

Jastrow-like ground states for quantum many-body potentials with near-neighbors interactions

Marzieh Baradaran

Department of Physics, University of Guilan, Rasht 41635-1914, Iran

José A. Carrasco, Federico Finkel, Artemio González-López*

Departamento de Física Teórica II, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 28040 Madrid, Spain

Abstract

We completely solve the problem of classifying all one-dimensional quantum potentials with nearest- and next-to-nearest-neighbors interactions whose ground state is Jastrow-like, i.e., of Jastrow type but depending only on differences of consecutive particles. In particular, we show that these models must necessarily contain a three-body interaction term, as was the case with all previously known examples. We discuss several particular instances of the general solution, including a new hyperbolic potential and a model with elliptic interactions which reduces to the known rational and trigonometric ones in appropriate limits.

Keywords: Short-range Calogero–Sutherland models; Jastrow-like ground state; elliptic potential.

1. Introduction

Since their introduction in the early 70's, the quantum integrable many-body models of Calogero [1] and Sutherland [2, 3] have been extensively studied due to their conceptual simplicity and their outstanding properties. In fact, the fundamental character of these models is attested by their appearance in such diverse areas as soliton theory [4, 5], orthogonal polynomials [6–8], random matrix theory [9–11], fractional statistics and anyons [12, 13], quantum Hall effect [14, 15], conformal field theory [16–18], general relativity [19, 20], hydrodynamics of cold atomic gases [21], and quantum quenching [22].

A remarkable feature of the Calogero and Sutherland models is that their ground-state wave function ψ is factorized over the A_{N-1} root system, i.e., is of the form

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}) \propto \prod_{i=1}^N \rho(x_i) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \chi(x_i - x_j). \quad (1.1)$$

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: marzie.baradaran@yahoo.com (Marzieh Baradaran), joseacar@ucm.es (José A. Carrasco), ffinkel@ucm.es (Federico Finkel), artemio@ucm.es (Artemio González-López)

Here $\mathbf{x} \equiv (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ and

$$\rho(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\omega x^2}, \quad \chi(x) = |x|^a$$

for the (harmonic) Calogero model, while

$$\rho(x) = 1, \quad \chi(x) = |\sin x|^a$$

for the Sutherland model (with $\omega > 0$ and $a > -1/2$). As first noted by Sutherland [2, 23], this property makes it possible to compute in closed form certain correlation functions of the latter models by exploiting their connection with random matrix theory. Indeed, for Calogero's model ψ^2 coincides with the joint probability density of the eigenvalues of the Gaussian orthogonal, unitary and symplectic ensembles respectively for $2\omega = 2a = 1, 2, 4$, while the same relation holds for the ground state of the Sutherland model and Dyson's circular unitary ensembles (with eigenvalues parametrized as e^{2ix_k}) [24]. Later on, Dyson [25] showed how to construct analogues of the Gaussian ensembles with eigenvalues distributed according to ψ^2 in Eq. (1.1), with essentially arbitrary ρ and $\chi(x) = |x|^{\beta/2}$ (as usual, β will be assumed to take the values 1, 2, 4 for the orthogonal, unitary and symplectic ensembles, respectively).

In view of these results, it is natural to look for the most general quantum Hamiltonian of Calogero–Sutherland (CS) type (i.e, with one- and two-body long-range interactions) whose ground state is of the form (1.1). A restricted version of this problem (with $\rho = 1$) was already formulated by Sutherland himself [2], who later found a solution thereof with an elliptic two-body interaction potential [26, 27]. Shortly afterwards, Calogero [28] showed that this is in fact the most general solution of this restricted problem. The general problem (with ρ not necessarily equal to 1) was tackled by Inozemtsev and Meshcheryakov [29], who claimed to have found a complete solution. A decade later, however, Forrester [30] found a model of CS type whose ground state, which exhibits long-range crystalline order in the thermodynamic limit, is of the factorized form (1.1) and yet did not appear in the classification of Ref. [29]. The latter classification was finally completed several years later by Koprucki and Wagner [31], who obtained Forrester's model as a particular case.

The probability distribution $p_\beta(s)$ of the (normalized) spacing s between two consecutive eigenvalues of the Gaussian β -ensembles is approximately given by Wigner's surmise $p_\beta(s) = A_\beta s^\beta e^{-c_\beta s^2}$, where the positive parameters A_β, c_β are fixed by normalization and the condition that the mean spacing be equal to 1 (see, e.g., Refs. [32, 33]). By contrast, it has been conjectured [34] that the spacings distribution of a “generic” quantum integrable model is Poissonian, i.e., $p(s) = e^{-s}$. The latter distributions are actually obeyed by the spectra of a wide range of either fully chaotic or completely integrable systems [32]. However, for certain so-called pseudo-integrable systems (like, for instance, the Aharonov–Bohm billiard [35] and the three-dimensional Anderson model at the metal-insulator transition point [36]) the spectrum statistics (in particular, the spacings distribution) was found to be quite different from those of either chaotic or generic integrable systems (see, e.g., Refs. [37, 38]). In the late 90's, Bogomolny, Gerland and Schmit [39, 40] tried to account for this discrepancy by assuming that for the latter systems the probability density $p(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)$ of the eigenvalues λ_k (in a finite range of the spectrum) is given by a nearest-neighbors version of the joint probability distribution

of the eigenvalues of the Gaussian β -ensembles, namely¹

$$p(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N) \propto \prod_{i=1}^N e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}\lambda_i^2} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{N-1} |\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}|^\beta.$$

If we identify the eigenvalue λ_k with the coordinate x_k of a quantum particle, the above distribution is the probability density of the ground state of the N -body Hamiltonian

$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} + \omega \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{2\alpha(\alpha-1)}{(x_i - x_{i+1})^2} - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{2\alpha^2}{(x_i - x_{i+1})(x_{i+1} - x_{i+2})},$$

with $2\alpha = 2\omega = \beta$ [41]. Note that, by contrast to the Calogero model, the latter Hamiltonian features only nearest-neighbors (two-body) and next-to-nearest-neighbors (three-body) interactions among the particles. Proceeding in a similar way with the joint probability density of the eigenvalues of Dyson's circular ensembles one obtains a nearest-neighbors version of the ground state of the Sutherland model, which is the ground state of a quantum many-body Hamiltonian with trigonometric two- and three-body near-neighbors interactions. This connection between random matrix theory and quantum many-body models with near-neighbors interactions of Calogero–Sutherland type has in fact spurred the construction of further such models (including particles with spin and interactions of arbitrary finite range) and the study of their properties (see, e.g., Refs. [42–46]).

