

# More on the gauge principle and nonobservability of some quantum numbers characterizing the Landau eigen-states

Masashi Wakamatsu\*

KEK Theory Center, Institute of Particle and Nuclear Studies,  
High Energy Accelerator Research Organization (KEK), Oho 1-1, Tsukuba, 305-0801, Ibaraki, Japan  
(Dated: November 29, 2023)

The eigen-states of the Landau Hamiltonian in the symmetric gauge are characterized by two integers  $n$  and  $m$ . Here,  $n$  denotes the familiar Landau quantum number, while  $m$  represents the eigen-value of the canonical orbital angular momentum (OAM) operator  $\hat{L}_z^{can}$ . On the other hand, the eigen-states in the 1st Landau gauge are characterized by two integers  $n$  and  $k_x$ , here  $n$  is the Landau quantum number, while  $k_x$  is the eigen-value of the canonical momentum operator  $\hat{p}_x^{can}$ . Since the canonical momentum and the canonical OAM are both gauge-variant quantities, their eigenvalues  $k_x$  and  $m$  are standardly believed not to correspond to observables. However, this wide-spread view was suspected in a recent paper based on the logical development of the gauge-potential-independent formulation of the Landau problem, which predicts the existence of two conserved momenta  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}$  and  $\hat{p}_y^{cons}$  and one conserved OAM  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}$ . They are regarded as Noether charges of the Landau Hamiltonian, the conservation of which is guaranteed *independently* of the choice of the *auge potential*. In particular, on the basis of novel covariant gauge transformation properties of these conserved operators, the eigen-values of which are characterized by the quantum numbers  $k_x$ ,  $k_y$ , and  $m$ , it was claimed that these quantum numbers correspond to observables at least in principle. The purpose of the present paper is to show that this claim is not justified, regardless of the differences in the two theoretical formulations of the Landau problem, i.e. the traditional formulation and the gauge-potential-independent formulation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

As is widely known, in the traditional formulation of the Landau problem, there are three typical choices of gauge, i.e. the symmetric gauge, and the 1st and 2nd Landau gauges [1–6]. In the symmetric gauge, the Landau eigen-states are characterized by two quantum numbers  $n$  and  $m$ , where the so-called Landau quantum number  $n$  characterizes the eigen-energies of the Landau Hamiltonian, while  $m$  is the eigen-value of the canonical orbital angular momentum (OAM) operator  $\hat{L}_z^{can}$ . In a series of papers [7–10], we tried to demonstrate that  $m$  does not correspond to observables in conformity with the fact that the canonical OAM is standardly believed to be a *gauge-variant* quantity. Those were arguments within the symmetric gauge choice, but we naturally anticipate that the same holds true also in other gauges, i.e. also in the two Landau gauges. For example, with the choice of the 1st Landau gauge, the eigen-states of the Landau Hamiltonian are characterized by two quantum numbers  $n$  and  $k_x$ , where  $n$  is the same quantum number as appearing in the eigen-states in the symmetric gauge, whereas  $k_x$  is the eigen-value of the canonical momentum operator  $\hat{p}_x^{can}$ . Since  $k_x$  is the eigen-value of the *gauge-variant* canonical momentum operator  $\hat{p}_x^{can}$ , we naturally anticipate that it too does not correspond to experimentally measurable quantities. In fact, the validity of this reasonable conjecture was extensively discussed in a recent paper [11].

However, this plausible conclusion drawn in [11] was criticized in a recent paper [12] based on logical development of the gauge-potential-independent formulation of the Landau problem, which predicts the existence of three conserved quantities [11, 12], i.e. the two conserved momenta  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}$  and  $\hat{p}_y^{cons}$  and one conserved OAM  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}$ , the conservation of which holds independently of the choices of the gauge potential. (We point out that these conserved quantities are basically the same quantities as those called the *pseudo momentum* and the *pseudo OAM* in some recent literature [8, 13–15].). According to the author of the paper [12] (see also [16]), the existence of the three types of Landau eigen-states, i.e. the two Landau-gauge-type eigen-states and the symmetric-gauge-type eigen-states has much to do with which of the three operators  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}$ ,  $\hat{p}_y^{cons}$  or  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}$  is diagonalized simultaneously with the Landau Hamiltonian, and it has little to do with the choices of gauge in the Landau problem. We have no objection to the first half part of the above statement, but the problem is the last half part. That is, we think that whether it has really nothing to do with the choice of gauge in the Landau problem is a highly nontrivial question, which concerns the deep philosophy of the *gauge symmetry concept* in physics. As will be explained in the body of the paper, this question is intimately connected with observability or nonobservability question of these three quantities. Curiously, a remarkable feature

---

\* wakamatu@post.kek.jp

of the above three conserved operators is that they transform *covariantly* under an arbitrary gauge transformation just like the mechanical momentum operators  $\hat{p}_x^{mech}$  and  $\hat{p}_y^{mech}$  and the mechanical OAM operator  $\hat{L}_z^{mech}$ , which are widely believed to correspond to genuinely gauge-invariant observable quantities. On the basis of this fact together with some other additional reasonings, the author of [12] claims that the three conserved quantities also correspond to observables at least in principle. The purpose of the present paper is to show that this claim is not necessarily justified, regardless of the differences in the two theoretical formulations of the Landau problem, i.e. the traditional formulation [1–6] and the gauge-potential-independent formulation [7, 11, 12, 14–17].

The plan of the paper is as follows. In sect.2, we discuss general features of the Landau eigen-functions in different gauges. In particular, by paying special attention to the role of the quantum guiding center (or orbit center) concept in the Landau problem [8, 18, 19], we show why the probability and current distributions of the Landau electron are so different in different gauges. Next, in sect.3, we briefly review the essence of the gauge-potential-independent formulation of the Landau problem with a particular intention of explaining what is the controversy over observability or nonobservability of the quantum numbers  $m$  and  $k_x$  characterizing the two types of Landau eigen-states. In sect.4, we try to convince non-observable nature of the quantum number  $k_x$  characterizing the Landau eigen-states in the 1st Landau gauge with the use of a concrete example, i.e. the familiar quantum Hall effect. Next, in sect.5, by paying attention to the similarity and dissimilarity between the Landau problem and the problem of the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator, we demonstrate that the quantum number  $m$  characterizing the Landau eigen-states in the symmetric gauge does not correspond to observables. In sect.6, we briefly discuss implication of the knowledge gained in the present paper on the so-called gauge-invariant decomposition problem of the nucleon spin. Finally, in sect.7, we summarize what we have learned in the present paper.

## II. GENERAL FEATURES OF THE LANDAU EIGEN-STATES IN DIFFERENT GAUGES

In classical mechanics, the electron in a uniform magnetic field makes a cyclotron motion around some fixed point  $(X, Y)$  in the 2-dimensional plane. This center of cyclotron motion is sometimes called the *guiding center* or simply the *orbit center*. Obviously, it is a constant of motion in classical mechanics. When going to quantum mechanics, the guiding center coordinates become quantum operators expressed with the position operators  $(\hat{x}, \hat{y})$  and the velocity operators  $(\hat{v}_x, \hat{v}_y)$  as

$$\hat{X} = \hat{x} + \frac{\hat{v}_y}{\omega_c}, \quad \hat{Y} = \hat{y} - \frac{\hat{v}_x}{\omega_c}. \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\omega_c$  is the cyclotron frequency given by  $\omega_c = \frac{eB}{m_e}$  with  $B$  being the strength of the uniform magnetic field and with  $m_e$  and  $-e$  ( $e > 0$ ) being the mass and the charge of the electron, respectively. Note that the velocity operator is related to the mechanical (or kinetic) momentum operator  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{mech}$  of the electron through the relation  $\hat{\mathbf{v}} = \hat{\mathbf{p}}^{mech}/m_e$ . (In the following, assuming that no confusion arises, we shall omit hat symbol indicating quantum operators, for notational simplicity.) Interestingly, the guiding center coordinates are constants of motion also in quantum mechanics in the sense that they commute with the Hamiltonian  $H$  of the Landau system [3, 18] :

$$[X, H] = [Y, H] = 0, \quad (2)$$

where  $H$  is given as

$$H = \frac{1}{2m_e} (\mathbf{p} + e\mathbf{A})^2. \quad (3)$$

Here, the vector potential  $\mathbf{A}$  is supposed to reproduce the uniform magnetic field by the relation  $\nabla \times \mathbf{A} = B \mathbf{e}_z$ . Very importantly, however,  $X$  and  $Y$  do not commute with each other. Rather, they satisfy the following commutation relation :

$$[X, Y] = il_B^2, \quad (4)$$

where  $l_B = 1/\sqrt{eB}$  is called the magnetic length in the Landau system. This non-commutability of  $X$  and  $Y$  makes physical interpretation of the guiding center coordinates in quantum mechanics far less intuitive as compared with the classical case [3]. The purpose of the present section is to reveal mysterious nature of the quantum mechanical Landau eigen-functions by paying maximum attention to the role of *quantum guiding center*.

Let us start the discussion with the familiar eigen-functions of the Landau Hamiltonian in the *symmetric gauge*. With the choice of the symmetric gauge potential  $\mathbf{A} = \frac{1}{2} B (-y, x)$ , the Landau Hamiltonian takes the following form

:

$$\begin{aligned}
H &= \frac{1}{2m_e}(p_x^2 + p_y^2) + \frac{(eB)^2}{8m_e}(x^2 + y^2) + \frac{eB}{2m_e}(xp_y - yp_x) \\
&= \frac{1}{2m_e}(p_x^2 + p_y^2) + \frac{1}{2}m_e\omega_L^2 r^2 + \omega_L L_z^{can}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Here,  $\omega_L = (eB)/(2m_e) = \omega_c/2$  is called the Larmor frequency, while  $L_z^{can} \equiv xp_y - yp_x$  is the usual canonical orbital angular momentum (OAM) operator. This form of Hamiltonian has a *rotational symmetry* around the  $z$ -axis. The eigen-functions of the above Hamiltonian are well-known and given in the form

$$\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}(x, y) = \frac{e^{im\phi}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} R_{n,m}(r), \tag{6}$$

where  $R_{n,m}(r)$  denotes the radial wave function given by

$$R_{n,m}(r) = N_{n,m} \left( \frac{r^2}{2l_B^2} \right)^{|m|/2} r^{-\frac{r^2}{4l_B^2}} L_{n-\frac{|m|+m}{2}}^{|m|} \left( \frac{r^2}{2l_B^2} \right), \tag{7}$$

with the use of the associated Laguerre polynomial  $L_k^\alpha(x)$ . Here,  $n$  is the familiar Landau quantum number taking non-negative integer, while  $m$  is an integer subject to the constraint  $m \leq n$ . To be more explicit,  $\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}(x, y)$  are the simultaneous eigen-functions of the Landau Hamiltonian and the canonical OAM operator  $L_z^{can} = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}$ :

$$H \Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}(x, y) = (2n + 1) \omega_L \Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}(x, y), \tag{8}$$

$$L_z^{can} \Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}(x, y) = m \Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}(x, y). \tag{9}$$

We also recall that the quantum number  $n - \frac{|m|+m}{2} \equiv n_r$  appearing in the above eigen-functions  $\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}(x, y)$  represents the number of nodes in the radial wave function  $R_{n,m}(r)$ .

