



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

PHYSICS 137A-B

Quantum Mechanics

Deval Deliwala

August 12, 2024

Contents

1	The Quantum Regime	5
1.1	The Limits of Theories	5
1.1.1	Why did Quantum Mechanics emerge when it did?	6
1.1.2	The Utility of Quantum Mechanics	8
2	Early QM – Quantization & Wave-Particle Duality	9
2.1	The Stefan-Boltzmann Law	9
2.1.1	Rayleigh-Jeans	9
2.1.2	Planck’s Revision	10
2.2	The Photoelectric Effect	11
2.3	de Broglie & the Bohr atom	12
3	Derivation of Schrödinger’s Equation, Correspondence, Superposition, & Wave Packets	14
3.1	The Classical Wave Equation	14
3.2	Schrödinger’s Equation	16
3.3	The Correspondence Principle	18
3.4	The Principle of Superposition & Wave Packets	19
3.4.1	Wave Packets & Uncertainty Relationships	19
3.5	Back to Schrödinger	20
4	Properties of the Wave Function	22
4.1	Interpretation of Ψ	22
4.2	Expected Value & Variance	24
4.3	Measurement & Collapse of Ψ	25
4.4	Expectation values of Operators	27
4.4.1	Time Evolution of Operator Expectation Values	28
4.4.2	The Uncertainty Principle	28
5	Stationary States & the “Prime Directive”	31
5.1	Stationary States	31
5.1.1	Stationary States as an Orthonormal Basis	32
5.1.2	Stationary States Form a Complete Basis	34
5.2	The “Prime Directive”	34

6	Solving the Time-Independent Schrödinger Equation	37
6.1	The Infinite Square Well	37
6.1.1	Various Comments about the Solutions	39
6.1.2	Wave Function Curvature	41
6.1.3	Example Problem – The Prime Directive	41
6.2	The Harmonic Oscillator	44
6.2.1	Ladder Operator Algebraic Technique	45
6.2.2	Example – Expectation Value of $V(x)$	48
6.2.3	Power Series Analytic Method	49
6.3	The Free Particle	54
6.3.1	Example Problem – Trapped Wave Packet	57
6.4	The Finite Square Well	58
6.4.1	Bound States	59
6.4.2	Counting Eigenvalues	62
6.4.3	Finding Eigenvalues	64
6.4.4	Finding Bound Stationary States Example	65
6.5	The Delta Function Potential	66
6.5.1	Wave Function Solution	70
6.6	Review and Outlook	70
6.7	Transmission and Reflection	71
6.7.1	Scattering off V_δ	71
6.7.2	Scattering off a Square Well	74
6.7.3	Perfect Transmission	76
6.7.4	Comparing V_δ and the Square Well	77
7	Quantum Mechanics Formalism	81
7.1	Dirac Notation	81
7.2	Infinite Dimensional Representations and Wave Functions	83
7.2.1	Summary	84
7.3	Continuous spectra, momentum, and position wave functions	85
7.3.1	Momentum-Position Symmetry	86
7.3.2	Example Problem – Schrödinger equation to the wave equation	88
7.4	Hilbert Spaces, Hermitian Operators	89
7.4.1	Hilbert Spaces	89
7.4.2	Observables as expectations of Hermitian operators	90
7.4.3	Determinate States of Hermitian Operators	94
7.4.4	Discrete Spectra	95
7.4.5	Projection Operators	95
7.4.6	Generalized Statistical Interpretation of Measurements	96
7.4.7	Simultaneous Measurements & Commuting Operators	97
7.4.8	Generalized Uncertainty Principle	98

Chapter 1

The Quantum Regime

1.1 The Limits of Theories

As physical theories are constructed to account for patterns that emerge from observation and experiment, it is not surprising that such theories are limited by the data that inspired them, and thus are subject to failure when extended into new regimes. We are familiar with historical examples. Newton observed a world that was Galilean invariant – velocities added, observers in different Galilean frames agree on their measurements of space and time separations of events, thus $x_1 - x_2 = x'_1 - x'_2$ and $t_1 - t_2 = t'_1 - t'_2$, so that events simultaneous in one observer’s frame are also simultaneous in another’s. Yet these properties were aspects of a theory constructed to account for measurements for which the dynamics were governed by the condition

$$\frac{v^2}{c^2} \ll 1$$

Einstein’s special theory of relativity did not replace classical mechanics, but rather incorporated it – the invariant separation among events changed to $c^2(t_1 - t_2)^2 - (x_1 - x_2)^2 = \text{constant}$, but in the limit where velocities small, the classical results are all recovered and valid apart from corrections of order v^2/c^2 . Classical mechanics is an *effective theory*, fully consistent with special relativity provided measurements are restricted to the effective theory’s range of validity, $v \ll c$. If this condition is fulfilled, one can use the simpler classical theory, with confidence that the predictions made will be valid with small errors

controlled by v^2/c^2 . This is our first encounter with the *correspondence principle*.

In physics, one expects to discover the simplest theories – the most “effective” theories – first. We discovered classical mechanics first because it is the theory of falling apples, planetary motion, and sailing ships. Only when we started probing higher velocities were the limitations of the theory recognized – motivating the creation of an extended theory, special relativity.

Effective theory is one of the most powerful and pervasive concepts in modern physics. Physics can often be viewed as a tower of effective theories, with each successive layer more complete and more predictive, valid over a wider range of parameters. When we analyze an experiment, we use the effective theory lowest in this tower that is adequate for our needs. The theory will be simpler when the physics we study is accurately encoded in a smaller set of parameters. If you are dealing with a non-relativistic mechanics problem, you can of course choose to use special relativity in your analysis – but you will need to work *much* harder and you will learn no new information.

Once you have completed your analysis, the information you obtain can be “ported up” to the more general effective theories that reside above: this is the process of “matching” one effective theory to another.

In subatomic physics today the last experimentally validated member of this tower is the Standard Model (SM) – decades of experiments have established its validity, in some cases to precisions exceeding a part in a billion. But we also know there is something

more – massive neutrinos, dark matter, and dark energy provided rather direct evidence of this. There is enormous effort underway to learn more about such phenomena, so that we will have a bit more guidance from experiments about the next effective theory in the tower. This theory will not replace SM, but rather incorporate it in a generalization that accounts for the new phenomena discovered.

Just as special relativity emerged when experiments began to probe higher velocities, *quantum mechanics* emerged when experiments started to probe atomic scales. The classical mechanics in use was not only nonrelativistic, but also deterministic. Knowledge of the initial conditions (e.g. positions and velocities) and interactions among objects allow one to compute the future evolution of the system. In principle this can be done to arbitrary accuracy, as the theory places no limits on the precision with which those initial conditions can be determined, or the classical equations solved.

This aspect of classical mechanics again reflects the limited range of the data informing the theory. A second scale that further restricts the applicability of classical physics and thus the boundary beyond which a more general, quantum description must be used, is defined in terms of Planck’s reduced constant \hbar .

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta E \Delta t &\gg \hbar = 6.58 \times 10^{-16} \text{ eV s} \\ \Delta E \Delta x &\gg \hbar c = 197.3 \text{ eV nm}\end{aligned}\tag{1.1}$$

If one were to ask, is quantum mechanics relevant to a squash ball confined to a squash court, the second expression in Equation 1.1 above tells us it is only if we are interested in changes of the squash ball’s energy of about one part in 10^{70} . We are welcome to calculate the future trajectory of a squash ball using quantum mechanics, but we’ll need about 10^{70} states in our calculations. The mistakes we make in treating squash ball dynamics using deterministic classical mechanics are *extraordinarily* small. Newton gave us the right effective theory for this purpose.

But \hbar tells us where the determinism of the classical theory will fail us, and from the numbers above, the failures will begin with atomic physics, and continue as we probe the nuclear and particle scales. The

hydrogen atom has the size (Bohr radius) a_0 of about an angstrom, or ~ 0.053 nm – and its electron is bound by $E_b \sim 13.6$ eV. How these parameters relate to the expressions above we will determine later, but we observe $E_b a_0 \sim 1$. The product is certainly not large on the $\Delta E \Delta x$ scale defined above.

1.1.1 Why did Quantum Mechanics emerge when it did?

It is the usual answer: Because experiment started telling us our prevailing theories were not up to the task of understanding the emerging subatomic world. It is helpful to look back to those early times to recognize what an interesting but confusing time it was.

Photoabsorption lines

In the early 1800s photoabsorption lines in the solar spectrum – a signature of the discrete transitions between atomic levels – were observed, but there was no theory context for their interpretation. By the middle of the century, specific spectral lines were understood to be associated with specific elements, and lines seen in the laboratory were correlated with some seen in the solar spectrum. Late in the century, the work of Balmer and Rydberg revealed the regularity of the hydrogen spectrum, with $1/\lambda$, where λ is the wavelength, related to integer differences in quantities $1/n_i^2$, where n_i is an integer.

Why were the spectral lines unexpected? Classically accelerating charges radiate, but their spectra produced are continuous. Even if someone brilliant in the 19th century had managed to come up with a quasi-modern description of atoms, she would have been hard-pressed to explain why electrons are confined to orbits of definite energy, the origin of the discrete spectral lines.

The Electron’s Discovery

The first necessary steps in understanding spectra came with J.J. Thompson’s discovery of the electron in 1897, followed by Rutherford’s discovery through alpha-particle scattering of a dense nuclear core within atoms. Rutherford correctly concluded

that the nuclear mass was a multiple of the hydrogen (proton) mass. In 1911, Rutherford proposed that the atom consisted of a central positive charge surrounded by orbiting negatively charged electrons. As discussed below, the conceptual difficulties presented by the instability of such a system in classical physics led to Bohr's early quantum mechanical theory of the atom. About a decade later – 1926 – a much more complete and self-consistent theory of wave mechanics emerged when Schroedinger introduced his equation, the focus of much of this book.

Radioactivities

Concurrent with these discoveries, radioactivities associated with nuclear decays were studied by Roentgen, Becquerel, and Marie and Pierre Curie. These included x -rays, β rays (energetic electrons produced in the weak process of β decay), and nuclear fission via α (the He nucleus) emission.

The Neutron

A correct theoretical interpretation of either the structure of atoms or the radiation coming from atoms would have been nearly impossible at the turn of the last century, as some particles participating in these reactions had not even been discovered. In 1916 Chadwick studied the continuous spectrum of electrons omitted in β decay. Rather than being pleased that a spectrum (not lines) was observed, he realized a continuous spectra contradicts energy conservation if the radioactive decay released definite energy. To avoid this, Chadwick speculated that some unobserved radiation was also coming out (preserving energy conservation). In 1930, Pauli proposed this radiation was a new, spin-1/2, light elementary particle he called the neutron, which we now call the neutrino. In 1932 Chadwick discovered the “real” neutron, of nearly the same mass as the proton, which quickly resolved enormous confusion over the varying masses, charges, and angular momentum/statistics of nuclei. It is remarkable we have had a basic understanding of the constituents of the atom – the neutron, proton, and electron – for less than a century.

Quantum mechanics is the theory that grew out

of our need to understand atoms – their structure, stability, and radiation, as well as other phenomena we will discuss later. Along with special relativity, these two revolutions rocked physics early in the last century.

Further, the need to reconcile special relativity and quantum mechanics was also recognized in the 1920s. Heisenberg, Born, and Jordan took the first step in developing a conceptually autonomous and logically consistent formulation of quantum mechanics via *matrix mechanics*. One year later, Schroedinger introduced his *wave mechanics*, and another year later, Dirac proposed a relativistic equation for the electron, the Dirac equation. In 1933, in an extraordinary step, Fermi combined the new particles into a remarkably modern theory of β decay

$$n \rightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$$

His paper was actually rejected from the Physical Review for being too speculative. His theory involved the spontaneous production of new particles – the electron and neutrino are not constituents of a nucleus, but instead are produced spontaneously from the vacuum. Fermi's guess for the form of the interaction mediating beta decay was based on analogies with the Coulomb interaction of electromagnetism, though Fermi somehow recognized that there should be no electric field – the interaction occurred between all four particles at a point. He later incorporated into his theory aspects of special relativity – charges viewed in a moving frame produce currents. Four years later Gamow and Teller argued that a second interaction contributed to beta decay, involving the spins of the particles, and to account for experiment this second interaction must be of comparable strength to Fermi's interaction. Remarkably, by this point an effective theory equivalent at low energies to the SM with its vector and axial interactions was being formulated – including the capacity to account for phenomena like parity violation that would not be discovered for another 20 years. This quantum mechanics, relativity, and particle production by fields were being cobbled together in these early times. The SM, a field theory, was formulated in the 1960s, treat-

ing electromagnetism and the weak interaction as aspects of one theory, with the final step in validating the basic structure of the SM coming with the recent discovery of the Higgs Boson in 2012.




Figure 1.1: Summary of the developments leading up to and beyond wave mechanics and the Schroedinger equation

1.1.2 The Utility of Quantum Mechanics

Quantum Mechanics (QM) emerged from studies of physics at the atomic and nuclear scales, and remains the effective theory of choice for an enormous range of phenomena in materials and condensed matter, atomic physics, and nuclear physics. Such systems are typically nonrelativistic. In an atom, while the interior 1s orbital does become increasingly relativistic with increasing nuclear charge (scaling as Z^2), still the Coulomb 1s energy is less than a tenth of the electron rest mass, provided $Z < 60$. The quasi-particles of nuclear physics – bound states of quarks and gluons which we call nucleons – typically have $\frac{v^2}{c^2} \sim \frac{1}{100}$ throughout the table of nuclei. (The lack of variation is because, unlike the Coulomb interaction, the strong interaction is actually repulsive at short range, so nucleons keep their distance from one another, whether they are in deuterium or in uranium.) Yet these systems are far, far from the classical deterministic limit: a wave description and all the associated interference effects are essential to the physics. Consequently, QM is the effective theory of choice.

Second, there is a huge “buzz” surrounding QM today, sometimes termed the *second quantum revolution*. The first quantum revolution was acknowledged through a series of Nobel Prizes over the last thirty


years recognizing the development of tools for *manipulating atoms* and other quantum matter, including the laser, the maser, quantum electronics, atom traps, optical tweezers, laser cooling, ultra-fast laser pulses, optical frequency combs, and atom interferometers. I recently had the luck of being able to attend a lecture on non-local quantum entanglement given by John Clauser, who won the Nobel Prize in 2022 for his work on entanglement. The first revolution allowed physicists and others to build computers and other devices based on classical concepts like a bit – information stored as a series of 0s or 1s – while achieving new milestones in speed and storage because devices could be packed ever more densely on silicon chips.

The second revolution – quantum information and computation – envisions new devices that employ quantum mechanics directly in the manipulation and processing of information. If one envisions the two possibilities encoded in a bit as a point either at the north or south poles of a unit sphere, what’s known as the *Bloch Sphere*, its quantum mechanical analog – a qubit consisting of two interfering states carrying arbitrary phases – covers the entire surface of that sphere, vastly increasing the information that is stored and potentially read out on interrogation. Quantum mechanics is fun because it stretches your mind – the rules of the subatomic world contradict so many of those of our macroscopic one – but also prepares us for future steps, should we encounter the quantum information/computing bug.

Chapter 2

Early QM – Quantization & Wave-Particle Duality

Here we will go through early developments that helped define attributes of the theory that Schrödinger would later capture in his wave equation. These observations were in addition to some already mentioned, such as the regular but discrete patterns of lines in photoabsorption or photoemission processes of atoms.



2.1 The Stefan-Boltzmann Law

2.1.1 Rayleigh-Jeans

A black body consists of a cavity in which electromagnetic standing waves in the cavity interior have reached thermal equilibrium with the cavity walls. The walls are perfect absorbers, absorbing all incident radiation regardless of frequency, and perfect emitters, radiating energy isotropically in a spectrum we discuss below. Physics has some remarkable examples of black bodies, with the cosmic microwave background left over from the Big Bang one of the most spectacular, as the spectral deviation from a perfect black body is on the order of one part in a million (and extremely interesting from the perspective of what they tell us about the structure of the infant universe). One can envision probing the radiation by making a pin-prick in the cavity to monitor the radiation.

Figure 2.1: A cubic cavity with walls held at temperature T , and with a volume L^3 . The walls perfectly absorb all incident energy, then readmit that radiation, maintaining an equilibrium between the contained radiation and the walls characteristic of T

The Stefan-Boltzmann Law was deduced experimentally in the late 19th century: the power P radiated per unit surface area A of a black body (of course, summed over all wavelengths) is

$$P/A = \sigma T^4$$

where $\sigma \sim 5.6703 \times 10^{-8}$ Watts/ $m^2 K^4$. This law nicely reproduces observations on systems that range from heated filament in the laboratory to the surface of stars. Rayleigh and Jeans attempted to derive this law – and thus obtain an expression for the Stefan-Boltzmann constant σ – from first princi-

ples, by explicitly summing over the electromagnetic standing waves in a box. This requires one to calculate the number of standing electromagnetic modes in the box of volume L^3 . Electromagnetic waves satisfy Laplace's equation which in Cartesian coordinates is

$$\frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial z^2} + k^2 \psi = 0$$

One writes $k^2 = k_x^2 + k_y^2 + k_z^2$ and separates the equation into a product of solutions in the x, y, z directions, each of which must vanish at the boundaries at 0 and L . The solutions are

$$\psi[n_x, n_y, n_z] = N \sin\left(\frac{\pi n_x}{L} x\right) \sin\left(\frac{\pi n_y}{L} y\right) \sin\left(\frac{\pi n_z}{L} z\right)$$

$$k^2 = \frac{\pi^2}{L^2} (n_x^2 + n_y^2 + n_z^2)$$

where (n_x, n_y, n_z) are positive integers. We want to count how many modes (n_x, n_y, n_z) there are, and we can do that by switching to spherical coordinates and integrating over k , while assuming a large volume. Taking into account that $k_i/(\pi/L) = n_i$, in the large volume limit we have

$$N(k)dk = \frac{1}{8} \times 2 \times \frac{4\pi k^2 dk}{(\pi/L)^3} = \frac{V k^2 dk}{\pi^2}$$

where of course, $V = L^3$. The factor of $\frac{1}{8}$ is needed as we only want the fraction of the sphere where all $n_i > 0$, and the factor of 2 is needed because each standing wave supports both transverse electric and transverse magnetic projections. One can use a classical Boltzmann distribution to calculate the average energy per cavity mode. One finds

$$\bar{E} = \frac{\int_0^\infty E e^{-E/k_B T} dE}{\int_0^\infty e^{-E/k_B T} dE} = k_B T$$

The denominator is to account for normalization. This result applies separately to the light quanta of the same frequency in a black body cavity. We can then fold this with the expression for the number of standing wave modes, derived above, to get the energy density,

$$\frac{E}{V} = k_B T \int \frac{k^2 dk}{\pi^2} = k_B T \int \frac{8\pi \nu^2 d\nu}{c^3} = k_B T \int \frac{8\pi d\lambda}{\lambda^4}$$

where we have used the relationship between wave number, frequency, and wavelength $k = \frac{2\pi\nu}{c} = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda}$ to write equivalent formulas.

This result neither reproduces observation nor the Stefan-Boltzmann law. The calculation is not self-consistent, as the integrals diverge for large k or large ν , alternatively small λ .

2.1.2 Planck's Revision

In 1900 Planck revised the Boltzmann result for the energy per mode by replacing the classical Boltzmann integral over energy-weighted modes by a discrete sum corresponding to energy quantized as $E = nh\nu$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where h is a new physical constant. This modifies the energy/mode calculation in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{E} &= \frac{\sum_{n=0}^\infty nh\nu e^{-nh\nu/k_B T}}{\sum_{n=0}^\infty e^{-nh\nu/k_B T}} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\sum_{n=0}^\infty e^{-nh\nu/k_B T}} \frac{d}{d\frac{1}{k_B T}} \sum_{n=0}^\infty e^{-nh\nu/k_B T} \end{aligned}$$

As the sum remaining is geometric, it can be done. A bit of algebra yields


$$\bar{E} = \frac{h\nu}{e^{h\nu/k_B T} - 1}$$

and thus Planck obtained (in frequency form)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{E}{V} &= \int_0^\infty \rho_E(\nu) d\nu \\ \rho_E(\nu) &= \frac{8\pi h}{c^3} \frac{\nu^3}{e^{h\nu/k_B T} - 1} \rightarrow \begin{cases} k_B T \frac{8\pi \nu^2}{c^3} & \frac{h\nu}{k_B T} \ll 1 \\ \frac{8\pi h}{c^3} e^{-h\nu/k_B T} \nu^3 & \frac{h\nu}{k_B T} \gg 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The Rayleigh-Jeans (classical) result is obtained for small frequencies, so we recognize $h \rightarrow 0$ as the

classical limit of Planck's black-body formula. But for high frequencies the energy density as a function of frequency is now well-behaved, diminishing exponentially, very unlike the classical case. Below I plot a comparison between Rayleigh-Jeans and Planck's derivation as a function of wavelength.



Rayleigh-Jeans' prediction diverges as the wavelength of light becomes small which goes against energy conservation. Planck's revision, however, viewing light as discrete packets of energy known as *quanta*, recovers the Stefan-Boltzmann law and is well-behaved.

2.2 The Photoelectric Effect

At about the same period when the issues with black body radiation were confusing physicist, experimentalists were examining the emission of electrons from a metal surface when UV light was focused on the surface.




Figure 2.2: Basics of a photoelectric effect experimental setup

Results from such experiments produced the following phenomenology:

1. The number but not the energy of the photoelectrons depends on the light intensity;
2. Photoelectrons appear as soon as the light is turned on (within few nanoseconds), even when the light intensity is low;
3. Photoelectron energy depends on the frequency of light, with a faint blue light (higher frequency) producing more energetic electrons than an intense red light (lower frequency). If the frequency of light is too low, no emission is seen.

These results are unexpected in the classical picture of light as a wave. And at the time these experiments were done, there were many verifications of the wave nature of light. In particular, energy *from a wave* would be absorbed across the metal surface, so that to knock out an electron, one would have to wait until the area immediately around the electron had absorbed enough energy to make that possible. If the frequency of the 'wave' light were increased, with all other parameters kept fixed, the necessary period might shorten, but when the threshold for emission is reached, the electrons emitted would be similar in energy to those produced with lower frequency light.

Einstein in 1909 resolved this problem by proposing a wave-particle duality – that light sometimes acts as a wave, and other times as a photon. Following up on Planck, Einstein argued that the photoelectric effect observations were consistent with a ballistic process in which individual quanta of light of energy $h\nu$

were responsible for knocking out individual electrons from the metal. Energy conservation then yields

$$h\nu = KE_e + h\nu_0 \quad (2.1)$$

Here $h\nu_0$ is the energy required to remove an electron from the metal – the work function, which is a property of the specific metal being used – and consequently no photoelectrons are produced if the frequency of light $\nu < \nu_0$. In this picture, provided $\nu > \nu_0$, photoelectrons are expected immediately on illumination, as each photon has the ability to dislodge an electron. If the frequency of the light is increased, the energy of the photoelectron increases linearly. If the frequency is held fixed but the intensity is doubled, the photon flux and the number of photoelectron-producing collisions doubles.

This explanation is simple, yet seemed to contradict years of study of light ways interfering and undergoing diffraction – a wave phenomena. Thus the intellectual leap was the hypothesis of the wave-particle duality of light – that different aspects of light could be manifested in different experimental settings.

2.3 de Broglie & the Bohr atom

By the early 1900s, Rutherford had established that atoms had a dense nuclear core and many experiments had been done observing the absorption and emission of visible and other light from simple atoms, including hydrogen. As the binding energy in hydrogen (neglecting fine structure) is $-13.6 \text{ eV}/n^2$, where the principle quantum number takes on integer values $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, the emission lines correspond to energies

$$E_{n_i} - E_{n_f} = 13.6 \text{ eV} \left(\frac{1}{n_f^2} - \frac{1}{n_i^2} \right), \quad n_f < n_i$$

The quantum number corresponds to the orbit an electron follows. The emission lines correspond to specific wavelengths of emitted radiation as a result of

an electron falling from a higher energy level (higher quantum number n_i) to a lower energy level (lower quantum number n_f). Various “series” had been identified

$$\text{Balmer 1885 (visible):} \quad \Delta E = 13.6 \text{ eV} \left(\frac{1}{2^2} - \frac{1}{n_i^2} \right)$$

$$\text{Lyman 1906 - 14 (UV):} \quad \Delta E = 13.6 \text{ eV} \left(\frac{1}{1^2} - \frac{1}{n_i^2} \right)$$

$$\text{Paschen 1908 (IR):} \quad \Delta E = 13.6 \text{ eV} \left(\frac{1}{3^2} - \frac{1}{n_i^2} \right)$$

While Rutherford had proposed a model of atoms as electrons orbiting and bound to a nucleus, Bohr attempted to relate this idea to the emerging notion of quantization in a 1913 model. He recognized that the phenomenology above could be reproduced by a classical model of electrons in circular orbits about the nucleus, where

$$|\vec{v} \times \vec{p}| = mvr = \frac{nh}{2\pi} = n\hbar$$

where we have introduced the reduced Planck’s constant \hbar – which everyone calls “h bar.” This is the constant we will be using in quantum mechanics *much* more often. If one accepts Bohr’s hypothesis as a constraint and computes the energies, indeed one reproduces the emission results above.

