

The Pauli Exclusion Operator: example of Hooke's atom

Tomasz M. Rusin* and Wlodek Zawadzki

Institute of Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Al. Lotników 32/46, 02-688 Warsaw, Poland

(Dated: January 12, 2021)

The Pauli Exclusion Operator (PEO) which ensures the proper symmetry of the eigenstates of multi-electron systems with respect to exchange of each pair of electrons is introduced. For two-electron states in two dimensions ($2D$) the PEO can be expressed in a closed form in terms of momentum operator, while in the position representation PEO is a non-local operator. Examples of analytical and numerical calculations of PEO are given for isotropic and anisotropic Hooke's atom in $2D$.

I. INTRODUCTION

Two-electron systems, e.g. the helium atom, were analyzed from the early years of quantum mechanics [1–3]. Since the exact solutions of such situations are not known one usually calculates the energies of low states and the corresponding wave functions using the variational method. To be consistent with the Pauli exclusion principle [4, 5] one first selects the spin state of the electron pair, that is either a singlet or a triplet, and then assumes the trial functions of two electrons to be either symmetric or antisymmetric with respect to exchange of the two particles. This approach was successfully applied to the ground energy of the helium atom as well as to its excited states [6, 7].

The Pauli exclusion principle can be introduced to the variational calculations by choosing the trial function of required symmetry with respect to exchange of the electrons. This approach may not be used in a numerical integration of the Schrodinger equation of the two electron systems since this equation does not include terms which can be related to the Pauli exclusion principle. Then, if one integrates this equation for two electrons or for two non-fermions having the same charges and masses as the electrons, then in both cases one obtains the same energies and states.

However, for the two-electron case some calculated states do not fulfill the Pauli exclusion principle and such states have to be eliminated as nonphysical ones. As an example, wave functions symmetric with respect to exchange of electrons are allowed for the singlet, but have to be eliminated for the triplet.

One can then state that, beyond the external potential and the Coulomb repulsion, there exists an additional spin-dependent field acting on both electrons which eliminates some states from the spectrum of the Hamiltonian \hat{H} . The presence of this field can be included in the model by introducing a spin-dependent operator \hat{P} responsible for the existence of the Pauli exclusion principle. The final effect of the operators \hat{H} and \hat{P} acting on the eigenstate $|\Psi(1, 2)\rangle$ of \hat{H} is that the states of the proper electron exchange symmetry are not altered but

those of the improper symmetry vanish. Then, by solving numerically the Schrodinger equation with the operator $(\hat{H} - \hat{P})$ instead of \hat{H}

$$(\hat{H} - \hat{P})|\Psi(1, 2)\rangle = E|\Psi(1, 2)\rangle, \quad (1)$$

one automatically obtains states fulfilling the Pauli exclusion principle. The main purpose of this work is to analyze the operator \hat{P} , [called further the Pauli Exclusion Operator (PEO)], in several two-electron systems. We show that in these cases it is possible to obtain PEO in a closed form. Note that PEO exists in the literature in a different meaning and it was used to calculate nuclear matter [8–10], see Discussion.

It is impossible to obtain PEO for the helium atom for two reasons. First, the Schrodinger equation of the latter does not separate into a sum of two one-electron equations, so one has to solve numerically the eigenequation in the six-dimensional space. Second, in the presence of the attractive Coulomb potential of helium nuclei there exist both localized and delocalized electron states, and the latter are difficult to be treated numerically.

There exists a model in which one avoids the above problems. This system, called the Hooke's atom, consists of two electrons in the field of N -dimensional harmonic oscillator [11–15]. In this model the Schrodinger equation separates into two equations of the center-of-mass and relative motion of electrons. For potentials with a radial symmetry one obtains two one-dimensional equations which are much easier to solve numerically. For sufficiently strong harmonic potential the spectrum of the Hooke's atom consists of the localized states alone. For these reasons we analyze here PEO in Hooke's atom model.

The work is organized as follows. In Section II we introduce the Pauli Exclusion Operator for $2D$ two-electron systems. In Section III we show examples of PEO in two $2D$ Hooke's atom models, and calculate them analytically and numerically. In Section IV we discuss the obtained results, while in the appendix we describe a numerical method of obtaining low and high energy states of the Hooke's atom. The work is concluded by the Summary.

* email: tmr@vp.pl

II. THEORY

In the atomic units the Hamiltonian of two interacting electrons in the presence of an external potential $U(\mathbf{r})$ reads

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2}\nabla_1^2 - \frac{1}{2}\nabla_2^2 + \frac{e^2}{|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|} + U(\mathbf{r}_1) + U(\mathbf{r}_2). \quad (2)$$

We consider a $2D$ case. The description given in Eq. (2) is not complete because the solutions have to be limited to those fulfilling the Pauli exclusion principle. The two-electron wave function $\Psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)$, being the eigenstate of \hat{H} should be either symmetric (for the singlet state) or antisymmetric (for triplet states) in respect to exchange $\mathbf{r}_1 \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{r}_2$. We introduce the center-of-mass $\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2)/2$ and the relative motion $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2$. In the new coordinates the exchange of electrons does not affect \mathbf{R} but changes sign of \mathbf{r} , i.e. $\mathbf{r} \rightarrow -\mathbf{r}$. Then there is

$$\Psi(\mathbf{R}, -\mathbf{r}) = \begin{cases} \Psi(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{r}) & \text{for singlet,} \\ -\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{r}) & \text{for triplets.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

