

# Solution of the Schrödinger equation containing a Perey-Buck nonlocality.

George H. Rawitscher

*Physics Department, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269*

## Abstract

The solution of a radial Schrödinger equation for  $\psi(r)$  containing a nonlocal potential of the form  $\int K(r, r') \psi(r') dr'$  is obtained to high accuracy by means of two methods. An application to the Perey-Buck nonlocality is presented, without using a local equivalent representation. The first method consists in expanding  $\psi$  in a set of Chebyshev polynomials, and solving the matrix equation for the expansion coefficients numerically. An accuracy of between  $1 : 10^{-5}$  to  $1 : 10^{-11}$  is obtained, depending on the number of polynomials employed. The second method consists in expanding  $\psi$  into a set of  $N_S$  Sturmian functions of positive energy, supplemented by an iteration procedure. For  $N_S = 15$  an accuracy of  $1 : 10^{-4}$  is obtained without iterations. After one iteration the accuracy is increased to  $1 : 10^{-6}$ . Both methods are applicable to a general nonlocality  $K$ . The spectral method is less complex (requires less computing time) than the Sturmian method, but the latter can be very useful for certain applications.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The solution of the Schrödinger equation in the presence of a nonlocal potential has been the subject of many investigations since 1934 [1]. In the optical model one source of nonlocality occurs in order to describe the knock-on scattering (a manifestation of the identity of nucleons and of the Pauli exclusion principle). Another nonlocality occurs in order to describe the dynamic polarization of the target or projectile during the scattering process (The Feshbach potential). An interesting study of the relation between both nonlocalities and the microscopic structure of target nuclei has recently been presented [2]. The knock-on process leads to a semi-separable rank one nonlocality (the meaning of "rank" is explained in Appendix A), while the dynamic polarization nonlocality leads to a general kernel  $K(\vec{r}, \vec{r}')$  that acts on the wave function  $\psi$  in the form of an integral in the Schrödinger equation

$$[-\nabla^2 + V(\vec{r}) - k^2] \psi(\vec{r}') = - \int K(\vec{r}, \vec{r}') \psi(\vec{r}') d^3\vec{r}'. \quad (1)$$

The potential  $V$  and the integral over the kernel  $K$  are in units of inverse length squared, and are obtained by transforming them from their energy units into  $fm^{-2}$  units by multiplication by the well known factor  $2m/\hbar^2$ . Here  $m$  is the reduced mass of the incident particle,  $\hbar$  is Plank's constant divided by  $2\pi$ ,  $V$  is the local part of the potential including the spin orbit interaction, and  $k$  is the wave number of the incident projectile, related to the center of mass energy  $E$  by  $(2m/\hbar^2)E = k^2$ . For application to the case of nucleon scattering from a nucleus,  $(\hbar^2/2m)$  can be set approximately equal to  $20.4 MeV fm^{-2}$ . Other analytical forms of nonlocalities have also been introduced [3], and a particular velocity dependent form is described in Ref. [4].

For the case that  $K$  is a semi-separable rank one operator, the solution of Eq. (1) was initially obtained by various laborious combinations of solutions of a local equation [5], subsequently a perturbative method using the Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) [6] was developed [7], and later a solution using a spectral [8] expansion into Chebyshev polynomials [9] was presented [10]. The latter did not make use of perturbation theory but applied only to this particular semi-separable rank one nonlocality. Other methods of solution for the nonlocality of the type of Eq. (1) have also been developed. In 1990 Kim and Udagawa [11] presented an efficient solution for a general nonlocal potential  $K$  using a Lanczos iterative method. Other iterative methods were also developed [12], [13]. Expansions into powers

of the momentum operator have been presented [14], [15], and local equivalent potentials have been developed [16] and used widely [17]. A different method of solution, employing expansions into Chebyshev polynomials, has also been described previously [18] for nonlocal potentials.

It is the purpose of the present article to present an alternate method, different from either method described above, by using a combination of the Spectral method and the SVD method. The method is nonperturbative, does not depend on a choice of an auxiliary local potential  $U_0$ , can reach an accuracy better than  $1 : 10^{-11}$ , is applicable to a general kernel  $K$ , and its complexity is less than that of Ref. [18]. A numerical example is given for the case of the Perey-Buck nonlocality [16], and a comparison with an iterative expansion into Sturmian functions [19] is also presented. That comparison not only serves as a check on the Spectral method presented here, but also serves to underline the usefulness of Sturmian expansions. As an example, Sturmian functions were found [20] to be very instrumental in describing resonances in low energy nucleon-nucleus scattering, as well as in implementing the Pauli exclusion principle, both of which are not generally taken account of in the conventional numerical solution of coupled channel equations.

In section II the version of the Perey-Buck nonlocality kernel used for the numerical application will be defined, in Section III the spectral method combined with the SVD decomposition will be described, in Section IV a sturmian expansion method for the wave function solution, together with an iterative correction method, is described, and Section V contains the summary and conclusions.

