

HEPHY-PUB 645/96  
UWThPh-1996-30  
July 1996

# RELATIVISTIC COULOMB PROBLEM: ENERGY LEVELS AT THE CRITICAL COUPLING CONSTANT ANALYTICALLY

**Wolfgang LUCHA**

Institut für Hochenergiephysik,  
Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften,  
Nikolsdorfergasse 18, A-1050 Wien, Austria

**Franz F. SCHÖBERL**

Institut für Theoretische Physik,  
Universität Wien,  
Boltzmannngasse 5, A-1090 Wien, Austria

## Abstract

The Hamiltonian of the spinless relativistic Coulomb problem combines the standard Coulomb interaction potential with the square-root operator of relativistic kinematics. This Hamiltonian is known to be bounded from below up to some well-defined critical coupling constant. At this critical coupling constant, however, the differences between all analytically obtainable upper bounds on the corresponding energy eigenvalues and their numerically determined (approximate) values take their maxima. In view of this, an analytical derivation of (not so bad) upper bounds on the lowest-lying energy levels at the critical coupling constant is presented.

*PACS:* 03.65.Pm; 03.65.Ge; 11.10.St; 12.39.Pn

The “spinless relativistic Coulomb problem” to be investigated here is defined by a self-adjoint Hamiltonian  $H$  composed of the square-root operator of the relativistic expression for the free (so-called “kinetic”) energy

$$T \equiv \sqrt{\mathbf{p}^2 + m^2} \quad (1)$$

of some particle of mass  $m$  and momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  as well as the (spherically symmetric) Coulomb interaction potential

$$V_C(r) = -\frac{\alpha}{r}, \quad \alpha > 0, \quad (2)$$

depending merely on the radial coordinate  $r \equiv |\mathbf{x}|$  and involving some dimensionless coupling constant  $\alpha$ :

$$H = \sqrt{\mathbf{p}^2 + m^2} - \frac{\alpha}{r}. \quad (3)$$

The serious investigation of the spectrum of the operator (3) started with Ref. [1], where it was shown that, roughly speaking, this operator is bounded from below precisely up to a critical value  $\alpha_c$  of the coupling constant  $\alpha$ , namely, up to

$$\alpha_c = \frac{2}{\pi}.$$

Unfortunately, until now this operator withstood all efforts to localize its (discrete) spectrum analytically. (Some brief account of the history of these attempts may be found, for instance, in Ref. [2].) In fact, from the point of view of analytical statements about the eigenvalues of this operator, at present one has to be content with sets of upper bounds on the latter [3, 4].<sup>1</sup> By comparing with numerical computations, however, one realizes that, rather generally, the quality of all these upper bounds decreases with increasing coupling constant  $\alpha$ . In view of the above, in this note we are interested in the analytic calculation of upper bounds on the eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian  $H$  given in (3) for large values of the coupling constant  $\alpha$ , in particular, at the critical coupling constant  $\alpha_c$ .

The theoretical basis as well as the primary tool for the derivation of rigorous upper bounds on the eigenvalues of some self-adjoint operator is, beyond doubt, the so-called “min–max principle” [6]. An immediate consequence of this min–max principle is the Rayleigh–Ritz technique: Let  $H$  be some semibounded self-adjoint operator [which, according to a comprehensive spectral analysis presented in Ref. [1], obviously holds

---

<sup>1</sup> See also Ref. [5].

for our (semi-)relativistic Hamiltonian, Eq. (3)]. Let  $E_k$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , denote the eigenvalues of  $H$ , ordered according to  $E_0 \leq E_1 \leq E_2 \leq \dots$ . Let  $D_d$  be some  $d$ -dimensional subspace of the domain of  $H$  and let  $\widehat{E}_k$ ,  $k = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$ , denote all  $d$  eigenvalues of this operator  $H$  restricted to the space  $D_d$ , ordered according to  $\widehat{E}_0 \leq \widehat{E}_1 \leq \dots \leq \widehat{E}_{d-1}$ . Then the  $k$ th eigenvalue (counting multiplicity) of  $H$ ,  $E_k$ , satisfies the inequality

$$E_k \leq \widehat{E}_k, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, d-1.$$

Now, let us assume that this  $d$ -dimensional subspace  $D_d$  is spanned by a set of  $d$  linearly independent basis vectors  $|\psi_k\rangle$ ,  $k = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$ . Then the set of eigenvalues  $\widehat{E}$  may immediately be determined as the  $d$  roots of the characteristic equation

$$\det (\langle \psi_i | H | \psi_j \rangle - \widehat{E} \langle \psi_i | \psi_j \rangle) = 0, \quad i, j = 0, 1, \dots, d-1, \quad (4)$$

as becomes clear from the expansion of any eigenvector of the operator  $H$  in terms of the basis vectors  $|\psi_k\rangle$ ,  $k = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$ , of the subspace  $D_d$ .

