

Minimum Length Uncertainty Relation and the Hydrogen Spectrum

R. Akhoury and Y.-P. Yao

Michigan Center for Theoretical Physics
Randall Laboratory of Physics
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1120

Abstract

Modifications of Heisenberg's uncertainty relation have been proposed in the literature which imply a minimum position uncertainty. We study the low energy effects of the new physics responsible for this by examining the consequent change in the quantum mechanical commutation relations involving position and momenta. In particular, the modifications to the spectrum of the hydrogen atom can be naturally interpreted as a varying (with energy) fine structure constant. From the data on the energy levels we attempt to constrain the scale of the new physics and find that it must be close to or larger than the weak scale. Experiments in the near future are expected to change this bound by at least an additional order of magnitude.

1. Several independent lines of investigations appear to suggest a modification of the Heisenberg uncertainty relation to the form :

$$\Delta x \geq \frac{\hbar}{2} \frac{1}{p} + \alpha \frac{\hbar^2}{2} p^2 ; \quad (1)$$

which implies a minimum position uncertainty of $\Delta x_{\min} = \hbar \alpha^{1/2}$. In perturbative string theory [1], such a consequence arises due to the fact that strings cannot probe distances smaller than the string scale. We should caution however, that this particular form of the generalized uncertainty relation is neither a unique nor a conclusive prediction of string theory. Indeed as shown in ref. [2], D-branes can probe distances smaller than the string scale and other generalizations of the uncertainty relations have been proposed, for a good review see [3]. Attempting to find a general deformed Heisenberg algebra, a generalized commutation relation (in three dimensions) has been proposed in [4] which implies the above uncertainty relation under certain assumptions. Finally, in ref. [5], the modified uncertainty relation has been argued to arise by taking into account the gravitational interactions of highly energetic photons with the other elementary particles and in this case is of the order of the (square of the) Planck length. In one dimension, a possible way to realize eq.(1) [6, 7] is through the following commutation relation,

$$[X; P] = i\hbar(1 + \alpha P^2) \quad (2)$$

and in higher dimensions this is generalized to the following tensorial form ,

$$[X_i; P_j] = i\hbar((1 + \alpha P^2) \delta_{ij} + \beta P_i P_j) : \quad (3)$$

As emphasized in [7] Eq.(1) has the interesting feature that it exhibits the so called UV /IR correspondence first noticed [8] in the context of the ADS/CFT correspondence. In our case this is just the statement that, as is evident from eq.(1), at large p , Δx is also large. Such a correspondence is hard to visualize in the context of local quantum field theories but it seems to be an essential feature of certain types of new physics [9] being considered recently.

In this paper we will take the viewpoint that eq.(1) and the commutation relation provide an effective description by means of which new physics effects may be manifested at low energies. The fact that these satisfy the UV /IR relation only makes this more likely and our purpose is to investigate how these kinds of novel ideas may be manifested in particular in the well known hydrogen atom problem. A calculation of the hydrogen spectrum indicates that in the generalized framework one is led naturally to a varying (with energy) fine structure constant. Precision data available on the energy levels can be used to constrain the scale of the new physics. Writing,

$$\alpha = \frac{\Lambda^2}{(c)^2} \quad (4)$$

and a similar equation for β , with dimensionless Λ and β of order one, we find that the present data implies that Λ must be close to or greater than the weak scale. Within the next few years, proposed experiments will improve this bound by two orders of magnitude. In the rest of this paper, the details leading to the above conclusions will be elucidated.

2. In addition to the commutation relation (3), assuming that the momenta commute with each other, the modified commutation relations for the coordinates are

$$[X_i; X_j] = i\hbar \frac{(2\beta + \alpha) P^2}{1 + \alpha P^2} (P_i X_j - P_j X_i) : \quad (5)$$

Because the coordinates do not commute, it is more convenient to work in momentum space and define coordinate dependent operators through their momentum representations. For the hydrogen atom, we have the Schrodinger equation

$$\left(\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m} - \frac{Ze^2}{r}\right)|j\rangle = E_j |j\rangle;$$

or equivalently,

$$\left(r\frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m} - Ze^2\right)|j\rangle = E_j r |j\rangle; \quad (6)$$

which calls for a definition of r , which will be expressed as functions of $\mathbf{p}$, its derivatives, and the angular momentum operators

$$L_{ij} = \frac{X_i p_j - X_j p_i}{1 + \mathbf{p}^2};$$

With this definition, one can check that the commutation relations of L_{ij} , being generators of rotations are the usual ones, i.e.,

$$[X_k, L_{ij}] = i\hbar (X_i \delta_{kj} - X_j \delta_{ki});$$

$$[p_k, L_{ij}] = i\hbar (p_i \delta_{kj} - p_j \delta_{ki});$$

and

$$[L_{kl}, L_{ij}] = i\hbar (L_{il} \delta_{kj} + L_{ki} \delta_{lj} - L_{jl} \delta_{ki} - L_{kj} \delta_{li});$$

