

# On Asymmetric Quasiperiodic Solutions of Hartree-Fock Systems

by

J. Dolbeault <sup>1)</sup>, R. Illner <sup>2)</sup> and H. Lange <sup>3)</sup>

1) CEREMADE, Université Paris IX-Dauphine, Place du Maréchal  
de Lattre de Tassigny, 75775 Paris Cédex 16, France  
(dolbeault@ceremade.dauphine.fr)

2) Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Victoria,  
P.O. Box 3045, Victoria, B.C. V8W 3P4, Canada  
(rillner@math.uvic.ca)

3) Institut für Mathematik, Universität Köln, Weyertal 86-90,  
D-50931 Köln, Germany  
(hlange@ruf.uni-freiburg.de)

## ABSTRACT

The time-dependent Hartree-Fock system is considered in the presence of external magnetic and electric fields, and with a self-consistent potential including anisotropies. A suitable ansatz reduces a quasiperiodic time-dependent problem to an eigenvalue problem, which is then solved by minimization of an energy functional.

**1. Introduction.** We are concerned with solutions of the Hartree-Fock system (see, e.g., [3]) in two space dimensions, in the presence of a constant magnetic field (vector potential)  $\vec{A}(x) = \omega(-x_2, x_1)$  with field strength  $\omega > 0$  and an external electric potential  $U_0(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{2}\rho_0|x|^2$  (constraints on  $\rho_0$  are given below).

This problem models a beam of spinless quantum particles satisfying the Pauli principle; the beam is confined by the magnetic field and the external electric field. It will be transparent from our analysis that the choice of the isotropic electric external potential is only an example of a larger admissible class of isotropic external potentials; the key point is that the electric potential cannot overcome the magnetic confinement of the beam.

By the same token, the method will be seen to generalize to three dimensions. All that is needed is a third (confining) component to the electric field, which will prevent the particle system from escaping in the third coordinate direction. We will do the rigorous analysis for the two-dimensional situation and then cover the three-dimensional case by comments.

Variational methods are classical for proving the existence of stationary solutions of the Hartree-Fock system (without imposing *a priori* anisotropy: see [1], [7], [8]). Our research was inspired by similar results obtained for the classical Vlasov-Poisson system (see [2]).

The type of Hamiltonian which we encounter in our study arises, e.g., in the study of quantum dots (see, e.g., [10] for a recent survey).

We denote  $x = (x_1, x_2)$ ,  $|x|^2 = x_1^2 + x_2^2$ . The full Hartree-Fock system is the nonlinearly coupled system for countably many wave functions  $\varphi_l$ ,  $l = 1, 2, \dots$ , dependent on  $x$  and  $t$ ,

$$i\hbar\partial_t\varphi_l = \frac{1}{2m}(-i\hbar\nabla_x - \frac{q}{c}\vec{A}(x))^2\varphi_l + qU[n]\varphi_l + q\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\lambda_j V_{lj}\varphi_j + q\frac{\rho_0}{2}|x|^2\varphi_l. \quad (1.1)$$

Here,  $q$  is the charge of a spinless quantum particle,  $m$  is its mass,  $\hbar$  is the Planck constant and  $c$  is the velocity of light. The  $\lambda_j$ s in (1.1) are probabilities that the system finds itself in the state  $\varphi_l$  at time  $t$ , where  $\varphi_l$  is the eigenfunction of the density matrix associated with the eigenvalue  $\lambda_l$ . The system (1.1) is one of three common and equivalent descriptions of the time evolution of ensembles of spinless quantum particles obeying the Pauli principle; the other two are the Heisenberg and Wigner descriptions (see [4]). In (1.1),  $n(x, t) = \sum \lambda_j |\varphi_j(x, t)|^2$ , and the self-consistent potential  $U[n]$  is

coupled with  $n$  via the Poisson equation

$$-\Delta U(\cdot, t) = n(\cdot, t). \quad (1.2)$$

The relevant solutions of (1.2) in two dimensions are

$$U(x, t) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int \ln|x-y| n(y, t) dy + U_1(x, t),$$

where  $\Delta U_1(\cdot, t) = 0$ . (if  $n$  decays fast enough for the integral to exist). The Pauli correction  $V_{lj}$  is given by

$$V_{lj}(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \ln|x-y| \varphi_l(y, t) \bar{\varphi}_j(y, t) dy. \quad (1.3)$$

