

## 8.05 Review Notes

*Information on the formula sheet is not usually reproduced here...*

### The First Bits of the Course...

- For a free particle

$$\hat{H} = \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + V(x) = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + V(x)$$

- General features of wavefunctions
  - The *ground state* must be *even*.
  - The number of nodes indicates how “high” the state is.
- To incorporate the fact a particle decays as  $\exp(-t/\tau)$ , add  $-i\hbar/2\tau$  to the potential.
- The particle flux is given by  $J(x,t) = \frac{\hbar}{m} \text{Im}\left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x}\right)$  with  $\dot{\rho} + J' = 0$ . To prove, write an expression for  $\dot{\rho} = \frac{d}{dt}(\psi\psi^*)$  and simplify with a complex-conjugated SE. Integrating the conservation law over all space, we end up with the fact total probability is conserved. For a fluid,  $J = \rho v$  which gives us a nice definition of quantum velocity.
- $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i\hbar$
- General tips and tricks with Dirac Notation

- A crucial step in many derivations is that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x | \hat{p} | p \rangle &= p \langle x | p \rangle \\ &= p \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}} e^{ipx/\hbar} \\ &= -i\hbar \frac{d}{dx} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}} e^{ipx/\hbar} \\ &= -i\hbar \frac{d}{dx} \langle x | p \rangle \end{aligned}$$

And similarly that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p | \hat{x} | x \rangle &= x \langle p | x \rangle \\ &= x \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\hbar}} e^{-ipx/\hbar} \\ &= i\hbar \frac{d}{dp} \langle x | p \rangle \end{aligned}$$

- When working out expressions like  $\langle x | \hat{p} | \psi \rangle$ , write it as  $\int \langle x | \hat{p} | p \rangle \langle p | \psi \rangle dp$ .
- To find  $\langle x | \hat{p} | y \rangle$ , insert the identity into  $\langle x | \hat{p} | \psi \rangle$  and compare.
- When showing that  $e^{\hat{A}}|\alpha\rangle$  is an eigenstate (of  $x$ , say), easiest way to do it is

$$\hat{x}e^{\hat{A}}|\alpha\rangle = e^{\hat{A}}(e^{-\hat{A}}\hat{x}e^{\hat{A}})|\alpha\rangle = e^{\hat{A}}(\hat{x} + [\hat{x}, \hat{A}])|\alpha\rangle$$

[This uses the fact that  $e^{\hat{A}}\hat{B}e^{-\hat{A}} = \hat{B} + [\hat{A}, \hat{B}]$ , quoted on the formula sheet].

- To find the Fourier Transform of a function like  $xe^{ipx}$ , eliminate the  $x$  by expressing it as a derivative of the exponential.
- The function of the doubly differentiated delta function is to “pick out” the double derivative.
- To find the maximum and/or minimum value of an operator  $\hat{A}$ , consider a normalised eigenvector  $\psi$  and realise that  $\langle \psi | \hat{A} | \psi \rangle = a \langle \psi | \psi \rangle$ . Then, write  $\hat{A}$  in two ways that makes  $\langle \psi | \hat{A} | \psi \rangle$  a norm, and realise it must therefore be greater than 0 (for example,  $\langle \psi | \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} | \psi \rangle = \|\hat{a}|\psi\rangle\|^2 \geq 0$  and  $\langle \psi | 1 - \hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger | \psi \rangle$ ).
- For a free particle, the wavelength is given by

$$\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} = E - V_{eff}$$

- Translation operators in QM

$$\boxed{\mathcal{U} = e^{-ix_0\hat{p}/\hbar}} \quad \langle x | \hat{\mathcal{U}} | \psi \rangle = \psi(x - x_0) \quad \hat{\mathcal{U}}^\dagger \hat{x} \hat{\mathcal{U}} = x + x_0$$

$$\boxed{\mathcal{U} = e^{i\phi\hat{J}_z}} \quad \text{rotates the system by } \phi \text{ about the } z\text{-axis}$$

- The postulates of QM:
  - At each instant, the state of a physical system is represented by a **ket**  $|\psi\rangle$  in the space of states.