After some rather tedious algebra, one can also show that if one defines

$$r = p_i f(\mathbf{p}^2);$$

where

$$f(\mathbf{p}^2) = \frac{1}{(1 + \mathbf{p}^2)^{1/2}} \tan^{-1} \frac{\mathbf{p}}{(1 + \mathbf{p}^2)^{1/2}}; \quad (7)$$

then

$$X_i = i\hbar \left[(1 + \mathbf{p}^2) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} + p_i p_j \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} + p_i \right] = i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} + a(\mathbf{p}^2) p_k L_{ik} + i\hbar p_i; \quad (8)$$

is the representation that satisfies the relevant commutation relations written in eqs.(3) and (5) where,

$$a(\mathbf{p}^2) \mathbf{p}^2 = 1 + \mathbf{p}^2 \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{p}^2)};$$

The constant here is arbitrary, which affects the definition of the scalar product, particularly in rendering a hermitian X_i . For a similar discussion in the context of the harmonic oscillator see [7]. Thus,

$$\langle f | g \rangle = \int \frac{d^3 p}{[1 + (1 + \mathbf{p}^2)^2]^{1/2}} f(\mathbf{p}) g(\mathbf{p}); \quad = \int \frac{d^3 p}{(1 + \mathbf{p}^2)^{1/2}};$$

where, D is the spatial dimensionality and then,

$$\langle f | X_{ij} | g \rangle = \langle g | X_{ij} | f \rangle :$$

In the following, where we treat the hydrogen atom problem, we shall limit ourselves to $D=3$ and for simplicity to zero angular momentum states, which implies

$$L_{ij} |g\rangle = 0; \quad (g_{ij} - \frac{p_i p_j}{p^2}) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} |g\rangle = 0$$

By using eq.(8), a simple calculation leads to

$$X_{ij}^2 |g\rangle = (\hbar)^2 \left[\frac{d^2}{d^2} + \frac{2}{p} (1 + (\dots)^2) \frac{d}{d} + (3 + (3 + \dots)^2) p^2 \right] |g\rangle ; \quad (9)$$

where

$$p^2 = \mathbf{p}^2; \quad \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{p}|} :$$

Our next task is to give meaning to X_{ij}^2 : We are interested in obtaining the energy eigenvalues, which should be independent of $\mathbf{r}$. Therefore, to simplify the calculations we transform it away. This is done by noting that

$$X_{ij} \frac{1}{(1 + (\dots)^2 p^2)^{\frac{1}{2}(\dots)}} F = \frac{1}{(1 + (\dots)^2 p^2)^{\frac{1}{2}(\dots)}} X_{ij} (\dots = 0) F :$$

We then have for eq.(9)

$$X_{ij}^2 |g\rangle = (\hbar)^2 \left(\frac{d^2}{d^2} + \frac{d}{d} \right) |g\rangle ; \quad (10)$$

where

$$= \frac{2}{p} (1 + p^2) :$$

A change of variable is now made

$$g = 0;$$

which entails

$$\frac{d}{d} = \frac{1}{(\frac{d}{d^0})} \frac{d}{d^0}; \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{d^2}{d^2} = \frac{1}{(\frac{d}{d^0})^2} \frac{d^2}{d^0} + \frac{1}{(\frac{d}{d^0})} \left(\frac{d}{d^0} \frac{1}{(\frac{d}{d^0})} \right) \frac{d}{d^0} :$$

