

Absence of Klein's paradox for massive bosons coupled by nonminimal vector interactions

T.R. Cardoso¹, L.B. Castro², A.S. de Castro³

UNESP - Campus de Guaratinguetá
Departamento de Física e Química
12516-410 Guaratinguetá SP - Brazil

¹cardoso@feg.unesp.br

²benito@feg.unesp.br

³castro@pq.cnpq.br.

Abstract

A few properties of the nonminimal vector interactions in the Duffin-Kemmer-Petiau theory are revised. In particular, it is shown that the space component of the nonminimal vector interaction plays a peremptory role for confining bosons whereas its time component contributes to the leakage. Scattering in a square step potential with proper boundary conditions is used to show that Klein's paradox does not manifest in the case of a nonminimal vector coupling.

Recently, Boumali [1] investigated the Duffin-Kemmer-Petiau (DKP) equation with a sort of nonminimal vector coupling. The very interesting result of his researching for a step potential is that Klein's paradox can manifest only for spin-0 particles but not for spin-1 particles. In Ref. [2], though, it was shown that due to some misconceptions this conclusion is not reliable. In the present paper we investigate the properties of the DKP theory with the nonminimal vector coupling interaction. We use one-dimensional potentials for the sake of simplicity. It is shown that nonminimal vector potentials have some special features not displayed by minimal vector potentials. Scattering in a square step potential is used to show that Klein's paradox never appears in the case of a nonminimal potential, contrary to what occurs for a minimally coupled potential [3]. First observed as a solution of the Dirac equation [4] and after that as a solution of the Klein-Gordon equation [5], the famous Klein's paradox consists in a reflection coefficient exceeding unity under a strong potential. The accepted interpretation for this phenomenon is that pair production occurs at the potential interface and that the created particles makes the reflection coefficient greater than 1. Of course, Klein's paradox exposes the inadequacy of relativistic theories as single-particle ones. Furthermore, the present paper shows that if the space component of the nonminimal potential exceeds its time component there will be a critical value for the potential strength which leads to two different possibilities for the waves beyond the potential interface, either a progressive wave or an evanescent wave, a circumstance that resembles the nonrelativistic result. Nevertheless, if the space component of the nonminimal potential does not exceed its time component the transmission coefficient will never vanish, in sharp contrast to the nonrelativistic quantum mechanics.

The first-order DKP formalism [6]-[7] describes spin-0 and spin-1 particles and has been used to analyze relativistic interactions of spin-0 and spin-1 hadrons with nuclei as an alternative to their conventional second-order Klein-Gordon and Proca counterparts. The onus of equivalence between the formalisms represented an objection to the DKP theory for a long time and only recently it was shown that they yield the same results in the case of minimally coupled vector interactions, on the condition that one correctly interprets the components of the DKP spinor [8]-[9]. The DKP equation for a free boson is given by [7] (with units in which $\hbar = c = 1$)

$$(i\beta^\mu\partial_\mu - m)\psi = 0 \tag{1}$$

where the matrices β^μ satisfy the algebra

$$\beta^\mu\beta^\nu\beta^\lambda + \beta^\lambda\beta^\nu\beta^\mu = g^{\mu\nu}\beta^\lambda + g^{\lambda\nu}\beta^\mu \tag{2}$$

and the metric tensor is $g^{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$. The algebra expressed by (2) generates a set of 126 independent matrices whose irreducible representations are a trivial

representation, a five-dimensional representation describing the spin-0 particles and a ten-dimensional representation associated to spin-1 particles. Indeed, the Dirac and the DKP equations are special cases of relativistic first-order equations for arbitrary spin known as Bhabha equation [10]. The four square matrices defining the spin, like β^μ in (1), are given by representations of the $so(5)$ algebra and furnishes one wave equation for each spin. The four-dimensional representation $R_5(1/2, 1/2)$, for instance, furnishes the Dirac equation, whilst the five-dimensional $R_5(1, 0)$ and the ten-dimensional $R_5(1, 1)$ representations furnish the DKP equation for spin-0 and spin-1, respectively [11]. The DKP spinor has an excess of components and the theory has to be supplemented by an equation which allows to eliminate the redundant components. That constraint equation is obtained by multiplying the DKP equation by $1 - \beta^0\beta^0$, namely

$$i\beta^j\beta^0\beta^0\partial_j\psi = m(1 - \beta^0\beta^0)\psi, \quad j \text{ runs from 1 to 3} \quad (3)$$