Although it is not necessarily very popular, the guiding center coordinates are quite important quantities in controlling the behaviors of the Landau wave functions and the associated probability and current densities of the electron [3]. Especially important here are the following two quantities [18],[9]. One is the square of the cyclotron radius (operator) defined by

$$r_c^2 \equiv (x - X)^2 + (y - Y)^2. \tag{10}$$

Another is the square of the distance between the guiding center and the coordinate origin given by

$$R^2 \equiv X^2 + Y^2. \tag{11}$$

As shown by Johnson and Lippmann many years ago [18], there is a remarkable relationship between these two quantities and the canonical OAM operator  $L_z^{can}$ , which is given as

$$L_z^{can} = \frac{1}{2l_B^2} (r_c^2 - R^2). \tag{12}$$

For convenience, we introduce the notation  $\langle O \rangle$  to denote the expectation value of any operator  $O$  between the Landau eigen-functions in the symmetric gauge, i.e.

$$\langle O \rangle \equiv \iint dx dy \Psi_{n,m}^{(S)*}(x, y) O \Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}(x, y). \tag{13}$$

The expectation values of the operators  $r_c^2$  and  $R^2$  can easily be evaluated as [9, 18]

$$\langle r_c^2 \rangle = (2n + 1) l_B^2, \tag{14}$$

$$\langle R^2 \rangle = (2n - 2m + 1) l_B^2. \tag{15}$$

Note that these answers are naturally consistent with the relation

$$\langle L_z^{can} \rangle = m \tag{16}$$

The above relation (15) plays a particularly important role for understanding the physical meaning of the quantum number  $m$ . For a fixed value of the Landau quantum number  $n$ , the quantum number  $m$  has little to do with the rotational motion, but instead it is related to the radial position of the guiding center with respect to the coordinate origin [3]. In particular, from Eqs.(14) and (15), one immediately notice that the following remarkable relations hold [9] :

$$\sqrt{\langle r_c^2 \rangle} > \sqrt{\langle R^2 \rangle} \quad \text{when } m > 0, \quad (17)$$

$$\sqrt{\langle r_c^2 \rangle} = \sqrt{\langle R^2 \rangle} \quad \text{when } m = 0, \quad (18)$$

$$\sqrt{\langle r_c^2 \rangle} < \sqrt{\langle R^2 \rangle} \quad \text{when } m < 0. \quad (19)$$

This shows that the sign of the magnetic quantum number  $m$  is intimately connected with the magnitude correlation between  $r_c$  and  $R$  [9]. For help in more visual understanding, we show on the upper panel of Fig.1 the probability and current densities of the electron corresponding to the two Landau eigen-states with  $n_r = 0, m = +20$  (or  $n = 20, m = +20$ ) and with  $n_r = 0, m = -20$  (or  $n = 0, m = -20$ ). In these two figures, higher probability density regions are indicated by brighter (white) color, whereas lower probability regions are drawn by darker (black) color. Note that the eigen-energies of the above two states are significantly different. In fact, the eigen-energy of the state with  $n = 20, m = +20$  is  $(2 \times 20 + 1) \omega_L = 41 \omega_L$ , while that of the state with  $n = 0, m = -20$  is  $(2 \times 0 + 1) \omega_L = \omega_L$ . Nonetheless, one can see that the probability densities of these two states perfectly coincide with each other. This is due to the following nontrivial relation for the radial wave function as pointed out in [9] :

$$R_{n-m, -m}(r) = R_{n,m}(r). \quad (20)$$

Interestingly, however, the electron current densities shown by red arrows are drastically different for these two states. In fact, for the state with  $n_r = 0, m = +20$ , the current is flowing in a counter-clock-wise direction in both of the inner and outer regions of the high probability region. On the other hand, for the state with  $n_r = 0, m = -20$ , the current is flowing in a counter-clock-wise direction in the outer region, while it is flowing in clock-wise direction in the inner part of the high probability region.

The reason of this critical difference can be understood from the schematic pictures of the quantum mechanical cyclotron motion of the Landau electron shown on the lower panel of Fig.1. The left figure here corresponds to the state with  $n_r = 0, m \gg 0$ , while the right figure to the state with  $n_r = 0, m \ll 0$ . For the first state with  $n_r = 0$  and  $m$  being positive integer with large absolute value, the cyclotron radius  $r_c$  is much larger than the distance  $R$  between the orbit center and the coordinate origin, so that the electron is circulating in the counter-clock-wise direction in the whole high probability region schematically shown by the two (dotted) concentric circles. On the other hand, for the second state with  $n_r = 0$  and  $m$  being negative integer with large absolute value, the cyclotron radius  $r_c$  is much smaller than the distance  $R$  between the orbit center and the coordinate origin. Here, somewhat non-intuitive in quantum mechanics is that there is an inherent uncertainty in the position of the orbit center because of the non-commutativity of the guiding center coordinates, i.e.  $[X, Y] \neq 0$ . The rotational symmetry of the problem dictates that that the guiding center in quantum mechanics is distributed on the circle of radius  $R$  with equal probability. Roughly speaking, it means that the electron is making a cyclotron motion around arbitrary points on the circle with radius  $R$ . This explains the reason why the flow of the current is counter-clock-wise in the outer region of the high probability region, while the flow of the current is clock-wise in the inner part [9]. (See the right picture on the lower panel of Fig.1.)

Next, with the choice of the *1st Landau gauge* potential  $\mathbf{A} = B(-y, 0)$ , the Landau Hamiltonian takes the following form :

$$H = \frac{1}{2m_e} (p_x^2 + p_y^2) - 2\omega_L y p_x + \frac{1}{2} \omega_L^2 y^2. \quad (21)$$

This form of Landau Hamiltonian shows the *translational symmetry* with respect to the  $x$ -direction. In fact, since  $H$  does not depend on the coordinate  $x$ , its eigen-functions are obtained in the following form :

$$\Psi_{n, k_x}^{(L_1)}(x, y) = \frac{e^{i k_x x}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} Y_n(y), \quad (22)$$

where

$$Y_n(y) = N_n e^{-\frac{(y-y_0)^2}{2l_B^2}} H_n \left( \frac{y-y_0}{l_B} \right), \quad (23)$$




FIG. 1. Two figures on the upper panel represent the probability distributions (gray scale) and the current distributions (red arrows in color) of the Landau electron in the symmetric gauge. The left figure corresponds to the Landau state with  $n_r = 0, m = +20$ , while the right figure corresponds to the state with  $n_r = 0, m = -20$ . Shown on the lower panel are the schematic pictures of the quantum mechanical cyclotron motion of the Landau electron. The left figure corresponds to the state with  $n_r = 0$  and  $m \gg 0$ , while the right figure corresponds to the state with  $n_r = 0$  and  $m \ll 0$ . In both figures,  $r_c$  represents the cyclotron radius, while  $R$  does the distance between the guiding center and the coordinate origin. Note that the position of the quantum guiding center is statistically distributed on the circle of radius  $R$  with equal probability.

with  $y_0 = l_B^2 k_x$ . They are the simultaneous eigen-functions of the Landau Hamiltonian  $H$  and the canonical momentum operator  $p_x^{can} = -i \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ :

$$H \Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}(x, y) = (2n + 1) \omega_L \Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}(x, y), \quad (24)$$

$$p_x^{can} \Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}(x, y) = k_x \Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}(x, y). \quad (25)$$

Physical interpretation of the above eigen-states is again far from intuitive. Classically, one expects that the Landau electron makes a circular motion around some fixed point. However, it is not so easy to read such a behavior from the above eigen-functions. The  $x$ -dependence of (22) takes a form of plane-wave, while the  $y$ -dependence of it shows a localized Harmonic oscillator around  $y = y_0$ . The concept of guiding center plays an important role also in understanding the behavior of these eigen-functions in the 1st Landau gauge. First, the relation  $y_0 = l_B^2 k_x$  indicates that the eigen-equation (25) can also be regarded as an eigen equation for the guiding center coordinate (operator)  $Y$  expressed as [3]

$$Y \Psi_{n,y_0}^{(L_1)}(x, y) = y_0 \Psi_{n,y_0}^{(L_1)}(x, y). \quad (26)$$

The validity of this conjecture can easily be confirmed as follows. With the choice of the 1st Landau gauge potential  $\mathbf{A}^{(L_1)} = B(-y, 0)$ , the mechanical momentum operator  $p_x^{mech}$  takes the following form:

$$p_x^{mech} \equiv p_x^{can} + e A_x = p_x^{can} - e B y. \quad (27)$$




FIG. 2. Two figures on the upper panel represent the probability distributions (gray scale) and the current distributions (red arrows in color) of the Landau electron in the 1st Landau gauge. The left figure corresponds to the Landau state with  $n = 0, y_0 = +5$ , while the right figure corresponds to the state with  $n = 0, y_0 = -5$ . Shown on the lower panel are the schematic pictures of the quantum mechanical cyclotron motion of the Landau electron. The left figure corresponds to the state with  $n = 0, y_0 = +5$ , while the right figure corresponds to the state with  $n = 0, y_0 = -5$ . Note that the positions of the guiding center are respectively distributed on the lines with  $y = y_0 = +5$  and  $y = y_0 = -5$  with equal statistical probability.

Then, the guiding center coordinate  $Y$  defined as  $Y = y + v_x / \omega_c = y + p_x^{mech} / (eB)$  reduces to

$$Y = y + \frac{1}{eB} (p_x^{can} - eBy) = \frac{1}{eB} p_x^{can} = l_B^2 p_x^{can}, \quad (28)$$

which means that the guiding center coordinate  $Y$  and the canonical momentum  $p_x^{can}$  represent the same entity aside from a proportionality constant. The equation (26) then means that  $y_0$  in the Landau eigen-functions  $\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}(x, y)$  represents the  $y$ -coordinate of the guiding center. However, the price to pay for it is that the  $x$ -coordinate of the guiding center becomes totally uncertain, that is, it is distributed uniformly along the line  $y = y_0$ .

To visually understand such circumstances, we show on the upper panel of Fig.2 the probability and current densities of two Landau states. The left figure corresponds to the state with  $n = 0$  and  $y_0 = +5$ , whereas the right figure to the state with  $n = 0$  and  $y_0 = -5$ . One clearly sees that the high probability region for the former state is distributed along the line  $y = +5$ , while the high probability region for the latter state is distributed along the line  $y = -5$ . Also interesting is the behavior of the current densities shown by red arrows. In both cases of  $y_0 = +5$  and  $y_0 = -5$ , the current is flowing to the left in the upper (larger  $y$ ) part of the high probability region, whereas it is flowing to the right in the lower (smaller  $y$ ) part of the high probability region. These behaviors can easily be understood from the two schematic pictures illustrated on the lower panel of Fig.2. These figures show that the electron is rotating counter-clockwise around the guiding center, which is uniformly distributed along the line  $y = y_0 = +5$  or  $y = y_0 = -5$ . It is clear that this explains the reason why the current is flowing to the left in the upper part of the higher probability band, while it is flowing to the right in the lower part of the higher probability band.

In any case, we now understand that the quantum mechanical electron's probability and the current distributions of the Landau eigen-states take remarkably different forms in different gauges, i.e. the symmetric gauge and the 1st Landau gauge. Still, if one believes the celebrated *gauge principle*, one would expect that physical observables are

independent of these choices of gauge<sup>1</sup>. As we shall discuss in the following, to explicitly confirm this fact turns out to be much more delicate subject than is naively anticipated.