The Coulombic Hamiltonian (3) involves only a single dimensional parameter, namely, the particle mass  $m$ . Consequently, for a vanishing particle mass all energy eigenvalues  $E_k$  must vanish too, as is also seen by application of the “relativistic virial theorem” proven in Refs. [7, 8]. Accordingly, in order to remain on the safe side, we consider here only the special case of a nonvanishing particle mass  $m$ :

$$m > 0.$$

Our particular choice for the basis vectors  $|\psi_k\rangle$  to be adopted here is defined by trial functions  $\psi$  given in configuration-space representation ( $r \equiv |\mathbf{x}|$ ) by<sup>2</sup>

$$\psi_k(r) = N_k r^{k+\beta-1} \exp(-m r), \quad \beta \geq 0,$$

with the normalization factor

$$N_k = \sqrt{\frac{(2m)^{2k+2\beta+1}}{4\pi \Gamma(2k+2\beta+1)}},$$

---

<sup>2</sup> A proper orthogonalization of this basis would yield basis functions which involve the (generalized) Laguerre polynomials. In some respect, this orthogonal basis appears to be more convenient for a numerical (which means, not entirely analytical) treatment of the present problem [9].

or in momentum-space representation ( $p \equiv |\mathbf{p}|$ ) by

$$\tilde{\psi}_k(p) = \tilde{N}_k \frac{\sin[(k + \beta + 1) \arctan(p/m)]}{p (p^2 + m^2)^{(k+\beta+1)/2}}, \quad \beta \geq 0,$$

with the normalization factor

$$\tilde{N}_k = \sqrt{\frac{(2m)^{2k+2\beta+1}}{2\pi^2 \Gamma(2k+2\beta+1)}} \Gamma(k + \beta + 1),$$

both of which are, of course, related simply by Fourier transformation. Whereas  $k$  indicates a positive integer,  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , the parameter  $\beta$  is introduced to allow, for some given value of the coupling constant  $\alpha$ , of a total cancellation of the divergent contributions to the expectation values of kinetic energy  $T$  and interaction potential  $V_C(r)$ :  $\beta = \beta(\alpha)$ . More precisely: in order to provide for that cancellation, the parameter  $\beta$  must be adjusted for the ground state according to the relation [10]

$$\alpha = \beta \cot\left(\frac{\pi}{2} \beta\right),$$

which implicitly determines  $\beta$  as a function of the coupling constant  $\alpha$ . In particular, this relation tells us that the critical coupling constant,  $\alpha_c$ , must be approached in the limit  $\beta \rightarrow 0$ . From the behaviour of the matrix elements  $\langle \psi_i | T | \psi_j \rangle$  of the kinetic energy  $T$  in Eq. (1) for large momenta  $p$  and of the matrix elements  $\langle \psi_i | V_C(r) | \psi_j \rangle$  of the Coulomb interaction potential  $V_C(r)$  in Eq. (2) at small distances  $r$ , respectively, it should become rather evident that, for our choice of basis states  $|\psi_k\rangle$ , these singularities will arise merely in those matrix elements which are taken with respect to  $|\psi_0\rangle$ , that is, only in  $\langle \psi_0 | T | \psi_0 \rangle$  and  $\langle \psi_0 | V_C(r) | \psi_0 \rangle$ .

The remainder of our way is straightforward to go. With the above basis functions, we obtain for the matrix elements of the kinetic energy  $T$  in Eq. (1)

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \psi_i | T | \psi_j \rangle \\ &= \frac{2^{i+j+2\beta+1} m}{\pi} \frac{\Gamma(i + \beta + 1) \Gamma(j + \beta + 1)}{\sqrt{\Gamma(2i + 2\beta + 1) \Gamma(2j + 2\beta + 1)}} \\ & \times \int_0^\infty dy \frac{\cos[(i - j) \arctan y] - \cos[(i + j + 2\beta + 2) \arctan y]}{(1 + y^2)^{(i+j+2\beta+1)/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which may be evaluated with the help of the expansion

$$\cos(N \arctan y) = \frac{1}{(1 + y^2)^{N/2}} \sum_{n=0}^N \binom{N}{n} \cos\left(\frac{n\pi}{2}\right) y^n$$

for  $N = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ,

for the matrix elements of the Coulomb interaction potential  $V_C(r)$  in Eq. (2)

$$\langle \psi_i | V_C(r) | \psi_j \rangle = - \frac{2 m \alpha \Gamma(i + j + 2 \beta)}{\sqrt{\Gamma(2 i + 2 \beta + 1) \Gamma(2 j + 2 \beta + 1)}} ,$$

and, finally, for the projections of the basis states  $|\psi_k\rangle$  onto each other

$$\langle \psi_i | \psi_j \rangle = \frac{\Gamma(i + j + 2 \beta + 1)}{\sqrt{\Gamma(2 i + 2 \beta + 1) \Gamma(2 j + 2 \beta + 1)}} .$$