In the circular coordinates $\mathbf{r} = (r, \phi)$ the change $\mathbf{r} \rightarrow -\mathbf{r}$ corresponds to the transformation: $(r, \phi) \rightarrow (r, \phi + \pi)$. We introduce symmetric (even in \mathbf{r}) and anti-symmetric (odd in \mathbf{r}) parts of $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)$

$$\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)^e = \frac{1}{2} [\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi) + \Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi + \pi)], \quad (4)$$

$$\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)^o = \frac{1}{2} [\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi) - \Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi + \pi)]. \quad (5)$$

Because of the existence of the Pauli exclusion principle one obtains two separate eigenproblems for $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)^\eta$ (with $\eta \in \{e, o\}$)

$$\hat{H}\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)^\eta = E^\eta\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)^\eta, \quad (6)$$

instead of the single problem for $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)$. We can introduce the spin-dependent operator \hat{P} , which we call the Pauli Exclusion Operator (PEO), that for a given combination of electron spins, removes even or odd states from the spectrum of \hat{H} . We define \hat{P} as [see Eq. (6)]

$$\left(\hat{H} - \hat{P}\right)\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi) = \hat{H}\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)^e, \quad (7)$$

for a symmetric function of spins \hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2 , and

$$\left(\hat{H} - \hat{P}\right)\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi) = \hat{H}\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)^o, \quad (8)$$

for antisymmetric function of \hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2 . In Eqs. (7) and (8) the operator $\left(\hat{H} - \hat{P}\right)$ acts on $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)$, while the operator \hat{H} in Eq. (6) acts on $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)^\eta$. In their spectrums the operators \hat{P} and $\left(\hat{H} - \hat{P}\right)$ contain states having opposite symmetry in respect of a change $\mathbf{r} \rightarrow -\mathbf{r}$, and sets of states belonging to both operators are disjointed. A closed form of \hat{P} for multi-electron systems

is unknown, but for two-electron Hamiltonians in $2D$ we can express \hat{P} in terms of differential operators, and as a nonlocal operator in the position representation.

To find the spectrum of \hat{P} we introduce two auxiliary operators \hat{P}^e and \hat{P}^o . Let \hat{P}^e equals \hat{P} in Eq. (7) and \hat{P}^o in Eq. (8). Let $|n\rangle$ and E_n be the states and energies of \hat{H} , respectively. Then $\hat{H} = \sum_n |n\rangle\langle n|E_n$, and

$$\hat{P}^e = \sum_{n \text{ even}} |n\rangle\langle n|E_n, \quad (9)$$

$$\hat{P}^o = \sum_{n \text{ odd}} |n\rangle\langle n|E_n, \quad (10)$$

where 'even' and 'odd' means that in the summations we restrict ourselves to states being even or odd functions of \mathbf{r} , respectively. The above form of operators \hat{P}^e and \hat{P}^o is useful if one knows all energies and states of \hat{H} . Examples of such calculations are presented in the next section. The operators \hat{P}^e and \hat{P}^o are on the same order as \hat{H} and they may not be treated as perturbations to \hat{H} . Operator \hat{P} depends on the Hamiltonian of the system and it is not an universal quantity.

Consider the functions Ψ , Ψ^o and Ψ^e in Eqs. (4) and (5). Let $\hat{T}_\mathbf{a}$ be the translation operator: $\hat{T}_\mathbf{a}w(\mathbf{r}) = w(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{a})$. Then one has [16]

$$\hat{T}_\mathbf{a} = \exp(-i\mathbf{a}\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\mathbf{r}/\hbar), \quad (11)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_\mathbf{r} = (\hbar/i)\hat{\nabla}_\mathbf{r}$ is the canonical momentum. Applying the above definition to ϕ coordinate in $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)$ one obtains from Eqs. (4), (5) and (11)

$$\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)^e = \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{I} + e^{-i\pi r \hat{p}_\phi / \hbar} \right) \Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi), \quad (12)$$

$$\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)^o = \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{I} - e^{-i\pi r \hat{p}_\phi / \hbar} \right) \Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi), \quad (13)$$

where $\hat{p}_\phi = (\hbar/ir)(\partial/\partial\phi)$ is the angular component of the momentum, and \hat{I} is the unity operator. We introduce two auxiliary operators

$$\hat{A}^e = \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{I} + e^{-i\pi r \hat{p}_\phi / \hbar} \right), \quad (14)$$

$$\hat{A}^o = \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{I} - e^{-i\pi r \hat{p}_\phi / \hbar} \right). \quad (15)$$

Then one has from Eqs. (7), (8), and (12)–(15)

$$\left(\hat{H} - \hat{P}^e\right)\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi) = \hat{H} \left[\hat{A}^o\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi) \right], \quad (16)$$

$$\left(\hat{H} - \hat{P}^o\right)\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi) = \hat{H} \left[\hat{A}^e\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi) \right]. \quad (17)$$