### III. CONTROVERSY OVER OBSERVABILITY OF THE QUANTUM NUMBERS $m$ AND $k_x$ CHARACTERIZING THE TWO TYPES OF LANDAU EIGEN-STATES

In the traditional interpretation of the gauge choice in the Landau problem which we follow in the previous section, the quantum number  $k_x$  is the eigen-value of the canonical momentum operator  $p_x^{can}$  in the 1st Landau gauge eigen-states, whereas the quantum number  $m$  is the eigen-value of the canonical OAM operator  $L_z^{can}$  in the symmetric gauge eigen-states. Note that the canonical momentum as well as the canonical OAM are standardly believed to be *gauge-variant* quantities. Then, if one believes the famous gauge principle, neither  $k_x$  nor  $m$  would correspond to *direct* experimental observables. However, this wide-spread view has been suspected in a recent paper by Govaerts [12] based on logical development of the gauge-potential-independent formulation of the Landau problem. The grounds of this claim is traced back to the observation that the quantum numbers  $k_x$  and  $m$  are related to the conserved Noether charges of the Landau Hamiltonian, the existence of which is guaranteed totally independently of the choice of the *gauge potential*. On the basis of this not-so-familiar knowledge together with some other reasonings, it was claimed that  $k_x$  and  $m$  both correspond to physical (or observable) quantities at least in principle.

To explain in more detail about the controversy over the physical significance of the quantum numbers  $k_x$  and  $m$  appearing in the two different types of Landau eigen-states, we need to briefly review the essence of the gauge-potential-independent formulation of the Landau problem, which was independently proposed by several authors in slightly different forms [7, 11, 14–17]. To make the discussion as elementary as possible, we think it most comprehensive to explain the problem based on the theoretical formulation developed in [11]. First, it is important to reconfirm the fact that the Landau Hamiltonian explicitly depends on the *gauge-dependent* vector potential  $\mathbf{A}$  as

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{A}) = \frac{1}{2m_e} (-i\nabla + e\mathbf{A})^2, \quad (29)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}$  is an arbitrary gauge potential, which reproduces the uniform magnetic field by the relation  $\nabla \times \mathbf{A} = B\mathbf{e}_z$ .

A nontrivial observation by several authors [7, 11, 12, 14, 15] is that there exist the following three *conserved quantities* in the Landau problem. They are two conserved momenta and one conserved OAM given by<sup>2</sup>

$$\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}) \equiv -i\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + eA_x + eBy = \hat{p}_x^{mech}(\mathbf{A}) + eBy, \quad (30)$$

$$\hat{p}_y^{cons}(\mathbf{A}) \equiv -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y} + eA_y - eBx = \hat{p}_y^{mech}(\mathbf{A}) - eBx, \quad (31)$$

$$\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A}) \equiv -i\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} + erA_\phi - \frac{1}{2}eBr^2 = \hat{L}_z^{mech}(\mathbf{A}) - \frac{1}{2}eBr^2. \quad (32)$$

In these equations,  $\hat{p}_x^{mech}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\hat{p}_y^{mech}(\mathbf{A})$  respectively denote the  $x$ - and  $y$ -components of the familiar mechanical momentum operators, while  $\hat{L}_z^{mech}(\mathbf{A})$  does the  $z$ - component of the mechanical OAM operator. In the following argument, since the operator  $\hat{p}_y^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  can be treated just in the same manner as  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$ , we concentrate on the relation between the two operators  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$ . Remarkably, the conservation of these quantities holds independently of the choice of the vector potential [11]. In fact, it can be shown that they commute with the Landau Hamiltonian for *arbitrary choice* of the gauge potential  $\mathbf{A}$ , i.e.

$$[\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}), \hat{H}(\mathbf{A})] = 0, \quad (33)$$

$$[\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A}), \hat{H}(\mathbf{A})] = 0. \quad (34)$$

Very importantly, however, they do not commute with each other [11],

$$[\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}), \hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A})] \neq 0. \quad (35)$$

This means that these two operators cannot be simultaneously diagonalized together with the Landau Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}(\mathbf{A})$ . One is forced to select either of the following two options :

<sup>1</sup> Note however that the gauge principle never demands that the converse is always true.

<sup>2</sup> They are called the *pseudo momenta* and the *pseudo OAM* in some literature [8, 13–15].

- (1) diagonalize  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\hat{H}(\mathbf{A})$ , simultaneously.
- (2) diagonalize  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\hat{H}(\mathbf{A})$ , simultaneously.

The easiest way to realize the 1st option is to start with the Landau eigen-states  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}\rangle$  in the symmetric gauge, which are known to satisfy the simultaneous eigen-equations as follows :

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{A}^{(S)}) |\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}\rangle = (2n+1)\omega_L |\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}\rangle, \quad (36)$$

$$\hat{L}_z^{can} |\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}\rangle = m |\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}\rangle. \quad (37)$$

Here,  $\mathbf{A}^{(S)} = \frac{1}{2}B(-y, x)$  represents the vector potential in the symmetric gauge, whereas  $\hat{L}_z^{can} = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}$  denotes the standard canonical OAM operator. An important observation here is that the eigen-equation (37) can also be expressed in the following form

$$\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A}^{(S)}) |\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}\rangle = m |\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}\rangle. \quad (38)$$

This is because  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  reduces to the canonical OAM operator when  $\mathbf{A}$  becomes  $\mathbf{A}^{(S)}$ ,

$$\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}^{(S)}) = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi} = \hat{L}_z^{can}. \quad (39)$$

Let us now consider a  $U(1)$  gauge transformation  $U(x) = e^{-ie\chi(x)}$ , which transforms the symmetric gauge potential  $\mathbf{A}^{(S)}$  to an arbitrary gauge potential  $\mathbf{A}^{(x)}$ . The quantum mechanical representation of such gauge transformation is represented as

$$-i\nabla + e\mathbf{A}^{(x)} = U(x) \left( -i\nabla + e\mathbf{A}^{(S)} \right) U(x)^\dagger. \quad (40)$$

Using it, one can verify the following (*gauge-covariant*) transformation properties of the Landau Hamiltonian as well as the conserved OAM operator :

$$U(x) \hat{H}(\mathbf{A}^{(S)}) U(x)^\dagger = \hat{H}(\mathbf{A}^{(x)}), \quad (41)$$

$$U(x) \hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A}^{(S)}) U(x)^\dagger = \hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A}^{(x)}). \quad (42)$$

After these preparations, let us define new states  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(x)}\rangle$ , which are obtained from the symmetric-gauge eigen-states  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}\rangle$  through the following  $U(1)$  gauge transformation,

$$|\Psi_{n,m}^{(x)}\rangle \equiv U(x) |\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}\rangle. \quad (43)$$

Now, with the use of Eqs.(36) and (38) together with the relation (41) and (42), it is easy to show that the following equations hold :

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{A}^{(x)}) |\Psi_{n,m}^{(x)}\rangle = (2n+1)\omega_L |\Psi_{n,m}^{(x)}\rangle, \quad (44)$$

$$\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A}^{(x)}) |\Psi_{n,m}^{(x)}\rangle = m |\Psi_{n,m}^{(x)}\rangle. \quad (45)$$

One therefore finds that the state  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(x)}\rangle$  are the simultaneous eigen-states of the Landau Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}(\mathbf{A}^{(x)})$  and the conserved OAM operator  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A}^{(x)})$  with the eigen-values  $(2n+1)\omega_L$  and  $m$ , respectively. In view of the arbitrariness of the choice for the gauge function  $\chi$ , this means that there are infinitely many such states.

Similarly, as the 2nd option, we can start with the eigen-states  $|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}\rangle$  in the 1st Landau gauge, which are known to satisfy the following simultaneous eigen-equations :

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{A}^{(L_1)}) |\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}\rangle = (2n+1)\omega_L |\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}\rangle, \quad (46)$$

$$\hat{p}_x^{can} |\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}\rangle = k_x |\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}\rangle, \quad (47)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}^{(L_1)} = B(-y, 0)$  represents the vector potential in the 1st Landau gauge, while  $\hat{p}_x^{can} = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$  is the standard canonical momentum operator. Since  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  reduces to the canonical momentum operator when  $\mathbf{A}$  approaches  $\mathbf{A}^{(L_1)}$  :

$$\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}^{(L_1)}) = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial x} = \hat{p}_x^{can}, \quad (48)$$



the eigen-equation (47) can also be expressed in the form

$$\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}^{(L_1)}) |\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}\rangle = k_x |\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}\rangle. \quad (49)$$

Then, similarly as before, let us consider a  $U(1)$  gauge transformation  $U^{(x')}(x) = e^{-ie\mathbf{A}^{(x)}(x)}$ , which transforms the 1st Landau gauge potential  $\mathbf{A}^{(L_1)}$  to an arbitrary gauge potential  $\mathbf{A}^{(x')}$ , the quantum mechanical representation of which is represented as

$$-i\nabla + e\mathbf{A}^{(x')} = U^{(x')} \left( -i\nabla + e\mathbf{A}^{(L_1)} \right) U^{(x')\dagger}. \quad (50)$$

Accordingly, one can readily verify that the following relations hold,

$$U^{(x')} \hat{H}(\mathbf{A}^{(L_1)}) U^{(x')\dagger} = \hat{H}(\mathbf{A}^{(x)}), \quad (51)$$

$$U^{(x')} \hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}^{(L_1)}) U^{(x')\dagger} = \hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}^{(x')}). \quad (52)$$

Thus, if one defines the new states  $|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(x')}\rangle$  by

$$|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(x')}\rangle = U^{(x')} |\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}\rangle, \quad (53)$$

they clearly satisfy the following eigen-equations :

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{A}^{(x')}) |\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(x')}\rangle = (2n+1)\omega_L |\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(x')}\rangle, \quad (54)$$

$$\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}^{(x')}) |\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(x')}\rangle = k_x |\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(x')}\rangle. \quad (55)$$

Again, we find that there are infinitely many states, which are simultaneous eigen-states of  $\hat{H}(\mathbf{A}^{(x')})$  and  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}^{(x')})$  with the eigen-values  $(2n+1)\omega_L$  and  $k_x$ , respectively.

In this way, we conclude that there are infinitely many eigen-states  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(x)}\rangle$  with arbitrary gauge potential  $\mathbf{A}^{(x)}$ , which are obtained from the symmetric-gauge eigen-state  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}\rangle$  by means of  $U(1)$  gauge transformations, and also another class of eigen-states  $|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(x')}\rangle$  with arbitrary gauge potential  $\mathbf{A}^{(x')}$ , which are obtained from the 1st Landau-gauge eigen-state  $|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}\rangle$ . In [11], these two types of eigen-states are classified into the quantum mechanical states belonging to *different gauge classes*.