Equation (1.1) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar\partial_t\varphi_l &= \frac{-\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta_x\varphi_l + \frac{i\hbar q\omega}{mc}(-x_2\partial_{x_1} + x_1\partial_{x_2})\varphi_l + qU[n]\varphi_l \\ &+ q\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\lambda_j V_{lj}\varphi_j + q\frac{\rho_0 + \omega^2\frac{q}{mc^2}}{2}|x|^2\varphi_l. \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

To simplify our analysis, we now set all the physical constants  $\hbar, m, c$  and  $q$  equal to one (the general case follows in complete analogy). Eqn. (1.4) simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial_t\varphi_l &= \frac{-1}{2}\Delta_x\varphi_l + i\omega(-x_2\partial_{x_1} + x_1\partial_{x_2})\varphi_l + U[n]\varphi_l \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\lambda_j V_{lj}\varphi_j + \frac{\rho_0 + \omega^2}{2}|x|^2\varphi_l. \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

Moreover, we consider (1.4) under the assumption that  $\omega^2 + \rho_0 > 0$ . We set  $\delta = \rho_0 + \omega^2$  and equation (1.5) reads

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial_t\varphi_l &= \frac{-1}{2}\Delta_x\varphi_l + i\omega(-x_2\partial_{x_1} + x_1\partial_{x_2})\varphi_l + U[n]\varphi_l \\ &- \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\lambda_j V_{lj}\varphi_j + \frac{\delta}{2}(x_1^2 + x_2^2)\varphi_l, \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

with  $\Delta U = -n$ .

We next reduce the problem further by looking only for a special class of periodic solutions. To this end, let  $R_\omega$  denote the rotation matrix in counter-clockwise direction by the angle  $\pi/4$ , and with angular velocity  $\omega$  :

$$R_\omega = \omega \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\exp(tR_\omega)x = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\omega t)x_1 - \sin(\omega t)x_2 \\ \sin(\omega t)x_1 + \cos(\omega t)x_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and for any sufficiently smooth function  $f$ ,  $(x, t) \rightarrow f(\exp(tR_\omega)x)$  solves

$$\partial_t \varphi = \omega(-x_2 \partial_{x_1} + x_1 \partial_{x_2})\varphi \quad (1.7)$$

(i.e., the differential operator on the right of (1.7) generates a rotation group).

This motivates the ansatz

$$\varphi_l(x, t) = e^{-iE_l t} \psi_l(e^{tR_\omega} x) \quad (1.8)$$

to solve (1.6), and by inspection one proves

**Theorem 1.** *The family of functions given by (1.8) solves (1.6) if and only if  $\Psi := (\psi_l)_{l=1,2,\dots}$  satisfy the coupled eigenfunction equations*

$$E_l \psi_l = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta \psi_l + U[n] \psi_l + \sum_j \lambda_j V_{lj} \psi_j + \frac{\delta}{2} (x_1^2 + x_2^2) \psi_l \quad (1.9)$$

with  $-\Delta U = n = \sum \lambda_l |\psi_l|^2$ , i.e.,  $U(x) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int \ln|x-y| n(y) dy + U_1(x)$  with  $\Delta U_1 = 0$ , and

$$V_{lj}(x) = \int \ln|x-y| \psi_l(y) \bar{\psi}_j(y) dy. \quad (1.10)$$

In the remainder of this paper, we solve (1.9-10) by minimizing an energy functional. Notice that  $U$  is only determined up to a harmonic contribution component  $U_1$  of the self-consistent potential (with a slight abuse of notation, we use the notations  $U$  and  $U_1$  even after making the ansatz (1.8);