The meaning of Eq. (16) is that the operator $\left(\hat{H} - \hat{P}^e\right)$, which has only odd states, acting on a general function $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)$ gives the same result as the Hamiltonian \hat{H} acting on $\hat{A}^o\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)$, which is an odd part of $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)$. Solving equations (16) and (17) for \hat{P}^e and \hat{P}^o one finds

$$\hat{P}^e = \frac{1}{2}\hat{H} \left(\hat{I} + e^{-i\pi r \hat{p}_\phi / \hbar} \right), \quad (18)$$

$$\hat{P}^o = \frac{1}{2}\hat{H} \left(\hat{I} - e^{-i\pi r \hat{p}_\phi / \hbar} \right). \quad (19)$$

Introducing the total spin: $\hat{S} = \hat{s}_1 + \hat{s}_2$ one obtains

$$\hat{P} = \frac{1}{2}\hat{H} \left(\hat{I} + (-1)^{2\hat{S}_z} e^{-i\pi r \hat{p}_\phi / \hbar} \right). \quad (20)$$

Operators \hat{P}^e , \hat{P}^o and \hat{P} defined in Eqs. (18)–(20) act on the function $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)$. The representation of \hat{P} , as given in Eqs. (18)–(20), exists only in $2D$, see Discussion. Inserting \hat{P} from Eq. (20) into Eqs. (7) and (8) one does not obtain the Schrodinger equation for $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, r, \phi)^\eta$ but the differential equations of higher order in \hat{p}_ϕ , since

$$e^{-i\pi r \hat{p}_\phi / \hbar} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left(\frac{-i\pi r \hat{p}_\phi}{\hbar} \right)^n. \quad (21)$$

The presence of \hat{p}_ϕ in the exponents in Eqs. (18)–(20) causes a non-locality of \hat{P} in the position representation. Using notation: $|\mathbf{Q}\rangle = |\mathbf{R}\mathbf{r}\rangle$ and $d\mathbf{Q} = d^2\mathbf{R}d^2\mathbf{r}$ the matrix element of \hat{P}^e in Eq. (18) between two $|\mathbf{Q}\rangle$ states is

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{Q} | \hat{P}^e | \mathbf{Q}' \rangle &= \int d\mathbf{Q}'' \langle \mathbf{Q} | \hat{H} | \mathbf{Q}'' \rangle \times \\ &\langle \mathbf{Q}'' | \frac{1}{2} \left(\hat{I} + e^{-i\pi r \hat{p}_\phi / \hbar} \right) | \mathbf{Q}' \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

and similarly for \hat{P}^o . In the position representation \hat{H} in Eq. (2) is a local operator, so that: $\langle \mathbf{Q} | \hat{H} | \mathbf{Q}'' \rangle = \hat{H}_{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}''} \delta(\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{Q}'')$. The translation $e^{-i\pi r \hat{p}_\phi / \hbar}$ in Eq. (18) has nonzero elements between states $|\mathbf{R}, r, \phi\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{R}, r, \phi + \pi\rangle$, (for $0 \leq \phi < 2\pi$), i.e. between states $|\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{r}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{R}, -\mathbf{r}\rangle$. This gives

$$\langle \mathbf{Q} | \hat{P}^e | \mathbf{Q}' \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \hat{H}_{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}'} \delta(\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{R}') [\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') + \delta(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}')], \quad (23)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{Q} | \hat{P}^o | \mathbf{Q}' \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \hat{H}_{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}'} \delta(\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{R}') [\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') - \delta(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}')]. \quad (24)$$

From the above equations one has, see Eq. (20)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{r} | \hat{P} | \mathbf{R}', \mathbf{r}' \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{r} | \hat{H} | \mathbf{R}', \mathbf{r}' \rangle \delta(\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{R}') \times \\ &\times \left[\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') + (-1)^{2\hat{S}_z} \delta(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}') \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

In the position representation one obtains a non-local equation for the energy levels and wave functions

$$\hat{H}\Psi(\mathbf{Q}) - \int d^2\mathbf{Q}' \langle \mathbf{Q} | \hat{P} | \mathbf{Q}' \rangle \Psi(\mathbf{Q}') = E\Psi(\mathbf{Q}), \quad (26)$$

which resembles the Yamaguchi equation [17]. The second term in Eq. (26) describes the correction to the two-particle Hamiltonian \hat{H} due to presence of the Pauli exclusion principle. Equations (25) and (26) completely describe the system because they contain *all* information necessary to solve the two-electron problem including the limitations resulting from the Pauli exclusion principle.

Equations (23)–(25) suggest that in the position representation in $1D$ and $3D$ the PEO for two-electron systems have similar forms. Examples in the next sections confirm this observation.

III. EXAMPLES OF \hat{P} OPERATORS

Here we show two examples of \hat{P} for two-electron systems and rederive analytically or numerically the results of Eqs. (23)–(25) by explicit summations over even or odd states of the Hamiltonian spectrum, see Eqs. (9) and (10).