## II. THE PEREY-BUCK NONLOCALITY

This nonlocality was first introduced by Frahn and Lemmer [21], and developed further by Perey and Buck [16]. The kernel is of the form

$$\bar{K}(\vec{r}, \vec{r}') = U\left(\frac{1}{2}|\vec{r} + \vec{r}'|\right) \frac{1}{\pi^{3/2} \beta^3} e^{-[\vec{r} - \vec{r}']^2 / \beta^2}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\beta$  is the nonlocality parameter. For the present application a simpler form will be adopted,

$$K(\vec{r}, \vec{r}') = V_{PB}(r) h(\vec{r}, \vec{r}') \quad (3)$$




FIG. 1: The Perey-Buck nonlocality function  $h_L(r_1, r_2)$ . for  $r_1 = 1.0 \text{ fm}$ , for various values of the partial wave angular momentum  $L$ .




FIG. 2: Same as Fig. 1 for  $r_1 = 7 \text{ fm}$ .

with

$$h(\vec{r}, \vec{r}') = \frac{1}{\pi^{3/2} \beta^3} e^{-[\vec{r}-\vec{r}']^2/\beta^2}. \quad (4)$$

The kernel  $K$  given by Eq. (3) is convenient for the purpose of numerical calculation but is no longer symmetric. For the partial wave decomposition, for each value of the angular momentum number  $L$  the angular momentum projection  $h_L(r, r')$  of the operator  $h$  is given in the Appendix of Ref. [16] in terms of Spherical Bessel functions and of gaussian exponentials in  $r$  and  $r'$ . The behavior of  $h_L(r, r')$  as a function of  $r'$  (indicated as  $r_2$ ) is illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2 for two values of  $r$  (indicated as  $r_1$ ), respectively, and using for  $\beta$  the standard value  $0.84 \text{ fm}$ .




FIG. 3: Potentials  $V_{PB}$  and  $V_{WS}$  as a function of  $r$ . Both potentials are of the Woods Saxon type, given by Eq. (5).  $V_{PB}$  is the potential that is multiplied into the nonlocal term  $h_L(r, r')$  according to Eq. (3) with parameters given in Eq. (6). The one denoted as  $V_{WS}$  has parameters given by  $(V_0, R, a) = (-5 fm^{-2}, 9 fm, 0.5 fm)$ , and is used to define the Sturmian functions described further below.

One sees from these figures that the angular momentum dependence of  $h_L(r, r')$  is reduced with increasing values of  $r$ , and that  $h_L$  peaks in the vicinity of  $r$ . The decrease of  $K_L(r, r') = V_{PB}(r) h_L(r, r')$  with distance  $r$  or  $r'$  is assured by the decrease with  $r$  of the factor  $V_{PB}(r)$ . The latter is taken to be of the Woods-Saxon form

$$V_{PB}(r) = V_0 / (1 + \exp[(r - R)/a]), \quad (5)$$

using for the parameters the values

$$V_0 = -3.36 fm^{-2}, \quad R = 3.5 fm, \quad a = 0.6 fm \quad (6)$$

This potential is illustrated in Fig. 3, where it is also compared with a potential  $V_{WS}$  which will be used to generate a set of Sturmian basis functions, to be used in a subsequent section.

### III. THE SPECTRAL METHOD

A version of the spectral method employed here was developed recently [9]. It consists in dividing the radial interval into partitions, and obtaining two independent solutions of the Schrödinger Eq. (1) in each partition. These solutions are obtained by transforming Eq. (1) into an equivalent Lippmann-Schwinger integral equation (L-S), and solving the

latter by expanding the solution into Chebyshev functions, mapped to the interval  $[-1, +1]$ . The corresponding discretized matrices are not sparse, but are of small dimension, and the two independent functions are very precise (accuracy of  $1 : 10^{-11}$ ). The solution  $\psi$  in each partition is obtained by a linear combination of the two independent functions, and the matrix required to obtain the expansion coefficients has a dimension twice as large as the number of partitions, but it is sparse. Details are given in Ref. [9], and a pedagogical version is found in Ref. [22]. For the present application the division of the radial interval into partitions is not made, because the effect of the nonlocal potential would extend into more than one partition, making the programming more cumbersome.

In the presence of a nonlocal potential  $K$ , the (L-S) equation for the partial wave function  $\psi$  and angular momentum number  $L = 0$  takes the form

$$\psi(r) = F(r) + \int_0^\infty \mathcal{G}_0(r, r') [V(r')\delta(r' - r'') + K(r', r'')] \psi(r'') dr'' dr', \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathcal{G}_0(r, r')$  is the Green's function given by

$$\mathcal{G}_0(r, r') = -\frac{1}{k} F(r_<) \times H(r_>), \quad (8)$$

where  $(r, r') = (r_<, r_>)$  if  $r \leq r'$  and  $(r, r') = (r_>, r_<)$  if  $r \geq r'$ , where

$$F(r) = \sin(kr); \quad H(r) = \cos(kr) + i \sin(kr), \quad (9)$$

and where  $k$  is the wave number.

