

Exact solvability of potentials with spatially dependent effective masses

A. de Souza Dutra*

UNESP/Campus de Guaratinguetá-DFQ
Av. Dr. Ariberto Pereira da Cunha, 333
Guaratinguetá - SP - Brasil
Cep 12516-410

C. A. S. Almeida

Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Ceará
Centro de Ciências, Campus do Pici, Caixa Postal 6030
CEP 60455-760, Fortaleza - Ceará - Brasil

October 30, 2018

Abstract

We discuss the relationship between exact solvability of the Schroedinger equation, due to a spatially dependent mass, and the ordering ambiguity. Some examples show that, even in this case, one can find exact solutions. Furthermore, it is demonstrated that operators with linear dependence on the momentum are nonambiguous.

*e-mail: dutra@feg.unesp.br

1 Introduction

Along the years, many people has studied the Schroedinger equation regarding its exact solvability. This because, despite of the intrinsic interest of the systems exactly solved, these solutions can be used to get better approximated solutions for potentials more physically interesting. In fact in the last decades many advances were put forward in this area by doing the classification of the quantum potentials regarding its solvability, for instance by relating the solutions to an underlying supersymmetry [1], or a dynamical one [2]. Similar discussions are done for the case of the so called quasi exactly solvable potentials [3], and the conditionally exactly solvable ones [4]. In particular the exact potentials are in general considered for constant or at most time-dependent masses [5]-[15]. Here we intend to show that when we take into account a spatial dependence of the mass, there are other potentials that are not solvable when the masses are constant. Furthermore, these potentials will lead to eigenfunctions and eigenvalues depending on the chosen ordering of the Hamiltonian operator.

On the other hand, the problem of ordering ambiguity is a long standing one in quantum mechanics. Some of the founders of quantum mechanics as Born and Jordan, Weyl, Dirac and von Newmann did work in this matter, see for instance the excellent critical review by Shewell [16]. There are many examples of physically important systems, for which such ambiguity is quite relevant. For instance we can cite the problem of impurities in crystals [17][18][19], the dependence of nuclear forces on the relative velocity of the two nucleons [20][21], and more recently the study of semiconductor heterostructures [22][23]. A very important example of ordering ambiguity is that of the minimal coupling in systems of charged particles interacting with magnetic fields [24]. This problem has as the accepted solution, the ordering of the ambiguous term $\vec{A}(\vec{x})\cdot\vec{p}$ by defining a symmetrized one (Weyl ordering) $(\vec{A}(\vec{x})\cdot\vec{p} + \vec{p}\cdot\vec{A}(\vec{x}))/2$. By the way this is even used to define the prescription to evaluate the Feynmann path integral at the mean point [25][26][27]. The way one chooses the point to evaluate the path integral is shown to be closely related to the problem of ordering ambiguity [28][29]. In fact the so called Weyl ordering is usually accepted by some textbooks as the correct one [30][31]. However we also show that, no matter the ordering used to the term $\vec{A}(\vec{x})\cdot\vec{p}$, the same result is obtained, *i. e.* there is no ambiguity.

Notwithstanding, taking into account the spatial variation of the semiconductor type, some effective Hamiltonians are proposed with a spatially dependent mass for the carrier [32]-[37]. In this last work, it was tried to circumvent the problem of ambiguity, by starting from the Dirac equation which does not have any ambiguity, and then taking the nonrelativistic limit. In this process the authors advocated in favor of the Li and Kuhn [36] proposal of effective Hamiltonian. One of the goals of this work is to show that the Hamiltonian proposed by Li and Kuhn [36][37], is in fact equivalent to that coming from the Weyl ordering.

We also suggest that these exact solutions could be used as a kind of guide to, at least, restrict the possible choices of ordering. The principal idea is to suppose that, once one have found the ordering without ambiguity for a given potential or class of potentials, that ordering should be extended to remaining physical potentials.