We consider first the Hooke's atom in $2D$ whose Hamiltonian is given in Eq. (2) with $U(\mathbf{r}_i) = kr_i^2/2$ and $i = 1, 2$ [11–15]. The harmonic potential strength is $k > 0$. Then \hat{H} separates into two parts $\hat{H}_{\mathbf{R}}$ and $\hat{H}_{\mathbf{r}}$ depending on \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{r} , respectively. The eigenfunctions of \hat{H} are $\Psi(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{r}) = F(\mathbf{R})f(\mathbf{r})$, where $F(\mathbf{R})$ and $f(\mathbf{r})$ satisfy equations

$$\left(-\frac{1}{4}\nabla_{\mathbf{R}}^2 + kR^2 \right) F(\mathbf{R}) = E_R F(\mathbf{R}), \quad (27)$$

$$\left(-\nabla_{\mathbf{r}}^2 + \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{4}kr^2 \right) f_{m,n}(\mathbf{r}) = E_{m,n} f_{m,n}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (28)$$

where $E_{m,n}$ is the energy of n -th state with the angular momentum number m . The center-of-mass motion, as given in Eq. (27), is described by $2D$ harmonic oscillator. For the relative motion in Eq. (28) we set: $f_{m,n}(\mathbf{r}) = g_{m,n}(r)e^{im\phi}/\sqrt{2\pi}$, where $g_{m,n}(r)$ are solutions of

$$\left(-\frac{d^2}{dr^2} - \frac{1}{r} \frac{d}{dr} + \frac{m^2}{r^2} + \frac{1}{r} + \frac{k}{4}r^2 \right) g_{m,n}(r) = E_{m,n} g_{m,n}(r). \quad (29)$$

Consider the operator \hat{P}^o in Eq. (10). Since $\hat{H}_{\mathbf{R}}$ in Eq. (27) is not affected by \hat{P}^o we concentrate on $\hat{H}_{\mathbf{r}}$. Let $|m, n\rangle$ be an eigenstate of Eq. (28), and $\langle \mathbf{r} | m, n \rangle = f(\mathbf{r})$. Then one has

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}^o &= \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E_{2m+1,n} |2m+1, n\rangle \langle 2m+1, n| \\ &= \hat{H} \left(\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |2m+1, n\rangle \langle 2m+1, n| \right). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

In the position representation there is

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{r} | \hat{P}^o | \mathbf{r}' \rangle &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^2\mathbf{r}'' \langle \mathbf{r} | \hat{H} | \mathbf{r}'' \rangle \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i(2m+1)(\phi'' - \phi')} \times \\ &\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_{2m+1,n}(r'')^* g_{2m+1,n}(r'). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

We first calculate the sum over n . The functions $g_{m,n}(r)$ are normalized using the weight function $w_g(r) = r$. Consider functions $h_{m,n}(r) = \sqrt{r}g_{m,n}(r)$ normalized using the weight function $w_h(r) = 1$. They are eigenfunctions of equation, see Eq. (29)

$$\left(-\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{m^2 - 1/4}{r^2} + \frac{1}{r} + \frac{k}{4}r^2 \right) h_{m,n}(r) = E_{m,n} h_{m,n}(r). \quad (32)$$

For fixed m , functions $h_{m,n}(r)$ form a complete set of states of the Hermitian operator in Eq. (29), so there is

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} h_{2m+1,n}(r'')^* h_{2m+1,n}(r') = \delta(r' - r''), \quad (33)$$

which gives

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_{2m+1,n}(r'')^* g_{2m+1,n}(r') = \frac{\delta(r' - r'')}{r''}, \quad (34)$$

and the result of summation over n does not depend on m . Consider now the sum over m in Eq. (31). Let $\xi = \phi'' - \phi'$. Then one has

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i(2m+1)\xi} = \frac{e^{i\xi}}{2\pi} \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{im(2\xi)} = \frac{e^{i\xi}}{2} \delta(\xi - N\pi), \quad (35)$$

which gives: $(\phi'' - \phi') = 0$ or $(\phi'' - \phi') = \pi$, since $(\phi' - \phi'') \in [0, 2\pi)$. In Eq. (35) we used identity: $\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{im\xi} = 2\pi\delta(\xi - 2N\pi)$ with N integer. Then one obtains

$$\langle \mathbf{r} | \hat{P}^o | \mathbf{r}' \rangle = \int d^2 \mathbf{r}'' \langle \mathbf{r} | \hat{H} | \mathbf{r}'' \rangle \times \left[\frac{1}{2} \delta(\phi'' - \phi') + \frac{e^{i\pi}}{2} \delta(\phi'' - \phi' + \pi) \right] \left[\frac{1}{r''} \delta(r'' - r') \right]. \quad (36)$$

There is $\langle \mathbf{r} | \hat{H} | \mathbf{r}'' \rangle = \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'')$ since the Hamiltonian is a local operator. Using the identity: $\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') = (1/r)\delta(r - r')\delta(\phi - \phi')$ for 2D delta function one obtains Eq. (24). The generalization of this approach to 1D and 3D Hooke's atoms is straightforward.

