

# Comment on “Critical assessment of the Schrödinger picture of quantum mechanics”

Hrvoje Nikolić

Theoretical Physics Division, Rudjer Bošković Institute,

P.O.B. 180, HR-10002 Zagreb, Croatia

hrvoje@thphys.irb.hr

October 30, 2018

## Abstract

Recently, Faria *et al* [Phys. Lett. A 305 (2002) 322] discussed an example in which the Heisenberg and the Schrödinger pictures of quantum mechanics gave different results. We identify the mistake in their reasoning and conclude that the example they discussed does not support the inequivalence of these two pictures.

PACS: 03.65.Ta

Keywords: Foundations of quantum mechanics

A long time ago, Dirac argued [1] that, in systems with an *infinite* number of the degrees of freedom, the Schrödinger picture of quantum mechanics may not be equivalent to the Heisenberg picture. The standard general proof of the equivalence of these two pictures may fail to be valid because, when an infinite number of the degrees of freedom is present, the formal unitary transformation between these two pictures may not exist in a rigorous sense. In [1], Dirac argued that it was the Heisenberg picture that was correct in the case of an infinite number of the degrees of freedom, while the Schrödinger picture was wrong. The two pictures are really equivalent only when the number of the degrees of freedom is finite.

Recently, Faria *et al* [2] considered an example in which they explicitly obtained a discrepancy between the results obtained in the two pictures. Specifically, they considered a charged harmonic oscillator in 3 dimensions (having 3, i.e. a *finite* number of the degrees of freedom!) interacting with the electromagnetic field (having an infinite number of the degrees of freedom). For simplicity, they studied only the  $x$ -direction of the harmonic oscillator. In the Heisenberg picture, they quantized both the harmonic oscillator and the electromagnetic field and obtained that the average square of the position operator of the harmonic oscillator in the ground state is equal to  $\langle x^2 \rangle = \hbar/2m\omega_0$  (where  $m$  is the mass of the harmonic oscillator and  $\omega_0$  is its frequency), the same result as if the interaction with the electromagnetic field was absent. In the Schrödinger picture, they used a semiclassical

approximation, i.e. they quantized only the harmonic oscillator, while they treated the electromagnetic field as a classical field. Using such a Schrödinger picture, they obtained  $\langle x^2 \rangle = \hbar/m\omega_0$ , i.e. twice the value of that in the Heisenberg picture. From this result they concluded that the result obtained in the Heisenberg picture was correct, while that obtained in the Schrödinger picture was wrong. Consequently, they concluded that the two pictures were not equivalent.

However, two objections to their conclusions seem natural. First, they used the semi-classical approximation only in one of the pictures, so in general one does not expect the results obtained in the two pictures to be identical. Therefore, the discrepancy they obtained may have nothing to do with a possible inequivalence of the two pictures. Second, in the Schrödinger picture they quantized only a finite number of the degrees of freedom, in which case the Schrödinger picture should be correct. Therefore, their results cannot be taken as an indication that the two pictures are inequivalent. In order to see more closely where they made a mistake in their reasoning, we make their reasoning more transparent by reviewing the main steps in their analysis and using a slightly different notation.

In the Heisenberg picture, the ground-state expected value of square of the position operator is

$$\langle x^2 \rangle_H(t) = \langle \phi_0 | \hat{x}_H^2(t) | \phi_0 \rangle, \quad (1)$$

where  $|\phi_0\rangle$  represents the ground state. The explicit value of the right-hand side of (1) is given by (14') (where the prime denotes equations in [2]).

In the Schrödinger picture, they show that the ground-state wave function takes the form

$$\psi(x, t) = \phi_0(x - q_c(t))e^{i\varphi(t)}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\phi_0(x)$  is the normalized ground-state wave function of a “free” (i.e. without the electromagnetic interaction) harmonic oscillator and  $q_c(t)$  is a c-number function that satisfies the classical equation of motion

$$m\ddot{q}_c(t) = -m\omega_0^2 q_c(t) + eE(t). \quad (3)$$

Here  $E(t)$  is the classical electric field in the  $x$ -direction. It is the sum of the classical vacuum field and the classical radiation reaction field. The expected value of square of the position operator is

$$\langle x^2 \rangle_S(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \psi^*(x, t)x^2\psi(x, t). \quad (4)$$

After making a shift of the integration variable  $x \rightarrow x - q_c(t)$  and using (2), one finds

$$\langle x^2 \rangle_S(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \phi_0^*(x)x^2\phi_0(x) + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \phi_0^*(x)q_c^2(t)\phi_0(x). \quad (5)$$

This result corresponds to (30').

