

Mod. Phys. Lett. A 14 (35) (1999) 2463-2469 [quant-ph/9911010 v3]

To understand hydrogen is to understand all of physics

in “The Yin and Yang of Hydrogen”, D. Kleppner, Phys. Today, April 1999, pp. 11-12

HYDROGEN ATOM AS AN EIGENVALUE PROBLEM IN 3D SPACES OF CONSTANT CURVATURE AND MINIMAL LENGTH

L.M. NIETO¹, H.C. ROSU², M. SANTANDER¹

1. *Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidad de Valladolid, 47011 Valladolid, Spain*

2. *Instituto de Física, Universidad de Guanajuato, Apdo Postal E-143, 37150 León, Gto, Mexico*

Received (August 18, 1999)

Revised (November 3, 1999)

An old result of A.F. Stevenson [*Phys. Rev.* **59**, 842 (1941)] concerning the Kepler-Coulomb quantum problem on the three-dimensional (3D) hypersphere is considered from the perspective of the radial Schrödinger equations on 3D spaces of any (either positive, zero or negative) constant curvature. Further to Stevenson, we show in detail how to get the hypergeometric wavefunction for the hydrogen atom case. Finally, we make a comparison between the “space curvature” effects and minimal length effects for the hydrogen spectrum.

1. Ever since Schrödinger first considered the hydrogen atom in the 3D hypersphere, the 3D space of constant positive curvature,¹ quantum mechanics in curved spaces has been of strong interest due to possible astrophysical and cosmological applications.²

The aim of this work is to present a discussion of the radial Schrödinger problem in 3D spaces of constant curvature (either positive, zero or negative) including explicitly the curvature parameter in the formalism, thus being more general from the mathematical standpoint than any study previously done and entailing early works as particular cases. In the final part of the work we discuss possible fundamental length effects and provide a comparison with the constant curvature one.

2. We start by recalling the famous result of Schrödinger,¹ who showed by his factorization method that in a 3D hypersphere (the 3D space of constant positive curvature $\kappa = 1/R^2$), the eigenspectra of the Kepler-Coulomb potential described by the radial potential $V(r) = -e^2/(R \tan(r/R))$ was given by:

$$E_n = B \left(-\frac{1}{n^2} + (n-1)(n+1) \frac{a_1^2}{R^2} \right), \quad (1)$$

where B is Rydberg's constant, a_1 is Bohr's radius, and R denotes the radius of curvature of the Universe. This is a result of amazing simplicity, where the spectra of the H-atom in flat space and the spectra of the hypersphere itself combine *additively* to give the spectrum of the H-atom in the hypersphere. As commented by Schrödinger, this formula allows for a smooth transition from 'bound' to 'free' motion for $n \approx \sqrt{R/a_1}$ a value for which Schrödinger's estimate is 10^{18} , the crowding of the Bohr (Rydberg) states gradually going into the crowding that represents the continuum. After the first impetus given by Schrödinger, several other authors, among whom we mention Infeld, Stevenson, Hull, Higgs, Leemon, Barut and Wilson,³ contributed to further mathematical clarifications of the problem. Recently, Debergh studied the isotropic oscillators of various dimensionalities in curved space by means of Witten's supersymmetric quantum mechanics,⁴ whereas Bonnor investigated the effects of cosmic expansion on the hydrogen atom.⁵