In the second example we calculate numerically operator \hat{P}^o in a system in which the functions $f(r, \phi)$ do not separate into products of two one-dimensional functions. Consider the model similar to the Hooke's atom in Eq. (29) but with nonradial external potential. Its Hamiltonian is given by Eq. (2) with $U(\mathbf{r}_i) = k_x x_i^2/2 + k_y y_i^2/2$ and $i = 1, 2$. The potential strengths $k_x, k_y > 0$. Introducing center-of-mass and relative motion coordinates one obtains

$$\left(-\frac{1}{4} \nabla_{\mathbf{R}}^2 + k_x X^2 + k_y Y^2 \right) F(\mathbf{R}) = E_R F(\mathbf{R}), \quad (37)$$

$$\left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} - \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi^2} + \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{4} k_y r^2 + q r^2 \cos(\phi)^2 \right) f(\mathbf{r}) = E_r f(\mathbf{r}). \quad (38)$$

where $q = k_x - k_y$ characterizes anisotropy of the external potential. To find \hat{P}^o we expand functions $f(r, \phi)$ in Eq. (38) into set of eigenstates $g_{m,n}(r)e^{im\phi}/\sqrt{2\pi}$ of the Hooke's atom, see Eq. (29)

$$f(r, \phi) = \sum_{m=-m_{max}}^{m_{max}} \sum_{n=1}^{n_{max}} b_{m,n} g_{m,n}(r) e^{im\phi}, \quad (39)$$




FIG. 1. Dimensionless sums $S^o(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1})$ and $S^e(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1})$ given in Eq. (43) calculated numerically for nonsymmetric 2D Hooke's atom in Eq. (38) for several values of relative phases $(\phi - \phi')$. The dashed lines represent sums $S^o(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1}) + S^e(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1})$ approximating delta function $\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{1})$. In panel a) the dotted line indicates ground-state function $g_{0,1}(r)$ of 2D Hooke's atom in Eq. (28).

where $b_{m,n}$ are the expansion coefficients, $m_{max} = 16$ and $n_{max} \simeq 250$. The presence of Hooke's atom functions in Eq. (29) ensures orthogonality of the basis. We used 8054 basis functions $g_{m,n}(r)$, which are calculated by the shooting method, see Appendix A. We introduce a mapping: $(m, n) \rightarrow i$ which labels the basis functions $g_{m,n}(r)$ with a single index i .

The eigenenergies and eigenstates of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (38) are obtained by solving the problem of finite-size matrix: $\sum_{i'} H_{ii'} a_{i'} = E a_i$, where a_i are uniquely obtained from $b_{m,n}$ by the mapping: $i \rightarrow (m, n)$. Using the inverse mapping $(m, n) \rightarrow i$ one has

$$H_{ii'} = E_i \delta_{i,i'} + q c_{m,m'} \int_0^{\infty} [r^2 g_{m,n}(r) g_{m',n'}(r)] r dr, \quad (40)$$

where for fixed m the functions $g_{m,n}$ are normalized: $\int_0^{\infty} g_{m,n}(r) g_{m,n'}(r) r dr = \delta_{n,n'}$. The selection rules




FIG. 2. Functions $g_{m,n}(r)$ of 2D Hooke's atom given in Eq. (29) calculated numerically for three m,n values. Function $g_{0,1}(r)$ corresponds to the ground state of the system.

for ϕ integrals are

$$\begin{aligned} c_{m,m'} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{i(m-m')\phi} \cos(\phi)^2 d\phi \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \delta_{m,m'} + \frac{1}{4} \delta_{m,m'\pm 2}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

The nonzero elements of $H_{ii'}$ are those with $m' = m$ and $m' = m \pm 2$. Let $\{f_l^e(r, \phi)\}$ be a set of eigenstates of $H_{ii'}$ obtained from even functions $g_{2m,n}(r)e^{(2m)i\phi}/\sqrt{2\pi}$, and $\{f_l^o(r, \phi)\}$ be a set of eigenstates of $H_{ii'}$ obtained from odd functions $g_{2m+1,n}(r)e^{(2m+1)i\phi}/\sqrt{2\pi}$. Then

$$\hat{P}^\eta(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \hat{H}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) \mathcal{S}^\eta(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'). \quad (42)$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}^\eta(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \sum_l f_l^\eta(r, \phi)^* f_l^\eta(r', \phi'), \quad (43)$$

and $\eta \in \{e, o\}$. Note that for $l \rightarrow \infty$ there is: $\mathcal{S}^e(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') + \mathcal{S}^o(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rightarrow \delta(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$. In our calculations we take 4146 $f_l^e(r, \phi)$ functions and 3908 $f_l^o(r, \phi)$ functions, respectively.

