Universität Tübingen, Mathematisches Institut Dr. Stefan Keppeler

# Groups and Representations

Instruction 9 for the preparation of the lecture on 19 May 2021

## 3.3 Perturbation theory and lifting of degeneracies

Setting: Hamiltonian is a sum of a (known) term  $H_0$  and a (small) perturbation H',

$$H = H_0 + H'.$$

Let G be the symmetry group of  $H_0$ . Two possibilities:

- 1. H' is also invariant under G.
- 2. H' is only invariant under a subgroup  $B \subset G$ .

In case 1 the spectra of  $H_0$  and of H look similar (same multiplicities).

Case 2 (symmetry breaking) typically leads to a splitting of energy levels:

- Eigenstates of H transform in irreps of B.
- ▶ Degenerate eigenstates of  $H_0$  transform in irreps of G.
- Eigenspaces of  $H_0$  carry reps of B, in general reducible. States transforming in different irreps of B, in general, have different energies. States transforming in the same irrep of B, are still degenerate.

#### Examples:

1. Hydrogen atom as in Section 3.2.

Adding a small radially symmetric potential V(r) (but not  $\frac{1}{r}$ ) breaks the O(4)symmetry to O(3). Each energy level splits into n levels with different  $\ell$ . Each new level is still  $(2\ell+1)$ -fold degenerate.

- 2. Fine structure of hydrogen.
  - ▶ Take electron spin into account: instead of  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$  consider  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ .
  - ▶ Intermediate step: Consider  $H \otimes \mathbb{1}_2$ . States which so far transformed in irrep  $\Gamma^{2\ell+1}$  of O(3), now transform in rep  $\Gamma^{2\ell+1} \otimes \Gamma^2$  of SU(2), but energies are unchanged, only the degeneracy is doubled.

Wait, why 
$$SU(2)$$
? https://youtu.be/2dFq2LwrrMU (4min) (3)

▶ Now add the perturbation H', containing spin-dependent terms (spin-orbit coupling), but still invariant under SU(2). Splittings follow from

$$\Gamma^{2\ell+1} \otimes \Gamma^2 = \Gamma^{2\ell} \oplus \Gamma^{2\ell+2}.$$
  
https://youtu.be/p1SZsPfGjEM (7min) (4)

(1)

### 4 Expansion into irreducible basis vectors

#### 4.1 Projection operators onto irreducible bases

Recall Lemma 8 and the following remark about constructing irreducible invariant subspaces. Let's elaborate on this idea. Let U be a (completely reducible ) representation (e.g. by unitary operators) on V and let  $e_1^{\nu}, \ldots, e_{d_{\nu}}^{\nu} \in V$  be functions/vectors that transform in the unitary irreducible representation  $\Gamma^{\nu}$  (with dim $(\Gamma^{\nu}) = d_{\nu}$ ). We can expand every  $\psi \in V$  into such basis vectors, i.e.

$$\psi = \sum_{\mu} \sum_{\beta=1}^{d_{\mu}} c^{\mu}_{\beta} e^{\mu}_{\beta} \,,$$

with expansion coefficients  $c^{\mu}_{\beta} \in \mathbb{C}$ . Let's apply U(g):

This motivates the following definition.

**Definition:** (generalised projection operators)

Let G be a group, U a representation,  $\Gamma^{\mu}$  an irreducible representation, dim  $\Gamma^{\mu} = d_{\mu}$ . We call

$$P_{jk}^{\mu} = \frac{d_{\mu}}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} [\Gamma^{\mu}(g)^{-1}]_{jk} U(g)$$

generalised projection operator.

**Remark:** In the following  $\Gamma$  will always be unitary, i.e.

$$[\Gamma^{\mu}(g)^{-1}]_{jk} = [\Gamma^{\mu}(g)^{\dagger}]_{jk} = \overline{\Gamma^{\mu}(g)_{kj}} \qquad \text{(cf. above)}.$$

We will study the properties of these operators on the next instruction sheet.