Excitation levels and magic numbers of small para-Hydrogen clusters $(N \leq 40)$

Rafael Guardiola¹ and Jesús Navarro²

 $¹$ Departamento de Física Atómica y Nuclear,</sup> Facultad de Física, 46100 Burjassot, Spain 2 IFIC (CSIC-Universidad de Valencia), Apdo. 22085, 46071 Valencia, Spain (Dated: October 27, 2018)

Abstract

The excitation energies of parahydrogen clusters have been systematically calculated by the diffusion Monte Carlo technique in steps of one molecule from 3 to 40 molecules. These clusters possess a very rich spectra, with angular momentum excitations arriving up to $L = 13$ for the heavier ones. No regular pattern can be guessed in terms of the angular momenta and the size of the cluster. Clusters with $N = 13$ and 36 are characterized by a peak in the chemical potential and a large energy gap of the first excited level, which indicate the magical character of these clusters. From the calculated excitation energies the partition function has been obtained, thus allowing for an estimate of thermal effects. An enhanced production is predicted for cluster sizes $N = 13, 31$ and 36, in agreement with experiment.

PACS numbers: 67.40.Db, 36.40.-c, 61.46.Bc

I. INTRODUCTION

Small $(\text{pH}_2)_N$ clusters of parahydrogen have been produced in a cryogenic free jet expan-sion and studied by Raman spectroscopy [\[1](#page-13-0)]. The $Q(0)$ Raman line of the H_2 monomer is shifted as the number N of molecules in the cluster changes, thus providing a method to identify the cluster mass. The first seven resolved peaks next the monomer line have been assigned to clusters with $N = 2, \ldots, 8$ molecules. Although in that experiment the resolution was not enough to resolve larger sizes, broad maxima were observed at $N \approx 13$ and 33, and perhaps 55, which have been interpreted as a propensity for geometric shell structures. Indeed, classical static [\[2](#page-13-1), [3](#page-13-2), [4](#page-13-3)] and molecular dynamics [\[4,](#page-13-3) [5\]](#page-13-4) results, based on a generic Lennard-Jones interaction potential, indicate that the expected structures for such clusters are the so-called Mackay icosahedra [\[6\]](#page-13-5), exhibiting some magic sizes (13, 33, 55...) related to the packing of molecules in closed icosahedral arrangements. A very complete discussion of classical geometrical patterns and their relation with the interaction features can be found in Ref. $[7]$ and references herein. However, quantum effects play a major role in $\rm pH_{2}$ clusters, like in their analogous helium droplets. The path integral Monte Carlo (PIMC) simulations of Sindzingre *et al.* [\[8\]](#page-13-7) have shown indeed that the superfluid fraction in pH_2 clusters with 13 and 18 molecules become large at temperatures below $T\simeq 2$ K. This prediction prompted both experimental [\[9](#page-13-8)] and theoretical [\[10,](#page-13-9) [11](#page-13-10), [12](#page-13-11), [13\]](#page-13-12) research of small clusters consisting of pH² molecules surrounding an OCS chromophore, confirming the existence of a superfluid response.

Quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) methods have been widely used in recent years as a theoretical tool to study pH_2 clusters. Several QMC techniques have been employed to calculate their properties, namely variational Monte Carlo (VMC) and diffusion Monte Carlo (DMC) [\[14](#page-13-13), [15](#page-13-14), [16,](#page-13-15) [17,](#page-13-16) [18\]](#page-13-17), path integral Monte Carlo (PIMC) [\[8,](#page-13-7) [19,](#page-13-18) [20](#page-13-19), [21](#page-13-20), [22](#page-13-21)], reptation Monte Carlo (RMC) [\[23\]](#page-13-22) and path integral ground state (PIGS) Monte Carlo [\[24\]](#page-14-0). Only some specific values of the number of constituents N have been considered in the past, related to the expected MacKay icosahedra structures. More recently, systematic calculations as a function of the number of molecules in the cluster have been performed. The ground state energies and the one-body densities of \rm{pH}_{N} clusters have been calculated by the DMC technique in steps of one molecule from $N=3$ to 50 [\[17\]](#page-13-16), by the PIGS technique from $N=2$ to 20 [\[24\]](#page-14-0) and by the PIMC from N=5 to 40 [\[21](#page-13-20), [22\]](#page-13-21). The calculations show that $(\text{pH}_2)_N$

clusters exhibit a clear geometrical order, with the molecules occupying concentric spherical shells, which could be related to some polyhedric arrangement. The apparent incompatibility between the large superfluid fractions and the structured radial distribution densities has been recently clarified [\[21,](#page-13-20) [22](#page-13-21)] by PIMC calculations which show that superfluidity is localized at the surface of the clusters.