In Figure 1 we plot the sums $\mathcal{S}^\eta(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ in Eq. (43) for $\mathbf{r}' = \mathbf{1}$ and several $(\phi - \phi')$ values, where $\mathbf{1}$ is a unit vector in arbitrary direction. In our calculations we take $k_y = 4$ and $k_x = 9.61$, which gives $q = 1.4025$, see Eq. (28). In Figure 1a there is $(\phi - \phi') = 0$ and both sums $\mathcal{S}^\eta(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1})$ tend to $\delta(r - 1)$, where $r = |\mathbf{r}|$. We also plot the un-normalized function $g_{0,1}(r)$. It is seen that \mathcal{S}^η are more localized than $g_{0,1}(r)$ which justifies treating $\mathcal{S}^\eta(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1})$ as approximations of $\delta(r - 1)$ function.




FIG. 3. a), b), c) Dimensionless sums $S(x, x')$ given in Eq. (44) for 1D harmonic oscillator functions calculated numerically for four N_{max} values and $x' = 1$. d) Sum $S(x, 1)$ calculated for $N_{max} = 500$ compared with rescaled sum $\mathcal{S}^e(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1}) + \mathcal{S}^o(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1})$ defined in Eq. (43) and shown in Figure 1a, dashed line. The scaling factor is $c = 0.1$.

By increasing $(\phi - \phi')$ in Figures 1b and 1c the sums $\mathcal{S}^\eta(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1})$ gradually decrease, but they do not vanish because they are truncated to finite number of terms. For $(\phi - \phi') = \pi$ in Figure 1d, the sum $\mathcal{S}^e(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1})$ tends to $\delta(r - 1)$, while the sum $\mathcal{S}^o(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1})$ tends to $-\delta(r - 1)$, so their sum practically cancels out (dotted line). The above results obtained numerically in Figure 1 for a non-separable function $f(r, \phi)$ illustrate general formulas in Eqs. (23)–(25).

We notice two approximations related to Figure 1. First, the summations over angular states are limited to $0 \leq m \leq 16$, and the results may be incomplete because we omitted basis functions with higher m . Second, for fixed m we take $n \simeq 250$ radial functions $g_{m,b}(r)$ and claim that they are sufficient to approximate combinations of delta functions in Eqs. (23) and (24). Both issues are clarified in Figures 2 and 3.

In Figure 2 we show normalized functions $g_{0,1}(r)$ (ground state), $g_{16,1}(r)$, and $g_{16,200}(r)$. As seen from Figures 2b and 2c, functions having $m = 16$ practically vanish at $r = 1$ and they give negligible contributions to $\mathcal{S}^\eta(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1})$ for $0 \leq r \leq 2$, see Eq. (43). This result confirms the validity of truncating the summation over m states to $m \leq 16$ in Figure 1. Selecting larger r' and r one has to include states with larger m .

To show that finite sums \mathcal{S}^η in Figure 1 approximate the combinations of delta functions we consider the set of functions $\{\psi_n(x)\}$ being states of the one-dimensional

harmonic oscillator with potential $U(x) = x^2$. Let

$$S(x, x') = \sum_n^{N_{max}} \psi_n(x) \psi_n(x') \rightarrow \delta(x - x'). \quad (44)$$

We calculate $S(x, x')$ numerically using the recursion relation [18]: $\sqrt{\frac{n+1}{2}} \psi_{n+1}(x) = x \psi_n(x) - \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} \psi_{n-1}(x)$ with the initial conditions: $\psi_0(x) = \pi^{-1/4} \exp(-x^2/2)$ and $\psi_{-1}(x) = 0$. In Figure 3 we show $S(x, 1)$ for several values of N_{max} . As seen in Figures 3a, 3b, and 3c, when increasing N_{max} the sums $S(x, 1)$ tend to $\delta(x - 1)$. In Figure 3d we compare the sum $S(x, 1)$ for $N_{max} = 500$ with the re-scaled sum $\mathcal{S}^e(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1}) + \mathcal{S}^o(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{1})$ for $(\phi - \phi') = 0$ shown in Figure 1a. Both curves are close to each other up to a scaling factor $c = 0.1$, which confirms the delta-like character of the curves shown in Figure 1.

IV. DISCUSSION

In the previous sections we introduced the Pauli Exclusion Operator that ensures appropriate symmetry of multi-electron eigenstate, see Eqs. (7) and (8). For two-electron systems we showed three alternative representations of PEO. In Eqs. (9) and (10) we expressed PEO in terms of infinite sums over subsets of states belonging to the spectrum of the Hamiltonian. Using this method we calculated PEO for the isotropic and anisotropic Hooke's atom.

For 2D two-electron systems it is possible to express \hat{P} in terms of momentum operators, see Eqs. (18)–(20). In the position representations \hat{P} is a nonlocal operator, and the states of the two-electron Hamiltonian should be calculated from the nonlocal Yamaguchi equation rather than the Schrodinger equation, see Eqs. (25) and (26).

To compare the above approach with the standard treatment of the two-electron system we note that one can calculate its energies and states by solving the Schrodinger equation, but then one has to explicitly exclude solutions that do not satisfy the Pauli exclusion principle. In variational calculations this requirement may be achieved by choosing the trial functions with appropriate symmetry. In perturbation calculations e.g., the second correction to the energy: $E_n^{(2)} = \sum_{m \neq n} |V_{mn}|^2 / (E_n - E_m)$, one should limit the sum over the intermediate states $|m\rangle$ to those having the same symmetry as the perturbed state $|n\rangle$. In the approach proposed here the operator $(\hat{H} - \hat{P})$ ensures proper exchange symmetry of its eigenstates.