- Every observable attribute of a physical system is described by an Hermitian operator that acts on the kets that describe the system.
- The only possible result of the measurement of an observable  $A$  is one of the eigenvalues of the corresponding operator  $A$ .
- When a measurement of an observable  $A$  is made on a generic state  $|\psi\rangle$ , the probability of obtaining an eigenvalue  $a_n$  is given by the square of the inner product of  $|\psi\rangle$  with the eigenstate  $|a_n\rangle$  –  $|\langle a_n | \psi \rangle|^2$ .
- Immediately after the measurement of an observable  $A$  has yielded a value  $a_n$ , the state of the system is the normalised eigenstate  $|a_n\rangle$ .
- The time-evolution of a quantum system preserves the normalisation of the associated ket. The time evolution of the state of a quantum system is described by  $|\psi(t)\rangle = \hat{U}(t, t_0)|\psi(t_0)\rangle$  where  $U$  is unitary.

## Uncertainty

- If  $[\hat{A}, \hat{B}] = 0$ , then  $A$  and  $B$  are compatible – simultaneous eigenfunctions.
- The **complete set of commuting observables** is one in which each basis state is specified by a unique set of eigenvalues.
- For incompatible observables, the generalised uncertainty principle states that

$$(\Delta A)^2 (\Delta B)^2 \geq \left( \langle \psi | \frac{1}{2i} [\hat{A}, \hat{B}] | \psi \rangle \right)^2$$

We note that  $\frac{1}{2i}[\hat{A}, \hat{B}]$  is Hermitian and so has real expectation values. Thus, the RHS is always real and positive. Note that even if  $[\hat{A}, \hat{B}] \neq 0$ , the expectation value of  $i[\hat{A}, \hat{B}]$  might still be 0.

- To prove the generalised uncertainty principle, consider

$$\begin{aligned} |f\rangle &= (\hat{A} - \langle \hat{A} \rangle) |\psi\rangle \\ |g\rangle &= (\hat{B} - \langle \hat{B} \rangle) |\psi\rangle \end{aligned}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f | f \rangle \langle g | g \rangle &\geq |\langle f | g \rangle|^2 \\ (\Delta A)^2 (\Delta B)^2 &\geq \left( \frac{\langle f | g \rangle + \langle g | f \rangle}{2} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\langle f | g \rangle - \langle g | f \rangle}{2i} \right)^2 \\ (\Delta A)^2 (\Delta B)^2 &\geq \left( \frac{\langle [\hat{A}, \hat{B}] \rangle}{2i} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

- For minimum uncertainty, we need
  - $|g\rangle = \alpha |f\rangle$  (with complex  $\alpha$ ). This gives us equality in the Schwarz Inequality.
  - $\langle f | g \rangle + \langle g | f \rangle = 0 \Rightarrow \alpha = i\lambda$
 And so  $(\hat{B} - \langle \hat{B} \rangle) |\psi\rangle = i\lambda (\hat{A} - \langle \hat{A} \rangle) |\psi\rangle$
- For an eigenstate, the uncertainty of the operator is 0. To see why, consider  $\langle \beta | \beta \rangle$  where  $|\beta\rangle = (\hat{A} - a) |\alpha\rangle$ . If  $\langle \hat{A}^2 \rangle = \langle \hat{A} \rangle^2$ .

## Quantum Dynamics

- **Time evolution** operator defined such that  $|\psi, t\rangle = \hat{U}(t, t_0) |\psi, t_0\rangle$ 
  - **If  $\hat{H}$  is independent of time**

$$\hat{U}(t, t_0) = e^{-i(t-t_0)\hat{H}/\hbar}$$
  - **If  $\hat{H}$  dependent on time but  $[\hat{H}(t), \hat{H}(t')] = 0$** 

$$\hat{U}(t, t_0) = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{t_0}^t \hat{H}(\tilde{t}) d\tilde{t}}$$
- [Eg: field with constant position and varying direction].
- **If  $\hat{H}$  dependent of time and  $[\hat{H}(t), \hat{H}(t')] \neq 0$ , not 8.05**
- For the first case above, insert the identity before and after  $\hat{U}$  to find that

$$|\psi, 0\rangle = \sum_n C_n |n\rangle \Rightarrow |\psi, t\rangle = \sum_n C_n e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}(t-t_0)E_n} |n\rangle$$