This constraint equation expresses three (four) components of the spinor by the other two (six) components and their space derivatives in the scalar (vector) sector so that the superfluous components disappear and there only remain the physical components of the DKP theory. The second-order Klein-Gordon and Proca equations are obtained when one selects the spin-0 and spin-1 sectors of the DKP theory. A well-known conserved four-current is given by

$$J^\mu = \bar{\psi}\beta^\mu\psi \quad (4)$$

where the adjoint spinor $\bar{\psi} = \psi^\dagger\eta^0$, with $\eta^0 = 2\beta^0\beta^0 - 1$ in such a way that $(\eta^0\beta^\mu)^\dagger = \eta^0\beta^\mu$ (the matrices β^μ are Hermitian with respect to η^0). The time component of this current is not positive definite but it may be interpreted as a charge density.

With the introduction of interactions, the DKP equation can be written as

$$(i\beta^\mu\partial_\mu - m - \mathbb{V})\psi = 0 \quad (5)$$

where the more general potential matrix \mathbb{V} is written in terms of 25 (100) linearly independent matrices pertinent to the five(ten)-dimensional irreducible representation associated to the scalar (vector) sector. In the presence of interactions J^μ satisfies the equation

$$\partial_\mu J^\mu + i\bar{\psi}(\mathbb{V} - \eta^0\mathbb{V}^\dagger\eta^0)\psi = 0 \quad (6)$$

Thus, if \mathbb{V} is Hermitian with respect to η^0 then the four-current will be conserved. The potential matrix \mathbb{V} can be written in terms of well-defined Lorentz structures. For the spin-0 sector there are two scalar, two vector and two tensor terms [12], whereas for the spin-1 sector there are two scalar, two vector, a pseudoscalar, two pseudovector and eight tensor terms [13]. The tensor terms have been avoided in applications because they

furnish noncausal effects [12]-[13]. By considering only the nonminimal vector terms, \mathbb{V} is in the form

$$\mathbb{V} = i[P, \beta^\mu]A_\mu \quad (7)$$

where P is a projection operator ($P^2 = P$ and $P^\dagger = P$) in such a way that $\bar{\psi}P\psi$ behaves as a scalar and $\bar{\psi}[P, \beta^\mu]\psi$ behaves like a vector. A_μ is the four-vector potential function. At this point it is also worthwhile to note that this matrix potential leads to a conserved four-current but the same does not happen if instead of $i[P, \beta^\mu]$ one uses either $P\beta^\mu$ or $\beta^\mu P$.

For the case of spin 0, we use the representation for the β^μ matrices given by [14]-[15]

$$\beta^0 = \begin{pmatrix} \theta & \bar{\mathbf{0}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{0}}^T & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \beta^i = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{0}} & \rho_i \\ -\rho_i^T & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \quad (8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \theta &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \rho_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$\bar{\mathbf{0}}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{0}}$ and $\mathbf{0}$ are 2×3 , 2×2 and 3×3 zero matrices, respectively, while the superscript T designates matrix transposition. Here the projection operator can be written as [12]

$$P = \frac{1}{3}(\beta^\mu \beta_\mu - 1) = \text{diag}(1, 0, 0, 0, 0) \quad (10)$$

In this case P picks out the first component of the DKP spinor. The five-component spinor can be written as $\psi^T = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_5)$ in such a way that the DKP equation for a boson constrained to move along the x -axis decomposes into

$$\begin{aligned} \left(D_0^{(-)} D_0^{(+)} - D_1^{(-)} D_1^{(+)} + m^2 \right) \psi_1 &= 0 \\ D_0^{(+)} \psi_1 &= -im\psi_2, \quad D_1^{(+)} \psi_1 = -im\psi_3 \\ \psi_4 &= \psi_5 = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where

$$D_\mu^{(\pm)} = \partial_\mu \pm A_\mu \quad (12)$$

Here we return to (4), which we rewrite as

$$J^0 = 2 \operatorname{Re} (\psi_2^* \psi_1), \quad J^1 = -2 \operatorname{Re} (\psi_3^* \psi_1), \quad J^2 = J^3 = 0 \quad (13)$$

If the terms in the potential \mathbb{V} are time-independent, one can write $\psi(x, t) = \varphi(x) \exp(-iEt)$ in such a way that the time-independent DKP equation splits into