The purpose of this paper is to classify all quantum many-body models in one dimension with nearest- and next-to-nearest-neighbors (translation invariant) interactions whose ground state factorizes as in Eq. (1.1), but with the differences $x_i - x_j$ replaced by the nearest-neighbors differences $x_i - x_{i+1}$. As we have just remarked, these models include the versions of the Calogero and Sutherland Hamiltonians with near-neighbors interactions introduced in Ref. [41]. In other words, our goal is to perform the near-neighbors analog of the well-known classification of CS-type models with a factorized ground state of the form (1.1), started by Sutherland and Calogero and ultimately completed by Koprućki and Wagner. We shall present the general solution of this classification problem, both for motion on the real line and on a circle. By contrast with the corresponding problem featuring long-range interactions, this general solution depends on an arbitrary function of one variable and (for motion in the real line) an arbitrary positive parameter. Moreover, we shall show that the three-body term appearing in all previously known examples is unavoidable. In other words, this term must necessarily be present in any potential whose ground state is of the sought-for form. We shall also see that the general solution contains an elliptic potential which yields in a suitable limit the rational and trigonometric models introduced in Ref. [41], as well as a new hyperbolic model akin to the long-range one discussed by Forrester [30].

We shall finish this Introduction with a brief outline of the paper's organization. In Section 2 we obtain a solution of the classification problem depending on an arbitrary function, and prove that the three-body term that it contains cannot be expressed as an

¹More precisely, the latter authors considered a periodic version of this density obtained by discarding the first factor, whose contribution is negligible in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, and adding an interaction term between the first and last particles.

external potential plus a two-body term. We show in Section 3 that there is no other solution, thus completing the proposed classification. Section 4 is devoted to verifying that the factorized eigenfunction associated with this solution is actually the (square-integrable) ground state of the corresponding Hamiltonian, provided that the arbitrary function which appears in the solution satisfies some natural physical requirements. In Section 5 we discuss some particular models included in the general solution, recovering the rational and trigonometric potentials of Ref. [41] and introducing the new hyperbolic and elliptic models mentioned above. The paper ends with a concluding section where we summarize our results and indicate possible future developments.

2. General solution

We shall consider quantum many-body Hamiltonians of the form

$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} + V(x_1, \dots, x_N), \quad (2.1)$$

where the potential

$$V(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i V_1(x_i) + \sum_i V_2(x_i - x_{i+1}) + \sum_i V_3(x_i - x_{i+1}, x_{i+1} - x_{i+2}) \quad (2.2)$$

features at most three-body near-neighbors translation invariant interactions. We shall assume that the particles move either on a circle or on the real line. In the first case the coordinates x_i are typically angular variables, and the particles 1 and N are considered to be nearest neighbors. In particular, in this case all sums and products will be assumed to run from 1 to N , with the identifications $x_{N+k} \equiv x_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. On the other hand, when the particles move on the real line the coordinates x_i are unbounded, and we shall not make the latter identifications. Thus in this case all sums and products will be taken to run over the largest meaningful range between 1 and N . For instance, in this case

$$\sum_i V_1(x_i) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N V_1(x_i), \quad \sum_i V_2(x_i - x_{i+1}) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} V_2(x_i - x_{i+1}),$$

and, in general,

$$\sum_i f(x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i+k}) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{N-k} f(x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i+k}). \quad (2.3)$$

With this convention, we will be able to present the results for the cases of motion on the circle or on the real line in a unified way.

Our goal is to classify the many-body potentials of the form (2.2), both on a circle and on the real line, for which H admits a ground state $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ of the form

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_i \rho(x_i) \cdot \prod_i \chi(x_i - x_{i+1}). \quad (2.4)$$

Here ρ and χ are two functions of one variable such that ψ is square-integrable. In other words (cf. Eq. (1.1)), the wave function (2.4) factorizes over the (positive) *simple*

roots of the A_{N-1} root system. We shall say that such a wave function is *Jastrow-like*, by analogy with the usual Jastrow-type form (1.1). We will show that there is no solution featuring only two-body interactions, while the general solution with three-body interactions depends on a constant and an arbitrary function of one variable. The latter solution includes the well-known (rational and trigonometric) potentials of Refs. [41, 43, 44, 47, 48] and their hyperbolic counterpart, as well as a new elliptic potential which encompasses the previously known ones.

Imposing that $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ in Eq. (2.4) be an eigenfunction of the Hamiltonian (2.1) with energy E we readily obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathbf{x}) - E = & \sum_i (\tau^2(x_i) + \tau'(x_i)) + 2 \sum_i (\varphi^2(x_i - x_{i+1}) + \varphi'(x_i - x_{i+1})) \\ & + 2 \sum_i \varphi(x_i - x_{i+1})(\tau(x_i) - \tau(x_{i+1})) - 2 \sum_i \varphi(x_i - x_{i+1})\varphi(x_{i+1} - x_{i+2}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

where the one-variable functions τ and φ are by definition the logarithmic derivatives of ρ and χ , i.e.,

$$\tau(x) \equiv \frac{\rho'(x)}{\rho(x)}, \quad \varphi(x) \equiv \frac{\chi'(x)}{\chi(x)}. \quad (2.6)$$

Here and in what follows we shall assume that φ' is not identically zero, since otherwise $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ is a product of one-particle states and there is no interaction between the particles. We shall also assume, for simplicity's sake, that τ and φ are meromorphic functions.

It is readily apparent from Eq. (2.5) that when $\tau'' \equiv 0$ the potential V is already of the sought for form (2.2), both for the circle and the real line. Without loss of generality (modulo a trivial overall translation of the coordinates), we can take $\tau(x) = -\omega x$. We thus obtain the following formulas for the potential V and its Jastrow-like eigenfunction $\psi(\mathbf{x})$:

