Comment on: "Semiclassical theory of spin-orbit interactions using spin coherent states"

Jens Bolte,^{*} Rainer Glaser,[†] and Stefan Keppeler[‡] Abteilung Theoretische Physik, Universität Ulm, Albert-Einstein-Alle 11, D-89069 Ulm, Germany

We point out that a certain kind of combined classical translational and spin dynamics – claimed in [M. Pletyukhov *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002) 116601] to arise from the Pauli equation in the semiclassical limit $\hbar \to 0$ for fixed spin – only shows up if one simultaneously considers the high spin limit $S \to \infty$.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Sq

The main intention of the recent Letter [1] is to derive a semiclassical trace formula for the density of states of quantum systems with a spin-orbit interaction. The Hamiltonians under consideration are of the form

$$\hat{H} = H_0(\hat{\boldsymbol{q}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{p}}) + \kappa \frac{\hbar}{2} \hat{\boldsymbol{s}} \cdot \boldsymbol{C}(\hat{\boldsymbol{q}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{p}}), \qquad (1)$$

where $H_0(\hat{q}, \hat{p})$ describes the translational motion and $\hat{s} = (\hat{s}_x, \hat{s}_y, \hat{s}_z)$ denotes normalized spin operators, i.e. generators of the (2S + 1)-dimensional irreducible representation of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2)$. As their main tool to evaluate the trace of the time evolution operator $e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\hat{H}t}$ the authors of [1] use coherent state path integrals for both translational and spin degrees of freedom. They claim that in the semiclassical limit $\hbar \to 0$, for fixed spin quantum number S, the classical periodic orbits entering the trace formula derive from coupled dynamics of the translational and the spin motion, including a back reaction of the spin on the translational part. This contradicts earlier results of two of us [2, 3]. It is the aim of the present Comment to point out that the aforementioned kind of coupled classical dynamics can only appear in the combined limits $\hbar \to 0$, $S \to \infty$ with $\hbar S = const$, but not for fixed spin S.

Two versions of semiclassical trace formulae for Hamiltonians of the type (1) have previously been derived in [3]. These two cases are distinguished by the way in which the semiclassical limit is performed. In the first scenario, referred to as the "weak-coupling limit" in [1], the single limit $\hbar \to 0$ is considered, whereas the further parameters κ and S in (1) are fixed. One then finds a trace formula which involves periodic orbits of the translational dynamics generated by the classical Hamiltonian $H_0(\boldsymbol{q}, \boldsymbol{p})$ and solutions of the spin precession equation $\dot{s} = \kappa C \times s$ along these orbits. The second scenario of [3], however, is concerned with the combined limits $\hbar \to 0, \kappa \to \infty$ such that $\tilde{\kappa} := \kappa \hbar = const$ and therefore represents a "strong-coupling limit". In this case the orbits relevant for the trace formula are determined by the ray Hamiltonians $H_0 + m\tilde{\kappa}|\mathbf{C}|, m = -S, \ldots, S$. The only remnants of the spin motion are certain geometric phases, but no classical spin precession enters. We also point out that only in the second scenario the problem of mode conversion can show up. These two scenarios are not properly distinguished in [1] as it is the first one which also applies to the Dirac equation, yet the second scenario proves the assumptions made in [4]. But most importantly, it should be noted that one can only achieve a *third* version of a trace formula, as intended in [1], in a scenario different from the previous ones. This would require to vary the additional parameter S entering (1) along with \hbar . Such an approach would provide a semiclassical theory with a different, rather than larger, range of validity.

The problematic step in the derivation of the trace formula in [1] is an incorrect application of the method of stationary phase to the coherent state path integral. The latter is dominated by paths that yield rapidly oscillating contributions to the total phase \mathcal{R}/\hbar in the limit $\hbar \to 0$. Terms in the principal function \mathcal{R} proportional to \hbar hence must not be included in the determination of stationary points. If properly employed at this stage, the two types of semiclassical limits studied in [3] will, as it should be, reproduce the result obtained there. In [1] the authors, however, also include \hbar -dependent terms in the principal function \mathcal{R} to determine their classical paths. An inspection of the expression for \mathcal{R} given in eqs. (7) and (8) in [1] reveals that in order for this to result from a correct application of the method of stationary phase the combined limits $\hbar \to 0, S \to \infty$ with $\hbar S = const$ must be taken. This seems to have been overlooked in [1], as also indicated by the fact that an example is given for the case S = 1/2.

We remark that the trace formula searched for in [1] emerges as a special case, for the Lie group G = SU(2), of a more general problem, see [5, 6] and references therein. In these papers it is indeed proven that the combined limits $\hbar \to 0$, $S \to \infty$ with $\hbar S = const$ have to be considered for the desired trace formula to hold.

* jens.bolte@physik.uni-ulm.de

- [‡] stefan.keppeler@physik.uni-ulm.de
- M. Pletyukhov, C. Amann, M. Mehta and M. Brack: Semiclassical theory of spin-orbit interactions using spin coherent states, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89 (2002) 116601
- J. Bolte and S. Keppeler: Semiclassical Time Evolution and Trace Formula for Relativistic Spin-1/2 Particles, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81 (1998) 1987–1991.
- [3] J. Bolte and S. Keppeler: A semiclassical approach to the Dirac equation, Ann. Phys. (NY) 274 (1999) 125–162.
- [4] H. Frisk and T. Guhr: Spin-Orbit Coupling in Semiclassical Approximation, Ann. Phys. (NY) 221 (1993) 229–257.
- [5] V. Guillemin and A. Uribe: *Reduction and the trace formula*, J. Differential Geom. **32** (1990) 315–347.
- [6] M. E. Taylor and A. Uribe: Semiclassical spectra of gauge fields, J. Funct. Anal. 110 (1992) 1–46.

[†] rainer.glaser@physik.uni-ulm.de