

Are we living in Non-Commutative Space? revisiting the classic hydrogen atom system

Pulkit S. Ghoderao*

Theoretical Physics Group, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ

P. Ramadevi†

Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Powai, Mumbai - 400 076

(Dated: February 1, 2022)

Our familiar Newton's laws allow determination of both position and velocity of any object precisely. Early nineteenth century saw the birth of quantum mechanics where all measurements must obey Heisenberg's uncertainty principle. Basically, we cannot simultaneously measure with precision, both position and momentum of particles in the microscopic atomic world. A natural extension will be to assume that space becomes fuzzy as we approach the study of early universe. That is, all the components of position cannot be simultaneously measured with precision. Such a space is called non-commutative space. In this article, we study quantum mechanics of hydrogen atom on such a fuzzy space. Particularly, we highlight expected corrections to the hydrogen atom energy spectrum due to non-commutative space.

I. INTRODUCTION

Let us recall our conventional notion of the trajectories of macroscopic objects $\vec{r}(t)$ (position \vec{r} as a function of time) in classical Newtonian mechanics. In the absence of any external forces, $\vec{r}(t)$ can be obtained from the second order differential equation,

$$\frac{d^2\vec{r}(t)}{dt^2} = 0, \quad (1)$$

provided we give both position \vec{r} and velocity $d\vec{r}/dt$ at initial time $t = t_0$. This concept of simultaneous determination of position and velocity is no longer true once we move to the microscopic atomic world. Particularly, we need a machinery called 'quantum mechanics' which is governed by the Heisenberg uncertainty principle.

In the microscopic world, we have the Planck constant \hbar controlling the imprecise measurement of both the observables, position \vec{r} and momentum $\vec{p} = m\vec{r}/dt$. We associate operators to all observables in quantum mechanics. The components of the position and momentum operators obey,

$$[\hat{r}_i, \hat{p}_j] = \hat{r}_i \hat{p}_j - \hat{p}_j \hat{r}_i = \frac{i\hbar}{2\pi} \delta_{ij} \equiv i\hbar \delta_{ij}, \quad (2)$$

where the square bracket is called *commutator bracket* as expanded above and δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta which is equal to 1 only if $i = j$ and zero otherwise. All the physics of quantum mechanics reduces to classical mechanics when we take the limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$.

The next theoretical idea beyond quantum will be to look at physics near the big bang singularity which represents the beginning of our expanding universe. Many

current research areas like string theory [1] and quantum gravity theories provide us evidence to believe that space near the origin of our universe was fuzzy. As a theoretical idea, which is a natural generalisation of classical to quantum, we introduce a parameter $\theta_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ijk}\theta_k$ which is similar to \hbar , to govern the fuzziness of space as follows:

$$[\hat{x}_i, \hat{x}_j] = \frac{i}{2} \sum_{k=1}^3 \epsilon_{ijk} \theta_k, \quad (3)$$

where ϵ_{ijk} is the Levi-Civita symbol. Such a space defined by the above commutation relation is called non-commutative space and θ_k is the *non-commutative (NC) parameter*. In the limit of $\theta_k \rightarrow 0$, we must get back our conventional quantum mechanics on a commutative space.

It is definitely an interesting exercise to study quantum mechanics of many known systems in the above non-commutative space [2]. Here we do so through just a simple modification of taking the coordinate commutator to be non-zero. Our aim is to enable a better understanding of the course content by reviewing the concepts taught in an undergraduate quantum mechanics course in light of this modification. It might also serve to generate exercise problems for students towards getting a hands-on experience in reviewing first order perturbation theory methods, calculating Clebsch-Gordon coefficients, and introduction to spectroscopic notation and Lamb shift.

In this article, we will initially elaborate the formalism of non-commutative quantum mechanics. Then we present a method to solve for energy values in non-commutative space. Finally, we obtain the energy values of the hydrogen atom problem including non-commutative corrections.

* pulkit.ghoderao18@imperial.ac.uk

† ramadevi@phy.iitb.ac.in

II. NON-COMMUTATIVE QUANTUM MECHANICS (NCQM) - THE FORMALISM

For a two-dimensional $x - y$ plane, Fig. 1 gives a pictorial description of fuzziness or non-commutativity encoded by parameter θ . Such a non-commutative plane is described by,

$$[x, y] = i\theta. \quad (4)$$

As the consequence of a non-zero commutator, there will be an additional uncertainty relation between the two spatial coordinates:

$$\Delta x \Delta y \gtrsim \theta. \quad (5)$$




FIG. 1. The two-dimensional space is divided into cells of area proportional to θ . The uncertainty relation forbids us to resolve space below this area. In n -dimensions, a volume proportional to $(\sqrt{\theta})^n$ will be unresolvable.