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \kappa^2 \right) \varphi_1 &= 0 \\ \varphi_2 &= \frac{E + iA_0}{m} \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_3 &= \frac{i}{m} \left(\frac{d}{dx} + A_1 \right) \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_4 &= \varphi_5 = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where

$$\kappa^2 = E^2 - m^2 + A_0^2 - A_1^2 + \frac{dA_1}{dx} \quad (15)$$

For this time-independent problem, J^μ has the components

$$J^0 = \frac{2E}{m} |\varphi_1|^2, \quad J^1 = \frac{2}{m} \operatorname{Im} \left(\varphi_1^* \frac{d\varphi_1}{dx} \right) \quad (16)$$

Since J^μ is not time dependent, φ describes a stationary state.

The one-dimensional square step potential is expressed as

$$A_\mu = \theta(x) c_\mu V \quad (17)$$

where c_μ are dimensionless and positive coupling constants constrained by $c_0 + c_1 = 1$, $\theta(x)$ denotes the Heaviside step function and $V > 0$ is the height of the step. For $x < 0$ the DKP equation has the solution

$$\varphi(x) = \varphi_+ e^{+ikx} + \varphi_- e^{-ikx} \quad (18)$$

where

$$\varphi_\pm^T = \frac{a_\pm}{\sqrt{2}} \left(1, \frac{E}{m}, \mp \frac{k}{m}, 0, 0 \right) \quad (19)$$

and

$$k = \sqrt{E^2 - m^2} \quad (20)$$

For $|E| > m$, the solution expressed by (18) and (19) describes plane waves propagating on both directions of the x -axis with the group velocity $v_g = dE/dk$ equal to the classical velocity. If we choose incident particles on the potential barrier ($E > m$), $\varphi_+ \exp(+ikx)$ will describe incident particles ($v_g = +k/E > 0$), whereas $\varphi_- \exp(-ikx)$ will describe reflected particles ($v_g = -k/E < 0$). The flux related to the current J^μ , corresponding to φ given by (18), is expressed as

$$J^1 = \frac{k}{m} (|a_+|^2 - |a_-|^2) \quad (21)$$

Note that the relation $J^1 = J^0 v_g$ maintains for the incident and reflected waves, since

$$J_\pm^0 = \frac{E}{m} |a_\pm|^2 \quad (22)$$

On the other hand, for $x > 0$ one should have $v_g \geq 0$ in such a way that the solution in this region of space describes an evanescent wave or a progressive wave running away from the potential interface. The general solution has the form

$$\varphi_t(x) = (\varphi_t)_+ e^{+iqx} + (\varphi_t)_- e^{-iqx} \quad (23)$$

where

$$(\varphi_t)_\pm^T = \frac{b_\pm}{\sqrt{2}} \left(1, \frac{E + ic_0 V}{m}, \frac{\mp q + ic_1 V}{m}, 0, 0 \right) \quad (24)$$

and

$$q = \sqrt{k^2 + (c_0 - c_1) V^2} \quad (25)$$

Due to the twofold possibility of signs for the energy of a stationary state, the solution involving b_- can not be ruled out a priori. As a matter of fact, this term may describe a progressive wave with negative energy and phase velocity $v_{ph} = |E|/q > 0$ (see, e.g. [3]). In other words, the solution $(\varphi_t)_- \exp(-iqx)$ with $q \in \mathbb{R}$ reveals a signature of Klein's paradox. One can readily envisage that two different classes of solutions can be distinguished:

- Class A. With $c_1 > c_0$ for $V < V^c$, where

$$V^c = \sqrt{\frac{E^2 - m^2}{c_1 - c_0}} \quad (26)$$

or with $c_1 \leq c_0$ for all V , one has $q \in \mathbb{R}$, and the solution describing a plane wave propagating in the positive direction of the x -axis with the group velocity $v_g = q/E$ is possible only if $b_- = 0$. In this case the components of the current are given by

$$J^0 = \frac{E}{m} |b_+|^2, \quad J^1 = \frac{q}{m} |b_+|^2 \quad (27)$$

- Class B. With $c_1 > c_0$ for $V > V^c$ one has that $q = \pm i|q|$, and (23) with $b_{\mp} = 0$ describes an evanescent wave. The solution satisfying the requirement of finiteness at infinity requires $b_{\mp} = 0$. In this case

$$J^0 = \frac{E}{m} e^{-2|q|x} |b_{\pm}|^2, \quad J^1 = 0 \quad (28)$$

Incidentally, the solution involving b_- is identical to the solution involving b_+ , so we consider $b_- = 0$.