In a three dimensional space of constant curvature κ the equivalent of the time-independent Schrödinger equation is $(-\Delta_{LB}^\kappa + U_\kappa(\vec{x}))\Psi_\kappa(\vec{x}) = \lambda\Psi_\kappa(\vec{x})$, where $\Delta_{LB}^\kappa = |g_\kappa|^{-1/2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (|g_\kappa|^{1/2} g_\kappa^{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j})$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator for the metric $(g_\kappa)_{ij}$, $U_\kappa = \frac{2m}{\hbar^2} V_\kappa$ is the potential function, and $\lambda = \frac{2m}{\hbar^2} E$ is the eigenvalue parameter; the label κ will remind we are working on the 3D space of nonzero constant curvature κ . For "polar" coordinates (r, θ, ϕ) , the metric tensor of a space with constant curvature κ is $g_\kappa = \text{diag}(1, S_\kappa^2(r), S_\kappa^2(r) \sin^2 \theta)$, where the "curved" sinus $S_\kappa(r)$ is defined to be $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \sin(\sqrt{\kappa}r)$, r , or $\frac{1}{\sqrt{-\kappa}} \sinh(\sqrt{-\kappa}r)$, for positive ($\kappa > 0$), zero ($\kappa = 0$), or negative curvature ($\kappa < 0$) respectively.⁶ After separating the standard spherical harmonics (there is still ordinary $SO(3)$ rotational invariance for any value of κ) $\Psi_\kappa(\vec{x}) = Y_l^m(\theta, \phi)G_\kappa(r)$, the following radial equation can be obtained:

$$\left[-\frac{1}{S_\kappa^2(r)} \frac{d}{dr} \left(S_\kappa^2(r) \frac{d}{dr} \right) + \frac{l(l+1)}{S_\kappa^2(r)} + U_\kappa(r) - \lambda \right] G_\kappa(r) = 0. \quad (2)$$

This radial equation does not reduce to the standard 1D Schrödinger form with an effective potential but instead still contains a first derivative term of the type $-\frac{2}{T_\kappa(r)} G'_\kappa(r)$, where $T_\kappa(r)$ is a similar notation for the curved tangent function as that for the curved sinus, so that $T_\kappa(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \tan(\sqrt{\kappa}r)$ for $\kappa > 0$, $T_\kappa(r) = r$ for $\kappa = 0$, and $T_\kappa(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\kappa}} \tanh(\sqrt{-\kappa}r)$ for $\kappa < 0$. Elimination of this first derivative term, leading to various so-called *normal* forms of Eq (2), can be done in many ways as exemplified by the works on the hydrogen atom in curved space of positive curvature. Of course, the spectrum does not depend on the method employed.

In this approach the radial coordinate r has dimensions of length. There are two length scales at hand. One is introduced through the coupling constant of the potential, and in the case of the hydrogen atom is the Bohr radius $a_1 = \hbar^2/me^2$. The other, which does not appear in flat space, is set by the space "curvature radius", $R = 1/\sqrt{\kappa}$ or $R = 1/\sqrt{-\kappa}$ according as $\kappa > 0$ or $\kappa < 0$.

3. We present now details on the (Kepler-Coulomb) hydrogen atom problem in spaces of constant curvature. The potential is $V(r) = -e^2/(R \tan(r/R))$ for positive and $V(r) = -e^2/(R \tanh(r/R))$ for negative curvature, respectively; these poten-

tials as well as the euclidean one can be described together as $V_\kappa(r) = -e^2/T_\kappa(r)$. Using the change of the independent variable $y = 1/T_\kappa(r)$, the term with the first derivative disappears and the radial equation is written in the form

$$G_\kappa'' + \left[\frac{\lambda + \beta y}{(\kappa + y^2)^2} - \frac{l(l+1)}{\kappa + y^2} \right] G_\kappa = 0, \quad (3)$$

where $\beta = \frac{2me^2}{\hbar^2} = \frac{2}{a_1}$. For *positive* curvature and using “natural” units where $\kappa = 1$ and r appear as the dimensionless angle $\chi = r/R$, measured in radians, Eq (3) is precisely Stevenson’s equation 2.

If $\kappa \neq 0$, Eq (3) has three singular regular points at $y = \{\pm\sqrt{-\kappa}, \infty\}$; when $\kappa = 0$ there is an irregular singularity at $y = 0$. We are going to solve first the $\kappa \neq 0$ case and $\kappa = 0$ will follow as a limiting case. The existence of three singularities suggests us to introduce a new change of variable in order to place the singularities at the standard positions $\{0, 1, \infty\}$; this is accomplished by means of a Möbius transformation, indeed $y = \sqrt{-\kappa}(z - 2)/z$, leading to an equation for a function, say $f(z)$, for which a standard decomposition of the type $f(z) = z^p(1 - z)^q g(z)$ is applied. This leads to the equation for the function $g(z)$