The nonlocal part  $K$  of the potential is expanded by means of the Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) as follows. First a set of Chebyshev support points  $\xi_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  are defined in each partition and the corresponding discretized matrix  $\mathcal{K}_{i,j} = K(\xi_i, \xi_j)$  is obtained, where  $N$  is the number of Chebyshev polynomials  $T_0, T_1, \dots, T_{N-1}$  to be used in the expansion. These support points are the zeros of the first Chebyshev polynomial  $T_N(x)$  not used in the expansion, mapped into the radial partition interval, as described previously [9, 22]. However, in the present application only one large partition is used. The singular value decomposition of a  $N \times N$  matrix  $\mathcal{K}$  is given by [6],  $\mathcal{K} = U \mathbf{S} V^\dagger$ , or  $\mathcal{K}_{i,j} = \sum_{s=1}^N u_{i,s} \sigma_s (v_{j,s})^\dagger$ ,  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . This result can be expressed in terms of the column vectors  $\mathbf{u}_s$  and  $\mathbf{v}_s$  of the  $N \times N$  unitary matrices  $U$  and  $V$ , respectively

$$\mathcal{K}_{i,j} = \sum_{s=1}^N \mathbf{u}_s(i) \sigma_s [\mathbf{v}_s(j)]^\dagger, \quad (10)$$

and  $\mathbf{S}$  is a diagonal matrix containing the singular values  $\sigma_s$ , with  $s = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . The  $\sigma_s$  are positive numbers, ordered in descending values, and the symbol  $\dagger$  signifies transposition and complex conjugation. The matrices  $U$  and  $V^\dagger$  are unitary, but are not orthogonal to each other.

According to the Eq. (10) the matrix  $\mathcal{K}$  can be expressed in terms of a sum of products  $(\mathbf{u}) \times (\mathbf{v})^\dagger$ , each of which represents a rank one  $N \times N$  matrix. Thus, if the values of the wave function  $\psi$  at the support points  $\xi_j$  were expressed as a column vector  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ , with  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_j = \psi(\xi_j)$ , then the integral in over  $dr''$  of the dot-product  $[\mathbf{v}_s]^\dagger \cdot \boldsymbol{\psi}$ , as required in Eq. (7), would be given by

$$\langle \mathbf{v}_s | \boldsymbol{\psi} \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^N v^\dagger(s, j) w_j \boldsymbol{\psi}_j, \quad (11)$$

where  $w_j$  are integration weights. Hence the action of  $K$  on  $\psi$  can be broken into simpler expressions of the type

$$(\mathcal{K}\boldsymbol{\psi})_i = \sum_{s=1}^N \mathbf{u}_s(i) \sigma_s \langle \mathbf{v}_s | \boldsymbol{\psi} \rangle. \quad (12)$$

In the spectral method, the integral  $\langle \mathbf{v}_s | \boldsymbol{\psi} \rangle$  is done by mapping  $\psi(r) \rightarrow \bar{\psi}(x)$  onto the interval  $[-1 \leq x \leq +1]$ , by expanding  $\bar{\psi}(x)$  into Chebyshev polynomials,

$$\bar{\psi}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^N a_j T_{j-1}(x). \quad (13)$$

and by using the integral properties of the Chebyshev polynomials. The various overlap integrals involving Chebyshev polynomials are obtained by a method denoted as the Chebyshev-Gauss integration procedure, and is given by Eq. (50) of Ref. [22]. By this means Eq. (7) can be transformed into an equation containing matrices acting on the expansion coefficients  $a_j$ , and its algebraic solution permits one to obtain the coefficients  $a_j$ , and hence  $\psi(r)$  via Eq. (13). The method utilizing the SVD expansion, described above, can be utilized for any non-singular matrix, and hence the method applies to any non-singular kernel  $K$ .

The solution  $\psi$  of Eq. (7) for  $k = 0.5 \text{ fm}^{-1}$  is displayed in Fig. 4. The effect of the nonlocality is to "push out" the wave function to larger distances. This can be seen from Figs. 5 and 6, which compare the real and imaginary parts of the solution  $\psi$  for  $k = 0.5 \text{ fm}^{-1}$  in the presence of the nonlocality with the solution for which the non-locality, given by Eq. (4), is replaced by a delta function,  $h_L(r, r') \rightarrow \delta(r - r')$ .




FIG. 4: The wave function  $\psi(r)$ , solution of the Schroedinger eq. (7) with the nonlocal potential kernel  $K$  given by Eq.(3). The solution is obtained by the spectral Chebyshev expansion method for  $k = 0.5 fm^{-1}$




FIG. 5: Comparison of the real parts of the local and nonlocal wave functions  $\psi$ . The nonlocal one assumes the presence of the Perey-Buck nonlocality, the local one replaces the nonlocality  $h_L(r, r')$  by  $\delta(r - r')$ . Here  $h_L$  is defined in Eq. (4) with  $L = 0$  and  $k = 0.5 fm^{-1}$

### A. Accuracy analysis

The error of the spectral method for the nonlocal potential  $K$  is obtained by comparing solutions for three different values  $N = 51, 71,$  and  $301$  of the number of Chebyshev expansion functions used in the radial interval  $[0, 20 fm]$  with the solution obtained with  $N = 501$ . The results are shown in Fig. 7, and listed in Table I, which also displays the respective




FIG. 6: Same as Fig. 5 for the imaginary parts of the wave functions.