2 Generalized Effective Schroedinger Equation

We start this section by defining a quite general Hermitian effective Hamiltonian for the case of a spatially dependent mass. In general it is used the Hamiltonian proposed by von Roos [38],

$$H_{VR} = \frac{1}{4} \left[m^\alpha(\vec{r}) \hat{p} m^\beta(\vec{r}) \hat{p} m^\gamma(\vec{r}) + m^\gamma(\vec{r}) \hat{p} m^\beta(\vec{r}) \hat{p} m^\alpha(\vec{r}) \right], \quad (1)$$

but to accommodate the possibility of including the case of the Weyl ordering [27] in a more evident way, we will use an effective Hamiltonian with four terms given by

$$H = \frac{1}{4(a+1)} \left\{ a \left[m^{-1}(\vec{r}) \hat{p}^2 + \hat{p}^2 m^{-1}(\vec{r}) \right] + m^\alpha(\vec{r}) \hat{p} m^\beta(\vec{r}) \hat{p} m^\gamma(\vec{r}) + m^\gamma(\vec{r}) \hat{p} m^\beta(\vec{r}) \hat{p} m^\alpha(\vec{r}) \right\}. \quad (2)$$

In both cases there is a constraint over the parameters: $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = -1$, and the Weyl ordering is recovered when one choose $a = 1$, $\alpha = \gamma = 0$. A similar Hamiltonian was used by Levinger and collaborators [20][21].

Using the properties of the canonical commutators, it is easy to show that one can put the momenta to the right, so obtaining the following effective Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} \hat{p}^2 + \frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{dm/dr}{m^2} \hat{p} + U_{\alpha\beta\gamma a}(r), \quad (3)$$

where

$$U_{\alpha\beta\gamma a}(r) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{4m^3(a+1)} \left[(\alpha + \gamma - a) m \frac{d^2m}{dr^2} + 2(a - \alpha\gamma - \alpha - \gamma) \left(\frac{dm}{dr} \right)^2 \right]. \quad (4)$$

It is curious to note that all the ambiguity is in the last effective potential term, and that it can be eliminated by imposing some convenient constraints over the ambiguity parameters, namely

$$\alpha + \gamma - a = 0, \quad a - \alpha\gamma - \alpha - \gamma = 0, \quad (5)$$

which have two equivalent solutions, (i) $\alpha = 0$ and $a = \gamma$, or (ii) $a = \alpha$ and $\gamma = 0$. In this case the effective Schroedinger equation will not depend on the ambiguity parameters, but will contain a first order derivative term. In the next section, we will be interested in getting exact solutions of the resulting equation for some particular potentials, and trying to get some information about the proposed orderings appearing in the literature.

3 Exact Potentials with Coordinate Dependent Mass

First of all, we will rewrite the Schroedinger equation coming from the above effective Hamiltonian

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2\psi}{dr^2} + \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \left(\frac{dm/dr}{m^2} \right) \frac{d\psi}{dr} + (V(r) + U_{\alpha\beta\gamma a}(r) - E) \psi = 0, \quad (6)$$

where we introduce, for the sake of generality, a potential term $V(r)$. It is not difficult to verify that doing a wave function redefinition

$$\psi(r) = m^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi(r),$$

one get a differential equation in a more familiar form

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2\varphi}{dr^2} + (U_{eff} - E)\varphi(r) = 0, \quad (7)$$

with the effective potential defined through

$$U_{eff} = V(r) + U_{\alpha\beta\gamma a}(r) + \frac{\hbar^2}{4m} \left(\frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{dm/dr}{m} \right)^2 - \frac{d^2m/dr^2}{m} \right). \quad (8)$$

At this point it is interesting to discuss about the exact solvability of a given system. From above equations, and noting that one could recover an usual Schroedinger equation with a constant unitary mass by multiplying it by $m(x)$. One can easily verify that whenever $m(x) (U_{eff}(x) - E) = V_N(x) - \mathcal{E}$, where $V_N(x)$ is an exact [1], quasi-exact [2] or conditionally exact [4] potential, and besides \mathcal{E} is a constant term, we will have the original pair of potential $V(x)$ and $m(x)$, with this same kind of solvability property.

