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Abstract

The regular solutions to the Schrödinger equation in the case of an electron experiencing a Coulomb force are well known. Being that the radial part of the differential equation to be solved is second order in derivatives, it will have two independent solutions, with the second irregular solutions being ill-behaved at the origin and unbound at infinity. For this reason, second solutions are dropped for bound electrons. However, these second solutions are still of academic interest for several reasons. One reason is to help devise schemes to control numerical contamination by second solutions to more general second-order differential equations when attempting to calculate the first solutions through recursion relations. Another is to study the analytic behavior of the electron Coulomb wave functions as the electron energy and angular momentum are each extended into the complex plane, important in investigations of bound-state poles and of Regge trajectories. In addition, toy problems having a finite radial region with a Coulombic interaction, with interior and exterior regions non Coulombic, require both regular and irregular solutions to match solutions across the boundaries. In this presentation, exact and closed form second irregular solutions are derived for the Coulomb bound states, using a hitherto unnoticed trick in the Nikiforov-Uvorov method.
1 Introduction

In the following, we will focus on the second (irregular) solutions to the Schrödinger equation for hydrogen-like atoms when the electron is in a steady state. As a second-order differential equation, the general solution before imposing boundary conditions is a linear combination of two independent solutions. However, in this case, the second solution produces electron probabilities that diverge at the origin when the orbital angular momentum quantum number $\ell$ is not zero, is not a solution near the origin when $\ell = 0$. The irregular solution also diverges with distance from the origin, and so the electron would be unbound. Therefore, the second solution is usually dropped from the general solution. (See Messiah [2, p 350-352], for more details of this argument.)

Even so, a second solution has utility. It may be employed when the electron potential energy is Coulombic only within a shell region around the nucleus. In that case, the shell-region solution in general has both first and second solutions added in order to match the wave function and its derivative on the boundaries of the shell. Also, knowing the second solution behavior is useful in formulating how to cure the second solution contamination of numerical calculations of first solutions of more general second-order differential equations. Thirdly, having the closed-form second solutions at hand helps in the study of the analytic behavior of Coulomb scattered-wave amplitudes as the energy $E$ of the scattered electron is extended into the complex plane, and as the electron angular momentum quantum $\ell$ takes on complex values, such as in Regge pole analysis. (See [1] and [5].)

2 Review of the first solution

The steady-state radial part $R(r)$ of the Schrödinger equation (SE) wave function $\psi(r, \theta, \phi) = R(r)Y_{l}^{m_{l}}(\theta, \phi)$ for a lone electron interacting with a nucleus carrying a charge $Z|e|$ satisfies

$$\frac{\hbar^{2}}{2\mu} \left( -\frac{1}{r^{2}} \frac{d}{dr} \left( r^{2} \frac{d}{dr} R(r) \right) + \ell(\ell + 1) \frac{1}{r^{2}} \right) - \left( E + \frac{Ze^{2}}{4\pi\varepsilon_{0}r} \right) R(r) = 0 . \tag{1}$$

Here, $\mu$ is the reduced nucleus-electron mass, $E$ the total energy of the system, $Y_{l}^{m_{l}}$ is a spherical harmonic, an eigenstate of $\vec{L}^{2}$ and $L_{z}$, with eigenvalues $\ell(\ell+1)\hbar^{2}$ and $m_{l}\hbar$, respectively, where $\vec{L}$ is the angular momentum operator of the nucleus-electron system, assuming its center-of-mass is at rest.
For bound states, $E < 0$. Let

$$\kappa = \frac{\sqrt{-2\mu E}}{\hbar},$$

making

$$r^2 \frac{d^2 R(r)}{dr^2} + 2r \frac{dR(r)}{dr} + \left( -\kappa^2 r^2 + \frac{2\mu e^2 Z}{4\pi\epsilon_0\hbar^2} r - \ell(\ell + 1) \right) R(r) = 0 .$$

(3)

For simplifying appearances and easing manipulations, define

$$\kappa_0 = \frac{\mu e^2 Z}{4\pi\epsilon_0\hbar^2} = \frac{\mu m_e Z}{a},$$

(4)