Whereas up to $N \simeq 22$ these calculations are substantially in agreement, for heavier clusters there are noticeable differences between DMC and PIMC results, particularly for $N \geq 26$. PIMC chemical potentials show very prominent peaks at N=26, 29, 34 and 39, in contrast with a smoother behavior obtained with DMC. These differences subsist even after an improved DMC calculation [\[18\]](#page-13-17), and seem to be related to thermal effects. According to Mezzacapo and Boninsegni [\[21](#page-13-20)] they should be associated to a coexistence of solid-like and liquid-like phases, with a dominance of the latter at low T, as a result of both the zero-point motion and quantum permutation exchanges. However, thermal effects could manifest in enhanced stability thresholds at finite temperature, similarly to what has been observed in ⁴He droplets [\[25\]](#page-14-1). Such droplets are definitely liquid-like and nevertheless they exhibit some magic numbers, which are not related to enhanced ground state binding energies at specific values of N . They are instead stability thresholds, related to the cluster sizes at which excited levels cross the chemical potential curve and become stabilized [\[26](#page-14-2)]. An analysis of the possible existence of similar enhanced stabilities in pH_2 could be helpful to interpret the experimental results of Ref. [\[1](#page-13-0)]

The purpose of the present article is to provide an accurate microscopic description of the ground state and the low-lying excited levels of $(pH_2)_N$ clusters. In the past, the excited states of the $N = 7$ cluster were analyzed by McMahon *et al.* [\[27\]](#page-14-3). We present here a systematic calculation of excitations with angular momentum from $L = 0$ to 13 for clusters with $N = 3, \ldots, 40$. For a given L-state the Schrödinger equation has been solved by means of stochastic DMC techniques using the pairwise potential determined by Buck $et al. [28]$ $et al. [28]$, hereafter referred to as BHKOS. Another popular choice is the potential due to Silvera and Goldman [\[29\]](#page-14-5), hereafter referred to as SG. Both potentials combine ab initio calculations with properties of the gas (or solid) as well as experimental information from collisions. The main difference among them is that SG contains a repulsive long-range term (c_9/r^9) to approximate the effective potential in a solid. As showed in Ref. [\[18](#page-13-17)], the BHOKS potential provides more binding than the SG one, and the BHOKS chemical potential is slightly higher than the SG one.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, technical details of the DMC calculations are given for the ground state and low-lying excited states. The energy levels of $(\text{pH}_2)_N$ clusters are presented and discussed in Sec. III. In Sec. IV the partition functions are obtained from the excitation energies, and they are applied to the calculation of the abundances in free jet expansions of parahydrogen clusters. A summary and some general conclusions are finally given in Sec. V.

II. THE DIFFUSION MONTE CARLO METHOD

The diffusion Monte Carlo (DMC) method [\[30\]](#page-14-6) solves the imaginary-time Schrödinger equation for a function $f(\mathcal{R}, t) = \Phi_{var}(\mathcal{R}) \Psi(\mathcal{R}, t)$ which is the product of the importancesampling wave function Φ_{var} and the true ground-state wave function Ψ . The variable $\mathcal R$ represents the set $(\mathbf{r}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{r}_N)$ of 3N coordinates of the N atoms which form the drop. The solution for f is obtained by constructing an approximate small-time Green's function $G(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}', \tau)$ which serves to advance f by a small time step τ ,

$$
f(\mathcal{R}', t + \tau) = \int d\mathcal{R}G(\mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R}, \tau) f(\mathcal{R}, t).
$$
 (1)

An initial set of walkers $\{\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \ldots \mathcal{R}_{N_w}\}$ is created to represent the function $f(\mathcal{R}, 0)$ at the initial time. After many repeated applications of the short-time approximate Green's function, all components of the starting wave function orthogonal to the ground state wave function disappear and the contributions of the other eigenstates go exponentially to zero as the time goes to infinity. The remaining set of walkers then provides a valid representation of the converged solution. In order to have a good statistical accuracy it is convenient to continue the application of the Green's function along a very large number of time steps and accumulate the resulting set of walkers. Then the mixed estimators of physically interesting quantities, such as the total energy, can be computed. Of course since the walkers are strongly correlated a block average is carried out in order to estimate the variance.

Our ground state calculations are based on a Jastrow-like importance sampling wave function depending on just two parameters

$$
\Phi_{\text{var}} = \prod_{i < j}^{N} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r_{ij}}{b}\right)^5 - \frac{r_{ij}}{p}\right) \tag{2}
$$

where $r_{ij} = |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|$ is the distance between the pair (i, j) . Once the variational parameters were determined for each value of N, DMC calculations were carried out with very small realtime steps $(5 \times 10^{-5} \text{ K}^{-1}$ to $1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ K}^{-1}$, for the light and heavier clusters, respectively) and very long number of evaluation steps. Notice that the Bose symmetry of the above guiding wave function is not modified in the DMC process. The inclusion of triplet correlations in the importance sampling function leads to a noticeable improvement of the variational energies, as showed in Ref. [\[18\]](#page-13-17). However, the DMC energies are essentially the same as those obtained with only two-body correlations, with slightly more binding in the heavier clusters. The main difference lies in the reduction of the standard deviation by typically a factor of two.