The model also got two important matters right:

1. Atomic systems can exist only in certain stationary or quantized states, each characterized by a definite energy;
2. Transitions between such states can occur via emission or absorption of radiation with energy $\Delta E = h\nu$, in agreement with how both Planck and Einstein treated radiation.

But there as many unanswered questions as answered ones:

1. Why are the stationary states stationary? Since a classical electron in circular motion radiates, the electron should lose energy, spiraling into the nucleus;

2. From our modern perspective of quantum mechanics, a classical orbit with a definite radius violates the uncertainty principle

In his 1924 thesis, de Broglie offered a possible explanation of the Bohr atom that anticipated the quantum mechanics revolution about to overtake physics. The details of how his suggestion supported the Bohr atom is not critical – the idea behind it is. Noting that Einstein and Planck had treated electromagnetic waves as particles, de Broglie suggested that perhaps *particles* (the electron in this case) sometimes behave as *waves*. This is quantum mechanics. For a photon,

$$p_\gamma = \frac{h\nu}{c} = \frac{h}{\lambda}$$

so perhaps a massive particle satisfies the same relationship:

$$p_e = m_e v = \frac{h}{\lambda} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lambda = \frac{h}{m_e v} \quad (2.2)$$

Where λ in this case, is the particle's de Broglie wavelength. Yes, particles have a wavelength.

If one calculates the de Broglie wavelength of an electron moving at $v/c \sim 0.01$, one finds $\lambda \sim 2$ angstroms – so about the circumference of an atom.

De Broglie was able to account for the Bohr model by assuming that electronic orbits in hydrogen correspond to an integer number of de Broglie wavelengths.




Figure 2.3: de Broglie proposed that atomic orbits correspond to an integer number of de Broglie wavelengths. The figure shows a slight mismatch at the top which means that the radius should be adjusted to remove this discontinuity.

Chapter 3

Derivation of Schrödinger's Equation, Correspondence, Superposition, & Wave Packets

3.1 The Classical Wave Equation





Figure 3.1: Example of a very intuitive wave phenomena, but mathematically a slightly complicated one. The one-dimensional cut of this wave shows the oscillation is damped.

Since the propagation of the wave is radial and the amplitude decreases as the radius increases, the simplest stationary wave function reads:

$$A(r) = A_0 \frac{\sin r}{r}$$

where $A(r)$ is the displacement of the water at position r and A_0 indicates the amplitude at $r = 0$. A mathematically much simpler wave equation is the sine wave displayed below:



The wave function of the sinusoidal wave above is given by

$$A(x, t) = A_0 \sin(kx - \omega t) \quad (3.1)$$

where $A_0 = 1$ and $k = 1$, $\omega t = 0$. Here k is the wave number and ω is the angular frequency. Note that the two parameters together describe the *phase velocity* of the wave:

$$v = \frac{\omega}{k} \quad (3.2)$$

By taking the second derivative of Equation 3.1 with respect to x and t and using Equation 3.2:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 A(x, t)}{\partial x^2} &= -k^2 A_0 \sin(kx - \omega t) \\ \frac{\partial^2 A(x, t)}{\partial t^2} &= -\omega^2 A_0 \sin(kx - \omega t) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial^2 A(x, t)}{\partial t^2} = \frac{\omega^2}{k^2} \frac{\partial^2 A(x, t)}{\partial x^2} = v^2 \frac{\partial^2 A(x, t)}{\partial x^2} \quad (3.3)$$

Equation 3.3 is the wave differential equation in classical mechanics. All parameters in the equation are real and physical. For the three dimensional problem this equation is given in the form of the Laplacian Operator ∇^2 :

$$\frac{\partial^2 A(\vec{r}, t)}{\partial t^2} = v^2 \nabla^2 A(\vec{r}, t) \quad (3.4)$$

Note that, since the cosine function can also describe this wave, it is possible to generalize this function via Euler's formula:

$$A(x, t) = A_0 e^{i(kx - \omega t)} \quad (3.5)$$

3.2 Schrödinger's Equation

Now that we are equipped with the classical definition of a wave, we can imbue Equation 3.5 with our knowledge of Energy and de Broglie's wavelength.

We now know the energy of electromagnetic waves is carried out by quanta (packets of energy) known as photons. Each photon carries with it an energy given by Equation 2.1:

$$E = h\nu = \hbar\omega \quad \hbar = h/2\pi \quad (3.6)$$

We also know each photon is characterized by its de Broglie wavelength given by Equation 2.2

$$\lambda = \frac{h}{p} \quad (3.7)$$

By using Equation 3.7, and the relation between the wave number and wavelength $k = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda}$, we obtain

$$k = 2\pi \frac{p}{h} = \frac{p}{\hbar}$$

And with the help of Equation 3.6, we can recast the original classical wave Equation 3.5 into the form

$$\Psi(x, t) = \Psi_0 e^{i(px - Et)/\hbar} \quad (3.8)$$

where we have replaced the displacement $A(x, t)$ with $\Psi(x, t)$ along with the amplitude to indicate it is a quantum wave function.

Now, since we are talking about a non-relativistic free particle described by a plane wave, the total energy of the particle is just its kinetic energy, $E = p^2/2m$. By using this fact and taking the first derivative of Equation 3.8 with respect to t , as well as the second derivative with respect to x , we obtain

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \Psi(x, t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2 \Psi(x, t)}{\partial x^2} \quad (3.9)$$

which is the wave equation for a free particle of mass m . Since the right hand side of Equation 3.9 corresponds to the kinetic energy KE , we may generalize this equation to describe a particle moving under the influence of a potential energy V . In the three dimensional coordinate system we get

$$i\hbar = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \Psi(\vec{r}, t) + V(\vec{r}) \Psi(\vec{r}, t) \quad (3.10)$$

where we have used the fact that the total energy $E = KE + V$. Equation 3.10 is the Schrödinger Equation in its general form. In one dimension, Schrödinger's Equation takes the form

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \Psi(x, t)}{\partial t} = \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + V(x) \right] \Psi(x, t). \quad (3.11)$$

This completes the derivation of the Schrödinger Equation. It is not rigorous by any means, however I feel it provides an intuition behind Schrödinger's Equation that many Quantum Mechanics textbooks/courses skim over.

3.3 The Correspondence Principle

The first chapter stressed that conceptional progress in physics is usually a process where an existing theory is not replaced by, but is instead subsumed into a more general theory that extends the scope and range of validity of the original theory. That is, Quantum Mechanics should not *replace* classical mechanics, but instead should include it within its wider scope.

This concept is incorporated in quantum mechanics via the *correspondence principle*. It states that classical mechanics emerges as a limit of quantum mechanics for large quantum numbers. For example, the bound states of a hydrogen atom have energies of $-13.6 \text{ eV}/n^2$. Thus n can be increased without limit, and this process ultimately produces bound orbits with binding energies that approach zero, and with radii that steadily increase, scaling as n^2 . Hydrogen (and other atoms) in such highly excited bound states are called *Rydberg atoms*. Their electron orbits approach the classical limit – the electron moves in a Keplerian orbit. This can be shown explicitly.

Another aspect of the correspondence principle is that the classical limit can also be obtained by altering quantum mechanics by taking the limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. In classical mechanics when one throws a ball from point x at time t_x that is caught by a receiver at point y at time t_y , the ball follows a precise path which we can calculate from Newton's laws. The path minimizes the action – the difference between the kinetic energy and potential energy, integrated along the time coordinate of the classical path,

$$S = \int_{t_x}^{t_y} [KE - V] dt.$$

If you sample any path other than the one given by Newton's Laws, the action along the path will be higher. Note that the action carries the same units as Planck's constant h – energy \times time.

There is formulation of quantum mechanics, equivalent to the one we will use in this class, in terms of paths. It provides a very intuitive picture of the relationship of quantum mechanics and classical me-

chanics. In quantum mechanics you are allowed to propagate from x to y by many paths – but the further a path deviates from the classical path, the less probable it is. One pays a “penalty” for increasing the action via a path other than the classical path – the bigger the increase in the action, the stiffer the penalty. Now to convert action to a number – something that could possibly lead to a probability – one needs a unit. h is that unit. The classical path remains the best path, but there are many many others that, though each may be somewhat less probable than the classical path, will contribute. The larger the deviation of the action from its classical path, the bigger the penalty one pays in units of h , and thus the less probable the path. So the difference between classical mechanics and quantum mechanics is that the former has a single defined path, while in the latter many, many paths are allowed, ‘fuzzifying’ (that’s probably not a word!) out the classical path – but not too much because of the heavy penalty one pays for taking a distant path. Classical mechanics is recovered by taking $h \rightarrow 0$. All penalties become infinite, so only the classical path is allowed. This is a beautiful way to think about Planck's constant, though is a little ‘hand-wavy.’

The penalty one pays actually arises from the *interference* among paths. If we represent the action by S , the weighting of a path is

$$e^{iS/\hbar}$$

so that a large excess in the action causes rapid fluctuations with respect to the classical path and its nearest neighbors, leading to destructive interference among paths. In contrast, paths near the classical path have slowly varying relative phases, and thus tend to cohere. If one drives $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ constructive interference among paths only occurs for paths increasingly near the classical one. At $\hbar = 0$ one converges to the classical path. I think this gives one a much deeper feel for the physics of Planck's constant – how it governs the deviations from classical mechanics – and helps one visualize how the classical limit is achieved as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. In summary,

Correspondence Principle

Quantum Mechanics becomes Classical as

$$n \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{or as} \quad \hbar \rightarrow 0.$$

3.4 The Principle of Superposition & Wave Packets

Any theory that would generalize classical mechanics should be required to reproduce classical mechanics in appropriate limits. The accumulation of phenomena in the early years of the 20th century indicating that light could behave as a particle and that particles could behave as waves, led us to a path where particles with definite positions and momenta gave way to a description in terms of waves and wave packets. Therefore, before we introduce the wave equation, we should remind ourselves of some of the properties achievable through waves.

Familiar wave equations are those for sound in air or waves in water, which in 1D take the form

$$\frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x^2} = \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial t^2}$$

We can look for solutions of this equation in the form of an oscillation wave.

$$\psi(x, t) = \phi(x)e^{i\omega t} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{\partial^2 \phi(x)}{\partial x^2} = -\frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \phi(x)$$

and we find

$$\phi(x) = e^{ikx} \quad \text{where} \quad c^2 k^2 = \omega^2$$

so that

$$\psi(x, t) = e^{i(kx - \omega t)} \quad \text{with} \quad k(\omega) = \pm \frac{\omega}{c}$$

This is the solution we found for Equation 3.5. These plane wave solutions are extended, covering the entire range of x . An important property of this

equation is that it is linear in ψ . This leads to the principle of superposition:

Principle of Superposition

If $\psi_1(\vec{x}, t)$ and $\psi_2(\vec{x}, t)$ satisfy the wave equation, so does $\psi_1(\vec{x}, t) + \psi_2(\vec{x}, t)$.

This property allows one to build *wave packets*, as you would get by throwing a stone into the middle of a quiet pond. Such a localized wave can be made from superpositions of the extended plan waves derived above. An example is given below.

It would be very difficult to envision a successful theory of Quantum Mechanics that lacked this property. The correspondence principle requires us to be able to create localized particles, and we know how to build localized wave packets from waves via Fourier Analysis:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x, t=0) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(k) e^{ikx} dk \\ \phi(k) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi(x, t=0) e^{-ikx} dx \end{aligned}$$

For example, let

$$\psi(x, t=0) = e^{-x^2/a^2}$$

Then,

$$\psi(x, t=0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-a^2 k^2/4} e^{ikx} dk$$

We can easily build a Gaussian wave packet out of plane waves, but the equivalent infinite sum of plane waves would not be a solution of our quantum mechanical wave equation unless the superposition principle holds.

3.4.1 Wave Packets & Uncertainty Relationships

The simple Gaussian example shown above illustrates another important property of wave packets. There is a size scale associated with our coordinate-space

wave packet, with $\Delta x \sim a$. But we see the smaller a – the more localized in x – the broader the range of contributing momentum-space (k) waves. That is,

$$e^{-a^2 k^2/4} = e^{-k^2/(2/a)^2} \Rightarrow \Delta k = \frac{2}{a}$$

Consequently $\Delta x \Delta k \sim 1$. A property of wave packets is the more they are *localized* in coordinate (x) space, the more they *delocalize* in momentum space. Thus as a wave theory, we would expect quantum mechanics to have an *uncertainty principle* that prevents us from simultaneously having particle locations and momenta. As the de Broglie relation (Equation 2.2) gives us $p = \frac{h}{\lambda} = \frac{h}{2\pi} k$ so that $\Delta k = \Delta p/\hbar$, it is not surprising that Quantum Mechanics has an uncertainty principle relating the product of coordinate and momentum uncertainties to \hbar . Its precise form is

$$\Delta x \Delta p \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}$$

We will do a more precise and rigorous derivation of *Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle* utilizing the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality in the near future.

3.5 Back to Schrödinger

In 1D, Schrödinger's Equation takes the form

$$\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + V(x) \right] \Psi(x, t) = i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi(x, t)$$

with the external potential $V(x)$ unspecified. As we saw, this equation is a fairly gentle variation of the sound/water wave equation we discussed, with a couple interesting differences.

So what does this equation mean? Staring at the LHS, the potential is clear, while the derivative term can be rewritten in a way that clarifies units

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} = -\frac{\hbar^2 c^2}{2mc^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}$$

As $(\hbar c)^2$ has units of (Energy-Distance)², mc^2 is an energy, and $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}$ has units of (distance)⁻², the first term on the LHS is an energy, and by the “what else can it be” argument, must be the kinetic energy. Classically this is $p^2/2m$. But $p^2/2m + V = E$, so on the RHS, the differential operator must be generating E . The requirement that Schrödinger's Equation with its differential operator corresponds with energy conservation allows us to identify the equations differential operators with a classical view.

We define the momentum operator \hat{p}

$$\hat{p} \equiv \frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \quad (3.12)$$

And the energy operator \hat{E}

$$\hat{E} \equiv i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \quad (3.13)$$

Therefore, we can rewrite Schrödinger's Equation using these operators as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + V(x) \right] \Psi(x, t) &= i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi(x, t) \\ \left[\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + V(x) \right] \Psi(x, t) &= \hat{E} \Psi(x, t) \end{aligned}$$

We indicate that \hat{p} and \hat{E} are Quantum Mechanical operators by giving them “hats.” They are differential operators that act on the wave function.

One of the most important differences between the QM wave equation and the wave equation for sound/water, is that the latter is quadratic in its space and time differential operators, while the Schrödinger Equation is quadratic in space but *linear in time*. The time-linearity of the Schrödinger Equation is a reflection of the non-relativistic relationship between a particles momentum and its energy – a consequence of building theory beyond classical mechanics that extends to our reach and beyond

the atomic scale, but shares with the nonrelativistic restrictions associated with classical mechanics. The linear-in-time nature of the Schrödinger Equation naturally leads to complex wave functions. As measurements involve *real* quantities, the connection between wave functions and observables requires discussion – the topic of next chapter.

I will quickly also note that our plane-wave solution of the Schrödinger Equation has a characteristic wavelength. The length of a wave corresponds to the distance required to change the phase by 2π , at a fixed time t . That is,

$$2\pi = \frac{p\Delta x}{\hbar} \equiv \frac{p\lambda}{\hbar}$$

Thus,

$$\lambda = \frac{2\pi\hbar}{p} = \frac{h}{p}$$

That is precisely de Broglie's wavelength!

Chapter 4

Properties of the Wave Function

4.1 Interpretation of Ψ

Given that we can solve Schrödinger's equation to generate a wave function $\Psi(x, t)$, the most natural first question to ask is “What is Ψ ?”. As the wave function for a particle is generally complex, Ψ cannot be associated with measurements. Instead, in the case of a wave function spread over a range of possible coordinates x , we identify the product of $\Psi(x, t)$ with its complex conjugate, $\Psi^*(x, t)$, as the *position probability density*.

$$P(x, t) = \text{position probability density} = \Psi^*(x, t)\Psi(x, t) = |\Psi(x, t)|^2$$

Therefore,

$$dP(x, t) \equiv |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx$$

is the probability of finding the particle in a region dx around x if the measurement is made at time t .

Generally this is the provided definition for what $\Psi(x, t)$ is – the function that when multiplied by its complex conjugate produces the position probability density of the particle it represents. Later however, when we encounter Dirac notation, we will learn of a much more intuitive and rigorous definition for Ψ . But for now, position probability density works.

Now since $|\Psi(x, t)|^2$ is a probability density, it follows that the integral of $|\Psi(x, t)|^2$ over all x must be 1 – the particle has to exist somewhere! Therefore, we require the *normalization condition* of the wave function:

$$\int_{\Omega} |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx = 1 \tag{4.1}$$

where the integral extends over the domain Ω , where the wave function is defined. If we are discussing a free particle, it may be all of space, $-\infty < x < \infty$. Or perhaps if we consider a particle confined within a potential well with infinitely high walls where the width of the well is a – a problem we consider *very*

soon, then the relevant boundaries of the integral may be $-a/2 < x < a/2$. Regardless of the situation, the particle has to exist somewhere, so we must require the normalization condition for all particles.

Of course, wave functions $\Psi(x, t)$ we obtain from solving Schrodinger's Equation have in general some arbitrary normalization. In that case we quantum mechanics have to fix that situation. If when we compute

$$\int_D |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx = N$$

Then we form the normalized wave function $\Psi_N(x, t)$

$$\Psi_N(x, t) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \Psi(x, t) \quad (4.2)$$

The wave function we use is the normalized one, $\Psi_N(x, t)$. But wait! suppose I normalize some way function at time $t = 0$. How do I know it *stays* normalized as time passes and $\Psi(x, t)$ evolves? Luckily, Schrödinger's Equation has the remarkable property that it *preserves* the normalization of the wave function. If this wasn't true, building a working theory of Quantum Mechanics would be a nightmare (at least, more of a nightmare). Because of how important this normalization-preservation fact is, I provide a proof, which utilizes the Schrödinger equation. We start by expanding the following time derivative:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx. \quad (4.3)$$

By the product rule,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\Psi(x, t)|^2 = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} [\Psi^*(x, t) \Psi(x, t)] = \Psi^* \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \Psi^*}{\partial t} \Psi. \quad (4.4)$$

Now the Schrödinger equation states

$$\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = \frac{i\hbar}{2m} \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial x^2} - \frac{i}{\hbar} V \Psi, \quad (4.5)$$

and hence also (taking the complex conjugate of Equation 4.5,

$$\frac{\partial \Psi^*}{\partial t} = -\frac{i\hbar}{2m} \frac{\partial^2 \Psi^*}{\partial x^2} + \frac{i}{\hbar} V \Psi^*. \quad (4.6)$$

Therefore, substituting in Equation 4.5 and Equation 4.6 into Equation 4.4,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\Psi|^2 = \frac{i\hbar}{2m} \left(\Psi^* \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial^2 \Psi^*}{\partial x^2} \Psi \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[\frac{i\hbar}{2m} \left(\Psi^* \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \Psi^*}{\partial x} \Psi \right) \right]. \quad (4.7)$$

The integral in Equation 4.3 can now be evaluated explicitly:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx = \frac{i\hbar}{2m} \left(\Psi^* \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \Psi^*}{\partial x} \Psi \right) \Bigg|_{-\infty}^{\infty}$$

And since $\Psi(x, t) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$ – otherwise the wave function would not be normalizable – it follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

Therefore, the integral is independent of time – if Ψ is normalized at $t = 0$, it *stays* normalized for all future time.

4.2 Expected Value & Variance

As $|\Psi(x, t)|^2$ represents a probability distribution, we can determine properties of this distribution by evaluating various moments of the outcome variable. The simplest would be the zeroth moment, defined here as the unweighted moment, which just checks that

$$\langle 1 \rangle \equiv \int_{\Omega} 1 |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx = 1$$

The next is the first moment – called the expected value (basically the mean) –

$$\langle x \rangle \equiv \int_{\Omega} x |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx \quad (4.9)$$

If one measured the position x of a particle with an identical wave function $\Psi(x, t)$, and recorded its value an infinite amount of times. The average of the recorded measurements is the mean, or expected value. Therefore, $\langle x \rangle$ is the most-likely x to come as an outcome of measuring $\Psi(x, t)$. This intuitively makes sense if you think of Equation 4.9 as an infinite discrete sum $\langle x \rangle = \sum_N x_N |\Psi(x, t)|^2$. We multiply each possible outcome x_N by the likelihood of this outcome $|\Psi(x, t)|^2$, and afterward sum up all our values, producing a ‘weighted average,’ or the mean/expected value.

The second moment of most interest is the variance. The second moment about the mean

$$\langle x - \langle x \rangle \rangle^2 \equiv \int_{\Omega} (x - \langle x \rangle)^2 |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx$$

And since $\langle x \rangle$ is just a number,

$$\langle x - \langle x \rangle \rangle^2 = \langle x^2 \rangle - \langle x \rangle^2 \geq 0$$

So knowledge of the first and second moments

$$\langle x \rangle = \int_{\Omega} x |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx \quad \langle x^2 \rangle = \int_{\Omega} x^2 |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx$$

allows one to calculate the variance. The standard deviation

$$\sigma \equiv \sqrt{\langle x - \langle x \rangle \rangle^2}$$

For distributions approximately Gaussian, the probability that an outcome will be within 1σ of the mean is about 2/3rds.

4.3 Measurement & Collapse of Ψ

A pitcher threw a fastball, and the hitter land off. The ball was caught by the catcher. But the umpire said nothing. Finally the batter said, “Well what was it, a ball or a strike?” The umpire replied “It ain’t nothing til I call it.” This is a pretty good description of the relationship of wave functions to measurement.

The position of an electron may be described by a probability $|\Psi(x, t)|^2$ that is nonzero over some range in x , but when a measurement is done, the electron’s location will be found to be some definite outcome x_1 . If a million measurement experiments were prepared, all with the same identical initial conditions, each would likely yield a definite value on making a measurement producing $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{1000000}\}$. The individual experiments likely yield different results, but Quantum Mechanics tells us that if we look at the *distribution* of measurements, it will match $|\Psi(x, t)|^2$. This is known as the Copenhagen interpretation of Quantum Mechanics – $|\Psi(x, t)|^2$ predicts the probabilities of all possible outcomes x_i , but does not tell us the specific value x_i that emerges from a specific measurement.

This implies something interesting about measurement – it impacts the wave function. If one makes a measurement producing the result x_1 at some time t , then repeats the measurement immediately afterwards, at some time $t + \delta t$, then the same outcome $x_2 \sim x_1$ (within some small δx) will be obtained. The first measurement impacted the wave function, *collapsing* it, greatly narrowing the possibilities.

This intuitively makes sense. If we measure a particles position and get some value x_i , and if we immediately perform another measurement within some δt , the particle could not have moved *that much* from its initial position x_i in such a small δt . This means the position probability density becomes more narrow and localized around $x \sim x_i$. How narrow the $|\Psi(x, t + \delta t)|^2$ becomes after measurement depends on how precisely the measurement was done. We have also already mentioned the uncertainty principle, the notion that the better one defines x , the broader the spread in p . So this new, more localized, wave packet, very narrow in x , will contain, as a result of the measurement, many high-momentum components – a really wide spread of the ‘momentum probability density’.




Figure 4.1: Performing a measurement collapses the wave function. Here, we consider that a measurement produces a value $x \sim -x_i$ for the particle. As a result the final position probability density is very narrow around $x = -x_i$.