We expect by demanding that it satisfy the equation

$$\frac{d}{d^0} \frac{1}{(\frac{d}{d^0})} + \dots = 0;$$

Through this, eq.(10) becomes

$$X^2 j > = r^2 j > = (ih)^2 (T^{-1} \frac{d}{d_0} T) (T^{-1} \frac{d}{d_0} T) T^{-1} j >;$$

where

$$T = (\frac{d}{d_0})^2; \quad (12)$$

The radial distance is then given by

$$r j > = (ih) (T^{-1} \frac{d}{d_0} T) T^{-1} j^0 >; \quad (13)$$

Note that because of the change of differential element implied by eq.(7), we must likewise change the term without r in eq.(6) by

$$j > \rightarrow \frac{d_0}{d} j >$$

which now becomes

$$[ih T^{-1} \frac{d}{d_0} (\frac{p^2}{2m} - E) - Z e^2 (\frac{d_0}{d})] j > = 0;$$

or

$$[ih \frac{d}{d} (\frac{p^2}{2m} - E) - Z e^2] j > = 0; \quad (14)$$

For the case when we have just the conventional commutation relation, (i. e. $\frac{d_0}{d} = 0$, which gives $\frac{d}{d} = p$ in eq.(7)) the solutions to eq.(14) will immediately give the hydrogen-like spectrum, if we demand single-valuedness of the wave functions. In fact, a more cogent argument is to demand that $j >$ should be an entire function in the lower half of the complex p -plane, which will guarantee outgoing scattered waves and also exponentially decreasing bound state wave functions for large r . The derivation to obtain eq.(14) in that case can be made much simpler, because when coordinates commute, we can use them as a representation basis. The representation of r in momentum space is then readily obtained through the Fourier representation

$$\langle r | p \rangle = \exp(ipr = \hbar);$$

which gives $r = i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial p}$ through integration by parts to impart its action on the momentum wave function. For the extended commutation relations as we have, there is no $\langle r | j \rangle$ basis, and we circumvent the problem through the procedure just proposed above. When $\frac{d_0}{d}$ and $\frac{d}{d_0}$ are non-vanishing, we have

$$\frac{d}{d} = \frac{dp}{d} \frac{d}{dp} = (1 + (\frac{d_0}{d} p^2)) \frac{d}{dp};$$

then eq.(14) becomes

$$\frac{d}{dp} j > + \frac{1}{p^2 - p_0^2} [2p + i \frac{Z e^2 2m}{\hbar (1 + (\frac{d_0}{d} p^2))}] j > = 0;$$

where

$$E = \frac{p_0^2}{2m};$$

Performing partial fractions, this becomes

$$\frac{d}{dp} j > + \left[\frac{1+i}{p-p_0} + \frac{1-i}{p+p_0} - \frac{p-i}{p-i-p_0} + \frac{p-i}{p+i-p_0} \right] j > = 0; \quad (15)$$

in which,

$$= \frac{Ze^2m}{\hbar p_0 (1 + (\frac{p_0}{c})^2)}; \quad (16)$$

and,

$$= \frac{Ze^2m}{\hbar (1 + (\frac{p_0}{c})^2)};$$

The solution to eq.(15) is

$$j > = A (p-p_0)^{(1+i)} (p+p_0)^{(1-i)} (p-\frac{i}{p_0}) (p+\frac{i}{p_0});$$

in which A is a constant of integration. Note that for bound states, the energies are negative and therefore,

$$p_0 = i; \quad (17)$$

The wave function will not have a pole in the lower p-plane if

$$= in; \quad (18)$$

where n is a positive integer. This is the condition to solve for the bound state energies. We should remark however, that in the present situation with $\epsilon < 0$, we have a cut in the lower half plane for the wave function. Its effects on the outgoing scattered wave require further investigation, as the meaning of the radial coordinate r is not that intuitive. From eqs.(16),(17)

and (18) we obtain for the energy levels:

$$n = \frac{Z m c}{(1 + (\frac{p_0}{c})^2)};$$

To leading order in the small parameters using eq.(4) we obtain, for the S-wave energy levels of the hydrogen atom

$$E = \frac{Z^2 m c^2}{2n^2} \left[1 + 2 \left(\frac{p_0}{c} \right)^2 \left(\frac{m}{n^2} \right)^2 \right]; \quad (19)$$

This may be used to define an energy dependant effective fine structure constant,

$$\alpha_{eff}(E) = \left(1 - 2 \left(\frac{p_0}{c} \right)^2 \left(\frac{m}{n^2} \right)^2 \right); \quad (20)$$

to leading order in the small parameters. Eqs(19) and (20) are the main results of this paper. We will next explore their consequences.

3. The 1S-2S energy shift in hydrogen has been measured to an accuracy of 1:8 parts in 10^{14} [10]. We may therefore use this to bound the scale of new physics, Λ . From eq.(19) we get,

$$\frac{E_{2S} - E_{1S}}{E_{1S}} = \frac{3}{4} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{m}{\Lambda} \right)^2 Z^2 \right) :$$

Using the above mentioned experimental result [10], and taking Λ and α to be of order unity, we obtain the bound,

$$50 \text{ GeV} :$$

In the near future the 2S-1S energy shift measurement is expected to be improved by two orders of magnitude [11] and that will bound Λ to be greater than about a TeV.