(a being the Bohr radius) so that the radial SE becomes

$$r^2 \frac{d^2 R(r)}{dr^2} + 2r \frac{dR(r)}{dr} + \left( -\kappa_0^2 r^2 + 2\kappa_o r - \ell(\ell + 1) \right) R(r) = 0 .$$

(5)

For large $r$, $R \to ce^{-\kappa r}$. (For now, we drop the $e^{\kappa r}$ solution as we are considering first solutions for bound states.) Extracting the asymptotic part, we define the function $u(r)$ by

$$R(r) = e^{-\kappa r} u(r)$$

(6)

giving

$$r^2 \frac{d^2 u(r)}{dr^2} + 2r(1 - \kappa r) \frac{du(r)}{dr} + (-\ell(\ell + 1) + 2(\kappa_0 - \kappa) r) u(r) = 0$$

(7)

Now, we will follow Nikiforov and Uvarov [3] to analyze the solutions of the differential equations which take the form

$$\sigma_1 u'' + \tau_1 u' + \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1} u = 0,$$

(8)

where the $\sigma$ are polynomials in $r$ of degree no greater than two, and the $\tau$ are polynomials of degree no greater than one. Here, primes are used to indicate differentiation with respect to the implied independent variable.

They put this differential equation into ‘standard’ hypergeometric form

$$\sigma_1 y'' + \tau_2 y' + \lambda y = 0$$

(9)

by using a special choice of transformation

$$u = \phi y .$$

(10)
For convenience, we will let
\[ \phi(r) = e^{\varphi(r)}. \] (11)

Then
\[ \frac{d^2 y(r)}{dr^2} + \left( 2 \frac{d\varphi(r)}{dr} + \frac{\tau_1}{\sigma_1} \right) \frac{dy(r)}{dr} + \left( \frac{d^2 \varphi(r)}{dr^2} + \left( \frac{d\varphi(r)}{dr} \right)^2 + \frac{\tau_1 \, d\varphi(r)}{\sigma_1} + \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1^2} \right) y(r) = 0. \] (12)

To gain simplicity, they try to select the function \( \phi \) so that the coefficient of the derivative term,
\[ 2 \frac{d\varphi(r)}{dr} + \frac{\tau_1}{\sigma_1}, \]
has the form \( \frac{\tau_2}{\sigma_1} \), where \( \tau_2 \) has degree no greater than one. Assume this can be done.

Let
\[ \tau_2 = 2\sigma_1 \frac{d\varphi(r)}{dr} + \tau_1 \] (13)

which means
\[ \sigma_1 \frac{d\varphi(r)}{dr} = \frac{1}{2} (\tau_2 - \tau_1) \] (14)

is also of degree no more than one.

In terms of \( \tau_2 \), the coefficient of \( y(r) \) is
\[ \frac{d^2 \varphi(r)}{dr^2} + \left( \frac{d\varphi(r)}{dr} \right)^2 + \frac{\tau_1 \, d\varphi(r)}{\sigma_1} + \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1^2}, \] (15)

which becomes
\[ \frac{1}{2\sigma_1} (\tau_2' - \tau_1') - (\tau_2 - \tau_1) \frac{1}{2\sigma_1'} \sigma_1' + \left( \frac{1}{2\sigma_1} (\tau_2 - \tau_1) \right)^2 + \frac{\tau_1}{2\sigma_1'} (\tau_2 - \tau_1) + \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1^2}. \] (16)

Define
\[ \sigma_3 = \frac{\sigma_1}{2} (\tau_2' - \tau_1') - \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1' (\tau_2 - \tau_1) + \frac{1}{4} (\tau_2^2 - \tau_1^2) + \sigma_2. \] (17)

Evidently, \( \sigma_3 \) is of degree no greater than two. The differential equation for \( y \) becomes
\[ \frac{d^2 y(r)}{dr^2} + \frac{\tau_2}{\sigma_1} \frac{dy(r)}{dr} + \frac{\sigma_3}{\sigma_1^2} y(r) = 0. \] (18)

To take the wanted hypergeometric form, the coefficient of \( y \) should be proportional to \( 1/\sigma_1 \), i.e.
\[ \sigma_3 = \lambda \sigma_1 \] (19)

for all \( r \). This is possible because there are three relations and three unknowns: \( (\tau_{20}, \tau_{21}, \lambda) \). Explicitly, we want
\[ \lambda \sigma_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1 (\tau_2' - \tau_1') - \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1' (\tau_2 - \tau_1) + \frac{1}{4} (\tau_2^2 - \tau_1^2) + \sigma_2, \] (20)
a quadratic in the variable \( r \), to hold for all \( r \).