Figure 4.2: A narrow $|\Psi(x, t)|^2$ (a) implies a very spread $|\Phi(p, t)|^2$ (b). Since coordinate-space wave packets and momentum-space packets are inverse Fourier transforms of one another, $\Psi(x, t)$ and $\Phi(p, t)$ are inverse F.T.'s of one another. Note from this moment on Ψ refers to coordinate-space and Φ refers to momentum-space.

Therefore, since a narrower coordinate-space wave packet contains many high-momentum and therefore high-velocity momentum-space wave packets, the particle moves *very* fast after an initial measurement. This means that the *narrower* $|\Psi(x, t)|^2$, after measurement, the *faster* $|\Psi(x, t)|^2$ *will spread*.

The more precise the measurement of x_1 , the larger the spread in momentum-space components – and the faster $|\Psi(x, t)|^2$ will spread. Thus if you do not make the second measurement immediately, but wait some significant time, you likely will not get an x_2 very near x_1 .

This is not classical mechanics, but a new theory guided by intuitive rules, and they are easy for us to embrace. The ideas are quite beautiful. We have not yet actually solved any Quantum Mechanics problems up to this point, but that is fine. If you are beginning to *intuitively understand* how the subatomic world works, that intuition will guide you as you begin to solve problems. Quantum Mechanics makes sense!

4.4 Expectation values of Operators

In our discussion of probability distributions and moments – means and standard deviations – we emphasized their importance in characterizing distribution functions, but the discussion directly above about measurement now takes us beyond the math, into the physics. If the outcome of our experiment is a particle's position, and if we repeat the experiment with identical initial conditions a thousand times, then we have already shown how the mean of those position outcomes relate to the wave function

$$\langle x \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx$$

In fact, we can rewrite this statement in a slightly different way that corresponds better to the concept of measurement,

$$\langle \hat{x} \rangle \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Psi^*(x, t) \hat{x} \Psi(x, t) dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Psi^*(x, t) x \Psi(x, t) dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx$$

It may seem like semantics at this point, but think of \hat{x} as an operator that *interrogates* the wave function (the process of taking a measurement), and x as the *outcome* of the interrogation (the experimental result).

The momentum operator provides another example of the distinction drawn above – interrogation vs. outcome. We deduced the momentum operator from our discussion of the Schrödinger equation in Equation 3.12. Therefore,

$$\langle \hat{p} \rangle \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Psi^*(x, t) \hat{p} \Psi(x, t) dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Psi^*(x, t) \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) \Psi(x, t) dx \quad (4.10)$$

Here we can write out the needed interrogation operator for our coordinate-space wave function, but we can't actually evaluate the outcome if we do not have an explicit form for our wave function. But if someone tells you that $\Psi(x, t)$ is a normalized plane wave confined to a 1D “volume” of length L , then you can carry out the interrogation to obtain the outcome

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} e^{i(p_0 x - E_0 t)/\hbar} \text{ where } E_0 = E_0(p) = p_0^2/2m \Rightarrow \\ \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} \Psi^*(x, t) \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) \Psi(x, t) dx &= \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} \Psi^*(x, t) p_0 \Psi(x, t) dx = p_0 \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} |\Psi(x, t)|^2 dx = p_0 \end{aligned}$$

I should stress that p_0 is just a number in the work above – a parameter defining the wave function.

4.4.1 Time Evolution of Operator Expectation Values

Consider an operator \hat{x} or \hat{p} that itself does not depend on time, but where the wave function it acts on *is* evolving in time. This would be the case, for example, of a wave packet moving with some velocity. Operator expectation values would then evolve in time because of the wave function changing. Following the same steps we employed to demonstrate that normalizations do not evolve in time, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\langle\hat{x}\rangle}{dt} &= \frac{i\hbar}{2m} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[\Psi^*(x,t) \frac{\partial\Psi(x,t)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial\Psi^*(x,t)}{\partial x} \Psi(x,t) \right] dx \\ &= -\frac{i\hbar}{2m} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\Psi^*(x,t) \frac{\partial\Psi(x,t)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial\Psi^*(x,t)}{\partial x} \Psi(x,t) \right] dx \\ &= -\frac{i\hbar}{m} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Psi^*(x,t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \Psi(x,t) dx = \frac{1}{m} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Psi^*(x,t) \left(\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) \Psi(x,t) dx\end{aligned}$$

where we integrated by parts to get the second step, assuming that the wave packet vanishes at the boundaries; and then integrated by parts again in the third line. Thus we find

$$\frac{d\langle\hat{x}\rangle}{dt} = \frac{\langle\hat{p}\rangle}{m} \equiv \langle\hat{v}\rangle$$

One can repeat the steps above starting with $\frac{d\langle\hat{p}\rangle}{dt}$ to find

$$\frac{d\langle\hat{p}\rangle}{dt} = \left\langle -\frac{\partial V}{\partial x} \right\rangle$$

which we recognize as Newton's second law. These two results constitute

Ehrenfest's Theorem

An example of the correspondence principle – expectation values obey the corresponding classical laws of motion.

4.4.2 The Uncertainty Principle

If you have taken linear algebra, you may have seen the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality. If \vec{u} and \vec{v} are two vectors in some vector space, then

$$\vec{u} \cdot \vec{u} \vec{v} \cdot \vec{v} \geq |\vec{u} \cdot \vec{v}|^2$$

For functions there is an analogous Cauchy-Schwarz Identity

$$\int |f(x)|^2 dx \int |g(x)|^2 dx \geq \left| \int f^*(x) g(x) dx \right|^2$$

We make the following definitions:

$$(\sigma_x)^2 \equiv \langle (\hat{x} - \langle \hat{x} \rangle)^2 \rangle = \langle \hat{x}^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{x} \rangle^2 \quad (\sigma_p)^2 \equiv \langle (\hat{p} - \langle \hat{p} \rangle)^2 \rangle = \langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{p} \rangle^2$$

and the following substitutions into the Cauchy-Schwarz Identity

$$f(x) \rightarrow (\hat{x} - \langle \hat{x} \rangle) \Psi(x, t) \quad \text{and} \quad g(x) \rightarrow (\hat{p} - \langle \hat{p} \rangle) \Psi(x, t)$$

The LHS is seen to be

$$(\sigma_x)^2 (\sigma_y)^2$$

while the RHS can be manipulated into the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} \left| \int \psi^*(x, t) [(\hat{x} - \langle \hat{x} \rangle)(\hat{p} - \langle \hat{p} \rangle) - (\hat{p} - \langle \hat{p} \rangle)(\hat{x} - \langle \hat{x} \rangle)] \Psi(x, t) dx \right|^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{4} \left| \int \psi^*(x, t) [(\hat{x} - \langle \hat{x} \rangle)(\hat{p} - \langle \hat{p} \rangle) + (\hat{p} - \langle \hat{p} \rangle)(\hat{x} - \langle \hat{x} \rangle)] \Psi(x, t) dx \right|^2 \\ & \geq \frac{1}{4} \left| \int \psi^*(x, t) [(\hat{x} - \langle \hat{x} \rangle)(\hat{p} - \langle \hat{p} \rangle) - (\hat{p} - \langle \hat{p} \rangle)(\hat{x} - \langle \hat{x} \rangle)] \Psi(x, t) dx \right|^2 \end{aligned}$$

as we have the sum of two positive definite terms. Now by direct evaluation you can show

$$[(\hat{x} - \langle \hat{x} \rangle)(\hat{p} - \langle \hat{p} \rangle) - (\hat{p} - \langle \hat{p} \rangle)(\hat{x} - \langle \hat{x} \rangle)] = i\hbar$$

Thus we obtain

$$(\sigma_x)^2 (\sigma_p)^2 \geq \frac{\hbar^2}{4}$$

So we retrieve the uncertainty principle

$$\sigma_x \sigma_p \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}.$$

This uncertainty relation also has an analog in *energy* and *time*. We consider the kinetic energy for an arbitrary wave packet

$$\Delta E = \Delta \frac{p^2}{2m} = \frac{p}{m} \Delta p$$

Hence, an uncertainty in momentum implies an uncertainty in energy. Now consider a measurement of the time it takes for the wave packet to pass a monitor that we setup to measure its passage. However, since the width of the packet is uncertain by Δx , there must be a corresponding uncertainty in the time measurement,

$$\Delta t = \frac{\Delta x}{v} = \frac{m}{p} \Delta x \geq \frac{m}{p} \frac{h}{2\Delta p} = \frac{h}{2} \frac{1}{\Delta E}$$

Therefore, rearranging yields

$$\Delta E \Delta t \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}$$

Chapter 5

Stationary States & the “Prime Directive”

We are one step away from finally beginning to *solve* quantum mechanical problems using the Schrödinger Equation. The final step – understanding *stationary states*.

5.1 Stationary States

We begin with the time-dependent Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \Psi(x, t)}{\partial t} = \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + V \right] \Psi(x, t) \quad (5.1)$$

The V here could, in principle, be a function of both x and t . For example, an electron in a cycling uniform magnetic field whose strength is being adjusted by an experimentalist. Here we assume this is not the case: V is assumed to be time-independent, so $V = V(x)$. We then look for a solution of the form

$$\Psi(x, t) = \psi(x) e^{-iEt/\hbar} \quad (5.2)$$

The $e^{-iEt/\hbar}$ factor results from solving Equation 5.1 via separation of variables. More specifically, the method of searching for a solution in the form $\Psi(x, t) = X(x)T(t)$ and separating Equation 5.1 into two different ordinary differential equations in x and t . The resultant t solution is $e^{-iEt/\hbar}$, and is **always** the same for any time-dependent wave-function solution. Hence in practice, Equation 5.2 is used, where $\psi(x) = X(x)$ – the solution of the time-*independent* Schrödinger equation

$$\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi(x) \equiv \hat{H}(x)\psi(x) = E\psi(x) \quad (5.3)$$

Note that Equation 5.3, the time-independent Schrödinger equation is an *eigenvalue equation*, with ordinary derivatives as $\psi(x)$ just depends on x . That is, we have reduced the problem to just solving an ordinary differential equation in x . In general when we solve this equation, including boundary conditions having to do with how a particle may be confined, there will exist solutions only for specific energy eigenvalues E_i . That is, our solutions are $\{\psi_i(x)\}$, with energy eigenvalues $\{E_i\}$. These solutions are called *stationary states*.

The name comes from the fact that

$$|\Psi_i(x, t)|^2 = |\psi_i(x)|^2$$

as the energy-phase $e^{-iEt/\hbar}$ cancels out. Thus for such states the probability of finding the particle in a region δx is stationary – it does not evolve in time. These states are also states of definite energy – (the energy-time uncertainty principle!), given by the energy eigenvalue E_i corresponding to its state $\psi_i(x)$. A system in a stationary state *stays in that state*, forever. Only such states can have a precise energy.

I will now show that these stationary states actually form a complete *orthonormal basis* for the time-independent Schrödinger equation. In other words, the final time-independent wave function $\Psi(x, t)$, can actually be defined as a linear combination of stationary states $\psi_i(x)$ with their corresponding energy-phase factor $e^{-iE_it/\hbar}$ tacked on.

5.1.1 Stationary States as an Orthonormal Basis

In the very near future we will do several calculations where we find all the states of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation – the first being the *infinite square well*. Most examples will be problems where a particle occupies some region of space and where the “outcome” of a measurement could be a specific particle location x_i . As there are an infinite number of outcomes, it should not be surprising that the number of stationary states is also infinite. These (properly normalized) states $\{\psi_i\}$ with energies $\{E_i\}$ are solutions of the time-independent Schrödinger equation for a given potential $V(s)$. I show below that they form an orthonormal basis. We first show that any two stationary-state wave functions belonging to different energies are orthogonal – which requires us to define “orthogonality” for wave functions.

We have the two stationary state wave function solutions ψ_1 and ψ_2 that solve

$$\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi_1(x) \equiv \hat{H}(x)\psi_1(x) = E_1\psi_1(x) \quad (5.4)$$

$$\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi_2(x) \equiv \hat{H}(x)\psi_2(x) = E_2\psi_2(x) \quad (5.5)$$

Multiplying the first equation 5.4 on both sides by $\psi_2^*(x)$ and the second equation 5.5 by $\psi_1^*(x)$,

$$\psi_2^*(x) \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi_1(x) = E_1 \psi_2^*(x) \psi_1(x) \quad (5.6)$$

$$\psi_1^*(x) \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi_2(x) = E_2 \psi_1^*(x) \psi_2(x) \quad (5.7)$$

Taking the conjugate of the second equation 5.7,

$$\psi_1(x) \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi_2^*(x) = E_2 \psi_1(x) \psi_2^*(x) \quad (5.8)$$

Subtracting Equation 5.6 and Equation 5.8 and integrating over all x ,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\psi_2^* \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi_1(x) - \psi_1(x) \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi_2^*(x) \right] dx = (E_1 - E_2) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_1(x) \psi_2^*(x) dx$$

Notice that the second term on the right can be partially integrated twice to get

$$\psi_1(x) \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi_2^*(x) dx = \psi_2^*(x) \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi_1(x) dx$$

which is identical to the first term. So we find

$$0 = (E_1 - E_2) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_1(x) \psi_2^*(x) dx \Rightarrow \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_1(x) \psi_2^*(x) dx = 0 \quad \text{if } E_1 \neq E_2 \quad (5.9)$$

The vanishing integral above is what is meant by the orthogonality of two functions. But there was an exception noted above – our conclusion of orthogonality depended on the absence of degeneracy, that $E_1 \neq E_2$. What if this is not the case? We know the solution from our experience with ordinary vectors: Gram-Schmidt. If we have two normalized vectors \vec{u} and \vec{v} that are linearly independent but not orthogonal, we can form a new orthonormal basis by defining

$$\vec{u}_1 \equiv \vec{u} \quad \vec{u}_2 = \vec{v} - \vec{u} \cdot \vec{v} \vec{u} \quad \text{so that } \vec{u}_1 \cdot \vec{u}_2 = \vec{u} \cdot \vec{v} - \vec{u} \cdot \vec{v} = 0$$

then normalizing \vec{u}_2 . We can do the same if we have two normalized functions $\psi_1(x)$ and $\psi_2(x)$ that are not orthogonal, with the same energy eigenvalue E .

$$\psi_1(x) \rightarrow \psi_1(x) \quad \psi_2(x) \rightarrow \psi_2(x) - \psi_1(x) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_1^*(x) \psi_2(x) dx \equiv \psi_2'(x)$$

Then

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_1^*(x) \psi_2'(x) dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_1^*(x) \psi_2(x) - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_1^*(x) \psi_1(x) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_1^*(x) \psi_2(x) dx = 0$$

So if we normalize $\psi_2'(x)$ we then have two orthogonal basis functions $\psi_1(x), \psi_2'(x)$, and by the principle of superposition, $\psi_2'(x)$ is also a solution of the time-independent Schrödinger equation with energy eigenvalue E .

In practice the tedious Gram-Schmidt process is almost never needed: degeneracies usually arise for a reason known to the quantum mechanic, and she chooses wave function labels that reflect the physics. As we will discuss later, this amounts to finding operators other than \hat{H} that commute with \hat{H} . If we find such an operator, we can label our eigenstates by the quantum numbers of both \hat{H} (energy) and this other operator. These other labels distinguish the degenerate state, and guarantee their orthogonality.

This past derivation was heavy in content; before moving on, you should be fully clear on how orthogonality is defined and how stationary states of different energies are orthogonal.

5.1.2 Stationary States Form a Complete Basis

The basis just formed above, $\{E_i, \psi_i(x), I = 1, \dots, \infty\}$ is a *complete orthonormal basis* for the time-independent Schrödinger equation. I'll not provide a general proof, but we will encounter bases that soon you will recognize as complete, such as the Fourier series.

Normalized stationary-state solutions form an orthonormal basis:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_i^*(x) \psi_i(x) dx = 1 \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_j^*(x) \psi_i(x) dx = 0, \quad i \neq j$$

Consequently any general function in the space can be expanded in terms of the basis of stationary states, with coefficients that follow from the orthogonality condition.

Expansion of time-independent arbitrary wave function $\Psi(x)$ in terms of stationary states

$$\Psi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \psi_i(x) \quad c_i = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_i^*(x) \Psi(x) dx \quad (5.10)$$

5.2 The “Prime Directive”

If you were going to choose to understand any one portion of this book – choose this one. We finally come to a result so important that we can dub it, in homage to Star Trek, the *prime directive*.

Suppose some experimentalist has started up some experiment at time t_0 that is governed by quantum mechanics – perhaps some interesting wave packet $\Psi(x, t_0)$ that is arbitrary, not corresponding to

any one of the stationary states. This wave packet might describe the possible position outcomes for a particle, should we interrogate it at time t_0 . The wave function would be normalized – $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\Psi(x, t_0)|^2 dx = 1$.

Because the stationary states form a complete set, we know

$$\Psi(x, t_0) = \sum_i c_i \psi_i(x) \quad (5.11)$$

But the wave packet is normalized and the stationary states are an orthonormal set. So

$$1 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\Psi(x, t_0)|^2 dx = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_j^* c_i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_j^*(x) \psi_i(x) dx = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_j^* c_i \delta_{ji} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |c_i|^2$$

Do not get confused by all the math above, I just substitute in Equation 5.11 to ultimately show that $|c_i|^2$ is the initial probability of being in the i th stationary state. To simplify notation let's set our clock to start at $t_0 = 0$. Then consider the wave function

$$\Psi(x, t) = \sum_i c_i \psi_i(x) e^{-iE_i t/\hbar}, t > 0$$

Plugging this into the time-dependent Schrödinger equation (superposition principle) yields

$$\sum_i E_i c_i \psi_i(x) e^{-iE_i t/\hbar} = \sum_i E_i c_i \psi_i(x) e^{-iE_i t/\hbar}$$

So we have a solution! Consequently we have what you might call the *prime directive* of quantum mechanics:

The Prime Directive

The prime directive: Let $\{\psi_i(x)\}$ and $\{E_i\}$ denote the complete set of stationary-state solutions and eigenvalues, that is

$$\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi_i(x) = E_i \psi_i(x)$$

Given a wave packet at $t = 0$, $\Psi(x, t = 0) = \sum_i c_i \psi_i(x)$, then the solution of the full time-dependent Schrödinger equation is

$$\Psi(x, t) = \sum_i c_i \psi_i(x) e^{-iE_i t/\hbar} \quad (5.12)$$

This is such a powerful result. It implies that apart from the special case of a pure stationary state, the stationary components of wave functions propagate with different phases, interfering in a time-dependent way. Thus the probability at some point x , $|\Psi(x, t)|^2$, is not fixed – not stationary – but instead varies in time. But it also states the probabilities $|c_i|^2$ do not evolve in time – all of the weird quantum physics

comes from time-varying interference.

Hence, according to our *prime directive*, to solve for the time dependent wave function of any particle or wave packet, we should

1. Find the stationary state and their eigenvalues via the time-independent Schrödinger Equation 5.3
2. Solve for the c_i 's using an initial starting wave packet via Equation 5.10
3. Solve for the full time-dependent $\Psi(x, t)$ by summing over Equation 5.12

So now we roll up our sleeves and start doing quantum mechanics.

Chapter 6

Solving the Time-Independent Schrödinger Equation

We will now implement the prime directive for several different potentials, the first of which is the infinite square well.

6.1 The Infinite Square Well

A particle of mass m is confined to a region of width a , $-a/2 < x < a/2$, by the potential

$$V(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & |x| < a/2 \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$




Figure 6.1: The Infinite Square Well

Aligning ourselves with the prime directive, we look for solutions of Schrödinger equation of the form

$$\Psi(x, t) = \sum_i \psi_i(x) e^{-iE_i t/\hbar} \quad \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi_i(x) = E_i \psi_i(x)$$

The solution outside the well is $\psi_i(x) = 0$. This will be demonstrated later in the chapter by solving the finite square well, then taking the infinite well limit. But intuitively it makes sense, since as the outside potential is infinite, the wave function can not penetrate past the boundary at all.

Inside the well we solve

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \psi_i(x) = E_i \psi_i(x) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \psi_i(x) = -k_i^2 \psi_i(x)$$

where $k_i = \frac{\sqrt{2mE_i}}{\hbar}$. This differential equation has the general solution (verify) of

$$\psi_i(x) = A \sin k_i x + B \cos k_i x$$

We now deal with the boundary conditions. The wave functions must vanish at $|x| = a/2$, as it vanishes for all $|x| > \frac{a}{2}$, and the wave function must also be continuous. This requires

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm a} \psi_i(x) = 0$$

Substituting in for $\psi_i(x)$, and evaluating the limit, we get

$$A \sin \frac{k_i a}{2} + B \cos \frac{k_i a}{2} = 0 \tag{6.1}$$

$$A \sin \left(-\frac{k_i a}{2} \right) + B \cos \left(-\frac{k_i a}{2} \right) = -A \sin \frac{k_i a}{2} + B \cos \frac{k_i a}{2} = 0 \tag{6.2}$$

Adding and subtracting Equations 6.1 and 6.2,

$$A \sin \frac{k_i a}{2} + B \cos \frac{k_i a}{2} + \left(-A \sin \frac{k_i a}{2} + B \cos \frac{k_i a}{2} \right) \Rightarrow B \cos \frac{k_i a}{2} = 0 \tag{6.3}$$

$$A \sin \frac{k_i a}{2} + B \cos \frac{k_i a}{2} - \left(-A \sin \frac{k_i a}{2} + B \cos \frac{k_i a}{2} \right) \Rightarrow A \sin \frac{k_i a}{2} = 0 \tag{6.4}$$

Therefore we yield two sets of solutions,

$$\psi_n(x) = \begin{cases} B \cos k_n x & k_n = \left\{ \frac{\pi}{a}, \frac{3\pi}{a}, \dots \right\} = \frac{\pi n}{a}, \quad n = 1, 3, 5, \dots & \text{even parity} \\ A \sin k_n x & k_n = \left\{ \frac{2\pi}{a}, \frac{4\pi}{a}, \dots \right\} = \frac{\pi n}{a}, \quad n = 2, 4, 6, \dots & \text{odd parity} \end{cases} \tag{6.5}$$

We replace i with n , the quantum number that “labels” our solutions. The even parity solutions for odd n occur when the stationary state wave function is symmetric about the origin. The odd parity solutions are antisymmetric. Now, knowing that

$$k_n = \frac{\sqrt{2mE_n}}{\hbar} \Rightarrow E_n = \frac{\hbar^2 k_n^2}{2m} = \frac{\hbar^2 n^2 \pi^2}{2ma^2}$$

We get the allowed energy eigenvalues that correspond to the stationary states labeled with quantum number n . Now we move onto normalization to determine the coefficients A and B . Using Equation 4.1,

$$\int_{-a/2}^{a/2} |\psi_{i, \text{even parity}}(x)|^2 dx = \int_{-a/2}^{a/2} B^2 \cos^2 \frac{\pi nx}{a} dx = B^2 \frac{a}{2} = 1 \Rightarrow B = \sqrt{\frac{2}{a}} \quad (6.6)$$

$$\int_{-a/2}^{a/2} |\psi_{i, \text{odd parity}}(x)|^2 dx = \int_{-a/2}^{a/2} A^2 \sin^2 \frac{\pi nx}{a} dx = A^2 \frac{a}{2} = 1 \Rightarrow A = \sqrt{\frac{2}{a}} \quad (6.7)$$

Therefore, our normalized stationary state solutions,

Infinite Square Well Stationary States

$$\psi_n(x) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{2}{a}} \cos \frac{\pi nx}{a}, & n = 1, 3, 5, \dots \quad \text{even parity} \\ \sqrt{\frac{2}{a}} \sin \frac{\pi nx}{a}, & n = 2, 4, 6, \dots \quad \text{odd parity} \end{cases}$$

$$E_n = \frac{\hbar^2 k_n^2}{2m} = \frac{\hbar^2 n^2 \pi^2}{2ma^2}$$

I plot the first four stationary state solutions along with their defined energies in Figure 6.2.

6.1.1 Various Comments about the Solutions

1. There are an infinite number of allowed energy eigenvalues and eigenfunctions labeled by the discrete quantum number index n . This is a consequence of the boundary condition that $\psi(x)$ vanish at $|x| < a/2$, limiting solutions to integer and half-integer wavelengths.
2. The basis is orthonormal as

$$\int_{-a/2}^{a/2} \psi_n'^*(x) \psi_n(x) dx = \delta_n^n$$

can be readily verified.

