

A simple high-accuracy method for solving bound-state equations with the Cornell potential in momentum space

Alfred Stadler,^{1,2,3,*} Elmar P. Biernat,^{4,3,2,†} and Vasco Valverde^{5,‡}

¹*Departamento de Física, Universidade de Évora, 7000-671 Évora, Portugal*

²*LIP Lisboa, Av. Prof. Gama Pinto 2, 1649-003 Lisboa, Portugal*

³*Departamento de Física, Instituto Superior Técnico,*

Universidade de Lisboa, Avenida Rovisco Pais 1, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal

⁴*CFTP, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa,*

Avenida Rovisco Pais 1, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal

⁵*NOVA School of Science and Technology, 2829-516 Caparica, Portugal*

(Dated: August 1, 2024)

We present a simple, high-accuracy method for solving bound-state integral equations in momentum space with singular kernels. For the case of the linear-confining potential, the associated Cauchy-principal-value singularity is removed by subtraction. Derivatives of the wave function that appear as a result of the subtraction technique are approximated by means of interpolating functions. The resulting non-singular integral equation is solved using the Nyström method. The results show excellent agreement with exactly known energy eigenvalues. By further increasing the number of integration points and the order of the Lagrange interpolation, results with extremely high accuracy can be achieved.

PACS numbers: 11.10.St, 14.40.Pq, 12.39.Pn, 03.65.Ge

I. INTRODUCTION

The nonrelativistic Cornell potential model [1–3], and “relativized” variations of it [4, 5], have been very successful in describing the masses and decay rates of heavy quarkonia. They describe the interaction between heavy quarks and antiquarks typically in terms of a combination of a long-range linear potential for confinement and a short-range color-Coulomb potential for one-gluon exchange. Generally formulated within Schrödinger theory, these models are not able to account for the dynamical covariant structure of light quarks. But for mesons with at least one light quark, a relativistic treatment is necessary, and in addition, for the description of the light mesons, in particular the pions, the implementation of dynamical mass generation and spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking ($S\chi SB$), is indispensable.

Nonperturbative approaches based on quantum field theory, such as the Dyson-Schwinger/Bethe-Salpeter (DSBS) formalism [6–11] and the Covariant Spectator Theory (CST) [12–19] are manifestly Poincaré covariant frameworks that are able to incorporate $S\chi SB$ in a consistent way. In CST, even in the presence of a confining interaction with a combination of Lorentz scalar and pseudoscalar structures, one can still demonstrate consistency with chiral symmetry and its dynamical breaking, which goes against common expectations [20]. Allowing the possibility of scalar structures in the kernel is interesting, because other approaches suggest that the confining interaction is actually mostly scalar [21–26]. In addition, while the DSBS equations are usually formulated in Eu-

clidean momentum space, the CST equations are solved directly in Minkowski space. Potential ambiguities that may arise for observables like form factors associated with the Wick rotation from Euclidean- to Minkowski-space momenta are not present in CST. Finally, the CST formalism allows for a covariant generalization of the Cornell potential model, i.e. the CST equations for mesons reduce in the nonrelativistic limit to the Cornell-potential Schrödinger equation. Successful attempts to employ a Poincaré invariant generalization of the Cornell potential also exist in the DSBS approach, however it is not entirely clear whether or not the corresponding covariant off-shell extension of the linear potential actually describes the confinement of quarks consistently [27].

Ambiguities of this kind do not show up in the CST, as demonstrated by the proof that a CST-generalization of the linear potential leads to quark confinement [14]. A CST model for mesons can therefore be viewed as the most natural covariant extension of the Cornell model that incorporates both $S\chi SB$ and confinement. Because of its fully-relativistic nature and its nonrelativistic Cornell limit, the CST model emerges as a particularly suited candidate for a unified description of all quark-antiquark mesons, from the pion to bottomonium.

When solving integral equations with singular kernels, efficient numerical methods are crucial for performing global fits of many states to obtain a unified description. In the Cornell potential case, the complexity arises from the linear confining kernel in momentum space, leading to a Cauchy-principal-value singularity in the Schrödinger equation. Even though this singularity is integrable, the direct application of standard numerical solution techniques becomes intricate. One way to avoid this problem in the nonrelativistic case is to solve the Schrödinger equation for the linear potential directly in coordinate space [28–30]. However, if one includes the lowest-order

* stadler@uevora.pt

† elmar.biernat@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

‡ v.valverde@campus.fct.unl.pt

relativistic corrections to the potential, which might already be important for charm quarks, non-local terms show up, apart from the well-known spin-spin, spin-orbit and tensor force contributions [31]. It is not obvious how to treat non-local terms in coordinate space and therefore they are usually neglected [23]. Even more drastic, a fully-relativistic treatment, as needed for the light quarks, is unfeasible in coordinate space and requires a momentum-space formulation.

Several works have addressed the linear-confining problem in momentum-space. They either use a non-singular screened linear potential [32, 33], or they start with a screened potential, perform a partial wave expansion and then take the “unscreened” limit [34–39]. The numerical integration of the principal-value singularity is then performed by expanding the wave function in a suitable set of basis functions and the applying the Sloan method, i.e. integrating by placing the Gaussian quadrature points symmetrically around the singularity. This procedure works in principle, but is impractical, for instance, in fitting procedures because the set of basis functions depends on the fitting parameters, i.e. the quark masses and the coupling. Alternatively, in Ref. [40], the linear-confining problem with $l = 0$ was solved using a quadrature method where the singularity of the integral is included in the weight functions. This method gives remarkable high-precision results, but is very involved in practice, because the weight functions must be adapted specifically for each integral appearing in the Schrödinger equation.

These difficulties are resolved by removing the principal-value singularity altogether by subtraction [41]. This occurs at the cost of introducing the derivatives of the wave function under the integral. Prior to the present work, we have dealt with this difficulty by applying the so-called Galerkin method, i.e. by expanding the wave function in basis functions whose derivatives can be easily calculated. For this method to work in practice, one needs to carefully choose appropriate basis functions that reproduce the wave function’s correct asymptotic behavior determined by the potential. It is this inflexibility together with long computation times that makes this method often impractical.

In view of these challenges our aim here was to develop a simpler, more flexible and faster numerical method. We show that the Nyström collocation method can be applied to the linear confining potential in momentum space after the principal-value singularity has been removed. This procedure provides extremely accurate results and can directly be extended to the fully-relativistic linear confining problem, because the singularity structure remains unchanged under covariant generalization.

In Section II we show how the Cauchy-principal value singularity is removed by subtraction, leading to ordinary integrals that involve the first and second derivatives of the wave function. Section III deals with the numerical evaluation of the integrals using the Nyström collocation method. The numerical results are presented and discussed in Section IV, and finally Section V gives

a summary of the work and conclusions.

II. THE CORNELL POTENTIAL IN MOMENTUM SPACE

The Cornell quark-antiquark potential [1–3] in coordinate space is composed of a Coulomb-like short-range interaction, originating from one-gluon-exchange, and a linearly rising confining potential, of the form

$$\tilde{V}(r) = -\frac{\alpha}{r} + \sigma r, \quad (2.1)$$

where $r = |\mathbf{r}|$ is the distance between the two quarks, α is the strong coupling constant, including a color factor, and the constant σ characterizes the strength of the confining potential.

The Fourier-transform of the Coulomb potential

$$\tilde{V}_C(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{\alpha}{r} \quad (2.2)$$

is very well known,

$$V_C(\mathbf{q}) = \int d^3r \tilde{V}_C(\mathbf{r}) e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} = -\frac{4\pi\alpha}{\mathbf{q}^2}, \quad (2.3)$$

which is obtained by first transforming a screened version of it and then taking the unscreened limit. The momentum transfer $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}$ is the difference between the relative momenta in the initial and final state.

In order to find the momentum-space version of the linear potential,

$$\tilde{V}_L(\mathbf{r}) = \sigma r, \quad (2.4)$$

one can apply the same general idea, but different screening methods can be used. In [41], we found that starting from a particular kind of screening leads to the convenient representation

$$V_L(\mathbf{q}) = \left[V_A(\mathbf{q}) - (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{q}) \int \frac{d^3q'}{(2\pi)^3} V_A(\mathbf{q}') \right], \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$V_A(\mathbf{q}) = -\frac{8\pi\sigma}{\mathbf{q}^4}. \quad (2.6)$$

The form of the “potential” (2.5) is somewhat peculiar and should be interpreted as a distribution. It will always be multiplied with a wave function and integrated over the loop momentum \mathbf{k} , which produces meaningful expressions.