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathbf{x}) = & \omega^2 r^2 + 2 \sum_i (\varphi'(x_i - x_{i+1}) + \varphi^2(x_i - x_{i+1})) \\ & - 2\omega \sum_i (x_i - x_{i+1})\varphi(x_i - x_{i+1}) - 2 \sum_i \varphi(x_i - x_{i+1})\varphi(x_{i+1} - x_{i+2}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}) \propto e^{-\omega r^2/2} \prod_i \chi(x_i - x_{i+1}), \quad \chi(x) \equiv \exp\left(\int^x \varphi(s) ds\right), \quad (2.8)$$

with $r^2 \equiv \sum_i x_i^2$ and energy $E = N\omega$. Note that φ is an arbitrary function, except for the requirement that the Jastrow-like eigenfunction (2.8) be square-integrable and other restrictions that we shall discuss below. We emphasize that the previous result is valid both for motion on the circle and on the line, with the convention for the range of the indices in sums and products explained above. However, in the former case one should set $\omega = 0$, since the external potential $\omega^2 r^2$ is not periodic in the angular variables x_i . In addition, in both cases there are several conditions that the function φ should satisfy stemming from natural physical requirements. In the first place, the two- and three-body potentials

$$V_2(x) = 2(\varphi'(x) + \varphi^2(x) - \omega x \varphi(x)), \quad V_3(x, y) = -2\varphi(x)\varphi(y) \quad (2.9)$$

should be even functions of their arguments, i.e., $V_2(-x) = V_2(x)$ and $V_3(-x, -y) = V_3(x, y)$. This immediately implies that $\varphi(x)$ should be an odd function of x . Furthermore, in the case of motion in the circle the boundary terms in the second and third sums in Eq. (2.2) should be consistent with the geometry of the system. For instance, the last term in the second sum, given by

$$V_2(x_N - x_{N+1}) \equiv V_2(x_N - x_1),$$

should be equal to $V_2(l + x_N - x_1)$, since $l - (x_1 - x_N)$ is the (arc) distance between the consecutive particles N and 1 on a circle of circumference l (cf. Fig. 1). This implies




Figure 1: Arc distance $l - (x_1 - x_N)$ between the particles 1 and N on a circle of circumference l .

that V_2 should be an l -periodic function, so that

$$V_2(x) = V_2(l + x) = V_2(l - x), \quad (2.10)$$

where the last equality is a consequence of the even character of V_2 . Similarly, from the last two terms in the third sum of Eq. (2.2) we obtain the relations

$$\begin{aligned} V_3(x_{N-1} - x_N, x_N - x_{N+1}) &\equiv V_3(x_{N-1} - x_N, x_N - x_1) = V_3(x_{N-1} - x_N, l + x_N - x_1), \\ V_3(x_N - x_{N+1}, x_{N+1} - x_{N+2}) &\equiv V_3(x_N - x_1, x_1 - x_2) = V_3(l + x_N - x_1, x_1 - x_2), \end{aligned}$$

which lead to the periodicity conditions

$$V_3(x + l, y) = V_3(x, y + l) = V_3(x, y). \quad (2.11)$$

From Eq. (2.9) we easily see that conditions (2.10)-(2.11) above are equivalent to the relation

$$\varphi(x + l) = \varphi(x). \quad (2.12)$$

In summary, φ should be an odd function of its argument and, in the case of motion on a circle, l -periodic. Thus in the latter case we have

$$\varphi(l - x) = \varphi(-x) = -\varphi(x), \quad (2.13)$$

so that φ is odd about $l/2$. Noting that²

$$\chi(x) = c \exp\left(\int_{l/2}^x \varphi(t) dt\right), \quad 0 < x < l,$$

(where c is a constant) we deduce that χ is symmetric about $l/2$ in the interval $(0, l)$, i.e.,

$$\chi(x) = \chi(l - x), \quad 0 < x < l.$$

The latter formula and the periodicity conditions (2.13) imply that

$$\chi(x) = \chi(l - x) = \chi(l + x)$$

holds everywhere (except, at most, at integers multiples of l). Thus in the case of motion on the circle χ is an even, l -periodic function. In particular, it follows from Eq. (2.8) that in this case the Jastrow-like wave function ψ is l -periodic in each variable.

To end this section, we shall next show that the solution (2.7) does not include potentials with purely two-body interactions. In other words, we must prove that the three-body term in Eq. (2.7) cannot be expressed as a sum of an external potential and a two-body term, i.e., that the equation

$$\sum_i \varphi(x_i - x_{i+1})\varphi(x_{i+1} - x_{i+2}) = \sum_i \lambda(x_i) + \sum_i F(x_i - x_{i+1}), \quad (2.14)$$

where λ, F are functions of one variable, cannot be satisfied unless φ is constant. To this end, consider first the case of motion on a circle, which is technically simpler due to the symmetry under the cyclic group. In this case, using the elementary identities

$$\sum_i \lambda(x_i) = \frac{1}{3} \sum_i (\lambda(x_i) + \lambda(x_{i+1}) + \lambda(x_{i+2})), \quad (2.15)$$

$$\sum_i F(x_i - x_{i+1}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i (F(x_i - x_{i+1}) + F(x_{i+1} - x_{i+2})), \quad (2.16)$$

and calling $(x_i, x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}) \equiv (x, y, z)$ we deduce that Eq. (2.14) is equivalent to the functional equation

$$\frac{1}{3}(\lambda(x) + \lambda(y) + \lambda(z)) + \frac{1}{2}(F(x - y) + F(y - z)) = \varphi(x - y)\varphi(y - z). \quad (2.17)$$

In terms of the independent variables $x, u \equiv x - y, v \equiv y - z$, the latter equation can be written as

$$\frac{1}{3}(\lambda(x) + \lambda(x - u) + \lambda(x - u - v)) + \frac{1}{2}(F(u) + F(v)) = \varphi(u)\varphi(v). \quad (2.18)$$

Differentiating with respect to x and setting $u = v = 0$ we deduce that $\lambda = \lambda_0$ is constant, so that

$$\varphi(u)\varphi(v) = \frac{1}{2}(F(u) + F(v)) + \lambda_0,$$

²We cannot represent χ by the following formula outside the open interval $(0, l)$, since φ is typically singular at $x = 0$, and hence at integer multiples of the period l . We shall assume in the following discussion that φ has no other singularities.

and hence

$$\varphi(u)^2 = F(u) + \lambda_0.$$

Substituting back in the previous equation we conclude that $\varphi(u) - \varphi(v)$ must be constant. This implies that φ itself is constant, which is excluded. In the case of motion on the line, Eq. (2.14) still holds (with the convention (2.3) for the summation range), but the identities (2.15)-(2.16) should be replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \lambda(x_i) &= \frac{1}{3} \sum_i (\lambda(x_i) + \lambda(x_{i+1}) + \lambda(x_{i+2})) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{3} (2\lambda(x_1) + \lambda(x_2) + \lambda(x_{N-1}) + 2\lambda(x_N)), \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i F(x_i - x_{i+1}) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_i (F(x_i - x_{i+1}) + F(x_{i+1} - x_{i+2})) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (F(x_1 - x_2) + F(x_{N-1} - x_N)). \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Consequently, in this case Eq. (2.14) is equivalent to Eq. (2.17) or Eq. (2.18), together with the following two relations coming from the boundary terms in Eqs. (2.19)-(2.20):

$$\frac{1}{3} (2\lambda(x) + \lambda(y)) + \frac{1}{2} F(x - y) = -\frac{1}{3} (\lambda(x) + 2\lambda(y)) - \frac{1}{2} F(x - y) = c,$$

where c is a constant. Since we have just seen that Eq. (2.18) cannot be satisfied unless φ is a constant, we conclude that there are no potentials of the form (2.7) with only two-body interactions also in the case of motion on the line.