Importance sampling wave functions with a non-zero angular momentum may equally well be considered, and correspondingly the initial state will be an admixture of eigenstates of a specified angular momentum L. A convenient trial function with angular momentum L is the following

$$
\Phi_{\text{var}}^{(L)}(\mathcal{R}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \text{Re}\left\{ |\mathbf{r}_{i} - \mathbf{R}_{\text{cm}}|^{L} Y_{LL}(\bar{\omega}_{i}) \right\} \times \Phi_{\text{var}}(\mathcal{R}), \tag{3}
$$

where $\bar{\omega}_i$ stands for the spherical angles of the vector $\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{R}_{cm}$ which defines the position of the *i*-th particle with respect to the center-of-mass coordinate $\mathbf{R}_{cm} = \sum_i \mathbf{r}_i/N$, and Y_{LM} is a spherical harmonic. Note that the sum over all the constituent particles and the subtraction of the center of mass coordinate \mathbf{R}_{cm} are required to maintain the the Bose symmetry and the translational invariance, respectively. Again, the application of the imaginary-time Green's function will select the lowest eigenstate in the subspace of angular momentum L, the remaining contributions being exponentially suppressed as the time increases. The prefactor entering Eq. [\(3\)](#page-4-0) is identical to zero when $L = 1$. In that case we have used

$$
\Phi_{\text{var}}^{(1)}(\mathcal{R}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \text{Re}\left\{ |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{R}_{\text{cm}}|^3 Y_{11}(\bar{\omega}_i) \right\} \times \Phi_{\text{var}}(\mathcal{R}). \tag{4}
$$

A similar procedure to deal with L-states has been used in Ref. [\[27\]](#page-14-3) for the $N = 7$ cluster, and in Ref. [\[26\]](#page-14-2) for ⁴He droplets.

Certainly, the trial function for $L \neq 0$ states is not positive definite and consequently cannot be interpreted as a probability distribution function. We have used the so-called fixed-node approximation [\[31\]](#page-14-7) assuming that the nodal surfaces are fixed by the importance sampling function. In this approximation an exact energy for the lowest angular momentum L state is, in fact, not obtained. The improved variational wave function and the corresponding mixed estimator of the energy, which is derived, does, however, provide a variational upper bound.

Besides the excited states with angular momentum L , one should also consider vibrational excitations characterized by a radial quantum number n . In short, let us represent each state by (n, L) . With the previous trial wave function, the DMC method selects the lowest eigenstate $(0, L)$ in the subspace of angular momentum L. An useful estimate of the energies of the average vibrational excitations $(n \geq 1, L)$ in each L-subspace is obtained by using sum rules [\[32](#page-14-8), [33\]](#page-14-9), which only require the knowledge of the lowest L-state wave functions. Consider the exact lowest state for a given angular momentum L and the full set of eigenstates of this subspace in order of increasing energy, represented by $\Psi_0^{(L)}$ and $\{\Psi_n^{(L)}, E_n^{(L)}\}\$, respectively, where $n = 0, 1...$ is the vibrational quantum number. Let $Q(\mathcal{R})$ be an arbitrary operator, assumed to be scalar under rotations, for which the sum rule of order p is given by

$$
M_p^{(L)}[Q] = \sum_{(n,\ell)\neq(0,L)} (E_n^{(\ell)} - E_0^{(L)})^p \left| \langle \Psi_n^{(\ell)} | Q | \Psi_0^{(L)} \rangle \right|^2, \tag{5}
$$

where the sum extends over all eigenstates of the Hamiltonian with the exception of the lowest energy state $(0, L)$ of angular momentum L. An upper bound to the energy of the first excited state of the subspace L is obtained as

$$
E_1^{(L)} - E_0^{(L)} \le \frac{M_1^{(L)}[Q]}{M_0^{(L)}[Q]},
$$
\n(6)

which involves the energy weighted and the non-energy weighted sum rules. Using the completeness relation of the set of functions $\{\Psi_n^{(L)}\}$, they can be written as

$$
M_0^{(L)}[Q] = \langle \Psi_0^{(L)} | Q^2 | \Psi_0^{(L)} \rangle - \left| \langle \Psi_0^{(L)} | Q | \Psi_0^{(L)} \rangle \right|^2, \tag{7}
$$

$$
M_1^{(L)} = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \langle \Psi_0^{(L)} | \sum_{i=1}^N |\nabla_i Q|^2 | \Psi_0^{(L)} \rangle.
$$
 (8)

The computation of these expressions only requires a knowledge of the lowest state wave function of the angular momentum L subspace.