FIG. 7: Estimate of the error of the spectral method, by comparison of the wave function  $\psi$  for various values  $N$  with each other. Here  $N$  is the number of Chebyshev polynomials used in the solution of Eq. (7) in the radial interval  $[0, 20 \text{ fm}]$ . Plotted are the absolute values of the difference of  $\psi$  between the results for  $N = 51$ ,  $N = 71$  and  $N = 301$ , respectively, with the result for  $N = 501$ .

computing times. The calculations are done in MATLAB, on a desktop using an Intel TM2 Quad, with a CPU Q 9950, a frequency of 2.83 GHz, and a RAM of 8 GB. Had the radial interval been subdivided into partitions, a further decrease of computing time would have been achieved. Such partition division is required if the wave function extends out to large distances, as was the case, for example, in the calculation of the Helium di-atom bound state [23] in the presence of a local He-He potential.

$N$	$accuracy$	$time(s)$
51	$2 \times 10^{-5}$	0.4
71	$10^{-7}$	0.7
301	$4 \times 10^{-11}$	13

TABLE I: Accuracy and computing time of the spectral method.  $N$  is the number of Chebyshev support points in the radial interval  $[0,20 \text{ fm}]$




FIG. 8: The singular values  $\sigma_s$ ,  $s = 1, 2, \dots, 30$ , for the Singular Value decomposition of the nonlocality kernel  $K_L(r, r') = V_{PB}(r) h_L(r, r')$ , for  $L = 0$ . The function  $h_L$  is defined in Eq. (A.2) in Ref. [16] and is illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2,  $V_{PB}$  is defined by Eqs. (5) and (6), and is illustrated in Fig. 3. The number of Chebyshev support points, which is equal to the number of Chebyshev polynomials used, is  $N = 302$ .

An illustration of the singular values  $\sigma_s$  for the case of the Perey-Buck nonlocal kernel, using only one partition from  $r = 0$  to  $r_{\max} = 15$ , with  $N = 301$ , is shown in Fig. 8. One sees that for  $s > 30$ , the corresponding values of  $\sigma_s$  are less than  $10^{-5}$ , and the expansion (10) could have been truncated at  $s = 30$  if an accuracy of  $1 : 10^{-5}$  had been sufficient. The Chebyshev expansion coefficients  $a_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$  of the wave function  $\bar{\psi}$ , Eq.(13) mapped into the interval  $[-1, +1]$  are illustrated in Fig. 9. The magnitude of these coefficients decreases exponentially with the index  $j$ , reaching the value  $\simeq 10^{-14}$  for  $j = 100$  and beyond. Had the expansion been truncated at  $j = 30$ , the error of the wave function would have been  $1 : 10^{-5}$ .

In conclusion, the accuracy of the solution of Eq. (7) with the spectral expansion method for a nonlocality described by Eq. (3), and using  $N = 51$  Chebyshev polynomials is  $1 : 10^{-5}$ ,




FIG. 9: The Chebyshev expansion coefficients  $a_j$  of the wave function  $\psi$  that satisfies the nonlocal Eq. (7), where  $K(r, r')$  is the Perey-Buck Kernel (3). The radial interval is  $[0, 15fm]$ , the wave number  $k = 0.5 fm^{-1}$ , and the total number  $N$  of Chebyshev polynomials is 302.

while using  $N = 301$  polynomials, the accuracy is better than  $1 : 10^{-10}$ .

#### IV. THE STURMIAN EXPANSION METHOD

The method consists in expanding the unknown solution  $\psi$  of Eq. (7) into a basis set of  $N$  "global" functions, formulate an equation for the expansion coefficients  $a_i$ , and if  $N$  is not large enough, iteratively correct for the truncation error. The expansion into Sturmian functions was described in Ref. [19], and only a few basic equations relevant for the present case will be repeated here, while Appendix B contains further details. References to many other applications of Sturmian functions to the solution of physics problems can also be found in Ref. [19].

For the present application the operator  $\mathcal{O}$  in the general one-dimensional integral equation

$$\psi(r) = F(r) + \int_0^\infty \mathcal{O}(r, r'')\psi(r'') dr'', \quad (14)$$

to be solved for  $\psi$  is, in view of Eq. (7), given by

$$\mathcal{O}(r, r'') = \int_0^\infty \mathcal{G}_0(r, r')K(r'r'')dr', \quad (15)$$

where it is assumed that the local part  $V$  of the potential in Eq. (7) has been set to zero. The function  $F$  is the driving term and  $\mathcal{G}_0$  is the Green's function, described in Eqs. (9)

and (11), respectively, both assumed to be known. The shorthand form of Eq. (14) is

$$\psi = F + \mathcal{O}\psi. \quad (16)$$

The iterative solution of Eq. (14) is achieved by approximating the operator  $\mathcal{O}$  by a separable representation  $\mathcal{O}_N$  of rank  $N$ , defining the remainder  $\Delta_N^{(1)}$  as

$$\Delta_N = \mathcal{O} - \mathcal{O}_N, \quad (17)$$

and iterating on the remainder.