The uncertainty as depicted in Fig. 1 means that we cannot be certain about space in an area less than θ . Hence the position is not given by a point but a fuzzy region of area θ . In order that all the different particles we observe also be allowed in non-commutative space, the non-commutative parameter is constrained to be $\theta < 10^{-40} m^2$ [3]. Our present day accelerator experiments cannot probe such length scales to verify whether space is actually non-commutative or not. Nevertheless, we would like to revisit hydrogen atom problem on non-commutative space and derive the expected non-commutative signatures. We hope future experiments at such length scales will be able to look for the theoretical predictions of non-commutative quantum mechanical systems.

III. THE CANONICAL FORMULATION OF NCQM

A natural generalisation of the non-commutative plane to any n -dimensional space will be,

$$[\hat{x}_i, \hat{x}_j] = i\theta_{ij} \quad i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (6)$$

Clearly, the commutator bracket between any two coordinates x_i and x_j is proportional to a constant matrix element θ_{ij} which must be antisymmetric $\theta_{ij} = -\theta_{ji}$ because $[x_i, x_j] = -[x_j, x_i]$.

To study quantum mechanics problems in such a non-commutative space, we will use the well known commutator between position and momentum but will assume that the momentum components are simultaneously measurable. That is, the complete set of the commutation relations are,

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{x}'_i, \hat{x}'_j] &= i\theta_{ij} \\ [\hat{p}'_i, \hat{p}'_j] &= 0 \\ [\hat{x}'_i, \hat{p}'_j] &= i\hbar\delta_{ij} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We would like to do a suitable coordinate transformation $\hat{x}'_i \rightarrow \hat{x}_i$ such that the above commutator relations can be transformed to satisfy,

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{x}_i, \hat{x}_j] &= 0 \\ [\hat{p}_i, \hat{p}_j] &= 0 \\ [\hat{x}_i, \hat{p}_j] &= i\hbar\delta_{ij}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The above relations resemble commutative space. The following variable change,

$$\hat{x}'_i \longrightarrow \hat{x}_i - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\theta_{ij}}{2\hbar} \hat{p}_j \quad (9)$$

$$\hat{p}'_i \longrightarrow \hat{p}_i \quad (10)$$

reproduces the commutative space relations eq.(8). Although this is not the only variable change which gives the correct relations, this form is inspired by another approach to NCQM -namely, the Moyal Product formulation [4].

The change in phase space variables eq.(9) and eq.(10) can be used to relate physics in commutative space to corresponding results in non-commutative space. This makes the evaluation of energy spectrum in problems like hydrogen atom in non-commutative space straightforward, as will be elaborated in the following section.

IV. HYDROGEN ATOM IN NCQM

It is well known that the hydrogen atom, which is a system of an electron and a proton, can be described by an effective one dimensional Hamiltonian,

$$H = \frac{\hat{p}_{r'}^2}{2\mu} - \frac{e^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{1}{\hat{r}'}, \quad (11)$$

where $\vec{r}' = \vec{r}'_e - \vec{r}'_p$ is the relative coordinate with subscripts denoting the electron and proton and $\mu = m_e m_p / (m_p + m_e)$ is the reduced mass. Even though the commutator between the coordinates of electron and

proton $[\vec{r}'_e, \vec{r}'_p] = 0$, the commutator between the relative coordinate components will be,

$$[r'_i, r'_j] = 2\iota\theta_{ij} \equiv \iota\tilde{\theta}_{ij} \leftrightarrow \iota\theta_{ij} \quad (12)$$

where we have redefined $\tilde{\theta}$ to θ for convenience. In what follows, we use atomic units such that $4\pi\epsilon_0 = e = m_e = \hbar = 1$, however we track \hbar in the perturbation term to identify its dependence in the result. Suppose we make a coordinate transformation $\vec{r}' \rightarrow \vec{r}$ and $\vec{p}' \rightarrow \vec{p}$ as given in eq.(9) and eq.(10), then the potential $V(|\vec{r}'|)$ will transform as

$$V = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\hat{x}'_i \hat{x}'_i}} = -1/\sqrt{(\hat{x}_i - \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{\theta_{ij}}{2\hbar} \hat{p}_j)(\hat{x}_i - \sum_{k=1}^3 \frac{\theta_{ik}}{2\hbar} \hat{p}_k)} \quad (13)$$