We present here results for the first vibrational state of the subspace $L = 0$, employing a general monopolar operator

$$
Q(\mathcal{R}) = \sum_{p=1}^{5} c_p \sum_{i < j} r_{ij}^p \,. \tag{9}
$$

The parameters c_p have been optimized so as to obtain the lowest upper bound to the first excited state. Notice that the excitations obtained are approximate because mixed matrix elements are used to calculate the required sum rules, so the strict variational character is lost.

III. THE ENERGY LEVELS OF PARAHYDROGEN CLUSTERS

Once calculated for each cluster the ground state $E_0^{(0)}$ $0^{(0)}(N)$ and the excited state energies $E_0^{(L)}$ $E_0^{(L)}(N)$ and $E_1^{(0)}$ $1^{(0)}(N)$, the excitation energies are defined as

$$
\Delta E_{L\neq 0}(N) = E_0^{(L)}(N) - E_0^{(0)}(N), \qquad (10)
$$

$$
\Delta E_0(N) = E_1^{(0)}(N) - E_0^{(0)}(N) \,. \tag{11}
$$

They are plotted as a function of N in figures [1-](#page-16-0)[3.](#page-18-0) For the sake of clarity, we have displayed them separately for each value of L in figures [1](#page-16-0)[-2](#page-17-0) and the full spectra is showed in figure [3.](#page-18-0) The chemical potential or dissociation energy

$$
\mu(N) = E_0^{(0)}(N-1) - E_0^{(0)}(N) \,, \tag{12}
$$

defined as the difference between the ground state energies of neighbor clusters, has also been plotted in all cases. Indeed the chemical potential defines the energetic region in which excited states are stable. Only stable states have been plotted in figures [1-](#page-16-0)[3.](#page-18-0)

As previously discussed in Refs. [\[17,](#page-13-16) [18\]](#page-13-17), the most prominent result regarding the chemical potential is the enhanced stability of the cluster $N = 13$, which confirms its magical character. A mild peak appears also at $N = 36$, but one cannot exclude that it could simply be a statistical fluctuation. An additional confirmation of its magicity will be given later on. In contrast, PIMC calculations of Refs. [\[21\]](#page-13-20) and [\[22](#page-13-21)], at $T=1$ and 0.5 K respectively, show an enhanced stability at $N = 13, 26, 29, 34,$ and 39.

The main characteristics of the spectra displayed in figures [1](#page-16-0) and [2](#page-17-0) can be summarized as follows. All clusters exhibit stable excitations for $L = 2$, 3 and 0 at $N = 3$ and onwards. The next excited level with $L = 4$ starts to be bound at $N = 4$, the following levels with $L = 5$ and 1 appear at $N = 6$. The next $L = 6, \ldots$ levels appear at regularly increasing size thresholds. In the considered size range the highest stable excited level corresponds to $L = 13$, which appears at $N = 31$ and onwards. The quadrupolar $L = 2$ excitation is the lowest one for all sizes, except at $N = 26, 28, 29$ and 37, for which the octupolar $L = 3$ state lies at a slightly lower energy. The excitations with $L \geq 7$ do not cross each other: the higher the angular momentum the higher the excitation energy. The vibrational excitation energies of the state $(n = 1, L = 0)$ present a smooth behavior as a function of N, apart from a mild minimum at $N = 13$. We have not pushed our calculations to the vibrational states $(1, L \neq 0)$. Presumably, they would also present a monotonic behavior with respect to their corresponding $(0, L)$ states. In contrast, the excitation energies of the states $(n = 0, L \neq 0)$ have a non-monotonic behavior with N.

The $N = 13$ cluster is very peculiar. Its excitation energies present a prominent peak for the states with $L = 1 - 5$, a prominent minimum for $L = 6$, and a pronounced change of trend for $L = 7$, 8 and 9. This cluster has no stable excited states for $L \geq 9$. No other so enhanced bumps appear up to $N = 40$. Such a behavior is related to the truly magic character of this size. Its enhanced stability results in a repulsion of the excitations, similarly to what has been observed in classical Lennard-Jones calculations [\[4,](#page-13-3) [34\]](#page-14-10). The prominent minimum found for $L = 6$ at $N = 13$ means that this value of the angular momentum is also special. A similar phenomenon was observed in the study of doped parahydrogen clusters $CO@(pH_2)_N$ by reptation QMC calculations [\[23\]](#page-13-22), where the time-correlation functions of the various multipole moments in the rotating-axes frame have been computed. A persistent crystal structure for $N = 12$ and a persistent time correlation of the $L = 6$ multipole has been observed by these authors. Their explanation for these facts was based in the property that the only non-null multipolar moments for the $N = 13$ cluster with icosahedral symmetry are $L = 6$ and $L = 10$.

