transforms the states of the Hermitian system, $|\varphi\rangle$, to those of the quasi-Hermitian system, $|\psi\rangle$:

$$|\psi\rangle = \rho^{-1} |\varphi\rangle. \quad (6)$$

This implies that the matrix element of an operator is

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_{ij} = \langle \psi_i | \eta \mathcal{O} | \psi_j \rangle. \quad (7)$$

In particular, the matrix elements of an observable can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_i | \eta A | \psi_j \rangle &= \langle \varphi_i | \rho^{-1} \eta (\rho^{-1} a \rho) \rho^{-1} | \varphi_j \rangle \\ &= \langle \varphi_i | a | \varphi_j \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

A very important observation is that

$$\begin{aligned}
H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) &= H(\rho \mathbf{X} \rho^{-1}, \rho \mathbf{P} \rho^{-1}) \\
&= \rho H(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P}) \rho^{-1} \\
&= h(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P}).
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Thus an alternative way of finding h is to calculate the observables \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{P} and then rewrite $H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})$ in terms of them.

The above concerns quasi-Hermitian systems considered in isolation. However, important conceptual issues arise when one attempts to consider such systems in interaction with an otherwise Hermitian environment. For example, Ref. [13] examined a non-Hermitian analogue of the Stern-Gerlach experiment in which the role of the intermediate inhomogeneous magnetic field flipping the spin is taken over by an apparatus described by a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian. This type of set-up has been further discussed and elaborated in a series of papers by various authors[14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19].

Again, scattering gives rise to problems, since unitarity, as conventionally defined, is generically not satisfied for a PT -symmetric Hamiltonian. Unitarity can be restored, by use of the η metric, but then the concept of “in” and “out” states has to be drastically Ref. [20, 21], or in some cases[22] less drastically, revised.

The present paper is concerned with another such issue, namely how does one couple a charged particle described by a quasi-Hermitian Hamiltonian to the electromagnetic field, following as closely as possible the well-known gauging procedure for a Hermitian Hamiltonian?

Brief Review of the Standard Procedure

In standard quantum mechanics the probability density is just $|\psi(\mathbf{x})|^2$, which is unchanged under a change of phase of the wavefunction: $\psi \rightarrow e^{ie\alpha}\psi$ provided that α is a real constant. If we try to extend this to $\alpha = \alpha(\mathbf{x})$, a real function of \mathbf{x} , an extra term appears in the Schrödinger equation, because now $\hat{\mathbf{p}} e^{ie\alpha}\psi = e^{ie\alpha}(\hat{\mathbf{p}} + e\nabla\alpha)\psi$. We cancel this additional $\nabla\alpha$ term by *minimal substitution*:

$$\mathbf{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{p} - e\mathbf{A} . \tag{10}$$

Then under the combined transformations

$$\begin{cases} \psi \rightarrow \psi' = e^{ie\alpha}\psi \\ \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}' = \mathbf{A} + (1/e)\nabla\alpha , \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

we obtain $(\hat{\mathbf{p}} - e\mathbf{A})\psi \rightarrow e^{ie\alpha}(\hat{\mathbf{p}} - e\mathbf{A})\psi$, as required. Moreover the electric and magnetic fields are unchanged by the gauge transformation (11).

So for a normal Hamiltonian of the form

$$H = \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m} + V(\mathbf{x}), \quad (12)$$

the coupling to the vector potential is $-e(\mathbf{A}\cdot\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{A})/(2m)$. A standard procedure then gives the transition rate between the states $|i\rangle$ and $|j\rangle$ induced by a plane wave

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \int d\omega \tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\omega) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} + c.c. \quad (13)$$

as

$$w_{ij} \propto \frac{e^2}{m^2} |\langle i|p_A|j\rangle|^2, \quad (14)$$

in the dipole approximation $e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \approx 1$ over the range of the interaction. Here the constant of proportionality is $(2\pi/\hbar^2)\tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\omega_{ij})^2$, where $\omega_{ij} = (E_i - E_j)/\hbar$, and p_A is the projection of \mathbf{p} in the direction of \mathbf{A} .