- We can view expectation values in two different ways

$$\overbrace{\langle \psi, 0 | U^\dagger(t, 0) \hat{A}_S U(t, 0) | \psi, 0 \rangle}^{\text{Schrodinger}} = \underbrace{\langle \psi, 0 |}_{\text{H}} \underbrace{U^\dagger(t, 0) \hat{A}_H U(t, 0)}_{\text{Heisenberg}} \underbrace{| \psi, 0 \rangle}_{\text{H}}$$

In the **Schrodinger Picture**, the **wavefunctions evolve with time** and **operators stay constant**. In the **Heisenberg picture**, the opposite is true.

- Schrodinger and Heisenberg operators are related by the **Heisenberg Equation of Motion**

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} \hat{A}_H(t) = [\hat{A}_H(t), \hat{H}_H(t)] + i\hbar \underbrace{\dot{\hat{A}}_H(t)}_{=\hat{U}^\dagger \dot{\hat{A}}_S \hat{U}}$$

This last term disappears if the Schrodinger operator does not vary with time, which is true most of the time. To **solve** this equation, find the **right-hand-side** and **integrate**. Taking **expectation values** of each side gives the **Ehrenfest Theorem**.

- A few notes
  - Changing picture does not change the form of commutators
 
$$[\hat{A}_S, \hat{B}_S] = \hat{C}_S \Leftrightarrow [\hat{A}_H, \hat{B}_H] = \hat{C}_H$$
  - If  $[\hat{H}(t), \hat{H}(t')] = 0$ , then  $[\hat{U}, \hat{H}] = 0$  and  $\hat{H}_H = U^\dagger \hat{H}_S U = \hat{H}_S$ .
  - If  $[\hat{H}, \hat{A}] = 0$ , then  $A$  is a **conserved quantity**.

## Two-State Systems

- The matrix element  $\langle 2 | \hat{H} | 1 \rangle$  is a measure of the tunnelling probability  $1 \rightarrow 2$ .
- The **Hamiltonian** for a spin in a field  $\mathbf{B}$  is

$$\hat{H} = -\gamma \mathbf{B} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}$$

Where  $\mathbf{S}$  is a vector containing the spin operators as its components. By using the **Heisenberg Equation of Motion** for  $S_x$ ,  $S_y$  and  $S_z$  and integrating, we can show that any spin **precesses** about  $\mathbf{B}$  with angular velocity  $\omega = \gamma |\mathbf{B}|$ .

- Any **general two-state Hamiltonian** can be written as a sum of the **identity matrix** and the **Pauli matrices**, and so can be thought of as a **precessing spin**.
- Now, consider instead a system with a **constant field** in the  $z$ -direction, and a rotating field in the  $x$ - $y$  plane ( $\omega_0 = \gamma B_0$  and  $\omega_1 = \gamma B_1$ )

$$\hat{H}(t) = -\frac{\hbar}{2}\omega_0\hat{\sigma}_3 - \frac{\hbar}{2}\omega_1[\cos(\omega t)\hat{\sigma}_1 - \sin(\omega t)\hat{\sigma}_2]$$

Using the properties of the Pauli Matrices

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H}(t) &= -\frac{\hbar}{2}\omega_0\hat{\sigma}_3 - \frac{\hbar}{2}\omega_1\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}i\omega t\sigma_3\right)\hat{\sigma}_1\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}i\omega t\sigma_3\right) \\ &= -\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}i\omega t\sigma_3\right)\left[\frac{\hbar}{2}\omega_0\hat{\sigma}_3 + \frac{\hbar}{2}\omega_1\hat{\sigma}_1\right]\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}i\omega t\sigma_3\right) \\ &= -\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}i\omega t\sigma_3\right)\left[\omega_0\hat{S}_z + \omega_1\hat{S}_x\right]\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}i\omega t\sigma_3\right)\end{aligned}$$

So in other words, our Hamiltonian is **constant** in a **rotating frame**. So if the state is  $|\psi_R(t)\rangle$  in the rotating frame, then in the lab frame, it is  $|\psi(t)\rangle = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}i\omega t\sigma_3\right)|\psi_R(t)\rangle$ .