$$z(1 - z)g''(z) + [2 + 2p - 2(p + q + 1)z]g'(z) + C(z)g(z) = 0, \quad (4)$$

where the coefficient $C(z)$ depends on $\{p, q, l, \beta, \kappa, \lambda\}$ and reduces to the constant $-ab$ of hypergeometric type if the following two conditions are satisfied

$$p(p + 1) = l(l + 1), \quad q^2 - q = \frac{\lambda - \beta\sqrt{-\kappa}}{4\kappa}. \quad (5)$$

From Eqs (4, 5), the following identification of the hypergeometric parameters a , b and c in terms of l and p, q can be obtained

$$a + b + 1 = 2(p + q + 1), \quad ab = (p + 1)(p + 2q) - \frac{\beta\sqrt{-\kappa}}{4\kappa}, \quad c = 2p + 2. \quad (6)$$

The first Eq in (5) has two solutions $p = l$ and $p = -(l + 1)$; our choice will be the first one to avoid singularities at $r = z = 0$. For simplicity, let us introduce two new parameters

$$\omega_+ = \sqrt{\frac{\kappa + \lambda + \beta\sqrt{-\kappa}}{\kappa}}, \quad \omega_- = \sqrt{\frac{\kappa + \lambda - \beta\sqrt{-\kappa}}{\kappa}}. \quad (7)$$

From the two possible solutions of the second Eq in (5)

$$q_\pm = \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \omega_-), \quad (8)$$

we choose q_+ , and therefore the solutions of (6) are

$$a_+ = l + 1 + \frac{1}{2}(\omega_- - \omega_+), \quad b_+ = l + 1 + \frac{1}{2}(\omega_- + \omega_+) \quad c = 2l + 2 \quad (9)$$

We have now all the ingredients to write down the solution of (4), but first remark that in order to have a well behaved *physical* solution, the function ${}_2F_1(a_+, b_+; c; z)$ has to be a polynomial, which implies $a_+ = -m \in \{0, -1, -2, \dots\}$. Using (7) and (9), this condition leads us to the following energy quantization

$$\lambda = -\frac{\beta^2}{4n^2} + (n^2 - 1)\kappa \quad \text{or} \quad E_n = B \left(-\frac{1}{n^2} + (n^2 - 1)\kappa a_1^2 \right), \quad n = l + m + 1, \quad (10)$$

where $B = me^4/(2\hbar^2)$ is Rydberg's constant. The physical solution for $g(z)$ is

$$g(z) = {}_2F_1(l + 1 + (\omega_- - \omega_+)/2, l + 1 + (\omega_- + \omega_+)/2; 2l + 2; z), \quad (11)$$

where the first argument is a negative integer $-m$ and the hypergeometric function reduces to a Jacobi polynomial $P_m^{(2l+1, -n+(\omega_-+\omega_+)/2)}(1-2z)$. From here the solution $G_\kappa(r)$ can be found to be

$$\begin{aligned} G_\kappa(r) &\propto (S_\kappa(r))^l e^{-\sqrt{-\kappa}r(l+2q_+)} \times \\ &\quad {}_2F_1\left(l + 1 + \frac{\omega_- - \omega_+}{2}, l + 1 + \frac{\omega_- + \omega_+}{2}; 2l + 2; 2\sqrt{-\kappa}S_\kappa(r) e^{-\sqrt{-\kappa}r}\right) \\ &\propto (S_\kappa(r))^l e^{-\sqrt{-\kappa}r(l+2q_+)} P_m^{(2l+1, -n+(\omega_-+\omega_+)/2)}(1 - 4\sqrt{-\kappa}S_\kappa(r) e^{-\sqrt{-\kappa}r}). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