Our results are compared in Table [I](#page-15-0) with those of McMahon *et al.* [\[27\]](#page-14-3) for $N = 7$ which, to the best of our knowledge, are the only available calculations of excited states of parahydrogen clusters. These authors have performed a DMC calculation using the BHKOS interaction and a trial wave function for L -excited states analogous to our Eq. (3) . It can be seen in the table that both calculations are in substantial agreement within at most two standard deviations.

In figure [3](#page-18-0) are collected our calculated DMC excitation energies, omitting error bars for the sake of clarity. The obtained spectrum for each $(\text{pH}_2)_N$ cluster is *complex*, in the sense that it does not resemble any of the simple models of excitations. The states with $L = 2$ are the lowest lying, apart from the few cases mentioned before. It is worth mentioning the presence of relevant energy gaps at $N = 13$ and $N = 36$, in coincidence with peaks in the chemical potential. Both facts indicate a magical character of these clusters. Note that analogous energy gaps have been determined in classical Lennard-Jones clusters [\[4\]](#page-13-3).

There is almost no information, neither experimental nor theoretical, of the spectrum of clusters weakly bound by van der Waals like interactions. An indirect determination of the $(\text{pH}_2)_2$ dimer excitations has been reported in Refs. [\[35](#page-14-11), [36](#page-14-12), [37\]](#page-14-13). These interesting experiments refer to the absorption of infrared radiation by parahydrogen gas at 20 K, slightly above the triple point. Just focusing in the region around the $Q_1(0)$ line there has been observed the *absence* of absorption at exactly the frequency of the free $Q_1(0)$ line, and the presence of two satellites at energies above and below the free parahydrogen frequency, interpreted as a signal of the dimer excited states. In practice, absorption experiments provide an indirect way of detecting the two-body ground state pH_2-pH_2 and measuring its spectrum.

In the case of ⁴He droplets, an indirect determination of their excitation energies results from the temperature-dependent analysis of the production abundances of such clusters in ultrasonic expansion of pressurized gas [\[26\]](#page-14-2). Sudden jumps have been observed in the quantum partition function at cluster sizes which can just accommodate one more additional stable excitation. The nice agreement between the experimental magic sizes and theoretical stability thresholds provides a confirmation of the calculated energy levels of these clusters.

In principle one could expect some parallelism between the spectra of ⁴He droplets and those made of parahydrogen: both constituents are bosons and the interaction is rather similar. However, our calculations rule out such an analogy, as helium clusters present regularly spaced spectra. In contrast, no simple pattern can be guessed for the spectra of parahydrogen clusters. Only the excitation energy of the $L = 0$ level has a smooth behavior with the number of pH_2 molecules, with a small inflection at $N = 13$. Its value is roughly constant near 20 K, quite far away from the dissociation limit, in contrast with the analogous level in ⁴He droplets which is close to the dissociation limit.

The $(n = 0, L > 1)$ of ⁴He excitations correspond to surface modes, described by ripplon like oscillations with radial frequencies given by [\[38,](#page-14-14) [39,](#page-14-15) [40\]](#page-14-16)

$$
\omega = \left[\frac{\sigma_0}{m\rho_0 R_0^3} L(L-1)(L+2)\right]^{1/2}.
$$
\n(13)

These frequencies were corrected by Tamura [\[41\]](#page-14-17) to include finite size effects and the

corrected expression reproduces very well the calculated DMC spectra of helium clusters [\[26](#page-14-2)]. Certainly, the smooth behavior related to the angular momentum dependence $[L(L-1)(L+1)]^{1/2}$ does not emerge in our calculated spectra of pH₂ clusters.

The excitation energy of the translationally invariant *forbidden* 1 mode, which requires a nodal surface in the radial coordinate space, has a quite high energy compared with the allowed levels $(2, 3, \ldots)$, like in the case of helium droplets. Nevertheless, its energy is again far away from the dissociation limit, in contrast with the case of ⁴He clusters. With respect to the variation with the number of molecules, it is noticeably smoother than the levels of low angular momentum (up to $L = 4$) but reveals a prominent bump near $N = 13$.

At the light of our calculations we infer a coexistence of liquid and crystal structure near $N = 13$, the liquid part being the responsable of the $L = 2, 3, ...$ excitations, and the crystal part the responsable of the $L = 6$ excitation. The region around $N = 13$ where the energy of the $L = 6$ mode is decreasing up to $N = 13$ and afterwards increasing up to a plateau will correspond to partial icosahedral symmetry. We have analyzed the known crystal structures related to Lennard-Jones clusters reported in the Cambridge Cluster Data Base [\[42\]](#page-14-18), by computing the multipolar moments. There are three significative cases worth to be mentioned. Firstly, the $N = 19$ cluster, for which the multipolar moments $L = 3$ and $L = 4$ are null and for which we obtain a very low $L = 2$ excitation and much higher $L = 3$ (a peak) and $L = 4$. Secondly, the $N = 26$ case, whose first non-null multipole is $L = 3$ and appears in our calculations with a minimum for this excitation. Finally, the $N = 38$ cluster, whose first non-null multipole is $L = 4$ appearing again in our calculations a valley around this value of the number of constituents. In conclusion, even if we do not find a simple or familiar model to describe the excitations of parahydrogen clusters, some aspects of the spectrum are qualitatively described by assuming a coexistence of liquid and solid phases.