3. The basis is complete for any function $\Psi(x)$ satisfying the boundary condition $\Psi(a/2) = \Psi(-a/2) = 0$ and defined on the interval $[-a/2, a/2]$. Any function satisfying these conditions can be expanded in




Figure 6.2: Infinite Square Well Stationary States

this basis. Those of you familiar with Fourier Series may have noticed that the odd basis functions

$$\sqrt{\frac{2}{a}} \sin\left(\frac{\pi n x}{a}\right), \quad n = 2, 4, 6, \dots \quad \text{which can be written as} \quad \sqrt{\frac{2}{a}} \sin\left(\frac{\pi n' x}{a/2}\right), \quad n' = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

are the standard odd functions of a Fourier Series, while the even basis functions

$$\sqrt{\frac{2}{a}} \cos\left(\frac{\pi n x}{a}\right), \quad n = 1, 3, 5, \dots \quad \text{which can be written as} \quad \sqrt{\frac{2}{a}} \cos\left(\frac{\pi(n' - \frac{1}{2})x}{a/2}\right), \quad n' = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

have been shifted in index, and the constant term ($n' = 0$) is absent. These modifications reflect restrictions imposed on the basis by our use of specific boundary conditions.

4. These wave functions have $n-1$ interior zeroes – coordinates at which the probability to find the trapped particle vanishes.
5. The eigenfunctions have alternating definite parity – even or odd – a consequence of the reflection symmetry of the potential.

6.1.2 Wave Function Curvature

Within the well interior the particle propagates as a free particle – a particle in the absence of any confining potential. One can understand the physics of our well solutions from the correlation between wave function curvature and momentum. The momentum operator *measures* curvature, and our energy is quadratic in p . This can be made explicit by evaluating the expectation value of $\langle p^2 \rangle$ between the stationary states

$$\langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle = \frac{\hbar^2 \pi^2 n^2}{a^2} \quad \text{so that} \quad \frac{1}{2m} \langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle = \langle \hat{H} \rangle$$

For a fixed number of nodes, doubling a will half the curvature. Therefore, energies depend *inversely* on a^2 . Conversely doubling the number of nodes doubles the curvature. Consequently energies scale as n^2 .

The square well is exceptional in that it confines all wave functions in the same way. This leads to the steep n^2 dependence of energy eigenvalues. In a finite well – a future exercise – where the boundaries are not infinitely strong – the wave functions at higher excitation energies *penetrate* into the classically-forbidden region of the potential, reducing the curvature and thus producing energies that increase less steeply than n^2 . This is known as **quantum tunneling**. In the harmonic oscillator – another future exercise – the widening r^2 potential leads to a spectrum that is evenly spaced, with eigenvalues rising with n .

6.1.3 Example Problem – The Prime Directive

We calculated the stationary states for the infinite square well above. But what is the full, time-dependent normalized wave function? How do you find the c'_i s in Equation 5.12?.

To determine these, we have to have an additional boundary condition, namely the wave function value at some time t , call it $t = 0$.

Example A particle in an infinite square well has the initial wave function shown in Figure 6.3.

$$\Psi(x, 0) = \begin{cases} Ax(a - x) & 0 \leq x \leq a \\ 0 & x > 0 \end{cases} \quad (6.8)$$

for some constant A . Find $\Psi(x, t)$.

First we must determine A using the normalization condition. If $\Psi(x, 0)$ is normalized, $\Psi(x, t)$ will stay normalized.

$$\int_0^a |\Psi(x, 0)|^2 dx = |A|^2 \int_0^a x^2(a - x)^2 dx = |A|^2 \int_0^a (a^2 x^2 - 2ax^3 + x^4) dx \quad (6.9)$$

$$= |A|^2 \left(a^2 \frac{x^3}{3} - 2a \frac{x^4}{4} + \frac{x^5}{5} \right) \Bigg|_0^a = |A|^2 \left(\frac{a^5}{3} - \frac{2a^5}{4} + \frac{a^5}{5} \right) = |A|^2 \frac{a^5}{30} = 1 \quad (6.10)$$

$$\Rightarrow |A| = \sqrt{\frac{30}{a^5}} \quad (6.11)$$




Figure 6.3: $\Psi(x, 0)$

Now we can determine the coefficients c_n using Equation 5.12.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Psi(x, 0) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \psi_n(x) \\
 c_n &= \int \psi_n(x) \Psi(x, 0) dx \\
 &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{a}} \int_0^a \sin\left(\frac{n\pi}{a}x\right) \sqrt{\frac{30}{a^5}} x(a-x) dx \\
 &= \frac{2\sqrt{15}}{a^3} \left[a \int_0^a x \sin\left(\frac{n\pi}{a}x\right) dx - \int_0^a x^2 \sin\left(\frac{n\pi}{a}x\right) dx \right] \\
 &= \frac{2\sqrt{15}}{a^3} \left[a \left[\left(\frac{a}{n\pi}\right)^2 \sin\left(\frac{n\pi}{a}x\right) - \frac{ax}{n\pi} \cos\left(\frac{n\pi}{a}x\right) \right]_0^a - \left[2\left(\frac{a}{n\pi}\right)^2 x \sin\left(\frac{n\pi}{a}x\right) - \frac{(n\pi xa)^2 - 2}{(n\pi a)^3} \cos\left(\frac{n\pi}{a}x\right) \right]_0^a \right] \\
 &= \frac{2\sqrt{15}}{a^3} \left[-\frac{a^3}{n\pi} \cos(n\pi) + a^3 \frac{(n\pi)^2 - 2}{(n\pi)^3} \cos(n\pi) + a^3 \frac{2}{(n\pi)^3} \cos(0) \right] \\
 &= \frac{4\sqrt{15}}{(n\pi)^3} [\cos(0) - \cos(n\pi)] \\
 &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \text{ even} \\ \frac{8\sqrt{15}}{(n\pi)^3} & \text{if } n \text{ odd} \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

So now we can form our time-dependent wave function using the prime directive by putting everything

together. We get

$$\Psi(x, t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \psi_n(x) e^{-iE_n t/\hbar} \quad (6.12)$$

$$\Psi(x, t) = \sqrt{\frac{30}{a}} \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^3 \sum_{n=1,3,5,\dots} \frac{1}{n^3} \sin\left(\frac{n\pi x}{a}\right) e^{-in^2\pi^2\hbar t/2ma^2} \quad (6.13)$$

Notice the solution only contains the $\sin\left(\frac{n\pi x}{a}\right)$ component. This is because the square well in this problem is defined from $0 < x < a$ and not reflection symmetric around the origin. The final solution in Equation 6.13 describes how the wave function changes as a function of time, provided the particle is in a square well.

Now let us study this wave function, and its implications on observables. We first determine what the expectation value of the energy is.

$$\langle E \rangle = \int \Psi(x, t)^* \hat{H} \Psi(x, t) dx \quad (6.14)$$

$$= \int \Psi(x, t)^* E_n \Psi(x, t) dx \quad (6.15)$$

Performing the calculation, one will find

$$\langle E \rangle = \sum_n |c_n|^2 E_n$$

So we can think of $|c_n|^2$ as the probability to measure the energy eigenvalue E_n . Therefore,

$$\sum_m |c_m|^2 = 1$$

The c_n^2 can also be thought of as telling us the “amount” of Ψ_n that is in the *total* wave function. In the example above, we can see that the initial wave function closely resembles Ψ_1 . If we look at c_1 ,

$$|c_1|^2 = \left(\frac{8\sqrt{15}}{\pi^3}\right)^2 = 0.998555\dots$$

we see that it is very close to 1, indicating that the $n = 1$ state dominates.

The Infinite Square Well is the classic introductory quantum mechanics problem. Before moving on, ensure you understand every derivation in this section *completely*.

6.2 The Harmonic Oscillator

This next section is *very* important. In nature, “friggin’ everything is a harmonic oscillator” – Reddit commenter. The harmonic oscillator stationary-state basis is arguably the most versatile and important in physics. Every field in physics includes key problems that require one to understand small-amplitude behavior that maps onto the harmonic oscillator.

The *quantum* 1D harmonic oscillator is to solve the Schrödinger equation for the potential shown in Figure 6.4

$$V(x) = \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2 x^2 \quad (6.16)$$




Figure 6.4: Quantum Harmonic Oscillator Potential

Therefore, by the prime directive, the time-independent Schrödinger equation reads

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2\psi}{dx^2} + \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2 x^2 \psi = E\psi \quad (6.17)$$

There are two methods to solve this problem. The first is the “brute force” attempt to solve the differential equation using power series. The second, according to Griffiths, is a “diabolically clever” technique using *ladder operators*. We will start with the ladder operator technique.

6.2.1 Ladder Operator Algebraic Technique

We rewrite Equation 6.17 utilizing the momentum operator:

$$\frac{1}{2m} [\hat{p}^2 + (m\omega x)^2] \psi = E\psi \quad (6.18)$$

where $\hat{p} \equiv -i\hbar \frac{d}{dx}$ is the momentum operator. We define the ladder operators as the following:

$$\hat{a}_{\pm} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\hbar m\omega}} (\mp i\hat{p} + m\omega x) \quad (6.19)$$

You might be wondering why the following operators are known as *ladder* operators – we’ll get to that in a bit, but for now, let us determine the product $\hat{a}_-\hat{a}_+$.

$$\hat{a}_-\hat{a}_+ = \frac{1}{2\hbar m\omega} (i\hat{p} + m\omega x)(-i\hat{p} + m\omega x) \quad (6.20)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\hbar m\omega} [\hat{p}^2 + (m\omega x)^2 - im\omega(x\hat{p} - \hat{p}x)] \quad (6.21)$$

Note above, we do not combine the terms $(m\omega x)(-i\hat{p})$ and $(i\hat{p})(m\omega x)$. This is because in we are dealing with operators. Operators do not, in general, **commute** ($x\hat{p} \neq \hat{p}x$). So we have to separate the two. As a result, there is an extra term involving $(x\hat{p} - \hat{p}x)$. We call this the **commutator** of x and \hat{p} . In general, the commutator of operators \hat{A} and \hat{B} is

$$[\hat{A}, \hat{B}] \equiv \hat{A}\hat{B} - \hat{B}\hat{A} \quad (6.22)$$

Using this notation,

$$\hat{a}_-\hat{a}_+ = \frac{1}{2\hbar m\omega} [\hat{p}^2 + (m\omega x)^2] - \frac{i}{2\hbar} [x, \hat{p}] \quad (6.23)$$

And so we need to figure out the commutator of x and \hat{p} . To do this, we employ an arbitrary “test” function f to see what the *effect* of the commutator is. At the end we can then throw away f to determine the value of the commutator. We have

$$[x, \hat{p}]f(x) = \left[x(-i\hbar) \frac{d}{dx} f(x) - (-i\hbar) \frac{d}{dx} (xf) \right] \quad (6.24)$$

$$= -i\hbar \left(x \frac{df}{dx} - x \frac{df}{dx} - f \right) \quad (6.25)$$

$$= i\hbar f(x) \quad (6.26)$$

Therefore, $[x, \hat{p}] = i\hbar$. This formula is known as the **canonical commutation relation**. With this, Equation 6.23 becomes

$$\hat{a}_- \hat{a}_+ = \frac{1}{\hbar\omega} \hat{H} + \frac{1}{2} \quad (6.27)$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{H} = \hbar\omega \left(\hat{a}_- \hat{a}_+ - \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (6.28)$$

Notice that the ordering of \hat{a}_+ and \hat{a}_- is important here; the same argument with \hat{a}_+ on the left, yields

$$\hat{a}_+ \hat{a}_- = \frac{1}{\hbar\omega} \hat{H} - \frac{1}{2} \quad (6.29)$$

Therefore, another expression for the Hamiltonian can be derived by rearranging Equation 6.29.

$$\hat{H} = \hbar\omega \left(\hat{a}_+ \hat{a}_- + \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (6.30)$$

Then, in terms of \hat{a}_\pm , the Schrödinger equation for the harmonic oscillator can be written as

$$\hbar\omega \left(\hat{a}_\pm \hat{a}_\mp \pm \frac{1}{2} \right) \psi = E\psi \quad (6.31)$$

Now comes the pinnacle of the ladder operator method – the reason it is “diabolically clever.”

Energy Eigenvalues of Ladder Operator

If ψ satisfies the Schrödinger equation with energy E (that is, $\hat{H}\psi = E\psi$), then $\hat{a}_+\psi$ satisfies the Schrödinger equation with energy $(E + \hbar\omega)$ (that is, $\hat{H}(\hat{a}_+\psi) = (E + \hbar\omega)(\hat{a}_+\psi)$).

Because this is so important and may seem like it came out of the blue, I provide a proof.

$$\hat{H}(\hat{a}_+\psi) = \hbar\omega \left(\hat{a}_+ \hat{a}_- + \frac{1}{2} \right) (\hat{a}_+\psi) = \hbar\omega \left(\hat{a}_+ \hat{a}_- \hat{a}_+ + \frac{1}{2} \hat{a}_+ \right) \psi \quad (6.32)$$

$$= \hbar\omega \hat{a}_+ \left(\hat{a}_- \hat{a}_+ + \frac{1}{2} \right) \psi = \hat{a}_+ \left[\hbar\omega \left(\hat{a}_+ \hat{a}_- + 1 + \frac{1}{2} \right) \psi \right] \quad (6.33)$$

$$= \hat{a}_+ (\hat{H} + \hbar\omega) \psi = \hat{a}_+ (E + \hbar\omega) \psi = (E + \hbar\omega) (\hat{a}_+ \psi). \quad \text{QED.} \quad (6.34)$$

Note that in the second line I replaced $\hat{a}_-\hat{a}_+$ by $(\hat{a}_+\hat{a}_- + 1)$. I can do this because (verify) $[\hat{a}_-, \hat{a}_+] = 1$. By the same procedure, $\hat{a}_-\psi$ is a solution as well, with energy eigenvalue $(E - \hbar\omega)$.

$$\hat{H}(\hat{a}_-\psi) = \hbar\omega \left(\hat{a}_-\hat{a}_+ - \frac{1}{2} \right) (\hat{a}_-\psi) = \hbar\omega \hat{a}_- \left(\hat{a}_+\hat{a}_- - \frac{1}{2} \right) \psi \quad (6.35)$$

$$= \hat{a}_- \left[\hbar\omega \left(\hat{a}_-\hat{a}_+ - 1 - \frac{1}{2} \right) \psi \right] = \hat{a}_- \left(\hat{H} - \hbar\omega \right) \psi = \hat{a}_- (E - \hbar\omega) \psi \quad (6.36)$$

$$= (E - \hbar\omega)(\hat{a}_-\psi). \quad (6.37)$$

This is why we call \hat{a}_\pm ladder operators. If we could just find *one* solution, we can use \hat{a}_\pm to “climb up and down” in energy, getting *all* the possible energy eigenvalues. Hence, we call \hat{a}_+ the **raising operator** and \hat{a}_- the **lowering operator**.

Let us try to find the *lowest rung*, ψ_0 , such that $\hat{a}_-\psi_0 = 0$. Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\hbar m\omega}} \left(\hbar \frac{d}{dx} + m\omega x \right) \psi_0 = 0 \quad (6.38)$$

Rearranging gives

$$\frac{d\psi_0}{dx} = -\frac{m\omega}{\hbar} x \psi_0 \quad (6.39)$$

Implementing separation of variables,

$$\int \frac{1}{\psi_0} d\psi_0 = -\frac{m\omega}{\hbar} \int x dx \quad \Rightarrow \quad \ln \psi_0 = -\frac{m\omega}{2\hbar} x^2 + \text{const.} \quad (6.40)$$

Hence,

$$\psi_0(x) = A e^{-\frac{m\omega}{2\hbar} x^2} \quad (6.41)$$

Normalizing,

$$1 = |A|^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-m\omega x^2/\hbar} dx = |A| \sqrt{\frac{\pi\hbar}{m\omega}} \quad \Rightarrow \quad A^2 = \sqrt{m\omega/\pi\hbar} \quad (6.42)$$

Therefore, we get the final “lowest-rung” stationary state

$$\psi_0(x) = \left(\frac{m\omega}{\pi\hbar}\right)^{1/4} e^{-\frac{m\omega}{2\hbar}x^2} \quad (6.43)$$

To determine the energy of this state we plug it into the Schrödinger Equation 6.31 and exploit the fact that $\hat{a}_-\psi_0 = 0$.]

$$\hbar\omega \left(\hat{a}_+\hat{a}_- + \frac{1}{2}\right) \psi_0 = E_0\psi_0 \quad (6.44)$$

$$\hbar\omega \left(\hat{a}_+(\hat{a}_-\psi_0) + \frac{1}{2}\psi_0\right) = E_0\psi_0 \quad (6.45)$$

$$\hbar\omega \left(0 + \frac{1}{2}\psi_0\right) = E_0\psi_0 \quad (6.46)$$

Therefore, $E_0 = \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega$. We have secured the **ground state** of the quantum harmonic oscillator. We now can just apply \hat{a}_+ repeatedly to generate the excited states, increasing the energy by $\hbar\omega$ each step as we go along. Therefore, every stationary state, labeled by a quantum number n can be defined as follows:

$$\psi_n(x) = A_n(\hat{a}_+)^n\psi_0(x), \quad E_n = \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right) \hbar\omega \quad (6.47)$$

where A_n is the normalization constant. You can get A_n algebraically, however, and the proof is laid out in Griffiths. It turns out that $A_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}}$. Thus,

$$\psi_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}}(\hat{a}_+)^n\psi_0 \quad (6.48)$$

$$\psi_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}}(\hat{a}_+)^n \left(\frac{m\omega}{\pi\hbar}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\frac{m\omega}{2\hbar}x^2}$$

6.2.2 Example – Expectation Value of $V(x)$

Example Find the expectation value of the potential energy in the n th stationary state of the harmonic oscillator.

$$\langle V \rangle = \left\langle \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2 x^2 \right\rangle = \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_n^* x^2 \psi_n dx$$

Expressing x and \hat{p} in terms of the raising and lowering operators,

$$x = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2m\omega}}(\hat{a}_+ + \hat{a}_-); \quad \hat{p} = i\frac{\hbar m\omega}{2}(\hat{a}_+ - \hat{a}_-)$$

Therefore,

$$x^2 = \frac{\hbar}{2m\omega} [(\hat{a}_+^2 + \hat{a}_+\hat{a}_- + \hat{a}_-\hat{a}_+ + \hat{a}_-^2)]$$

Hence,

$$\langle V \rangle = \frac{\hbar\omega}{4} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_n^* [(\hat{a}_+^2 + (\hat{a}_+\hat{a}_-) + (\hat{a}_-\hat{a}_+) + \hat{a}_-^2)] \psi_n dx$$

But $\hat{a}_+^2\psi_n$ is (apart from normalization), just ψ_{n+2} , which is orthogonal to ψ_n and the same goes for $\hat{a}_-^2\psi_n \sim \psi_{n-2}$. So those terms drop out, and we are left with

$$\langle V \rangle = \frac{\hbar\omega}{4} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_n^* [(\hat{a}_+\hat{a}_-) + (\hat{a}_-\hat{a}_+)] \psi_n dx$$

Now, without proof (but check Griffiths) I will use the following relations:

$$\hat{a}_+\hat{a}_-\psi_n = n\psi_n, \quad \hat{a}_-\hat{a}_+\psi_n = (n+1)\psi_n$$

Therefore, we get the final result,

$$\langle V \rangle = \frac{\hbar\omega}{4}(n + n + 1) = \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega(n + \frac{1}{2}).$$

We see that the expectation value of the potential energy $V(x)$ is exactly *half* of the total energy $E = (n + \frac{1}{2})\hbar\omega$. This is a beautiful fact of the harmonic oscillator and a reason as to why it shows up literally everywhere in physics.

6.2.3 Power Series Analytic Method

I will now show the second, ‘brute-force’ power series method to solve the Schrödinger equation for the harmonic oscillator,

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2\psi}{dx^2} + \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2 x^2 \psi = E\psi \tag{6.49}$$

and solve it directly. We first introduce a dimensionless variable ξ to make things cleaner, where

$$\xi \equiv \sqrt{\frac{m\omega}{\hbar}}x \quad (6.50)$$

Hence, the Schrödinger equation now reads

$$\frac{d^2\psi}{d\xi^2} = (\xi^2 - K)\psi \quad (6.51)$$

where $K \equiv \frac{2E}{\hbar\omega}$. Our problem is to solve Equation 6.51 and in the process obtain the allowed values of K , and thus E . To begin with, we notice that at very large ξ , (very large x), ξ^2 completely dominates over the constant K , so in this circumstance,

$$\frac{d^2\psi}{d\xi^2} \approx \xi^2\psi \quad (6.52)$$

which has the approximate solution (verify)

$$\psi(\xi) \approx Ae^{-\xi^2/2} + Be^{\xi^2/2} \quad (6.53)$$

And since the B term blows up as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, we get rid of it to ensure $\psi(\xi)$ is normalizable. The physically acceptable solutions are then

$$\psi(\xi) \rightarrow h(\xi)e^{\xi^2/2}, \quad \text{at large } \xi \quad (6.54)$$

where we replaced the constant A with another function $h(\xi)$ in hopes that it has a simpler functional form than $\psi(\xi)$ itself. Differentiating Equation 6.54,

$$\frac{d\psi}{d\xi} = \left(\frac{dh}{d\xi} - \xi h \right) e^{\xi^2/2} \quad (6.55)$$

$$\frac{d^2\psi}{d\xi^2} = \left(\frac{d^2h}{d\xi^2} - 2\xi \frac{dh}{d\xi} + (\xi^2 - 1)h \right) e^{-\xi^2/2} \quad (6.56)$$

And therefore, equating Equation 6.51 and Equation 6.56 transforms the Schrödinger equation into

$$\frac{d^2h}{d\xi^2} - 2\xi \frac{dh}{d\xi} + (K - 1)h = 0 \quad (6.57)$$

And here is where we utilize power series. We search for solutions to Equation 6.57 in the form of a power series in ξ .

$$h(\xi) = a_0 + a_1\xi + a_2\xi^2 + \cdots = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j \xi^j \quad (6.58)$$

Differentiating the power series term by term to determine $\frac{dh}{d\xi}$ and $\frac{d^2h}{d\xi^2}$,

$$\frac{dh}{d\xi} = a_1 + 2a_2\xi + 3a_3\xi^2 + \cdots = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j a_j \xi^{j-1} \quad (6.59)$$

$$\frac{d^2h}{d\xi^2} = 2a_2 + 2 \cdot 3a_3\xi + 3 \cdot 4a_4\xi^2 + \cdots = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (j+1)(j+2)a_{j+2}\xi^j \quad (6.60)$$

Putting all these equations into Equation 6.57, we find

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} [(j+1)(j+2)a_{j+2} - 2ja_j + (K-1)a_j]\xi^j = 0 \quad (6.61)$$

It follows that the coefficient of *each power* of ξ must vanish (since the whole thing equals 0). In other words

$$(j+1)(j+2)a_{j+2} - 2ja_j + (K-1)a_j = 0$$

Rearranging gives us a recurrence relation,

$$a_{j+2} = \frac{(2j+1-K)}{(j+1)(j+2)} a_j \quad (6.62)$$

Starting with a_0 , we can generate all the even-numbered coefficients. Starting with a_1 , we can generate all the odd-numbered coefficients. Therefore, we can write $h(\xi)$ as

$$h(\xi) = h_{\text{even}}(\xi) + h_{\text{odd}}(\xi) \quad (6.63)$$

where

$$h_{\text{even}} = a_0 + a_2\xi^2 + a_4\xi^4 \quad (6.64)$$

$$h_{\text{odd}} = a_1\xi + a_3\xi^3 + a_5\xi^5 \quad (6.65)$$

For very large j , the recursion formula becomes approximately,

$$a_{j+2} \approx \frac{2}{j} a_j$$

with the solution

$$a_j \approx \frac{C}{(j/2)!}$$

for some constant C . This yields (for very large ξ),

$$h(\xi) \approx C \sum \frac{1}{(j/2)!} \xi^j \approx C \sum \frac{1}{j!} \xi^{2j} \approx C e^{\xi^2}$$

However, something seems wrong. If $h \sim e^{+\xi^2}$, then $\psi(\xi) = h(\xi)e^{-\xi^2/2} \sim e^{+\xi^2/2}$ – which blows up for large ξ , (and hence for large x). There is only one way to resolve this. For normalizable solutions, **the series must terminate at some j** . There must occur some “highest j ”. (call it j_{\max} , such that the recursion formula spits out $a_{j_{\max}+2} = 0$, which will make every coefficient afterwards also 0. Therefore, for physically acceptable solutions, Equation 6.62 requires

$$K = 2j_{\max} + 1$$

for some positive integer j_{\max} . And since $K = \frac{2E}{\hbar\omega}$, we recover the energy equation for a harmonic oscillator

$$E_j = \left(j + \frac{1}{2}\right) \hbar\omega, \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (6.66)$$

We recover, by a completely different method, the fundamental quantization condition we algebraically uncovered in Equation 6.47.