This becomes clear when the momentum-space Cornell potential,

$$V(\mathbf{q}) = V_C(\mathbf{q}) + V_L(\mathbf{q}), \quad (2.7)$$

is now inserted into the Schrödinger equation for the momentum-space wave function $\psi(\mathbf{p})$ of a two-body system with reduced mass m_R ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p^2}{2m_R} \psi(\mathbf{p}) + \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} V_C(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k}) \psi(\mathbf{k}) \\ + \mathbf{P} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} V_A(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k}) [\psi(\mathbf{k}) - \psi(\mathbf{p})] = E \psi(\mathbf{p}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Both integrands are singular at $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{p}$, and it appears that the singularity in V_A is even much stronger than the one in V_C . However, it is weakened by the wave-function subtraction in the numerator that arises from the Dirac-delta term in V_L of Eq. (2.5). As a result, the integral over V_A in (2.8) reduces to a Cauchy principal value integral, indicated by the symbol Pf , and is therefore well defined [41].

Next, we expand Eq. (2.8) into partial waves. Introducing the unit vectors $\hat{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$, such that $\mathbf{p} = p\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\mathbf{k} = k\hat{\mathbf{k}}$, and abbreviating $x = \hat{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}$, the potentials, depending only on $\mathbf{q}^2 = p^2 + k^2 - 2pkx$, can be written as functions of p , k , and x . Let's first look at the Coulomb potential. The angular dependence is represented as a series of Legendre polynomials $P_\ell(x)$,

$$V_C(p, k, x) = \sum_{\ell} \frac{4\pi}{2\ell + 1} V_{C,\ell}(p, k) P_\ell(x). \quad (2.9)$$

The expansion coefficients are determined through the angular integral

$$\begin{aligned} V_{C,\ell}(p, k) &= 2\pi \int_{-1}^1 dx P_\ell(x) V_C(p, k, x) \\ &= -8\pi^2 \alpha \int_{-1}^1 dx \frac{P_\ell(x)}{p^2 + k^2 - 2pkx} \\ &= -\frac{8\pi^2 \alpha}{pk} Q_\ell(y), \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

where the Legendre functions of the second kind, $Q_\ell(y)$, depend on

$$y = \frac{p^2 + k^2}{2pk}, \quad (2.11)$$

and are singular at $y = 1$, which occurs when $k = p$. The representation

$$Q_\ell(y) = P_\ell(y)Q_0(y) - W_{\ell-1}(y), \quad (2.12)$$

with

$$W_{\ell-1}(y) = \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{m} P_{\ell-m}(y) P_{m-1}(y), \quad (2.13)$$

is very useful here. It shows that the singularities in the potential matrix elements for all angular momenta have their origin in $Q_0(y)$, which can also be written

$$Q_0(y) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left| \frac{y+1}{y-1} \right| = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{p+k}{p-k} \right)^2, \quad (2.14)$$

whereas $W_{\ell-1}(y)$ is not singular and contributes only for $\ell \geq 1$.

The partial-wave decomposition of the linear potential $V_L(\mathbf{q})$ of (2.5) has been derived in [41]. Because of its nature as a distribution, it is easiest to write how it acts on the partial-wave components $\psi_\ell(p)$ of the wave function¹. We find

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty \frac{dk k^2}{(2\pi)^3} V_{L,\ell}(p, k) \psi_\ell(k) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \frac{dk k^2}{(2\pi)^3} [V_{A,\ell}(p, k) \psi_\ell(k) - V_{A,0}(p, k) \psi_\ell(p)], \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

where the partial-wave elements of V_A are

$$\begin{aligned} V_{A,\ell}(p, k) &= 2\pi \int_{-1}^1 dx P_\ell(x) V_A(p, k, x) \\ &= \frac{8\pi^2 \sigma}{(pk)^2} [P_\ell(y) Q'_0(y) + P'_\ell(y) Q_0(y) - W'_{\ell-1}(y)] \\ &= -\frac{8\pi^2 \sigma}{(pk)^2} \left[\left(\frac{2pk}{p^2 - k^2} \right)^2 P_\ell(y) - P'_\ell(y) Q_0(y) + W'_{\ell-1}(y) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

In addition to the singularity in $Q_0(y)$, that is also present in the Coulomb potential (2.10), the first term, due to the derivative $Q'_0(y)$, is even stronger singular and the source of all the difficulties in this calculation.

We can now write the partial-wave Schrödinger equation for the Cornell potential as

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{p^2}{2m_R} \psi_\ell(p) - \frac{\alpha}{\pi p} \int_0^\infty dk k [P_\ell(y) Q_0(y) - W_{\ell-1}(y)] \psi_\ell(k) \\ &- \frac{\sigma}{\pi p^2} \text{P} \int_0^\infty dk \left\{ \frac{4p^2 k^2}{(k^2 - p^2)^2} [P_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \psi_\ell(p)] - Q_0(y) P'_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) + W'_{\ell-1}(y) \psi_\ell(k) \right\} = E \psi_\ell(p). \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

¹ Because of rotational symmetry, neither the partial-wave po-

tentials nor wave functions depend on the eigenvalue of the

Next we turn our attention to the problem of solving this equation numerically.

A. The Nyström method

The Schrödinger equation in momentum space (2.17) is a homogeneous Fredholm integral equation of the form

$$\int_a^b dk K(p, k)\phi(k) = E\phi(p), \quad (2.18)$$

where $K(p, k)$ is its kernel. One convenient method to solve it numerically is the Nyström method [42], which is based on the numerical integration of a function $f(k)$ by means of a quadrature rule,

$$\int_a^b f(k)dk \approx \sum_{j=1}^N w_j f(k_j). \quad (2.19)$$

The quadrature points k_j and weights w_j are determined by the choice of the quadrature method and the integration interval, which in our case extends from 0 to ∞ . After applying (2.19) to (2.18), one obtains a closed set of N linear equations if for the external variable p we choose each of the points $\{k_j\}$ of the quadrature rule,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N w_j K(k_i, k_j)\phi(k_j) = E\phi(k_i). \quad (2.20)$$

The continuous variables p and k have thereby been discretized to take on only values from the same set, and they are now essentially only distinguished by their indices. From here on we will refer to the set of quadrature points as $\{p_i\}$ and use the notation p_i or p_j rather than k_i or k_j .

If we introduce the notation $\phi_i = \phi(p_i)$ and $M_{ij} = w_j K(p_i, p_j)$, the discretized Schrödinger equation can be written as a linear eigenvalue problem for the $N \times N$ matrix M_{ij} ,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N M_{ij}\phi_j = E\phi_i, \quad (2.21)$$

where the eigenvector for each eigenvalue E is a set of values of the corresponding eigenfunction at the quadrature points, $\phi(p_i)$.

B. Subtraction of logarithmic singularities from the kernel

Several terms in the kernel of Eq. (2.17) are singular when $k = p$ (and $y = 1$). Therefore, the diagonal elements M_{ii} in (2.21) don't exist and the Nyström method cannot be applied.

However, by means of a trick due to Landé [43], the logarithmic singularities in the $Q_0(y)$ terms can be eliminated. Taking advantage of the well-known result [44]

$$\int_0^\infty dk \frac{Q_0(y)}{k} = \frac{\pi^2}{2}, \quad (2.22)$$

and using $P_\ell(1) = 1$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty dk k P_\ell(y) Q_0(y) \psi_\ell(k) \\ &= \int_0^\infty dk \left[k P_\ell(y) Q_0(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \frac{p^2}{k} Q_0(y) \psi_\ell(p) \right] \\ & \quad + \int_0^\infty dk \frac{p^2}{k} Q_0(y) \psi_\ell(p) \\ &= p \int_0^\infty dk \left[\frac{k}{p} P_\ell(y) Q_0(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \frac{p}{k} Q_0(y) \psi_\ell(p) \right] \\ & \quad + p^2 \frac{\pi^2}{2} \psi_\ell(p). \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

The integrand in square brackets vanishes in the limit $k \rightarrow p$ and therefore does not contribute to the diagonal of the matrix M . The complete Coulomb term in the Schrödinger equation (2.17) can now be written

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{\alpha}{\pi p} \int_0^\infty dk k [P_\ell(y) Q_0(y) - W_{\ell-1}(y)] \psi_\ell(k) \\ &= -\frac{\alpha}{\pi p} \int_0^\infty dk \left[k Q_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \frac{p^2}{k} Q_0(y) \psi_\ell(p) \right] \\ & \quad - \frac{\alpha \pi p}{2} \psi_\ell(p). \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

For the Nyström method, we need to know the limit of the integrand of the second line of (2.24) as $k \rightarrow p$, which comes only from the $W_{\ell-1}(y)$ term hidden in $Q_\ell(y)$,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow p} \left[k Q_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \frac{p^2}{k} Q_0(y) \psi_\ell(p) \right] = -p W_{\ell-1}(1) \psi(p), \quad (2.25)$$

and it is easy to see that

$$W_{\ell-1}(1) = \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{m}. \quad (2.26)$$

Using the Landé subtraction technique, the pure Coulomb problem can therefore be solved quite easily with the Nyström method.