Since the non-standard contribution to the 2S-1S energy shift is such a small number, it would be interesting to study its effects on the hyperfine splitting. For this one will have to solve the Dirac equation for the hydrogen atom and include the higher angular momentum states. The bound on the scale of the new physics coming from this measurement is expected to be a whole lot stronger. Data from higher Z hydrogen like ions could also potentially provide a better bound.

In conclusion, we would like to make a few comments on some related work. Proposing a careful measurement of an electron in a highly excited energy level in a Penning trap, the authors of ref.([7]) gave a potential lower limit of $\Lambda = 1 \text{ GeV}$: This is an exceedingly difficult endeavour. Also, by taking some classical limit, the same group of authors [12] and others used the precision limit of the precession of the perihelion of Mercury to yield a bound of $\Lambda = 2.3 \times 10^{68} \text{ m}$, a number way below the Planck length, which a fortiori renders the argument for a minimal length postulate suspect. As initially raised by the authors themselves, we may therefore question whether their approach to the classical limit is unique in a non-commutative space. It may be safer to adhere to a pure quantum mechanical system for an analysis, as we have done here for the hydrogen-like atom.

In a different setting, where the space-time non-commutativity is characterized by $[x_i, x_j] = i \theta_{ij}$, where θ_{ij} is a set of external parameters, effects on the fine structures of the hydrogen atom were estimated to yield $\Delta E \sim 100 \text{ GeV}$, [13] which is comparable to ours. However, it should be pointed out that rotational invariance is violated in their considerations. In our analysis, space is still isotropic and the hydrogen system is a closed one.

We are grateful to Paul Berman for a discussion. This work was supported by the US Department of Energy.

References

- [1] G. Veneziano, *Europhys. Lett.* 2 (1986) 199; D. Amati, M. Ciafaloni, and G. Veneziano, *Phys. Lett. B* 197 (1987) 81; *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* 3 (1988) 1615; *Phys. Lett. B* 216 (1989) 41; *Nucl. Phys. B* 347 (1990) 530; D. J. Gross and P. F. Mende, *Phys. Lett. B* 197 (1987) 129; *Nucl. Phys. B* 303 (1988) 407; K. Konishi, G. Pauti and P. Provero, *Phys. Lett. B* 234 (1990) 276; E. Witten, *Phys. Today* 49 (4) (1997) 24.
- [2] J. Polchinski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75 (1995) 4724; M. R. Douglas, D. Kabat, P. Pouliot and S. H. Shenker, *Nucl. Phys. B* 485 (1997) 85.
- [3] T. Yoneya, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 103 (2000) 1081.
- [4] M. Maggiore, *Phys. Rev. D* 49 (1994) 5182; *Phys. Lett. B* 319 (1993) 83.
- [5] R. J. Adler and D. I. Santiago, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* 14 (1999) 1371.
- [6] A. Kempf, *Phys. Rev. D* 63 (2001) 083514; A. Kempf and J. C. Niemeyer, *Phys. Rev. D* 64 (2001) 103501.
- [7] L. N. Chang, D. M. Ćinic, N. Okamura and T. Takeuchi, *Phys. Rev. D* 65 (2002) 125027.
- [8] L. Susskind and E. Witten, *hep-th/9805114*; A. W. Peet and J. Polchinski, *Phys. Rev. D* 59 (1999) 065011.
- [9] M. R. Douglas and N. A. Nekrasov, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 73 (2001) 977; C. M. Hull, *JHEP* 9807 (1998) 021; *JHEP* 9811 (1998) 017; V. Balasubramanian, P. Horava and D. M. Ćinic, *JHEP* 0105 (2001) 043; E. Witten, *hep-th/0106109*; A. Strominger, *JHEP* 0110 (2001) 034; *JHEP* 0111 (2001) 049; V. Balasubramanian, J. de Boer and D. M. Ćinic, *Phys. Rev. D* 65 (2002) 123508.
- [10] M. Niering et. al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 84 (2000) 5496.
- [11] D. G. Fried et. al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 81 (1998) 3811.
- [12] S. Benczik, L. N. Chang, D. M. Ćinic, N. Okamura, S. Rayyan and T. Takeuchi, *Phys. Rev. D* 66 (2002) 026003.
- [13] M. Chaichian, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and A. Tureanu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86, (2001) 2716; see, however, P.-M. Ho and H.-C. Kao, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88 (2002) 151602.