Note that there is no reason to require that the either the spinor and or its derivative are continuous across finite discontinuities of the potential. A careful analysis reveals, though, that proper matching conditions follow from the differential equations obeyed by the spinor components. Only the first component of the spinor satisfies the second-order Klein-Gordon-like equation, so that φ_1 and its first derivative are continuous even the potential suffers finite discontinuities. In this case of a discontinuous potential, φ_2 (if $A_0 \neq 0$) and φ_3 (if $A_1 \neq 0$) are discontinuous but J^0 and J^1 are not. A possible discontinuity of J^0 would not matter if it is to be interpreted as a charge density but J^1 (involving $\varphi_1^* d\varphi_1/dx$) should be continuous in a stationary regime. The demand for continuity of φ_1 and $d\varphi_1/dx$ at $x = 0$ fixes the wave amplitudes in terms of the amplitude of the incident wave, viz.

$$\frac{a_-}{a_+} = \begin{cases} \frac{k-q}{k+q} & \text{for the class A} \\ \frac{(k-i|q|)^2}{k^2+|q|^2} & \text{for the class B} \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

$$\frac{b_+}{a_+} = \begin{cases} \frac{2k}{k+q} & \text{for the class A} \\ \frac{2k(k-i|q|)}{k^2+|q|^2} & \text{for the class B} \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

Now we focus attention on the calculation of the reflection (R) and transmission (T) coefficients. The reflection (transmission) coefficient is defined as the ratio of the reflected

(transmitted) flux to the incident flux. Since $\partial J^0/\partial t = 0$ for stationary states, one has that J^1 is independent of x . This fact implies that

$$R = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{k-q}{k+q}\right)^2 & \text{for the class A} \\ 1 & \text{for the class B} \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

$$T = \begin{cases} \frac{4kq}{(k+q)^2} & \text{for the class A} \\ 0 & \text{for the class B} \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

For all the classes one has $R + T = 1$ as should be expected for a conserved quantity. Note that the charge density in (27) and (28) is always a positive quantity and so is J^1 in (27). This means that the scattered waves describe particles and not antiparticles, then Klein's paradox never manifests.

For $c_1 > c_0$ the transmission coefficient vanishes for a potential strength V greater than the cutoff potential V^c . In fact, the mixed step potential behaves effectively as an ascending step and a similar situation occurs in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics. The uncertainty in the position beyond the potential boundary for $V > V^c$ can be obtained from (28), namely

$$\Delta x = \frac{1}{2|q|} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{m^2 + (c_1 - c_0)V^2 - E^2}} \quad (33)$$

From this last result one can see that the penetration of the boson into the region $x > 0$ will shrink without limit as V increases. At first glance it seems that the uncertainty principle dies away provided such a principle implies that it is impossible to localize a particle into a region of space less than half of its Compton wavelength (see, e.g., [16] and [17]). This apparent contradiction can be remedied by recurring to the concepts of effective mass and effective Compton wavelength. Indeed, Eq. (33) suggests that we can define the effective mass as

$$m_{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{m^2 + (c_1 - c_0)V^2} \quad (34)$$

in such a way that

$$\Delta x = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{m_{\text{eff}}^2 - E^2}} \quad (35)$$

The effective mass clearly indicates that this kind of potential couples to the mass of the boson and consequently it couples to the positive-energy component of the spinor in the same way it couples to the negative-energy component. This amounts to say that Klein's

paradox does not appear. It is seen that the minimum uncertainty is $(\Delta x)_{\min} = 1/(2m_{\text{eff}})$ in the limit as $V \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, for obtaining a result consistent with the uncertainty principle it is necessary to use the effective Compton wavelength defined as $\lambda_{\text{eff}} = 1/m_{\text{eff}}$ so that the minimum uncertainty consonant with the uncertainty principle is given by $\lambda_{\text{eff}}/2$. It means that the localization of the boson does not require any minimum value in order to ensure the single-particle interpretation of the DKP equation.