$U$  and  $U_1$  do now not depend on  $t$  anymore). The trivial choice  $U_1 = 0$  leads to isotropic eigenstates. We will treat the more general situation where  $U_1 = \frac{\tilde{\theta}}{2}(x_1^2 - x_2^2)$ , which leads to anisotropy if  $\tilde{\theta} > 0$ . Note that  $\Delta U_1 = 0$ , i.e.,  $U_1$  is an admissible correction to the self-consistent potential. To guarantee confinement, we have to restrict ourselves to the weak anisotropy situation where  $0 \leq \tilde{\theta} < \delta$  (the case  $-\delta < \theta \leq 0$  follows then by exchanging  $x_1$  with  $x_2$ ). Setting  $\tilde{\theta} = \theta\delta$ , Eqn. (1.9) becomes

$$E_l \psi_l = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta \psi_l + U[n] \psi_l + \sum_j \lambda_j V_{lj} \psi_j + \frac{\delta}{2} ((1 + \theta)x_1^2 + (1 - \theta)x_2^2) \psi_l \quad (1.11)$$

with  $U[n] = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int \ln|x - y| n(y) dy$ .

**2. Solving the eigenvalue problem.** We first recall the representation of the density matrix  $\rho$  in terms of its eigenfunctions:

$$\rho(x, y, t) = \sum \lambda_l \bar{\varphi}_l(x, t) \varphi_l(y, t). \quad (2.1)$$

Next, we define an energy functional for the system (1.11) by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\Psi) := & \frac{1}{4} \sum_l \lambda_l \int |\nabla \psi_l(x)|^2 dx \\ & - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int \int \ln|x - y| (n(x)n(y) - |\rho(x, y)|^2) dx dy \\ & + \frac{\delta}{2} \int ((1 + \theta)x_1^2 + (1 - \theta)x_2^2) n(x) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

Let a function space  $\mathbb{Y}$  be defined by

$$\mathbb{Y} = \{\Psi; \quad \psi_l \in L^2 \cap H^1, \quad \sum \lambda_l \|\psi_l\|_{H^1}^2 < \infty, \quad \sum \lambda_l \int x^2 |\psi_l(x)|^2 dx < \infty\}. \quad (2.3)$$

We consider the problem of minimizing  $\mathcal{E}(\Psi)$  in the space  $\mathbb{Y}$  subject to the countably many constraints  $\|\psi_l\|_{L^2} = 1$ ,  $l = 1, 2, \dots$ . Solutions to this minimization problem satisfy the associated Euler-Lagrange equations, which are exactly the system (1.9-10). We now formulate our main result.

**Theorem 2.** *The energy functional  $\mathcal{E}(\Psi)$  is bounded below on the subset of  $\mathbb{Y}$  where  $\|\psi_l\|_{L^2} = 1$ ,  $l = 1, 2, \dots$ , and the minimum is assumed. The functions  $\psi_l$  which minimize  $\mathcal{E}$  satisfy (1.9-10) in the distributional sense, and the  $E_l$  are the Lagrange multipliers which arise from the constrained minimization.*

*Proof.* **1.** We first establish energy bounds from below. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$|\rho(x, y)|^2 \leq n(x)n(y),$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int \int \ln|x-y| (n(x)n(y) - |\rho(x, y)|^2) dx dy \\ & \geq - \int \int_{|x-y| \geq 1} \dots dx dy \\ & \geq - \int \int_{1 \leq |x-y| < r} \dots dx dy - \frac{\ln r}{r^2} \int \int_{r \leq |x-y|} |x-y|^2 n(x)n(y) dx dy \\ & =: I + II, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we chose  $r > \sqrt{e}$ . By the chosen normalization,

$$M := \sum \lambda_l \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 = 1,$$

and we can estimate

$$I \geq -(\ln r)M^2 = -\ln r, \quad II \geq -\frac{4 \ln r}{r^2} M \sum \lambda_l \int |x|^2 |\psi_l(x)|^2 dx.$$

Collecting these estimates, we find

$$\mathcal{E}(\Psi) \geq \frac{1}{4} \sum \lambda_l \int |\nabla \psi_l|^2 dx - \frac{\ln r}{4\pi} + \left[ \frac{\delta}{2}(1 - \theta) - \frac{\ln r}{r^2 \pi} \right] \sum_l \lambda_l \int |x|^2 |\psi_l(x)|^2 dx.$$

The term  $\frac{\delta}{2}(1 - \theta) - \frac{\ln r}{r^2 \pi}$  becomes positive for sufficiently large  $r$  (as a function of  $\delta$  and  $\theta$ ) This proves that  $\mathcal{E}(\Psi)$  is bounded below.