3. Uniqueness

We shall show in this section that (2.7) is the most general potential of the form (2.2) admitting a Jastrow-like eigenfunction (2.4). Together with the result at the end of the previous section, this implies that no potential of the form (2.2) with only two-body interactions admits a Jastrow-like eigenfunction (2.4). For clarity's sake, we shall deal separately with the case of motion on a circle and on the real line.

3.1. Motion on a circle

To begin with, note that in this case we can express the sum of a two- and a three-body term as a pure three-body term, namely

$$\sum_i F_2(x_i - x_{i+1}) + \sum_i F_3(x_i - x_{i+1}, x_{i+1} - x_{i+2}) = \sum_i F(x_i - x_{i+1}, x_{i+1} - x_{i+2}), \quad (3.1)$$

with $F(x, y) = F_3(x, y) + (F_2(x) + F_2(y))/2$. Hence the RHS of Eq. (2.5) will be of the form (2.2) provided that there exist a function λ of one variable and a function F of two variables such that

$$\sum_i \lambda(x_i) + \sum_i F(x_i - x_{i+1}, x_{i+1} - x_{i+2}) = 2 \sum_i \varphi(x_i - x_{i+1}) (\tau(x_i) - \tau(x_{i+1})). \quad (3.2)$$

Taking into account Eq. (2.15) and the analogous identity

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \sum_i \varphi(x_i - x_{i+1})(\tau(x_i) - \tau(x_{i+1})) \\ &= \sum_i \varphi(x_i - x_{i+1})(\tau(x_i) - \tau(x_{i+1})) + \sum_i \varphi(x_{i+1} - x_{i+2})(\tau(x_{i+1}) - \tau(x_{i+2})), \end{aligned}$$

and calling again $(x_i, x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}) \equiv (x, y, z)$, we arrive at the functional equation

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{3}(\lambda(x) + \lambda(y) + \lambda(z)) + F(x - y, y - z) \\ &= \varphi(x - y)(\tau(x) - \tau(y)) + \varphi(y - z)(\tau(y) - \tau(z)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Equivalently, setting $u \equiv x - y$ and $v \equiv y - z$ we can rewrite the latter equation as

$$L(x, u, v) = F(u, v), \quad (3.4)$$

where the function $L(x, u, v)$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, u, v) \equiv & \varphi(u)(\tau(x) - \tau(x - u)) + \varphi(v)(\tau(x - u) - \tau(x - u - v)) \\ & - \frac{1}{3}(\lambda(x) + \lambda(x - u) + \lambda(x - u - v)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

In particular, from the last two equations it easily follows that λ and F are meromorphic functions of their arguments.

We shall now show that Eq. (3.4) implies that $\tau'' \equiv 0$, which, as explained in the previous section, yields the potential (2.7). The key idea in our proof is to note that by Eq. (3.4) the partial derivative of $L(x, u, v)$ with respect to x must vanish identically, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{3}(\lambda'(x) + \lambda'(x - u) + \lambda'(x - u - v)) \\ &= \varphi(u)(\tau'(x) - \tau'(x - u)) + \varphi(v)(\tau'(x - u) - \tau'(x - u - v)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Letting $v \rightarrow -u$ in the latter equation and taking into account the odd character of φ we obtain

$$2\lambda'(x) + \lambda'(x - u) = 6\varphi(u)(\tau'(x) - \tau'(x - u)).$$

If $\tau''(x) \not\equiv 0$ we can solve for $\varphi(u)$ in the latter equation, with the result

$$6\varphi(u) = \frac{2\lambda'(x) + \lambda'(x - u)}{\tau'(x) - \tau'(x - u)}. \quad (3.7)$$

Expanding the RHS of this equality in a Laurent series around $u = 0$ we readily obtain

$$6\varphi(u) = \frac{3\lambda'(x)}{\tau''(x)u} + \frac{3\lambda'(x)\tau'''(x)}{2\tau''(x)^2} - \frac{\lambda''(x)}{\tau''(x)} + \mathcal{O}(u).$$

The coefficient of $1/u$ in the latter equation must be a constant 6α , while that of u^0 must vanish on account of the odd character of φ . We thus deduce that

$$\lambda'(x) = 2\alpha\tau''(x), \quad \alpha\tau'''(x) = 0.$$

From the latter equations it also follows that $\alpha \neq 0$, since otherwise φ would vanish identically on account of Eq. (3.7). Hence $\tau''' = 0$, so that can write

$$\tau(x) = \tau_0 + \tau_1 x + \tau_2 x^2, \quad \lambda(x) = \lambda_0 + 4\alpha\tau_2 x,$$

with λ_0, τ_i constant and $\tau_2 \neq 0$. Substituting into Eq. (3.7) we easily obtain

$$\varphi(u) = \frac{\alpha}{u}.$$

However, this solution is not acceptable, since it does not satisfy the periodicity condition (2.12) that should hold in this case. We thus conclude that in the case of motion on the circle there is no solution of the problem posed with $\tau'' \neq 0$, as claimed.

3.2. Motion on the real line

We shall next discuss the case of motion on the real line, in which the coordinates x_i are unbounded. To begin with, in this case the identity (3.1) should be replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_i F_2(x_i - x_{i+1}) + \sum_i F_3(x_i - x_{i+1}, x_{i+1} - x_{i+2}) \\ &= \sum_i F(x_i - x_{i+1}, x_{i+1} - x_{i+2}) + \frac{1}{2}(F_2(x_1 - x_2) + F_2(x_{N-1} - x_N)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where as before $F(x, y) = F_3(x, y) + (F_2(x) + F_2(y))/2$, and we are using the convention (2.3) on the range of summation indices. Consequently, Eq. (3.2) now reads

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_i \lambda(x_i) + \sum_i F(x_i - x_{i+1}, x_{i+1} - x_{i+2}) + G(x_1 - x_2) + G(x_{N-1} - x_N) \\ &= 2 \sum_i \varphi(x_i - x_{i+1})(\tau(x_i) - \tau(x_{i+1})), \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

where λ, G are functions of one variable and F is a function of two variables. Using Eq. (2.19) and the identity