The approximate discretization of the kernel  $\mathcal{O}$  into a representation of rank  $N$  is accomplished by using a set of auxiliary positive or negative energy sturmian functions  $\Phi_s(r)$ ,  $s = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and is of the form

$$\mathcal{O}_N(r, r') = \sum_{s=1}^N \mathcal{O} \Phi_s \rangle \frac{1}{\langle \Phi_s \bar{V} \Phi_s \rangle} \langle \Phi_s \bar{V}. \quad (18)$$

Here the symbol  $\rangle$  denotes that the quantity to the left of it is evaluated at position  $r$ , and  $\langle$  denotes that the quantity to the right of it is evaluated at  $r'$ . The bra-ket  $\langle \Phi_s \bar{V} \Phi_s \rangle$  denotes the integration  $\langle \Phi_s \bar{V} \Phi_{s'} \rangle = \int_0^\infty \Phi_s(r) \bar{V}(r) \Phi_{s'}(r) dr$  where  $\langle \Phi_s$  is *not* the complex conjugate of  $\Phi_s$ , and  $\bar{V}(r)$  is the local potential used in the definition of the Sturmians.

The sturmian functions  $\Phi_s$  are eigenfunctions of the integral kernel  $\mathcal{G}_0(r, r') \bar{V}(r')$

$$\eta_s \Phi_s(r) = \int_0^\infty \mathcal{G}_0(r, r') \bar{V}(r') \Phi_s(r') dr', \quad s = 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (19)$$

with  $\eta_s$  the eigenvalue, and  $\bar{V}(r')$  the sturmian potential. The differential Schrödinger equation corresponding to Eq. (19) is

$$(d^2/dr^2 + E) \Phi_s = \Lambda_s \bar{V} \Phi_s, \quad (20)$$

with  $\Lambda_s = 1/\eta_s$ . The Sturmians for positive energies are not square integrable, but they are orthogonal to each other with the weight factor  $\bar{V}$  (that is assumed to decrease sufficiently fast with  $r$ ). The normalization of the Sturmians adopted for most of the present discussion is

$$\langle \Phi_s \bar{V} \Phi_{s'} \rangle = \eta_s \delta_{s,s'}. \quad (21)$$

Because of the completeness of the sturmian functions, one has the identity

$$\delta(r - r') = \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \Phi_s(r) \frac{1}{\langle \Phi_s \bar{V} \Phi_s \rangle} \Phi_s(r') \bar{V}(r'), \quad (22)$$

which shows that the larger the number of terms  $N$  in the expansion (18), the better is the approximation of  $\mathcal{O}_N$  to  $\mathcal{O}$ , provided that  $\mathcal{O}$  is compact.

The first step in the solution of Eq. (16) is to obtain the solution  $\mathcal{F}$  of the approximate equation

$$\mathcal{F}(r) = F(r) + \int_0^\infty \mathcal{O}_N(r, r'') \mathcal{F}(r'') dr''. \quad (23)$$

The solution can be obtained algebraically [20] by making the ansatz [19]

$$\mathcal{F}(r) = F(r) + \sum_{s=1}^N c_s |\mathcal{O} \Phi_s\rangle_r, \quad (24)$$

and the coefficients  $c_s$ ,  $s = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , are obtained from the solution of the matrix equation

$$\sum_{s'=1}^N (\delta_{s,s'} - M_{s,s'}) c_{s'} = \frac{1}{\langle \Phi_s \bar{V} \Phi_s \rangle} \langle \Phi_s \bar{V} F \rangle, \quad (25)$$

where

$$M_{s,s'} = \frac{1}{\langle \Phi_s \bar{V} \Phi_s \rangle} \langle \Phi_s \bar{V} | \mathcal{O} \Phi_{s'} \rangle = \langle \Phi_s K \Phi_{s'} \rangle. \quad (26)$$

Eqs. (25) and (26) are obtained by inserting (24) into (23), making use of Eq. (18), multiplying the resulting equation by  $[1/\langle \Phi_s \bar{V} \Phi_s \rangle] \langle \Phi_s(r) \bar{V}(r)$  on both sides, integrating over  $r$ , and making use of the normalization (21). The matrix element  $\langle \Phi_s \bar{V} | \mathcal{O} \Phi_{s'} \rangle$  involves a triple integral, while the result  $\langle \Phi_s K \Phi_{s'} \rangle$  in Eq. (26) requires only a double integral in view of Eq. (19). This simplification is one of the advantages of using Sturmian functions in the expansion (18) of  $\mathcal{O}$ . The integrals in the equations above are carried out using a Gauss-Chebyshev procedure [22] that has high accuracy, and does not require the use of the *SVD* decomposition.

Had the expansion  $\sum_{s=1}^N c_s |\mathcal{G}_0 \mathcal{K} \Phi_s \rangle$  in Eq. (24) been replaced by the expansion  $\sum_{s=1}^{\bar{N}} d_s |\Phi_s \rangle$ , then the relation between the two sets of coefficients would have been

$$d_s = \sum_{s'=1}^N M_{s,s'} c_{s'} \quad s = 1, 2, \dots, \bar{N}. \quad (27)$$

Since  $\bar{N}$  can be larger than  $N$ , the expansion in Eq. (24) is preferable because  $|\mathcal{O} \Phi_s \rangle_r$  may lie outside of the space spanned by the functions  $|\Phi_s \rangle_r$ , and hence is more general. However, for the present application  $\bar{N} = N$ .