This viewpoint was criticized in a recent paper [12], however. According to the standpoint advocated in that paper, the existence of the two classes of eigen-states  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(x)}\rangle$  and  $|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(x')}\rangle$  has little to do with the choice of gauge, but rather which of the two operators  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}$  or  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}$  one wants to have diagonalized [16]. The latter half part of this statement is nothing different from our own argument explained above. A delicate question here is whether the choice of the two types of eigen-states has really nothing to do with the choice of gauge in the Landau problem. A critical statement made in [12], which deeply concerns the core of the problem, may be rephrased as follows by using our notation [11] instead of somewhat complicated notation in [12]. It was claimed in [12] that the two bases  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(x)}\rangle$  and  $|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(x')}\rangle$  span a same abstract Hilbert space and they are mutually related through a *specific* unitary transformation. Actually, this statement is not justified. To explain the reason as plainly as possible, let us consider the symmetric-gauge eigen-states  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}\rangle$  as a representative of  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(x)}\rangle$ , and the 1st Landau-gauge eigen-state  $|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}\rangle$  as a representative of  $|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(x')}\rangle$ . It is already known that they are connected through the following relation [7, 11, 16],

$$U_0 \Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}(x, y) = \int dk_x U_{n,m}(k_x) \Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}(x, y). \quad (56)$$

In the above equation,  $U_0 = e^{i\frac{1}{2}eBxy}$  is a  $U(1)$  gauge transformation, which transforms the symmetric gauge potential  $\mathbf{A}^{(S)}$  to the 1st Landau-gauge potential  $\mathbf{A}^{(L_1)}$ , while  $U_{n,m}(k_x)$  is defined as the following matrix element of the unitary operator  $U_0$ ,

$$U_{n,m}(k_x) \equiv \langle \Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)} | U_0 | \Psi_{n,m}^{(S)} \rangle. \quad (57)$$

Here, we omit to show the explicit form of  $U_{n,m}(k_x)$ , since it is already given in several previous papers [7, 11, 16]. What is important to recognize here is that the eigen-functions in the 1st Landau gauge and those in the symmetric gauge

are not connected through a simple  $U(1)$  transformation (or a phase transformation). Rather, the states  $U_0 |\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}\rangle$  obtained from the symmetric-gauge eigen-states by means of a  $U(1)$  gauge transformation  $U_0$  are *superposition* of the eigen-states  $|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}\rangle$  in the 1st Landau gauge for the variable  $k_x$  with the weight function  $U_{n,m}(k_x)$ . This is only natural in view of the fact that, if the two states  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}\rangle$  and  $|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}\rangle$  were related through a simple  $U(1)$  gauge transformation, the electron's probability and current densities corresponding to these two states must exactly be the same. On the contrary, however, we have already shown in Sect.2 that they are drastically different from each other :

$$|\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}(x,y)|^2 \neq |\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}(x,y)|^2, \quad (58)$$

This should be contrasted with the two classes of eigen-states defined by Eqs.(43) and (53). Since either of the gauge transformation operators in Eq.(43) or Eq.(53) is just a  $U(1)$  or a phase transformation, it immediately follows that

$$|\Psi_{n,m}^{(\chi)}(x,y)|^2 = |\Psi_{n,m}^{(S)}(x,y)|^2, \quad (59)$$

and

$$|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(\chi')} (x,y)|^2 = |\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(L_1)}(x,y)|^2, \quad (60)$$

for arbitrary gauge functions  $\chi$  and  $\chi'$ . Naturally, the probability densities of all the 1st class eigen-states  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(\chi)}\rangle$  has a *rotational symmetry* around the  $z$ -axis, while those of all the 2nd class eigen-states  $|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(\chi')}\rangle$  has a *translational symmetry* along the  $x$ -axis. This is the reason why we say that they belong to two different gauge classes *even* within the gauge-potential-independent formulation of the Landau problem.

Another evidence to support our viewpoint above was already discussed in [11]. However, we recall below the essence of this argument just in order to demonstrate the unjustified nature of the criticism developed in a recent paper [12]. An important element here is the comparison of the expectation values of the conserved quantities  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$ ,  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  and those of the mechanical quantities  $\hat{p}_x^{mech}(\mathbf{A})$ ,  $\hat{L}_z^{mech}(\mathbf{A})$  between the two different classes of eigen-state  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(\chi)}\rangle$  and  $|\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(\chi')}\rangle$ . Before comparing the expectation values of the above four operators, some technical preparation is necessary. Since the 2nd type of eigen-states have a plane-wave-like normalization (with respect to the  $x$ -direction) given as

$$\iint dx dy \Psi_{n,k'_x}^{(\chi')*}(x,y) \Psi_{n,k_x}^{(\chi')}(x,y) = \delta(k'_x - k_x), \quad (61)$$

their expectation values (or the *diagonal* matrix elements) of any operator *diverge*. It is therefore convenient to introduce the corresponding normalizable eigen-functions with the wave-packet-like nature [11]. They are obtained by the following replacement of the plane-wave-like part of the eigen-functions  $\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(\chi')}(x,y)$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{i k_x x} \rightarrow F_{k_x}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dk}{\sqrt{2\pi}} g(k - k_x) e^{i k x}, \quad (62)$$

where  $g(k)$  is an appropriate weight function of superposition, which is supposed to have a peak at  $k = 0$  and is normalized as

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk |g(k)|^2 = 1. \quad (63)$$

Corresponding to the above replacement, the eigen-functions above are replaced by

$$\Psi_{n,k_x}^{(\chi')}(x,y) \rightarrow \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}^{(\chi')}(x,y) = F_{k_x}(x) Y_n(y), \quad (64)$$

with

$$Y_n(y) = N_n H_n \left( \frac{y - y_0}{l_B} \right) e^{-\frac{(y - y_0)^2}{2l_B^2}}. \quad (65)$$

It can be easily verified that they have the following normalization :

$$\iint dx dy \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}^{(\chi')*}(x,y) \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}^{(\chi')}(x,y) = 1. \quad (66)$$

To proceed, we recall an important observation made in [11]. As is widely known, the mechanical momentum operator  $\hat{p}_x^{mech}$  as well as the mechanical OAM operator  $\hat{L}_z^{mech}$  transform covariantly under a quantum mechanical gauge transformation. Curiously, this is also the case with the conserved momentum operator  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}$  and the conserved OAM operator  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}$ . (This is easily convinced from the definition of  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}$  given in (30) and that of  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}$  given in (32).) An immediate consequences of this covariant gauge transformation property of the mechanical and conserved operators are the following identities :

$$\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') | \hat{p}_x^{mech}(\mathbf{A}(\chi')) | \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') \rangle = \langle \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi) | \hat{p}_x^{mech}(\mathbf{A}(\chi)) | \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi) \rangle, \quad (67)$$

$$\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') | \hat{L}_z^{mech}(\mathbf{A}(\chi')) | \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') \rangle = \langle \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi) | \hat{L}_z^{mech}(\mathbf{A}(\chi)) | \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi) \rangle, \quad (68)$$

$$\langle \Psi_{n,m}(\chi') | \hat{p}_x^{mech}(\mathbf{A}(\chi')) | \Psi_{n,m}(\chi') \rangle = \langle \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) | \hat{p}_x^{mech}(\mathbf{A}(\chi)) | \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) \rangle, \quad (69)$$

$$\langle \Psi_{n,m}(\chi') | \hat{L}_z^{mech}(\mathbf{A}(\chi')) | \Psi_{n,m}(\chi') \rangle = \langle \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) | \hat{L}_z^{mech}(\mathbf{A}(\chi)) | \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) \rangle, \quad (70)$$

and

$$\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') | \hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}(\chi')) | \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') \rangle = \langle \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi) | \hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}(\chi)) | \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi) \rangle, \quad (71)$$

$$\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') | \hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A}(\chi')) | \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') \rangle = \langle \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi) | \hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A}(\chi)) | \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi) \rangle, \quad (72)$$

$$\langle \Psi_{n,m}(\chi') | \hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}(\chi')) | \Psi_{n,m}(\chi') \rangle = \langle \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) | \hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}(\chi)) | \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) \rangle, \quad (73)$$

$$\langle \Psi_{n,m}(\chi') | \hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A}(\chi')) | \Psi_{n,m}(\chi') \rangle = \langle \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) | \hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A}(\chi)) | \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) \rangle. \quad (74)$$

Here,  $\chi'$  and  $\chi$  are arbitrary gauge function characterizing the vector potential configuration in each of the two types of eigen-states, which diagonalizes either of  $(\hat{H}, \hat{p}_x^{cons})$  or  $(\hat{H}, \hat{L}_z^{cons})$ . The above equalities are naturally expected to hold, because the mechanical quantities as well as the conserved quantities are thought to be gauge-invariant quantities as long as the expectation values within the *same class* of eigen-states are concerned.

What is nontrivial is the comparison of the expectation values of the conserved and mechanical operators between the eigen-states belonging to two *different classes*. For the mechanical quantities, we found in [11] that

$$\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') | \hat{p}_x^{mech}(\mathbf{A}(\chi')) | \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') \rangle = \langle \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) | \hat{p}_x^{mech}(\mathbf{A}(\chi)) | \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) \rangle = 0, \quad (75)$$

$$\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') | \hat{L}_z^{mech}(\mathbf{A}(\chi')) | \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') \rangle = \langle \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) | \hat{L}_z^{mech}(\mathbf{A}(\chi)) | \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) \rangle = (2n+1). \quad (76)$$

On the contrary, for the conserved quantities, we found that [11]

$$\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') | \hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}(\chi')) | \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') \rangle \neq \langle \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) | \hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A}(\chi)) | \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) \rangle, \quad (77)$$

$$\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') | \hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A}(\chi')) | \tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}(\chi') \rangle \neq \langle \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) | \hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A}(\chi)) | \Psi_{n,m}(\chi) \rangle. \quad (78)$$

A central question here is how to interpret the above drastic differences, which exist between the expectation values of the mechanical quantities and the conserved quantities. According to the interpretation in [11], Eqs.(75) and (76) show *genuinely* gauge-invariant nature of the mechanical momentum as well as the mechanical OAM. The reason is because the expectation values of the mechanical momentum operator as well as the mechanical OAM operator between the two *in-equivalent gauge classes* of eigen-functions precisely coincide, which legitimately meets the criterion of observables required from the gauge principle. It should be noticed that the class of eigen-states  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(\chi)}\rangle$  is characterized by the two quantum numbers  $n$  and  $m$ , while another class of eigen-states  $|\tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}^{(\chi')}\rangle$  is characterized by the quantum numbers  $n$  and  $k_x$ . This implies that, if the expectation values of some operator between these two different classes of eigen-state coincide with each other, those expectation values must depend only on the Landau quantum number  $n$  or simply vanish, as is the case with Eqs. (76) and (75).

The situation is totally different for the expectation values of the conserved quantities. Despite the fact that the conserved momentum operator and the conserved OAM operator both transform gauge-covariantly just like the mechanical momentum operator and the mechanical OAM operator, the expectation values of them between the eigen-states  $|\tilde{\Psi}_{n,k_x}^{(\chi')}\rangle$  turn out to generally depend on both of  $n$  and  $k_x$ , while those between the eigen-states  $|\Psi_{n,m}^{(\chi)}\rangle$  depend on both of  $n$  and  $m$ . (Their explicit forms can be found in [11] or in [12].) This is the cause of inequalities as shown in Eqs.(77) and (78) for the expectation values of the conserved quantities.

In this way, in sharp contrast to the claim in [12], we conclude that there is a physically unmissable difference between the mechanical quantities and the conserved quantities in the Landau problem, despite the fact that *both* transform covariantly under a gauge transformation. We conjecture that the cause of this difference would be explained

as follows. As is widely known, the Lagrangian of the quantum electrodynamics (QED) is obtained from the free Dirac Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_D = \bar{\psi}(x) (i \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m) \psi(x), \quad (79)$$

based on the  $U(1)$  gauge-invariance requirement, and it is given as

$$\mathcal{L}_{QED} = \bar{\psi}(x) (i \gamma^\mu D_\mu - m) \psi(x) - \frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}, \quad (80)$$

with  $D_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu + i e A_\mu(x)$ . To be more precise, what plays a critical role in this construction is the celebrated *minimal principle*, which demands the replacement of the ordinary derivative in the Dirac Lagrangian by the covariant derivative as

$$\partial_\mu \rightarrow \partial_\mu + i e A_\mu(x) \equiv D_\mu. \quad (81)$$

Although this minimal prescription ensures the gauge invariance of the QED Lagrangian, the converse is not necessarily true. In fact, the requirement of the gauge-invariance alone never prevents from adding to the QED Lagrangian the term like

$$\bar{\psi}(x) \sigma^{\mu\nu} \psi(x) F_{\mu\nu}(x), \quad (82)$$

with  $\sigma^{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{i}{2} [\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu]$ . This term is certainly  $U(1)$  gauge invariant, but it turned out that an addition of such terms to the basic QED Lagrangian is not supported by nature.