In the Coulomb case, the equation

\[
\sigma_1 u'' + \tau_1 u' + \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1} u = 0
\]

(21)

reads

\[
r \frac{d^2 u(r)}{dr^2} + 2 (1 - \kappa r) \frac{du(r)}{dr} + \frac{-\ell(\ell + 1) + 2 (\kappa_0 - \kappa) r}{r} u(r) = 0 ,
\]

(22)

so

\[
\sigma_1 = r ,
\]

(23)

\[
\tau_1 = 2 (1 - \kappa r) ,
\]

(24)

\[
\sigma_2 = -\ell(\ell + 1) + 2 (\kappa_0 - \kappa) r .
\]

(25)

Transforming the differential equation to standard hypergeometric form will make

\[
\lambda \sigma_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1 (\tau_2' - \tau_1') - \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1' (\tau_2 - \tau_1) + \frac{1}{4} (\tau_2^2 - \tau_1^2) + \sigma_2
\]

(26)

or, in terms of the coefficients in the polynomials,

\[
\lambda r = \left( -\frac{1}{2} \tau_{20} + \frac{1}{4} \tau_{20}^2 - \ell (l + 1) \right) + \left( \frac{1}{2} \tau_{20} \tau_{21} + 2 \kappa_0 \right) r + \left( -\kappa^2 + \frac{1}{4} \tau_{21}^2 \right) r^2 .
\]

(27)

Thus, the two coefficients in \( \tau = \tau_2 + \tau_2 r \) must satisfy

\[
\tau_{20} = 2 \ell + 2 , -2 \ell ,
\]

(28)

\[
\tau_{21} = -2 \kappa , 2 \kappa ,
\]

(29)

and the ‘eigenvalue’ \( \lambda \) will be

\[
\lambda = \frac{1}{2} \tau_{20} \tau_{21} + 2 \kappa_0
\]

(30)

\[
= 2 \kappa_0 - 2 (\ell + 1) \kappa .
\]

(31)

Nikiforov and Uvarov observed that to be able to get eigenfunction solutions having a non-negative index (see equation (43)), the polynomial \( \tau_2 \) must have a negative derivative, and a zero, somewhere in \([0, \infty)\), so we take

\[
\tau_{20} = 2 \ell + 2
\]

(32)

\[
\tau_{21} = -2 \kappa ,
\]

(33)
i.e. \[ \tau_2 = 2 (\ell + 1 - \kappa r) \] . \hfill (34)

Now from
\[ \tau_2 = 2 \sigma_1 \frac{d\varphi(r)}{dr} + \tau_1 \] \hfill (35)

\[ \frac{d\varphi(r)}{dr} = \frac{1}{2\sigma_1} (\tau_2 - \tau_1) \] \hfill (36)
\[ = \frac{1}{2r} (2 (\ell + 1 - \kappa r) - 2 (1 - \kappa r)) \] \hfill (37)
\[ = \frac{\ell}{r} \] \hfill (38)
\[ \varphi = \ell \ln r \] \hfill (39)

so we get
\[ \phi = r^\ell \] \hfill (40)

From
\[ \sigma_3 = \left( \frac{\sigma_1}{2} (\tau'_2 - \tau'_1) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma'_1 (\tau_2 - \tau_1) + \frac{1}{4} \left( \tau_2^2 - \tau_1^2 \right) + \sigma_2 \right) \] \hfill (41)

we have
\[ \sigma_3 = -\frac{1}{2} + 2 (\kappa_0 - (\ell + 1) \kappa r) \] . \hfill (42)

