

## Remarks on negative energy states in supersymmetric quantum mechanics

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

1988 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 21 3673

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/21/18/019>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 129.252.86.83

The article was downloaded on 31/05/2010 at 16:39

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

COMMENT

**Remarks on negative energy states in supersymmetric quantum mechanics**

Pinaki Roy†, Rajkumar Roychoudhury† and Y P Varshni‡

† Electronics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta 700 035, India

‡ Department of Physics, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5, Canada

Received 5 May 1988

**Abstract.** We analyse the role of singular superpotentials in supersymmetric quantum mechanics. In particular, we investigate the existence of negative energy states in supersymmetry and analyse the behaviour of superpartners in such cases.

Supersymmetric quantum mechanics (SUSYQM) (Witten 1981) is the simplest system which allows Bose-Fermi symmetry. It can be regarded as a field theory in (0+1) dimensions and various ideas can be tested within this framework in a simple manner. For example, it has been shown (Cooper and Freedman 1983) that SUSY breaking can be obtained if the superpotential is chosen suitably. However, apart from a few exceptions (Jevicki and Rodrigues 1984) most of the papers deal with non-singular superpotentials and the role of singular superpotentials in SUSYQM have not been investigated in detail. In this comment we shall treat SUSYQM models with singular superpotentials and discuss the occurrence of (normalisable) negative energy states in such systems. The models to be used are a family of double-well potentials and their SUSY partners.

A SUSYQM model in one dimension is specified by a pair of Hamiltonians (Cooper and Freedman 1983)

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} H_+ & 0 \\ 0 & H_- \end{pmatrix} = \{Q^+, Q\} \tag{1}$$

$$H_{\pm} = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V_{\pm}(x) \tag{2}$$

$$V_{\pm}(x) = W^2(x) \pm W'(x) \tag{3}$$

$$Q = (p - iW) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{4}$$

$$Q^+ = (p + iW) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

In the above  $Q$  and  $Q^+$  are called the supercharges and  $W(x)$  is called the superpotential. Here an important observation is that the zero-energy states corresponding to  $H_{\pm}$  are given by

$$\varphi_{\pm}^0(x) = C \exp\left(\pm \int^x W(t) dt\right) \tag{6}$$

where  $C$  is a normalisation constant.

In the present case we take  $W(x)$  to be (Roy and Roychoudhury 1987)

$$W(x) = x^3 - \frac{c}{x} - \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{2g_i x}{(1 + g_i x^2)} \quad g_0 = 0. \tag{7}$$

This is the general form of the superpotential for the double-well potentials of the type

$$V_-(x) = x^6 - (2n + 1)x^2 \quad (n = 0, 1, 2, \dots).$$

Let us first analyse the case  $c = 1, N = 0$ . In this case we get from (3)

$$V_-(x) = x^6 - 5x^2 \tag{8}$$

$$V_+(x) = x^6 + x^2 + 2/x^2. \tag{9}$$

Note that  $W(x)$  and  $V_+(x)$  have a singularity at the origin. Also from (6) we have

$$\varphi_+^0(x) = C_1 x^{-1} \exp(\frac{1}{4}x^4) \tag{10}$$

$$\varphi_-^0(x) = \left(\frac{2^{1/4}}{\Gamma(3/4)}\right)^{1/2} x \exp(-\frac{1}{4}x^4). \tag{11}$$

It is clear that while  $\varphi_-^0(x)$  is normalisable,  $\varphi_+^0(x)$  is not. The form of  $\varphi_-^0(x)$  (equation (11)) suggests that the  $H_-$  sector has negative energy states. This can also be seen from the following arguments. Let

$$f_0 = \exp(-\frac{1}{4}x^4). \tag{12}$$

This is the ground state of  $H_-^R$  given by

$$H_-^R = H_- + 2x^2 = (-\partial + x^3)(\partial + x^3) \tag{13}$$

where

$$H_- = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + x^6 - 5x^2 \tag{14}$$

then

$$(f_0, H_- f_0) = -2(f_0, x^2 f_0) < 0. \tag{15}$$

Hence  $H_-$  is a negative operator ( $-d^2/dx^2 + x^6 - \gamma x^2$  is always a negative operator for  $\gamma > 3$ ). Now from (1),

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} H_- & 0 \\ 0 & H_+ \end{pmatrix} = K^2 \tag{16}$$

(say) where

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\partial + w \\ \partial + w & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{17}$$

and

$$W(x) = x^3 - 1/x. \tag{18}$$

Since  $H_-$  is a negative operator,  $K^2$  is not positive and  $K$  cannot be self-adjoint. But since  $H_-$  is obviously self-adjoint  $H_+$  cannot be self-adjoint. Also  $H_+$  is unbounded. This follows from the following arguments. Let  $\psi_0(x) = e^{-x^2/2}$  (ground-state harmonic oscillator wavefunction); then  $(\psi_0, H_+ \psi_0)$  involves an integral proportional to