**2.** Let  $\mathbb{Y}_c = \{\Psi \in \mathbb{Y}; \|\psi_l\|_{L^2} = 1 \ \forall l = 1, 2, \dots\}$ . Choose a minimizing sequence  $\{\Psi^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{Y}_c$  such that  $\forall n, l \ \|\psi_l^n\|_{L^2} = 1$  and  $\mathcal{E}(\Psi^n) \rightarrow \inf_{\mathbb{Y}_c} \mathcal{E}(\Psi)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows from the

bounds on  $\mathcal{E}$  that there is a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\sum_l \lambda_l \int |\nabla_x \psi_l^n|^2 dx < C, \quad \sum_l \lambda_l \int |x|^2 |\psi_l^n(x)|^2 dx < C. \quad (2.3)$$

Without restricting the generality, we may assume that the (fixed) constants  $\lambda_l$  are all strictly positive. Therefore, (2.3) implies

$$\int |\nabla_x \psi_l^n|^2 dx < C/\lambda_l \quad \text{and} \quad \int |x|^2 |\psi_l^n(x)|^2 dx < C/\lambda_l$$

for all  $n, l$ . By compact embedding and a standard diagonal argument, we can extract a subsequence such that for all  $l \in \mathbb{N}$   $\psi_l^n \rightarrow \psi_l$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ . As the space  $Y := \{\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2); \int |x|^2 |\psi(x)|^2 dx < \infty\}$  is continuously embedded in  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for all  $p \in [2, \infty)$ , we also can use Hölder's inequality to get strong convergence in all such  $L^p$ -spaces.

**3.** The minimizer  $\Psi = \{\psi_l\}$  will satisfy the Euler-Lagrange equations associated with our minimization problem if we can show that the nonlinear terms converge in the sense of distributions. To this end, let  $\varphi$  be a smooth test function, supported in  $B_R(0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2; |x| \leq R\}$ , and consider, say, the component of the self-consistent field  $\int \ln|x-y| |\psi_j^n(y)|^2 dy$ . We abbreviate this as  $U[\psi_j^n]$ . Consider the nonlinear terms arising in the  $l$ -th equation. We write

$$\begin{aligned} & \int U[\psi_j^n] \psi_l^n(x) \varphi(x) dx - \int U[\psi_j] \psi_l(x) \varphi(x) dx \\ &= \int_{|x| \leq R} U[\psi_j^n] \{\psi_l^n(x) - \psi_l(x)\} \varphi(x) dx \\ & \quad + \int_{|x| \leq R} \{U[\psi_j^n] - U[\psi_j]\} \psi_l(x) \varphi(x) dx \\ &=: I_n + J_n. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Further, abbreviating

$$K_j^n(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\ln|x-y||^q (|\psi_j^n(y)| + |\psi_j(y)|)^q dy$$

we estimate, using Hölder's inequality with  $p \geq 2$  and  $q = \frac{p}{p-1}$

$$|J_n| \leq \int_{|x| \leq R} K_j^n(x)^{1/q} \|\psi_j^n - \psi_j\|_{L^p} |\varphi(x)| |\psi_l(x)| dx. \quad (2.5)$$

We now apply Hölder's inequality a second time, this time to  $K_j^n(x)$ , where we choose  $t = \frac{2}{q} \geq 1$  and  $s$  such that  $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{t} = 1$ . Then  $s \in [2, \infty)$ , and we get for  $\epsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} |K_j^n(x)| &\leq \int \frac{|\ln|x-y||^q (1+|y|)^\epsilon}{(1+|y|)^\epsilon} (|\psi_l^n(y)| + |\psi_l(y)|)^q dy \\ &\leq \left( \int \frac{|\ln|x-y||^{qs}}{(1+|y|)^{\epsilon s}} dy \right)^{1/s} \left( \int (1+|y|)^{\epsilon t} (|\psi_l^n(y)| + |\psi_l(y)|)^2 dy \right)^{1/t}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose  $\epsilon t = 2$ , i.e.,  $\epsilon = 2/t = q$ . Then  $\epsilon s = \frac{2q}{2-q}$ , and the last line becomes

$$\left( \int \frac{|\ln|x-y||^{q\frac{2}{2-q}}}{(1+|y|)^{\frac{2q}{2-q}}} dy \right)^{2/(2-q)} \left( \int (1+|y|)^2 (|\psi_l^n(y)| + |\psi_l(y)|)^2 dy \right)^{q/2}.$$