In this work we concentrate on the analysis of the Pauli Exchange Operator for 2D Hooke's atom, which is simpler than Hooke's atom in 3D. In the latter case the Hamiltonian also separates into parts depending on the center-of-mass motion and the relative motion. The states of the Hooke's atom Hamiltonian in 3D have the form $\Psi(\mathbf{r}) = g_{lm}(r) Y(\Theta, \phi)$, where $Y_{lm}(\Theta, \phi)$ are the

spherical harmonics in the standard notation. Functions $g_{l,m}(r)$ are the solutions of the equation

$$\left(-\frac{d^2}{dr^2} - \frac{2}{r} \frac{d}{dr} + \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} + \frac{1}{r} + \frac{k}{4} r^2 \right) g_{l,n}(r) = E_{l,n} g_{l,n}(r), \quad (45)$$

where $l = 0, 1, \dots$ is angular momentum number and $E_{l,n}$ are the energies. Functions $g_{l,n}(r)$ in Eq. (45) are similar to $g_{m,n}(r)$ in Eq. (29), see Figure 2. In 3D the transformation $\mathbf{r} \rightarrow -\mathbf{r}$ does not change r coordinate, but changes the angular functions

$$Y_{lm}(\Theta, \phi) \rightarrow Y_{lm}(\pi - \Theta, \phi + \pi) = (-1)^l Y_{lm}(\Theta, \phi). \quad (46)$$

Then, similarly to 2D case, the states with even l are symmetric with respect of exchange of electrons, while those with odd l are asymmetric. In 3D one may *not* express \hat{P} in terms of differential operator, because the transformation $\Theta \rightarrow \pi - \Theta$ can not be expressed in terms of translation operator, see Eqs. (11) and (20). However, representation of PEO in Eqs. (23)–(25) is valid also in 3D Hooke's atom model.

There exist two systems having two interacting electrons, i.e. the helium atom and the lithium ion. In these systems the external potential acting on the electrons is the Coulomb potential of the nuclei. The Schrodinger equations of both systems do not separate into the center-of-mass and relative motions, and in order to find eigenvalues or the eigenstates one has to use approximate methods, e.g. variational calculations, molecular orbital approximations or perturbation methods [6, 7]. These methods work correctly for low energy states but their accuracy decreases for high-energies. For this reason it is practically impossible to calculate PEO for helium atom and lithium ion by summing the eigenstates in Eqs. (9) and (10). However, the results in Figures 1 and 3 suggest that for both systems the position representation of PEO is also given in Eqs. (23)–(25). Finally, for hypothetical 2D helium atom PEO is also given by Eq. (20).

In the present paper we concentrate on PEO for two electron systems. Since the Pauli exclusion principle holds for any multi-electron situations, in the latter case one can also introduce PEO ensuring the antisymmetry of the multi-electron state. However, only in some systems one can find PEO closed form. There is no simple generalizations of our results for situations having more than two electrons. The reason is that the most general method of calculating PEO given in Eqs. (9) and (10) requires knowledge of the whole spectrum of \hat{H} , which is practically impossible to compute numerically. The other methods, as e.g. Eq. (20) or (25), are restricted to the two-electron states. However, from Eq. (26) we may expect that for multi-electron systems PEO is also a nonlocal operator.

In two-electron systems the spectrum the Hamiltonian contains only symmetric or antisymmetric states. This is not valid in multi-electron cases, since for the latter situations the solutions of the Schrodinger equations may be symmetric for the exchange of some pairs of electrons

and antisymmetric for the others. Only application of the Pauli exclusion principle selects states of \hat{H} that are antisymmetric for exchange of all pairs of electrons. In the standard approach one calculates the energy of the system using the Slater determinants. In our approach, by adding PEO to the Hamiltonian one ensures proper symmetry of the calculated states.

A practical application of PEO in realistic calculations is a possible existence of an approximate form of PEO that can be added to the Hamiltonian, see Eqs. (7) and (8). This modification would automatically ensure the correct symmetry of the resulting multi-electron states and no further corrections as e.g, inclusion of the correlation energy, would be necessary. However, no exact or approximate form of PEO in three or more electron systems is known.

PEO in literature appear previously in calculations of nuclear matter properties [8–10]. In the approach of Ref. [10] the \hat{G} matrix satisfies the Bethe-Goldstone equation

$$\hat{G} = v + v \frac{\hat{Q}}{\epsilon} \hat{G}, \quad (47)$$

where \hat{G} is the reaction matrix, v is the two-nucleon interaction, ϵ is re-scaled energy and \hat{Q} is PEO in nuclear

matter which prevents two particles from scattering into intermediate states with momenta below the Fermi energy. In some aspects this approach is similar to ours since the authors introduce an operator responsible for the Pauli exclusion principle, but PEO in the previous approach excludes some states from real or virtual scattering. In our approach PEO ensures proper symmetry of multi-electron wave function.