as the summation variables j and k are equivalent dummy indices the above potential will be simplified as,

$$= -1/\sqrt{\hat{x}_i \hat{x}_i - \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{\theta_{ij}}{2\hbar} (\hat{p}_j \hat{x}_i + \hat{x}_i \hat{p}_j) + \sum_{j,k=1}^3 \frac{\theta_{ij}\theta_{ik}}{4\hbar^2} \hat{p}_j \hat{p}_k}, \quad (14)$$

since $[\hat{x}_i, \hat{p}_j] = \iota\hbar\delta_{ij} \Rightarrow \hat{p}_j \hat{x}_i = \hat{x}_i \hat{p}_j - \iota\hbar\delta_{ij}$, the previous equation simplifies as,

$$= -1/\sqrt{\hat{x}_i \hat{x}_i - \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{\theta_{ij}}{2\hbar} (2\hat{x}_i \hat{p}_j - \iota\hbar\delta_{ij}) + \sum_{j,k=1}^3 \frac{\theta_{ij}\theta_{ik}}{4\hbar^2} \hat{p}_j \hat{p}_k} \quad (15)$$

$$= -1/\sqrt{\hat{x}_i \hat{x}_i - \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{(2\theta_{ij}\hat{x}_i \hat{p}_j - \iota\hbar\theta_{ii})}{2\hbar} + \sum_{j,k=1}^3 \frac{\theta_{ij}\theta_{ik}}{4\hbar^2} \hat{p}_j \hat{p}_k}. \quad (16)$$

We know that θ_{ii} (antisymmetry property) is zero hence,

$$V = -1/\sqrt{\hat{x}_i \hat{x}_i - \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{\theta_{ij}\hat{x}_i \hat{p}_j}{\hbar} + \sum_{j,k=1}^3 \frac{\theta_{ij}\theta_{ik}}{4\hbar^2} \hat{p}_j \hat{p}_k}. \quad (17)$$

Keeping the terms upto θ in the potential is sufficient to see the signature or correction due to non-commutative space. Hence by performing the binomial expansion of $V(r)$ we obtain,

$$V = -(\hat{x}_i \hat{x}_i)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\hat{x}_i \hat{x}_i} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \frac{\theta_{ij}\hat{x}_i \hat{p}_j}{\hbar} + \text{Order}(\theta^2) \right) \quad (18)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{2\hbar r^3} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \theta_{ij} \hat{x}_i \hat{p}_j, \quad (19)$$

where $r = \sqrt{\hat{x}_i \hat{x}_i}$ must not be zero. Recall, $\theta_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \theta_k$. Hence the potential can be simplified as,

$$V = -\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{4\hbar r^3} \sum_{i,j,k=1}^3 \epsilon_{ijk} \theta_k \hat{x}_i \hat{p}_j. \quad (20)$$

This expression shows the additional term is dependent on angular momentum operator $\hat{L}_k = \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \epsilon_{ijk} \hat{x}_i \hat{p}_j$,

$$V = -\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{4\hbar r^3} \sum_{k=1}^3 \hat{L}_k \theta_k \quad (21)$$

$$V = -\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{4\hbar r^3} \hat{\vec{L}} \cdot \vec{\theta}. \quad (22)$$

Thus we have obtained a perturbation term to the ordinary $1/r$ potential for the hydrogen atom. Taking $\vec{\theta} = |\vec{\theta}|\hat{n}$ and choosing the direction \hat{n} along z-axis implies the perturbation in this choice of frame is, $-\frac{1}{4\hbar r^3} \theta_z \hat{L}_z$. The energy spectrum can now be found using first order perturbation,

$$\Delta E = \langle n, l, m | -\frac{\theta_z \hat{L}_z}{4\hbar r^3} | n, l, m \rangle. \quad (23)$$

As \hat{L}_z commutes with the perturbation free Hamiltonian, the hydrogen atom eigenstates $|n, l, m\rangle$ are eigenstates of \hat{L}_z too, satisfying

$$\hat{L}_z |n, l, m\rangle = m\hbar |n, l, m\rangle. \quad (24)$$

Thus the perturbation expression simplifies to,

$$\Delta E = -\frac{\theta_z m}{4} \langle n, l, m | \frac{1}{r^3} | n, l, m \rangle. \quad (25)$$