A similar singular term as in the Coulomb potential appears also in the kernel (2.16) of the linear potential in all partial waves with $\ell \geq 1$. We can treat it with a

z -component of the angular momentum, so it is suppressed throughout.

slight variation of the same idea,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^\infty dk Q_0(y) P'_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) \\
&= \int_0^\infty dk \left[Q_0(y) P'_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \frac{p}{k} Q_0(y) P'_\ell(1) \psi_\ell(p) \right] \\
&\quad + \int_0^\infty dk \frac{p}{k} Q_0(y) P'_\ell(1) \psi_\ell(p) \\
&= \int_0^\infty dk \left[Q_0(y) P'_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \frac{p}{k} Q_0(y) P'_\ell(1) \psi_\ell(p) \right] \\
&\quad + p \frac{\pi^2}{2} P'_\ell(1) \psi_\ell(p), \tag{2.27}
\end{aligned}$$

where $P'_\ell(1) = \ell(\ell + 1)/2$.

Again, the integrand vanishes when $k \rightarrow p$ and can therefore be omitted from the diagonal elements of the matrix M when the Nyström method is used. There is no need to write $\text{P}\int_0^\infty$ in the first line of (2.27) because this is now a regular integral.

C. Subtraction of the principal value singularities

There is only one singular term remaining in the kernel of the linear potential in (2.17), but this is the most problematic one. After pulling out a factor $2p^2$ for convenience, we have to deal with

$$\text{P}\int_0^\infty dk \frac{2k^2}{(k^2 - p^2)^2} [P_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \psi_\ell(p)]. \tag{2.28}$$

There appears to be a double pole at $k = p$, but the numerator goes to zero like $(k - p)$, so it is actually only a single pole, and the principal value integral exists.

To see this, we expand the factor in brackets in the numerator of (2.28) in a Taylor series around $k = p$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \psi_\ell(p) = (k - p) \psi'_\ell(p) \\
&+ \frac{(k - p)^2}{2!} \left[\frac{P'_\ell(1)}{p^2} \psi_\ell(p) + \psi''_\ell(p) \right] + \frac{(k - p)^3}{3!} R_\ell(k), \tag{2.29}
\end{aligned}$$

where the function $R_\ell(k)$ is the remainder of the Taylor series after the terms up to second order have been subtracted and $(k - p)^3/3!$ has been factored out. The only important property of $R_\ell(k)$ in this context is that it is finite at $k = p$. Equation (2.29) confirms that one power of $k - p$ in the denominator of (2.28) is canceled and that the singularity is therefore only a single pole.

Substituting (2.29) into (2.28) shows that the integrand in the vicinity of $k = p$ behaves like

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{2k^2}{(k^2 - p^2)^2} [P_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \psi_\ell(p)] \\
&= \frac{2k^2}{k + p} \frac{\psi'_\ell(p)}{k^2 - p^2} + \frac{k^2}{(k + p)^2} \left[\frac{P'_\ell(1)}{p^2} \psi_\ell(p) + \psi''_\ell(p) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{k^2(k - p)}{3(k + p)^2} R_\ell(k) \\
&= \frac{p \psi'_\ell(p)}{k^2 - p^2} + \frac{2k + p}{(k + p)^2} \psi'_\ell(p) \\
&+ \frac{k^2}{(k + p)^2} \left[\frac{P'_\ell(1)}{p^2} \psi_\ell(p) + \psi''_\ell(p) \right] + \frac{k^2(k - p)}{3(k + p)^2} R_\ell(k). \tag{2.30}
\end{aligned}$$

For the Nyström method to work, this singularity has to be removed. In [41] we have shown that this can be done with another Landé subtraction. The reason why we have separated the term proportional to $\psi'_\ell(p)$ in (2.30) into two parts is that, when the first one is subtracted,

$$\text{P}\int_0^\infty dk \frac{2k^2}{(k^2 - p^2)^2} [P_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \psi_\ell(p)] = \int_0^\infty dk \left\{ \frac{2k^2}{(k^2 - p^2)^2} [P_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \psi_\ell(p)] - \frac{p \psi'_\ell(p)}{k^2 - p^2} \right\} + p \psi'_\ell(p) \text{P}\int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{k^2 - p^2}, \tag{2.31}$$

the well-known integral

$$\text{P}\int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{k^2 - p^2} = 0 \tag{2.32}$$

takes care of the principal value singularity. The final result is an ordinary integral, free of singularities,

$$\text{P}\int_0^\infty dk \frac{2k^2}{(k^2 - p^2)^2} [P_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \psi_\ell(p)] = \int_0^\infty dk \left\{ \frac{2k^2}{(k^2 - p^2)^2} [P_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \psi_\ell(p)] - \frac{p \psi'_\ell(p)}{k^2 - p^2} \right\}. \tag{2.33}$$

The price to pay for this simplification is that the deriva-

tive of the wave function makes its entrance into the inte-

grand, which does not seem compatible with the Nyström method. In [41] we therefore followed a different strategy

to solve the—now singularity-free—integral equation for the Cornell potential,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{p^2}{2m_R} - \frac{\alpha\pi p}{2} + \frac{\sigma\pi}{2p} \right) \psi_\ell(p) - \frac{\alpha}{\pi p} \int_0^\infty dk \left[k Q_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \frac{p^2}{k} Q_0(y) \psi_\ell(p) \right] \\ & - \frac{2\sigma}{\pi} \int_0^\infty dk \left\{ \frac{2k^2}{(k^2 - p^2)^2} [P_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \psi_\ell(p)] - \frac{p\psi'_\ell(p)}{k^2 - p^2} - \frac{Q_0(y)}{2p^2} \left[P'_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \frac{p}{k} P'_\ell(1) \psi_\ell(p) \right] + \frac{W'_{\ell-1}(y)}{2p^2} \psi_\ell(k) \right\} \\ & = E\psi_\ell(p), \quad (2.34) \end{aligned}$$

namely to expand $\psi_\ell(p)$ into a set of basis functions whose derivatives can be easily calculated. In [41] we chose a basis of modified cubic B-spline functions.

In this method, sometimes referred to as the Galerkin method, one solves for the expansion coefficients instead of the function values at grid points. The method works well and gives accurate results, but the choice of basis functions requires special care. It is especially important that the basis is able to accurately reproduce the behavior of the solutions at very small and very large momenta. This asymptotic behavior needs to be determined before the equation is solved, which is not always easy to do. It is one of the advantages of the Nyström method that no advance knowledge of the properties of the solutions is needed.

D. The Nyström method for the subtracted kernels

The purpose of this work is to show how the Nyström method can be applied to solve the integral equation (2.34). As already mentioned before, one of the requirements is to be able to calculate the kernel along the diagonal $k = p$. That the kernel is not singular at $k = p$ is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition. In the case of the subtracted Coulomb potential, (2.27) provides these matrix elements. We need to do the same for the subtracted linear potential.

From (2.30) we can read off

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow p} \left\{ \frac{2k^2}{(k^2 - p^2)^2} [P_\ell(y) \psi_\ell(k) - \psi_\ell(p)] - \frac{p\psi'_\ell(p)}{k^2 - p^2} \right\} \\ & = \frac{3}{4} \psi'_\ell(p) + \frac{1}{4} \left[\frac{P'_\ell(1)}{p^2} \psi_\ell(p) + \psi''_\ell(p) \right]. \quad (2.35) \end{aligned}$$

The $Q_0(y)$ term of the linear potential in (2.34) vanishes in this limit, so only the unproblematic $W'_{\ell-1}(1)\psi_\ell(p)/2p^2$ has to be added to (2.35).