For the allowed values of K , the recursion formula reads

$$a_{j+2} = \frac{-2(j_{\max} - j)}{(j+1)(j+2)} a_j \quad (6.67)$$

If $j_{\max} = 0$, there exists only one term in the series, $h_0(\xi) = a_0$. And hence

$$\psi_0(\xi) = a_0 e^{-\xi^2/2} \quad \text{if } j_{\max} = 0$$

which, apart from normalization is equivalent to Equation 6.43. For $j_{\max} = 1$, we take $a_0 = 0$, and Equation 6.67 with $j = 1$ yields $a_3 = 0$, so

$$h_1(\xi) = a_1\xi \quad \Rightarrow \quad \psi_1(\xi) = a_1\xi e^{-\xi^2/2} \quad (6.68)$$

For $j_{\max} = 2$, $j = 0$ yields $a_2 = -2a_0$, and $j = 2$ gives $a_4 = 0$, so

$$h_2(\xi) = a_0(1 - 2\xi^2) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \psi_2(\xi) = a_0(1 - 2\xi^2)e^{-\xi^2/2} \quad (6.69)$$

and so on. The polynomials for $h(\xi)$ that are generated are known as **Hermite Polynomials**. There are actually two different forms of Hermite Polynomials – the “physicist’s” and the “probabilist’s,” that are related. Obviously, the type us superior physicists use are the physicist’s Hermite Polynomials. By convention, the arbitrary multiplicative factor is chosen so that the coefficient of the highest power of ξ is $2^{j_{\max}}$. Then, the normalized stationary states for the harmonic oscillator are

$$\psi_n(x) = \left(\frac{m\omega}{\pi\hbar}\right)^{1/4} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n n!}} H_n(\xi) e^{-\xi^2/2} \quad (6.70)$$

where we use $j_{\max} = n$ to label the quantum number of each state. These are identical of course to the ones we obtained algebraically in Equation 6.48. I plot the solutions $\psi_n(x)$ in Figure 6.5 below.




Figure 6.5: Stationary State Wave Functions for 1D Harmonic Oscillator

Note the energies are evenly spaced as $E_n = (n + \frac{1}{2}) \hbar\omega$. We can afterwards determine $\Psi(x, t)$ via the prime directive using Equation 5.12.

6.3 The Free Particle

We have previously (in studying the infinite square well) considered a particle that could propagate freely in the region $-a/2 < x < a/2$, but was confined at the boundaries by an infinitely strong potential. The solutions of the time-independent Schrödinger equation were states of definite energy. We described these states as sin and cos functions – standing waves with fixed nodes, formed by combining left-moving with right-moving amplitudes. These states were normalizable and provided a complete orthonormal basis for describing the propagation of any wave packet $\Psi(x, t)$.

Here we consider a similarly free propagating particle, but one not confined by any potential. Instead the particle is free – able to move over the region $-\infty < x < \infty$. Here however, we will choose to describe the waves as plane waves in the form e^{ikx} rather than with sin and cos. These states, as you shall soon see, are not normalizable and are thus not true stationary states, yet they are still of use as they form a basis for expanding physical states – wave packets – that *are* normalizable physical states.

As the particle is free ($V(x) = 0$) for all $-\infty < x < \infty$, the Schrödinger equation for the time-independent stationary states is the following:

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2\psi(x)}{dx^2} = E\psi(x) \quad (6.71)$$

In terms of the wave number

$$k = \frac{\sqrt{2mE}}{\hbar} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{d^2\psi(x)}{dx^2} = -k^2\psi(x)$$

And therefore the general time-independent solution is

$$\psi(x) = Ae^{ikx} + Be^{-ikx} \quad (6.72)$$

And the full time-dependent solution is therefore, via the prime directive,

$$\Psi(x, t) = Ae^{ikx - iEt/\hbar} + Be^{-ikx - iEt/\hbar} \quad k \text{ positive} \quad (6.73)$$

If we allow k to run over both positive and negative values, then $k = \pm \frac{\sqrt{2mE}}{\hbar}$, and this simplifies the time-dependent solution into

$$\Psi(x, t) = Ae^{ikx - iEt/\hbar} = Ae^{i\left(kx - \frac{\hbar k^2}{2m}t\right)} \quad k \text{ positive or negative} \quad (6.74)$$

We can identify the *velocity* of our solutions by jumping on the wave function – hanging onto a point of fixed phase – and measuring which way we travel. We take a positive step in time Δt and demand that the phase remain fixed

$$kx - \frac{\hbar k^2}{2m}t \rightarrow k(x + \Delta x) - \frac{\hbar k^2}{2m}(t + \Delta t) \Rightarrow k\Delta x - \frac{\hbar k^2}{2m}\Delta t = 0 \quad (6.75)$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta t} \equiv v = \frac{\hbar k}{2m} \quad (6.76)$$

Therefore, our solutions with positive k have a positive velocity (traveling to the right) while those with negative k have negative velocity (traveling to the left).

$$k = +\frac{\sqrt{2mE}}{\hbar} > 0 \rightarrow \text{traveling to the right (+x)}$$

$$k = -\frac{\sqrt{2mE}}{\hbar} < 0 \rightarrow \text{traveling to the left (-x)}$$

We can define the wavelength as a positive number

$$\lambda = \frac{2\pi}{|k|} \quad (6.77)$$

but include a sign in the de Broglie relationship for momentum,

$$p = \frac{2\pi\hbar}{\lambda} \rightarrow (2\pi\hbar) \left(\frac{k}{2\pi} \right) = \hbar k$$

so that momentum becomes a signed quantity (positive for waves moving to the right, negative for those moving to the left).

However, there are two issues with our calculations. The first is regarding our calculated wave velocity. The velocity of the waves we calculated in Equation 6.76 is

$$v_{\text{quantum}} = \frac{\hbar|k|}{2m} = \sqrt{\frac{E}{2m}} \quad (6.78)$$

On the other hand, the *classical* speed of a free particle with energy E is given by $E = \frac{1}{2}mv^2$, so

$$v_{\text{classical}} = \sqrt{\frac{2E}{m}} = 2v_{\text{quantum}} \quad (6.79)$$

We get a quantum mechanical wave function that travels at *half* the speed of what the particle *should*. The second issue is the fact that our calculated wave function *is not normalizable*.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\psi(x, t)|^2 dx = |A|^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(e^{-ikx + iEt/\hbar} \right) \left(e^{ikx - iEt/\hbar} \right) dx \rightarrow |A|^2(\infty) \quad (6.80)$$

Therefore, our solutions do not represent physically realizable states. A free particle can not exist in a stationary state – *there is no such thing as a free particle of definite energy*. But like I said previously, they still serve purpose. They play a *mathematical* role entirely dependent of their *physical* interpretation. The general solution to the time-dependent Schrödinger equation via the prime directive is still a linear combination of our stationary states. Only this time its an *integral* over the continuous variable k instead of a discrete sum over index n .

$$\Psi(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(k) e^{i\left(kx - \frac{\hbar k^2}{2m}t\right)} dk \quad (6.81)$$

The quantity $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$ is factored out for convenience. This wave function *can* be normalized. But it carries a *range* of ks , and hence a range of energies and velocities. This is what we call a **wave packet**.

In a normal quantum mechanics problem, we are provided $\Psi(x, 0)$ and asked to find $\Psi(x, t)$. For a free particle the solution takes the form of Equation 6.81. But how do we determine $\phi(k)$? so as to match the initial wave function

$$\Psi(x, 0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(k) e^{ikx} dk$$

The answer, as you may have noticed given the form of Equation 6.81 is via Fourier/Inverse fourier Transform.

$$\boxed{f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F(k) e^{ikx} dk \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad F(k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) e^{-ikx} dx}$$

$F(k)$ is the *fourier transform* of $f(x)$, and likewise $f(x)$ is the *inverse fourier transform* of $F(k)$. These integrals exist if the initial wave packet $\Psi(x, 0)$ is normalized. The solution for a free particle is Equation 6.81 with

$$\phi(k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Psi(x, 0) e^{-ikx} dx \quad (6.82)$$

Putting everything together,

Wave Packet → Wave Function

Given an arbitrary initial wave packet $\Psi(x, 0)$.

For a discrete system (Harmonic Oscillator, Infinite Square Well, ...)

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(x, 0) &= \sum_n c_n \psi_n(x) & c_n &= \int_{\Omega} \psi_n^*(x) \Psi(x, 0) dx \\ \Psi(x, t) &= \sum_n c_n \psi_n(x) e^{-iE_n t/\hbar}\end{aligned}$$

where $\psi_n(x)$ and E_n are the solutions to the discrete problem, and where the integration in x is over the region Ω where ψ_n is nonzero.

For a free particle, with its continuous plane-wave basis,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(x, 0) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(k) \psi(k, x) dk & \phi(k) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^*(k, x) \Psi(x, 0) dx \\ \Psi(x, t) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(k) \psi(k, x) e^{-iE(k)t/\hbar} dk\end{aligned}$$

where $\psi(k, x) \equiv \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi}} e^{ikx}$ and $E(k) = \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m}$.

6.3.1 Example Problem – Trapped Wave Packet

We start with a normalized wave packet that has been confined to a region of width $2a$,

$$\Psi(x, 0) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2a}} & -a < x < a \\ 0 & |x| > a \end{cases} \quad (6.83)$$

Using Equation 6.82,

$$\phi(k) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-ikx} \right) \Psi(x, 0) dx = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2a}} \int_{-a}^a \cos kx dx = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi a}} \frac{\sin ak}{k}$$

Then finally, via the prime directive, or by using Equation 6.81,

$$\Psi(x, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(k) \psi(k, x) e^{-iE(k)t/\hbar} dk = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi a}} \frac{\sin ak}{k} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{ikx} \right) e^{-i\hbar k^2 t/2m} dk \quad (6.84)$$

Below I plot the initial probability density function at $|\Psi(x, 0)|^2$ along with the probability density function $|\Psi(x, ma^2/\hbar)|^2$, at a later time $t = ma^2/\hbar$ (the curve) in Figure 6.6. As you can see, the probability density function and the wave function itself begin to delocalize over time.




Figure 6.6: Plot of $|\Psi(x, 0)|^2$ and $|\Psi(x, ma^2/\hbar)|^2$.

6.4 The Finite Square Well

We have previously solved problems involving *bound* stationary states (Infinite Square Well, Harmonic Oscillator) and where the basis consists entirely of plane waves (Free Particle). Here we tackle the first problem where free and bound states coexist. The *Finite Square Well* depicted in Figure 6.7 below.




Figure 6.7: Finite Well Potential

6.4.1 Bound States

We seek solutions where $E < 0$. In region I the Schrödinger equation is

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2\psi(x)}{dx^2} = E\psi(x) = -|E|\psi(x) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{d^2\psi(x)}{dx^2} = \kappa^2\psi(x); \quad \kappa \equiv \frac{\sqrt{2m|E|}}{\hbar} > 0$$

The general solution is

$$\psi(x) = Ae^{-\kappa x} + Be^{\kappa x}$$

However, the first term diverges as $x \rightarrow -\infty$. Therefore the solution in region I is

$$\text{Region I: } \psi_I(x) = Be^{\kappa x}, \quad x < -\frac{a}{2}$$

The same arguments lead to

$$\text{Region III: } \psi_{III}(x) = Ae^{-\kappa x}, \quad x > \frac{a}{2}$$

In region II we have

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2\psi(x)}{dx^2} - V_0\psi(x) = -|E|\psi(x) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{d^2\psi(x)}{dx^2} = -k^2\psi(x); \quad k \equiv \frac{\sqrt{2m(V_0 - |E|)}}{\hbar}$$

We require $V_0 > |E|$ – the eigenvalue above the floor of the potential – as is the case classically. The general solution is

$$\text{Region II: } \psi_{II}(x) = C \cos kx + D \sin ks, \quad -\frac{a}{2} < x < \frac{a}{2}$$

As the potential is mirror-symmetric, we can label the wave function by parity – whether even or odd around zero. In this way we can construct solutions corresponding to either the even or odd terms in region II.

Even Solution: Choosing the even-parity solution of region II,

$$\text{Region II: } \psi_{II}(x) = C \cos kx, \quad -\frac{a}{2} < x < \frac{a}{2}$$

Second order differential equations require two constraints as initial conditions to solve. We can use the required continuity of the wave function across regions for both. The value and first derivative of the wave function at the boundary between regions must match to guarantee continuity. Thus at the boundary of II and III,

$$C \cos kx = Ae^{-\kappa x} \Big|_{x=a/2} \Rightarrow C \cos \frac{ka}{2} = Ae^{-\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \quad (6.85)$$

$$-Ck \sin kx = -\kappa Ae^{-\kappa x} \Big|_{x=a/2} \Rightarrow -Ck \sin \frac{ka}{2} = -A\kappa e^{-\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \quad (6.86)$$

These yield two constraints:

$$A = Ce^{\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \cos \left(\frac{ka}{2} \right) \quad k \tan \left(\frac{ka}{2} \right) = \kappa,$$

the second of which, the eigenvalue condition, is obtained by taking the ratio of the two equations. The same matching at the boundary of I and II yields

$$C \cos \left(-\frac{ka}{2} \right) = Be^{-\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad -Ck \sin \left(-\frac{ka}{2} \right) = B\kappa e^{-\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \quad (6.87)$$

$$C \cos \left(\frac{ka}{2} \right) = Be^{-\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad Ck \sin \left(\frac{ka}{2} \right) = B\kappa e^{-\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \quad (6.88)$$

These yield the same eigenvalue constraints as above with an additional condition,

$$B = Ce^{\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \cos \left(\frac{ka}{2} \right)$$

The matching at the second boundary was unnecessary – we could have just used the fact that the wave function is even under parity to get the same constraint. We finally obtain

Even Solution

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} C e^{\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \cos\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) e^{\kappa x} & x < -\frac{a}{2} \\ C \cos kx & -\frac{a}{2} < x < \frac{a}{2} \\ C e^{\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \cos\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) e^{-\kappa x} & x > \frac{a}{2} \end{cases}$$

eigenvalue condition: $k \tan\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) = \kappa$

The remaining work is to solve for the allowed eigenvalues, and find C by requiring the solution to be normalized. This will be shown after deriving the odd-parity solution.

Odd Solution: Choosing the odd-parity solution of region II,

$$\text{Region II: } \psi_{II}(x) = D \sin kx, \quad -\frac{a}{2} < x < \frac{a}{2}$$

We match the solutions at the boundary of II and III,

$$D \sin kx = A e^{-\kappa x} \Big|_{x=a/2} \Rightarrow D \sin \frac{ka}{2} = A e^{-\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \quad (6.89)$$

$$Dk \cos kx = -\kappa A e^{-\kappa x} \Big|_{x=a/2} \Rightarrow Dk \cos \frac{ka}{2} = -\kappa A e^{-\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \quad (6.90)$$

These yield two constraints,

$$A = D e^{\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \sin\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) \quad k \cot\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) = -\kappa.$$

The same matching at the boundary of I and II yields

$$D \sin\left(-\frac{ka}{2}\right) = B e^{-\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad Dk \cos\left(-\frac{ka}{2}\right) = B \kappa e^{-\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \Rightarrow \quad (6.91)$$

$$-D \sin\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) = B e^{-\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad Dk \cos\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) = B \kappa e^{-\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \quad (6.92)$$

These yield the same eigenvalue constraints as above with the additional condition

$$-B = A = D e^{\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \cos\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right)$$

which makes sense as the solution in region I is the odd-mirror of the solution in region II. Therefore we obtain

Odd Solution

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} -De^{\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \sin\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) e^{\kappa x} & x < -\frac{a}{2} \\ D \sin ks & -\frac{a}{2} < x < \frac{a}{2} \\ De^{\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \sin\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) e^{-\kappa x} & x > \frac{a}{2} \end{cases}$$

eigenvalue condition: $k \cot\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) = -\kappa$

Even Solution

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} Ce^{\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \cos\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) e^{\kappa x} & x < -\frac{a}{2} \\ C \cos kx & -\frac{a}{2} < x < \frac{a}{2} \\ Ce^{\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \cos\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) e^{-\kappa x} & x > \frac{a}{2} \end{cases}$$

eigenvalue condition: $k \tan\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) = \kappa$

The kinematic variables are

$$k = \frac{\sqrt{2m(V_0 - |E|)}}{\hbar} \quad \kappa = \frac{\sqrt{2m|E|}}{\hbar}$$

Now all that is left is to calculate the eigenvalues of the bound states, then normalize.

6.4.2 Counting Eigenvalues

The allowed bound-state energies are obtained by solving the eigenvalue conditions

$$k \tan\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) = \kappa \quad \text{and} \quad k \cot\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) = -\kappa$$

for the even and odd cases, respectively, subject to the constraint

$$k^2 + \kappa^2 = \frac{2mV_0}{\hbar^2} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \kappa^2 = \frac{2mV_0}{\hbar^2} - k^2$$

Multiplying the top equations by $a/2$ and the bottom equations by $(a/2)^2$, we can re-express them in a simpler form:

$$z \equiv \frac{ka}{2} = \frac{a\sqrt{2m(V_0 - |E|)}}{2\hbar} \quad z_0 \equiv \frac{a}{2\hbar}\sqrt{2mV_0} \quad \text{so } \frac{\kappa a}{2} = \sqrt{z_0^2 - z^2}$$

$$\text{even eigenvalues: } \tan z = \frac{1}{z}\sqrt{z_0^2 - z^2} = \sqrt{\frac{z_0^2}{z^2} - 1}$$

$$\text{odd eigenvalues: } \cot z = -\frac{1}{z}\sqrt{z_0^2 - z^2} = -\sqrt{\frac{z_0^2}{z^2} - 1}$$

z_0 is a unit-less number derived by the potential we are given – the parameters V_0 and a . Before we draw graphs to visualize this in Figure 6.8, consider the process of gradually increasing V_0 , which allows more and more states to be captured in the potential well. When does a new state enter? When $|E| \sim 0 \Rightarrow \kappa = 0 \Rightarrow z \sim z_0$. This means

$$\text{even: } \tan z \sim \tan z_0 = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad z_0 = n\frac{\pi}{2}, n = 0, 2, 4, \dots \quad \Rightarrow \quad a^2V_0 = n^2\pi^2\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}, n = 0, 2, 4, \dots$$

Therefore if

$$(n+2)^2\pi^2\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} > a^2V_0 > n^2\pi^2\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}, n = 0, 2, 4, \dots \quad \text{there are } \frac{n}{2} + 1 \text{ even bound states}$$

Note that there is always at least one bound state that persists even as $V_0 \rightarrow 0$. For the odd-parity states,

$$\text{odd: } \cot z \sim \cot z_0 = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad z_0 = n\frac{\pi}{2}, n = 1, 3, 5, \dots \quad \Rightarrow \quad a^2V_0 = n^2\pi^2\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}, n = 1, 3, 5, \dots$$

Therefore if

$$(n+2)^2\pi^2\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} > a^2V_0 > n^2\pi^2\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}, n = 1, 3, 5, \dots \quad \text{there are } \frac{n+1}{2} \text{ odd bound states}$$

Putting these two results together:

Number of Energy Eigenstates

For a finite well of width a and depth V_0 , if

$$(n+1)^2 \pi^2 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} > a^2 V_0 > n^2 \pi^2 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m}, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

there are $n+1$ bound states. The equivalent condition on z_0 is

$$(n+1) \frac{\pi}{2} > z_0 > n \frac{\pi}{2} \quad (6.93)$$

6.4.3 Finding Eigenvalues

Our eigenvalue equations are

$$\tan z = \sqrt{\frac{z_0^2}{z^2} - 1} \quad \cot z = -\sqrt{\frac{z_0^2}{z^2} - 1}$$

which we must solve as a function of z_0 . We do so by plotting the left and right-handed sides, for a series of z_0^2 and finding the intersections. This is shown in Figure 6.8 for the cases of $z_0 = \pi/4$ and $z_0 = 3\pi/4$. The pattern of solutions follows the discussion above. One can also use Mathematica or MATLAB to get accurate results.

Consistency with the Infinite Square Well: In our calculation we can take $V_0 \rightarrow \infty$ or equivalently $z_0 \rightarrow \infty$. Then our even eigenvalue equation becomes

$$\tan z = \tan \frac{ka}{2} = \frac{1}{z} \sqrt{z_0^2 - z^2} \rightarrow \infty \Rightarrow \frac{k_n a}{2} = \frac{n\pi}{2}, \quad n = 1, 3, 5, \dots$$

and our odd equation becomes

$$-\cot z = -\cot \frac{ka}{2} = \frac{1}{z} \sqrt{z_0^2 - z^2} \rightarrow \infty \Rightarrow \frac{k_n a}{2} = \frac{n\pi}{2}, \quad n = 2, 4, 6, \dots$$

Thus

$$k_n a = n\pi, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots \Rightarrow E_n = \frac{\hbar^2 k_n^2}{2m} = \frac{n^2 \pi^2 \hbar^2}{2ma^2}, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

which is the same result as before.

6.4.4 Finding Bound Stationary States Example

We consider a specific case where

$$z_0 = \frac{\pi}{20}$$

Let's first determine how many bound states this potential can hold. Referring to our eigenvalue condition on z_0 from Equation 6.93,

$$(n+1)\frac{\pi}{2} > \frac{\pi}{20} > n\frac{\pi}{2}$$

The only n that satisfies this equation is $n = 0$. Therefore this potential will have only a single, even-parity bound state. This choice leads to

$$z_0 \equiv \frac{a}{2\hbar} \sqrt{2mV_0} \Rightarrow V_0 = \left(\frac{\pi}{20}\right)^2 \frac{2\hbar^2}{ma^2}$$

This is a very weak potential, one that supports a barely-bound state. We can compute the wave number and wavelength of the wave function inside the well,

$$k = \frac{\sqrt{2m(V_0 - |E|)}}{\hbar} < \frac{\sqrt{2mV_0}}{\hbar} = \frac{\pi}{10} \frac{1}{a} \Rightarrow \lambda = \frac{2\pi}{k} > 20a$$

The wave length is *much* longer than the width of the well. We will return to this fact soon when we study *quantum tunneling*. Solving our even eigenvalue equation yields

$$z \equiv \frac{ka}{2} = 0.1551918$$

But from our earlier formulae,

$$\frac{\kappa a}{2} = \sqrt{z_0^2 - \left(\frac{ka}{2}\right)^2} = 0.02428 \quad \text{and} \quad |E| = \left(\frac{\kappa a}{2}\right)^2 \frac{2\hbar^2}{ma^2} = \left(\frac{\kappa a}{2}\right)^2 V_0 \left(\frac{20}{\pi}\right)^2 = 0.02245V_0$$

This state is very near the top of the well – 98% of the well is below. The wave function is almost free! Only about 5% of the probability density is within the well – the rest is spread out in the classically forbidden region. We could make this solution less and less bound, forcing it to approach arbitrarily close to a free particle wave of the form

$$\frac{1}{2} [e^{ikx} + e^{-ikx}]$$




Figure 6.8: Finite Well even (left) and odd (right) parity plots to identify eigenvalues. For $z_0 = \pi/4$, one even solution is found. For $z_0 = 3\pi/4$, one even and one odd solution is found.