The expectation value for $1/r^3$ can be obtained by a beautiful trick [5],

$$\langle n, l, m | \frac{1}{r^3} | n, l, m \rangle = \frac{1}{n^3 l(l+1/2)(l+1)}. \quad (26)$$

For obtaining the expectation value, we need to integrate $1/r^3$ from zero to infinity, but our earlier approximation eq.(18) that the radial distance must not approach zero is violated. This does not pose a problem as for $l \neq 0$, the hydrogen wave-function tends to zero as r tends to zero, making the integral zero there. The $l = 0$ states on the other hand have $m = 0$ and hence do not contribute in the perturbation expression, which now is

$$\Delta E = -\frac{\theta_z m}{4n^3 l(l+1/2)(l+1)}. \quad (27)$$

Essentially the problem that we began with, namely, to obtain the energy eigenvalues of the hydrogen atom has been solved, at least to first order in perturbation theory.

In all of the above, we have used n, l and m quantum numbers to denote the states of hydrogen atom. But it is known through experiments, that for hydrogen atom the *total angular momentum* is what is conserved. Accordingly, a more complete treatment would demand that we consider both the orbital as well as spin quantum numbers. This can be done easily by introducing in the place of $|n, l, m\rangle$ the states $|n, j, j_z\rangle$ where $j = l + s$ is the total angular momentum quantum number.

Returning back to the first order perturbation expression and performing the appropriate replacement of eigenstates,

$$\Delta E = \langle n, j, j_z | -\frac{\theta_z \hat{L}_z}{4\hbar r^3} | n, j, j_z \rangle, \quad (28)$$

Now consider only,

$$\langle n, j, j_z | \hat{L}_z | n, j, j_z \rangle \quad (29)$$

By completeness condition, $\hat{\mathbb{I}} = |n, l, l_z; s, s_z\rangle \langle n, l, l_z; s, s_z|$, dropping the n for brevity we can write,

$$= \langle j, j_z | \hat{L}_z \left(\sum_{l_z, s_z} |l, l_z; s, s_z\rangle \langle l, l_z; s, s_z| \right) | j, j_z \rangle \quad (30)$$

$$= \sum_{l_z, s_z} \langle j, j_z | \hat{L}_z | l, l_z; s, s_z \rangle \langle l, l_z; s, s_z | j, j_z \rangle \quad (31)$$

$$= \sum_{l_z, s_z} l_z \hbar \langle j, j_z | l, l_z; s, s_z \rangle \langle l, l_z; s, s_z | j, j_z \rangle \quad (32)$$

Noting that $\langle j, j_z | l, l_z; s, s_z \rangle$ and $\langle l, l_z; s, s_z | j, j_z \rangle$ are Clebsch-Gordan (CG) coefficients which are equal,

$$= \sum_{l_z, s_z} l_z \hbar |\langle l, l_z; s, s_z | j, j_z \rangle|^2. \quad (33)$$

Here we see that if $l = 0$, l_z has only one value, $l_z = 0$, hence the expression is zero for $l = 0$ states. In the appendix we show how to find a general Clebsch-Gordan expression when $s = 1/2$ [6]. Substituting the values of CG coefficients and performing the summation, the reader can verify that,

$$\langle n, j, j_z | \hat{L}_z | n, j, j_z \rangle = \begin{cases} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2l+1}\right) j_z \hbar & \text{for } j = l + 1/2 \\ \left(1 + \frac{1}{2l+1}\right) j_z \hbar & \text{for } j = l - 1/2 \end{cases}$$

With this in mind, the first order energy difference ΔE simplifies to,

$$\Delta E = -\frac{\theta_z}{4} \left(1 \mp \frac{1}{2l+1}\right) j_z \langle n, l', j, j'_z | \frac{1}{r^3} | n, l, j, j_z \rangle. \quad (34)$$

Once again, for obtaining the expectation value, we seemingly violate our earlier approximation (15) that the radial distance must not approach zero. But here too it goes through as for $l \neq 0$, the hydrogen wave-function tends to zero as r tends to zero, making the integral zero there. The $l = 0$ states on the other hand are seen eq.(33) to undergo no correction at first order. We have thus obtained the energy spectrum for hydrogen atom in non-commutative space, this time incorporating spin, as:

$$\Delta E = -\frac{\theta_z j_z}{4} \left(1 \mp \frac{1}{2l+1}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n^3 l(l+1/2)(l+1)}\right). \quad (35)$$

This result was first derived using quantum field theory arguments in ref.[7].