The first factor in this last product is bounded as  $|x| < R$  and  $\frac{2q}{2-q} > 2$ . The second factor is bounded because of the energy bounds. Since  $|\varphi(x)| \cdot |\psi_j(x)|$  is in  $L^1$ , It follows using the dominated convergence theorem that  $J_n$  converges to zero. Similarly, one has that  $I_n$  converges to zero, and from this one easily concludes convergence of the nonlinear terms in the equation. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

**3. Three Dimensions.** The method presented above generalizes with minor modifications to fermion clouds confined in three dimensions. There are only two changes.

We continue to assume that the exterior magnetic field is

$$\vec{A}(x) = \omega(-x_2, x_1, 0),$$

i.e., there is no  $x_3$ -component. The existence of a confined cloud in (quasi-) periodic motion is then only feasible if there is electric confinement in the  $x_3$ -direction, i.e., the external electric potential must have a part like  $Cx_3^2$ , with  $C > 0$ .

Otherwise, a particle cloud would disperse in this  $x_3$ -direction and approach vacuum as an asymptotic state (for the situation depicted here, this



is physically reasonable, but mathematically just a conjecture; in Fermion systems without any confinement, decay results of this type were proved in [4].

With confinement, the energy functional corresponding to the three-dimensional case is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\Psi) = & \frac{1}{4} \sum \lambda_l \int |\nabla \psi_l(x)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{8\pi} \int \int \frac{1}{|x-y|} [n(x)n(y) - |\rho(x,y)|^2] dx dy \\ & + \frac{\delta}{2} \int ((1+\theta)x_1^2 + (1-\theta)x_2^2 + c_1 x_3^2) n(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

with some  $c_1 > 0$ . It is immediate that  $\mathcal{E}(\Psi)$  is bounded below (by 0) on  $\mathbb{Y}_c$  as long as  $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$ .

**Remark.** As a mathematical curiosity with (probably) no physical implications, we point out that  $\mathcal{E}(\Psi)$  remains bounded below

even in the fictitious case where the interparticle force is *attractive*, i.e., the case where the second term in the energy functional is

$$I_2 := -\frac{1}{8\pi} \int \int \frac{1}{|x-y|} [n(x)n(y) - |\rho(x,y)|^2] dx dy.$$

To this end, we estimate as on p. 357 in [5],

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| & \geq -\frac{1}{8\pi} \int \int \frac{n(x)n(y)}{|x-y|} dx dy = \frac{1}{2} \int U(x)n(x) dx \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \int U(x)\Delta U(x) dx = -\frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla U(x)|^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 3.4 in [5] there is a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla U\|_{L^2}^2 & \leq C \left( \sum \lambda_l \|\psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{3/2} \left( \sum \lambda_l \|\nabla \psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq C \left( \sum \lambda_l \|\nabla \psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \frac{C}{\epsilon} + \epsilon \left( \sum \lambda_l \|\nabla \psi_l\|_{L^2}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that  $\Psi \in \mathbb{Y}_c$ . Choosing  $\epsilon < 1/4$ , the last term here can be absorbed in the first term in  $\mathcal{E}(\Psi)$ , and lower bounds on  $\mathcal{E}(\Psi)$  follow.

For results on the time-dependent case involving attractive forces, we refer to [6] and [9].

The second part in our existence proof for the two-dimensional case now carries over without changes. Note that it is here that the confinement with respect to the  $x_3$ -direction becomes important; without it, we could not use compact embeddings.

There is also a difference in the Sobolev embedding quoted at the end of step 2. The continuous embedding now only holds for  $2 \leq p \leq 6$  ( $= \frac{2n}{n-2}$  with  $n = 3$ ). The convergence argument for the nonlinear terms therefore requires more care.