At this point, the situation seems to be even worse than expected from looking at (2.34), because we need to know the first *and second* derivatives of the unknown function $\psi_\ell(p)$ to construct the complete kernel matrix along the diagonal.

The new idea of this work is to calculate the derivatives of the wave function at the grid points p_i by means of interpolating functions that depend linearly on the values of the wave function at the grid points in the vicinity of p_i . The Schrödinger equation can thereby be cast into the form (2.21) and solved by standard numerical methods to determine the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of square matrices.

III. THE DISCRETIZED FORM OF THE MOMENTUM-SPACE SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION

As already outlined in Sec. II A, we discretize the integrations over k according to (2.19), rename the grid points $k_j \rightarrow p_j$, and choose the points p on the same grid of points $\{p_i\}$. Furthermore, we introduce the abbreviations $\psi_i = \psi_\ell(p_i)$ and $y_{ij} = (p_i^2 + p_j^2)/(2p_i p_j)$. With these conventions, the Schrödinger equation (2.34) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{p_i^2}{2m_R} - \frac{\alpha p_i}{2} + \frac{\sigma\pi}{2p_i} \right) \psi_i - \frac{\alpha}{\pi p_i} \sum_{j \neq i} w_j \left[p_j Q_\ell(y_{ij}) \psi_j - \frac{p_j^2}{p_j} Q_0(y_{ij}) \psi_i \right] + \frac{\alpha}{\pi} w_i W_{\ell-1}(1) \psi_i \\
& - \frac{2\sigma}{\pi} \sum_{j \neq i} w_j \left\{ \frac{2p_j^2}{(p_j^2 - p_i^2)^2} [P_\ell(y_{ij}) \psi_j - \psi_i] - \frac{p_i \psi_i'}{p_j^2 - p_i^2} - \frac{Q_0(y_{ij})}{2p_i^2} \left[P_\ell'(y_{ij}) \psi_j - \frac{p_i}{p_j} P_\ell'(1) \psi_i \right] + \frac{W'_{\ell-1}(y_{ij})}{2p_i^2} \psi_j \right\} \\
& + \frac{2\sigma}{\pi} w_i \left\{ \frac{3}{4} \psi_i' + \frac{1}{4} \left[\frac{P_\ell'(1)}{p_i^2} \psi_i + \psi_i'' \right] + \frac{W'_{\ell-1}(1)}{2p_i^2} \psi_i \right\} = E \psi_i. \quad (3.1)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that, for both potentials, the summations over j exclude the diagonal terms $j = i$, whose explicit expressions are written right after the corresponding summation.

As already mentioned above, we approximate now the derivatives $\psi_\ell'(p_i)$ and $\psi_\ell''(p_i)$ through the derivatives of an interpolating function, which represents $\psi_\ell(p)$ as a linear combination of the wave function at some subset of the grid points,

$$\psi_\ell(p) = \sum_j \psi_\ell(p_j) L_j(p), \quad (3.2)$$

where the functions $L_j(p)$ are often taken to be polynomials. For instance, for Lagrange interpolation using n points $\{p_k\}$ near point p , they are

$$L_j(p) = \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^n \frac{p - p_k}{p_j - p_k}. \quad (3.3)$$

With this we get the derivatives at the quadrature points as

$$\psi_\ell'(p_i) = \sum_j L_j'(p_i) \psi_\ell(p_j), \quad \psi_\ell''(p_i) = \sum_j L_j''(p_i) \psi_\ell(p_j). \quad (3.4)$$

How many and exactly which indices j are summed over here depends on the order of the interpolating polynomials. It seems best to choose the interpolation points p_k to be the closest quadrature points to the left and right of p_i . For instance, for a 5-point Lagrange interpolation, the p_k should be $p_{i-2}, p_{i-1}, p_i, p_{i+1}, p_{i+2}$. Exceptions must be made for the points close to the ends, where not enough interpolation points to the left or right are available.

Equation (3.1) can now be written as an eigenvalue equation of the form $M\psi = E\psi$, where ψ is a column vector with elements $\psi_i \equiv \psi_\ell(p_i)$, and M is a matrix (with elements M_{ij}). For the derivatives we write

$$\psi_i' = \sum_j D_{ij}^{(1)} \psi_j, \quad \psi_i'' = \sum_j D_{ij}^{(2)} \psi_j, \quad (3.5)$$

where the matrices $D_{ij}^{(1)} = L_j'(p_i)$ and $D_{ij}^{(2)} = L_j''(p_i)$ depend only on the grid points close to p_i . Other interpolation methods can of course be used as well, such as spline interpolation. This will lead to different matrices $D_{ij}^{(1)}$ and $D_{ij}^{(2)}$, but the general form (3.5) will stay the same.

It is convenient to slightly reorganize (3.1). The subtraction terms in the summations over j contain ψ_i and other factors that don't depend on the summation index and can be pulled out, leaving the following sums:

$$S_i^{(1)} = \sum_{j \neq i} w_j \frac{2p_j^2}{(p_j^2 - p_i^2)^2}, \quad S_i^{(2)} = \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{w_j}{p_j^2 - p_i^2}, \quad S_i^{(3)} = \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{w_j}{p_j} Q_0(y_{ij}). \quad (3.6)$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ \frac{p_i^2}{2m_R} + \frac{\alpha p_i}{\pi} \left(S_i^{(3)} - \frac{\pi^2}{2} + \frac{w_i W_{\ell-1}(1)}{p_i} \right) + \frac{2\sigma}{\pi} \left[\frac{\pi^2}{4p_i} - \frac{P_\ell'(1)}{2p_i} S_i^{(3)} + \frac{w_i}{2p_i^2} \left(\frac{P_\ell'(1)}{2} + W'_{\ell-1}(1) \right) + S_i^{(1)} \right] \right\} \psi_i \\
& - \frac{\alpha}{\pi p_i} \sum_{j \neq i} w_j p_j Q_\ell(y_{ij}) \psi_j - \frac{2\sigma}{\pi} \sum_{j \neq i} w_j \left[\frac{2p_j^2}{(p_j^2 - p_i^2)^2} P_\ell(y_{ij}) - \frac{Q_0(y_{ij})}{2p_i^2} P_\ell'(y_{ij}) + \frac{W'_{\ell-1}(y_{ij})}{2p_i^2} \right] \psi_j \\
& + \frac{2\sigma}{\pi} \sum_j \left[\left(p_i S_i^{(2)} + \frac{3w_i}{4} \right) D_{ij}^{(1)} + \frac{w_i}{4} D_{ij}^{(2)} \right] \psi_j = E \psi_i. \quad (3.7)
\end{aligned}$$

Equation (3.7) is organized in such a way that all diagonal kernel elements appear in the first line, the off-diagonal elements in the second line, and in the third line the contributions from the derivatives of the wave function, which are usually contained in a more or less narrow band along the diagonal.

The form of this equation is

$$\sum_{j=1}^N M_{ij} \psi_j = E \psi_i, \quad (3.8)$$

and we can read off the elements of the matrix M from (3.7):

$$\begin{aligned} M_{ij} = \delta_{ij} & \left\{ \frac{p_i^2}{2m_R} + \frac{\alpha p_i}{\pi} \left(S_i^{(3)} - \frac{\pi^2}{2} + \frac{w_i W_{\ell-1}(1)}{p_i} \right) + \frac{2\sigma}{\pi} \left[\frac{\pi^2}{4p_i} - \frac{P'_\ell(1)}{2p_i} S_i^{(3)} + \frac{w_i}{2p_i^2} \left(\frac{P'_\ell(1)}{2} + W'_{\ell-1}(1) \right) + S_i^{(1)} \right] \right\} \\ & + (1 - \delta_{ij}) w_j \left\{ -\frac{\alpha}{\pi p_i} p_j Q_\ell(y_{ij}) - \frac{2\sigma}{\pi} \left[\frac{2p_j^2}{(p_j^2 - p_i^2)^2} P_\ell(y_{ij}) - \frac{Q_0(y_{ij}) P'_\ell(y_{ij}) + \frac{W'_{\ell-1}(y_{ij})}{2p_i^2}}{2p_i^2} \right] \right\} \\ & + \frac{2\sigma}{\pi} \left[\left(p_i S_i^{(2)} + \frac{3w_i}{4} \right) D_{ij}^{(1)} + \frac{w_i}{4} D_{ij}^{(2)} \right]. \quad (3.9) \end{aligned}$$

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section we present the results of calculations we performed for the linear confining part of the Cornell potential with the Nyström method, by numerically determining the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the matrix M of (3.9), where we have set $\alpha = 0$.