Here, we recall the fact that both of the mechanical momentum and the mechanical OAM can be related to the *gauge-invariant electric current* of the electron, which is obtained from the *minimal principle*. On the other hand, the conserved momentum and the conserved OAM are not such quantities, which are related to the minimal current of the electron. Probably, the genuinely gauge-invariant (or the *observable*) nature of the mechanical quantities as compared with the conserved quantities can be understood by this difference.

To sum up, the consideration so far strongly indicates nonobservable nature of the quantum numbers  $k_x$  and  $m$  characterizing the Landau eigen-states. As was repeatedly stated, in the standard interpretation of the gauge choice in the Landau problem, which we believe is nothing wrong and is a well-established point of view, the quantum number  $k_x$  is the eigen-value of the canonical momentum operator  $\hat{p}_x^{can}$  in the 1st Landau gauge, while the quantum number  $m$  is the eigen-value of the canonical OAM operator  $\hat{L}_z^{can}$  in the symmetric gauge. Since the canonical momentum as well as the canonical OAM are the gauge-variant quantities, they would not correspond to observables. This standard viewpoint was criticized in a recent paper [12], however. We have no objection to the fact that, in the gauge-potential-independent formulation of the Landau problem, the quantum number  $k_x$  and  $m$  can in principle be introduced independently of the choice of the gauge potential configuration. However, the quantum numbers  $k_x$  and  $m$  appearing in the standard formulation of the Landau problem and the quantum numbers  $k_x$  and  $m$  appearing in the gauge-potential-independent formulation represent basically the same  $c$ -number quantities. In fact, we have seen that the conserved momentum operator  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  appearing in the gauge-potential-independent formulation simply reduces to the ordinary canonical momentum operator  $\hat{p}_x^{can}$  in the limit  $\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}^{(L1)}$ , and the eigen-values of  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  and of  $\hat{p}_x^{can}$  are both characterized by the same quantum number  $k_x$ . Similarly, the conserved OAM operator  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  appearing in the gauge-potential-independent formulation simply reduces to the ordinary canonical OAM operator  $\hat{L}_z^{can}$  in the limit  $\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}^{(S)}$ , and the eigen-values of  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  and of  $\hat{L}_z^{can}$  are both characterized by the same quantum number  $m$ . The problem is therefore not the difference of the standard formulation and the gauge-potential-independent formulation. What we are required to answer is the physical question : “Do the quantum numbers  $k_x$  and  $m$  characterizing the Landau eigen-states after all correspond to observable quantities or not?” In the following two sections, we try to answer this question with the help of illustrative concrete examples.

#### IV. NONOBSERVABILITY OF THE QUANTUM NUMBER $k_x$ CHARACTERIZING THE 1ST LANDAU GAUGE EIGEN-STATES

The observations made in sect.II revealed the fact that the quantum number  $k_x$  appearing in the eigen-functions in the 1st Landau gauge has little to do with the motion in the  $x$ -direction, but instead it is related to the  $y$ -coordinate  $y_0$  of the guiding center of the cyclotron motion related through  $y_0 = l_B^2 k_x$ . On the other hand, the  $x$ -coordinate of the guiding center is totally uncertain and it is distributed uniformly along the line  $y = y_0$ . This strongly indicates that the quantum number  $k_x$  is not such a quantity that would be related to direct observables. In the following, we

try to demonstrate that this is indeed the case, through the consideration of the familiar Hall effect as a concrete and instructive example [20, 21].

The Hall effect is observed when the electric field  $E$  is additionally applied to the perpendicular direction (say the  $y$ -axis direction) to the  $z$ -axis, which is the direction of the uniform magnetic field. The relevant Hamiltonian is given as

$$\begin{aligned} H' &= \frac{1}{2m_e} (\Pi_x^2 + \Pi_y^2) - e E y \\ &= \frac{1}{2m_e} \{ (p_x^{can} + e A_x)^2 + (p_y^{can} + e A_y)^2 \} - e E y. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Here,  $p_x^{can}$  and  $p_y^{can}$  stand for the *canonical momentum* operators. This problem is convenient to treat in the 1st Landau gauge  $\mathbf{A}^{(L1)} = B(-y, 0)$ . With this gauge choice,  $H'$  reduces to

$$H' = \frac{1}{2m_e} \{ (p_x^{can} - e B y)^2 + (p_y^{can})^2 \} - e E y. \quad (84)$$

Since the Hamiltonian  $H'$  does not explicitly contain the coordinate  $x$ , it has eigen-functions of the following form :

$$\Psi'^{(L1)}(x, y) \propto e^{i k_x x} Y'(y), \quad (85)$$

so that the canonical momentum operator  $p_x^{can}$  can effectively be replaced by a  $c$ -number  $k_x$ . Then,  $H'$  can effectively be transformed as

$$\begin{aligned} H' &\rightarrow \frac{1}{2m_e} \{ (k_x - e B y)^2 + (p_y^{can})^2 \} - e E y \\ &= \frac{1}{2m_e} \left\{ (p_y^{can})^2 + \left( k_x - e B y - \frac{m_e}{e B} e E \right)^2 \right\} - k_x \frac{1}{e B} e E - \frac{1}{2m_e} \left( \frac{m_e}{e B} e E \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2m_e} \left\{ (p_y^{can})^2 + \left( k_x - e B y - m_e \frac{E}{B} \right)^2 \right\} + \text{constant} \\ &= \frac{1}{2m_e} \left\{ (p_y^{can})^2 + (e B)^2 \left[ y - \frac{1}{e B} \left( k_x + m_e \frac{E}{B} \right) \right]^2 \right\} + \text{constant}. \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

Now, the eigen-functions of the above Hamiltonian can easily be obtained as

$$\Psi'_{n, k_x}(x, y) = \frac{e^{i k_x x}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} Y'_n(y). \quad (87)$$

where

$$Y'_n(y) = N_n H_n \left( \frac{y - y'_0}{l_B} \right) e^{-\frac{(y - y'_0)^2}{2 l_B^2}}, \quad (88)$$

with

$$y'_0 = \frac{k_x}{e B} + \frac{m_e E}{e B^2}. \quad (89)$$

Since these eigen-functions have a plane-wave-like normalization (with respect to the  $x$ -axis), it is convenient to introduce the corresponding normalizable eigen-functions with wave-packet-like nature, as was done in the previous section. This is achieved by the following replacement :

$$\Psi'_{n, k_x}(x, y) \rightarrow \tilde{\Psi}'_{n, k_x}(x, y) = F_{k_x}(x) Y'_n(y), \quad (90)$$

where the function  $F_{k_x}(x)$  is defined in the previous section.

Now we are ready to continue our discussion. As is widely known, the gauge-invariant probability current density of the electron is represented by the velocity operator or the mechanical momentum operator as

$$\mathbf{j} = e \mathbf{v} = \frac{e}{m_e} \Psi^* \mathbf{p}^{mech} \Psi = \frac{e}{m_e} \Psi^* (\mathbf{p}^{can} + e \mathbf{A}) \Psi, \quad (91)$$

where  $\Psi$  is the electron wave function in any gauge. Since we are working in the 1st Landau gauge, the corresponding expectation values of  $j_x$  and  $j_y$  become

$$\langle j_x \rangle = \frac{e}{m_e} \iint dx dy \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)^*(x, y) (p_x^{can} - e B y) \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)(x, y), \quad (92)$$

$$\langle j_y \rangle = \frac{e}{m_e} \iint dx dy \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)^*(x, y) p_y^{can} \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)(x, y). \quad (93)$$

First, it is easy to verify the relation,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle j_y \rangle &= \frac{e}{m_e} \iint dx dy \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)^*(x, y) p_y^{can} \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)(x, y) \\ &= \frac{e}{m_e} \int dy Y'_n(y) p_y^{can} Y'_n(y) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Next, we obtain

$$\langle j_x \rangle = \langle j_x^{can} \rangle + \langle j_x^{gauge} \rangle, \quad (95)$$

with

$$\langle j_x^{can} \rangle = \frac{e}{m_e} \iint dx dy \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)^*(x, y) p_x^{can} \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)(x, y), \quad (96)$$

$$\langle j_x^{gauge} \rangle = \frac{e}{m_e} \iint dx dy \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)^*(x, y) (-e B y) \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)(x, y). \quad (97)$$

Using the relation

$$\int dx F_{k_x}^*(x) p_x^{can} F_{k_x}(x) = k_x, \quad (98)$$

together with the relation

$$\int dy [Y'_n(y)]^2 = 1, \quad (99)$$

we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p_x^{can} \rangle &= \iint dx dy \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)^*(x, y) p_x^{can} \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)(x, y) \\ &= k_x. \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

The expectation value of  $y$ , which appears in Eq.(92) can be calculated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle y \rangle &= \iint dx dy \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)^*(x, y) y \tilde{\Psi}'_{n,k_x}(L_1)(x, y) = \int dy Y'_n(y) y Y'_n(y) \\ &= \int dy Y'_n(y) (y - y'_0 + y'_0) Y'_n(y) = y'_0 = \frac{k_x}{e B} + \frac{m_e E}{e B^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

In this way, we eventually get

$$\langle j_x^{can} \rangle = \frac{e}{m_e} k_x, \quad (102)$$

$$\langle j_x^{gauge} \rangle = -\frac{e}{m_e} k_x - e \frac{E}{B}, \quad (103)$$

which in turn gives

$$\begin{aligned} \langle j_x \rangle &= \langle j_x^{can} \rangle + \langle j_x^{gauge} \rangle \\ &= \frac{e}{m_e} k_x + \left( -\frac{e}{m_e} k_x - e \frac{E}{B} \right) = -e \frac{E}{B}. \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

Accordingly, the expectation value of the velocity operator  $v_x$  becomes

$$\langle v_x \rangle = \frac{1}{e} \langle j_x \rangle = -\frac{E}{B}. \quad (105)$$

This is nothing but the familiar *drift velocity* of the electron in the Hall effect, which obviously corresponds to a direct observable [20, 21]. All these affairs are nothing new and they are textbook materials of the non-relativistic quantum mechanics. To our knowledge, however, this material has seldom been discussed from the viewpoint of the observability or non-observability of the quantum number  $k_x$  characterizing the Landau eigen-states. One can confirm that the quantum number  $k_x$ , which is the eigen-values of the canonical momentum operator  $p_x^{can}$ , certainly appears in the expectation values of the canonical part and also in the gauge-potential-dependent part of the net probability current operator  $j_x$ . However, in the sum of the canonical and gauge part, they cancel out exactly. This means that, the canonical and gauge parts of the net current (i.e. the mechanical current) cannot be separately observed, which is equivalent to say that the quantum number  $k_x$  does not correspond to a direct experimental observable. It seems to us that this is not only consistent with the gauge principle that demands non-observability of the gauge-variant canonical momentum but also the nature of the quantity  $k_x$  as clarified in sect.2. In fact, we have shown there that the quantum number  $k_x$  has little to do with the motion in the  $x$ -direction, but instead it rather represents the  $y$ -coordinate of the guiding center, which is uniformly distributed (in a quantum mechanical probability sense) along the line  $y = y_0 \equiv l_B^2 k_x$ .