- Substitute  $|\psi(t)\rangle = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}i\omega t\sigma_3\right)|\psi_R(t)\rangle$  into the **LHS** of the SE to get

$$i\hbar\frac{d}{dt}|\psi_R(t)\rangle = [(\omega - \omega_0)\hat{S}_z - \omega_1\hat{S}_x]|\psi_R(t)\rangle$$

So in the rotating frame, there is **precession** about a **new field**  $B_{\text{eff}}$ . Since, typically,  $\omega_1 \ll \omega_2$ , the possible options are as follows

- $\omega$  **very different from**  $\omega_0$  – the field basically precesses around the  $z$  axis (ie: nearly not at all for a spin up).
- $\omega \approx \omega_0$  – the field precesses around the  $x$ -axis at a frequency  $\omega_1$ . Since our rotating frame is also moving around the  $z$ -axis, the spins spirals all the way down.
- **NMR** works as follows
  - We turn on a radio pulse with  $\omega = \gamma_{\text{proton}} B_0$ , for strength  $B_1$  for a time  $\Delta t = \pi / 2\gamma_{\text{proton}} B_1$ . This brings the spin “down” and makes it maximally perpendicular to the  $z$ -axis.
  - We then switch the field off and look for radio emission of precessing spins at a frequency  $\omega_0$  resulting from such spins.

## QM in Three-Dimensions

- Using all kinds of horribly complicated maths, we derive

$$\mathbf{L}^2 + (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p})^2 = r^2 \mathbf{p}^2 + i\hbar \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p} \Rightarrow \mathbf{p}^2 = \frac{(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p})^2 - i\hbar \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{L}^2}{r^2}$$

Using this relation and even more complicated maths, we get

$$\mathbf{H} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{2}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) + \frac{\mathbf{L}^2}{2mr^2} + V(r)$$

And finally, using a last dose of complicated maths, we find that a **maximal set of commuting operators** for this system is

$$\{H, \mathbf{L}^2, L_z\}$$

- Start with eigenfunctions  $|\ell, m\rangle$ , and **assume** that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}^2 |\ell, m\rangle &= \hbar^2 \ell(\ell + 1) |\ell, m\rangle \\ L_z |\ell, m\rangle &= \hbar m |\ell, m\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Use horrible maths once again to get

$$\mathbf{L}^2 = L_+ L_- + L_z^2 - \hbar L_z$$

Then, derive facts about these as follows:

- o **Constraint on  $\ell$**

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \ell, m | \mathbf{L}^2 | \ell, m \rangle &= \|L_z | \ell, m \rangle\|^2 \geq 0 \\ \langle \ell, m | \mathbf{L}^2 | \ell, m \rangle &= \ell(\ell + 1) \langle \ell, m | \ell, m \rangle \end{aligned}$$

And so

$$\ell(\ell + 1) \geq 0 \Rightarrow \boxed{\ell \geq 0}$$

- o **Constraint on  $m$**

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \ell, m | L_- L_+ | \ell, m \rangle &= \|L_+ | \ell, m \rangle\|^2 \geq 0 \\ \langle \ell, m | L_+ L_- | \ell, m \rangle &= \langle \ell, m | \mathbf{L}^2 - L_z^2 - \hbar L_z | \ell, m \rangle \end{aligned}$$

And so

$$\ell(\ell + 1) \geq m(m + 1)$$

When we have  $|\ell, m_{\max}\rangle$ , we have equality because  $L_+ |\ell, m_{\max}\rangle = 0$ , and so  $m_{\max} = \ell$ . Doing the same with  $L_+ L_-$ , we find

$$\boxed{-\ell \leq m \leq \ell}$$

- **Action of ladder operators** – consider  $\hat{L}^2$  and  $\hat{L}_z$  acting on  $L_{\pm}|\ell, m\rangle$  to prove the lowering action. Write

$$L_{\pm}|\ell, m\rangle = C_{\pm}|\ell, m \pm 1\rangle$$

$$|C_{\pm}(\ell, m)|^2 = \langle \ell, m | L_{\mp} L_{\pm} | \ell, m \rangle$$

And then find  $C_{\pm}$  by writing the product of ladder operators as above.