Of course, some care has to be taken when extracting the singularity of the matrix element  $\langle \psi_0 | T | \psi_0 \rangle$ , which may be done by observing that

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\infty dy \frac{1 - \cos[(2 + 2 \beta) \arctan y]}{(1 + y^2)^{1/2 + \beta}} = 2 \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\infty dy \frac{y^2}{(1 + y^2)^{3/2 + \beta}} .$$

Introducing for notational simplicity a dimensionless and scaled energy eigenvalue  $\varepsilon$  by

$$\widehat{E} = \frac{2}{\pi} m \varepsilon ,$$

the characteristic equation for the Hamiltonian  $H$  in (3) thus becomes

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} 4 \ln 2 - 2 - \varepsilon & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} & \cdots \\ \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{17}{15} - \varepsilon & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix} = 0 .$$

The roots of this characteristic equation are then given, for  $d = 1$ , by

$$\varepsilon = 2 (2 \ln 2 - 1) ,$$

which entails the upper bound

$$\frac{\widehat{E}_0}{m} = 0.4918 \dots ,$$

and, for  $d = 2$ , by

$$\varepsilon = \frac{1}{15} \left( 60 \ln 2 - 23 \pm \sqrt{(60 \ln 2)^2 - 4800 \ln 2 + 1649} \right) ,$$

which entails the upper bound

$$\frac{\widehat{E}_0}{m} = 0.484288 \dots ,$$

for the ground-state eigenvalue  $E_0$  of the Coulombic Hamiltonian (3). In principle, the  $d$  (real) roots of the characteristic equation (4) may be determined algebraically up to and including the case  $d = 4$ , entailing, of course, analytic expressions of rather rapidly increasing complexity. For  $d = 4$ , this yields for the lowest-lying energy level the upper bound

$$\frac{\widehat{E}_0}{m} = 0.4842564 \dots \quad (5)$$

With respect to existing numerical determinations of energy levels, the exploration of the Hamiltonian (3) culminated so far with Ref. [11], where—with the aid of the so-called local-energy theorem for the lower bound and a standard variational procedure for the upper bound—the admissible range of the energy eigenvalue of the ground state has been narrowed down to an amazingly tiny gap. In particular, at the critical coupling constant  $\alpha_c$  this range is numerically fixed to be given by [11]

$$0.4825 \leq \frac{E_0}{m} \leq 0.4842910 \quad \text{for } \alpha = \alpha_c .$$

Comparing these numerically determined bounds on the ground-state energy level with our above upper bounds resulting algebraically from the characteristic equation (4), one immediately realizes that, already for the case  $d = 2$ , our analytical bound lies well within the numerically obtained range. Consequently, the bound derived, in particular, in the case  $d = 4$ , Eq. (5), represents, rather obviously, a clear improvement of the best upper bounds known until now for the ground-state energy eigenvalue of the spinless relativistic Coulomb problem at the critical coupling constant. Needless to say, this simple analytical investigation serves, in addition, to strengthen our confidence in merely numerically computed upper bounds.

## References

- [1] I. W. Herbst, Commun. Math. Phys. **53** (1977) 285; **55** (1977) 316 (addendum).
- [2] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, *All Around the Spinless Salpeter Equation*, in: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Quark Confinement and the Hadron Spectrum* (Como, Italy, June 1994), eds. N. Brambilla and G. M. Prosperi (World Scientific, River Edge, N. J., 1995) p. 100.
- [3] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Vienna preprint HEPHY-PUB 596/94 (1994) (unpublished);  
W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Phys. Rev. D **50** (1994) 5443.
- [4] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Vienna preprint HEPHY-PUB 632/96 (1996).
- [5] A. Martin and S. M. Roy, Phys. Lett. B **233** (1989) 407.
- [6] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics IV: Analysis of Operators* (Academic Press, New York, 1978) Sections XIII.1 and XIII.2.
- [7] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 2733.
- [8] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A5** (1990) 2473.
- [9] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Vienna preprint (in preparation).
- [10] B. Durand and L. Durand, Phys. Rev. D **28** (1983) 396; **50** (1994) 6662 (erratum);  
P. Castorina, P. Cea, G. Nardulli, and G. Paiano, Phys. Rev. D **29** (1984) 2660;  
L. J. Nickisch, L. Durand, and B. Durand, Phys. Rev. D **30** (1984) 660; **30** (1984) 1995 (erratum);  
G. Hardekopf and J. Sucher, Phys. Rev. A **31** (1985) 2020.
- [11] J. C. Raynal, S. M. Roy, V. Singh, A. Martin, and J. Stubbe, Phys. Lett. B **320** (1994) 105.