The matrix element $\langle i|p_A|j\rangle$ can be recast in terms of $\langle i|x_A|j\rangle$, where x_A is similarly defined, by

$$(E_i - E_j)\langle i|\mathbf{x}|j\rangle = \langle i|[H, \mathbf{x}]|j\rangle = -\frac{i\hbar}{m}\langle i|\mathbf{p}|j\rangle, \quad (15)$$

so that

$$\langle i|p_A|j\rangle = im\omega_{ij}\langle i|x_A|j\rangle. \quad (16)$$

Quasi-Hermitian Quantum Mechanics

The total[†] probability is now $\langle\psi|\eta|\psi\rangle$, where η is the metric operator. This is no longer invariant under $|\psi\rangle \rightarrow e^{ie\alpha(\mathbf{x})}|\psi\rangle$, except in the special case where $\eta = \eta(\mathbf{x})$, so that $[\eta, \mathbf{x}] = 0$.

It is, however, invariant under

$$|\psi\rangle \rightarrow e^{ie\alpha(\mathbf{X})}|\psi\rangle, \quad (17)$$

[†]Note that the probability density $\rho(x) = \langle\psi|\rho|x\rangle\langle x|\rho|\psi\rangle$ is also invariant under the transformation of Eq. (17).

where \mathbf{X} is the observable $\mathbf{X} = \rho^{-1}\mathbf{x}\rho$. For then

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\psi|\eta|\psi\rangle &\rightarrow \langle\psi|e^{-ie\alpha(\mathbf{X})^\dagger}\eta e^{ie\alpha(\mathbf{X})}|\psi\rangle \\ &= \langle\psi|\eta|\psi\rangle,\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

since $\mathbf{X}^\dagger\eta = \eta\mathbf{X}$. Note that, in terms of the eigenstates $|\varphi\rangle$ of h , Eq. (17) corresponds to

$$|\varphi\rangle \rightarrow \rho e^{ie\alpha(\mathbf{X})}\rho^{-1}|\varphi\rangle = e^{ie\alpha(\mathbf{x})}|\varphi\rangle.\tag{19}$$

Since we are using \mathbf{X} in the exponent in Eq. (17), we will also need to write H in terms of \mathbf{X} and the corresponding conjugate observable \mathbf{P} , according to Eq. (9), i.e.

$$H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = h(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{P}).\tag{20}$$

The minimal substitution we require is then

$$\mathbf{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{P} - e\mathbf{A}\tag{21}$$

with the combined transformations

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} |\psi\rangle \rightarrow |\psi'\rangle = e^{ie\alpha(\mathbf{X})}|\psi\rangle \\ \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}' = \mathbf{A} + (1/e)\nabla_{\mathbf{X}}\alpha(\mathbf{X}). \end{array}\right.\tag{22}$$

There is, however, a severe problem with this transformation of \mathbf{A} . A true gauge transformation adds a gradient term of the form $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\Omega$ to \mathbf{A} , in order that the magnetic field $\mathbf{B} = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \times \mathbf{A}$ remain invariant. These two requirements are only consistent if $\alpha(\mathbf{X})$ is restricted to be linear in \mathbf{X} , in which case one is merely adding a constant vector to \mathbf{A} . Nonetheless one can use this limited form of gauge transformation to motivate the coupling to \mathbf{A} .

If h is of standard form, $\mathbf{p}^2/(2\mu) + U(x)$, the scattering rate is

$$\begin{aligned}w_{ij} &\propto \frac{e^2}{\mu^2}|\langle\psi_i|\eta P_A|\psi_j\rangle|^2 \\ &= \frac{e^2}{\mu^2}|\langle\varphi_i|p_A|\varphi_j\rangle|^2,\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

and the second form of the matrix element can then be rewritten, as in the Hermitian case, as a matrix element of x_A , namely

$$\langle\varphi_i|p_A|\varphi_j\rangle = i\mu\omega_{ij}\langle\varphi_i|x_A|\varphi_j\rangle.\tag{24}$$

The Swanson Model

A much-studied example where h , but not H , is of standard form is the Swanson Hamiltonian[8], whose three-dimensional version reads

$$H = \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m_1} + \frac{1}{2}i\omega\varepsilon\{x_r, p_r\} + \frac{1}{2}m_2\omega^2\mathbf{x}^2, \quad (25)$$

with $m_2 = (1 - \varepsilon^2)m_1$. There is actually a one-parameter family[23] of Q s, from which we consider just the two cases (i) $Q = Q(\mathbf{x})$ and (ii) $Q = Q(\mathbf{p})$. In either case the equivalent Hermitian Hamiltonian is just a harmonic oscillator of the form

$$h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2\mu} + \frac{1}{2}\mu\omega^2\mathbf{x}^2 \quad (26)$$

(i) $Q = Q(\mathbf{x}) = \varepsilon m_1\omega \mathbf{x}^2$.