- To find  $Y_{\ell m} = \langle \theta, \phi | \ell, m \rangle$ 
  - Apply  $\langle \theta, \phi |$  to the left of both sides of  $L_z |\ell, m\rangle = \hbar m |\ell, m\rangle$
  - Separate variables, and get  $\phi$  dependence directly.
  - Apply  $\langle \theta, \phi |$  to the left of both sides of  $L_+ |\ell, \ell\rangle = 0$  to find  $Y_{\ell \ell}$
  - Lower to find others.

Note that  $Y_{1,0}$  is a dumbbell, but  $Y_{1,\pm 1}$  are doughnuts.

- Half-integer  $\ell$  is impossible for spatial wavefunctions, because they can otherwise be lowered forever.
- The **parity operator**  $\Pi$  is defined by  $\Pi|\mathbf{r}\rangle = |-\mathbf{r}\rangle$ , and it is **hermitian** and **unitary**. It can be shown that

$$\Pi|\ell, m\rangle = (-1)^{\ell} |\ell, m\rangle$$

- Separating variables on the Schrodinger Equation gives

$$\left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{\hbar^2 \ell(\ell+1)}{2mr^2} + V(r) \right) U(r) = EU(r)$$

Where

$$\psi(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{r} U(r) Y_{\ell m}(\theta, \phi)$$

And normalisation implies that

$$\int_0^{\infty} |U(r)|^2 dr = 1$$

- We can derive some asymptotic conditions on  $U$ :
  - If  $U(r) \rightarrow r^S$  as  $r \rightarrow 0$ , then  $S = \ell + 1$ , assuming that the potential is no more singular than  $1/r$ . Can be shown by solving the above and normalising, or by requiring  $H$  to be Hermitian.



- Assuming that  $V$  vanishes at infinity, then  $U(r) \sim e^{\pm r\sqrt{-2mE/\hbar^2}}$ , and depending on whether  $E > 0$  or  $E < 0$ , we get plane waves or decaying exponentials.
- When “sketching” states:
  - The state starts off as  $U(r) \sim r^{\ell+1}$
  - At  $\infty$ , we either have a sinusoidal function or a decaying exponential.
  - In between, we have **oscillatory behaviour**, where a **higher potential** (less energy) means a **higher amplitude** and a **longer wavelength**.
- The **super symmetric method**
  - We define pairs of related Hamiltonians,  $H^{(1)} = \mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{A}$ ,  $H^{(2)} = \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^\dagger$ . [Note that in each of the Hamiltonians, only the sign of the  $\mathcal{W}'$  changes].
  - Important facts are that:
    1.  $H^{(1)}$  and  $H^{(2)}$  have the **same energy spectrum**, and if  $\phi_n$  is an eigenstate of  $H^{(1)}$ , then  $\mathcal{A}\phi_n$  is an eigenstate of  $H^{(2)}$  with the **same eigenvalue**.
    2. There is usually some sort of relationship between  $H^{(1)}$  and  $H^{(2)}$ .
    3. Only one of  $H^{(1)}$  and  $H^{(2)}$  can have a normalisable state with 0 energy.
  - So the tactic for these problems is
    - Use **3** to get a state of  $H^{(1)}$ , say.
    - Use **2** to get the next level state, but for  $H^{(2)}$ .
    - Use **1** to make that into a state of  $H^{(1)}$
    - Rinse, lather, repeat...

## Spin

- Eigenvalues of the Pauli matrices are
  - $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(1, -1)$  and  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(1, 1)$  for  $\sigma_x$ .
  - $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(-i, 1)$  and  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(1, -i)$  for  $\sigma_y$ .