6.5 The Delta Function Potential

Here we define the delta function $\delta(x)$ as the limit

$$\delta(x - 0) = \delta(x) \equiv \lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{|b|\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-(x/b)^2}$$

If we integrate the Gaussian over all x ,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-(x/b)^2} dx = \sqrt{\pi}|b| \quad \text{so} \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(x) dx = 1$$

Delta Function Definition and Properties

$$\delta(x) \equiv \lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{|b|\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-(x/b)^2} \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \delta(x - \beta) dx = f(\beta) \quad \delta(\beta x) = \frac{1}{|\beta|} \delta(x)$$

Delta Function Potential: Consider the case of a square well potential and a weakly bound state, where $\lambda \gg a$. Were we to consider the expectation value of $V(x)$ for this low-momentum state, we could approximate

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^*(x) V(x) \psi(x) dx \sim \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [\psi^*(0) + x\psi'^*(0) + \dots] V(x) [\psi(0) + x\psi'(0) + \dots] dx \quad (6.94)$$

$$= \psi^*(0)\psi(0) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} V(x) dx + (\psi'^*(0)\psi(0) + \psi^*(0)\psi'(0)) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x V(x) dx + \dots \quad (6.95)$$

For the limits of the well we get,

$$\psi^*(0)\psi(0) \int_{-a/2}^{a/2} (-V_0) dx + (\psi'^*(0)\psi(0) + \psi^*(0)\psi'(0)) \int_{-a/2}^{a/2} x(-V_0) dx + \dots \quad (6.96)$$

$$= -\psi^*(0)V_0a\psi(0) + 0(\psi'^*(0)\psi(0) + \psi^*(0)\psi'(0)) + \dots \quad (6.97)$$

$$= -V_0a \int \psi^*(x) \delta(x) \psi(x) dx \quad (6.98)$$

where the second term vanishes because our potential is even. Therefore, our work above identifies

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi^*(x) V(x) \psi(x) dx \sim -aV_0 \int \psi^*(x) \delta(x) \psi(x) dx$$

These two potentials $-V(x)$ and $-aV_0\delta(x)$ would give us equivalent answers if we restrict our attention to low energies. For such low-momentum, long-wavelength states, this derivation suggests we can replace our square well interaction $V(x)$ with a simpler one:

$$V(x) \rightarrow V_\delta(x) \equiv -aV_0\delta(x)$$

This derivation showed that the delta function ‘strength’ in general is given by the integral

$$\int_{-a/2}^{a/2} V(x) dx$$

where $V(x)$ is the potential and a defines the region over which the unspecified potential is nonzero. We define $\alpha = aV_0$ to be the strength of the attractive finite well potential. The finite square well potential $V(x)$ and $V_\delta = \alpha\delta(x)$ should yield equivalent solutions of the Schrödinger equation that have wavelength $\lambda \gg a$.

But this also guarantees that we can take a similar limit of the square well potential itself, shrinking a and proportionally increasing V_0 , since the proper delta function strength depends on the product $\alpha = aV_0$. This is nice because we have solved the square well, and can use those results for any a .

When counting the number of possible eigenstates in Equation 6.93, we found

If $\pi^2 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} > a^2 V_0 > 0$, we have one even bound state

If $4\pi^2 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} > a^2 V_0 > \pi^2 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m}$, we have one even and one odd bound state

In taking the delta function limit, we keep the product aV_0 constant. But the factor appearing above is $a^2 V_0 = a\alpha$. Thus as we make a smaller, clearly at some point the second equation is unsatisfied. But the first states

$$a^2 V_0 = \alpha a > 0$$

No matter how small we make a , keeping aV_0 fixed, this condition remains satisfied. We conclude

An attractive delta function potential $V_\delta = -\alpha V_0 \delta(x)$, $\alpha > 0$, has exactly one even bound state, independent of the potential's strength α .

What is the strength of this bound state? The finite square well eigenvalue condition is

$$\frac{ka}{2} \tan\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) = \frac{\kappa a}{2} \quad k = \frac{\sqrt{2m(V_0 - |E|)}}{\hbar} \quad \kappa = \frac{\sqrt{2m|E|}}{\hbar}$$

But as $a \rightarrow 0$,

$$\frac{ka}{2} = \sqrt{a} \frac{\sqrt{2ma(V_0 - |E|)}}{2\hbar} = \sqrt{a} \frac{\sqrt{2maV_0(1 - \frac{|E|}{V_0})}}{2\hbar} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{so} \quad \frac{ka}{2} \tan\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) \rightarrow \left(\frac{ka}{2}\right)^2$$

So our eigenvalue equation becomes

$$\frac{ka}{2} \tan\left(\frac{ka}{2}\right) = \frac{\kappa a}{2} \Rightarrow \left(\frac{ka}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{\kappa a}{2} \quad \text{exact as } a \rightarrow 0 \Rightarrow \quad (6.99)$$

$$\frac{a}{4\hbar^2} 2maV_0 \left(1 - \frac{|E|}{V_0}\right) = \frac{a}{2\hbar} \sqrt{2m|E|} \Rightarrow \frac{m(aV_0)}{\hbar} \left(1 - \frac{|E|}{V_0}\right) = \sqrt{2m|E|} \quad (6.100)$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{m(aV_0)}{\hbar} = \sqrt{2m|E|} \quad \text{exact as } a \rightarrow 0 \quad (6.101)$$

Solving for $|E|$,

$$|E| = \frac{m(aV_0)^2}{2\hbar^2} = \frac{m\alpha^2}{2\hbar^2}$$

This result is also valid (for long wavelength ψ) for our finite well potential and a weakly bound state, but as noted, becomes *exact* when we take the delta function limit, keeping $\alpha = aV_0$ fixed. This makes sense, as in the limit *every* wave function is long compared to the delta function potential. In summary

The bound state of a delta function potential $V_\delta = -\alpha\delta(x)$ has a binding energy of

$$|E| = \frac{m\alpha^2}{2\hbar^2}$$

The other result we can derive concerns the derivative of the wave function at the delta function potential, or more correctly, the discontinuity of the derivative across the delta function. We saw in the case of the infinite square well that the derivative could be discontinuous at the interface with an infinite wall. (In all other cases, where there is no infinite potential, the wave function derivative must be continuous). Here the situation is not so clear, because the potential is going to infinity, but its width is going to zero...

Our finite square well solution left of the potential well is

$$\psi_L(x) = Ce^{\frac{\kappa a}{2}} \cos \frac{ka}{2} e^{\kappa x} \rightarrow Ce^{\kappa(x+\frac{a}{2})}$$

And because we just showed in the delta function limit that $ka \sim \sqrt{a} \rightarrow 0$,

$$\psi'_L(x) = C\kappa e^{\kappa(x+\frac{a}{2})} \rightarrow C\kappa \text{ as } x \rightarrow -\frac{a}{2}$$

And similarly on the right side,

$$\psi_R(x) \rightarrow Ce^{-\kappa(x-\frac{a}{2})} \quad \psi'_R(x) = -C\kappa e^{-\kappa(x-\frac{a}{2})} \rightarrow -C\kappa \text{ as } x \rightarrow \frac{a}{2}$$

and as $\psi(x=0) = C$, one concludes

The discontinuity of the derivative across $V_\delta = -\alpha\delta(x)$, $\alpha > 0$ is

$$\psi'_R(0) - \psi'_L(0) = -2\kappa\psi(0) = -2\frac{\sqrt{2m|E|}}{\hbar}\psi(0) = -\frac{2m\alpha}{\hbar^2}\psi(0). \quad (6.102)$$

The wave functions are continuous and $\frac{d\psi}{dx}$ is continuous except at points where the potential is infinite.

6.5.1 Wave Function Solution

Now

$$\kappa = \frac{\sqrt{2m|E|}}{\hbar} = \frac{m\alpha}{\hbar^2}$$

Our wave function normalization condition is

$$\int_{-\infty}^0 |C|^2 e^{2\kappa x} dx + \int_0^{\infty} |C|^2 e^{-2\kappa x} dx = \frac{|C|^2}{\kappa} \Rightarrow C = \sqrt{\kappa} = \frac{\sqrt{m\alpha}}{\hbar}$$

Putting everything together, we have a universal bound state solution for an attractive delta function potential:

Delta Function Potential Solution

$$V_{\delta}(x) = -\alpha\delta(x), \alpha > 0$$

$$|E| = \frac{m\alpha^2}{2\hbar^2} \quad \kappa = \frac{m\alpha}{\hbar^2}$$

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\kappa}e^{\kappa x}, & x < 0 \\ \sqrt{\kappa}e^{-\kappa x}, & x > 0 \end{cases} \quad \psi'(x) = \begin{cases} \kappa^{3/2}e^{\kappa x}, & x < 0 \\ -\kappa^{3/2}e^{-\kappa x}, & x > 0 \end{cases}$$

6.6 Review and Outlook

Let's review what we have done so far

1. We have studied bound states of the infinite square well, the harmonic oscillator, and the finite square well. In the last, the bound states were the states defined by $E < 0$.
2. In these problems we sought the stationary states, the solutions of the time-independent Schrödinger equation. This required us to solve eigenvalue equations – finding solutions only at certain energies. Consequently the energies were discrete. The eigenvalue conditions were somewhat different in detail, but conceptually similar:
 - For the infinite square well, the wave functions were required to vanish at the infinite potential wall.
 - For the bound states of the finite square well, we required continuity of the wave function and its derivative at the finite wall boundary. The eigenvalue equation came from this formula

$$\left. \frac{\psi'(x)}{\psi(x)} \right|_{x=-\frac{a}{2}-\epsilon} \leftrightarrow \left. \frac{\psi'(x)}{\psi(x)} \right|_{x=-\frac{a}{2}+\epsilon}$$

- For the harmonic oscillator, the eigenvalue equation comes from demanding that the wave function not increase at large r to maintain normalizability. At certain energies this proved possible, yielding wave functions that die off as a Gaussian $e^{-\xi^2/2}$, times finite Hermite polynomials in ξ .
- 3. The resulting stationary states are normalizable and labeled by a discrete index n . Thus the stationary states are physical states we can prepare in a laboratory.
- 4. We also introduced free-particle states. These stationary states were labeled by a continuous index k , extended over all space, and were not normalizable. These states are still useful as a basis, but a single stationary state is not a candidate for a real physical state. We can not envision ever preparing such a state.
- 5. Our finite square well gave us another example of free but distorted states – states with $E > 0$ that extend over all space. These wave functions near the well get distorted by the well.
- 6. In all cases, the (complete set) stationary states can be used to expand any wave packet presented to us – a physical state. Under subsequent time evolution, the expansion coefficients remain, but each accumulates a distinct phase governed by the stationary state energy. Thus we obtain general solutions of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation. This is the prescription we call the *prime directive*. Note that for the finite well the complete basis requires both bound and continuum states.

This is amazing progress. However, there are a number of phenomena we know about classically which we can examine in quantum mechanics, as well as some phenomena with no classical analog. Phenomena without any classical analog often involve free ($E > 0$) but interacting states that encounter potential wells or hills, generating phenomena like reflection and transmission, or particle *spin* – which we will get to later. The next chapter deals with understanding reflection and transmission, the main concepts behind *quantum tunneling*. Afterwards we begin studying QM less tightly connected to wave functions.

6.7 Transmission and Reflection

6.7.1 Scattering off V_δ

We can utilize a simple delta function potential – either a well or a barrier – to scatter. As we have learned, this will give us a very accurate representation of scattering of much more complicated potentials, provided the deBroglie wavelength of the incident particle is significantly larger than the width of the barrier.

Consider scattering for a delta function potential at $x = 0$. $E > 0$ and the time-independent Schrödinger equation for $x < 0$ is

$$\frac{d^2\psi(x)}{dx^2} = -k^2\psi(x) \quad k = \frac{\sqrt{2mE}}{\hbar} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \psi(x) = Ae^{ikx} + Be^{-ikx}$$

Likewise for $x > 0$,

$$\psi(x) = Fe^{ikx} + Ge^{-ikx}$$

Continuity at $x = 0$ requires

$$A + B = F + G$$

And we can compute the derivative on either side of the delta function,

$$\left. \frac{d\psi}{dx} \right|_R = ik(F - G) \quad (6.103)$$

$$\left. \frac{d\psi}{dx} \right|_L = ik(A - B) \quad (6.104)$$

So for an attractive well, combining both continuity conditions and our calculated derivative discontinuity across the delta potential from Equation 6.102,

$$V_\delta = -\alpha\delta(x) \quad \Rightarrow \quad ik(F - G - A + B) = -\frac{2m\alpha}{\hbar^2}\psi(0) = -\frac{2m\alpha}{\hbar^2}(A + B) \quad (6.105)$$

$$\Rightarrow F - G = A(1 + 2i\beta) - B(1 - 2i\beta) \quad \beta \equiv \frac{m\alpha}{\hbar^2 k} = \frac{\alpha}{\hbar} \sqrt{\frac{m}{2E}} \quad \beta^2 = \frac{m\alpha^2}{2\hbar^2 E} \quad (6.106)$$

There are two constraints and four unknowns – A, B, F, G , so to get a solution we need more information. Normalization is of no help, as these are free-particle non-normalizable states.

Recall that when we convert to time-dependent solutions, per the prime directive, a phase $e^{-iEt/\hbar}$ is added. When that is done, one sees

1. e^{ikx} generates a wave traveling with positive velocity (traveling to the right): it would be associated with a wave packet component $e^{i(kx - \omega t)}$ that travels to the right.
2. e^{-ikx} generates a wave with negative velocity (travels to the left).

So suppose we wish to describe the scattering of a wave packet coming in from the left, off our potential. Part of the wave will be reflected, moving back to the left. Some of it will be transmitted, going to the right, through the potential. But there is no wave to generate at positive x that is moving to the left. So if we set our initial conditions to reflect the experiment just described, we should require

$$G = 0$$

The experiment described is depicted in Figure 6.9 below.




Figure 6.9: Scattering by a beam incident on a delta function potential from the left

A then corresponds to the amplitude of the incident wave coming in from the left. We can then solve our two equations to find

$$B = \frac{i\beta}{1 - i\beta}A \quad F = \frac{1}{1 - i\beta}A \quad (6.107)$$

which should be interpreted as the amplitude of the reflected and transmitted wave, respectively. The probability of reflection is then

$$R = \frac{|B|^2}{|A|^2} \equiv \frac{|\text{Amplitude}_{\text{reflected}}|^2}{|\text{Amplitude}_{\text{incoming}}|^2} = \frac{\beta^2}{1 + \beta^2} \quad (6.108)$$

Similarly, the probability of transmission is

$$T = \frac{|F|^2}{|A|^2} \equiv \frac{|\text{Amplitude}_{\text{transmitted}}|^2}{|\text{Amplitude}_{\text{incoming}}|^2} = \frac{1}{1 + \beta^2} \quad (6.109)$$

You can check that $R + T = 1$. Plugging in our expression for β ,

Transmission and Reflection Coefficients – Delta Potential

$$V_\delta = \pm\alpha\delta(x) \quad \Rightarrow \quad T = \frac{1}{1+\beta^2} \quad R = \frac{\beta^2}{1+\beta^2} \quad \beta^2 = \frac{m\alpha^2}{2\hbar^2 E} \quad (6.110)$$

Note that we allowed for the scattering to be off a well or a *barrier*, as we found that the answer does not depend on the sign of α . We see

1. As $E \rightarrow 0$, $T \rightarrow 0$, $R \rightarrow 1$. The wave is fully reflected.
2. As $E \rightarrow \infty$, $T \rightarrow 1$, $R \rightarrow 0$. The wave is fully transmitted.
3. As $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, $T \rightarrow 0$, $R \rightarrow 1$. The wave is fully reflected.
4. As $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, $T \rightarrow 1$, $R \rightarrow 0$. The wave is fully transmitted.

All of this is as expected classically. However, our barrier is infinitely high for any finite α , and yet there is always some transmission for any nonzero E . This is quantum mechanical tunneling.

6.7.2 Scattering off a Square Well

There are additional unique phenomena that are not captured in the delta-potential well calculation just outlined, but do emerge from scattering off a realistic well of equivalent strength $\alpha = aV_0$. The situation is depicted in Figure 6.10 below.




Figure 6.10: Scattering by a beam incident from the left on a well of depth V_0 and width a .

We will now repeat our previous calculations to see what new aspects arise from details of the well, beyond its net strength $\alpha \equiv aV_0$.

This is a slightly new problem for us as we are solving a problem involving the free states *above* the well, not bound states within. We define our kinematic variables in the usual way, remembering by assumption that $E > 0$,

$$k \equiv \frac{\sqrt{2mE}}{\hbar} \quad l = \frac{\sqrt{2m(E + V_0)}}{\hbar}$$

Because of our experience above, we can speed things along by setting $G = 0$ as before. Only a transmitted wave is allowed in Region III.

I have previously stressed in earlier problems how much efficiency is gained by utilizing reflection symmetry. However now we require an asymmetric solution by setting $G = 0$. Consequently we have to deal with all three regions. The solutions in each region are

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} Fe^{ikx} & x > \frac{a}{2} \\ Ce^{ilx} + D^{-ilx} & -\frac{a}{2} < x < \frac{a}{2} \\ Ae^{ikx} + Be^{-ilx} & x < -\frac{a}{2} \end{cases}$$

We match solutions and their derivatives at the boundary of regions II and III ($x = \frac{a}{2}$). We yield

$$\begin{aligned} Fe^{ika/2} &= Ce^{ila/2} + De^{-ila/2} \\ ikFe^{ika/2} &= il(Ce^{ila/2} - D^{-ila/2}) \end{aligned}$$

As there are two constraints, F determines C and D . Doing (a lot of) the algebra,

$$C = F \left(\frac{l+k}{2l} \right) e^{i(k-l)\frac{a}{2}} \quad D = F \left(\frac{l-k}{2l} \right) e^{i(k+l)\frac{a}{2}} \quad (6.111)$$

Now we need to match the boundary of regions I and II ($x = -\frac{a}{2}$). Let's first use the information above to write out the solutions in the two regions.

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} F \left(\frac{l+k}{2l} \right) e^{ika/2} e^{il(x-a/2)} + F \left(\frac{l-k}{2l} \right) e^{ika/2} e^{-il(x-a/2)} & -\frac{a}{2} < x < \frac{a}{2} \\ Ae^{ikx} + Be^{-ikx} & x < -\frac{a}{2} \end{cases}$$

The continuity of the wave function and its derivative yields

$$\begin{aligned} F \left(\frac{l+k}{2l} \right) e^{ika/2} e^{-ila} + F \left(\frac{l-k}{2l} \right) e^{ika/2} e^{ila} &= Ae^{-ika/2} + Be^{ika/2} \\ il \left[F \left(\frac{l+k}{2l} \right) e^{ika/2} e^{-ila} - F \left(\frac{l-k}{2l} \right) e^{ika/2} e^{ila} \right] &= ik [Ae^{-ika/2} - Be^{ika/2}] \end{aligned}$$

These two constraints can be used to eliminate A and B . Doing (again a lot of) algebra,

$$A = F \frac{e^{ika}}{4lk} [(l+k)^2 e^{-ila} - (l-k)^2 e^{ila}] \quad (6.112)$$

$$B = F \frac{(l+k)(l-k)}{4lk} [e^{ila} - e^{-ila}] \quad (6.113)$$

When all the dust clears, we have a solution in which only one unknown constant F remains. This is no problem since F will cancel when calculating the transmission and reflection ratios.

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} Fe^{ikx} & x > \frac{a}{2}, \\ F \frac{e^{ika/2}}{2l} [(l+k)e^{il(x-a/2)} + (l-k)e^{-il(x-a/2)}] & -\frac{a}{2} < x < \frac{a}{2}, \\ Fe^{ikx} \frac{1}{4lk} [(l+k)^2 e^{i(k-l)a} + (l-k)^2 e^{i(k+l)a}] + Fe^{-ikx} \frac{(l^2-k^2)}{4lk} 2i \sin la & x < -\frac{a}{2}. \end{cases} \quad (6.114)$$

From this we identify

$$\text{transmitted wave :} \quad Fe^{ikx} \quad x > \frac{a}{2} \quad (6.115)$$

$$\text{incoming wave :} \quad Fe^{ikx} \frac{1}{4lk} [(l+k)^2 e^{i(k-l)a} - (l-k)^2 e^{i(k+l)a}] \quad x < -\frac{a}{2} \quad (6.116)$$

$$\text{reflected wave :} \quad Fe^{-ikx} \frac{(l^2-k^2)}{4lk} 2i \sin la \quad x < -\frac{a}{2} \quad (6.117)$$

We can now calculate the ratios of reflection and transmission.

Transmission and Reflection Coefficients – Finite Well

$$R = \text{Prob. of reflection} = \frac{|A_{\text{reflect}}|^2}{|A_{\text{incoming}}|^2} = \frac{4(l^2-k^2) \sin^2 la}{(4lk)^2 + 4(l^2-k^2)^2 \sin^2 la} \quad (6.118)$$

$$= \frac{(l^2-k^2) \sin^2 la}{(2lk)^2 + (l^2-k^2)^2 \sin^2 la} \quad (6.119)$$

$$T = \text{Prob. of transm} = \frac{|A_{\text{transmission}}|^2}{|A_{\text{incoming}}|^2} = \frac{(4lk)^2}{(4lk)^2 + 4(l^2-k^2)^2 \sin^2 la} \quad (6.120)$$

$$= \frac{(2lk)^2}{(2lk)^2 + (l^2-k^2)^2 \sin^2 la} \quad (6.121)$$

6.7.3 Perfect Transmission

Physically we argued that $V_\delta = -\alpha\delta(x)$ should be effectively equivalent to a square well solution if the scattered particle's wavelength is very large relative to a . For the finite well our kinematic variable l

$$l = \frac{\sqrt{2m(E + V_0)}}{\hbar}$$

Thus, for a particle's wavelength λ_l to be much larger than a ,

$$\lambda_l = \frac{2\pi}{l} \gg a \quad \Rightarrow \quad l \ll \frac{2\pi}{a}$$

Consequently, V_δ fails to capture an interesting aspect of real wells – the fact that $T \rightarrow 1$ when $\sin^3 la = 0$. This occurs at

$$la = n\pi, \quad n = 1, 2, 3 \dots$$

The physics of this effect is shown below in Figure 6.11, drawn for $la = 2\pi$.




Figure 6.11: Perfect transmission, $la = 2\pi$

One sees that the wave function while in the well executes exactly a 2π phase change and consequently, since our wave functions and their derivatives are continuous, one could “cut out” the well from $-a/2$ to $a/2$ and patch the two exterior pieces together with no change in the wave function phase from scattering.

6.7.4 Comparing V_δ and the Square Well

A bit of algebra and the identification $\alpha = aV_0$ yields the following relations

$$ka = \frac{a\sqrt{2mE}}{\hbar} = \frac{a\sqrt{2mV_0}}{\hbar} \sqrt{\frac{E}{V_0}} \quad la = \frac{a\sqrt{2mV_0}}{\hbar} \sqrt{1 + \frac{E}{V_0}} \quad \beta^2 = \frac{m\alpha^2}{2\hbar^2 E} = \frac{m\alpha^2 V_0}{2\hbar^2} \frac{V_0}{E}$$

We will consider the scattering off three wells of different strengths in the ratio of $\frac{1}{16} : 1 : 16 : 256$,

$$V_0 = \frac{\hbar^2}{32ma^2} \quad V_0 = \frac{\hbar^2}{2ma^2} \quad V_0 = \frac{8\hbar^2}{ma^2} \quad V_0 = \frac{128\hbar^2}{ma^2}$$

which then yields

$$V_0 = \frac{\hbar^2}{32ma^2} \Rightarrow ka = \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{E}{V_0}} \quad la = \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{1 + \frac{E}{V_0}} \quad \beta^2 = \frac{1}{64} \frac{V_0}{E} \quad (6.122)$$

$$V_0 = \frac{\hbar^2}{2ma^2} \Rightarrow ka = \sqrt{\frac{E}{V_0}} \quad la = \sqrt{1 + \frac{E}{V_0}} \quad \beta^2 = \frac{1}{4} \frac{V_0}{E} \quad (6.123)$$

$$V_0 = \frac{8\hbar^2}{ma^2} \Rightarrow ka = 4\sqrt{\frac{E}{V_0}} \quad la = 4\sqrt{1 + \frac{E}{V_0}} \quad \beta^2 = 4 \frac{V_0}{E} \quad (6.124)$$

$$V_0 = \frac{128\hbar^2}{ma^2} \Rightarrow ka = 16\sqrt{\frac{E}{V_0}} \quad la = 16\sqrt{1 + \frac{E}{V_0}} \quad \beta^2 = 64 \frac{V_0}{E} \quad (6.125)$$

The progression increases the depth of the well while keeping fixed width. This identifies E/V_0 as the “control parameter” for the scattering.

Let’s analyze the λ/a ratios for particles at the top of the well ($E = V_0$) each of the four cases.

