

## FOUNDATIONS OF QUANTUM MECHANICS: ASSIGNMENT 6

### Exercise 23: Essay question

Explain why the interference pattern in the double-slit experiment disappears if a detector measures through which slit the electron went, even if we ignore the outcome of the detection. Derive this fact from the projection postulate, using the observable  $P_B$  defined by  $P_B\psi(\mathbf{x}) = 1_B(\mathbf{x})\psi(\mathbf{x})$  as a model of a detector, where  $B$  is a suitable neighborhood of one slit. Explain why the pattern on the screen must be the same as if one slit were closed in each run, each slit in 50% of the runs. (Use formulas where appropriate.)

### Exercise 24: Projections

We defined a projection to be an operator  $P$  such that there is an ONB  $\{\phi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  diagonalizing  $P$ ,  $P\phi_n = \lambda_n\phi_n$ , with eigenvalues  $\lambda_n$  that are 0 or 1.

- (a) Show that the projections are exactly the self-adjoint operators  $P$  with  $P^2 = P$ .
- (b) Suppose that  $P : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is a projection with range  $\mathcal{K}$ ; one says that  $P$  is the projection to  $\mathcal{K}$ . Show that  $I - P$  is the projection to the orthogonal complement of  $\mathcal{K}$ , i.e., to  $\mathcal{K}^\perp = \{\phi \in \mathcal{H} : \langle \phi | \psi \rangle = 0 \forall \psi \in \mathcal{K}\}$ .
- (c) Suppose that  $P$  is the projection to  $\mathcal{K}$ . Show that the element in  $\mathcal{K}$  closest to a given vector  $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$  is  $P\psi$ .

### Exercise 25: Iterated Stern-Gerlach experiment

Consider the following experiment on a single electron. Suppose it has a wave function of the product form  $\psi_s(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_s \chi(\mathbf{x})$ , and we focus only on the spinor. The initial spinor is  $\phi = (1, 0)$ .

- (a) A Stern–Gerlach experiment in the  $y$ -direction (or  $\sigma_2$ -measurement) is carried out, then a Stern–Gerlach experiment in the  $z$ -direction (or  $\sigma_3$ -measurement). Both measurements taken together have four possible outcomes: up-up, up-down, down-up, down-down. Find the probabilities of the four outcomes.
- (b) As in (a), but now the  $z$ -experiment comes first and the  $y$ -experiment afterwards.

Please turn over.

**Exercise 26: Lie algebras of  $SO(3)$  and  $SU(2)$**  (level: difficult)

A *Lie group*  $G$ , named after Sophus Lie (1842–1899), is a group that is also a manifold (a curved surface) such that the group multiplication and inversion are smooth mappings. Examples of Lie groups include  $GL(n)$ ,  $SO(n)$ ,  $U(n)$ ,  $SU(n)$ . The elements infinitesimally close to 1 in  $G$  form the *Lie algebra*  $\mathfrak{g}$  of  $G$ ; more precisely,  $\mathfrak{g}$  is the tangent space of 1, which is here the set

$$\left\{ \frac{dA}{dt}(t=0) \mid A : (-1, 1) \rightarrow G \text{ smooth, } A(0) = 1 \right\}.$$

(a) Determine the Lie algebras  $\mathfrak{so}(3)$  and  $\mathfrak{su}(2)$  as subspaces of the space of all real  $3 \times 3$  (complex  $2 \times 2$ ) matrices.

(b) The *exponential mapping*  $\exp : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow G$  can be heuristically understood as follows: For  $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ , a corresponding group element infinitesimally close to 1 can be written as  $1 + X/n$  with  $n$  a large natural number (so  $1/n$  serves as an infinitesimal  $dt$ ). Hence, roughly speaking,  $(1 + X/n) \in G$ , hence  $(1 + X/n)^n \in G$ ; take the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$  to obtain  $\exp(X) =: e^X$ . Verify that the matrix exponential (defined by the exponential series) actually maps  $\mathfrak{so}(3)$  to  $SO(3)$  and  $\mathfrak{su}(2)$  to  $SU(2)$ . (Hint: diagonalize  $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ .)

(c) We now consider the question what the group multiplication of  $e^X$  and  $e^Y$  looks like for  $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ . We know that the solution  $Z$  of  $e^Z = e^X e^Y$  is  $Z = X + Y$  if  $X$  and  $Y$  commute, but not in general. A version of the *Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula* says that

$$\text{the solution of } e^Z = e^{-tX} e^{-tY} e^{t(X+Y)} \text{ is } Z = \frac{1}{2}t^2[X, Y] + \mathcal{O}(t^3)$$

as  $t \rightarrow 0$ , with  $[X, Y] = XY - YX$  the *commutator* or *Lie bracket*. The Lie bracket is an operation on  $\mathfrak{g}$  that encodes how the group multiplication deviates from addition in  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Thus, one defines a *Lie algebra* in general as a vector space together with a bracket  $[\cdot, \cdot] : \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$  that is anti-symmetric, bilinear, and satisfies the Jacobi identity

$$[[X, Y], Z] + [[Y, Z], X] + [[Z, X], Y] = 0.$$

Verify that  $\mathfrak{so}(3)$  and  $\mathfrak{su}(2)$  (with commutators as Lie brackets) are isomorphic Lie algebras. (Hint: The Pauli matrices have something to do with rotations about the  $x$ -,  $y$ -, and  $z$ -axis.)

**Hand in:** by Tuesday December 7, 2021, 8:15am via [urm.math.uni-tuebingen.de](http://urm.math.uni-tuebingen.de).

---

**Reading assignment** due Thursday December 9, 2021: A. Einstein, *Reply to Criticisms*, pages 665–688 in P. Schilpp (editor): *Albert Einstein, Philosopher–Scientist* (1949). Read pages 665–672 and the first quarter of 673.