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \sum_i \varphi(x_i - x_{i+1})(\tau(x_i) - \tau(x_{i+1})) \\ &= \varphi(x_1 - x_2)(\tau(x_1) - \tau(x_2)) + \varphi(x_{N-1} - x_N)(\tau(x_{N-1}) - \tau(x_N)) \\ &+ \sum_i \left[\varphi(x_i - x_{i+1})(\tau(x_i) - \tau(x_{i+1})) + \varphi(x_{i+1} - x_{i+2})(\tau(x_{i+1}) - \tau(x_{i+2})) \right] \end{aligned}$$

in Eq. (3.9) we readily obtain Eq. (3.3), or equivalently (3.4)-(3.5), plus the additional constraints

$$\begin{aligned} (\tau(x) - \tau(y))\varphi(x - y) &= \frac{1}{3}(2\lambda(x) + \lambda(y)) + G(x - y) + c \\ &= \frac{1}{3}(\lambda(x) + 2\lambda(y)) + G(x - y) - c, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where c is a constant. From the latter equations we immediately deduce that $\lambda = \lambda_0$ must be a constant. This in turn implies that $\tau(x) - \tau(y)$ is a function of $x - y$, so that τ must be linear in x . Thus also in this case there is no solution with $\tau'' \neq 0$, as claimed.

4. Ground state conditions

We shall show in this section that the Jastrow-like eigenfunction (2.8) is actually the ground state of the potential (2.7), provided that the function φ satisfy very general assumptions that we shall now discuss.

We shall start our discussion with the case of motion on the line. First of all, it is natural on physical grounds to require that φ be analytic everywhere except at the origin, so that the only singularities of the potential (2.7) are located on the hyperplanes $x_i = x_{i+1}$. For simplicity, we shall further assume that φ has a simple pole at the origin, i.e.,

$$\varphi(x) = \frac{\alpha}{x} + \varphi_0(x),$$

with $\alpha \neq 0$ and φ_0 analytic on the real line. The wave function (2.8) can thus be written as

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}) \propto e^{-\omega r^2/2} \prod_i |x_i - x_{i+1}|^\alpha \cdot \prod_i e^{\Phi(x_i - x_{i+1})}, \quad (4.1)$$

with $\Phi(x) = \int^x \varphi_0(s) ds$ analytic on the real line. Note that we must have $\alpha > 1/2$, to ensure that the expected value of the kinetic energy of the eigenstate ψ be finite. This automatically guarantees the square integrability of ψ near the singular hyperplanes $x_i = x_{i+1}$. Moreover, since the potential (2.7) diverges near these hyperplanes as $\alpha(\alpha - 1)(x_i - x_{i+1})^{-2}$, if $\alpha \neq 1$ the particles cannot overtake each other [1, 49]. Thus we can fix the ordering of the particles as, e.g., $x_1 > \dots > x_N$, which amounts to taking the configuration space of the system as the open set

$$A = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid x_1 > \dots > x_N\}.$$

It is then clear that ψ does not vanish on A by Eq. (4.1). Hence to show that ψ is indeed the ground state of H it suffices to verify that it is square-integrable at infinity. To this end, we need only impose that³ $\omega > 0$ and $\Phi(x) \leq cx^2$ with $c < \omega/8$. Indeed, if this is the case we have

$$e^{-\omega r^2/2} \prod_i e^{\Phi(x_i - x_{i+1})} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\omega r^2 + c \sum_i (x_i - x_{i+1})^2\right) \equiv e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} b_{ij} x_i x_j}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $B \equiv (b_{ij})_{1 \leq i,j \leq N}$ is the circulant matrix with first row $(\omega - 4c, 2c, \dots, 2c)$ (the dots standing for zeros) [50]. Since the eigenvalues of B , given by⁴

$$\lambda_j = \omega - 8c \sin^2(j\pi/N), \quad j = 0, \dots, N-1,$$

are all positive on account of the condition $\omega > 8c$, the associated quadratic form is positive definite. By the inequality (4.2), this implies that the eigenfunction (4.1) is square-integrable at infinity.

³If $\omega = 0$, the potential (2.7) is translation-invariant, so that the total momentum is conserved. In this case we can separate the center of mass motion and regard the differences $x_i - x_{i+1}$, $1 \leq i \leq N-1$, as independent variables. Consequently, the eigenfunction (2.4) with $\omega = 0$ will be square-integrable at infinity provided that $\Phi(x) \leq -c_0 \log|x| + c_1$ with $c_0 > 1$.

⁴For $N = 2$, the eigenvalues of B are $\omega - 2c$ and $\omega - 6c$.

In the case of motion on a circle, we shall again require that φ have a simple pole at the origin with residue $\alpha \neq 0$. By the periodicity condition (2.12), φ must have simple poles with residue α at integer multiples of the circle's circumference l , so that

$$\varphi(x) = \alpha \left(\frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{x-l} \right) + \varphi_0(x),$$

with φ_0 analytic on the interval $[0, l]$. The Jastrow-like eigenfunction (2.4) (with $\omega = 0$) is then given by

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}) \propto \prod_i |(x_i - x_{i+1})(l - x_i + x_{i+1})|^\alpha \cdot \prod_i e^{\Phi(x_i - x_{i+1})}, \quad (4.3)$$

where $\Phi(x) = \int^x \varphi_0(s) ds$ is analytic on the interval $[0, l]$. As before, the square integrability of the eigenfunction ψ at $x_i - x_{i+1} = kl$ (with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$) and the finiteness of the average kinetic energy require that $\alpha > 1/2$. Furthermore, the potential (2.7) diverges near the singular hyperplanes $x_i - x_{i+1} = kl$ as $\alpha(\alpha - 1)(x_i - x_{i+1} - kl)^{-2}$. Hence if $\alpha \neq 1$ the particles cannot overtake each other, and the system's configuration space can thus be taken as the open set

$$A = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid x_1 > \cdots > x_N > x_1 - l\}. \quad (4.4)$$

The Jastrow-like eigenfunction ψ in Eq. (4.3) is square-integrable on A , since the potential is translation-invariant and we can therefore regard the differences $x_i - x_{i+1}$, which range over the bounded interval $(0, l)$, as independent variables after separating the center of mass motion. Moreover, ψ does not vanish on the configuration space (4.4), and is thus again the system's ground state.