Results for the function  $\mathcal{F}$ , given by Eqs. (24) to (26), were compared with the wave function obtained by the Spectral Chebyshev method described in section III. The difference




FIG. 10: The error of the sturmian expansion of  $\mathcal{F}$ , the solution of Eq. (23), for different numbers  $N$  of Sturmian basis functions. The auxiliary Sturmian potential  $\bar{V}$ , is of the Woods Saxon form, given by Eq. (5) with parameters  $(V_0, R, a) = 5 fm^{-2}, 11 fm, 0.5 fm)$ . The radial interval is  $0 \leq r \leq 20 fm$ , and the wave number is  $k = 0.5 fm^{-1}$

$N_S$	$N_P$	$\mathcal{F}$	$1^{st} iter$
10	301	$2 \times 10^{-3}$	$7 \times 10^{-5}$
15	301	$9 \times 10^{-5}$	$2 \times 10^{-6}$
20	453	$3 \times 10^{-6}$	$3 \times 10^{-7}$

TABLE II: Accuracy of the Sturmian expansion.  $N_S$  is the number of Sturmians,  $N_P$  is the number of support points in the radial interval  $[0, 15 fm]$

between the two results was taken as a measure of the accuracy of the Sturmian expansion, that in turn depends on the range  $R$  of the Sturmian auxiliary potential  $\bar{V}$ , and the number  $N$  of sturmian functions used. Here  $R$  is defined in Eq. (5). The dependence of the accuracy of  $\mathcal{F}$  on the number  $N$  of sturmians for a fixed value of  $R = 11 fm$  is illustrated in Fig. 10. It shows that with  $N = 20$  an accuracy of  $1 : 10^{-6}$  is achieved. The accuracy for different values of  $R$  and  $N$  is summarized in Table II and is illustrated in Figs. 12 and 13. The computational time, carried out in MATLAB, is listed in Table III. This result does not include the time required to calculate the Sturmian functions.

$N_S$	$N_P$	$\mathcal{F}(s)$	$1^{st}iter.(s)$
10	301	11	0.04
15	301	11	0.04
20	453	26	0.11

TABLE III: Computing time of the Sturmian expansion.  $N_S$  is the number of Sturmians,  $N_P$  is the number of support points in the radial interval  $[0,15 \text{ fm}]$

### A. Iterative corrections to $\mathcal{F}$ .

The iterative correction to the Sturmian expansion of  $\mathcal{F}$ , Eq. (24) is carried out by defining the remainder  $\Delta_N$  according to Eq. (17) and iterating on the remainder. If the norm of  $\Delta_N$  is less than unity, the iterations should converge [19]. Since the numerical complexity of performing iterations is less than the complexity of solving a linear equation with a matrix of large dimension, this method can be computationally advantageous, as is shown in the 4<sup>th</sup> column of Table III, and furthermore the exact eigenfunctions of the operator  $\mathcal{O}$  need not be known.

The iterative corrections to  $\psi$  proceed according to

$$\psi = \mathcal{F} + \chi_1 + \chi_2 + \dots \quad (28)$$

where the  $\chi_{n+1}$  are related to  $\chi_n$  through the iterative equation [19]

$$\chi_{n+1} = \mathcal{O}_N \chi_{n+1} + \Delta_N \chi_n, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \quad (29)$$

with  $\chi_0 = \mathcal{F}$ . If the expansion of  $\chi_{n+1}$  is given by

$$\chi_{n+1}(r) = \sum_{s=1}^N d_s^{(n+1)} \Phi_s(r) \quad (30)$$

then the coefficients  $d_s^{(n+1)}$  obey the algebraic equation

$$\sum_{s'=1}^N (\delta_{s,s'} - M_{s,s'}) d_{s'}^{(n+1)} = \frac{1}{\langle \Phi_s \bar{V} \Phi_s \rangle} \langle \Phi_s \bar{V} \Delta_N \chi_n \rangle, \quad (31)$$

where  $M_{s,s'}$  is given by Eq. (26). However, before inserting the numerical value of  $\chi_n(r)$  into the right hand side of Eq. (31), Eq. (30) is replaced by  $\sum_1^N c_s^{(n)} |\mathcal{G}_0 \mathcal{K} \Phi_s\rangle$ , with  $c_s^{(n)} = \sum_{s'=1}^N (M^{-1})_{s,s'} d_{s'}^{(n)}$ , according to Eq. (27).




FIG. 11: Iterative corrections to the wave function  $\psi$ , using 10 Sturmians, which are described in Fig. 10. The result labeled  $F$  illustrates the value of  $\mathcal{F}$  as described in Fig. 10. The other results are obtained after 1, 2 or 3 iterations. The maxima of the three curves occur at  $3 \times 10^{-3}$ ,  $10^{-4}$ , and  $4 \times 10^{-5}$ , respectively.

The results for the number of Sturmians  $N = 10$  is illustrated in Fig. 11 for  $R = 11$  fm. It is seen that as the number of iterations increases, the result for  $\psi$  converges but not, within the accuracy of the calculation, to the value obtained from the spectral method. This is in contrast with the case of a local potential. There the converged result of the iterative Sturmian method was found to be in good agreement with the spectral result [19] of  $1 : 10^{-8}$ , as compared with the less accurate result for the present nonlocal case. It is suspected that the reason for this difference is related to a difference in the treatment of the long-range part of the potential, as is discussed further in Appendix B. On the other hand the error of  $\mathcal{F}$  (compared to  $\psi$ ) is much smaller in the present nonlocal case than it is for the local case [19]. That difference is very likely due to the presence of a repulsive core in the scattering potential for the local case, but is absent in the nonlocal case.