The reason for this restriction is simply that the Coulomb problem has already been solved with the Nyström method in the past. We have of course also solved the pure Coulomb problem as a test case, but we do not display here any results because there are no new insights to be gained. Suffice it to say that we reproduce the exactly known energy levels and wave functions with excellent accuracy.

For the quadrature rule (2.19), we start with Gauss-Legendre quadrature points $\{x_i\}$ and weights $\{w_{x,i}\}$ for the interval $x \in [-1, +1]$, such that

$$\int_{-1}^{+1} g(x) dx \approx \sum_{i=1}^N w_{x,i} g(x_i), \quad (4.1)$$

and then map from the interval $[-1, +1]$ to $[0, \infty)$ with the transformation

$$p(x) = p_0 \frac{1+x}{1-x}, \quad (4.2)$$

such that

$$p_i = p_0 \frac{1+x_i}{1-x_i}, \quad w_i = p_0 \frac{2w_{x,i}}{(1-x_i)^2}, \quad (4.3)$$

where $p_0 > 0$ is a scaling parameter.

The Hamiltonian contains two parameters, namely the string tension σ of the linear potential and the reduced mass m_R of the 2-body system. Because the energy eigenvalues scale with $(\sigma^2/2m_R)^{1/3}$, it is sufficient to solve Eq. (3.8) for $\sigma = 2m_R = 1$.

The linear potential in S -waves is the ideal case to test our numerical methods, because its exact solutions in coordinate space are known in terms of the Airy functions

Ai, with the corresponding energies given by

$$E_n^{\ell=0} = -z_n \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2m_R} \right)^{1/3}, \quad \text{with } \text{Ai}(z_n) = 0, \quad (4.4)$$

where $z_n < 0$ is the n -th root of the Airy function $\text{Ai}(z)$.

First we demonstrate for the linear potential the numerical convergence of the energy eigenvalues to the exact values as the number of Gauss-Legendre points N increases. We calculated the lowest energy eigenvalues $n = 1$ to $n = 10$ using 5-point Lagrange interpolation to approximate the first and second derivatives of the wave function. Table I shows that our numerical S -wave energies converge quickly to the exact eigenvalues. For $N = 1000$ Gauss-Legendre points we find excellent agreement up to the 9th decimal place for the lowest eigenvalues, while for the highest eigenvalues we still reach very good agreement up to the 7th decimal place.

In Table II the S -wave results for the energy eigenvalues $n = 1$ to $n = 10$, obtained with four different methods, are compared. For the Nyström methods, 1000 Gauss-Legendre integration points were used, while for the Galerkin method with expansion in a basis of 64 B-spline functions the numerical integration was performed using the “NIntegrate” routine in MATHEMATICA. Excellent agreement with the exact results was achieved with 5-point and higher Lagrange interpolation, whereas the B-spline method with 64 basis functions still yields accurate results, but clearly less than what is achieved with the Nyström methods.

The higher-order Lagrange interpolation results turned out to be so precise that we wanted to see how high their accuracy can go when the number of integration points and the order of the interpolating polynomials is increased. In Tables III, IV, and V, we show the differences between the numerical results and the exact energies given by Eq. (4.4) with higher precision. The exact energies are given up to 20 decimal places, together with the difference between the numerical and the exact results.

In Tab. III we see that, for $N = 200$ integration points, the accuracy increases with the interpolation order up

to about 11-point interpolation, then it drops again to levels similar to 3-point interpolation, except that the accuracy of the higher states remains somewhat higher. Similarly, Tab. IV for $N = 600$ shows that higher-order interpolations improve the accuracy further until a drop that happens at a higher order. For $N = 1000$ in Tab. V, a clear drop is no longer discernible, and an impressive accuracy is achieved even in the highly excited states.

We can conclude that, as expected, increasing the number of integration points improves the accuracy of the results. So does increasing the order of the Lagrange interpolation polynomial. However, if the number of integration points is low one should not choose a high-order interpolation. The plausible explanation for this behaviour is that high-order interpolating polynomials tend to oscillate between the node points, such that the derivatives become unreliable. Increasing the number of nodes (here the integration points) reduces their relative distance and

lowers this tendency, such that higher-order interpolation actually improves the results.

It should be mentioned that the calculations for Tables III to V were performed with MATHEMATICA with 30-digit precision. In normal machine-precision (16 digits), the roundoff errors accumulate too much to allow such high accuracy. In applications to actual physical problems, like calculations of the meson spectra with the Cornell potential, a much lower accuracy is of course sufficient.

For higher partial waves, with $\ell > 0$, no exact solutions are available. However, given the extreme accuracy of our Nyström method, we list in, Tab. VI, the converged energies, up to 10 decimal places, for angular momenta up to $\ell = 5$, calculated with $N = 1000$ and 15-point Lagrange interpolation. Partial waves like P -, D -, and F -waves with $\ell = 1, 2, 3$, respectively, are of practical importance as they contribute to the wave functions of scalar, vector, axial-vector, and tensor mesons.

TABLE I. Energy eigenvalues for the lowest eigenstates $n = 1$ to $n = 10$ for the linear potential for $\ell = 0$ for increasing number N of Gauss-Legendre integration points, using a 5-point Lagrange interpolation. One can see an excellent convergence to the exact eigenvalues shown in the last row. The energies are given in units of $(\sigma^2/2m_R)^{1/3}$.

N	Energy level n				
	1	2	3	4	5
50	2.3381366586	4.0883811896	5.5205090235	6.7830986753	7.9303780220
100	2.3381083587	4.0879637759	5.5205602995	6.7865928385	7.9436701246
200	2.3381074406	4.0879499019	5.5205598624	6.7867044514	7.9441187098
400	2.3381074114	4.0879494586	5.5205598293	6.7867079757	7.9441331176
600	2.3381074106	4.0879494460	5.5205598283	6.7867080750	7.9441335251
800	2.3381074105	4.0879494445	5.5205598282	6.7867080865	7.9441335724
1000	2.3381074104	4.0879494443	5.5205598281	6.7867080889	7.9441335822
Exact	2.3381074105	4.0879494441	5.5205598281	6.7867080901	7.9441335871

N	Energy level n				
	6	7	8	9	10
50	8.9868873730	9.9628553476	10.8600670363	11.6520490076	12.3644392700
100	9.0213956811	10.0373646777	11.0029378425	11.9257952285	12.8112165757
200	9.0226099870	10.0400815207	11.0083369103	11.9356672738	12.8281686672
400	9.0226495588	10.0401713896	11.0085183186	11.9360043877	12.8287571438
600	9.0226506823	10.0401739512	11.0085235116	11.9360140829	12.8287741529
800	9.0226508127	10.0401742488	11.0085241154	11.9360152111	12.8287761342
1000	9.0226508400	10.0401743111	11.0085242420	11.9360154477	12.8287765498
Exact	9.0226508533	10.0401743416	11.0085243037	11.9360155632	12.8287767529

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we propose an accurate and simple method for solving the Schrödinger equation with a linear confining potential in momentum space. The linear potential gives rise to a Cauchy principal-value singularity and a logarithmic singularity which complicate the direct application of standard numerical solution techniques, such as the Nyström collocation method. In a preceding paper [41], we have showed how both, the principal-value

and logarithmic singularity can be subtracted making the Schrödinger equation singularity free. However, as a consequence of the removal of the principal singularity, the derivatives of the – a priori – unknown wave function appear in the equation. One way to deal with this difficulty is the so-called Galerkin method, i.e. the expansion of the wave function in a basis of appropriate functions whose derivatives are known or can be calculated. Then the problem becomes a generalized eigenvalue problem for the expansion coefficients that can be solved and the energy eigenvalues and eigenfunctions are obtained.

TABLE II. Energy eigenvalues for the lowest eigenstates $n = 1$ to $n = 10$ for the linear potential for $l = 0$, calculate with different methods. The first line displays the results of Ref. [41] where the wave functions are expanded into a basis of 64 B-splines. For the results of the second line, a cubic spline interpolation with vanishing first derivatives at the endpoints was employed instead of Lagrange interpolation. The results obtained with different orders of the Lagrange polynomials in lines 3–9 were calculated with 1000 integration points, the last line is the exact result of Eq. (4.4). The energies are given in units of $(\sigma^2/2m_R)^{1/3}$.