5. Examples

As we have seen in the previous sections, the most general potential of the form (2.2) admitting a Jastrow-like eigenfunction (2.8) depends on an essentially arbitrary function φ of one variable and, in the case of motion on the line, an additional constant ω . In particular, choosing φ appropriately one should be able to recover all the potentials of the form (2.2) previously proposed in the literature, as well as several interesting generalizations thereof. Thus, if $\varphi(x) = \alpha/x$, from Eqs. (2.7) and (2.8) we obtain the rational potential introduced in Ref. [41], namely

$$V(\mathbf{x}) = \omega^2 r^2 + \sum_i \frac{2\alpha(\alpha - 1)}{(x_i - x_{i+1})^2} - \sum_i \frac{2\alpha^2}{(x_i - x_{i+1})(x_{i+1} - x_{i+2})},$$

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}) \propto e^{-\omega r^2/2} \prod_i |x_i - x_{i+1}|^\alpha, \quad E = N\omega + 2(N - 1)\alpha\omega.$$

Although the previous formulas for V and ψ are *formally* valid both for the circle and the real line, as discussed in Section 2 the above potential has a natural physical interpretation only in the latter case⁵.

⁵Note, however, that the variant of the latter potential with cyclic symmetry and its spin version have been used in Ref. [51] to construct an analogue of the Polychronakos–Frahm spin chain [52, 53] with nearest-neighbors interactions, whose first few eigenvalues can be computed in closed form.

Similarly, the choice $\varphi(x) = (\pi\alpha/l) \cot(\pi x/l)$ with $\omega = 0$ leads to the trigonometric potential [41]

$$V(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{\pi}{l}\right)^2 \sum_i \frac{2\alpha(\alpha-1)}{\sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{l}(x_i - x_{i+1})\right)} - 2\left(\frac{\pi\alpha}{l}\right)^2 \sum_i \cot\left(\frac{\pi}{l}(x_i - x_{i+1})\right) \cot\left(\frac{\pi}{l}(x_{i+1} - x_{i+2})\right),$$

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}) \propto \prod_i \left| \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{l}(x_i - x_{i+1})\right) \right|^\alpha, \quad E = 2N \left(\frac{\pi\alpha}{l}\right)^2.$$

The natural interpretation of this model is on a circle of radius $l/(2\pi)$.

A hyperbolic version of the previous potential is easily obtained by taking $l = i\pi/\beta$ (with $\beta > 0$) in the previous formula for $\varphi(x)$. We thus obtain $\varphi(x) = \alpha\beta \coth(\beta x)$ and

$$V(\mathbf{x}) = \omega^2 r^2 - 2\alpha\beta\omega \sum_i (x_i - x_{i+1}) \coth(\beta(x_i - x_{i+1})) + \sum_i \frac{2\alpha(\alpha-1)\beta^2}{\sinh^2(\beta(x_i - x_{i+1}))} - 2\alpha^2\beta^2 \sum_i \coth(\beta(x_i - x_{i+1})) \coth(\beta(x_{i+1} - x_{i+2})), \quad (5.1)$$

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}) \propto e^{-\omega r^2/2} \prod_i \left| \sinh(\beta(x_i - x_{i+1})) \right|^\alpha, \quad E = N\omega - 2(N-1)\alpha^2\beta^2. \quad (5.2)$$

Note that we have taken $\omega > 0$, since the latter potential has a natural physical interpretation only on the line, and the term $e^{-\omega r^2/2}$ in the expression for ψ is therefore needed to guarantee its square integrability. The hyperbolic model (5.1) can be regarded as the near-neighbors analogue of the long-range model of CS type introduced by Forrester [30]. The ground state of the latter model, which is similar to (5.2) but is factorized over the whole A_{N-1} root system, was shown by Forrester to describe a Wigner solid in the thermodynamic limit.




Figure 2: Hyperbolic potential (5.1) (left) and its normalized Jastrow-like eigenfunction (5.2) (right) for $N = 3$, $\alpha = 2$, $\omega = \beta = 1$ in the center of mass frame $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 0$ as a function of the relative coordinates $u \equiv x_1 - x_2$, $v \equiv x_2 - x_3$.

In the classification of long-range interaction potentials with two-body interactions and Jastrow-type ground state performed in Refs. [28, 29, 31], the rational, trigonometric and hyperbolic solutions are obtained precisely from the three choices of the function φ used in the previous examples. In fact, in this case there is an additional solution given

by

$$\varphi(x) = \alpha\zeta(x) + \gamma x, \quad (5.3)$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\zeta(x) \equiv \zeta(x; g_2, g_3)$ is the Weierstrass zeta function with invariants g_2 and g_3 [54], which yields the above three choices of φ as particular cases on account of the identities

$$\begin{cases} \zeta(x; \frac{4}{3}\beta^4, \frac{8}{27}\beta^6) - \frac{\beta^2 x}{3} = \beta \cot(\beta x), \\ \zeta(x; 0, 0) = \frac{1}{x}, \\ \zeta(x; \frac{4}{3}\beta^4, -\frac{8}{27}\beta^6) + \frac{\beta^2 x}{3} = \beta \coth(\beta x). \end{cases}$$

It is therefore natural to consider the potential (2.7) generated by the function φ in Eq. (5.3). We shall assume that the invariants $g_{2,3}$ are real and satisfy the condition $g_2^3 > 27g_3^2$, so that ζ is real for real values of its argument and the corresponding Weierstrass function $\wp(z) \equiv -\zeta'(z)$ has a real fundamental period $l < \infty$ and a purely imaginary one ω_3 (with $\text{Im}\omega_3 > 0$). Since the ζ function has simple poles at integer multiples of these periods, the corresponding potential (2.7) is naturally defined on a circle of circumference l . As explained in Section 2, this requires that $\omega = 0$ and that φ be an l -periodic function. In view of the identity

$$\zeta(z + l) = \zeta(z) + 2\eta_1,$$

where $\eta_1 \equiv \zeta(l/2)$, the latter condition will be satisfied if and only if $\gamma = -2\alpha\eta_1/l$. We are thus led to consider the choice

$$\varphi(x) = \alpha \left(\zeta(x) - \frac{2\eta_1}{l} x \right), \quad (5.4)$$

whose associated potential is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathbf{x}) = & -2\alpha \sum_i \wp(x_i - x_{i+1}) + 2 \sum_i \varphi(x_i - x_{i+1})^2 \\ & - 2 \sum_i \varphi(x_i - x_{i+1})\varphi(x_{i+1} - x_{i+2}) \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

with $\alpha > 1/2$. The corresponding Jastrow-like eigenfunction and energy read