This amounts to completing the square as

$$H = \frac{(\mathbf{p} + i\varepsilon m_1\omega\mathbf{x})^2}{2m_1} + \frac{1}{2}m_1\omega^2\mathbf{x}^2 \quad (27)$$

so that $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$, while $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p} + i\varepsilon m_1\omega\mathbf{x}$. Thus in this case

$$h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m_1} + \frac{1}{2}m_1\omega^2\mathbf{x}^2, \quad (28)$$

so that $\mu = m_1$. The coupling to the vector potential is thus

$$-\frac{e}{2m_1}(\mathbf{A}\cdot\mathbf{P} + \mathbf{P}\cdot\mathbf{A}) = -\frac{e}{2m_1}[(\mathbf{A}\cdot\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{A}) + i\varepsilon m_1\omega(\mathbf{A}\cdot\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}\cdot\mathbf{A})] \quad (29)$$

The required matrix element

$$\langle\psi_i|\eta P_A|\psi_j\rangle = \langle\varphi_i|p_A|\varphi_j\rangle, \quad (30)$$

is then found from expressing each component of p on the right-hand side in terms of creation and annihilation operators: $p = i\sqrt{(m_1\omega/2)}(a^\dagger - a)$.

(ii) $Q = Q(\mathbf{p}) = -\varepsilon \mathbf{x}^2/(m_2\omega)$.

This amounts to completing the square instead as

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m_2} + \frac{1}{2}m_2\omega^2\left(\mathbf{x} + \frac{i\varepsilon\mathbf{p}}{m_2\omega}\right)^2 \\ &\equiv \frac{\mathbf{P}^2}{2m_2} + \frac{1}{2}m_2\omega^2\mathbf{X}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

so that $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{p}$, while $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} + i\varepsilon\mathbf{p}/(m_2\omega)$. Thus in this case

$$h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m_2} + \frac{1}{2}m_2\omega^2\mathbf{x}^2, \quad (32)$$

with $\mu = m_2$. The coupling to the vector potential is thus

$$-\frac{e}{2m_2}(\mathbf{A}\cdot\mathbf{P} + \mathbf{P}\cdot\mathbf{A}) = -\frac{e}{2m_2}(\mathbf{A}\cdot\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{A}) \quad (33)$$

The matrix elements are still of the form of Eq. (30), but now the components of p on the right-hand side are expressed as $p = i\sqrt{(m_2\omega/2)}(a^\dagger - a)$.

The important thing to notice is that one will get different transition rates in the two cases. That is, the system is determined not only by the Hamiltonian H , but also by the particular metric operator η used to restore unitarity.

$$V = \frac{1}{2}x^2 + igx^3$$

The more common situation is that H is of standard form, while h is a complicated non-local object. For example, in the case of the (one-dimensional) prototype Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{1}{2}(p^2 + x^2) + igx^3, \quad (34)$$

we have[12]

$$Q = -g\left(\frac{4}{3}p^3 + 2xpx\right) + O(g^3), \quad (35)$$

which gives rise[24, 25] to the observables

$$\left. \begin{aligned} X &= x + ig(x^2 + 2p^2) + g^2(-x^3 + 2pxp) \\ P &= p - ig(xp + px) + g^2(2p^3 - xpx) \end{aligned} \right\} + O(g^3). \quad (36)$$

Referring to Eq. (9), we can write $H(x, p)$ as $h(X, P)$, where $h(x, p)$ has been calculated up to second order in g as[24, 25]

$$h(x, p) = \frac{1}{2}(p^2 + x^2) + 3g^2\left(\frac{1}{2}x^4 + S_{2,2}(x, p) - \frac{1}{6}\right) + O(g^4), \quad (37)$$

where $S_{2,2}(x, p) = (x^2p^2 + xp^2x + p^2x^2)/3$.

