

Reply to a Comment by J. Bolte, R. Glaser and S. Keppeler on: Semiclassical theory of spin-orbit interactions using spin coherent states

M. Pletyukhov, Ch. Amann, M. Mehta² and M. Brack

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Regensburg, D-93040 Regensburg, Germany

²*present address: Harish-Chandra Research Institute, Chhatnag Road, Jhusi, Allahabad 211019, India*

The essential points in a recent Comment by Bolte, Glaser and Keppeler (BGK) [1] are their claims (*i*) that our results in [2] contradict earlier findings by Bolte and Keppeler (BK) [3], (*ii*) that a semiclassical trace formula with explicit coupling of orbital and spin degrees of freedom can only be obtained in the limit of infinite spin: $S \rightarrow \infty$, and (*iii*) that our approach [2] uses an incorrect application of the stationary-phase approximation. We disagree with all three points.

Ad i:) We have already stated in [2] that in the “weak-coupling limit” (WCL), our approach yields the same result as that obtained in [3]. The detailed proof is given in [4]. In the WCL, the orbital motion is not affected by the spin, as found also in [3], but it is essential in our approach to keep the \hbar -dependent terms in the principal function \mathcal{R} , see Eq. (7) of [2], and to take into account the Solari-Kochetov phase correction [5,6]. Of the two versions of semiclassical trace formulae mentioned by BGK, the WCL thus leads to perfect agreement between our approach and that of BK [3], and there is no contradiction. The “strong-coupling limit” (SCL) [7,8] has not been studied from within our approach, so that no contradiction can be claimed.

Ad ii:) We have not “overlooked” (as suggested by BGK) that there is a formal problem with the use of a finite spin S , but clearly pointed this out in the last paragraph of our paper [2]. We have stated there that the path integral has the correct measure only in the large-spin limit, and that this calls for a proper renormalization scheme for finite spin. For pure spin systems, the scheme is known [5,6] and leads [9] to the so-called “Weyl shift” $S \rightarrow S + 1/2$ that yields a valid semiclassical description also in our formalism. It can, e.g., easily be checked that for a pure spin Zeeman interaction $-\mu \hat{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{B}$ this semiclassical treatment becomes exact. (This also contradicts the third objection by BGK, see point *iii*.) In spin-orbit coupled systems, the renormalization scheme is not known yet. However, as shown in [4] and mentioned in point *i*, the Weyl shift appears to be justified at least in the weak-coupling limit, since it yields the same result as [3]. Therefore, there is good reason to expect our approach to give reasonable approximations for finite S also in the general case – as substantiated by the successful application to a real physical system in [2].

A general remark is appropriate here. Even if a semiclassical approach is mathematically only justified in the limit of large quantum numbers like $S \rightarrow \infty$, one is entitled as a physicist to try and use it in situations where

this limit is not fulfilled. It is a well-known bonus of semiclassical approximations that they work even in limits where they mathematically ought not to work (provided that the dependence on the quantum numbers is sufficiently smooth and that appropriate phase corrections – the Maslov indices – are incorporated). See, e.g., the WKB quantization of orbital motion which rigorously is justified only for quantum numbers $n \rightarrow \infty$, but in harmonic oscillators becomes exact even for $n = 0$.

Ad iii:) We do not see why our use of the stationary-phase approximation should be incorrect. Whenever $\mathcal{R}_0 \gg \hbar$, so that the stationary-phase method is justified, no harm is done in adding a small term of order \hbar to \mathcal{R}_0 : the phase (\mathcal{R}/\hbar) for $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_0 + \hbar \mathcal{R}_1$ will still be rapidly oscillating. In fact, it is precisely the \hbar terms in \mathcal{R} (7) – if properly treated, as shown in [4] – that yield the BK spin modulation factor in the weak-coupling limit (cf. point *i*). Another proof of the validity of the stationary-phase approximation using (7) is the fact already mentioned in point *ii* that it leads to exact semiclassical results for pure spin systems. *It is the very essence of our approach to have gone beyond the leading-order \hbar approximation used by BK [3].* To include \hbar terms – which are all proportional to S – into \mathcal{R} (7) and the equations of motion (9), and hence to get a non-trivial spin-orbit coupling where the orbital motion is modified by the spin motion (which is physically sound), appears to be a well-working semiclassical approach. We do not claim it to be the only one.

Let us finally point out that for the system investigated in [2] – a quantum dot with Rashba spin-orbit interaction – neither the WCL nor the SCL can be used: in the WCL the BK approach [3] leads to a trivial spin modulation factor 2 ignoring spin-orbit coupling effects, and the SCL is obstructed by the mode conversion problem [7,8,10]. This demonstrates that for certain systems a more general approach is required; we have proposed one that works in the above system. Another case where both WCL and SCL give wrong results is the two-dimensional electron gas with Rashba interaction in a homogeneous magnetic field. It was shown analytically in [10] that the BK trace formula for this system is correct only to leading order in the spin-orbit coupling strength κ .

We are grateful to Oleg Zaitsev and Stephen Creagh for helpful discussions.

-
- [1] J. Bolte, R. Glaser and S. Keppeler, preprint ULM-TP/02-7 (2002); nlin.CD/0208031.
 - [2] M. Pletyukhov, Ch. Amann, M. Mehta, and M. Brack, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 116601 (2002).
 - [3] J. Bolte and S. Keppeler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1987 (1998); Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **274**, 125 (1999).
 - [4] O. Zaitsev, Regensburg University preprint (2002); nlin.CD/0208047.
 - [5] E. Kochetov, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 4667 (1995).
 - [6] H.G. Solari, J. Math. Phys. **28**, 1097 (1987).
 - [7] R. G. Littlejohn and W. G. Flynn, Phys. Rev. A **44**, 5239 (1991); Phys. Rev. A **45**, 7697 (1992).
 - [8] H. Frisk and T. Guhr, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **221**, 229 (1993).
 - [9] M. Stone, K.-S. Park, and A. Garg, J. Math. Phys. **41**, 8025 (2000).
 - [10] Ch. Amann and M. Brack, J. Phys. A **35**, 6009 (2002).