Now let us take some particular cases where one have exact solution for the above equation. As the first example we consider a particle with exponentially decaying or increasing mass, in the presence of a potential with similar behavior,

$$m(x) = m_0 e^{cx}, \quad V(x) = V_0 e^{cx}, \quad (9)$$

and in this case we will have as the effective equation

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_0} \frac{d^2\varphi}{dx^2} + (V_0 e^{2cx} - E e^{cx}) \varphi = \mathcal{E} \varphi, \quad (10)$$

where $\mathcal{E} \equiv \frac{\hbar^2}{m_0} \left(q - \frac{c^2}{8} \right)$, and we defined q as

$$q = \frac{c^2}{4(a+1)} (a - 2\alpha\gamma - \alpha - \gamma). \quad (11)$$

Note that this last equation corresponds to a Schroedinger equation for a particle with constant mass under the influence of the Morse potential [39]. However we will make a further modification that is convenient to put it

in a more familiar form, that of a harmonic oscillator with centripetal barrier. This is done by using a coordinate transformation and a wave function redefinition defined as [4]

$$x = f(u), \varphi(x) = \sqrt{\frac{df(u)}{du}} \chi(u), \quad (12)$$

so that, after straightforward calculations one ends with

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_0} \frac{d^2\chi}{du^2} + (W_T(u) - E_T) \chi = 0, \quad (13)$$

with the following definitions

$$W_T(u) - E_T = \left(\frac{df(u)}{du}\right)^2 [W(u) - E] - \frac{\hbar^2}{4} \left[\frac{d^3f(u)/du^3}{df(u)/du} - \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{d^2f(u)/du^2}{df(u)/du}\right)^2 \right], \quad (14)$$

and it was used that in Eq. 10, $W(u) = m_0 V_0 e^{2cf(u)} - E e^{cf(u)}$. In the present case $f(u) = \ln\left(u^{\frac{2}{c}}\right)$ and this lead us to

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2} \frac{d^2\chi}{du^2} + \left(\frac{\omega^2}{2} u^2 - \frac{g}{u^2}\right) \chi = E_T \chi, \quad \omega = \frac{\sqrt{2m_0 V_0}}{c},$$

$$g = \frac{\mathcal{E}}{c^2} + \frac{\hbar^2}{8}, \quad E_T = \frac{m_0 E}{c^2}, \quad (15)$$

From which one can easily reconstruct the wave function of the original potential and the respective energy spectrum. This last is given by

$$E_n = (\hbar c) \sqrt{\frac{2V_0}{m_0}} [2n + 1 + \nu(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, a)], \quad \nu(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, a) = \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{2q}{c^2}\right). \quad (16)$$

Now we study the effect of using some of the orderings appearing in the literature. By using the Gora and Williams ordering ($a = \gamma = 0, \alpha = -1$) [34] or that due to BenDaniel and Duke ($a = \alpha = \gamma = 0$) [32], one ends with a complex energy because in these cases one have $\nu(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, a) = \frac{i}{2}$. If one consider that the good ordering should lead to sensible results for any potential, these orderings should be discarded. On the other hand, once what is observable are the differences between the energy levels, it is easy

to conclude that in this case the spectrum is nonambiguous. Furthermore for the orderings of Zhu and Kroemer [33] ($a = 0, \alpha = -\frac{1}{2} = \gamma$), Li and Kuhn [36] ($a = 0, \alpha = 0, \gamma = -\frac{1}{2}$), and Weyl [30] ($a = 1, \alpha = 0 = \gamma$), the ambiguous term ν is zero.

The next example is that of a quadratically growing mass in the presence of a singular potential

$$m(x) = cx^2, V(x) = \frac{A}{cx^4} + \frac{B}{cx^2}. \quad (17)$$

In this case the corresponding effective equation, analogously to the equation (10) is given by

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2} \frac{d^2\varphi}{dx^2} + \left(- (cE) x^2 + \frac{(A+g)}{x^2} \right) \varphi = -B\varphi, \quad (18)$$

where g comes from the ambiguity correction and is given by

$$g = \frac{\hbar^2}{2(a+1)} [4\alpha\gamma + 3(\alpha + \gamma) - a + 2].$$

Here, using once again the solution for the harmonic oscillator with centripetal barrier, the energy spectrum is written as

$$E_n = -\frac{2B^2}{c(2n + \nu + 1)^2 \hbar^2}, \nu(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, a, A) = \left[\frac{1}{4} - \frac{2(A+g)}{\hbar^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (19)$$

Now it is very clear that the ambiguity can not be avoided through some redefinition of the zero point energy. Let us now to evaluate the results coming from the cases proposed in the literature, for Gora and Williams case the function $\nu = \left[\frac{5}{4} - \frac{2A}{\hbar^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$, for that due to BenDaniel and Duke $\nu = \left[-\frac{7}{4} - \frac{2A}{\hbar^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$, Zhu and Kroemer gives $\nu = \left[\frac{1}{4} - \frac{2A}{\hbar^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$, for Li and Kuhn $\nu = \left[-\frac{1}{4} - \frac{2A}{\hbar^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and when using Weyl ordering one gets again the same result of Li and Kuhn. By the way it is interesting to note this feature and in fact we will show that these orderings are equivalent in the next section.