V. LAMB'S SHIFT AND NON-COMMUTATIVE CORRECTION

For the more methodically minded reader, the ad-hoc inclusion of spin quantum number in the treatment above might seem a little incoherent. This concern can safely be abandoned as spin is known to come out naturally and rather miraculously by incorporating relativity into quantum mechanics via the Dirac equation.

In the case of hydrogen atom for example the energy spectrum through Dirac equation is found to depend on n and j ,

$$j = \{l + s, l + s - 1, \dots \dots \text{decreasing in steps of one until, } |l - s|\} \quad (36)$$

where the j indicates coupled angular momentum and the energy is different for each j . A striking consequence of this result is that the energies of $|n = 2, l = 1, s = 1/2\rangle$, which are split according to,

$$j = \begin{cases} 1 + (1/2) = 3/2 & \rightarrow {}^2P_{3/2} \\ 1 + (1/2) - 1 = 1/2 & \rightarrow {}^2P_{1/2} \end{cases}$$

and $|n = 2, l = 0, s = 1/2\rangle$ having,

$$j = 0 + (1/2) = 1/2 \rightarrow {}^2S_{1/2}$$

are equal when j for both is $1/2$ while $n = 2$ is same for both states. In the above, the notation following the arrows represents coupled states and is known as the 'spectroscopic' or 'term symbol' notation. This notation is expressed as $^{2s+1}l_j$.

The prediction of equal energies of ${}^2P_{1/2}$ and ${}^2S_{1/2}$ states was shattered in 1947, through experiments conducted by Lamb and Retherford who found that there was a difference in energies between these states. The difference became famous as 'Lamb Shift' for which Willis E. Lamb was awarded the 1955 Nobel prize in physics, "*for his discoveries concerning the fine structure of the hydrogen spectrum*".

Let us investigate what happens to the above two states in the NC space energy spectrum we derived by means of an ad-hoc introduction of spin,

$$\Delta E = -\frac{\theta_z j_z}{4} \left(1 \mp \frac{1}{2l+1}\right) \left(\frac{1}{n^3 l(l+1/2)(l+1)}\right). \quad (37)$$

We can readily see that the energy is in fact dependent on both l and n quantum numbers thus giving a shift between the aforementioned states. But there is more! A j_z term is also present which tells us that the energy is further split according to,

$$j_z = \{-j, -j+1, \dots, \text{increasing in steps of one till, } +j\} \quad (38)$$


Specifically in our case, the $l = 0$ states are shown to have no correction to first order eq.(33), so ${}^2S_{1/2}$ level is not

changed. The ${}^2P_{1/2}$ level on the other hand undergoes a correction as,

$${}^2P_{j=1/2} = \begin{cases} {}^2P_{-1/2} & \text{for } j_z = -j = -1/2 \\ {}^2P_{+1/2} & \text{for } j_z = -j + 1 = +1/2 = +j \end{cases}$$

Thus, the ‘Lamb Shift’ itself is split into two lines corresponding to different j_z . (See Fig.2. As a cautionary note, although we have placed NCQM after QED in the figure, while deriving the shift we have not used any field theoretical arguments.)

FIG. 2. Hydrogen atom energy levels according to different theories. ‘QED’ stands for Quantum Electrodynamics while ‘NCQM’ is Non-commutative Quantum Mechanics. The ${}^2P_{1/2}$ level splits into ${}^2P_{-1/2}$ and ${}^2P_{+1/2}$ when we consider the non-commutativity of space.



Although we started out with undergraduate level quantum mechanics we have now been led to the level of Quantum Electrodynamics, a theory which lies at the frontier of physics today! The most monumental success of quantum electrodynamics is its explanation for the Lamb Shift in hydrogen atom. It is indeed one of the pillars on which the theory stands. Our investigations suggest that we can expect even finer structure to the Lamb Shift!

The next question that we have to ask is that why is this splitting of Lamb Shift not detected, as surely many modern experiments would have verified the Lamb Shift with increasing precision. The answer to this also lies in our energy expression, the presence of θ_z term tells us that this splitting is of the order of θ which is very small for the present technology to detect. Indeed, as we had pointed out earlier, this splitting can be used as a confirmation that the space we live in is actually non-commutative. Not only this, but also a measurement of the amount of splitting can estimate the value of the non-commutativity parameter directly by using eq.(37).