- We can decompose any 2 by 2 matrix into

$$\boxed{M = a_0 \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}}$$

$$\left[ a_0 = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(M) \quad \mathbf{a} = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(M \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \right]$$

## Addition of Angular Momenta

- Two angular momenta  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{L}'$ , with  $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{L}'$  can be described in two different bases
  - $\hat{\mathbf{L}}^2, \hat{\mathbf{L}}'^2, \hat{L}_z, \hat{L}'_z$ , and states are  $|\ell, \ell', m_\ell, m'_\ell\rangle$
  - $\hat{\mathbf{L}}^2, \hat{\mathbf{L}}'^2, \hat{\mathbf{J}}^2, \hat{J}_z$ , and states are  $|\ell, \ell', J, M_j\rangle$
- It is useful to have the  $\mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{L}'$  operator in the two bases

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{L}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{L}}' &= \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\mathbf{J}}^2 - \hat{\mathbf{L}}^2 - \hat{\mathbf{L}}'^2) \\ \hat{\mathbf{L}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{L}}' &= \hat{L}_z \hat{L}'_z + \hat{L}_x \hat{L}'_x + \hat{L}_y \hat{L}'_y = \hat{L}_z \hat{L}'_z + \frac{1}{2} (\hat{L}_+ \hat{L}'_- + \hat{L}_- \hat{L}'_+) \end{aligned}}$$

In systems in which both bases are referred to in the Hamiltonian, it pays to stay in the  $\hat{\mathbf{L}}^2, \hat{\mathbf{L}}'^2, \hat{L}_z, \hat{L}'_z$  basis and diagonalise the Hamiltonian.

- The transformations between the two bases are listed in tables, and are obtained roughly as follows:
  - **Start from the maximum  $J$  and  $M_j$  value** (trivially obtained by adding all the maximum states). Lower using the ladder operators.
  - **Find the state with  $J - 1$  and  $M_j = J - 1$**  by using the fact it will be orthogonal to the  $J, M_j = J - 1$  state. Lower.
  - **Rinse, lather, repeat...**

## Identical Particles

- $\hat{P}_{ij}$  is the **exchange operator** – it exchanges *all* the labels  $i$  and  $j$  in a state. It is **Hermitian** and **unitary**, and can have **eigenvalues**  $+1$  (*bosons with integer spin*) or  $-1$  (*fermions with half-integer spin*).

- Constructing symmetric and antisymmetric wavefunctions
  - Consider  **$N$  Fermions** (1, 2, ...,  $N$ ) which could be in any state  $\alpha, \beta, \dots, \nu$ . The most general **antisymmetric linear combination** of these states is given by the **Slater Determinant**

$$\Psi(1, 2, \dots, N) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N!}} \begin{vmatrix} u_\alpha(1) & u_\alpha(2) & \cdots & u_\alpha(N) \\ u_\beta(1) & u_\beta(2) & \cdots & u_\beta(N) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ u_\nu(1) & u_\nu(2) & \cdots & u_\nu(N) \end{vmatrix}$$
  - Thus, if we're looking for a state in which we **know** one particle is in  $\alpha$ , one in  $\beta$  and one in  $\gamma$ , we simply calculate the above. Notes:
    - Swapping one particle does exactly what is expected.
    - If *any* states are identical, the determinant goes to 0 and the wavefunction **cannot** be anti-symmetrised.
  - For  **$N$  bosons**, similar considerations apply, but with all the **alternating signs** in the **Slater determinant** changed to “positives”.
- General results – if we have  $N$  particles and  $j$  possible states, then the number of different three particle states possible is
  - $j^N$  if the particles are **distinguishable**.
  - ${}^{N+j-1}C_{j-1}$  if the particles are **indistinguishable bosons**. [Placing  $j - 1$  barriers between  $N + j - 1$  states].
  - ${}^jC_N$  if the particles are **indistinguishable fermions**.
- Spatial and spin parts
  - It is also possible to factor a wavefunction into **spin** and **spatial** wavefunctions. It is the **product of both** that has to satisfy appropriate symmetry.
  - We can **individually symmetrise/antisymmetrise** each part using the tactics above.
  - In general, for the  $\ell \otimes \ell'$  spin case, states with resulting **even**  $J$  will be even, and states with resulting **odd**  $J$  will be odd.
- Correlation and exchange forces

- **Symmetric** wavefunctions result in particles appearing to “**attract**” each other, and vice-versa.
- Thus, energy levels in the Helium molecule are *lower* when spins are *aligned* (symmetric) because the spatial part then has to be *antisymmetric*, which results in less repulsion.
- Similarly, bonds are caused by *antisymmetric* spins, which then cause the electrons to attract.