

Comments

Comments are short papers which comment on papers of other authors previously published in the Physical Review. Each Comment should state clearly to which paper it refers and must be accompanied by a brief abstract. The same publication schedule as for regular articles is followed, and page proofs are sent to authors.

Comment on "Quantum oscillator in a non-self-interacting radiation field: Exact calculation of the partition function"

G. W. Ford

Department of Physics, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

J. T. Lewis

School of Theoretical Physics, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, Dublin 4, Ireland

R. F. O'Connell

Department of Physics and Astronomy, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

(Received 30 March 1987)

In their recent paper [Phys. Rev. A **35**, 4122 (1987)] Castrigiano and Kokiantonis claim to present an exact calculation of the partition function for a quantum oscillator interacting with the black-body radiation field. In this Comment it is shown that their result is in fact wrong, due essentially to their neglect at the outset of the A^2 term in the Hamiltonian. It is further shown how their error can be repaired to give the correct result given by us in an earlier publication [Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 2273 (1985)].

In their paper¹ Castrigiano and Kokiantonis claim to present an exact calculation of the partition function and, hence, the free energy of a quantum harmonic oscillator interacting with the radiation field. We wish to point out here that their calculation is wrong and that when the error is repaired a calculation such as theirs gives the correct result.²

The point is this. They begin with the correct Hamiltonian for a three-dimensional charged oscillator of (bare) mass m and spring constant K interacting via dipole coupling with the radiation field

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} \left[\mathbf{p} - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A} \right]^2 + \frac{1}{2} K \mathbf{r}^2 + H_{\text{rad}}, \tag{1}$$

where the vector potential in dipole approximation is

$$\mathbf{A} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \left[\frac{2\pi\hbar c^2}{\omega V} \right]^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} (a_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} + a_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^*), \tag{2}$$

and the radiation field Hamiltonian is

$$H_{\text{rad}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \hbar\omega (a_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^* a_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} + \frac{1}{2}). \tag{3}$$

But at the outset they drop the term

$$e^2 A^2 / 2mc^2. \tag{4}$$

Then, at a later stage, they add a term [the "counter-term" appearing in the text following Eq. (10)] that, when expressed in terms of the variables of the original Hamil-

tonian (1), takes the form

$$\frac{2\pi e^2}{m^2 V} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \left[\frac{\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}}{\omega} \right]^2. \tag{5}$$

Finally they interchange the meaning of coordinate and momentum with the canonical transformation: $\mathbf{r} \rightarrow \mathbf{p}$, $\mathbf{p} \rightarrow -\mathbf{r}$. The result is the Hamiltonian

$$H'' = \frac{1}{2} K \mathbf{p}^2 + \frac{1}{2m} \mathbf{r}^2 + \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \hbar\omega \left\{ \left[a_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^* + \left[\frac{2\pi e^2}{\hbar\omega^3 V} \right]^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{r}}{m} \right] \times \left[a_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} + \left[\frac{2\pi e^2}{\hbar\omega^3 V} \right]^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{r}}{m} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \right\}. \tag{6}$$

This Hamiltonian does *not* correspond to the oscillator coupled to the radiation field. In fact, it corresponds to a Drude model with a frequency-independent friction constant equal to $2Ke^2/3mc^3$. This, then, is their error: they calculate from the outset with the wrong Hamiltonian.

Indeed, the "main result" of Castrigiano and Kokiantonis, their Eq. (11), is equivalent with the expression for the free energy for such a Drude model given in Ref. 2, Eq. (25). Thus their path-integral calculation is correct; it is their physics which is wrong. Here we should

perhaps emphasize that their wrong starting point leads them to completely miss the well-known T^2 dependence of the free energy of an atom interacting with *high-temperature* blackbody radiation. They are incorrect when they say this is a low-temperature result.

The importance of retaining the A^2 term in order to obtain physically consistent results was pointed out in the

well-known work of Power and Zienau.^{3,4} There, too, one finds (Ref. 4, p. 104) the unitary transformation

$$U = \exp \left[\frac{ie}{\hbar c} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{A} \right], \quad (7)$$

which brings the Hamiltonian (1) to the form

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} \mathbf{p}^2 + \frac{1}{2} K \mathbf{r}^2 + \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \hbar \omega \left\{ \left[a_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma}^* - i \left(\frac{2\pi e^2}{\hbar \omega V} \right)^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \cdot \mathbf{r} \right] \left[a_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} + i \left(\frac{2\pi e^2}{\hbar \omega V} \right)^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \cdot \mathbf{r} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \right\}. \quad (8)$$

This Hamiltonian is equivalent to the original Hamiltonian (1), *with no terms added and no terms dropped*, and it is of the form desired by Castrigiano and Kokiantonis for their path-integration method. With it they will find the exact result for the free energy obtained in Ref. 2 by a rigorous and, we believe, far simpler method.

This research was partially supported by the National Science Foundation Grant No. INT-8504402 and by the U.S. Office of Naval Research under Contract No. N00014-86-K-0002.

¹D. P. L. Castrigiano and N. Kokiantonis, Phys. Rev. A **35**, 4122 (1987).

²G. W. Ford, J. T. Lewis, and R. F. O'Connell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 2273 (1985).

³E. A. Power and S. Zienau, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London **251**, 427 (1959).

⁴E. A. Power, *Introductory Quantum Electrodynamics* (American Elsevier, New York, 1965).