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-x^2}}{x^2} dx$$

which does not exist because of the singularity at  $x=0$ . Hence  $H_+ \notin B(H)^\dagger$  and therefore though  $H_+$  is Hermitian it is not self-adjoint and it may have complex eigenvalues (see Dunford and Schwarz 1965). In fact, the above arguments hold for a more general superpotential than  $x^3 - 1/x$ . Consider a superpotential  $W^R(x)$  which is positive and such that  $W^R(x)/x$  is integrable near the origin. Then consider the Hamiltonian  $H^R = K^{R^2}$  where

$$K^R = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\partial + W^R \\ \partial + W^R & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now consider the superpotential  $W$  given by  $W = W^R - 1/x$  and the corresponding Hamiltonian  $H_-$  given by

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\partial + W \\ \partial + W & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly

$$H_- = H^R - 2W^R/x$$

which is self-adjoint but

$$(f_0, H_- f_0) = -2 \int f_0^2 \frac{W^R}{x} dx$$

is definitely negative,  $f_0$  being the ground state corresponding to  $H_-^R$ . But  $K^2$  is not positive and  $H_+$  will not be self-adjoint. As has been shown by Roy and Roychoudhury (1987) the superpotential  $2gx/(1 + gx^2)$  also has this property because it drops out in  $H_-$  but appears in  $H_+$  and if  $g < 0$ , the singularity appears in  $H_+$  which is absent in  $H_-$ . Some numerical results where the superpotential contains a term like  $2gx/(1 + gx^2)$  are given below. (Though the exact numerical value of the negative energy state is not required for the above arguments the numerical values of energy for the ground state and the first few excited states for the potential  $V(x) = x^6 - 5x^2$  and  $V(x) = x^6 - 7x^2 - 2\sqrt{2}$  are presented here (table 1) for future comparison.) It may be pointed out that the ground state for the potential  $x^6 - 7x^2 - 2\sqrt{2}$  can be calculated exactly and is found to be  $\psi_0 = (1 + 2x^2) e^{-x^4/4}$  with eigenvalue  $-4\sqrt{2}$  while its zero-energy state is  $\psi_0 = (1 - 2x^2) e^{-x^4/4}$ .

**Table 1.** Energy value corresponding to  $W = x^3 - 1/x$  and  $W = x^3 + 2\sqrt{2}x/(1 - \sqrt{2}x^2)$ .

$n$	$V_-(x) = x^6 - 5x^2$	$V_-(x) = x^6 - 7x^2 - 2\sqrt{2}$
0	-1.153 54	-5.6568
1	0.0	-5.0935
2	5.047 803	0
3	9.455 53	4.3696
4	15.539 11	10.1807
5	22.503 93	16.8930

† See also Boya *et al* (1987).

† Here  $B(H)$  denotes the Banach algebra of all bounded linear operators  $T$  on a Hilbert space  $H$ .

Usually the quantity which is of much importance in double-well potentials is the difference between the two lowest eigenvalues given by  $t = E_1 - E_0$  as it corresponds to the tunnelling route through the double-well barrier. As the coefficient of  $x^2$  increases in magnitude the quantity  $t$  becomes very small and is difficult to calculate numerically. Some authors (Keung *et al* 1988, Bernstein and Brown 1984) claim that supersymmetry facilitates the evaluation of  $t$  in these cases. They actually calculate the ground state of the superpartner Hamiltonian  $H_+$  and assume that this is the same as the first excited state of  $H_-$ , i.e. the degeneracy holds. But as the potential barrier increases,  $H_-$  can have negative eigenvalues and as we have shown in this comment,  $H_+(x)$  ceases to become self-adjoint and the degeneracy argument breaks down (also see Deift 1978).

The authors are extremely grateful to the referee for his constructive criticism and technical hints without which this comment could not have been written in its present form. Also one of us (PR) thanks the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, New Delhi for financial assistance.

## References

- Bernstein M and Brown L S 1984 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52** 1953  
Boya L J, Kmiecik M and Bohm A 1987 *Phys. Rev. D* **35** 1255  
Cooper F and Freedman B 1983 *Ann. Phys., NY* **146** 262  
Deift P A 1978 *Duke Math. J.* **45** 267  
Dunford N and Schwarz J T 1965 *Linear Operators II Special Theory* (New York: Interscience)  
Jevicki A and Rodrigues J P 1984 *Phys. Lett.* **146B** 55  
Keung W, Kovacs E and Sukhatme U P 1988 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60** 41  
Roy P and Roychoudhury R 1987 *Phys. Lett.* **122A** 275  
Witten E 1981 *Nucl. Phys. B* **188** 513  
— 1982 *Nucl. Phys. B* **202** 253