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha\eta_1}{l} \sum_i (x_i - x_{i+1})^2\right) \prod_i |\sigma(x_i - x_{i+1})|^\alpha, \quad E = \frac{4N\eta_1\alpha}{l}, \quad (5.6)$$

where the Weierstrass σ function is defined by $\sigma'/\sigma = \zeta$ and $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \sigma(z)/z = 1$ (see Fig. 3 for a plot of the potential (5.5) and its Jastrow-like eigenfunction (5.6) for $N = 3$ particles when $\alpha = 2$, $l = 1$ and $\text{Im}\omega_3 = 1/2$). Recall that σ is entire and odd, and it vanishes only at the periods of \wp , so that in particular $\sigma(kl) = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence ψ does not vanish on the configuration space (4.4), and is therefore the system's ground state. We also know from the general discussion of Section 2 (and is also obvious from the l -periodicity of \wp and φ) that the two-body potential

$$V_2(x) = 2(-\alpha\wp(x) + \varphi(x)^2) \quad (5.7)$$

is l -periodic and symmetric about $l/2$ (cf. Eq. (2.10)), and that the Jastrow-like eigenfunction (5.6) is also l -periodic in each of its variables. The latter fact can also be checked directly with the help of the identity

$$\sigma(z+l) = -e^{2\eta_1(z+\frac{l}{2})}\sigma(z).$$

In Fig. 4 we present a plot of V_2 and χ for $\alpha = 2$, $l = 1$ and several values of $\text{Im } \omega_3$ in the half-period $0 < x < 1/2$.

The potential (5.5) depends on three real parameters, namely $\alpha > 1/2$, $\text{Im } \omega_3 > 0$, and $l > 0$. Note, however, that from the well known identities

$$\wp(\mu x|\mu l/2, \mu\omega_3) = \frac{1}{\mu^2}\wp(x), \quad \zeta(\mu x|\mu l/2, \mu\omega_3) = \frac{1}{\mu}\zeta(x)$$

(where $f(z|\mu l/2, \mu\omega_3)$ denotes the corresponding Weierstrass function f with periods μl and $2\mu\omega_3$) it easily follows that either $\text{Im } \omega_3$ or l can be rescaled to (say) 1 by an appropriate overall dilation of the coordinates. Note also that when $\text{Im } \omega_3 \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$\wp(x) \rightarrow \frac{\pi^2}{l^2} \left(\sin^{-2}\left(\frac{\pi x}{l}\right) - \frac{1}{3} \right), \quad \zeta(x) \rightarrow \frac{\pi^2 x}{3l^2} + \frac{\pi}{l} \cot\left(\frac{\pi x}{l}\right), \quad \eta_1 \rightarrow \frac{\pi^2}{6l}$$

(see, e.g., Refs. [55, 56]), and consequently

$$\varphi(x) \rightarrow \frac{\alpha\pi}{l} \cot\left(\frac{\pi x}{l}\right), \quad V_2(x) \rightarrow \frac{2\alpha(\alpha-1)}{\sin^2\left(\frac{\pi x}{l}\right)} - 2\left(\frac{\pi}{l}\right)^2 \alpha \left(\alpha - \frac{1}{3} \right)$$

(cf. Fig. 4). From these equations it readily follows that as $\text{Im } \omega_3 \rightarrow \infty$ the potential (5.5) tends to

$$V_{\text{trig}}(\mathbf{x}) - 2\left(\frac{\pi}{l}\right)^2 N\alpha \left(\alpha - \frac{1}{3} \right),$$

where $V_{\text{trig}}(\mathbf{x})$ is the trigonometric potential in Ref. [41] discussed above.




Figure 3: Elliptic potential (5.5) (left) and its normalized Jastrow-like eigenfunction (5.6) (right) for $N = 3$, $\alpha = 2$, $l = 1$ and $\text{Im } \omega_3 = 1/2$ as a function of the relative coordinates $u \equiv x_1 - x_2$, $v \equiv x_2 - x_3$.




Figure 4: Left: elliptic two-body potential (5.7) with $l = 1$, $\alpha = 2$ and several values of $\text{Im } \omega_3$, compared to its limiting trigonometric potential $4 \sin^{-2}(\pi x) - 20\pi^2/3$ (dashed black line). Right: analogous plot for the corresponding functions $\chi(x)$ determining the Jastrow-like eigenfunction (2.8) (with the normalization $\int_0^1 |\chi(x)|^2 dx = 1$).

6. Summary and outlook

In this paper we completely solve the problem of classifying all one-dimensional quantum Hamiltonians with nearest- and next-to-nearest-neighbors (translation invariant) interactions admitting a Jastrow-like ground state, both for motion on the real line and on a circle. This is the simplest near-neighbors analogue of the well-known problem for Calogero–Sutherland models with long-range interactions proposed shortly after their introduction and completely solved in Ref. [31]. Our solution differs in two fundamental ways with its long-range counterpart. In the first place, we show that the potential must necessarily contain a three-body interaction term, which by construction is absent in the long-range solution. Secondly, the near-neighbors solution depends on an essentially arbitrary function of one variable (and, for motion on the line, on an additional positive parameter). The general solution contains a potential featuring elliptic interactions, which yields the (rational and trigonometric) particular solutions considered so far [41] as limiting cases.

Our results suggest several lines of work for further research. To begin with, it would certainly be of interest to study in detail the potentials contained in the general solution, and in particular determine whether one can exactly compute other eigenfunctions besides the ground state. This is known to be true for the previously known rational and trigonometric models, and it would therefore be very natural to verify if it is also the case for the more general elliptic potential introduced in Section 5 or its hyperbolic limit. Another possible line for future research is the construction and analysis of the spin versions of the near-neighbors models considered (see Refs. [43, 44] for the rational and trigonometric models), and their associated short-range spin chains (as was done in Ref. [51] for the rational model). Similarly, it would be of interest to study the extension of our results to more general Jastrow-like ground states depending on differences $x_i - x_{i+k}$ with k less than a fixed range $r > 1$ (see, e.g., Refs. [45, 46]), as well as to ground states factorized over other root systems like BC_N [47, 48]. Finally, another topic worth investigating is the explicit computation of the correlation functions of the eigenvalue probability densities given by the Jastrow-like ground states considered in this paper,

like, e.g., the elliptic wave function in Eq. (5.6). This can be done in principle with the techniques of Refs. [57, 58], although the evaluation of the resulting integrals could be far from trivial in this case. In fact, the analogous problem for the density (2.8) with $\omega = 0$ and $\chi(x) = |x|^{\beta/2}$ has already been solved in Ref. [39]. The corresponding distribution of the spacings of consecutive eigenvalues has been shown in the latter reference to be a good approximation to this statistic for certain pseudo-integrable billiards and for the Anderson model at the transition point.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by Spain's MINECO under research grant no. FIS2015-63966-P. JAC acknowledges the financial support of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid through a 2015 predoctoral scholarship. MB was supported by a grant from the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology of Iran. She would also like to thank the Departamento de Física Teórica II of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid for their warm hospitality.