4. We will show now that the flat space limit of Eq (12) leads to the well known result in terms of associated Laguerre polynomials. Taking into account the following approximations for small values of κ , and the standard limiting relation from the Jacobi to Laguerre polynomials:

$$S_\kappa(r) = r + O(\kappa), \quad (13)$$

$$\sqrt{-\kappa}(l + 2q_+) = \sqrt{-\lambda_0}r + O(\sqrt{\kappa}), \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{\omega_- - \omega_+}{2} = \frac{\beta}{2\sqrt{-\lambda_0}} + O(\kappa), \quad (15)$$

$$l + 1 + \frac{\omega_- + \omega_+}{2} = \sqrt{\frac{-\lambda_0}{-\kappa}} + O(\sqrt{\kappa}), \quad (16)$$

$$\sqrt{-\kappa}S_\kappa(r) e^{\sqrt{-\kappa}r} = \sqrt{-\kappa}r + O(\kappa), \quad (17)$$

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow 0} P_m^{(\mu, \nu)}(1 - 2x/\nu) = L_m^\mu(x), \quad (18)$$

where $\lambda_0 = -\beta^2/(4n^2)$ is the value of the eigenvalue parameter for $\kappa = 0$. From the second form in Eq (12) we get

$$\begin{aligned} G_0(r) &\propto r^l e^{-\sqrt{-\lambda_0}r} \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} P_m^{(2l+1, -n+(\omega_-+\omega_+)/2)}(1 - 4\sqrt{-\kappa}S_\kappa(r) e^{-\sqrt{-\kappa}r}) \\ &\propto r^l e^{-\sqrt{-\lambda_0}r} L_m^{2l+1}(2\sqrt{-\lambda_0}r). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The same result can be of course obtained directly from the first form in Eq (12) by using the definition of the confluent hypergeometric function ${}_1F_1(a, c; z) = \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} {}_2F_1(a, b, c; \frac{z}{b})$, and the fact that when the first argument is a negative integer $-m$ this reduces to a Laguerre polynomial, ${}_1F_1(-m, 2l + 2; z) \propto L_m^{2l+1}(z)$.

Therefore we reach the right flat space result, starting from either the 3D spherical or 3D hyperbolic spaces.

5. At the request of the Editor we briefly discuss whether or not recently proposed “minimal length” effects may carry significance for the H-atom.⁷ These effects lead to modifications of the uncertainty relations and are related to either vogue ideas implied by string theories and non-commutative geometry, or by any type of possible non-pointlike structures within any quantum particle,⁸ in our case the electron. At the formal level, a rather general procedure of modifying the uncertainty principles is provided by the Kempf-Mangano-Mann⁹ change of the mixed commutator in the Heisenberg algebra

$$[\hat{x}_i, \hat{p}_j] = i\hbar(\delta_{ij} + \gamma\hat{p}_i\hat{p}_j + \gamma\delta_{ij}\hat{p}^2) \quad (20)$$

where $\sqrt{\gamma} = \mathcal{L}/\hbar$ is a deformation parameter introducing the new length scale \mathcal{L} in the problem at hand. If gravitational effects are taken into account there are minute modifications in other commutators as well.¹⁰

In the first perturbative order in γ the consequences of this ‘minimally’ modified Heisenberg algebra on the H-spectrum have been recently studied by Brau.¹¹ We write Brau’s result for the corrected energy eigenvalues in the slightly changed form

$$E_{n,l} = B \left(-\frac{1}{n^2} + 4 \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}}{a_1} \right)^2 \frac{4n - 3(l + 1/2)}{n^4(l + 1/2)} \right). \quad (21)$$

As one can see, the correction is always positive and is maximal for the ground state, leading to a relative decrease $Q_{\mathcal{L}} = \Delta E_1/E_1 = -20(\mathcal{L}/a_1)^2$ of the hydrogen ionization energy, which would mean a very tiny calibration effect in the Rydberg constant. Within each n multiplet the effect is maximal for the $l = 0$ levels: $\Delta E_{n,0}/E_{n,0} = -4(\mathcal{L}/a_1)^2(8n - 3)/n^2$. This suggests looking to the accuracy in the frequency data for the $1S - 2S$ transition, which at the present time is 1KHz.¹² The precision in the energy difference between the two levels is about 10^{-12} eV, implying $\mathcal{L} \leq 0.01$ fm. If we discard any non-pointlike structure within the electron and claim that a fundamental length scale parameter may be only the Planck length, $\mathcal{L} = L_P$, then the relative effect in the Rydberg calibration constant is $Q_P = -20(L_P/a_1)^2 \approx -2 \cdot 10^{-48}$.