As for $c_1 \leq c_0$, however, there is no cutoff potential. This is a result that runs counter our conceptions drawn from the nonrelativistic quantum mechanics. For $c_1 = c_0$ the half-and-half mixed step potential is transparent ($T = 1$ for all V), and for $c_1 < c_0$ the mixed step presents a transmission coefficient that goes as

$$T \rightarrow \frac{4}{V} \sqrt{\frac{E^2 - m^2}{c_0 - c_1}} \quad (36)$$

as $V \rightarrow \infty$. Those strange facts occur because the space component of the step potential behaves as an ascending step whereas its time component behaves as a descending step. For $c_1 = c_0$, although $\varphi_+ \neq (\varphi_t)_+$, effects due to the time and the space components cancel each other as far as the transmission coefficient is regarded. That is to say, the effective potential behaves as a transparent potential. For $c_1 < c_0$ the tendency to a descending step dominates so that the mixed step potential effectively behaves as a descending step. Note that the reflection and transmission coefficients are the same for a wave incident from the right as for a wave incident from the left.

To conclude, we have shown minimal and nonminimal vector interactions in the DKP theory behave quite diversely. In particular, nonminimal vector interactions have no counterparts in the Klein-Gordon theory. Nonminimal vector interactions have the very same effects on both particles and antiparticles and so they might be useful for boson-confining models. Scattering in a square step potential clearly shows that Klein's paradox, present in the case of a minimal coupling [3], is absent in the case of a nonminimal coupling. An apparent contradiction with the uncertainty principle has been cured by introducing the concepts of effective mass and effective Compton wavelength. When the space component of the nonminimal potential does not exceed its time component, the transmission coefficient is different from zero even if the height of the step potential is extremely high. That odd result has been endorsed by observing the behaviour of the effective potential.

We have talking about the spin-0 sector of the DKP theory but the state of affairs for the step potential is not different for the spin-1 sector as one can see in Appendix A.

Appendix A

For the case of spin 1, the β^μ matrices are [15], [18]

$$\beta^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \bar{0} & \bar{0} & \bar{0} \\ \bar{0}^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \bar{0}^T & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \bar{0}^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \beta^i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \bar{0} & e_i & \bar{0} \\ \bar{0}^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & -is_i \\ -e_i^T & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \bar{0}^T & -is_i & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \quad (37)$$

where s_i are the 3×3 spin-1 matrices $(s_i)_{jk} = -i\varepsilon_{ijk}$, e_i are the 1×3 matrices $(e_i)_{1j} = \delta_{ij}$ and $\bar{0} = (0 \ 0 \ 0)$, while \mathbf{I} and $\mathbf{0}$ designate the 3×3 unit and zero matrices, respectively. In this representation

$$P = \beta^\mu \beta_\mu - 2 = \text{diag}(1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0) \quad (38)$$

i.e., P projects out the four upper components of the DKP spinor. With the spinor written as $\psi^T = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{10})$, and partitioned as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_I^{(+)} &= \begin{pmatrix} \psi_3 \\ \psi_4 \end{pmatrix}, & \psi_I^{(-)} &= \psi_5 \\ \psi_{II}^{(+)} &= \begin{pmatrix} \psi_6 \\ \psi_7 \end{pmatrix}, & \psi_{II}^{(-)} &= \psi_2 \\ \psi_{III}^{(+)} &= \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{10} \\ -\psi_9 \end{pmatrix}, & \psi_{III}^{(-)} &= \psi_1 \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

the one-dimensional DKP equation can be expressed in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \left(D_0^{(\mp)} D_0^{(\pm)} - D_1^{(\mp)} D_1^{(\pm)} + m^2 \right) \psi_I^{(\pm)} &= 0 \\ D_0^{(\pm)} \psi_I^{(\pm)} = -im\psi_{II}^{(\pm)}, & \quad D_1^{(\pm)} \psi_I^{(\pm)} = -im\psi_{III}^{(\pm)} \\ \psi_8 &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where $D_\mu^{(\pm)}$ is again given by (12). In addition, expressed in terms of (39) the current can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} J^0 &= 2 \text{Re} \left(\psi_{II}^{(+)\dagger} \psi_I^{(+)} + \psi_{II}^{(-)\dagger} \psi_I^{(-)} \right) \\ J^1 &= -2 \text{Re} \left(\psi_{III}^{(+)\dagger} \psi_I^{(+)} + \psi_{III}^{(-)\dagger} \psi_I^{(-)} \right) \\ J^2 &= J^3 = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Meanwhile the time-independent DKP equation decomposes into