First Case: $V_0 = \frac{\hbar^2}{32ma^2}$

$$\text{at } E = V_0, \quad \frac{\lambda_k}{a} = 8\pi \quad \frac{\lambda_l}{a} = 4\sqrt{2}\pi \quad \beta^2 = \frac{1}{64}$$

Second Case: $V_0 = \frac{\hbar^2}{2ma^2}$

$$\text{at } E = V_0, \quad \frac{\lambda_k}{a} = 2\pi \quad \frac{\lambda_l}{a} = \sqrt{2}\pi \quad \beta^2 = \frac{1}{4}$$

Third Case: $V_0 = \frac{8\hbar^2}{ma^2}$

$$\text{at } E = V_0, \quad \frac{\lambda_k}{a} = \frac{\pi}{2} \quad \frac{\lambda_l}{a} = \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{2}} \quad \beta^2 = 4$$

Fourth Case: $V_0 = \frac{128\hbar^2}{ma^2}$

$$\text{at } E = V_0, \quad \frac{\lambda_k}{a} = \frac{\pi}{8} \quad \frac{\lambda_l}{a} = \frac{\pi}{8\sqrt{2}} \quad \beta^2 = 64$$

In the first case, the wavelengths are very long compared to the well both in the exterior and interior. The potential is weak, and the delta function representation might work well up to fairly high energies. In the second case, wavelengths are on the order $2\pi a$ – the well’s shape should start to play a role at incident

energies comparable to the well depth. And in the third case, the well can definitely be detected, and one suspects that the delta function representation will certainly have failed as E is increased toward V_0 .

We can plot our transmission and reflection coefficients as a function of ka parameterized by V_0/E . Results are shown in Figure 6.12 as a function of E/V_0 . We should expect that as $E/V_0 \rightarrow 1$, for higher V_0 , the delta function and square well results to spread apart. The delta function results (orange) and square well results (blue) only agree at small ka (and la).




Figure 6.12: Transmission and Reflection Coefficients plotted for increasing V_0 . Blue represents the square well potential and orange represents delta function potential of equivalent strength.

This concludes our introduction to the fundamental problems in Quantum Mechanics. By now, you should have a strong grasp of the methods used to solve the time-independent Schrödinger equation for basic potentials, providing a solid foundation for the material to come. It's not necessary to memorize every algebraic step or derivation for each potential discussed. Instead, focus on developing an intuitive sense of how these problems are approached and solved. What matters most is understanding the general procedure for solving these problems and truly comprehending the underlying principles of each derivation.

Next chapter presents ways of thinking of Quantum Mechanics less tightly connected to wave functions. We are diving directly into Quantum theory.

Chapter 7

Quantum Mechanics Formalism

We have so far focused on wave functions and their properties, developing some intuition about wave mechanics. A few curiosities may have struck you however. For example, we found in the harmonic oscillator that we could express the Hamiltonian (once we chose the right variables) in terms of a dimensionless operator

$$\frac{\hbar\omega}{2} (\hat{p}_\xi^2 + \hat{\xi}^2) \rightarrow \frac{\hbar\omega}{2} (p_\xi^2 + \xi^2)$$

Most textbooks, notably Griffiths, have the habit of indicating \hat{p} is an operator, but dropping the “hat” on $\hat{x} \rightarrow x$. Why is this? At an even more basic level, the harmonic oscillator is manifestly symmetric in \hat{p} and \hat{x} , yet our wave function formalism favored x . When we operate on our wave function with the \hat{x} operator we just get back the value x . But when we act with \hat{p} , we have to take a derivative. Where did we lose the $p - x$ symmetry?

It has been lost because we choose a basis for representing our states – a position basis. We will now review some of what we know about vectors and their representations. Take the example of a vector \vec{v} in 3D space. We are aware that this is a geometrical object, with a length and a direction, that exists independent of the basis we select to represent the vector. We will denote this abstract vector, without a specified basis, with the following notation of Dirac – $|\vec{v}\rangle$.

7.1 Dirac Notation

Suppose we have a vector in ordinary 3D space. That vector is a geometric object, consisting of a length and direction, independent on the basis we choose. We could choose to *represent* the vector in a specific basis. For example, the basis could be taken to be the three Cartesian unit vectors

$$\hat{e}_x, \hat{e}_y, \hat{e}_z \Rightarrow |\hat{e}_x\rangle, |\hat{e}_y\rangle, |\hat{e}_z\rangle$$

The bases we use satisfy two important conditions. The first requirement on our basis vectors is *orthonormality*,

$$\langle \hat{e}_i | \hat{e}_j \rangle = \langle i | j \rangle = \delta_{ij} \quad \{i, j\} \in \{x, y, z\}$$

That is, our basis vectors are unit vectors orthogonal to one another. The second, implicit when we expand a vector $|\alpha\rangle$ in a basis, is *completeness*.

$$\sum_{i \in \{x,y,z\}} |\hat{e}_i\rangle\langle\hat{e}_i| \equiv \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| = 1$$

We use this result when we represent a vector in terms of an orthonormal basis. Thus

$$|\vec{v}\rangle = \sum_i |\hat{e}_i\rangle\langle\hat{e}_i|\vec{v}\rangle = |\hat{e}_x\rangle v_x + |\hat{e}_y\rangle v_y + |\hat{e}_z\rangle v_z$$

These requirements involve both vectors, e.g., $|\alpha\rangle$, and adjoint vectors, $\langle\alpha|$, which I explain below.

One is free to choose any basis satisfying the conditions above, a freedom that can be used to simplify many problems. For example, if one is working in 3D and interested in a problem with spherical symmetry, an alternative basis that transforms more simply under rotations is the spherical basis:

$$|\hat{e}_1\rangle = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\hat{e}_x\rangle + i|\hat{e}_y\rangle) \quad |\hat{e}_0\rangle = |\hat{e}_z\rangle \quad |\hat{e}_{-1}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\hat{e}_x\rangle - i|\hat{e}_y\rangle)$$

Here the adjoint basis vectors are

$$\langle\hat{e}_1| = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\langle\hat{e}_x| - i\langle\hat{e}_y|) \quad \langle\hat{e}_0| = \langle\hat{e}_z| \quad \langle\hat{e}_{-1}| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\langle\hat{e}_x| + i\langle\hat{e}_y|)$$

That is, $\langle\alpha|$ is the *conjugate transpose* of $|\alpha\rangle$. For this basis one can readily verify orthonormality and completeness. Consequently we can also represent a vector in 3D in a spherical basis

$$|\vec{v}\rangle = \sum_i |\hat{e}_i\rangle\langle\hat{e}_i|\vec{v}\rangle = |\hat{e}_{-1}\rangle v_{-1} + |\hat{e}_0\rangle v_0 + |\hat{e}_1\rangle v_1$$

The discussion above can be generalized beyond simple vectors in 3D, as we can represent any vector $|\alpha\rangle$ of finite dimension N similarly,

$$|\alpha\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N |i\rangle\langle i|\alpha\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i |i\rangle$$

in terms of a chosen N -dimensional set of unit basis vectors. Here $\langle i|\alpha\rangle$ is a scalar, the inner product defined below. The adjoint (conjugate transpose) of a vector is defined by

$$\langle\alpha| \equiv |\alpha\rangle^\dagger = \sum_{i=1}^N \langle\alpha|i\rangle\langle i| = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i^* \langle i|$$

That is, the inner product satisfies

$$\langle i|\alpha\rangle^* = \langle \alpha|i\rangle.$$

We can think of $|\alpha\rangle$ represented in a basis as a column vector whose entries are the expansion coefficients in that basis

$$|\alpha\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_N \end{pmatrix}$$

Correspondingly, the adjoint vector can be viewed as a row matrix in that basis,

$$\langle \alpha| = (\alpha_1^*, \alpha_2^*, \dots, \alpha_N^*)$$

7.2 Infinite Dimensional Representations and Wave Functions

On several occasions (infinite square well, harmonic oscillator) we have expanded initial wave packets over stationary states that were discrete (like above) but infinite dimensional (unlike above), obtaining an expression for the wave function that could be used with the prime directive to determine the time evolution of the wave packet.

$$\Psi(x, t=0) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \psi_i(x) \quad \text{where} \quad c_i = \int_{\Omega} \psi_i^*(y) \Psi(y, t=0) dy$$

where Ω is the relevant domain). Let's assume we have a problem like the harmonic oscillator where the wave functions extend over all space ($\Omega \equiv -\infty < x < \infty$). In this case,

$$\Psi(x, t=0) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \psi_i(x) \quad \text{where} \quad c_i = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_i^*(y) \Psi(y, t=0) dy$$

where $\psi_i(y)$ are the stationary state wave functions.

Can we extract this result from the more abstract Dirac-formulation described just above? Consider

$$|\Psi(t=0)\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i | \Psi(t=0)\rangle \tag{7.1}$$

We introduce the complete set of normalized position states (postponing additional discussion until later). As position is a continuous quantum number,

$$1 = \sum_i |\hat{e}_i\rangle\langle\hat{e}_i| \quad \Rightarrow \quad 1 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |y\rangle\langle y| dy$$

Consequently,

$$|\Psi(t=0)\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |y\rangle\langle y|\Psi(t=0)\rangle dy \quad (7.2)$$

Inserting this into Equation 7.1 then yields

$$|\Psi(t=0)\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\psi_i\rangle \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle\psi_i|y\rangle\langle y|\Psi(t=0)\rangle dy$$

Finally we take the scalar product with $\langle x|$,

$$\langle x|\Psi(t=0)\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle x|\psi_i\rangle \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle\psi_i|y\rangle\langle y|\Psi(t=0)\rangle dy \quad (7.3)$$

Now if we define the wave function as the quantity

$$\Psi(x, t=0) = \langle x|\Psi(t=0)\rangle$$

and likewise with the other quantities appearing in Equations 7.2 and 7.3, those equations become

$$(7.2') \quad |\Psi(t=0)\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Psi(y, t=0)|y\rangle dy \quad (7.3') \quad |\Psi(x, t=0)\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \psi_i(x) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi_i^*(y)\Psi(y, t=0) dy$$

Equation 7.3' is just the expression we have been using up to this point, where we expand the initial wave packet in terms of stationary-state wave functions, prior to employing the prime directive. Equation 7.2' identifies the wave function $\psi(x)$ as the coefficients of the expansion of the state $|\psi\rangle$ in terms of the position basis functions $|x\rangle$. In other words, wave functions are expansion coefficients, analogous to the c_i that arose in the discrete case we described first.

The notion of expansions and wave functions lead to an interpretation of the wave function as a particular representation of a more basic and more object, abstract state – Dirac's “ket”, which he denoted as $|\Psi\rangle$.

7.2.1 Summary

We now recognize wave functions are just a particular representation of a more fundamental quantity, the state vector $|\Psi\rangle$, that exists independent of the representation, just as an ordinary 3D vector exists

independent of any coordinate basis. However, one always has the freedom to select a basis, to represent both state vectors and their adjoints. In Dirac's notation,

Dirac Notation

Dirac's Ket: $|\Psi\rangle$ representation in a basis i : $|\Psi\rangle \equiv \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i|\Psi\rangle \equiv \sum_i |i\rangle c_i$

Dirac's Bra: $\langle\Psi|$ representation in a basis i : $\langle\Psi| \equiv \sum_i \langle\Psi|i\rangle\langle i| \equiv \sum_i \langle i|c_i^*$

If the basis is described by a continuous index rather than a discrete one like i , the sum is replaced with an integral.

Up to this point we have repeatedly dealt with states of infinite dimension, representing them by taking an integral over the position eigenstates,

$$\sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \equiv 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \int |x\rangle\langle x| dx = 1$$

We used the position eigenstate representation and an inner product defined over the vector space of functions,

$$\delta_{\beta\alpha} = \langle\psi_\beta|\psi_\alpha\rangle \Rightarrow \int \langle\psi_\beta|x\rangle\langle x|\psi_\alpha\rangle dx = \int \langle x|\psi_\beta\rangle^* \langle x|\psi_\alpha\rangle dx = \int \psi_\beta^*(x)\psi_\alpha(x) dx$$

7.3 Continuous spectra, momentum, and position wave functions

The *spectrum* of an operator is defined as the set of possible outcomes after measurement.

If the spectrum of a Hamiltonian, or any other quantum mechanical operator is continuous, the eigenfunctions are not normalizable – not part of the “Hilbert Space” we will describe soon. For example, in the infinite square well and harmonic oscillator, we found the resultant eigenfunctions / wave functions to be discrete in energy, following

$$\text{Infinite Square Well: } E_n = \frac{\hbar^2 n^2 \pi^2}{2ma^2} \quad \text{Harmonic Oscillator: } E_n = \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right) \hbar\omega$$

If you refer back to Figures 6.5 and 6.2 you will see the spectrum of the Hamiltonian is discrete – only certain wave functions are allowed at specific energies. Because the set of wave functions, the spectrum, is not continuous, the wave functions are normalizable.

7.3.1 Momentum-Position Symmetry

Now that we understand the Dirac formulation of Quantum mechanics, let's return to our question at the beginning of this chapter – why the momentum operator \hat{p} requires a derivative, yet the position operator $\hat{x} \rightarrow x$ just returns x . I answered that the reason for this is our choice of representing our quantum states with the position basis – $\psi(x)$. Let's try to understand this more closely.

In the *position basis*, the position operator \hat{x} acting on a position eigenstate $|x\rangle$ yields

$$\hat{x}|x\rangle = x|x\rangle$$

Because $p \leftrightarrow x$ are manifestly symmetric, in the *momentum basis*, the momentum operator \hat{p} acting on a momentum eigenstate $|p\rangle$ yields

$$\hat{p}|p\rangle = p|p\rangle$$

However, in the position basis, from our Dirac formulation, this equation can also be written as

$$\hat{p}\langle x|p\rangle = p\langle x|p\rangle$$

Here, $\langle x|p\rangle$ is the wave function of the momentum eigenstate $|p\rangle$, in the position basis. Substituting in the momentum operator $\hat{p} = -i\hbar \frac{d}{dx}$ into the above equation,

$$-i\hbar \frac{d}{dx} \langle x|p\rangle = p\langle x|p\rangle$$

This is a first-order differential equation. We separate the variables,

$$\frac{d}{dx} \langle x|p\rangle = \frac{ip}{\hbar} \langle x|p\rangle \tag{7.4}$$

$$\frac{1}{\langle x|p\rangle} \frac{d}{dx} \langle x|p\rangle = \frac{ip}{\hbar} \tag{7.5}$$

Integrating,

$$\int \frac{1}{\langle x|p\rangle} \frac{d\langle x|p\rangle}{dx} dx = \int \frac{ip}{\hbar} dx$$

Finally,

$$\ln \langle x|p\rangle = \frac{ipx}{\hbar} + C \tag{7.6}$$

$$\langle x|p\rangle = Ae^{\frac{ipx}{\hbar}} \tag{7.7}$$

The expression $\langle x|p\rangle = Ae^{ipx/\hbar}$ thus represents the wave function of the momentum eigenstate in the position basis. To solve for A , we normalize,

$$\langle p'|p\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle p'|x\rangle \langle x|p\rangle dx = A^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i(p-p')x/\hbar} dx = |A|^2 2\pi\hbar \delta(p-p')$$

Therefore to allow $\langle p'|p\rangle = \delta(p'-p)$, i.e. satisfying orthonormality (both orthogonality and normalization), $A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}}$. Thus

$$\langle x|p\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}} \quad \text{then} \quad \langle p'|p\rangle = \delta(p'-p)$$

Griffiths calls this *Dirac-Delta Orthonormality*. These wave functions form a complete basis that can expand any normalizable state vector. We note

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |p\rangle \langle p| dp = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x\rangle \langle x|p\rangle \langle p|x'\rangle \langle x'| dx' = \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dp \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x\rangle \langle x'| e^{ip(x-x')/\hbar} dx' \quad (7.8)$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x\rangle \langle x'| \delta(x-x') dx' = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x\rangle \langle x| dx = 1 \quad (7.9)$$

Thus we can use these momentum eigenstates just as we use the position eigenstates. Given a state vector $|\alpha\rangle$, we can insert a complete set to determine

$$|\alpha\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |p\rangle \langle p|\alpha\rangle dp = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |p\rangle \psi_{\alpha}(p) dp$$

Then taking the inner product with $\langle x|$,

$$\psi_{\alpha}(x) \equiv \langle x|\alpha\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle x|p\rangle \langle p|\alpha\rangle dp = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ipx/\hbar} \psi_{\alpha}(p) dp$$

And conversely,

$$\psi_{\alpha}(p) = \langle p|\alpha\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle p|x\rangle \langle x|\alpha\rangle dx = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ipx/\hbar} \psi_{\alpha}(x) dx$$

The momentum wave function is the Fourier transform of the position wave function! Hence the symmetry.

This raises a question we have not yet answered – what is the *wave function* of a position state? That is, we have a position ket $|x_0\rangle$ with

$$\hat{x}|x_0\rangle = x_0|x_0\rangle$$

So inserting a complete set of position states,

$$|x_0\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x\rangle \langle x|x_0\rangle dx \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x\rangle \psi_{x_0}(x) dx \quad \Rightarrow \quad \psi_{x_0} = \delta(x - x_0)$$

7.3.2 Example Problem – Schrödinger equation to the wave equation

We have learned that the Schrödinger equation wave functions that we have focused on thus far of are a particular representation – in position space – of a *more fundamental* equation that can be written out in terms of an abstract state vector and operators acting on it. Let's try to go from the abstract equation to the wave equation. We start with an elementary Hamiltonian energy eigenvalue equation:

$$\left[-\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + \hat{V}(\hat{x}) \right] |\alpha\rangle = E|\alpha\rangle$$

We take the inner product with $\langle x|$,

$$\langle x| \left[-\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + \hat{V}(\hat{x}) \right] |\alpha\rangle = E\langle x|\alpha\rangle = E\psi_\alpha(x)$$

So far so good, we have the wave function on the right. Now

$$\langle x|\hat{V}(x)|\alpha\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle x|\hat{V}(\hat{x})|x'\rangle \langle x'|\alpha\rangle dx' = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} V(\hat{x}') \langle x|x'\rangle \langle x'|\alpha\rangle dx' = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} V(x') \delta(x-x') \psi_\alpha(x') dx' = V(x) \psi_\alpha(x)$$

In the next section, where we discuss *Hermitian* operators, we will be able to obtain the same result more efficiently. \hat{V} is Hermitian, and such operators can be moved from the ket to the bra in the following way,

$$\langle x|\hat{V}(\hat{x})|\alpha\rangle = \langle \hat{V}(\hat{x})x|\alpha\rangle = V(x)\langle x|\alpha\rangle = V(x)\psi_\alpha(x)$$

obtaining the same result as above. And for \hat{p}^2 ,

$$\langle x|\hat{p}^2|\alpha\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle x|\hat{p}^2|p\rangle \langle p|\alpha\rangle dp = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p^2 \langle x|p\rangle \langle p|\alpha\rangle dp = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p^2 e^{-ipx/\hbar} \langle p|\alpha\rangle dp \quad (7.10)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(-\hbar^2 \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \right) e^{ipx/\hbar} \langle p|\alpha\rangle dp = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(-\hbar^2 \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \right) \langle x|p\rangle \langle p|\alpha\rangle dp = \left(-\hbar^2 \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \right) \langle x|\alpha\rangle \quad (7.11)$$

$$= \left(-\hbar^2 \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \right) \psi_\alpha(x) \quad (7.12)$$

Putting the pieces together, we get our familiar position-space wave function equation

$$\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi_\alpha(x) = E\psi_\alpha(x)$$

7.4 Hilbert Spaces, Hermitian Operators

Here, we review the properties of vector spaces and scalar products, connecting them to function spaces and integration. These concepts allow us to extract scalars – representing amplitudes and observables – from our infinite-dimensional vectors (functions).

7.4.1 Hilbert Spaces

The Hilbert spaces in which quantum mechanical state vectors and operators reside are vector spaces to which an inner product has been added, one with specific properties connecting to our quantum mechanical requirements that $|\psi(x)|^2$ be normalizable.

Inner Product Spaces

Inner product spaces are vector spaces with an inner product defined on them. The inner product of two vectors $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$ is a mapping from these vectors to a scalar in the scalar field of the vector space, $\langle u|v\rangle = a$. In our applications this is a complex scalar. The inner product (or scalar product) has the following properties:

1. $\langle \gamma|\alpha + \beta\rangle = \langle \gamma|\alpha\rangle + \langle \gamma|\beta\rangle$
2. $\langle \beta|a\alpha\rangle = a\langle \beta|\alpha\rangle$
3. $\langle \alpha|\alpha\rangle \geq 0$
4. $\langle \alpha|\beta\rangle^* = \langle \beta|\alpha\rangle$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \alpha + \beta|\gamma\rangle &= \langle \gamma|\alpha + \beta\rangle^* = \langle \gamma|\alpha\rangle^* + \langle \gamma|\beta\rangle^* = \langle \alpha|\gamma\rangle + \langle \beta|\gamma\rangle \\ \langle a\alpha|\beta\rangle &= \langle \beta|a\alpha\rangle^* = (a\langle \beta|\alpha\rangle)^* = a^* \langle \alpha|\beta\rangle \\ |\langle \alpha|\beta\rangle|^2 &\leq \langle \alpha|\alpha\rangle \langle \beta|\beta\rangle \end{aligned}$$

The last result, the triangle inequality, is familiar from ordinary vectors in geometry,

$$|\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}| = |ab \cos \theta| \leq ab \quad \Rightarrow \quad |\langle a|b\rangle|^2 \leq \langle a|a\rangle \langle b|b\rangle$$

The triangle inequality takes the form of the Schwarz inequality the infinite-dimensional vector spaces use in quantum mechanics

$$|\langle\alpha|\beta\rangle|^2 \leq \langle\alpha|\alpha\rangle\langle\beta|\beta\rangle \rightarrow \left| \int_a^b \psi_2^*(x)\psi_1(x) dx \right|^2 \leq \int_a^b |\psi_1(x)|^2 dx \int_a^b |\psi_2(x)|^2 dx$$

The normalizable stationary states we have derived form complete basis in an infinite dimensional complex vector space with these properties. Such spaces are called *Hilbert spaces*. Specifically, our vector space of states includes only those whose wave functions are *square integrable*. Thus this choice of functions (our vectors describing physical states) along with the complex numbers (our scalar field) and the inner product defined as above, constitutes our Hilbert space.

7.4.2 Observables as expectations of Hermitian operators

We want to define the properties of operators whose expectation values correspond to possible quantum mechanical measurements. We note operators with their “hats” \hat{Q} . Operators act on states to produce new states:

$$\hat{Q}|\alpha\rangle = |\hat{Q}\alpha\rangle \equiv |\beta\rangle$$

Here an operator \hat{Q} acts on a state $|\alpha\rangle$ to produce a new state $|\hat{Q}\alpha\rangle$. If we want we can give this new state a different name – we call it $|\beta\rangle$.

We have discussed how abstract states can be represented in a basis that we select, by using completeness of this basis, $\sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| = 1$

$$|\alpha\rangle = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i|\alpha\rangle \equiv \sum_i |i\rangle\alpha_i \quad \text{e.g.} \quad |\alpha\rangle = \int |x\rangle\langle x|\alpha\rangle dx \equiv \int |x\rangle\psi_\alpha(x) dx \quad (7.13)$$

The coefficients of the basis vectors $|i\rangle$ in the expansion are numbers generated from the inner product for our vector space – $\langle i|\alpha\rangle$. If the basis we adopt is the position eigenstates, then $\langle i|\alpha\rangle = \psi_\alpha(x)$, the wave function value at that x .

In exactly the same way, we can pick a basis in which to represent operators

$$\hat{Q} = \sum_i \sum_j |i\rangle\langle i|\hat{Q}|j\rangle\langle j| \equiv \sum_i \sum_j |i\rangle\langle j|Q_{ij}$$

The $Q_{ij} \equiv \langle i|\hat{Q}|j\rangle$ are just numbers generated from taking the inner product of vectors

$$Q_{ij} = \langle i|\hat{Q}|j\rangle = \langle i|\hat{Q}j\rangle$$

and are the expansion coefficients of our operator \hat{Q} in terms of the basis operators $|i\rangle\langle j|$, exactly in the way that $\alpha_i \equiv \langle i|\alpha\rangle$ in Equation 7.13 are the expansion coefficients of the state vector $|\alpha\rangle$ in terms of the basis vectors $|i\rangle$. The quantity $\langle i|\hat{Q}|j\rangle$ is called the *matrix element* of \hat{Q} in the basis introduced above.

Frequently in quantum mechanics we are asked to solve an eigenvalue/eigenvector problem,

$$\hat{Q}|\alpha\rangle = Q_\alpha|\alpha\rangle \quad \text{e.g.} \quad \hat{H}_{SE}|\alpha\rangle = \left[\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + \hat{V}(\hat{x}) \right] |\alpha\rangle = E_\alpha|\alpha\rangle \quad (7.14)$$

Up to this point, \hat{Q} has been our Schrödinger Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{SE} for which we were asked to find the eigen-energies and eigenvector wave functions. We generally did this working in a specific representation – the position basis. But as we noted with the harmonic oscillator, underlying this is the abstract, basis-independent form of the Schrödinger equation of Equation 7.14.