Method	Energy level n				
	1	2	3	4	5
Expansion into B-splines [41]	2.3381076139	4.0879494012	5.5205596162	6.7867079447	7.9441334370
Cubic spline interpolation	2.3381073948	4.0879490817	5.5205592518	6.7867079666	7.9441352618
3-point Lagrange interpolation	2.3381074769	4.0879489796	5.5205581177	6.7867039490	7.9441251616
4-point Lagrange interpolation	2.3381074265	4.0879498190	5.5205604254	6.7867082210	7.9441318589
5-point Lagrange interpolation	2.3381074105	4.0879494443	5.5205598281	6.7867080889	7.9441335823
6-point Lagrange interpolation	2.3381074105	4.0879494441	5.5205598284	6.7867080913	7.9441335902
7-point Lagrange interpolation	2.3381074105	4.0879494441	5.5205598281	6.7867080901	7.9441335871
8-point Lagrange interpolation	2.3381074105	4.0879494441	5.5205598281	6.7867080901	7.9441335871
9-point Lagrange interpolation	2.3381074105	4.0879494441	5.5205598281	6.7867080901	7.9441335871
Exact	2.3381074105	4.0879494441	5.5205598281	6.7867080901	7.9441335871

Method	Energy level n				
	6	7	8	9	10
Expansion into B-splines [41]	9.0226512090	10.0401766855	11.0085333135	11.9360442615	12.8288594552
Cubic spline interpolation	9.0226565188	10.0401871972	11.0085487188	11.9360572362	12.8288428719
3-point Lagrange interpolation	9.0226354555	10.0401482812	11.0084827276	11.9359522932	12.8286841273
4-point Lagrange interpolation	9.0226449940	10.0401610335	11.0084990145	11.9359723795	12.8287082138
5-point Lagrange interpolation	9.0226508400	10.0401743111	11.0085242419	11.9360154477	12.8287765499
6-point Lagrange interpolation	9.0226508587	10.0401743485	11.0085243088	11.9360155581	12.8287767217
7-point Lagrange interpolation	9.0226508533	10.0401743415	11.0085243037	11.9360155630	12.8287767523
8-point Lagrange interpolation	9.0226508534	10.0401743416	11.0085243038	11.9360155634	12.8287767531
9-point Lagrange interpolation	9.0226508533	10.0401743416	11.0085243037	11.9360155632	12.8287767529
Exact	9.0226508533	10.0401743416	11.0085243037	11.9360155632	12.8287767529

TABLE III. Energy eigenvalues calculated with a grid of $N = 200$ integration points for the lowest eigenstates $n = 1$ to $n = 10$ for the linear potential for $l = 0$ for increasing number NL of points used in the Lagrange interpolation. The second column shows the exact values obtained from (4.4), the other columns show the differences between the numerical and the exact results, $E_{\text{num}} - E_{\text{exact}}$, where the exponents of base 10 are given in parentheses. The energies are given in units of $(\sigma^2/2m_R)^{1/3}$.

n	$l = 0$ exact	NL=3	NL=5	NL=7	NL=9	NL=11	NL=13	NL=15
1	2.33810741045976703849	8.25 (-6)	3.01 (-8)	-2.78 (-10)	1.07 (-12)	-1.67 (-13)	-3.23 (-7)	1.34 (-6)
2	4.08794944413097061664	-5.77 (-5)	4.58 (-7)	2.22 (-9)	-9.61 (-11)	8.98 (-13)	-3.24 (-7)	1.34 (-6)
3	5.52055982809555105913	-2.12 (-4)	3.43 (-8)	4.50 (-8)	-2.75 (-10)	-2.77 (-11)	-3.25 (-7)	1.34 (-6)
4	6.78670809007175899878	-5.14 (-4)	-3.64 (-6)	1.52 (-7)	4.28 (-9)	-2.43 (-10)	-3.25 (-7)	1.34 (-6)
5	7.94413358712085312314	-1.04 (-3)	-1.49 (-5)	2.43 (-7)	2.98 (-8)	-3.10 (-10)	-3.26 (-7)	1.34 (-6)
6	9.02265085334098038016	-1.91 (-3)	-4.09 (-5)	-3.61 (-8)	1.06 (-7)	3.45 (-9)	-3.27 (-7)	1.34 (-6)
7	10.04017434155808593059	-3.22 (-3)	-9.28 (-5)	-1.57 (-6)	2.60 (-7)	2.47 (-8)	-3.28 (-7)	1.34 (-6)
8	11.00852430373326289324	-5.14 (-3)	-1.87 (-4)	-6.19 (-6)	4.67 (-7)	9.70 (-8)	-3.26 (-7)	1.34 (-6)
9	11.93601556323626251701	-7.81 (-3)	-3.48 (-4)	-1.72 (-5)	5.29 (-7)	2.84 (-7)	-3.06 (-7)	1.34 (-6)
10	12.82877675286575720041	-1.14 (-2)	-6.08 (-4)	-4.02 (-5)	-1.37 (-7)	6.73 (-7)	-2.27 (-7)	1.33 (-6)

In Ref. [41] we followed this approach and solved the singularity-free Schrödinger equation by means of an expansion in a basis of cubic B-splines. We found that the solutions converge quickly with increasing number of basis functions, especially, for the lowest energy eigenvalues. For the higher energy eigenstates, however, a rather large number of basis functions was needed to find good agreement with the exactly known values. A large number of basis functions made the numerical computations

also time consuming and is therefore not very practicable for performing global fits in the future that involve many states of the meson spectrum. But the main drawback of the expansion in B-splines is, that the appropriate basis functions must be chosen for each problem individually. For instance, if the basis functions do not have the same asymptotic behavior as the wave function determined by the potential in the Schrödinger equation, then this can lead to problems with convergence. These issues can be

TABLE IV. Energy eigenvalues calculated with a grid of $N = 600$ integration points for the lowest eigenstates $n = 1$ to $n = 10$ for the linear potential for $\ell = 0$ for increasing number NL of points used in the Lagrange interpolation. The second column shows the exact values obtained from (4.4), the other columns show the differences between the numerical and the exact results, where the exponents of base 10 are given in parentheses. The energies are given in units of $(\sigma^2/2m_R)^{1/3}$.

n	$\ell = 0$ exact	NL=3	NL=5	NL=7	NL=9	NL=11	NL=13	NL=15
1	2.33810741045976703849	3.07 (-7)	1.25 (-10)	-1.27 (-13)	1.04 (-16)	2.60 (-15)	1.01 (-15)	-5.31 (-11)
2	4.08794944413097061664	-2.15 (-6)	1.91 (-9)	1.03 (-12)	-5.82 (-15)	1.32 (-15)	-2.94 (-16)	-5.31 (-11)
3	5.52055982809555105913	-7.91 (-6)	1.67 (-10)	2.10 (-11)	-1.57 (-14)	8.95 (-16)	-2.61 (-16)	-5.31 (-11)
4	6.78670809007175899878	-1.91 (-5)	-1.51 (-8)	7.16 (-11)	2.22 (-13)	6.87 (-16)	-9.53 (-16)	-5.31 (-11)
5	7.94413358712085312314	-3.90 (-5)	-6.20 (-8)	1.17 (-10)	1.57 (-12)	-6.17 (-16)	-9.39 (-16)	-5.31 (-11)
6	9.02265085334098038016	-7.12 (-5)	-1.71 (-7)	-4.35 (-12)	5.70 (-12)	2.06 (-14)	-1.17 (-15)	-5.31 (-11)
7	10.04017434155808593059	-1.20 (-4)	-3.90 (-7)	-7.12 (-10)	1.44 (-11)	1.48 (-13)	-1.34 (-15)	-5.31 (-11)
8	11.00852430373326289324	-1.92 (-4)	-7.92 (-7)	-2.88 (-9)	2.72 (-11)	6.03 (-13)	-2.15 (-16)	-5.31 (-11)
9	11.93601556323626251701	-2.92 (-4)	-1.48 (-6)	-8.15 (-9)	3.49 (-11)	1.83 (-12)	1.23 (-14)	-5.31 (-11)
10	12.82877675286575720041	-4.28 (-4)	-2.60 (-6)	-1.93 (-8)	7.66 (-12)	4.58 (-12)	7.01 (-14)	-5.31 (-11)

TABLE V. Energy eigenvalues calculated with a grid of $N = 1000$ integration points for the lowest eigenstates $n = 1$ to $n = 10$ for the linear potential for $\ell = 0$ for increasing number NL of points used in the Lagrange interpolation. The second column shows the exact values obtained from (4.4), the other columns show the differences between the numerical and the exact results, where the exponents of base 10 are given in parentheses. The energies are given in units of $(\sigma^2/2m_R)^{1/3}$.