V. SUMMARY

In this work we introduce the Pauli Exclusion Operator which ensures proper symmetry of the states of multi-electron systems with respect to exchange of each pair of electrons. PEO is analyzed for two-electron Hamiltonian and we found its three representations. We concentrated on PEO in $2D$ in which it can be expressed in closed form. Some properties of PEO in $3D$ and $1D$ for two-electron states are discussed. PEO are calculated analytically or numerically for symmetric and antisymmetric Hooke's atoms. PEO exists also in multi-electron systems, but for the latter we can not describe them in closed forms. However, if such an operator is found in exact or approximate form it may be useful in calculating energies and states of multi-electron systems.

-
- [1] G. W. Kellner, Z. Phys. **44**, 91 (1927).
 [2] E. A. Hylleraas, Z. Phys. **48**, 469 (1928).
 [3] E. A. Hylleraas, Z. Phys. **54**, 347 (1929).
 [4] W. Pauli, Zeits. Phys. **31**, 765 (1925).
 [5] W. Pauli, Phys. Rev. **58**, 715 (1940).
 [6] H. A. Bethe and E. E. Salpeter *Quantum Mechanics of One- and Two-electron Atoms* (Academic Press, New York, 1957).
 [7] G. Tanner, K. Richter and J. M. Rost, Rev. Mod. Phys. **72**, 497 (2000).
 [8] T. Cheon and E. F. Redish, Phys. Rev. C **39**, (1989).
 [9] E. Schiller, H. Muther, and P. Czernski, Phys. Rev. C **59**, 2934 (1999); Erratum Phys. Rev. C **60**, 059901 (1999).
 [10] K. Suzuki, R. Okamoto, M. Kohno, and S. Nagata, Nucl. Phys. **A665**, 92 (2000).
 [11] S. Kais, D. R. Herschbach, and R. D. Levine, J. Chem. Phys. **91**, 7791 (1989).
 [12] M. Taut, Phys. Rev. A **48**, 3561 (1993).
 [13] M. Taut, J. Phys. A **27**, 1045 (1994).
 [14] D. P. O'Neill and P. M. W. Gill, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022505 (2003).
 [15] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hooke%27s_atom, (2020).
 [16] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Translation_operator_\(quantum_mechanics\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Translation_operator_(quantum_mechanics)), (2020).
 [17] Y. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. **95**, 1628 (1954).
 [18] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hermite_polynomials, (2020).
 [19] W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and B. P. Flannery *Numerical Numerical Recipes: The Art of Scientific Computing* (3rd ed.), (New York: Cambridge 2007), Section 18.1.
 [20] J. H. Verner, Proc. Conf. Appl. Numer. Analysis, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **228**, Springer Verlag, p. 340 (1971).
 [21] E. Hairer, S. P. Norsett, and G. Wanner, *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations I, Nonstiff Problems* (2nd ed.), (Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, Berlin, 1993) p. 181, Table 5.4.

Appendix A: Shooting method

The eigenenergies and eigenstates of Hooke's atom in Eq. (29) are found using shooting method [19]. As the initial guesses for the energies we use those of two-dimensional harmonic oscillator equal to $E_n = \sqrt{(k/4)}(2n + 1)$, $n = 0, 1, \dots, m$ and $k = 4$. Then we iteratively bracket the true energies of \hat{H} by analyzing behavior of $g_{m,n}(r)$ at large r . The advantage of the shooting method is that it is equally accurate for low and high energy states. Only functions with $m \geq 0$ were calculated since $g_{-m,n}(r) = g_{m,n}(r)$. We tabulate normalized states of Eq. (29) from $n = 1$ (ground state) to $n = 250$ and from $m = 0$ to $m = 16$.

We solve Eq. (29) using DVERK procedure which is 6-th order Runge-Kutta method [20, 21]. The accuracy of calculations has been verified by checking the orthogonality of all pairs of $g_{m,n}(r)$ and $g_{m',n'}(r)$ functions with $m = m'$ and $n \neq n'$. In each case the accuracy below 10^{-5} has been obtained.

For small r there is: $g_{0,n}(r) \simeq c_0(1+r)$ with $c_0 > 0$, and the initial conditions for DVERK procedure are: $g_{0,n}(0) = 1$, $g'_{0,n}(0) = h$, where h is the integration step, and $h \simeq 0.001 - 0.01 r_B$. For $m > 0$ and small r there is: $g_{m,n}(r) \propto r^m$, and the initial conditions for DVERK procedure are: $g_{m,n}(0) = 0$, $g'_{m,n}(0) =$

mh^{m-1} . For large m the last condition is unstable numerically, and it is replaced by: $g_{m,n}(r_0) = g_c$, $g'_{m,n}(r_0) = mg_c/r_0$, $g_c \simeq 10^{-5}$, and $g_{m,n}(r) = 0$ for $r < r_0$. Here $r_0 > 0$ and its values for $g_{m,n}(r)$ are obtained by analysis of $g_{m-1,n}(r)$ for small r . Generally, r_0 gradually increases with m .