IV. THERMAL EFFECTS AND MAGIC NUMBERS

The knowledge of the full spectra allows us to analyze different thermal effects by means of the partition function. In particular, we consider in this section the expectation value of the temperature-dependent energy $E(T)$ and the effect of excited states on the production abundances of clusters in free jet expansion of pressurized gas.

The partition function of each cluster is expressed as the product

$$
\Xi_N = Z_N \xi_N \tag{14}
$$

of the center-of-mass (Z_N) and internal (ξ_N) partition functions. The former can be written as

$$
Z_N = \left(\frac{NmkT}{2\pi\hbar^2}\right)^{3/2}.\tag{15}
$$

The internal partition function is given in terms of bound state energy levels E_j of the state $j = (n, L)$ of the N-molecule cluster by

$$
\xi_N = \sum_j g_j(N) \exp\left[-\frac{E_j(N)}{kT}\right],\tag{16}
$$

where the degeneracy factor for the state with the radial quantum number n and angular momentum L is given by $g_j = 2L + 1$.

By using the notation of section [III,](#page-6-0) Eqs. [\(10-11\)](#page-6-1), the internal partition function may be written in a computationally convenient form

$$
\xi_N = \exp\left[-\frac{E_0^{(0)}(N)}{kT}\right] \left[1 + \sum_L (2L+1) \exp\left[-\frac{\Delta E_L(N)}{kT}\right]\right],\tag{17}
$$

where $\Delta E_L(N)$ are the excitation energies for angular momentum L, and the statistical factor has been written in the explicit form $(2L + 1)$.

The internal energy of a given cluster at a temperature T is given by

$$
E_N(T) = E_0^{(0)}(N) + \frac{1 + \sum_L (2L+1)\Delta E_L(N)e^{-\Delta E_L(N)/kT}}{1 + \sum_L (2L+1)e^{-\Delta E_L(N)/kT}}.
$$
\n(18)

Sizable thermal effects on the energy values will start to appear at temperatures close to the energy of the first excited state. Thus, at $T = 1$ the energy changes are minimal, with a maximum of 0.4 K for $N \simeq 20$, related to the minimum of ΔE_2 (see fig. [1\)](#page-16-0). The energy of the other clusters remains practically unaltered, and consequently the chemical potential at $T = 1$ has practically the same shape as at $T = 0$. This observation is interesting in relation with PIMC calculations, which have been carried out at $T = 0.5$ K [\[22](#page-13-21)] and $T = 1$ K [\[21\]](#page-13-20). The series of peaks observed in the PIMC chemical potential as a function of the number of molecules is not reproduced by the present extension of DMC to $T = 1$. Although different interactions have been used in these calculations, namely BHKOS in DMC and SG in PIMC, we do not expect this as the origin of the differences. Indeed, DMC results using both interactions [\[18](#page-13-17)] give substantially the same chemical potential shape, apart from the mentioned mild peak at $N = 36$, not visible with the SG interaction.

On the other hand, the effect of the temperature on the mechanism by which clusters are formed in the free jet expansion turns out to be very interesting. The analysis which follows is similar to the one carried out for Helium droplets [\[25](#page-14-1), [26\]](#page-14-2) which explained the experimentally observed anomalously high production rates of clusters with a specific number of constituents, the anomalies being related to the excitation spectrum of the clusters and not to a magical character.

Let us assume that cluster growth is dominated by the chemical equilibrium reaction

$$
(pH_2)_{N-1} + pH_2 + X \rightleftharpoons (pH_2)_N + X , \tag{19}
$$

where X is a spectator particle required to fulfill the energy and momentum conservation laws. The related equilibrium constant is independent of the spectator particle and is given by a quotient of partition functions

$$
K_N = \frac{\Xi_N}{\Xi_{N-1}\Xi_1} \,. \tag{20}
$$

The equilibrium constant is dominated by the quotient Ξ_N/Ξ_{N-1} , which is conveniently written as

$$
\frac{\Xi_N}{\Xi_{N-1}} = \left(\frac{N}{N-1}\right)^{3/2} e^{\mu(N)/kT} \frac{1 + \sum_L g_L e^{-\Delta E_L(N)/kT}}{1 + \sum_L g_L e^{-\Delta E_L(N-1)/kT}} \tag{21}
$$

Neither the chemical potential nor the excitation energies are smooth functions of N , as has been show in figure [3.](#page-18-0) One can expect that the above quotient will reflect such a non monotonic behavior as jumps at particular values of N . The quotient of partition functions Ξ_N/Ξ_{N-1} is displayed in figure [4](#page-19-0) as a function of N for several values of temperature, lower than the source temperatures of Ref. [\[1](#page-13-0)], about 40 K. As these ratios span several orders of magnitude as T varies, we have arbitrarily given the value 1 to the case $N = 40$.

