

Comment on “Quantum mechanics of an electron in a homogeneous magnetic field and a singular magnetic flux tube”

R. M. Cavalcanti*

*Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, Cx. Postal 66318, 05315-970, São Paulo, SP,
Brazil*

(October 24, 2018)

Abstract

Recently Thienel [*Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **280** (2000), 140] investigated the Pauli equation for an electron moving in a plane under the influence of a perpendicular magnetic field which is the sum of a uniform field and a singular flux tube. Here we criticise his claim that one cannot properly solve this equation by treating the singular flux tube as the limiting case of a flux tube of finite size.

Typeset using REVTeX

*E-mail:rmoritz@fma.if.usp.br

The Pauli Hamiltonian for an electron (of mass M , charge $-|e|$ and g -factor 2) moving in the (x, y) -plane under the influence of a magnetic field pointing in the z -direction is given by

$$H = \frac{1}{2M} \left(\mathbf{p} + \frac{|e|\hbar}{c} \mathbf{A} \right)^2 + \frac{|e|\hbar}{Mc} B_z S_z. \quad (1)$$

Thienel [1] has recently investigated the eigenvalue problem for this Hamiltonian in the case of a magnetic field which is the sum of a uniform field and a singular flux tube,

$$B_z(\mathbf{r}) = B + \alpha \Phi \delta^2(\mathbf{r}) \quad (B > 0; \Phi \equiv 2\pi\hbar c/|e|). \quad (2)$$

He claims that standard approaches to this problem fail. The purpose of this Comment is to show not only that they do work, they are also simpler than his alternative method.

As Thienel, we choose the vector potential in the symmetric gauge,

$$\mathbf{A}(r) = \left(\frac{Br}{2} + \frac{\alpha\Phi}{2\pi r} \right) \mathbf{e}_\varphi,$$

and use magnetic units (where the unit of length is $\lambda = (\Phi/\pi B)^{1/2}$ and the unit of energy is $\hbar\omega$, with $\omega = |e|B/Mc$ the Larmor frequency). Then we can rewrite (1) as

$$H = -\frac{1}{4r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) - \frac{1}{4r^2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} + i\alpha \right)^2 - \frac{i}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} + i\alpha \right) + \frac{1}{4} r^2 + \left[1 + \frac{\alpha}{2r} \delta(r) \right] S_z \quad (3)$$

(our r corresponds to his \tilde{r}). Since H , L_z and S_z commute with each other they can be diagonalized simultaneously, so we can write the eigenfunctions of H as $\Psi_{E,m,\sigma}(r, \varphi) = \psi_{E,m,\sigma}(r) e^{im\varphi} |\sigma\rangle$, with m an integer and $S_z |\sigma\rangle = \sigma |\sigma\rangle$, $\sigma = \pm 1/2$. Solving the resulting differential equation for $\psi_{E,m,\sigma}(r)$ and demanding that $\psi_{E,m,\sigma}(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ we finally obtain

$$\Psi_{E,m,\sigma}(r, \varphi) = \mathcal{N} r^{|m+\alpha|} e^{-r^2/2} U(\xi, |m+\alpha|+1, r^2) e^{im\varphi} |\sigma\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $U(a, b, z)$ is one of Kummer's functions [2], \mathcal{N} is a normalization constant and

$$\xi \equiv \frac{1}{2} (|m+\alpha| + m + \alpha + 1 + 2\sigma) - E. \quad (5)$$

In order to determine the possible values of E we need to know the correct boundary condition at the origin. This problem was examined by Hagen [3] and Górnicki [4] in the case of a pure Aharonov-Bohm potential (i.e., with $B = 0$). By treating the singular flux tube as the limiting case of a flux tube of finite size, they obtained the following result: the eigenfunctions corresponding to the spin component which “sees” a repulsive delta-function potential at the origin (i.e., $\sigma = +1/2$ if $\alpha > 0$, $\sigma = -1/2$ if $\alpha < 0$) must be regular there. (By contrast, Thienel requires, without justification, that they vanish at the origin. This is the reason why a vacancy line occurs in his $(E, m + \sigma)$ -plane — see FIG. 1 of Ref. [1] — for integer $\alpha \neq 0$, whereas in our solution no such vacancy line occurs.) The supersymmetry of

the Pauli Hamiltonian [1,5] determines the eigenfunctions corresponding to the other spin component.

A few remarks are in order here: (i) although such a boundary condition was derived for the Dirac equation, one can easily show that it also holds for the Pauli equation (with $g = 2$) [5,6]; (ii) the presence of background smooth magnetic field does not alter the boundary condition at the origin, as it does not add any singular term to the Hamiltonian.

Let us first consider the case $\alpha > 0$. Then $\Psi_{E,m,1/2}$ must be regular at the origin, which occurs only if $\xi = -n$ ($n = 0, 1, 2 \dots$), for then

$$U(-n, |m + \alpha| + 1, r^2) = (-1)^n n! L_n^{|m+\alpha|}(r^2), \quad (6)$$

where $L_n^\alpha(z)$ is the associated Laguerre polynomial [2]. Combining this with (4) and (5) and normalizing $\Psi_{E,m,1/2}$ to unity we thus obtain

$$\Psi_{n,m,1/2}(r, \varphi) = \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(n+1)}{\pi \Gamma(|m+\alpha| + n + 1)}} r^{|m+\alpha|} e^{-r^2/2} L_n^{|m+\alpha|}(r^2) e^{im\varphi} |+\rangle, \quad (7)$$

$$E_{n,m,1/2} = n + 1 + \frac{1}{2} (|m + \alpha| + m + \alpha) \quad (n = 0, 1, 2 \dots; m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2 \dots). \quad (8)$$