## V. NONOBSERVABILITY OF THE QUANTUM NUMBER $m$ CHARACTERIZING THE SYMMETRIC GAUGE LANDAU EIGEN-STATES

It is well-known that there is an intimate connection between the Landau Hamiltonian and the Hamiltonian of the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator [18]. In particular, the magnetic quantum number  $m$  appears in both of the eigen-states of the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator in the spherical basis and the eigen-states of the Landau Hamiltonian in the symmetric gauge. Here, we discuss observability or non-observability of the magnetic quantum number  $m$  in both systems by paying a special attention to the similarities and dissimilarities of these two quantum mechanical systems [22]. First, the Hamiltonian of the isotropic 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator is given by

$$H_{osc} = \frac{1}{2m} (p_x^2 + p_y^2) + \frac{1}{2} m \omega^2 (x^2 + y^2). \quad (106)$$

(In this section, the canonical momentum operators are simply denoted as  $p_x$  and  $p_y$  to avoid unnecessary notational complexity.) The problem of the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator can be solved in either of the Cartesian coordinate system or the spherical coordinate system. Let us start the discussion with the eigen-states of the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator in the Cartesian basis. As is well-known, these eigen-states are characterized by two non-negative integers  $n_x$  and  $n_y$  and represented as (see, for example, [? ]) )

$$|n_x, n_y\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x! n_y!}} (a_x^\dagger)^{n_x} (a_y^\dagger)^{n_y} |0, 0\rangle. \quad (107)$$

Here,  $a_x^\dagger$  and  $a_y^\dagger$  are the creation operators of the Harmonic oscillator quanta with respect to the  $x$ - and  $y$ -directions, while the state  $|n_x = 0, n_y = 0\rangle$  stands for the vacuum of the Harmonic oscillator quanta. The states  $|n_x, n_y\rangle$  satisfy the following eigen-value equation :

$$H_{osc} |n_x, n_y\rangle = E |n_x, n_y\rangle, \quad (108)$$

with the eigen-energies

$$E = (n_x + n_y + 1) \omega. \quad (109)$$

Note that, by introducing the quantum number  $n$  by  $n \equiv n_x + n_y$ , the above eigen-energies can also be expressed as  $E = (n + 1) \omega$ . It is easy to verify that the state with the eigen-energy  $(n + 1) \omega$  has  $(n + 1)$ -fold degeneracy.

The same problem can be solved also in the spherical basis. The eigen-states in the spherical basis are characterized by two integers  $n$  and  $m$ , and represented as  $|n, m\rangle$ . They are the simultaneous eigen-states of the Hamiltonian  $H_{osc}$  and the canonical OAM operator  $L_z = x p_y - y p_x$ , which satisfy the eigen equations :

$$H_{osc} |n, m\rangle = (n + 1) \omega |n, m\rangle, \quad (110)$$

$$L_z |n, m\rangle = m |n, m\rangle. \quad (111)$$

As shown in Appendix, for a fixed value of  $n$ , the magnetic quantum number  $m$  takes the following  $(n + 1)$  values,

$$m = n, n - 2 \cdots, -(n - 2), -n. \quad (112)$$

Namely, one confirms that, also in the spherical-basis treatment, the state with the eigen-energy  $(n + 1)\omega$  has  $(n + 1)$ -fold degeneracy.

Now let us ask the following question. What happens if we add the uniform magnetic field along the  $z$ -direction to the system of 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator? The perturbed Hamiltonian would be given in the form :

$$H'_{osc} = H_{osc} + \Delta H, \quad \text{with } \Delta H = \lambda L_z, \quad (113)$$

where

$$\lambda = \mu_B \quad \text{with } \mu_B = \frac{q}{2m}. \quad (114)$$

In this problem, we assume that the particle moving in the Harmonic oscillator potential has a charge  $q$ . The answer is very simple, if we consider the problem in the spherical basis. Since the  $|n, m\rangle$ -basis is the eigen-states of  $L_z$  with the eigen-value  $m$ , we immediately find that

$$H'_{osc} |n, m\rangle = E' |n, m\rangle, \quad (115)$$

where

$$E' = (n + 1)\omega + \lambda m. \quad (116)$$

This means that, due to the uniform magnetic field applied along the  $z$ -direction, the degeneracy about the quantum number  $m$  is lifted (Zeeman splitting). It clearly shows that the quantum number  $m$  characterizing the eigen-states of the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator corresponds to a direct observable.

How can we answer the same question in the treatment with the Cartesian basis  $|n_x, n_y\rangle$ ? At first, it seems to be a somewhat nontrivial question, because the magnetic quantum number  $m$  never appears in the Cartesian basis  $|n_x, n_y\rangle$ . If one naively applies the non-degenerate perturbation theory in the 1st order, the perturbed energy is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E^{(1)} &= \langle n_x, n_y | \Delta H | n_x, n_y \rangle \\ &= \lambda \langle n_x, n_y | i (a_x a_y^\dagger - a_x^\dagger a_y) | n_x, n_y \rangle \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

Therefore, it looks as if no Zeeman splitting occurs. This is of course wrong. Because there are degeneracies about the energy eigen-states, we must apply the degenerate perturbation theory. (In our present problem, the following procedure is equivalent to diagonalize anew the total Hamiltonian  $H'_{osc}$ . We nevertheless think that the consideration below is instructive to understand the meaning and the answer of our proposed question above.)

Let us look into several eigen-states with smaller value of  $n$  in order. First, there is no degeneracy in the  $n = 0$  state. Next, for  $n = 1$ , the two states  $|n_x = 1, n_y = 0\rangle$  and  $|n_x = 0, n_y = 1\rangle$  have the same energy. Following the strategy of the degenerate perturbation theory, we calculate the matrix elements of  $\Delta H = \lambda L_z$  within the space of these two bases, and write down the secular equation. The matrix elements are given as

$$\langle n_x = 1, n_y = 0 | L_z | n_x = 1, n_y = 0 \rangle = 0, \quad (118)$$

$$\langle n_x = 1, n_y = 0 | L_z | n_x = 0, n_y = 1 \rangle = -i, \quad (119)$$

$$\langle n_x = 0, n_y = 1 | L_z | n_x = 1, n_y = 0 \rangle = +i, \quad (120)$$

$$\langle n_x = 0, n_y = 1 | L_z | n_x = 0, n_y = 1 \rangle = 0, \quad (121)$$

so that the corresponding secular equation becomes

$$\begin{vmatrix} 0 - E^{(1)} & -i\lambda \\ i\lambda & 0 - E^{(1)} \end{vmatrix} = 0. \quad (122)$$

Solving the secular equation, one finds that the perturbed eigen-energies are given by

$$E^{(1)} = \pm \lambda, \quad (123)$$



while the corresponding eigen-vectors are given by

$$|\psi_{n=1,\alpha}^{(1)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \{|n_x = 1, n_y = 0\rangle + i |n_x = 0, n_y = 1\rangle\}, \quad (124)$$

$$|\psi_{n=1,\beta}^{(1)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \{|n_x = 1, n_y = 0\rangle - i |n_x = 0, n_y = 1\rangle\}. \quad (125)$$

Using the general formula relating the  $|n_x, n_y\rangle$ -basis and the  $|n, m\rangle$ -basis derived in Appendix, one can easily confirm that the two eigen-vectors obtained above are nothing but the states  $|n = 1, m = 1\rangle$  and  $|n = 1, m = -1\rangle$  in the spherical basis, respectively.

Next, for  $n = 2$ , the three states  $|n_x = 2, n_y = 0\rangle$ ,  $|n_x = 1, n_y = 1\rangle$  and  $|n_x = 0, n_y = 2\rangle$  are energetically degenerate. By diagonalizing  $\Delta H$  in these bases, the perturbed eigen-energies are obtained as

$$E^{(1)} = 2\lambda, 0, -2\lambda, \quad (126)$$

and the corresponding eigen-vectors become

$$|n = 2, m = 2\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \{|n_x = 2, n_y = 0\rangle - |n_x = 0, n_y = 2\rangle + \sqrt{2}i |n_x = 1, n_y = 1\rangle\}, \quad (127)$$

$$|n = 2, m = 0\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \{|n_x = 2, n_y = 0\rangle + |n_x = 0, n_y = 2\rangle\}, \quad (128)$$

$$|n = 2, m = -2\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \{|n_x = 2, n_y = 0\rangle - |n_x = 0, n_y = 2\rangle - \sqrt{2}i |n_x = 1, n_y = 1\rangle\}, \quad (129)$$

In this way, we confirm that, if the uniform magnetic field is added to the Hamiltonian of the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator, the Zeeman splitting occurs in both of the spherical-basis treatment and the Cartesian-basis treatment, and the magnetic quantum number  $m$  in principle correspond to an observable. This is nothing surprising, because the physics should not change depending on how one chooses the coordinate basis to solve the problem.

As we shall see below, however, the situation is remarkably different in the Landau problem. Under the assumption of the uniform magnetic field directed to the  $z$ -direction, the Landau problem is essentially a 2-dimensional problem. However, a critical difference from the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator system is that the Landau Hamiltonian depends on the vector potential  $\mathbf{A}$  as

$$H_{Landau} = \frac{1}{2m_e} (\mathbf{p} + e\mathbf{A})^2. \quad (130)$$

The well-known problem is that the vector potential, which reproduces the uniform magnetic field, is not unique (gauge arbitrariness). The three popular gauge choices are the 1st Landau gauge, the 2nd Landau gauge, and the symmetric gauge. For example, with the choice of the 1st Landau gauge potential  $\mathbf{A}^{(L_1)} = B(-y, 0)$ , the Landau Hamiltonian reduces to the form :

$$H_{Landau} = \frac{1}{2m_e} \{(p_x - eBy)^2 + p_y^2\}. \quad (131)$$

On the other hand, with the choice of the symmetric gauge potential  $\mathbf{A}^{(S)} = \frac{1}{2}B(-y, x)$ , the Landau Hamiltonian reduces to

$$H_{Landau} = H_{osc} + \omega_L L_z, \quad (132)$$

where  $H_{osc}$  is the Hamiltonian of the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator given by

$$H_{osc} = \frac{1}{2m_e} (p_x^2 + p_y^2) + \frac{1}{2} m_e \omega_L^2 (x^2 + y^2). \quad (133)$$

In the above equation,  $L_z \equiv x p_y - y p_x$  is the  $z$ -component of the canonical OAM operator, whereas  $\omega_L = \frac{eB}{2m_e}$  is the familiar Larmor frequency. What is important to recognize here is the fact that the Landau Hamiltonian takes totally different forms depending on the choice of gauge potential. Different from the problem of the simple 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator, this is not a mere difference of the choices of the Cartesian coordinate system and the spherical coordinate system. With the choice of the 1st Landau gauge, the Landau Hamiltonian shows *translational symmetry* with respect to the  $x$ -axis. On the other hand, with the choice of the symmetric gauge, the Landau Hamiltonian shows

*rotational symmetry* around the coordinate origin. This should be contrasted with the fact that the Hamiltonian of the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator has rotational symmetry around the coordinate origin regardless of the Cartesian coordinate treatment and the spherical coordinate treatment.