4 Equivalence of Weyl and Li and Kuhn orderings

As can be easily checked from the equation (8), the effective potentials of both these orderings are equal,

$$U_{eff} = V(r) + \frac{\hbar^2}{8m} \left(\left(\frac{dm/dr}{m} \right)^2 - \frac{d^2m/dr^2}{m} \right), \quad (20)$$

but we will demonstrate the equivalence by starting with the Weyl ordered Hamiltonian

$$H_{Weyl} = \frac{1}{8} \left[\frac{1}{m} \hat{p}^2 + \hat{p}^2 \frac{1}{m} + 2 \hat{p} \frac{1}{m} \hat{p} \right], \quad (21)$$

and using that one can rewritten the operators suitably,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{p} \frac{1}{m} \hat{p} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \hat{p} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \hat{p} + \hat{p} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \hat{p} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} + \frac{i\hbar}{2} \left[\left(\frac{dm/dr}{m^2} \right) \hat{p} - \hat{p} \left(\frac{dm/dr}{m^2} \right) \right], \\ \hat{p}^2 \frac{1}{m} &= \hat{p} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \hat{p} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} + \frac{i\hbar}{2} \hat{p} \left(\frac{dm/dr}{m^2} \right), \\ \frac{1}{m} \hat{p}^2 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \hat{p} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \hat{p} - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \left(\frac{dm/dr}{m^2} \right) \hat{p}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

substituting these operators in the Weyl Hamiltonian, it becomes equal to

$$H_{Weyl} = \frac{1}{4} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \hat{p} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \hat{p} + \hat{p} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \hat{p} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \right] = H_{LK}, \quad (23)$$

which is precisely the Hamiltonian proposed by Li and Kuhn [36]. This ends our demonstration of the equivalence of these two orderings. Now it is important to stress that this implies that this ordering has the advantage being that which comes naturally from the corresponding nonambiguous Dirac equation [37].

In the next, we show that when the ambiguous term is linear in the momentum (classically $H_{clas} = f(x) p$), contrary to what is usually believed, there is no ambiguity in fact. For this we observe that

$$f(x)^\alpha p f(x)^\beta = f(x) p - i\hbar \beta \frac{df}{dx}, \quad \alpha + \beta = 1, \quad (24)$$

$$\frac{\left(f(x)^\alpha p f(x)^\beta + f(x)^\beta p f(x)^\alpha\right)}{2} = f(x) p - i\hbar \frac{df}{dx}. \quad (25)$$

So, any Hermitian construction of the quantum Hamiltonian will be necessarily equivalent to that due to any other, and consequently nonambiguous. At this point it is important to remark that the common notion that, the so called minimum coupling principle for the introduction of the electromagnetic interaction implies into the Weyl ordering as the privileged one, is really misleading once the above demonstration lead us to conclude that any ordering will conduce essentially to the same Schroedinger equation in this case.

5 Conclusions

In this work we have discussed the problem of solvability and ordering ambiguity in quantum mechanics. It was shown through particular examples that the exact solvability depends not only on the form of the potential, but also on the spatial dependence on the mass. In the first example we have considered an exponentially decaying or increasing mass and potential, which was mapped into a harmonic oscillator with centripetal barrier. In this case the energy levels could be redefined in such a way that the ordering ambiguity disappears. In the second case however, a quadratically growing mass and a singular potential, this can not be done. Furthermore we did observe that some orderings proposed in the literature lead us to non physically acceptable energies, and could possibly be discarded. In both cases we did note that the orderings due Weyl and Li and Kuhn lead us to the same results. This stimulated us to demonstrate that, in fact, they are equivalent. In the second example we did perceive that some kind of extremum principle could possibly be used to render the problem less ambiguous.

Finally we demonstrate that operators with linear dependence on the momentum are totally nonambiguous, leading to the conclusion that there is no reason, from this point of view, to choose the mean point expansion in the path integral formalism, as is usually accepted [25][26]. As far as we know, this feature was not perceived until now.