n	$\ell = 0$ exact	NL=3	NL=5	NL=7	NL=9	NL=11	NL=13	NL=15
1	2.33810741045976703849	6.64 (-8)	9.74 (-12)	-5.07 (-15)	2.37 (-15)	1.09 (-15)	1.23 (-15)	-1.72 (-16)
2	4.08794944413097061664	-4.64 (-7)	1.48 (-10)	2.83 (-14)	2.22 (-15)	8.83 (-16)	1.31 (-16)	-2.25 (-15)
3	5.52055982809555105913	-1.71 (-6)	1.32 (-11)	5.89 (-13)	2.00 (-16)	1.46 (-15)	-4.58 (-16)	-1.14 (-15)
4	6.78670809007175899878	-4.14 (-6)	-1.18 (-9)	2.01 (-12)	2.69 (-15)	-7.20 (-16)	-3.19 (-17)	-2.31 (-15)
5	7.94413358712085312314	-8.43 (-6)	-4.83 (-9)	3.30 (-12)	1.64 (-14)	2.17 (-16)	4.44 (-16)	-2.96 (-15)
6	9.02265085334098038016	-1.54 (-5)	-1.33 (-8)	-9.48 (-14)	5.74 (-14)	-7.26 (-16)	1.39 (-16)	-2.63 (-15)
7	10.04017434155808593059	-2.61 (-5)	-3.04 (-8)	-2.00 (-11)	1.48 (-13)	4.55 (-17)	-2.95 (-17)	-1.99 (-15)
8	11.00852430373326289324	-4.16 (-5)	-6.18 (-8)	-8.10 (-11)	2.79 (-13)	2.64 (-15)	8.66 (-16)	-8.48 (-16)
9	11.93601556323626251701	-6.33 (-5)	-1.16 (-7)	-2.29 (-10)	3.61 (-13)	7.41 (-15)	2.40 (-16)	-1.18 (-15)
10	12.82877675286575720041	-9.26 (-5)	-2.03 (-7)	-5.44 (-10)	9.31 (-14)	1.81 (-14)	1.80 (-15)	-1.25 (-15)

resolved by modifying the basis functions accordingly in order to reproduce the correct behavior of the wave function. But because the basis functions also depend on the fitting parameters of the problem, this makes the method is often impractical and sometimes unreliable.

Our objective here was to develop a simpler, more reliable and yet sufficiently general numerical method that can in principle be applied to any type of realistic bound-state problem. In this work, we demonstrated that the Nyström collocation method can be used to solve the Schrödinger equation with the linear confining potential after the principal singularity has been subtracted accordingly. The first and second derivatives of the wave function, that enter the equation, can be re-expressed in terms of the wave function itself by means of an expansion in interpolating polynomials. The problem then reduces to an ordinary eigenvalue problem that can be easily solved.

We tested different interpolation methods and already with a 5-point Lagrange interpolation with 600 Gauss-Legendre integration points very good agreement with the exactly known S-wave values was achieved. With 1000 we reached excellent agreement up to the 9th decimal place for the lowest energy eigenvalues and for the highest energy eigenvalues agreement up to the 7th dec-

imal place. Even though, the computations were performed in MATHEMATICA programming language, the computing times were reasonably short (orders of several seconds) such that this method is suitable for near-future global fits of the meson spectrum. For comparison, for the cubic B-spline method with 64 basis functions, the computing time was by a factor of 1000 longer and at the same time the results were significantly less accurate. In addition, we found that by further increasing the number of integration points and the order of the Lagrange interpolation, extreme accuracy can be achieved, which requires to go beyond normal machine precision in the numerical computations. With 1000 integration points and a 13-point Lagrange interpolation the differences between the numerical results obtained from a calculation in MATHEMATICA with 30-digit precision and the exact values are of the order 10^{-15} or smaller. For higher partial waves, for which there exist no exact values, we list the converged energies, up to 10 decimal places, for angular momenta up to $\ell = 5$, calculated with $N = 1000$ and 15-point Lagrange interpolation. Partial waves like P -, D -, and F -waves are of practical importance as they contribute to the wave functions of scalar, vector, axial-vector, and tensor mesons.

TABLE VI. Energy eigenvalues for the lowest eigenstates $n = 1$ to $n = 10$ of the linear potential for increasing orbital angular momentum ℓ . To be sure that all shown 10 decimal places are converged, the results were calculated with $N = 1000$ integration points and a 15-point Lagrange interpolation. The energies are given in units of $(\sigma^2/2m_R)^{1/3}$.

n	Orbital angular momentum ℓ					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
1	2.3381074105	3.3612545287	4.2481822704	5.0509256508	5.7944228052	6.4930175133
2	4.0879494441	4.8844518636	5.6297084371	6.3321154965	6.9992605338	7.6369670555
3	5.5205598281	6.2076233326	6.8688828130	7.5046459023	8.1172598797	8.7092259071
4	6.7867080901	7.4056654987	8.0097031246	8.5971174402	9.1683269015	9.7243497970
5	7.9441335871	8.5152343949	9.0770033453	9.6272676380	10.1656642600	10.6924917742
6	9.0226508533	9.5576160388	10.0864602026	10.6070045389	11.1185630862	11.6210674240
7	10.0401743416	10.5465223126	11.0487412666	11.5447896633	12.0338590400	12.5156900526
8	11.0085243037	11.4914275107	11.9715080333	12.4468977833	12.9167581611	13.3807317800
9	11.9360155632	12.3992183084	12.8604916131	13.3181394690	13.7713365311	14.2196783310
10	12.8287767529	13.2750964716	13.7201176498	14.1623023780	14.6008585064	15.0353631723

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by FCT under project No. CERN/FIS-PAR/0023/2021. E.B. was also supported by FCT and IST-ID under contract No. IST-ID/148/2018.

Appendix A: Approximate derivatives with Lagrange interpolation

In this appendix, we list the explicit expressions for the matrices that determine the approximate first and second derivatives of the wave function at the grid points.

1. Construction of the Lagrange polynomial

We start with a set of N points $\{p_j\}$, where $j = 1, \dots, N$, and the respective values of a function $f(p)$ at these points, $\{f_j\}$, where we abbreviate $f_j \equiv f(p_j)$. The Lagrange interpolating polynomial is the unique polynomial $L(p)$ of order $N - 1$ that passes exactly through these given points (p_j, f_j) , i.e.,

$$L(p_j) = f_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, N. \quad (\text{A1})$$

It can be written in the form

$$L(p) = \sum_{j=1}^N f_j L_j(p), \quad (\text{A2})$$

with

$$L_j(p) = \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^N \frac{p - p_k}{p_j - p_k} \quad (\text{A3})$$

To find the first derivative of the interpolating polynomial,

$$L'(p) = \sum_{j=1}^N f_j L'_j(p), \quad (\text{A4})$$

we only need to find $L'_j(p)$. Applying the rule for the derivative of a product, we get

$$L'_j(p) = \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq j}}^N \frac{1}{p_j - p_m} \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j \\ k \neq m}}^N \frac{p - p_k}{p_j - p_k}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Similarly, we get the second derivative through

$$L''(p) = \sum_{j=1}^N f_j L''_j(p), \quad (\text{A6})$$

and

$$L''_j(p) = \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq j}}^N \frac{1}{p_j - p_m} \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ l \neq j \\ l \neq m}}^N \frac{1}{p_j - p_l} \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j \\ k \neq l \\ k \neq m}}^N \frac{p - p_k}{p_j - p_k}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

2. Derivatives at the nodes

An important application of the Lagrange polynomials is the numerical approximation of the derivatives of the unknown function $f(p)$ that is only known at a list of points. The derivatives at arbitrary points can be calculated from the expressions (A4)-(A5) and (A6)-(A7), respectively. If the derivatives are needed only at the nodes themselves, this can be somewhat simplified.

First, note that for any specific node p_i , which is one of the set $\{p_j\}$, we get

$$L_j(p_i) = \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^N \frac{p_i - p_k}{p_j - p_k} = \delta_{ij}, \quad (\text{A8})$$

because if $i \neq j$, i will coincide with one of the k 's and therefore the product is zero because it must include a factor $p_i - p_i$, whereas each factor is 1 if $i = j$. Inserting in (A2), this also implies

$$L(p_i) = \sum_{j=1}^N f_j L_j(p_i) = \sum_{j=1}^N f_j \delta_{ij} = f_i, \quad (\text{A9})$$

as it must.