So far so good. However, now comes their step that turns out to be wrong. *From the fact that  $q_c(t)$  and  $\langle \phi_0 | \hat{x}_H(t) | \phi_0 \rangle$  obey the same equation of motion (3), they conclude that the second term in (5) is equal to the right-hand side of (1), i.e. that*

$$\langle \phi_0 | \hat{x}_H^2(t) | \phi_0 \rangle = q_c^2(t). \quad (6)$$

It is clear that such a reasoning is not correct, i.e. that, in general, (6) does not have to be valid. Nevertheless, with such a reasoning, (5) becomes

$$\langle x^2 \rangle_S(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \phi_0^*(x) x^2 \phi_0(x) + \langle x^2 \rangle_H(t), \quad (7)$$

which corresponds to (31'). From this, they concluded that the Schrödinger picture was not equivalent to the Heisenberg picture, i.e. that the Schrödinger picture led to the wrong result (7).

We agree that (7) is wrong, because if the two pictures are equivalent, then  $\langle x^2 \rangle_S(t) = \langle x^2 \rangle_H(t)$ . However, we do not agree that the wrong result (7) implies that the Schrödinger picture is wrong. Instead, it is their reasoning designated by italics above that is wrong.

Note that if the reasoning designated by italics was correct, then one would obtain (7) for any value of  $e$  in (3), including the case  $e \rightarrow 0$ . This would imply that the two pictures are not equivalent even without the electromagnetic interaction. On the other hand, it is well known that the two pictures are equivalent for such a simple harmonic oscillator. Indeed, when  $e \rightarrow 0$ , one of the solutions of (3) is  $q_c(t) = 0$  for all  $t$ . This solution does *not* satisfy (6). With this solution, the second term in (5) vanishes, leading to

$$\langle x^2 \rangle_S(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \phi_0^*(x) x^2 \phi_0(x). \quad (8)$$

Contrary to (7), this is a consistent result. It is shown in [2] that the right-hand sides of (8) and (1) are *both* equal to  $\hbar/2m\omega_0$ .

When  $e \neq 0$ , then the solution  $q_c(t)$  of (3) does not vanish, provided that  $E(t)$  does not vanish. Consequently, the second term in (5) does not vanish, which contradicts the result obtained in the Heisenberg picture in [2]. However, in [2], the function  $E(t)$  has not been calculated explicitly. A correct treatment of the case  $e \neq 0$  is given in [3, 4]. Since  $E(t)$  in [2] does not contain an external field, (3) describes a damped harmonic oscillator [4], so that  $q_c(t)$  eventually vanishes. This is also in agreement with the results of [3]. The result  $q_c(t) = 0$  can also be understood from an approach in which the electric field is quantized, because it appears that the two contributions to the electric field (the vacuum field and the radiation reaction field) cancel in the ground state [5].

By reconsidering the example considered in [2], we have found that this example does not support the inequivalence of the Schrödinger picture with the Heisenberg picture. In this way, we have shown that the main conclusion of [2] is incorrect. Of course, the general arguments against the Schrödinger picture [1] mentioned in the introductory paragraph are not discredited by our result. However, we note that today the formal problem with the Schrödinger picture of quantum field theory is usually not considered as a serious problem because today theorists are used to use various methods of regularization that cure the pathologies emerging from theories with an infinite number of the degrees of freedom. For example, the regularization on a lattice transforms the theory with an infinite number of the degrees of freedom into a theory with a finite number of them, in which case the two pictures are equivalent.

The author is grateful to an anonymous referee for the valuable remarks. This work was supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology of the Republic of Croatia under Contract No. 0098002.

## References

- [1] P.A.M. Dirac, Phys. Rev. 139 (1965) B684.
- [2] A.J. Faria, H.M. Franca, C.P. Malta, R.C. Sponchiado, Phys. Lett. A 305 (2002) 322.
- [3] T.H. Boyer, Phys. Rev. D 11 (1975) 790.
- [4] H.M. Franca, M.T. Thomaz, Phys. Rev. D 31 (1985) 1337; Erratum 38 (1988) 2651.
- [5] P.W. Milonni, Am. J. Phys. 52 (1984) 340.