From Eq. (37), we see that the minimal substitution $P \rightarrow P - eA$ in $h(X, P)$ will give rise to additional couplings, of order g^2 , arising from the mixed term $S_{2,2}(X, P)$.

To $O(g)$ the matrix elements will be just $\langle \psi_i | \eta P_A | \psi_j \rangle$. In order to calculate this we will need the corrected eigenfunctions, which have a first-order contribution, namely

$$\psi_i(x) = \psi_i^0(x) + g \sum_{j \neq i} \langle \psi_j^0 | i x^3 | \psi_i^0 \rangle \psi_j^0(x) + O(g^2) \quad (38)$$

In this case it is much easier[26] to work with H directly rather than with h .

Summary

For a standard Hermitian system the coupling to the electromagnetic potential, via the minimal substitution $\mathbf{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{p} - e\mathbf{A}$, is induced by implementing the position-dependent phase change $\psi \rightarrow e^{ie\alpha(\mathbf{x})}\psi$ and demanding that the transformed Schrödinger equation be unchanged. For a quasi-Hermitian system we find instead that the phase must be taken as $\alpha(\mathbf{X})$, where \mathbf{X} is the observable associated with \mathbf{x} . The coupling to the electromagnetic vector potential thus induced is via the minimal substitution for $\mathbf{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{P} - e\mathbf{A}$, where \mathbf{P} is the observable associated with \mathbf{p} . However, contrary to the Hermitian case, $\alpha(\mathbf{X})$ has to be restricted to a linear function, in order that the associated transformation of \mathbf{A} be a true gauge transformation.

The matrix elements governing electromagnetic transitions from one state of the system to another depend on both H and the metric η . In the special case of the Swanson Hamiltonian, when h is local, this dependence is encoded in the mass of the particle, which cannot simply be read off from H . Generically h is not local, and the coupling is considerably more complicated.

References

- [1] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998) 5243.
- [2] G. Levai and M. Znojil, J. Phys. A **33** (2000) 7165.
- [3] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody and H. F. Jones, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002) 270401; *ibid.* **92** (2004) 119902 (E).
- [4] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. **43** (2002) 205.
- [5] F. Scholtz, H. Geyer and F. Hahne, Ann. Phys. **213** (1992) 74.
- [6] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Phys. A **36** (2003) 7081.

- [7] C. M. Bender, P. N. Meisinger and Q. Wang, J. Phys. A **36** (2003) 1973.
- [8] M. S. Swanson, J. Math. Phys. **45** (2004) 585.
- [9] H. B. Geyer, F. G. Scholtz and I. Snyman, Czech. J. Phys. **54** (2004), 1069.
- [10] H. F. Jones, J. Phys. A **38** (2005) 1741.
- [11] H. F. Jones and J. Mateo, Phys. Rev. **D73** (2006) 085002.
- [12] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody and H. F. Jones, Phys. Rev. D **D70** (2004) 025001; *ibid.* **D71** (2005) 049901.
- [13] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody, H. F. Jones and B. K. Meister, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** (2007) 040403.
- [14] P. Assis and A. Fring, arXiv:quant-ph/0703254.
- [15] U. Guenther, I. Rotter and B. F. Samsonov, J. Phys. A **40** (2007) 8815.
- [16] A. Mostafazadeh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99** (2007) 130502.
- [17] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody and H. F. Jones, arXiv:0804.3487 [quant-ph].
- [18] A. Nesterov, arXiv:0806.4646 [quant-ph].
- [19] U. Guenther and B. F. Samsonov, arXiv:0807.3643v2 [quant-ph].
- [20] H. F. Jones, Phys. Rev. **D76** (2007) 125003.
- [21] H. F. Jones, Phys. Rev. **D78** (2008) 065032.
- [22] M. Znojil, arXiv:0805.2800 [hep-th].
- [23] D. P. Musumbu, H. B. Geyer and W. D. Heiss, J. Phys. A **40** (2007) F75.
- [24] H. F. Jones, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38** (2005) 1741.
- [25] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Phys. A **38** (2005) 6557; *ibid.* 8185 (E).
- [26] C. M. Bender, J.-H. Chen and K. A. Milton, J. Phys. A **39** (2006) 1657.