VI. CONCLUSION

In this article, we have taken a tour through the world of non-commuting space coordinates. In doing so, we have studied a way to incorporate non-commutativity

into our usual framework of quantum mechanics and then applied this method to get a splitting in the Lamb shift of the hydrogen atom. Although it is as yet unknown whether our space is non-commutative, we hope to have impressed upon the reader that even a simple and generally assumed notion like the commutator for space coordinates being zero, when inspected more thoroughly, can reveal some new and exciting physics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Toby Wiseman of Theoretical Physics Group at Imperial College London for helpful comments on the manuscript. PSG acknowledges support from the Rajarshi Shahu Maharaj foreign education scholarship 2018-19 of the Government of Maharashtra State, India.

APPENDIX

The total angular momentum operator is given by,

$$\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{S} \quad (\text{A.39})$$

Squaring, we find

$$2\mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{S} = \mathbf{J}^2 - \mathbf{L}^2 - \mathbf{S}^2 = 2L_z S_z + L_+ S_- + L_- S_+ \quad (\text{A.40})$$

where $A_{\pm} = A_x \pm iA_y$. The eigenstates of \mathbf{J}^2 are same as those of $\mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{S}$ as can be proved by obtaining commutator between them to be vanishing. Therefore the eigenvalue equation for $2\mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{S}$ can be written as,

$$(2L_z S_z + L_+ S_- + L_- S_+) |j, j_z\rangle = \lambda |j, j_z\rangle \quad (\text{A.41})$$

Pre-multiplying both sides by $\langle l, l_z; s, s_z |$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle l, l_z; s, s_z | (2L_z S_z + L_+ S_- + L_- S_+) |j, j_z\rangle \\ = \lambda \langle l, l_z; s, s_z | j, j_z \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.42})$$

The term on the right hand side is recognised as the CG coefficient. Now there are two equations for the two possible values of s_z . For $s_z = -1/2$, $l_z = j_z + 1/2$ and for $s_z = +1/2$, $l_z = j_z - 1/2$. In terms of the CG coefficients $a = \langle l, j_z + 1/2; 1/2, -1/2 | j, j_z \rangle$ and $b = \langle l, j_z - 1/2; 1/2, +1/2 | j, j_z \rangle$, and using the operator rules for A_z, A_+ and A_- operators, the above two equations can be written as,

$$\sqrt{(l - j_z + 1/2)(l + j_z + 1/2)} b - (j_z + 1/2) a = \lambda a \quad (\text{A.43})$$

$$(j_z - 1/2) b + \sqrt{(l - j_z + 1/2)(l + j_z + 1/2)} a = \lambda b \quad (\text{A.44})$$

Solving the above two equations in terms of l and j_z we have,

$$b/a = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{l+j_z+1/2}{l-j_z+1/2}} & \text{for } \lambda = l \\ -\sqrt{\frac{l-j_z+1/2}{l+j_z+1/2}} & \text{for } \lambda = -l - 1 \end{cases}$$

The coefficients are required to satisfy $a^2 + b^2 = 1$. Also the standard sign convention for CG coefficients dictates that we take sign for a to be positive. Keeping in mind the orthogonality between CG coefficients, the values for

a and b can be unambiguously obtained as shown below,

CG Coefficients for $s=1/2$		
	$s_z = 1/2$	$s_z = -1/2$
$j = l+1/2$	$\sqrt{\frac{l+j_z+1/2}{2l+1}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{l-j_z+1/2}{2l+1}}$
$j = l-1/2$	$-\sqrt{\frac{l-j_z+1/2}{2l+1}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{l+j_z+1/2}{2l+1}}$

-
- [1] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, [JHEP **09**, 032 \(1999\)](#), [arXiv:hep-th/9908142 \[hep-th\]](#).
 - [2] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics*, Course of Theoretical Physics, Vol. 3 (Pergamon Press, 1965) pp. 423–426, [available on archive.org](#); A. Smailagic and E. Spallucci, [Phys. Rev. **D65**, 107701 \(2002\)](#), [arXiv:hep-th/0108216 \[hep-th\]](#).
 - [3] P. S. Ghoderao, R. V. Gavai, and P. Ramadevi, [Modern Physics Letters A **34**, 1950191 \(2019\)](#), <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217732319501918>.
 - [4] L. Gouba, [Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A31**, 1630025 \(2016\)](#), [arXiv:1603.07176 \[hep-th\]](#).
 - [5] R. Shankar, *Principles of Quantum Mechanics*, 2nd ed. (Springer US, 1994) pp. 470–471.
 - [6] R. Shankar, *Principles of Quantum Mechanics*, 2nd ed. (Springer US, 1994) pp. 414–415.
 - [7] M. Chaichian, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, and A. Tureanu, [Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2716 \(2001\)](#).