While we solved the harmonic oscillator in its abstract form, via raising and lowering operators, in all other cases we solved the eigenvalue/eigenfunction problems using a basis. Let's go through the steps of representing the operator Equation 7.14 above in terms of a basis. Since this reduces an abstract problem into one that involves only numbers, we can solve using differential equations, or a computer. We assume a finite Hilbert space of dimension N to make visualization easier.

$$\hat{Q}|\alpha\rangle = Q_\alpha|\alpha\rangle \Rightarrow \quad (7.15)$$

$$\sum_i \sum_j |i\rangle \langle i| \hat{Q} |j\rangle \langle j| \alpha\rangle = Q_\alpha \sum_k |k\rangle \langle k| \alpha\rangle \Rightarrow \quad (7.16)$$

$$\sum_i \sum_j \langle m|i\rangle \langle i| \hat{Q} |j\rangle \langle j| \alpha\rangle = Q_\alpha \sum_k \langle m|k\rangle \langle k| \alpha\rangle \Rightarrow \quad (7.17)$$

$$\sum_j \langle m| \hat{Q} |j\rangle \langle j| \alpha\rangle = Q_\alpha \langle m| \alpha\rangle \quad (7.18)$$

In the third line above we took the inner product with a specific adjoint basis state $\langle m|$, $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ so we have N choices for that state. Everything appearing in these equations is a number. We can write out these N equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} & \cdots & Q_{1N} \\ Q_{21} & Q_{22} & \cdots & Q_{2N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ Q_{N1} & Q_{N2} & \cdots & Q_{NN} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_N \end{pmatrix} = Q_\alpha \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_N \end{pmatrix}$$

This is the familiar matrix form of an eigenvalue problem.

In other cases, we are simply acting on a state with an operator, not necessarily looking for the operator's eigenvalues. We represented this abstractly by

$$\hat{Q}|\alpha\rangle = |\hat{Q}\alpha\rangle \equiv |\beta\rangle$$

The new vector generated, $|\beta\rangle$ in general would not be proportional to $|\alpha\rangle$. If we now adopt a representation, this becomes

$$\sum_i \sum_j |i\rangle \langle i| \hat{Q} |j\rangle \langle j| \alpha\rangle = \sum_k |k\rangle \langle k| \beta\rangle$$

and taking the inner product with $\langle m|, m \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ yields N equations of the form

$$\sum_j \langle m| \hat{Q} |j\rangle \langle j| \alpha\rangle = \langle m| \beta\rangle \quad (7.19)$$

The matrix/vector form of this is

$$\hat{Q}|\alpha\rangle \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{12} & \cdots & Q_{1N} \\ Q_{21} & Q_{22} & \cdots & Q_{2N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ Q_{N1} & Q_{N2} & \cdots & Q_{NN} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \\ \vdots \\ a_N \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \\ \vdots \\ b_N \end{pmatrix} \leftrightarrow |\hat{Q}\alpha\rangle \quad \text{where} \quad b_i = \sum_{j=1}^N Q_{ij} a_j$$

Infinite Dimensional Spaces

Although we used a finite-dimensional vector space to illustrate the operator algebra, the results extend to the infinite dimensional case. For example, if we specialize Equation 7.18 to the Hamiltonian and use the position basis,

$$\sum_j \langle m| \hat{Q} |j\rangle \langle j| \alpha\rangle = Q_\alpha \langle m| \alpha\rangle \Rightarrow \int \langle x| \left[\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + \hat{V}(\hat{x}) \right] |x'\rangle \psi_\alpha(x') = E_\alpha \psi_\alpha(x) \quad (7.20)$$

Now we showed previously that

$$\langle x| \hat{V}(\hat{x}) |x'\rangle = V(x') \delta(x - x')$$

while

$$\langle x| \hat{p}^2 |x'\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle x| \hat{p}^2 |p\rangle \langle p| x'\rangle dp = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p^2 \langle x| p\rangle \langle p| x'\rangle dp = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}} e^{ipx/\hbar} \langle p| x'\rangle dp \quad (7.21)$$

$$= -\hbar^2 \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}} e^{ipx/\hbar} \langle p| x'\rangle dp = -\hbar^2 \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle x| p\rangle \langle p| x'\rangle dp = -\hbar^2 \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \langle x| x'\rangle \quad (7.22)$$

$$= -\hbar^2 \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \delta(x - x') \quad (7.23)$$

Plugging in these two results into Equation 7.20 and using the delta function to do the integral over x' yields the familiar result:

$$\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \right] \psi_\alpha(x) = E_\alpha \psi_\alpha(x)$$

Adjoint of matrices and Hermitian Operators

The adjoint of a matrix is obtained by taking its transpose, then complex conjugating. So in a representation,

$$[\hat{Q}^\dagger]_{ij} = [\hat{Q}]_{ji}^* = Q_{ji}^*$$

A vector $|\alpha\rangle$ in a representation is just a matrix with one column, with components $[\alpha]_{i1}$. So the adjoint vector $\langle\alpha|$ has components of

$$[\langle\alpha|]_{1i} \leftrightarrow \langle\alpha|i\rangle = \langle i|\alpha\rangle^* = a_i^* \leftrightarrow [\alpha]_{i1}^*$$

That is, vectors and their adjoints in a representation are related by

$$|\alpha\rangle : \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \\ \vdots \\ a_N \end{pmatrix} \leftrightarrow (a_1^*, a_2^* \dots, a_N^*) : \langle\alpha|$$

Now if we take the conjugate of Equation 7.18,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N Q_{mj}^* a_j^* = b_m^* \quad \sum_{j=1}^N [\langle\alpha|]_{1j} [Q^\dagger]_{jm} = [\langle\beta|]_{1m}$$

So we see

$$[\hat{Q}|\alpha\rangle]^\dagger = |\hat{Q}\alpha\rangle^\dagger = \langle\hat{Q}\alpha| = \langle\alpha|Q^\dagger$$

In quantum mechanics the expectation of a measurement should be real, as it must correspond to an observable. Thus we should require

$$\langle\alpha|\hat{Q}|\alpha\rangle = \langle\alpha|\hat{Q}|\alpha\rangle^* \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \langle\alpha|\hat{Q}|\alpha\rangle = \langle\alpha|\hat{Q}^\dagger|\alpha\rangle \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \langle\alpha|\hat{Q}\alpha\rangle = \langle\hat{Q}\alpha|\alpha\rangle$$

In a representation, Hermitian operators correspond to matrices for which $[\hat{Q}^\dagger]_{ij} = [\hat{Q}]_{ij}$ – the matrix is equal to its adjoint. Operators that satisfy the above conditions for all $|\alpha\rangle$ are called Hermitian.

Hermitian Operators

$$\hat{Q} = \hat{Q}^\dagger$$

Observables are represented by Hermitian operators – real, possible measurements: $\langle \alpha | \hat{Q} | \alpha \rangle = \langle \hat{Q} | \alpha \rangle$

For example, the momentum operator is Hermitian, which we show via partial integration,

$$\langle \psi | \hat{p} | \psi \rangle = \int \langle \psi | x \rangle \langle x | \hat{p} | \psi \rangle dx = \int \psi^*(x) \frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{d}{dx} \psi(x) dx = \int \left[-\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{d}{dx} \psi^*(x) \right] \psi(x) dx \quad (7.24)$$

$$= \int \left[\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{d}{dx} \psi(x) \right]^* \psi(x) dx = \int [\langle x | \hat{p} | \psi \rangle]^* \langle x | \psi \rangle dx = \int \langle \hat{p} | \psi | x \rangle \langle x | \psi \rangle dx = \langle \hat{p} | \psi | \psi \rangle \quad (7.25)$$

But the operator $\frac{d}{dx}$ would not be.

7.4.3 Determinate States of Hermitian Operators

The Hamiltonians we have studied thus far have stationary states of definite energy. If you measure the energy of a stationary state you always get back the same value. $|\alpha\rangle$ is said to be a determinate state of an operator \hat{Q} if every measurement

$$\langle \alpha | \hat{Q} | \alpha \rangle = Q$$

returns the same value Q . In this case,

$$0 = \sigma^2 = \langle \alpha | \hat{Q}^2 | \alpha \rangle - \langle \alpha | \hat{Q} | \alpha \rangle^2 = \langle \alpha | (\hat{Q} - Q)^2 | \alpha \rangle = \langle (\hat{Q} - Q) | \alpha \rangle \langle (\hat{Q} - Q) | \alpha \rangle$$

But this can only be if

$$\hat{Q} | \alpha \rangle = Q | \alpha \rangle$$

Determinate states of an operator \hat{Q} are eigenfunctions of \hat{Q} . This means the eigenvalue Q can be used as a wave function label! – we'll get to that later.

The eigenvalue Q of a Hermitian operator is a real number – I will distinguish operators from their eigenvalues by denoting the former with a hat, \hat{Q} . Thus the stationary states $|\alpha_i\rangle$ of the Hamiltonians we have considered

$$\hat{H} |\alpha_i\rangle = E_i |\alpha_i\rangle$$

are the determinate states of \hat{H} . The collection of all eigenvalues of an operator \hat{Q} is the *spectrum* of \hat{Q} . States with the same eigenvalue are said to be *degenerate*.

7.4.4 Discrete Spectra

We consider a Hermitian operator with a discrete spectrum – the eigenvalues correspond to eigenfunctions that are normalizable and thus proper states. We note

The eigenvalues of the normalizable eigenfunctions of a Hermitian operator are *real* and eigenfunctions belonging to distinct eigenvalues are *orthogonal*.

The eigenvalues are real because

$$Q_\alpha = \langle \alpha | \hat{Q} \alpha \rangle = \langle \hat{Q} \alpha | \alpha \rangle = \left[|\hat{Q} \alpha \rangle \right]^\dagger | \alpha \rangle = [Q_\alpha | \alpha \rangle]^\dagger | \alpha \rangle = Q_\alpha^* \langle \alpha | \alpha \rangle = Q_\alpha^*$$

Eigenfunctions belonging to distinct eigenvalues are orthogonal because, if $\hat{Q}|\alpha\rangle = Q_\alpha|\alpha\rangle$ and $\hat{Q}|\beta\rangle = Q_\beta|\beta\rangle$, with $Q_\alpha \neq Q_\beta$, then

$$Q_\beta \langle \alpha | \beta \rangle = \langle \alpha | \hat{Q} \beta \rangle = \langle \hat{Q} \alpha | \beta \rangle = Q_\alpha \langle \alpha | \beta \rangle \Rightarrow (Q_\beta - Q_\alpha) \langle \alpha | \beta \rangle = 0 \Rightarrow \langle \alpha | \beta \rangle = 0$$

If a subset of eigenfunctions are degenerate, we have previously described how these states can be *made* orthogonal/orthonormal via Gram-Schmidt. Thus we can assume that the eigenfunctions of a Hermitian operator form an orthonormal basis.

A third property of the eigenfunctions of a Hermitian operator is

The eigenfunctions of an operator for any observable are complete. Any state in the Hilbert space can be expanded in terms of this basis.

We have generally used the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian \hat{H} as our basis, expanding initial wave packets in terms of these stationary states, then exploiting the prime directive to determine the time evolution of the wave packet. While this is a special basis because of the prime directive, we certainly have the freedom to use as a basis the eigenfunctions of other operators.

7.4.5 Projection Operators

We have previously expressed the completeness of our Hilbert space, for simplicity assumed discrete here, by the identity

$$I = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |i\rangle \langle i|$$

The projection operator onto the state i is defined by

$$\hat{P}_i = |i\rangle\langle i| \quad \text{so equivalently} \quad I = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \hat{P}_i$$

Projection operators have the following properties, which follow immediately from the assumed orthonormality of the basis,

$$\hat{P}_i \hat{P}_j = \delta_{ij} \hat{P}_j \quad \text{so in particular} \quad \hat{P}_i \hat{P}_i = \hat{P}_i$$

Projection operators in quantum mechanics are connected with measurement, and thus are very useful. For example, if a measurement is done on a wave packet formed as a sum over many stationary states, there may be many possible outcomes of that measurement. However, a specific measurement will yield one result. The act of measurement is often said to “collapse” the wave function. To be specific, suppose a measurement is done on a system described by a wave packet to determine the energy. Assuming the stationary states are non-degenerate, the result obtained will correspond to the energy of one of the stationary states i . The measurement will thus have collapsed the wave packet to that state. The state of the system immediately after measurement will then be given by the projection operator \hat{P}_i acting on the original wave packet (up to normalization, which in this case would be adjusted to one).

In the case of measurement, the basis you use and thus the projection operator employed depends on what one measures – energy, position, momentum, spin, etc. But each such observable corresponds to a Hermitian operator for which there is a complete set of eigenfunctions, as noted above. The appropriate projection operator thus should use the basis appropriate to the measurement. If the operator is not the Hamiltonian, measurement will again collapse the wave function, but the projection will generally not be to a single stationary state.

7.4.6 Generalized Statistical Interpretation of Measurements

We can generalize early discussions about operators and measurements to include any Hermitian operator, which all correspond to possible observables. The normalizable eigenfunctions of a Hermitian operator \hat{Q} are real and the normalized eigenfunctions form an orthonormal basis. Consequently for any Hermitian operator with a discrete spectrum,

$$\langle \alpha | \hat{Q} | \alpha \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \alpha | i \rangle \langle i | \hat{Q} | j \rangle \langle j | \alpha \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \alpha | i \rangle Q_j \langle i | j \rangle \langle j | \alpha \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} Q_i |\langle i | \alpha \rangle|^2 \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} Q_i |c_i^\alpha|^2$$

Here it is understood that $|\alpha\rangle$ is the state of a system at some time of measurement t , and that the sum is over all discrete eigenstates of \hat{Q} which here is taken to be infinite, but could also very well be finite.

The Quantum Mechanical interpretation is that if a series of identical experiments are done, with $|\alpha\rangle$ prepared identically each time, then the possible outcomes Q_i will be found with probability $|\langle i | \alpha \rangle|^2 = |c_i^\alpha|^2$. This is a probability because

$$1 = \langle \alpha | \alpha \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle \alpha | i \rangle \langle i | \alpha \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |c_i^\alpha|^2$$

Thus any outcome Q_i is possible in a given measurement – that is, any outcome for which the amplitude $\langle i|\alpha\rangle$ is nonzero. Only the expectation – the average of the outcomes after many repetitions of an identical experiment – is certain in Quantum Mechanics,

$$\langle \hat{Q} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} Q_i |c_i^\alpha|^2$$

This interpretation generalizes to the continuous case

$$\langle \alpha | \hat{Q} | \alpha \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle \alpha | z \rangle \langle z | \hat{Q} | z' \rangle \langle z' | \alpha \rangle dz' = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle \alpha | z \rangle Q(z') \langle z | z' \rangle \langle z' | \alpha \rangle dz' \quad (7.26)$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle \alpha | z \rangle Q(z') \delta(z - z') \langle z' | \alpha \rangle dz' = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} Q(z) |\langle z | \alpha \rangle|^2 dz \quad (7.27)$$

where z represents the appropriate continuous eigenspectrum, for example, x if we are finding the expectation values for some potential $\hat{V}(\hat{x})$ or p if we were evaluating the operator $-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\hat{p}^2$. So we can summarize

A Hermitian \hat{Q} has a discrete spectrum and eigenstates

$$\{Q_i, |i\rangle\} \Rightarrow \langle \alpha | \hat{Q} | \alpha \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} Q_i |c_i^\alpha|^2$$

$$\text{Probability of outcome } Q_i = |c_i^\alpha|^2 = |\langle i | \alpha \rangle|^2.$$

A Hermitian \hat{Q} has a continuous spectrum and eigenstates

$$\{Q(z), |z\rangle\} \Rightarrow \langle \alpha | \hat{Q} | \alpha \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} Q(z) |\langle z | \alpha \rangle|^2 dz$$

$$\text{Probability of outcome } dQ(z) = |\langle z | \alpha \rangle|^2 dz$$

Here we define $dQ(z)$ via a Taylor series expansion. If z_0 is the middle of the region δz ,

outcome between $Q(z_0 + \delta z/2)$ and $Q(z_0 - \delta z/2)$ has the probability $|\langle z_0 | \alpha \rangle|^2 \delta z$

$$\text{outcome between } Q(z_0) \pm \frac{1}{2} \frac{dQ(z)}{dz} \bigg|_{z_0} dz \text{ has the probability } |\langle z_0 | \alpha \rangle|^2 dz$$

7.4.7 Simultaneous Measurements & Commuting Operators

Now we come to a key point that will influence much of the rest of this book, as we move onto problems in 3D with more degrees of freedom.

Suppose we have two Hermitian operators \hat{A} and \hat{B} with a common, complete set of eigenvectors. That is,

$$\hat{A}\psi_{A_i, B_i} = A_i\psi_{A_i, B_i} \quad \hat{B}\psi_{A_i, B_i} = B_i\psi_{A_i, B_i}$$

Let's first pause here to explain the notation. I've assumed a basis exists that can be enumerated by i , with each basis state carrying to quantum numbers A_i and B_i that are the eigenvalues obtained when the operators \hat{A} and \hat{B} act on the basis state. One can view (A_i, B_i) as the index of the various basis states – one has to specify two basis state eigenvalues to identify the basis state. Our basis states are simultaneously eigenvectors of both \hat{A} and \hat{B} .

It follows that

$$\hat{A}[\hat{B}\psi_{A_i, B_i}] = \hat{A}[B_i\psi_{A_i, B_i}] = A_i B_i \psi_{A_i, B_i} \quad (7.28)$$

$$\hat{B}[\hat{A}\psi_{A_i, B_i}] = \hat{B}[A_i\psi_{A_i, B_i}] = A_i B_i \psi_{A_i, B_i} \quad (7.29)$$

Thus $(\hat{A}\hat{B} - \hat{B}\hat{A})\psi_{A_i, B_i} = 0$ for every state in the Hilbert space. We conclude

If two observables are simultaneously measurable,

$$[\hat{A}, \hat{B}] = 0$$

Conversely one can show if $[\hat{A}, \hat{B}] = 0$, a common set of eigenfunctions for the operators can be found.

7.4.8 Generalized Uncertainty Principle

Most Hermitian do not commute ($[\hat{A}, \hat{B}] = 0 \rightarrow \hat{A}\hat{B} = \hat{B}\hat{A}$). If $\hat{A} = \hat{p}$ and $\hat{B} = \hat{x}$, then working in position space,

$$[\hat{A}, \hat{B}]\psi(x) = \left[\frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{d}{dx} x - x \frac{\hbar}{i} \frac{d}{dx} \right] \psi(x) = \frac{\hbar}{i} \psi(x) \quad [\hat{A}, \hat{B}] = \frac{\hbar}{i}$$

So one can not label states simultaneously by their position and momentum.

If \hat{A} and \hat{B} are Hermitian, then their product can be written as the sum of two Hermitian operators,

$$\hat{A}\hat{B} = \frac{1}{2} \left[(\hat{A}\hat{B} + \hat{B}\hat{A}) + i \left(\frac{1}{i} [\hat{A}, \hat{B}] \right) \right] \equiv \frac{1}{2} [\hat{H}_1 + i\hat{H}_2]$$

as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_1^\dagger &\equiv (\hat{A}\hat{B} + \hat{B}\hat{A})^\dagger = \hat{B}\hat{A} + \hat{A}\hat{B} = \hat{H}_1 \\ \hat{H}_2^\dagger &\equiv \left(\frac{1}{i} [\hat{A}, \hat{B}] \right)^\dagger = -\frac{1}{i} (\hat{A}\hat{B} - \hat{B}\hat{A})^\dagger = -\frac{1}{i} (\hat{B}\hat{A} - \hat{A}\hat{B}) = \hat{H}_2 \end{aligned}$$

We have previously defined uncertainty for a (Hermitian) operator \hat{A} in terms of the variance

$$\langle(\Delta\hat{A})^2\rangle \equiv \langle\psi|(\hat{A}-\langle\hat{A}\rangle)^2|\psi\rangle = \langle\Delta\hat{A}\psi\rangle \equiv \langle f|f\rangle$$

so also

$$\langle(\Delta\hat{B})^2\rangle \equiv \langle\Delta\hat{B}\psi|\Delta\hat{B}\psi\rangle \equiv \langle g|g\rangle$$

Previously we have used various forms of the Schwarz inequality, which comes from

$$\int (\langle g|g\rangle f(x) - \langle g|f\rangle g(x))^* (\langle g|g\rangle f(x) - \langle g|f\rangle g(x)) dx \geq 0 \quad (7.30)$$

$$\Rightarrow [\langle g|g\rangle^2 \langle f|f\rangle - \langle g|g\rangle \langle f|g\rangle \langle g|f\rangle - \langle g|g\rangle \langle g|f\rangle^* \langle g|f\rangle + \langle g|f\rangle^* \langle g|f\rangle \langle g|g\rangle] \geq 0 \quad (7.31)$$

$$\Rightarrow \langle g|g\rangle \langle f|f\rangle \geq |\langle f|g\rangle|^2 \quad (7.32)$$

So applying this to the f and g defined above,

$$\langle\Delta\hat{A}\psi|\Delta\hat{A}\psi\rangle \langle\Delta\hat{B}\psi|\Delta\hat{B}\psi\rangle \geq \left| \langle\Delta\hat{A}\psi|\Delta\hat{B}\psi\rangle \right|^2 \quad (7.33)$$

$$\Rightarrow \langle\psi|(\Delta\hat{A})^2|\psi\rangle \langle\psi|(\Delta\hat{B})^2|\psi\rangle \geq \left| \langle\psi|\Delta\hat{A}\Delta\hat{B}|\psi\rangle \right|^2 \quad (7.34)$$

Now we utilize our theorem above,

$$\Delta\hat{A}\Delta\hat{B} = \frac{1}{2} \left[(\Delta\hat{A}\Delta\hat{B} + \Delta\hat{B}\Delta\hat{A}) + i \left(\frac{1}{i} [\Delta\hat{A}, \Delta\hat{B}] \right) \right] \equiv \frac{1}{2} [\hat{H}_1 + i\hat{H}_2]$$

So applying this to the RHS above and remembering expectation values of Hermitian operators are real numbers (observables),

$$\left| \langle\psi|\Delta\hat{A}\Delta\hat{B}|\psi\rangle \right|^2 = \left| \langle\psi| \frac{1}{2} [\hat{H}_1 + i\hat{H}_2] |\psi\rangle \right|^2 = \langle\psi| \frac{1}{2} \hat{H}_1 |\psi\rangle^2 + \langle\psi| \frac{1}{2} \hat{H}_2 |\psi\rangle^2 \geq \langle\psi| \frac{1}{2} \hat{H}_2 |\psi\rangle^2$$

Thus we obtain the generalized uncertainty principle:

Generalized Uncertainty Principle

$$\langle(\Delta\hat{A})^2\rangle\langle(\Delta\hat{B})^2\rangle \geq \langle\frac{1}{2i}[\Delta\hat{A},\Delta\hat{B}]\rangle^2 = \langle\frac{1}{2i}[\hat{A},\hat{B}]\rangle^2$$
$$\text{or } \sigma_A\sigma_B \geq \left|\langle\frac{1}{2i}[\hat{A},\hat{B}]\rangle\right|$$

Consequently if $[\hat{A}, \hat{B}]$ commute, then it is possible that $\sigma_A^2\sigma_B^2 = 0$, in which case we could find a basis in which the state has *definite* eigenvalues A and B . But if $[\hat{A}, \hat{B}] \neq 0$, like position and momentum, we can not label wave functions by the eigenvalues of both operators. These observables are incompatible in this sense, and we can not construct a complete set of common eigenfunctions. It follows

There is an uncertainty principle for every pair of observables whose operators do not commute.

It is enormously helpful to identify *maximal sets of commuting operators* such as $\hat{H}, \hat{P}, \hat{L}^2, \hat{L}_z, \dots$. Once identified, they provide instructions for identifying complete orthonormal bases that simplify our mechanics. Such bases break up the Hilbert space into blocks that can often be treated separately.

But we also learn that uncertainties are inherent in Quantum Mechanics when we ask multiple questions of systems. It is not just \hat{x} and \hat{p} that can not be determined simultaneously with unlimited precision, but most observables.