Eigenvalues for the number \( \lambda \) are determined by
\[ \lambda + n_r \tau_2 + \frac{1}{2} n_r (n_r - 1) \sigma_1'' = 0 \] , \hfill (43)

where \( n_r \) is a non-negative integer (later identified as the number of radial nodes in the solution \( R(r) \)). Inserting the Coulomb case,
\[ 2\kappa_0 - 2 (\ell + 1) \kappa = 2\kappa n_r = 0 \] . \hfill (44)

Thus, the \( \kappa \) are quantized according to
\[ \kappa = \kappa_0 \frac{1}{n_r + \ell + 1} \] . \hfill (45)

Using the definition of \( \kappa \), we see that for the bound-state solution to exist, the energy \( E \) of the electron must be quantized according to
\[ E = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{1}{4 \kappa_0^2 (n_r + \ell + 1)^2} \] \hfill (46)
\[ = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \left( \frac{mZ}{\hbar^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{e^2}{4 \pi \epsilon_0} \right)^2 \frac{1}{(n_r + \ell + 1)^2} \] \hfill (47)
\[ = -\frac{mZ^2}{2\hbar^2} \left( \frac{e^2}{4 \pi \epsilon_0} \right)^2 \frac{1}{(n_r + \ell + 1)^2} , \] \hfill (48)
which are the energy levels first derived by Bohr. Comparing with the Bohr formula, we can identify the positive integer

\[ n \equiv n_r + l + 1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (49)

as the Bohr quantum number (also, these days, called the ‘principle’ quantum number).

The transformed differential equation becomes

\[ \sigma_1 y'' + \tau_2 y' + \lambda y = 0 . \]  \hspace{1cm} (50)

In the Coulomb case,

\[ r y'' + 2 (\ell + 1 - \kappa r) y' + 2 (\kappa_0 - (\ell + 1) \kappa) y = 0 . \]  \hspace{1cm} (51)

Compare to the differential equation for the associated Laguerre polynomials, \( L_1(n, m, x) \equiv L_n^m(x) \), which is

\[ x L'' + (m + 1 - x) L' + nL = 0 . \]  \hspace{1cm} (52)

The comparison suggests we let

\[ x = 2 \kappa r , \]  \hspace{1cm} (53)

so

\[ x \frac{d^2}{dx^2} y + (2\ell + 1 + 1 - x) \frac{d}{dx} y + \left( \frac{\kappa_0}{\kappa} - (l + 1) \right) y = 0 . \]  \hspace{1cm} (54)

From the above, we also know that quantization of the electron bound states gives \( \kappa = \kappa_n \), where the quantized \( \kappa_n \) are fixed by

\[ \frac{\kappa_0}{\kappa_n} = n_r + \ell + 1 , \]  \hspace{1cm} (55)

so

\[ x \frac{d^2}{dx^2} y + (2\ell + 1 + 1 - x) \frac{d}{dx} y + n_r y = 0 . \]  \hspace{1cm} (56)

Thus, the ‘regular’ (‘first’) solutions for the differential equation for \( y(x) \) are

\[ y_1(n, \ell, x) = L_1(n - \ell - 1, 2\ell + 1, 2\kappa_n r) \equiv L_{n_r}^{2\ell+1}(2\kappa_n r) , \]  \hspace{1cm} (57)

and the radial SE ‘regular’ solution is (up to a constant factor)

\[ R_1(n, \ell, r) = (2\kappa_n r)^\ell e^{-\kappa_n r} L_1(n - \ell - 1, 2\ell + 1, 2\kappa_n r) . \]  \hspace{1cm} (58)

where

\[ L_1(n_r, m, x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n_r} (-1)^j \frac{(n_r + m)!}{(n_r - j)! (m + j)!} \frac{1}{j!} x^j . \]  \hspace{1cm} (59)
3 The second solution

Consider the differential equation \((52)\) expressed as:

\[
xy'' + (m + 1 - x)y' + \overline{n}y = 0
\]

in which \(m\) is a positive integer and \(\overline{n}\) is a non-negative integer. (In the Coulomb case, \(\overline{n} = n_r\), \(m = 2l + 1\).)