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + k_{\pm}^2 \right) \phi_I^{(\pm)} &= 0 \\ \phi_{II}^{(\pm)} &= \frac{1}{m} (E \pm iA_0) \phi_I^{(\pm)} \\ \phi_{III}^{(\pm)} &= \frac{i}{m} \left(\frac{d}{dx} \pm A_1 \right) \phi_I^{(\pm)} \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where

$$k_{\pm}^2 = E^2 - m^2 + A_0^2 - A_1^2 \pm \frac{dA_1}{dx} \quad (43)$$

Now the components of the four-current are

$$\begin{aligned} J^0 &= \frac{2}{m} E \left(|\phi_I^{(+)}|^2 + |\phi_I^{(-)}|^2 \right) \\ J^1 &= \frac{2}{m} \text{Im} \left(\phi_I^{(+)\dagger} \frac{d\phi_I^{(+)}}{dx} + \phi_I^{(-)\dagger} \frac{d\phi_I^{(-)}}{dx} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

From (42)-(43) one sees that the solution for the spin-1 sector consists in searching solutions for two Klein-Gordon-like equations, owing to the term dA_1/dx in (43). For the square step potential given by (17), because $dA_1/dx = 0$ for $x \neq 0$ one has that $\phi_I^{(+)}$ and $\phi_I^{(-)}$ obey the same equation so that the solution in the region $x < 0$ can be written as

$$\phi_I^{(\pm)} = A_+^{(\pm)} e^{+ikx} + A_-^{(\pm)} e^{-ikx} \quad (45)$$

where k is once again given by (20), and $A_{\pm}^{(\pm)}$ is defined in terms of the arbitrary amplitudes α_{\pm} , β_{\pm} and γ_{\pm} as

$$A_{\pm}^{(+)} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{\pm} \\ \beta_{\pm} \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{\pm}^{(-)} = \gamma_{\pm} \quad (46)$$

Defining

$$a_{\pm} = \sqrt{2(|\alpha_{\pm}|^2 + |\beta_{\pm}|^2 + |\gamma_{\pm}|^2)} \quad (47)$$

it follows that the components of the current can be written in the same form as (21) and (22). A similar procedure for the region $x > 0$ allows one to obtain the results (29)-(36).

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by means of funds provided by CAPES and CNPq.

References

- [1] A. Boumali, Can. J. Phys. **86**, 1233 (2008).
- [2] T.R. Cardoso, L.B. Castro, and A.S. de Castro, Comment on “Solutions of the Duffin-Kemmer-Petiau equation for a pseudoscalar potential step in (1+1) dimensions”, arXiv: hep-th/0904.2209. To appear in Can. J. Phys.
- [3] T.R. Cardoso, L.B. Castro, and A.S. de Castro, Phys. Lett. A **372**, 5964 (2008).
- [4] O. Klein, Z. Phys. **53**, 157 (1929).
- [5] R.G. Winter, Am. J. Phys. **27**, 355 (1959).
- [6] G. Petiau, Acad. R. Belg., A. Sci. Mém. Collect. **16**, No. 2 (1936); N. Kemmer, Proc. R. Soc. A **166**, 127 (1938); R.J. Duffin, Phys. Rev. **54**, 1114 (1938).
- [7] N. Kemmer, Proc. R. Soc. A **173**, 91 (1939).
- [8] M. Nowakowski, Phys. Lett. A **244**, 329 (1998).
- [9] J.T. Lunardi *et al.*, Phys. Lett. A **268**, 165 (2000).
- [10] H.J. Bhabha, Rev. Mod. Phys. **17**, 200 (1945); **21**, 451 (1949).
- [11] R.A. Krajcik and M.M. Nieto, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 4049 (1974); Am. J. Phys. **45**, 818 (1977).
- [12] See, e.g., R.F. Guertin and T.L. Wilson, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 1518 (1977).
- [13] See, e.g., B. Vijayalakshmi, M. Seetharaman, and P.M. Mathews, J. Phys. A **12**, 665 (1979).
- [14] Y. Nadjadi and R.C. Barret, J. Phys. G **19**, 87 (1993).
- [15] Y. Nadjadi and R.C. Barret, J. Phys. A **27**, 4301 (1994).
- [16] W. Greiner, Relativistic Quantum Mechanics, Wave Equations, Springer, Berlin, 1990.
- [17] P. Strange, Relativistic Quantum Mechanics with Applications in Condensed Matter and Atomic Physics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [18] Y. Nadjadi and R.C. Barret, J. Math. Phys. **35**, 4517 (1994).