The effect of the range  $R$  of  $\bar{V}$  and the number  $N$  of Sturmians is displayed in Figs. 12 and 13. These figures show that for a given  $N$ , the accuracy of  $\mathcal{F}$  is better for a smaller value of  $R$ , but the iterations give a more accurate value for  $\psi$  for a larger value of  $R$ . Table III shows that the iteration time is considerably less than the time to compute  $\mathcal{F}$ , and in order to obtain the same accuracy, the latter is considerably longer than the computing time for the Spectral Chebyshev expansion.




FIG. 12: Maximum absolute error of  $\psi$ , as a function of the number of Sturmian basis functions. The Sturmian potential  $\bar{V}$  is defined in Eq. (5) with the parameters  $(V_0, R, a)$  given by  $(-5 \text{ fm}^{-2}, 9 \text{ fm}, 0.5 \text{ fm})$ . The line labeled "F" represents the result for  $\mathcal{F}$ , Eq. (24), while the line labeled "iter 1" is obtained by correcting  $\mathcal{F}$  by one iteration, as described in the text.




FIG. 13: Same as for Fig. 12 for a larger range  $R = 11 \text{ fm}$  of the sturmian potential.

## V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The solution of a radial Schrödinger equation for  $\psi(r)$  containing a general nonlocal potential of the form  $\int K(r, r') \psi(r') dr'$  is obtained by means of a spectral expansion into Chebyshev polynomials [9], combined with a Singular Value Decomposition. For a semi-separable kernel  $K$  of rank one, that occurs in exchange scattering due to the Pauli exclusion principle, a spectral expansion method has been previously devised [10]. But for a general  $K$  the present method is quite different, and has not been presented before. The

results for a numerical example of  $K$  given by a Perey-Buck ansatz [16] are calculated and their accuracy, as well as the required computer time, is investigated as a function of the number of Chebyshev polynomials employed (see Table I). For a wave number  $k = 0.5 \text{ fm}^{-1}$  an accuracy of between  $1 : 10^{-5}$  to  $1 : 10^{-10}$  is obtained as the number of polynomials in the whole radial interval is increased from 50 to 300. A second method is presented, based on an expansion into  $N$  Sturmian functions of positive energy, supplemented by an iteration procedure [19]. For  $N = 15$  an accuracy of  $1 : 10^{-4}$  is obtained without iterations, and after one iteration the accuracy is increased to  $1 : 10^{-6}$ , as shown in Fig. 13. The iterations converge quickly, but not to exactly to the value given by the spectral method. It is suspected that the reason is due to the range of the Sturmian functions employed not being as large as the range of the nonlocal potential  $K$ , as is further discussed in Appendix B.

The method, being applicable to a general nonlocality  $K$ , opens the way to formulate optical potentials that incorporate the physical effects that are the source of the nonlocality. This study is particularly relevant for Astrophysics, where the colliding nuclei are generally unstable, and hence the resulting nonlocalities are more pronounced.

Acknowledgment: The author is grateful to Professor M. Jaghoub for rekindling his interest into the subject of nonlocalities.

## Appendix A: The rank of a matrix

Various definitions of the rank of a matrix can be found in Chapter 9, p. 432 of Ref. [24]. According to one of the definitions, the rank of a matrix  $A$  is the order of the largest square sub-matrix of  $A$  whose determinant is not equal to zero. A practical definition is obtained via the SVD decomposition of the matrix  $A$  according to which the rank of  $A$  is the number of non-zero singular values of  $A$ . For example: given two column vectors  $\vec{u}$  and  $\vec{v}$ , both having  $N$  elements  $u_i$  and  $v_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , then  $v^T \cdot u = \sum_{i=1}^N v_i u_i$  is a number, while  $u v^T$  is a  $N \times N$  matrix  $W$ . Here the superscript  $T$  means transposition. The matrix  $W$  has only one nonvanishing singular value, hence its rank is 1. The  $4 \times 4$  matrix  $A$  given on p. 433 of Ref. [24] has 3 non zero singular values, hence its rank is 3, in agreement with Ref. [24].

In the case of exchange scattering, the non locality  $K$  is given by  $K(r, r') = f(r)g(r')$  for  $r' < r$ , and  $g(r)f(r')$  for  $r' \geq r$ . Once the radial distance  $r$  is discretized into  $N$  values  $r_i$ , the function of  $r'_i$  is interpreted as a line vector, while the function of  $r_i$  is taken as a




FIG. 14: The Sturmiian eigenvalues  $\Lambda_s$  of Eq. (20) obtained with a Woods–Saxon potential  $V_{WS}$  described in the caption of Fig. 12, with a wave number  $k = 0.5 \text{ fm}^{-1}$

column vector, and the kernel  $K$  is the separable combination of two rank 1 matrices, each of dimension  $N \times N$ , and hence it is called semi-separable of rank one.