Next, we calculate (A5) for $p = p_i$.

$$L'(p_i) = \sum_{j=1}^N f_j L'_j(p_i), \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$L'_j(p_i) = \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq j}}^N \frac{1}{p_j - p_m} \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j \\ k \neq m}}^N \frac{p_i - p_k}{p_j - p_k}, \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$L''(p_i) = \sum_{j=1}^N f_j L''_j(p_i), \quad (\text{A12})$$

$$L''_j(p_i) = \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq j}}^N \frac{1}{p_j - p_m} \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ l \neq j \\ l \neq m}}^N \frac{1}{p_j - p_l} \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j \\ k \neq l \\ k \neq m}}^N \frac{p_i - p_k}{p_j - p_k}. \quad (\text{A13})$$

Note that $m = i$ and $l = i$ are not excluded from the sums, and that $k = i$ gives 0 in the product.

3. Interpolation on a subset of points

Usually we have a table of $n > N$ points and first need to select a subset of points on which to perform the N -point Lagrange interpolation. The result of the interpolated function and its derivatives will depend on the selected subset, and clearly different reasonable choices are possible.

We adopted an algorithm for the selection of the subset of points for the case that we want to calculate the derivatives at one of the n given points p_i . We assume that the closest neighbouring points should be selected, i.e., we need to determine the offset s , such that the interpolation will use all N points between $j = s + 1$ and

$j = s + N$:

$$L(p_i) = \sum_{j=s+1}^{s+N} f_j L_j(p_i) = f_i, \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$L'(p_i) = \sum_{j=s+1}^{s+N} f_j L'_j(p_i), \quad (\text{A15})$$

$$L'_j(p_i) = \sum_{\substack{m=s+1 \\ m \neq j}}^{s+N} \frac{1}{p_j - p_m} \prod_{\substack{k=s+1 \\ k \neq j \\ k \neq m}}^{s+N} \frac{p_i - p_k}{p_j - p_k}, \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$L''(p_i) = \sum_{j=s+1}^{s+N} f_j L''_j(p_i), \quad (\text{A17})$$

$$L''_j(p_i) = \sum_{\substack{m=s+1 \\ m \neq j}}^{s+N} \frac{1}{p_j - p_m} \sum_{\substack{l=s+1 \\ l \neq j \\ l \neq m}}^{s+N} \frac{1}{p_j - p_l} \prod_{\substack{k=s+1 \\ k \neq j \\ k \neq l \\ k \neq m}}^{s+N} \frac{p_i - p_k}{p_j - p_k}. \quad (\text{A18})$$

With our map (4.2), the points are distributed such that the distance between them increases as one moves to larger values. In this situation, it makes sense to take an equal number of points to the left and to the right of i if N is odd, but one more point to the left if N is even.

Our algorithm for determining s is:

- For odd N

- (i) If $i < \frac{N+1}{2}$: $s = 0$
- (ii) If $i > n - \frac{N-1}{2}$: $s = n - N$
- (iii) Else: $s = i - \frac{N+1}{2}$

- For even N

- (i) If $i < \frac{N+2}{2}$: $s = 0$
- (ii) If $i > n - \frac{N-2}{2}$: $s = n - N$
- (iii) Else: $s = i - \frac{N+2}{2}$.

-
- [1] E. Eichten, K. Gottfried, T. Kinoshita, J. Kogut, K. D. Lane, and T. M. Yan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **34**, 369 (1975).
[2] E. Eichten, K. Gottfried, T. Kinoshita, K. D. Lane, and T. M. Yan, Phys. Rev. D **17**, 3090 (1978).
[3] E. Eichten, K. Gottfried, T. Kinoshita, K. D. Lane, and T. M. Yan, Phys. Rev. D **21**, 203 (1980).
[4] S. Godfrey and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **32**, 189 (1985).
[5] T. Barnes, S. Godfrey, and E. S. Swanson, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 054026 (2005).
[6] G. Eichmann, R. Williams, H. Sanchis-Alepuz, R. Williams, R. Alkofer, and C. S. Fischer, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **91**, 1 (2016), arXiv:1606.09602 [hep-ph].
[7] R. Alkofer and L. von Smekal, Phys. Rept. **353**, 281 (2001).
[8] C. S. Fischer, J. Phys. G **G32**, R253 (2006).
[9] C. D. Roberts and A. G. Williams, Prog.Part.Nucl.Phys. **33**, 477 (1994), arXiv:hep-ph/9403224 [hep-ph].
[10] C. D. Roberts and S. M. Schmidt, Prog.Part.Nucl.Phys. **45**, S1 (2000), arXiv:nucl-th/0005064 [nucl-th].
[11] P. Maris and C. D. Roberts, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **E12**, 297 (2003).
[12] F. Gross, Phys. Rev. **186**, 1448 (1969).
[13] E. P. Biernat, F. Gross, M. T. Peña, and A. Stadler, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 016005 (2014).
[14] C. Savkli and F. Gross, Phys. Rev. C **63**, 035208 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/9911319 [hep-ph].
[15] F. Gross and J. Milana, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 2401 (1991).
[16] F. Gross and J. Milana, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 969 (1992).
[17] F. Gross and J. Milana, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 3332 (1994).
[18] F. Gross, Phys. Rev. **134**, B405 (1964).

- [19] F. Gross, *Phys. Rev.* **136**, B140 (1964).
- [20] E. P. Biernat, M. T. Peña, J. E. Ribeiro, A. Stadler, and F. Gross, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 096008 (2014), arXiv:1408.1625 [hep-ph].
- [21] D. Gromes, *Z. Phys. C* **26**, 401 (1984).
- [22] C. Michael, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 1219 (1986).
- [23] W. Lucha, F. F. Schoberl, and D. Gromes, *Phys. Rept.* **200**, 127 (1991).
- [24] G. S. Bali, K. Schilling, and A. Wachter, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 2566 (1997), arXiv:hep-lat/9703019 [hep-lat].
- [25] T. J. Allen, M. Olsson, and S. Veseli, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 094021 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/0001227 [hep-ph].
- [26] R. Alkofer, C. S. Fischer, and F. J. Llanes-Estrada, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **23**, 1105 (2008), arXiv:hep-ph/0607293.
- [27] V. Sauli, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 096004 (2012), arXiv:1112.1865 [hep-ph].
- [28] N. R. Soni, B. R. Joshi, R. P. Shah, H. R. Chauhan, and J. N. Pandya, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78**, 592 (2018), arXiv:1707.07144 [hep-ph].
- [29] N. R. Soni, R. M. Parekh, J. J. Patel, A. N. Gadaria, and J. N. Pandya, *Few Body Syst.* **63**, 77 (2022), arXiv:2012.00294 [hep-ph].
- [30] D. Kang and E. Won, *J. Comput. Phys.* **227**, 2970 (2008), arXiv:physics/0609176.
- [31] E. Eichten and F. Feinberg, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 2724 (1981).
- [32] D. Eyre and J. P. Vary, *Phys. Rev. D* **34**, 3467 (1986).
- [33] J.-K. Chen, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 036013 (2012), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 89, 099904 (2014)].
- [34] J. W. Norbury, D. E. Kahana, and K. Maung Maung, *Can. J. Phys.* **70**, 86 (1992).
- [35] K. M. Maung, D. E. Kahana, and J. W. Norbury, *Phys. Rev. D* **47**, 1182 (1993).
- [36] H. Hershbach, *Phys. Rev. D* **47**, 3027 (1993).
- [37] A. Tang and J. W. Norbury, *Phys. Rev. E* **63**, 066703 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0103276.
- [38] A. Deloff, *Annals of Physics* **322**, 2315 (2007).
- [39] J.-K. Chen, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 076006 (2013).
- [40] V. V. Andreev, *Phys. Part. Nucl. Lett.* **14**, 66 (2017).
- [41] S. Leitão, A. Stadler, M. T. Peña, and E. P. Biernat, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 096003 (2014), arXiv:1408.1834 [hep-ph].
- [42] E. J. Nyström, *Acta Mathematica* **54**, 185 (1930), publisher: Institut Mittag-Leffler.
- [43] A. Landé, as quoted in Ref. [44].
- [44] Y. R. Kwon and F. Tabakin, *Phys. Rev. C* **18**, 932 (1978).