Clearly pronounced peaks are observed at $N = 13, 31$ and 36, and less pronounced at $N = 26$. Other peaks exist, like $N = 19$ and $N = 29$, but they only appear at specific values of T. The pronounced peaks give an explanation of the experimentally determined production peaks at $N = 13$ and 33. It should be mentioned that the relation between the Raman shift and the number of molecules of the clusters in the work of Ref. [\[1\]](#page-13-0) is

an *extrapolation* from small values of N , and the position of the peak at $N = 33$ may be imprecise. It is worth noticing that the last value is half way between the theoretical peaks at $N = 31$ and $N = 36$ related to an enhanced production.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we have determined the excited-state energy levels of parahydrogen clusters containing up to 40 molecules by means of a DMC calculation based on an importancesampling function with a nonzero angular momentum L plus the fixed-node approximation. A variational upper bound has been obtained for the lowest-lying energy of a given L-state. Bound excited states have been found for states $(n = 0, L = 1 - 13)$ and $(n = 1, L = 0)$, the size threshold for binding increasing as L increases. It turns out that the spectra are complex, in the sense that no simple pattern can be guessed to fit them as a function of the angular momentum of the state and the size number. In particular, and contrary to what happens in the analogous system of helium droplets, the liquid drop model formula is excluded.

The $N = 13$ and $N = 36$ clusters are magic, as indicated by the existence of peaks in the chemical potential in coincidence with energy gaps for their first low-lying excited state, relative to their neighbors.

The spectra of weakly bound van der Waals clusters have not yet been experimentally measured. Only an indirect determination [\[25,](#page-14-1) [26\]](#page-14-2) has resulted from the analysis of enhanced production of clusters of ⁴He in terms of the successive stabilization of excited levels at growing values of the number of constituents of the clusters. The analysis of the partition function of parahydrogen clusters has revealed the existence of production enhancements at $N = 13, 31$ and 36, in nice agreement with the experiment [\[1\]](#page-13-0). The effect is similar to the case of helium clusters, but the nature is very different. Instead of the stability threshold reason of helium clusters, here the enhanced production is basically related to the existence of energy gaps in the excitations at the mentioned values of the number of constituents. There may be some corrections due to not including the $(n = 1, L \neq 0)$ levels in the partition function. We expect, however, these effects to be small, as presumably such vibrational excitations would be some 20 K above the non-vibrational $(n = 0, L)$ corresponding level.

Acknowledgments

Stimulating conversations with S. Montero, M. Sevryuk and J.P. Toennies are gratefully acknowledged. This work has been supported by MCyT (Spain), grant No. FIS2007-60133.

