

# Comment on: Cyclic quantum–evolution dependence on the Hamiltonian and geometric phase

Ali Mostafazadeh\*

Theoretical Physics Institute, Department of Physics,  
University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta,  
Canada T6G 2J1.

April 1996

## Abstract

It is shown that the analysis and the main result of the article by L-A. Wu [Phys. Rev. A. **53**, 2053 (1996)] are completely erroneous.

PACS number: 03.65.Bz

There are a number of mistakes in the article by Wu [1]. I shall point out the most obvious ones which question the merits of the basic idea presented in this article.

According to Eq. 3 of [1], it is the phases  $e^{i\phi_j}$  which are single-valued functions, not the phase angles  $\phi_j$ . The phase angles are not single-valued. Therefore, Eq. 5 and consequently Eq. 6 of [1], in which  $N_j$  are treated as single-valued integers, are not valid as strict equations. Working with single-valued quantities, i.e.,  $e^{i\phi_j}$ , one can show that Eq. 4 of [1] together with the completeness and orthonormality of  $\{\psi_j\}$ , lead to:

$$C_j(e^{i\phi_j} - e^{i\phi}) = 0, \quad \text{for all } j.$$

Therefore, for all  $j$  with  $C_j \neq 0$ , one has  $e^{i\phi_j} = e^{i\phi}$ . But this means that:

$$\psi(\tau) = e^{i\phi} \sum_j C_j \psi_j = e^{i\phi} \psi(o). \quad (1)$$

---

\*E-mail: alimos@phys.ualberta.ca

On the other hand, since  $\psi(\tau)$  is the solution of the Schrödinger equation:

$$\psi(\tau) = U(\tau, 0)\psi(0) . \quad (2)$$

Eqs. (1) and (2) indicate that contrary to the claim made in Ref. [1],  $\psi(0)$  is an eigenstate vector of  $U(\tau, 0)$ . In fact, using the completeness of  $\{\psi_j\}$ , one can conclude that  $\psi(0)$  must be proportional to one of  $\psi_j$ 's, i.e.,  $C_j = 0$  for all  $j$  except one. The only exception to this argument is the case where  $e^{i\phi}$  is a degenerate eigenvalue of  $U(\tau, 0)$ . In this case, there may be more than one  $C_j$  that is non-vanishing. But then the geometric phase is a matrix belonging to the unitary group  $U(n)$ , where  $n$  is the degree of degeneracy, and again the analysis of Ref. [1] does not apply.

Finally I would like to comment on a remark made in Ref. [1] (first paragraph) regarding the Berry's phase being a topological phase. I must emphasize that Berry's phase and its generalization, the geometric or Aharonov-Anandan phase are by no means topological. By this I mean that unlike topological phases such as the Aharonov-Bohm phase, the geometric phase does depend on the specific shape of the curve in the parameter space or the projective Hilbert space. The qualification *geometric* means that the geometric phase is independent of the parameterization of these curves. In the case of topological phases, however, they are also invariant under arbitrary continuous deformations of these curves, alternatively the Hamiltonian. The relation between the geometric and the topological phases is that the latter is a special case of the former.

In view of these considerations, Wu's article [1] seems to lack a logical foundation. Specifically, his claim made in the abstract of his article, namely: "This paper will show that, for some specific Hamiltonians, cyclic evolution may occur, even if the initial wave function is not one of the eigenfunctions of the evolution operator," and repeated in the Summary (section VI): "This paper has shown that, for some special Hamiltonians, cyclic evolution occurs, even if the initial wave function is not one of the eigenfunctions of the evolution operator," is absolutely wrong.

## References

- [1] L-A. Wu, Phys. Rev. A. **53**, 2053 (1996).