As we have seen, equation \((60)\) has polynomial solutions proportional to the associated Laguerre polynomials \(L^m_{\overline{n}}(x)\). These polynomials are expressible in terms of the confluent hypergeometric function as

\[
L^m_{\overline{n}}(x) = \frac{(m + 1)_{\overline{n}}}{\overline{n}!} \, _1F_1(-\overline{n}, m + 1, x)
\]

in which

\[
_1F_1(-\overline{n}, m + 1, x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\overline{n}} \frac{(-\overline{n})_k}{(m + 1)_k k!} x^k,
\]

where \((-\overline{n})_k\) and \((m + 1)_k\) are Pochhammer symbols, defined by \((a)_k \equiv a(a + 1) \cdots (a + k - 1) = \Gamma(a + k)/\Gamma(a)\), with \((a)_0 = 1\).

Following Nikiforov and Uvarov, if we know a first solution \(\Phi_1(\overline{n}, m, x)\) to the hypergeometric equation, a second linearly independent solution is given by the extended Cauchy integral:

\[
\Phi_2(\overline{n}, m, x) = \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \int_0^\infty \frac{\rho(s)\Phi_1(\overline{n}, m, s)}{s - x} ds
\]

in which the weight function \(\rho(x) = e^{-x}x^m\) is, for the differential equation \((60)\), a solution of the equation \((x\rho(x))' = (m - x)\rho(x)\). The integral is taken with principle value near the pole of the integrand.

We now write \((63)\) in the form

\[
\begin{align*}
\Phi_2(\overline{n}, m, x) &= x^m e^x \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-s}}{s-x} \left[ s^m \Phi_1(\overline{n}, m, s) - x^m \Phi_1(\overline{n}, m, x) \right] ds \\
&\quad + \Phi_1(\overline{n}, m, x) \int_{-x}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-s}}{s} ds.
\end{align*}
\]

The great advantage (‘trick’) in this separation is that the first integral no longer has a pole at \(s = x\) AND the exponential factor \(e^{-s}\) has been taken out of the bracketed expression.
Inserting the hypergeometric solution (62), the first of the two integrals in Eq. (64) is

\[\sum_{k=0}^{\pi} \frac{(-\pi)_{k}}{(m+1)_{k}k!} \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-s} \frac{e^{-s}}{(s-x)} [s^{m+k} - x^{m+k}] ds\]

\[= \sum_{k=0}^{\pi} \frac{(-\pi)_{k}}{(m+1)_{k}k!} \sum_{j=0}^{m+k-1} \frac{(m+k-1-j)! x^{j}}{k!} \]  

(65)

while the last term of Eq. (64) contains the ‘standard’ exponential-integral function

\[Ei (1, -x) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{x} e^{-s} s ds\]

times the first solution. There results

\[\Phi_{2}(\eta, m, x) = \frac{m!}{(\eta + m)!} P_{2}(\eta, m, x) \frac{e^{x}}{x^{m}} + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1, m+1, x)} \frac{e^{x}}{x^{m}} \]  

(66)

where the polynomials \(P_{2}(\eta, m, x)\) are

\[P_{2}(\eta, m, x) = \frac{(\eta + m)!}{m!} \sum_{k=0}^{\pi} \sum_{j=0}^{m+k-1} \frac{(-\pi)_{k} (m+k-1-j)!}{(m+1)_{k} k!} x^{j} \]  

(67)

The equation (66) constitutes an explicit closed-form second solution to the confluent hypergeometric differential equation in the degenerate case.

The normalization of the polynomial \(P_{2}(\eta, m, x)\) has been chosen to make the coefficient of \(x^{n+m-1}\) be \((-1)^{n}\). It then turns out that all the coefficients of the powers of \(x\) are integers.

The polynomials \(P_{2}(\eta, m, x)\) can be written as a sum of two terms, the first with only positive coefficients and powers of \(x\) up to \(x^{m-1}\), and a second with sign-oscillating terms with powers \(x^{m}\) up to \(x^{n+m-1}\):

\[P_{2}(\eta, m, x) = \sum_{\pi=0}^{m-1} \frac{(\eta + p)! (m-p-1)!}{p!} x^{p} \]

\[-x^{m} \sum_{\pi=0}^{\pi-1} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{\pi-p-1} \frac{\eta!}{(\eta-k-p-1)! (m+k+p+1)! (k+p+1)!} (-1)^{k} k! \right] (-x)^{p} \]  

