

A curious proof of the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula

Equation (39) of [1] states the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula for two operators a, b that commute with their commutator $[a, b]$

$$e^a e^b = e^{a+b+[a,b]/2}, \quad (1.1)$$

and provides the outline of an interesting method of proof. That method is to consider the derivative of

$$f(\lambda) = e^{\lambda a} e^{\lambda b} e^{-\lambda(a+b)}, \quad (1.2)$$

That derivative is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{df}{d\lambda} &= e^{\lambda a} a e^{\lambda b} e^{-\lambda(a+b)} + e^{\lambda a} b e^{\lambda b} e^{-\lambda(a+b)} - e^{\lambda a} b e^{\lambda b} (a+b) e^{-\lambda(a+b)} \\ &= e^{\lambda a} \left(a e^{\lambda b} + b e^{\lambda b} - e^{\lambda b} (a+b) \right) e^{-\lambda(a+b)} \\ &= e^{\lambda a} \left([a, e^{\lambda b}] + [b, e^{\lambda b}] \right) e^{-\lambda(a+b)} \\ &= e^{\lambda a} [a, e^{\lambda b}] e^{-\lambda(a+b)}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

The commutator above is proportional to $[a, b]$

$$\begin{aligned} [a, e^{\lambda b}] &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} [a, b^k] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} k b^{k-1} [a, b] \\ &= \lambda \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{k-1}}{(k-1)!} b^{k-1} [a, b] \\ &= \lambda e^{\lambda b} [a, b], \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

so

$$\frac{df}{d\lambda} = \lambda [a, b] f. \quad (1.5)$$

To get the above, we should also do the induction demonstration for $[a, b^k] = kb^{k-1} [a, b]$. This clearly holds for $k = 0, 1$. For any other k we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 [a, b^{k+1}] &= ab^{k+1} - b^{k+1}a \\
 &= \left([a, b^k] + b^k a \right) b - b^{k+1} a \\
 &= kb^{k-1} [a, b] b + b^k ([a, b] + ba) - b^{k+1} a \\
 &= kb^k [a, b] + b^k [a, b] \\
 &= (k+1)b^k [a, b] \quad \square
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1.6}$$

Observe that eq. (1.5) is solved by

$$f = e^{\lambda^2 [a, b] / 2}, \tag{1.7}$$

which gives

$$e^{\lambda^2 [a, b] / 2} = e^{\lambda a} e^{\lambda b} e^{-\lambda(a+b)}. \tag{1.8}$$

Right multiplication by $e^{\lambda(a+b)}$ which commutes with $e^{\lambda^2 [a, b] / 2}$ and setting $\lambda = 1$ recovers eq. (1.1) as desired.

What I wonder looking at this, is what thought process led to trying this in the first place? This is not what I would consider an obvious approach to demonstrating this identity.

Bibliography

- [1] Roy J Glauber. Some notes on multiple-boson processes. *Physical Review*, 84(3):395, 1951. [1](#)