For each of these states there is a superpartner with the same energy and opposite spin, obtained by applying the supercharge Q^\dagger (Eq. (10) of Ref. [1]) to (7):

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{n,m+1,-1/2}(r, \varphi) &= E_{n,m,1/2}^{-1/2} Q^\dagger \Psi_{n,m,1/2}(r, \varphi) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(n+1)}{\pi E_{n,m,1/2} \Gamma(|m+\alpha| + n + 1)}} \\ &\quad \times \left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{m+\alpha}{r} + r \right) r^{|m+\alpha|} e^{-r^2/2} L_n^{|m+\alpha|}(r^2) e^{i(m+1)\varphi} |-\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The factor $E_{n,m,1/2}^{-1/2}$ ensures proper normalization:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi_{n,m+1,-1/2} | \Psi_{n,m+1,-1/2} \rangle &= E_{n,m,1/2}^{-1} \langle \Psi_{n,m,1/2} | Q Q^\dagger | \Psi_{n,m,1/2} \rangle \\ &= E_{n,m,1/2}^{-1} \langle \Psi_{n,m,1/2} | (H - Q^\dagger Q) | \Psi_{n,m,1/2} \rangle = 1. \end{aligned}$$

The eigenstates with zero energy are annihilated by both supercharges,

$$Q |E = 0\rangle = Q^\dagger |E = 0\rangle = 0.$$

They are given by

$$\Psi_{E=0,m,-1/2}(r, \varphi) = \frac{r^{-(m+\alpha)} e^{-r^2/2} e^{im\varphi} |-\rangle}{\sqrt{\pi \Gamma(-m - \alpha + 1)}}; \quad (10)$$

square integrability requires $m + \alpha < 1$.

If $\alpha < 0$ it is $\Psi_{E,m,-1/2}$ which must be regular at $r = 0$. Thus

$$\Psi_{n,m,-1/2}(r, \varphi) = \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(n+1)}{\pi \Gamma(|m+\alpha|+n+1)}} r^{|m+\alpha|} e^{-r^2/2} L_n^{|m+\alpha|}(r^2) e^{im\varphi} |-\rangle, \quad (11)$$

$$E_{n,m,-1/2} = n + \frac{1}{2} (|m+\alpha| + m + \alpha) \quad (n = 0, 1, 2 \dots; m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2 \dots). \quad (12)$$

The zero modes are already included among these states ($n = 0, m + \alpha \leq 0$). The spin-up states are obtained by applying the supercharge Q (Eq. (9) of Ref. [1]) to the spin-down states with nonzero energy (the factor $E_{n,m,-1/2}^{-1/2}$ ensures proper normalization):

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{n,m-1,1/2}(r, \varphi) &= E_{n,m,-1/2}^{-1/2} Q \Psi_{n,m,-1/2}(r, \varphi) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(n+1)}{\pi E_{n,m,-1/2} \Gamma(|m+\alpha|+n+1)}} \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{m+\alpha}{r} + r \right) r^{|m+\alpha|} e^{-r^2/2} L_n^{|m+\alpha|}(r^2) e^{i(m-1)\varphi} |+\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The same results can be obtained by treating the singular flux tube as the limiting case of a flux tube of finite size in the presence of a background homogeneous magnetic field. The calculations, however, are more complicated and not illuminating. Here I shall only point out to the origin of Thienel's wrong conclusion that such an approach fails. First of all, we note that the correct form of Ψ outside the flux tube is given by (4). Then, by demanding continuity of $\partial\Psi/\partial r$ at the border of the tube, one is led to what is essentially his Eq. (17) multiplied by $R^{|m+\alpha|-1} e^{-R^2/2} U(\xi, |m+\alpha|+1, R^2)$. As a function of ξ , U has an infinite number of zeros, which were completely overlooked by Thienel. [One can show, in particular, that the zeros ξ_n of U satisfy $\lim_{R \rightarrow 0} \xi_n = -n$ ($n = 0, 1, 2 \dots$). This follows from the asymptotic behavior of U for small R [2],

$$U(\xi, |m+\alpha|+1, R^2) \stackrel{R \rightarrow 0}{\sim} -\frac{\Gamma(|m+\alpha|)}{\Gamma(\xi)} R^{-2|m+\alpha|}$$

(valid for $\xi \neq -n$ and $m+\alpha \neq 0$), the fact that $\Gamma(-n+\epsilon)$ and $\Gamma(-n-\epsilon)$ have opposite signs for $n = 0, 1, 2 \dots$ and $0 < \epsilon < 1$, and the continuity of U as a function of ξ .]

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Adilson José da Silva and Marcelo Gomes for a critical reading of this paper. This work was supported by FAPESP.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. P. Thienel, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **280** (2000), 140.
- [2] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun (Eds.), “Handbook of Mathematical Functions,” Chap. 13, Dover, New York, 1965.
- [3] C. R. Hagen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** (1990), 503.
- [4] P. Górnicki, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **202** (1990), 271.
- [5] Y. Aharonov and A. Casher, *Phys. Rev. A* **19** (1979), 2461.
- [6] R. Jackiw, in “M. A. B. Bég Memorial Volume” (A. Ali and P. Hoodbhoy, Eds.), World Scientific, Singapore, 1991.