(68)
As shown by Parke and Maximon [4], the bracketed coefficient in the second sum can be simplified, so that

\[
P_2(n, m, x) = \sum_{p=0}^{m-1} \frac{(\pi + p)!}{p!} (m - p - 1)! x^p
\]

\[
- x^m \sum_{p=0}^{\pi-1} \frac{(\pi + m)!}{(m + p)!} \left( \sum_{k=m+p+1}^{\pi+m} \frac{1}{k} (\pi + m + 1 - k)! \right) \frac{(-x)^p}{p!}
\]

(69)

or

\[
P_2(n, m, x) = \sum_{p=0}^{m-1} \frac{(\pi + p)!}{p!} (m - p - 1)! x^p
\]

\[
- \frac{(\pi + m)!}{m!} x^m \left( \sum_{k=m+1}^{\pi+m} \frac{1}{k} + \sum_{p=1}^{\pi-1} \frac{m!}{(m + p)!} (-x)^p \sum_{k=m+p+1}^{\pi+m} \frac{1}{k} \prod_{j=1}^{p} (\pi + m + j - k) \right).
\]

(70)

(The value \( \pi = 0 \) is special, since the sum has an upper limit smaller than the lower limit. It is consistent to take such a sum as zero. Similarly, a product of this type is taken as one.)

4 Second radial solution

From the above analysis, our Coulomb radial second solution is proportional to

\[
\Psi(n_r, m, x) = \exp\left(-x/2\right) x^{-\ell} L_1(n_r, m, x) E_1(1-x),
\]

where \( n_r = n - \ell - 1, m = 2\ell + 1 \), and \( x = 2\kappa r \).

We will define the arbitrary coefficient which can be placed as a factor in front of the solution \( \Psi(n_r, m, x) \) to make the \( E_1 \) term (after using equation (66)) be simply \( \exp\left(-x/2\right) x^{-\ell} L_1(n_r, m, x) E_1(1-x) \), where, from equation (61),

\[
L_1(n_r, m, x) = \frac{(m + n_r)!}{m! n_r!} \frac{1}{x} F_1(-n_r, m + 1, x).
\]

This means that our second (‘irregular’) solutions \( R_2(n, \ell, r) \) to the steady-state (bound electron) radial Schrödinger equation can be written as
\[ R_2(n, \ell, r) = \frac{1}{n_r!} \frac{1}{(2\kappa_n r)^{\ell+1}} e^{\kappa_n r} P_2(n_r, 2\ell + 1, 2\kappa_n r) \]
\[ + (2\kappa_n r)^\ell e^{-\kappa_n r} L_1(n_r, 2\ell + 1, 2\kappa_n r) Ei(1, -2\kappa_n r). \]

where \( L_1(n_r, 2\ell + 1, 2\kappa_n r) = L_{2\ell+1}^2(2\kappa_n r) \) are associated Laguerre polynomials; \( \kappa_n = \kappa_0/n, n = 1, 2, \cdots \), \( \ell = 0, 1, \cdots, n-1 \); and the polynomials \( P_2(n_r, m, x) \) are defined in equation (67), and simplified in (70).

The conventional second solution is commonly represented by a logarithmic term \( \ln (r) \) times the first solution together with an infinite Laurent series. Such a series can be found by expanding the exponential integral in equation (72) into powers of \( r \). The exponential integral then contributes a \( \ln (r) \) term. Since the factor in front of the exponential function \( Ei \) is a first solution, one can replace \( \ln (r) \) by \( \ln (cr) \), with \( c \) a constant, and still have a solution to the SE. In this way, units of the radius can be restored, and other constant terms in the expansion of the exponential integral can be removed.