The above-mentioned difference between the two physical system is related to a special nature of the Landau problem, in which the magnetic field is uniformly spread over the whole 2-dimensional plane, so that the choice of the *coordinate origin* is totally *arbitrary*. This should be contrasted with the problem of the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator. In the latter problem, the choice of the coordinate origin is practically unique. It is just the center of the Harmonic oscillator potential. Note that this is usually the case also in other physical problems which we normally encounter. For example, in the description of the hydrogen atom, the most natural choice of the coordinate origin is the position of the proton, which is much heavier than the electron and is thought to be at rest in a good approximation. Although it is not usually mentioned clearly or explicitly, we claim that this very fact must be a crucial reason why the magnetic quantum numbers  $m$  of the hydrogen eigen-states have good physical meaning as degrees of intensity of rotational motion around a definite orbit center and can be observed by means of the Zeeman splitting or something.

Now we argue that this is not the case with the magnetic quantum number  $m$ , which appears in the Landau eigen-states in the symmetric gauge. Certainly, the eigen-states of the Landau Hamiltonian in the symmetric gauge is characterized by two quantum numbers, i.e. the nonnegative Landau quantum number  $n$  and the magnetic quantum number  $m$ . Suppose that we attempt to lift the energy degeneracy in the quantum number  $m$  by imposing an additional magnetic field given as

$$\Delta\mathbf{B} = \Delta B \mathbf{e}_z. \quad (134)$$

The only change caused by this additional magnetic field is the following :

$$B \rightarrow B' = B + \Delta B, \quad (135)$$

$$\omega_L \rightarrow \omega'_L = \frac{e B'}{2m_e}, \quad (136)$$

so that the degeneracy in the quantum number  $m$  is never lifted and just remains. One therefore realizes that there is a crucial difference between the physics of degeneracy in the magnetic quantum number  $m$  in the Landau problem and that in the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator. As mentioned above, the ultimate reason of this difference is thought to be connected with the complete arbitrariness in the choice of the *coordinate origin* in the Landau problem. In fact, this is reflected in the uncertainty of the position of the orbit center with respect to the coordinate origin hidden in the Landau eigen-states even if we choose to work in the symmetric gauge.

## VI. IMPLICATION ON THE GAUGE-INVARIANT DECOMPOSITION PROBLEM OF THE NUCLEON SPIN

Although it might appear that there is little connection between the discussions in the present paper and the unsettled debates on the gauge-invariant decomposition problem of the nucleon spin, there actually exists a deep connection between them. The present section is devoted to briefly discussing this issue. The nucleon spin decomposition problem is how to decompose the total spin of the nucleon, which is naturally one-half, to the contributions of the intrinsic spin parts and the orbital angular momentum parts of quarks and gluons that make up the nucleon. It is widely recognized that there are two different types of decomposition : one is the canonical-type decomposition characterized by the canonical OAM of quarks [23] and the other is the mechanical-type decomposition characterized by the mechanical (or kinetic) OAM of quarks inside the nucleon [24, 25]. (For reviews, see [26, 27], for example.) Originally, the canonical OAM of quarks appearing in the famous Jaffe-Manohar decomposition of the nucleon spin [23] was believed to be a *gauge-variant* quantity. However, after Chen et al.'s paper appeared [28], several authors proposed the concept of gauge-covariant (g.c.) extension of the canonical OAM [26, 29, 30], and the belief that this *extended* canonical OAM can be regarded as a gauge-invariant quantity became popular. An apparent problem of such an idea is that the way of gauge-covariant extension is far from unique and there are plural possibilities of extension. Some popular examples are the g.c. extension based on the light-cone gauge, the g.c extension based on the temporal gauge, the g.c. extension based on the spatial axial gauge, and the g.c. extension based on the Coulomb gauge, etc. This means that the way of g.c. extension depends on the choice of *basis gauge*, and it in turn implies that g.c. extensions based on different basis gauges belong to *different gauge classes*.

The significance of the present paper is to elucidate this intricate gauge theoretical question with the help of an analytically solvable model, i.e. the Landau problem. (See also the discussion in [7], which is developed based on the gauge-invariant but path-dependent formulation of the Landau problem.) In fact, we have shown that the conserved momentum  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}$  in our paper can be regarded as a g.c. extension of the canonical momentum  $\hat{p}_x^{can}$  based

on the 1st Landau gauge, while the conserved OAM  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}$  in our paper can be thought of as a g.c. extension of the canonical OAM  $\hat{L}_z^{can}$  based on the symmetric gauge. We have also shown that, despite the formal gauge-covariant transformation properties, neither  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}$  nor  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}$  can be regarded as genuinely gauge-invariant physical quantities, which is critically different from the mechanical quantities like  $\hat{p}_x^{mech}$  and  $\hat{L}_z^{mech}$ . Exactly the same can be said for the g.c. extension of the canonical OAM of quarks appearing in the nucleon spin decomposition problem. The fact is that, despite the *formal* gauge-covariant transformation property, the g.c. extensions of the canonical OAM of quarks does not corresponds to a gauge-invariant quantity in a standard or physical sense. Under the presence of *nonzero* color-electromagnetic fields inside the nucleon, what is genuinely gauge-invariant is the mechanical OAM of quarks not the canonical OAM.

## VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In the gauge-potential-independent formulation of the Landau problem, there exist three conserved quantities, i.e. two conserved momenta  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\hat{p}_y^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$ , and one conserved orbital angular momentum  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$ . The conservation of these quantities are guaranteed not only in classical mechanics but also in quantum mechanics in the sense that they commute with the Landau Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}(\mathbf{A})$  for arbitrary choice of the gauge potential  $\mathbf{A}$ . However, these three operators do not commute with each other. Then, if one wants to obtain the eigen-functions of the Landau Hamiltonian, one must choose either of the following three options :

- (1) construct simultaneous eigen-states of  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\hat{H}(\mathbf{A})$ .
- (2) construct simultaneous eigen-states of  $\hat{p}_y^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\hat{H}(\mathbf{A})$ .
- (3) construct simultaneous eigen-states of  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\hat{H}(\mathbf{A})$ .

These three types of eigen-states are respectively characterized by the sets of quantum numbers  $(n, k_x)$ ,  $(n, k_y)$ , and  $(n, m)$ , where  $k_x$ ,  $k_y$ , and  $m$  are the eigen-values of the conserved operators  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$ ,  $\hat{p}_y^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$ , and  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  corresponding to the eigen-functions of the respective classes. In the traditional formulation of the Landau problem, these three eigen-states are related to those of the 1st Landau gauge, the 2nd Landau gauge, and the symmetric gauge, after suitably fixing the gauge potential configuration. In the gauge-potential-independent formulation, however, the construction of these three types of eigen-states can be done without specifying the form of the gauge potential at least formally. This means that there are infinitely many eigenstates characterized by the quantum numbers  $(n, k_x)$ , and similarly for other two types of eigen-states.

Still, a vitally important fact, which we have demonstrated in the present paper, is that the probability and current distributions of the Landau electron in the three types of eigen-states are totally different. In fact, the probability and current distributions of the 1st type of eigen-states have a translational symmetry with respect to the  $x$ -axis, those of the 2nd type eigen-states have a translational symmetry with respect to the  $y$ -axis, and those of the 3rd type eigen-states have a rotational symmetry with respect to the  $z$ -axis. We emphasize that the statements above is true for *arbitrary choices* of the gauge potential configuration, since the eigen-functions belonging to the same class are related by  $U(1)$  gauge transformations or phase transformation. Importantly however, the eigen-functions belonging to different classes are not connected by a *phase transformation*. This is the very reason why the probability and current distributions corresponding to the three different types of eigen-states are totally different. For this reason, we claim in [11] that these three types of eigen-states fall into different gauge classes even in the gauge-potential-independent formulation of the Landau problem. This viewpoint was however criticized in [12], and it was claimed that there is only one gauge class within the gauge-potential-independent formulation of the Landau problem.

In our opinion, for confirming the validity of our viewpoint explained above, what plays a decisively important role is the comparison of the expectation values of the above conserved quantities with those of the corresponding mechanical quantities, i.e. the two mechanical momentum operators  $\hat{p}_x^{mech}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\hat{p}_y^{mech}(\mathbf{A})$ , and the mechanical OAM operator  $\hat{L}_z^{mech}(\mathbf{A})$  between the different classes of eigen-states. Note that these mechanical quantities are standardly believed to be manifestly gauge-invariant and observable quantities. In fact, we have explicitly shown that the expectation values of these mechanical operators between the above different gauge classes of eigen-states coincide perfectly with each other, which reconfirms that they are in fact *genuinely* gauge-invariant quantities. In sharp contrast, despite the novel covariant gauge transformation properties of the conserved operators  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$ ,  $\hat{p}_y^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$ , and  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$ , we find that the their expectation values in the three different classes of eigen-states do not coincide with each other. This implies that, in spite of the novel covariant gauge transformation property, these conserved quantities cannot be regarded as gauge-invariant quantities in the standard sense. This also implies that the quantum numbers  $k_x$ ,  $k_y$ , and  $m$ , which are the eigen-values of the conserved operators  $\hat{p}_x^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$ ,  $\hat{p}_y^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$ , and  $\hat{L}_z^{cons}(\mathbf{A})$  in

the respective classes of eigen-states, do not correspond to direct experimental observables. In fact, we have explicitly demonstrated nonobservability of the quantum number  $k_x$  through the analysis of the familiar quantum Hall effect. Similarly, nonobservability of the quantum number  $m$  has been demonstrated through the comparison of the Landau problem and the problem of the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator.

In summary, although the two conserved momentum operators and one conserved OAM operator in the Landau problem transform covariantly under arbitrary gauge transformation just like the corresponding two mechanical momentum operators and the mechanical OAM operator do, there is an essential difference between these quantities. We must say that, different from the mechanical quantities, much physical significance cannot be given to the gauge-covariant transformation properties of the conserved quantities. After all, they are not gauge-invariant quantities in the standard or physical sense. Undoubtedly, exactly the same can be said for the gauge-covariant extension of the canonical OAM operator of quarks appearing in the gauge-invariant decomposition problem of the nucleon spin.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The present work has been accomplished on the basis of a number of previous works, which were carried out in collaborations with Pengming Zhang, Yoshio Kitadono, Liping Zou, and also with Akihisa Hayashi. The author would like to thank all of them for useful discussions.

### Appendix A: General formula relating the eigen-functions of the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator in the Cartesian basis and the spherical basis

The relation between the eigen-functions of the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator in the Cartesian-coordinate basis and the spherical-coordinate basis is discussed in many textbooks of quantum mechanics. (See, for example, Complement D<sub>VI</sub> in the book by Cohen-Tannoudji et al. [31]). However, it is not so easy to find an explicit general formula, which relates the eigen-states in the two bases. The purpose of this Appendix is to offer it.