Specifically, the estimates starting with (2.4) have to be modified as follows:

Let  $\varphi$  be a test function supported in  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3; |x| \leq R\}$ . To estimate

$$\int_{|x| \leq R} \int_y \frac{1}{|x-y|} (|\psi_j^n(y)|^2 - |\psi_j(y)|^2) \psi_l(x) \varphi(x) dy dx,$$

we break up the integration domain as

$$\int_{|x| \leq R} \int_{|x-y| < 1} \dots + \int_{|x| \leq R} \int_{|x-y| \geq 1} \dots = I(n, l) + II(n, l).$$

Then, for  $2 \leq p \leq 6$  and  $1/q + 1/p = 1$ , by Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} |I(n, l)| &\leq \|\psi_j^n - \psi_j\|_{L^p} \int_{|x| \leq R} \int_{|y-x| \leq 1} \frac{1}{|x-y|^q} |\psi_j^n + \psi_j|^q(y) dy |\psi_l(x) \varphi(x)| dx \\ &\leq C \|\psi_j^n - \psi_j\|_{L^p} \left( \int_{|y-x| \leq 1} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{qs}} dy \right)^{1/s} \left( \int |\psi_j^n + \psi_j|^{qr}(y) dy \right)^{1/r} \end{aligned}$$

where we need  $qs < 3$  and  $1 < r, s < \infty$ ,  $1/r + 1/s = 1$ . Choosing, say,

$$p = 6, q = 6/5, r = 5 \text{ and } s = 5/4 \text{ shows that } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |I(n, l)| = 0.$$

The convergence argument for  $II(n, l)$  is even more straightforward. All we have to note is that

$$|II(n, l)| \leq C(\varphi, \psi_l) \|\psi_j^n - \psi_j\|_{L^2} \|\psi_j^n + \psi_j\|_{L^2}.$$

These estimates are sufficient for the convergence in the nonlinear terms in the minimization problem.

**Acknowledgements.** Jean Dolbeault and Horst Lange would like to acknowledge the hospitality of the Mathematics and Statistics Department at the University of Victoria, where this research was started. All three authors would also like to thank the ESI institute in Vienna for stimulating visits. The research was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada under operating grant No. 7847. Jean Dolbeault was also partially supported by the TMR “Asymptotic methods in kinetic equations” under contract ERB FMRX CT97 0157.

#### REFERENCES

1. A. Arnold, P.A. Markowich and N. Mauser, The One-Dimensional Periodic Bloch-Poisson Equation, *Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. Sci.* **1** (1), 83-112 (1991)
2. J. Dolbeault, Monokinetic Charged Particle Beams: Qualitative Behavior of the Solutions of the Cauchy Problem and 2d Time-Periodic Solutions of the Vlasov-Poisson System, preprint No. 9732, CEREMADE 1997
3. A. Galindo, P. Pascual, Quantum Mechanics II. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1991
4. I. Gasser, R. Illner, P. A. Markowich and C. Schmeiser, Semiclassical,  $t \rightarrow \infty$  Asymptotics and Dispersive Effects for Hartree-Fock Systems, *Math. Mod. Num. An.* **32** (6), 699-713 (1998)
5. R. Illner, H. Lange, and Paul Zweifel, Global Existence, Uniqueness and Asymptotic Behaviour of Solutions of the Wigner-Poisson and Schrödinger-Poisson Systems, *Math. Meth. Appl. Sci.* **17**, 349-376 (1994)
6. J.L. Lopez, J. Soler, Asymptotic Behaviour to the 3-D Schrödinger/Hartree-Poisson and Wigner-Poisson Systems, *Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. Sci.*, to appear

7. P.A. Markowich, Boltzmann Distributed Quantum Steady States and their Classical Limit, *Forum Math.* **6** (1), 1-33 (1994)
8. F. Nier, Schrödinger-Poisson Systems in Dimension  $d \leq 3$ : the Whole-Space Case, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **123** (6), 1179-1201 (1993)
9. E. Ruiz Arriola, J. Soler, Asymptotic Behavior for the 3-D Schrödinger-Poisson System in the Attractive Case with Positive Energy, *Appl. Math. Lett.*, to appear (1999)
10. J. Yngvason, Quantum Dots: A Survey of Rigorous Results. ESI preprint 643, Vienna (1998)