Acknowledgments: The authors are grateful to CNPq and FAPESP for partial financial support. The authors also acknowledge M. Hott for a careful reading of the manuscript.

References

- [1] F. Cooper, J. N. Ginocchio and A. Khare, Phys. Rev. D **36** (1987) 2458.
- [2] H. Boschi-Filho and A. N. Vaydia, Ann. Phys. (N. Y.), **212** (1991) 1,
- [3] A. de Souza Dutra and H. Boschi-Filho, Phys. Rev. A **44** (1991) 4721, and references therein.
- [4] A. de Souza Dutra, Phys. Rev. A **47** (1993) R2435.
- [5] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Phys. A **31** (1998) 6495; Phys. Rev. A **55** (1997) 4084.
- [6] L. Ferrari, Phys. Rev. A **57** (1998) 2347.
- [7] I. A. Pedrosa, G. P. Serra and I. Guedes, Phys. Rev. A **56** (1997) 4300.
- [8] R. S. Kaushal, Phys. Rev. A **55** (1997) 2610.
- [9] O. V. Manko, Nuovo Cim. **111** (1996) 1111.
- [10] J. Y. Ji, J. K. Kim and S. P. Kim, Phys. Rev. A **51** (1995) 4268.
- [11] L. S. Brown, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 527.
- [12] G. S. Agarwal and A. S. Kumar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 3665.
- [13] A. de Souza Dutra, L. C. Farina and L. C. Albuquerque, Phys. Lett. A **156** (1991) 371.
- [14] M. Razavy, Phys. Rev. A **44** (1991) 2384.
- [15] R. K. Colegrave and M. S. Abdalla, Opt. Acta **28** (1981) 495; J. Phys. A **14** (1981) 2269; J. Phys. A **15** (1982) 1549.
- [16] J. R. Shewell, Am. J. Phys. **27** (1959) 16.
- [17] J. M. Luttinger and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. **97** (1955) 869.
- [18] G. H. Wannier, Phys. Rev. **52** (1957) 191.
- [19] J. C. Slater, Phys. Rev. **76** (1949) 1592.

- [20] O. Rojo and J. S. Levinger, Phys. Rev. **123** (1961) 2177.
- [21] M. Razavy, G. Field and J. S. Levinger, Phys. Rev. **125** (1962) 269.
- [22] G. Bastard, “Wave Mechanics Applied to Semiconductor Heterostructures ” (Les Éditions de Physique, Les Ulis, 1992).
- [23] C. Weisbuch and B. Vinter, “Quantum Semiconductor Heterostructures” (Academic Press, New York, 1993).
- [24] L. V. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, “Quantum Mechanics, Nonrelativistic Theory ”, (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1965).
- [25] R. P. Feynmann and A. R. Hibbs, “Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals” (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1985).
- [26] L. S. Schulmann, “Techniques and Applications of Path Integration” (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1981).
- [27] J. Sá Borges, L. N. Epele, H. Fanchiotti, C. A. Garcia Canal and F. R. A. Simão, Phys. Rev. A **38** (1988)3101.
- [28] E. H. Kerner and W. G. Sutcliffe, J. Math. Phys. **11** (1970) 391.
- [29] L. Cohen, J. Math. Phys. **11** (1970) 3296.
- [30] T. D. Lee, “Particle Physics and Introduction to Field Theory” (Harwood, Chur, 1981).
- [31] S. Gasiorowicz, “Quantum Physics”, (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1974)
- [32] D. J. BenDaniel and C. B. Duke, Phys. Rev. B **152** (1966) 683.
- [33] Q. G. Zhu and H. Kroemer, Phys. Rev. B **27** (1983) 3519.
- [34] T. Gora and F. Williams, Phys. Rev. **177** (1969) 1179.
- [35] G. Bastard, Phys. Rev. B **24** (1981) 5693.
- [36] T. Li and K. J. Kuhn, Phys. Rev. B **47** (1993) 12760.

- [37] F. S. A. Cavalcante, R. N. Costa Filho, J. Ribeiro Filho, C. A. S. de Almeida and V. N. Freire, Phys. Rev. B **55** (1997) 1326.
- [38] O. von Roos, Phys. Rev. B **27** (1981) 7547.
- [39] P. M. Morse, Phys. Rev. **34** (1929) 57.