QMU Phys 652

Solutions of HW#2

Problem #1

(a) reuniste as à state vecdor:

Since
$$L_{\pm}|l,m\rangle = \hbar \sqrt{\ell(\ell+1)} - m(m\pm 1) |l,m\pm 1\rangle$$

term 11,1> doesn't survive; since L+ 11,1>=0

$$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} f_{\sqrt{1.2-(-1).0}} | 1,0 > + \sqrt{3} f_{\sqrt{1.2-0.1}} | 1,1 \right)$$

(6) If
$$L_2$$
 is measured => $m = 0, \pm 1 \Rightarrow$ $\ell_2 = -h, 0, +h$ are sound

$$P_{\ell_z=-k} = |\langle 1, -1 | \psi \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{5}$$
 $(m=-1)$

$$P_{\ell_{t}=f} = |\langle 1, 1 | 4 \rangle|^{2} = \frac{1}{5}$$
(m=+1)

The uncertainty
$$\Delta L_x = \sqrt{\langle L_x^2 \rangle - \langle L_x \rangle^2}$$

 $\Delta L_y = \sqrt{\langle L_y^2 \rangle - \langle L_y \rangle^2}$

$$\langle L_x^2 \rangle = \langle L_y^2 \rangle = \langle L_z^2 \rangle - \langle L_z^2 \rangle = \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \left[\ell(\ell+1) - m^2 \right]$$

See worksheet #3

$$\langle L_{x}^{2} \rangle = \langle L_{y}^{2} \rangle = \frac{\hbar^{2}}{2} [1.2 - 1] = \frac{\hbar^{2}}{2} = 0$$

$$\Delta L_{x} = \Delta L_{y} = \frac{\hbar}{15}$$

= sindcoso (ei4e-i4)

Problem #2

(ii) $\frac{X^2}{r^2} = r^2 \sin\theta \cos\theta \cos\theta$

The total angular momentum is VZY11214> = V6R2<414> = V6R (6). $L_{+}Y = ?$ L+ Y= 1/2 L+ Y2+ V2 (L+ Y2-1 - L+ Y2) ()
Use L+ Ye = f \(\left(\text{\left(\left(\teft(\left(\left € -1 - 4 V6 Y2 + 1= f (V6 Y2 - 2 Y2) + V2 f (V6 /2,0) - 2/2,2) $< 41 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} < 2,01$ $+\sqrt{\frac{2}{5}}\left(\langle 2, -1 | -\langle 2, 1 | \right)$ <41414>= 1/5/5 + V6 (2,012,0) - AVE. (c) From part (a), $L_{2}\Psi = -hV_{5}^{2}(Y_{2}^{-1} + Y_{2}^{1})$ i.e. possible values for L_{2} are $\pm h$ and 0.

Probabilities: P(Lz=0)=1; P(Lz=±h)==; =+==1

August 1	party :	wag to a
		•

Problem #3.

Analysis of the paper entitled "Fullerene quantum gyroscope" by M. Krause et al. (*Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 137403 (2004)).

1) What is the claim of the paper?

The authors claim the first experimental observation of quantized rotational states of the C₂ molecule encapsulated in solid fullerene.

2) Did the authors do experiment, calculations or both?

The authors performed both the experiment and calculations (DFT and MD).

3) What kind of experiment did the authors do?

The experimental method was Raman scattering in a backscattering geometry at two laser wavelengths of excitation (647 nm and 514 nm, respectively) as a function of temperature.

4) What are the measured quantities?

Spectral content of the scattered light was measured, and dependence of the intensity of the scattered light on the frequency shift with respect to the laser excitation frequency was analyzed at various temperatures.

5) How is the experimentally measured line separation (see Fig.2) related to the difference in energy levels (e.g. E_{l} - E_{l-1})?

The line separation (
$$\Delta v$$
) is $\Delta v = v_{l+2} - v_l = \frac{E_{l+2} - E_l}{h} - \frac{E_l - E_{l-2}}{h}$

(note that we take a difference between the energy levels l and $l \pm 2$ due to selection rules in the case of Raman scattering experiment)

Also note that the line separation is the difference in frequencies, not in energies!

5) In the first column of page 2, the authors state that if the motion of the rotator is confined to a plane, then the energies are E(m)=Bm². Why?

If the motion is confined to a plane (say, x-y plane), then the angular momentum has only z component, i.e. $\vec{L}^2 = L_z^2$. Then the Hamiltonian is $H = \frac{L_z^2}{2\mu r_e^2}$.

Since
$$H\psi = E\psi$$
 and $L_z\psi = hm\psi$, then $\frac{L_z^2}{2\mu r_e^2}\psi = \frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu r_e^2}m^2\psi$, from which $E=Bm^2$,

where
$$B = \frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu r_e^2}$$
.

6) What are the selection rules for Raman scattering? What line separation is expected and why?

The selection rules are $\Delta J=\pm 2$, $\Delta m=\pm 2$.

Strictly speaking, the line separation is

$$\Delta v = v_{j+2} - v_j = \frac{E_{j+2} - E_j}{h} - \frac{E_j - E_{j-2}}{h} = \frac{B}{h} ((j+2)(j+3) - 2j(j+1) + (j-2)(j-1)) = 8\frac{B}{h}$$

Similarly,

$$\Delta v = v_{m+2} - v_m = \frac{E_{m+2} - E_m}{h} - \frac{E_m - E_{m-2}}{h} = \frac{B}{h} \left((m+2)^2 - 2m^2 + (m-2)^2 \right) = 8\frac{B}{h}$$

However, note that the rotational constant B, defined in class as $B = \frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu r_e^2}$, has

the units of energy (Joules), while the authors define it in the units of cm⁻¹. As a result, their line separation is expressed in terms of the wave numbers (cm⁻¹) and not in the frequencies (s⁻¹), and so their line separation Δv (in cm⁻¹) is just 8B, not 8B/h.

Also note that the rotational spectrum lines in this paper correspond to transitions 0->2, 2->4, 4->6, ... (see Table 1), so only even rotational states are allowed (and odd ones such as 1->3, 3->5,... are disallowed) due to symmetry considerations (page 2, column 2, first paragraph).

7) How is the rotational constant B derived from the experimental data? What is the obtained value for B?

The average line separation deduced from the data is $\Delta v=8B=13.8$ cm⁻¹, from which B=13.8/8=1.73 cm⁻¹.

8) What are the obtained values for the moment of inertia and a distance between the atoms (i.e. r_e)?

 $I=1.617x10^{-46} \text{ kg m}^2; r_e=0.127 \text{ nm}$

9) Under what conditions the model of an unperturbed rotator is applicable to this "real" system?

The closer the system to a free rotator (i.e. very low rotational barrier), the better the agreement with the unperturbed model (i.e. V=0).

10) What do the authors introduce in the Schroedinger equation to better describe the experimental results?

The authors introduce the potential term $V(\gamma)$ in the Schroedinger equation.

12) Which model provides a better agreement with the experiment (see Table I)?

At all frequencies, the plane rotor models (both unperturbed and perturbed) provide a better agreement with the data than the free rotor model.

However, the perturbed plane rotor model has an advantage over the unperturbed plane rotor model at low frequencies.

andminer

deliniuri...