5 Examples of second solutions

To show the simplicity of our expressions for the second solutions to the Coulombic radial Schrödinger equation, and for reference, we give below some examples of \( R_2(n, \ell, r) \). In these examples, the radial coordinate \( r \) is measured in units of the Bohr radius (corrected for reduced mass) divided by the atomic number \( Z \).

\[ R_2(1, 0, r) = \frac{1}{2r} e^{1/2} + e^{-r} \int_{-2r}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-s}}{s} ds \]
\[ R_2(2, 0, r) = \frac{1}{r} (1 - r) e^{1/2} + (2 - r) e^{-1/2} \int_{-r}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-s}}{s} ds \]
\[ R_2(2, 1, r) = \frac{1}{r^2} e^{1/2} (2 + r + r^2) + r e^{-1/2} \int_{-r}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-s}}{s} ds \]
\[ R_2(3, 0, r) = \left( \frac{3}{2r} - \frac{5}{2} + \frac{1}{3} \right) e^{1/2} + \left( 3 - 2r + \frac{2}{9} \right) e^{-1/2} \int_{-2r/3}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-s}}{s} ds \]
\[ R_2(3,1,r) = \left( \frac{9}{2r^2} + \frac{3}{r} + 3 - \frac{2}{3} \right) e^{\frac{1}{3}r} + \left( \frac{8}{3}r - \frac{4}{9}r^2 \right) e^{-\frac{1}{3}r} \int_{-r/3}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-s}}{s} ds \]

\[ R_2(3,2,r) = R_{20}(3,r) = \left( \frac{81}{2r^2} + \frac{27}{2r} + \frac{3}{r} + 1 + \frac{2}{3r} \right) e^{\frac{1}{3}r} + \frac{4}{9}r^2 e^{-\frac{1}{3}r} \int_{-2r/3}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-s}}{s} ds \]

\[ R_2(4,0,r) = \left( \frac{2}{r} - \frac{13}{3} + \frac{22}{24} - \frac{1}{24}r^2 \right) e^{\frac{1}{4}r} + \left( 4 - 3r + \frac{1}{2}r^2 - \frac{1}{48}r^3 \right) e^{-\frac{1}{4}r} \int_{-r/2}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-s}}{s} ds \]

\[ R_2(4,1,r) = \left( \frac{8}{r^2} + \frac{6}{r} + 6 - \frac{9}{4}r + \frac{1}{8}r^2 \right) e^{\frac{1}{4}r} + \left( 5r - \frac{5}{4}r^2 + \frac{1}{16}r^3 \right) e^{-\frac{1}{4}r} \int_{-r/2}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-s}}{s} ds \]

\[ R_2(4,2,r) = \left( \frac{192}{r^3} + \frac{48}{r^2} + \frac{12}{r} + 4 - \frac{5}{2}r - \frac{1}{4}r^2 \right) e^{\frac{1}{4}r} + \left( \frac{3}{2}r^2 - \frac{1}{8}r^3 \right) e^{-\frac{1}{4}r} \int_{-r/2}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-s}}{s} ds \]

\[ R_2(4,3,r) = R_{20}(4,r) = \left( \frac{11520}{r^4} + \frac{960}{r^3} + \frac{96}{r^2} + \frac{12}{r} + 2 + \frac{1}{2}r + \frac{1}{4}r^2 \right) e^{\frac{1}{4}r} + \frac{1}{8}r^3 e^{-\frac{1}{4}r} \int_{-r/2}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-s}}{s} ds \]

**6 Conclusions**

Even though both independent solutions to the quantum Coulomb problem have been extensively studied, the existence of explicit closed-form second solutions seems not to have been noticed. In a commonly-used technique, second solutions for degenerate differential equations, a logarithm of the independent variable times the first solution is added to an infinite series of terms whose coefficients are calculated. For the Coulomb case, the logarithm can be justified by a limiting process leading to an expression with a term that differentiates the first solution with respect to the angular momentum quantum number \( \ell \). Because \( r^\ell \) is a factor in the first solution, a \( \ln(r) \) times the first solution occurs. The rest of the terms in the second solution become an infinite Laurent series in the radius. However, an infinite series representation of the second (irregular) solutions can be avoided by the method employed in this paper. Rather than an infinite series, the results here give irregular solutions as two terms, the first having only a polynomial of degree \( (n + \ell - 1) \) times \( r^{-\ell-1} \) times the exponential integral \( \text{Ei}(1, -2Zr/(na)) \), and a second term expressed by an associated Laguerre polynomial of degree \( (n - \ell - 1) \) times the factor \( r^\ell \) times the exponential integral \( \text{Ei}(1, -2Zr/(na)) \).
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