References

- [1] F. Calogero, *J. Math. Phys.* 12 (1971) 419–436.
- [2] B. Sutherland, *Phys. Rev. A* 4 (1971) 2019–2021.
- [3] B. Sutherland, *Phys. Rev. A* 5 (1972) 1372–1376.
- [4] A. P. Polychronakos, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 74 (1995) 5153–5157.
- [5] A. G. Abanov, A. Gromov, M. Kulkarni, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* 44 (2011) 295203(21).
- [6] T. H. Baker, P. J. Forrester, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 188 (1997) 175–216.
- [7] C. F. Dunkl, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 197 (1998) 451–487.
- [8] K. Takemura, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 258 (2005) 367–403.
- [9] N. Taniguchi, B. S. Shastry, B. L. Altshuler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75 (1995) 3724–3727.
- [10] H.-J. Stöckmann, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 37 (2004) 137–146.
- [11] M. Caselle, U. Magnea, *Phys. Rep.* 394 (2004) 41–156.
- [12] A. L. Carey, E. Langmann, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 201 (1999) 1–34.
- [13] A. P. Polychronakos, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 39 (2006) 12793–12845.
- [14] H. Azuma, S. Iso, *Phys. Lett. B* 331 (1994) 107–113.
- [15] B. A. Bernevig, F. D. M. Haldane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 100 (2008) 246802(4).
- [16] J. Cardy, *Phys. Lett. B* 582 (2004) 121–126.
- [17] R. Sakamoto, J. Shiraishi, D. Arnaudon, L. Frappat, E. Ragoucy, *Nucl. Phys. B* 704 (2005) 490–509.
- [18] B. Estienne, V. Pasquier, R. Santachiara, D. Serban, *Nucl. Phys. B* 860 (2012) 377–420.
- [19] G. W. Gibbons, P. K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett. B* 454 (1999) 187–192.
- [20] A. Galajinsky, *Phys. Rev. D* 85 (2012) 085002(7).
- [21] M. Kulkarni, A. G. Abanov, *Phys. Rev. A* 86 (2012) 033614(16).
- [22] M. A. Rajabpour, S. Sotiriadis, *Phys. Rev. A* 89 (2014) 033620(8).
- [23] B. Sutherland, *J. Math. Phys.* 12 (1971) 246–250.
- [24] F. J. Dyson, *J. Math. Phys.* 3 (1962) 140–156.
- [25] F. J. Dyson, *J. Math. Phys.* 13 (1972) 90–97.
- [26] B. Sutherland, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 35 (1975) 185–188.
- [27] B. Sutherland, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 34 (1975) 1083–1085.
- [28] F. Calogero, *Lett. Nuovo Cimento* 13 (1975) 507–511.
- [29] V. I. Inozemtsev, D. V. Meshcheryakov, *Phys. Lett. A* 106 (1984) 100–104.
- [30] P. J. Forrester, *J. Stat. Phys.* 76 (1994) 331–346.
- [31] T. Koprucki, H.-J. Wagner, *J. Stat. Phys.* 100 (2000) 779–790.
- [32] M. L. Mehta, *Random Matrices*, Elsevier, San Diego, 3rd edition, 2004.
- [33] P. J. Forrester, *Log-Gases and Random Matrices*, Princeton University Press, 2010.
- [34] M. V. Berry, M. Tabor, *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A* 356 (1977) 375–394.
- [35] M. V. Berry, M. Robnik, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen* 19 (1986) 649–668.

- [36] P. W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev.* 109 (1958) 1492–1505.
- [37] G. Date, S. R. Jain, M. V. N. Murthy, *Phys. Rev. E* 51 (1995) 198–203.
- [38] T. Guhr, A. Müller-Groeling, H. A. Weidenmüller, *Phys. Rep.* 299 (1998) 189–425.
- [39] E. B. Bogomolny, U. Gerland, C. Schmit, *Phys. Rev. E* 59 (1999) R1315–R1318.
- [40] E. Bogomolny, U. Gerland, C. Schmit, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 19 (2001) 121–132.
- [41] S. R. Jain, A. Khare, *Phys. Lett. A* 262 (1999) 35–39.
- [42] B. Basu-Mallick, A. Kundu, *Phys. Lett. A* 279 (2001) 29–32.
- [43] A. Enciso, F. Finkel, A. González-López, M. A. Rodríguez, *Phys. Lett. B* 605 (2005) 214–222.
- [44] A. Enciso, F. Finkel, A. González-López, M. A. Rodríguez, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* 40 (2007) 1857–1883.
- [45] T. R. Tummuru, S. R. Jain, A. Khare, Truncated Calogero–Sutherland models on a circle, 2016. 1609.07928v1 [quant-ph].
- [46] S. M. Pittman, M. Beau, M. Olshanii, A. del Campo, *Phys. Rev. B* 95 (2017) 205135(9).
- [47] G. Auberson, S. R. Jain, A. Khare, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 34 (2001) 695–724.
- [48] M. Ezung, N. Gurappa, A. Khare, P. K. Panigrahi, *Phys. Rev. B* 71 (2005) 125121(8).
- [49] M. Andrews, *Am. J. Phys.* 44 (1976) 1064–1066.
- [50] R. M. Gray, *Foundations and Trends[®] in Communications and Information Theory* 2 (2006) 155–239.
- [51] A. Enciso, F. Finkel, A. González-López, M. A. Rodríguez, *Nucl. Phys. B* 789 (2008) 452–482.
- [52] A. P. Polychronakos, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 70 (1993) 2329–2331.
- [53] H. Frahm, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 26 (1993) L473–L479.
- [54] E. T. Whittaker, G. N. Watson, *A Course of Modern Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 1927.
- [55] F. W. J. Olver, D. W. Lozier, R. F. Boisvert, C. W. Clark (Eds.), *NIST Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [56] F. Finkel, A. González-López, *J. Stat. Mech.-Theory E.* 2014 (2014) P12014(28).
- [57] F. Gürsey, *Math. Proc. Cambridge* 46 (1950) 182–194.
- [58] L. van Hove, *Physica* 16 (1950) 137–143.