Putting together in the H-spectrum the extremely small fundamental effects discussed here we get the following formula

$$E_{n,l} = B \left(-\frac{1}{n^2} + 4 \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}}{a_1} \right)^2 \frac{4n - 3(l + 1/2)}{n^4(l + 1/2)} + \kappa(a_1)^2(n^2 - 1) \right). \quad (22)$$

For the ground state, $n = 1$, the constant curvature (or “Schrödinger”) effect does not contribute and one is left with the minimal length effect (for the Planck case of relative order 10^{-48} as aforementioned). For $n = 2$, and for the estimate $R/a_1 \approx 10^{36}$, the cosmological effect which may be either positive or negative, according to the sign of the space curvature, is of the order $|\Delta E_2/E_2| \approx 10^{-71}$, whereas the

order of a Planckian effect is $\Delta E_2/E_2 \approx 10^{-48}$. The two effects become comparable (of relative order $10^{-52} - 10^{-53}$) around $n = 10^5$, but this is a Rydberg region as yet unavailable, not to mention the ‘‘Schrödinger’’ range $n = 10^{18}$ where the ‘‘cosmological’’ effect is of relative order one. The present day detected Rydberg atoms are at $n \leq 10^3$. However, all these hopeless estimates change drastically for $\mathcal{L} \gg L_P$ and/or in strong local curvature fields.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Projects from CONACyT (No. 458100-5-25844E), DGES from the Spanish Ministerio de Educación (PB98-0370), and Junta de Castilla y León (CO2/97). H.C.R. wishes to acknowledge the kind hospitality at the Departamento de Física Teórica, U. de Valladolid, and F. Brau for correspondence. We acknowledge D.V. Ahluwalia for suggesting to comment on the minimal length effect as related to the context of this work, and for other useful remarks.

References

1. E. Schrödinger, *Proc. R. Irish Acad.* **A46**, 9 (1940).
2. See for example, J. Audretsch and G. Schäfer, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **9**, 243, 489 (1978); L. Parker, *Phys. Rev.* **D22**, 1922 (1980); F. Pinto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 3839 (1993); A. Zecca, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **38**, 945 (1999).
3. L. Infeld, *Phys. Rev.* **59**, 737 (1941); A.F. Stevenson, *Phys. Rev.* **59**, 842 (1941); L. Infeld and T.E. Hull, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **23**, 21 (1951); P.W. Higgs, *J. Phys.* **A12**, 309 (1979); H.I. Leemon, *J. Phys.* **A12**, 489 (1979); A.O. Barut and R. Wilson, *Phys. Lett.* **A110**, 351 (1985).
4. N. Debergh, *J. Phys.* **A30**, 7427 (1997).
5. W. Bonnor, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **16**, 1313 (1999).
6. A. Ballesteros, F.J. Herranz, M.A. del Olmo and M. Santander, *J. Phys.* **A26**, 5801 (1993); M. F. Rañada and M. Santander, *J. Math. Phys.* **40**, 5026 (1999). A complete exposition of this formalism can be found in J. F. Herranz, R. Ortega and M. Santander, math-ph 9910041.
7. For a recent review, see R.J. Adler and D.I. Santiago, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A14**, 1371 (1999).
8. A. Kempf, *J. Phys.* **A30**, 2093 (1997).
9. A. Kempf, G. Mangano, and R.B. Mann, *Phys. Rev.* **D52**, 1108 (1995).
10. D.V. Ahluwalia, *Phys. Lett.* **B339**, 301 (1994).
11. F. Brau, *J. Phys.* **A32**, 7691 (1999) (quant-ph/9905033).
12. T. Udem et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2646 (1997); B. de Beauvoir et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 440 (1997)