- [1] G. Tejeda, J.M. Fernández, S. Montero, D. Blume, and J. P. Toennies, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 223401 (2004).
- [2] M.R. Hoare and P. Pal, Adv. Phys. 20, 161 (1971).
- [3] M.R. Hoare, Adv. Chem. Phys. 40, 49 (1979).
- [4] J.D. Honeycutt and H.C. Andersen, J. Phys. Chem. 91, 4950 (1987).
- [5] J. Jellinek, T.L. Beck and R.S. Berry, J. Chem. Phys. 84, 2783 (1986).
- [6] A.L. Mackay, Acta Crystallogr. 15, 916 (1962).
- [7] F. Baletto and R. Ferrando, Rev. Mod. Phys. 77, 317 (2005).
- [8] Ph. Sindzingre, D.M. Ceperley and M.L. Klein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 1871 (1991).
- [9] S. Grebenev, B. Sartakov, J.P. Toennies, and A.F. Vilesov, Science 289, 1532 (2000).
- [10] Y. Kwon and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 273401 (2002).
- [11] F. Paesani, R.E. Zillich, and K.B. Whaley, J. Chem. Phys. 119, 11682 (2003).
- [12] J. Tang and A.R.W. McKellar, J. Chem. Phys. 121, 3087 (2004).
- [13] F. Paesani, R.E. Zillich, Y. Kown, and K.B. Whaley, J. Chem. Phys. 122, 181106 (2005).
- [14] M.V. Rama Krishna and K.B. Whaley, Z. Phys. D 20, 223 (1991).
- [15] M.A. McMahon, R.N. Barnett and K.B. Whaley, J. Chem. Phys. 99, 8818 (1993).
- [16] M.A. McMahon and K.B. Whaley, Chem. Phys. 182, 119 (1994).
- [17] R. Guardiola and J. Navarro, Phys. Rev. A 74, 025201 (2006).
- [18] R. Guardiola and J. Navarro, Central Eur. J. Phys. in press (2008)
- [19] D. Scharf, M.L. Klein and G.J. Martyna, J. Chem. Phys. 97, 3590 (1992).
- [20] F. Mezzacapo and M. Boninsegni, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 045301 (2006).
- [21] F. Mezzacapo and M. Boninsegni, Phys. Rev. A 75, 033201 (2007).
- [22] S.A. Khairallah, M.B. Sevryuk, D.M. Ceperley, and J.P. Toennies, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 183401 (2007).
- [23] S. Baroni and S. Moroni, Chem. Phys. Chem. **6**, 1884 (2005).
- [24] J.E. Cuervo and P.N. Roy, J. Chem. Phys. **125**, 124314 (2006).
- [25] R. Brühl, R. Guardiola, A. Kalinin, O. Kornilov, J. Navarro, T. Savas, and J.P. Toennies, Phys. Rev. Lett, 92, 185301 (2004).
- [26] R. Guardiola, O. Kornilov, J. Navarro. and J.P. Toennies, J. Chem. Phys. 124, 084307 (2006).
- [27] M.A. McMahon, R.N. Barnett, and K.B. Whaley, J. Chem. Phys. 99, 8816 (1993).
- [28] U. Buck, F. Huisken, A. Kohlhase, D. Otten, and J. Schaeffer, J. Chem. Phys. 78, 4439 (1983).
- [29] I.F. Silvera, V.V. Goldman, J. Chem. Phys. 69, 4209 (1978).
- [30] J. Boronat, in Microscopic Approaches to Quantum Liquids in Confined Geometries, edited by E. Krotscheck and J. Navarro (World Scientific, Singapore, 2002), Chap 2, pp 21-90.
- [31] P.J. Reynolds, D.M. Ceperley, B.J. Alder, and W.A. Lester Jr., J. Chem. Phys. 77, 5593 (1982).
- [32] O. Bohigas, A.M. Lane and J. Martorell, Phys. Rep. 51, 267 (1979).
- [33] E. Lipparini and S. Stringari, Phys. Rep. 175, 103 (1989).
- [34] D.D. Frantz, J. Chem. Phys. **115**, No. 13, 6136 (2001)
- [35] A. Watanabe and H.L. Welsh, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13, 810 (1964).
- [36] A.R.W. McKellar, J. Chem. Phys. **92**, 3261 (1990).
- [37] A.R.W. McKellar, J. Chem. Phys. 95, 3081 (1991).
- [38] L. Rayleigh, Proc. R. Soc. London 29, 71 (1879).
- [39] A. Bohr and B. R. Mottelson, Nuclear Structure, Nuclear Deformations, II. (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998), pp. 654-676.
- [40] S. Stringari, in The Chemical Physics of Atomic and Molecular Clusters, edited by G. Scoles (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1990), pp. 223-228.
- [41] A. Tamura, Z. Phys. D: At., Mol. Clusters **40**, 225 (1997).
- [42] D.J. Wales and J.P.K. Doye, J. Phys. Chem. A 101, 5111 (1997). Coordinates of the clusters may be found in<http://www-wales.ch.cam.ac.uk/CCD.html>

	McMahon et al.	Present results
$E_0^{(0)}$	$-98.89(15)$	$-98.76(1)$
μ	25.90(15)	25.37(2)
ΔE_2	8.3(3)	7.92(13)
ΔE_3	13.2(2)	12.92(17)
ΔE_5	15.4(2)	14.74(18)

TABLE I: Cluster with $N = 7$. DMC results of Ref. [\[27](#page-14-3)] are compared with present results. All energies are in K È,

FIG. 1: (Color online) Excitation energies (in K) of $(pH_2)_N$ clusters as a function of the number N of constituents for states with $L = 1-6$. The chemical potential $\mu(N)$ is also displayed to indicate the stability limit.

FIG. 2: (Color online) Excitation energies (in K) of $(pH_2)_N$ clusters as a function of the number N of constituents for states with $L = 7 - 13$ and the vibrational state with $L = 0$. The chemical potential $\mu(N)$ (green dots) is also displayed to indicate the stability limit.

FIG. 3: (Color online) Excitation energies (in K) of $(pH_2)_N$ clusters as a function of the number of constituents. The chemical potential $\mu(N)$ (green dots) is also displayed to indicate the stability limit. Levels with $L = 2$ and 0 are plotted in red and blue, respectively.

FIG. 4: (Color online) The ratio of the partition functions Ξ_N/Ξ_{N-1} is plotted versus N for several values of temperature: 1, 5, 10, 15, and 20 K. The scale has been arbitrarily fixed at $N = 40$.