The Hamiltonian of the 2-dimensional (isotropic) Harmonic oscillator is given by

$$H_{osc} = \frac{1}{2m} (p_x^2 + p_y^2) + \frac{1}{2} m \omega^2 (x^2 + y^2). \quad (A1)$$

It is widely known that, if we introduce the ladder operators by

$$a_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m\omega}} (m\omega x + ip_x), \quad (A2)$$

$$a_y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m\omega}} (m\omega y + ip_y), \quad (A3)$$

they satisfy the following commutation relations (C. R.'s) :

$$[a_x, a_x^\dagger] = 1, [a_y, a_y^\dagger] = 1, \text{ other C.R.'s} = 0, \quad (A4)$$

and the Hamiltonian can be expressed in the form

$$H_{osc} = \omega (a_x^\dagger a_x + a_y^\dagger a_y + 1). \quad (A5)$$

The eigen-states of this Hamiltonian are also well-known. They are specified by two non-negative integers  $n_x$  and  $n_y$  and satisfy the following eigen-equation :

$$H_{osc} |n_x, n_y\rangle = E |n_x, n_y\rangle, \quad (A6)$$

with

$$E = (n_x + n_y + 1) \omega. \quad (A7)$$

Here, the two quantum numbers  $n_x$  and  $n_y$  respectively corresponds to the numbers of oscillator quanta with respect to the  $x$ -direction and  $y$ -direction. Th explicit form is the eigen-states  $|n_x, n_y\rangle$  is given as

$$|n_x, n_y\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_x! n_y!}} (a_x^\dagger)^{n_x} (a_y^\dagger)^{n_y} |0, 0\rangle, \quad (A8)$$

where  $|0, 0\rangle$  represents the vacuum of the oscillator quanta in both directions.

Another important quantity in the 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator is the (canonical) angular momentum operator defined by

$$L_z \equiv x p_y - y p_x. \quad (\text{A9})$$

With the use of the ladder operators, it can be expressed as

$$L_z = i(a_x a_y^\dagger - a_x^\dagger a_y). \quad (\text{A10})$$

As easily verified, it commutes with the (isotropic) Harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian  $H_{osc}$  :

$$[L_z, H_{osc}] = 0. \quad (\text{A11})$$

This means that there exist simultaneous eigen-states of  $H$  and  $L_z$ . To find out them, it is convenient to introduce the following ladder operators [?] :

$$a_+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_x - i a_y), \quad a_- = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_x + i a_y). \quad (\text{A12})$$

They satisfy the following C.R.'s :

$$[a_+, a_+^\dagger] = 1, \quad [a_-, a_-^\dagger] = 1 \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$\begin{aligned} [a_+, a_-] &= [a_+, a_-^\dagger] = [a_+^\dagger, a_-] = [a_+^\dagger, a_-^\dagger] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A14})$$

By using these ladder operators,  $H_{osc}$  and  $L_z$  are expressed as

$$H_{osc} = (a_+^\dagger a_+ + a_-^\dagger a_- + 1)\omega, \quad (\text{A15})$$

$$L_z = a_+^\dagger a_+ - a_-^\dagger a_-. \quad (\text{A16})$$

Now, the simultaneous eigen-states of  $H_{osc}$  and  $L_z$  are easily constructed as

$$|n_+, n_-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_+! n_-!}} (a_+^\dagger)^{n_+} (a_-^\dagger)^{n_-} |0, 0\rangle. \quad (\text{A17})$$

In fact, it can be shown that they satisfy the following eigen-equations :

$$\begin{aligned} H_{osc} |n_+, n_-\rangle &= E |n_+, n_-\rangle \\ \text{with } E &= (n_+ + n_- + 1)\omega, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A18})$$

$$\begin{aligned} L_z |n_+, n_-\rangle &= m |n_+, n_-\rangle \\ \text{with } m &= n_+ - n_-. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A19})$$

Introducing the quantum number  $n$  by  $n = n_+ + n_-$ , the eigen-value of  $H_{osc}$  is given by  $(n+1)\omega$ . On the other hand, for a fixed integer  $n$ , the eigen-value of  $L_z$  takes the following values :

$$\begin{aligned} m &= n_+ - n_- = 2n - n_- \\ &= n, n-2, \dots, -(n-2), -n, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A20})$$

which means that the state with energy  $E = (n+1)\omega$  has  $(n+1)$ -fold degeneracy. Then, it is convenient to characterize the simultaneous eigen-states of  $H_{osc}$  and  $L_z$  by using the quantum numbers  $n$  and  $m$  instead of  $n_+$  and  $n_-$ . Such eigen-states satisfy the equations :

$$H_{osc} |n, m\rangle = (n+1)\omega |n, m\rangle, \quad (\text{A21})$$

$$L_z |n, m\rangle = m |n, m\rangle. \quad (\text{A22})$$

Note that the states  $|n, m\rangle$  correspond to the eigen-functions solved in the 2-dimensional spherical coordinates, while the states  $|n_x, n_y\rangle$  correspond to the eigen-functions solved in the 2-dimensional Cartesian coordinates. Of our interest is a general formula, which relates these two types of eigen-states.

Using the relations  $a_+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_x - i a_y)$ , and  $a_- = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_x + i a_y)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|n, m\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{n+m}{2}\right)! \left(\frac{n-m}{2}\right)!}} (a_+^\dagger)^{\frac{n+m}{2}} (a_-^\dagger)^{\frac{n-m}{2}} |0, 0\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{n+m}{2}\right)! \left(\frac{n-m}{2}\right)!}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{\frac{n+m}{2}} 2^{\frac{n-m}{2}}}} \\
&\times \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{n+m}{2}} \binom{\frac{n+m}{2}}{k} (a_x^\dagger)^{\frac{n+m}{2}-k} (i a_y^\dagger)^k \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{n-m}{2}} \binom{\frac{n-m}{2}}{j} (a_x^\dagger)^{\frac{n-m}{2}-j} (-i a_y^\dagger)^j |0\rangle_x |0\rangle_y.
\end{aligned} \tag{A23}$$

After rearranging the equation, we eventually get

$$\begin{aligned}
|n, m\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{n+m}{2}\right)! \left(\frac{n-m}{2}\right)!}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \\
&\times \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{n+m}{2}} \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{n-m}{2}} \binom{\frac{n+m}{2}}{k} \binom{\frac{n-m}{2}}{j} i^{k-j} \sqrt{(n-k-j)!(k+j)!} |n-k-j\rangle_x |k+j\rangle_y.
\end{aligned} \tag{A24}$$

This is the general formula, which provides us with the relation between the  $|n_x, n_y\rangle$ -basis and  $|n, m\rangle$ -basis in the problem of 2-dimensional Harmonic oscillator.

- 
- [1] L.D. Landau, Diamagnetisms der Metalle, Z. Phys. **64**, 629-637 (1930).
  - [2] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics : Non-Relativistic Theory, Course of Theoretical Physics*, 3rd ed., Vol.3 (Pergamon, New York, 1977).
  - [3] L.E. Vallentine, *Quantum Mechanics : A Modern Development* (World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., 1998).
  - [4] I.D. Vagner, V.M. Gvozdkov, and P. Wyder, Quantum mechanics of electrons in strong magnetic field, *HIT Journal of Science and Engineering* Vol.3 Issue 1, 5-55, (2005)
  - [5] M.O. Goerbig, Quantum Hall Effects, *arXiv:0909.1998* (2009).
  - [6] D. Tong, Quantum Hall Effects, *arXiv:1606.06687* (2016).
  - [7] M. Wakamatsu, Y. Kiadono, and P.-M. Zhang, The issue of gauge choice in the Landau problem and the physics of canonical and mechanical orbital angular momenta, *Ann. Phys.* **392**, 287-322 (2018).
  - [8] Y. Kitadono, M. Wakamatsu, L. Zou, and P. Zhang, Role of guiding center in Landau level system and mechanical and pseudo orbital angular momentum, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A.* **35**, 2050096/1-16 (2020).
  - [9] M. Wakamatsu, Y. Kiadono, L. Zou, and P.-M. Zhang, The physics of helical electron beam in a uniform magnetic field as a testing ground of gauge principle, *Phy. Lett. A* **384**, 126415/1-7 (2020).
  - [10] M. Wakamatsu, Y. Kiadono, L. Zou, and P.-M. Zhang, Revisiting the compatibility problem between the gauge principle and the observability of the canonical orbital angular momentum in the Landau problem, *Ann. Phys.* **434**, 168647/1-26 (2021).
  - [11] M. Wakamatsu and A. Hayashi, Physical symmetries and gauge choices in the Landau problem, *Eur. Phys. J.* **A58**, 121/1-20 (2022).
  - [12] J. Govaerts, External gauge field-coupled quantum dynamics: Gauge choices, Heisenberg algebra representations and gauge invariance in general, and the Landau problem in particular, *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* **35**, 2350014/1-53 (2023).
  - [13] D. Yoshioka, *The Quantum Hall Effects*, (Springer, 2002) pp.20-23 (2002).
  - [14] G. Konstantinou and K. Mouloupoulos, Generators of dynamical symmetries and the correct gauge transformation in the Landau level problem : use of pseudomomentum and pseudo-angular momentum, *Eur. J. Phys.* **37**, 065401/1-15 (2016).
  - [15] G. Konstantinou and K. Mouloupoulos, The "forgotten" pseudomomenta and gauge changes in generalized Landau level problems : spatially nonuniform magnetic and temporally varying electric fields *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **56**, 1484-1503 (2017).
  - [16] T. Haugset, J. Aa. Ruud, and F. Ravndal F, Gauge invariance of Landau levels *Physica Scripta* **47**, 715-719 (1993).
  - [17] J. Govaerts, M.N. Hounkonnou, and H.V. Mweene, Variations on the planar Landau problem : canonical transformations, a purely linear potential and the half-plane, *J.Phys. A : Math. Theor.* **42**, 485209/1-19 (2009).
  - [18] M. Johnson, B. Lippmann, Motion in a constant magnetic field, *Phys. Rev.* **76**, 828-832 (1949).
  - [19] S.J. van Enk, Angular momentum in the fractional quantum Hall effect, *American Journal of Physics* **88**(4), 286-291 (2020).
  - [20] H. Murayama, 221A Lecture Notes :Landau Levels, <http://hitoshi.berkeley.edu/221a/landau.pdf>.

- [21] R.L. Jaffe, MIT Quantum Theory Notes : Supplementary Notes for MIT's Quantum Theory Sequence, <https://ocw.mit.edu/courses/8-06-quantum-physics-iii-spring-2016/>.
- [22] S.C. Tiwari, Symmetry of Dirac two-oscillator system, gauge-invariance, and Landau problem, *Modern Physics Letters A*, Vol.38, No.20n21, 2350095 (2023).
- [23] R.L. Jaffe and A. Manohar, The  $g_1$  problem : Deep inelastic scattering and the spin of the nucleon, *Nucl. Phys.* **B337**, 509-546 (1990).
- [24] X. Ji, Gauge-invariant Decomposition of Nucleon Spin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 610-613 (1997).
- [25] M. Wakamatsu, Gauge-invariant decomposition of nucleon spin, *Phys. Rev.* **D81**, 114010/1-9 (2010).
- [26] E. Leader and C. Lorcé, The angular momentum controversy : What's it all about and does it matter?, *Phys. Rep.* **541**, 163-248 (2014).
- [27] M. Wakamatsu, Is gauge-invariant complete decomposition of the nucleon possible?, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **29**, 1430012/1-52 (2014).
- [28] X.S. Chen, X.F. Lü, W.M. Sun, F. Wang, and T. Goldman, Spin and Orbital Angular Momentum in Gauge Theories : Nucleon Spin Structures and Multipole Radiation Revisited, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 232002/1-4 (2008).
- [29] Y. Hatta, Gluon polarization in the nucleon demystified, *Phys. Rev.* **D84**, 04701(R)/1-4 (2011).
- [30] C. Lorcé, Gauge-covariant canonical formalism revisited with application to the proton spin decomposition, *Phys. Rev.* **D88**, 044037/1-8 (2013).
- [31] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, B. Diu, and F. Laloë, *Quantum Mechanics*, (WILEY-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co.KGaA, Germany, 2020).