## Appendix B: Sturmiian functions

Some properties of Sturmiian functions [19] will be recalled here. According to Eq. (19) Sturmiian functions are defined in the radial interval  $[0, \infty]$ . However, the numerical evaluation of (19) has to be carried out only in the interval  $0 \leq r \leq R_{\max}$ , beyond which the Sturmiian potential is negligible. An example of the spectrum of the  $\Lambda$  eigenvalues for the Woods-Saxon potential  $V_{WS}$  illustrated in Fig. 3, for a wave number  $k = 0.5 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ , is shown in Fig. 14. The imaginary parts are slightly negative, while the real parts are monotonically positive. This is in contrast with the case of a sturmiian potential that has a repulsive core, for which some of the eigenvalues have a negative real part, and a correspondingly positive imaginary part [19].

The radial  $r$ -dependence of some of the Sturmiian functions is illustrated in Figs. 15 and 16. Their normalizations differ from Eq. (21) so that all acquire the same Hankel function asymptotic behavior, since they obey Eq. (19). The Sturmiian potential  $\bar{V}$  has a range  $R = 9 \text{ fm}$ , and the figures show that for  $r > 8 \text{ fm}$ , these Sturmiian functions are not strongly linearly independent from each other, and hence cease to form a practical complete expansion set. This is the reason why the Sturmiian expansion for a Woods-Saxon potential with a range  $R = 9 \text{ fm}$  does not give a result as precise as the expansions for  $R = 11 \text{ fm}$  and even that range may not suffice to obtain an accuracy better than  $1 : 10^7$ , displayed in




FIG. 15: The real parts of Sturmian eigenfunctions of Eq. (20) obtained with a Woods–Saxon potential  $V_{WS}$  described in the caption to Fig. 12, whose eigenvalues are illustrated in Fig. 14




FIG. 16: Same as for Fig. 15, for the imaginary parts of the Sturmian functions.

Fig. 13. This conclusion is further corroborated by examining the magnitude of the kernel  $K$  in the region where the Sturmian functions lose most of their independence, which is of the order of  $10^{-7} \text{ fm}^{-2}$ .

---

[1] G. Wataghin, Z. Phys. **88**, 92 (1934), Nuovo Cimento **9**, 519 (1958);

[2] P. Fraser, K. Amos, S. Karataglidis, L. Canton, G. Pisent, and J.P. Svenne, Eur. Phys. J. A **35**, 69 (2008);

- [3] S. G. Cooper and R. S. Mackintosh, Phys. Rev. C **54**, 3133 (1996); S. G. Cooper, Nucl. Phys. A **618**, 87 (1997);
- [4] M. I. Jaghoub, M. F. Hassan, and G. H. Rawitscher, Phys. Rev. C **84**, 034618 (2011);  
M. I. Jaghoub and G. H. Rawitscher, Nucl. Phys. A **877**, 59-69 (2012);  
M. I. Jaghoub, Phys. Rev. C **85**, 024604 (2012);
- [5] W. N. Sams and D. J. Kouri, J. Chem. Phys **51**,4809 (1969); Ed. R. Smith and R. J. Henry, Phys. Rev. A **7**, 1585 (1973), R. J. W. Henry, S. P. Rountree, and Ed. R. Smith, Comput. Phys. Commun. **23**, 233 (1981);
- [6] J. Stoer and R. Bulirsch, Introduction to Numerical Analysis (New York: Springer Verlag, 1980); W. H. Press, B. P. Flannery, S.A. Teukolsky and W. T. Vetterling, *Numerical Recipes*, Cambridge University Press (New. York) , 1992, section 2.9;
- [7] E. Zerrad,A.-S. Khan, K. Zerrad, and G. Rawitscher, Can. J. of Phys., **81**, 1215 (2003);
- [8] L. N. Trefethen, *Spectral Methods in MATLAB*, (SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2000) ; John P. Boyd, *Chebyshev and Fourier Spectral Methods*, 2nd revised ed. (Dover Publications, Mineola, NY, 2001); B. Fornberg, *A practical Guide to Pseudospectral Methods*, Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics, Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, UK, 1998);
- [9] R. A. Gonzales, J. Eisert, I Koltracht, M. Neumann and G. Rawitscher, J. of Comput. Phys. **134**, 134-149 (1997); R. A. Gonzales, S.-Y. Kang, I. Koltracht and G. Rawitscher, J. of Comput. Phys. **153**, 160-202 (1999); G. Rawitscher and I. Koltracht, Computing Sci. Eng. **7**, 58 (2005); G. Rawitscher, *Applications of a numerical spectral expansion method to problems in physics: A retrospective*, in Operator Theory, Advances and Applications, Vol. 203, edited by Thomas Hempfling (Birkäuser Verlag, Basel, 2009), pp. 409–426; A. Deloff, Ann. Phys. (NY) **322**, 1373–1419 (2007);
- [10] George H. Rawitscher, S. -Y. Kang and I. Koltracht, J. of Chem. Phys. **118**, 9149 (2003);
- [11] B. T. Kim and T. Udagawa, Phys. Rev. C **42**, 1147 (1990); B. T. Kim et. al.,  
Comp. Phys. Comm. **71**, 150 (1992);
- [12] B. Sinha, Phys. Rept. **20 C 1**, (1975);
- [13] B. Z. Georgiev and R. S. Mackintosh, Phys. Lett. **73 B**, 250-254 ( 1978);
- [14] B. Baseia, C.M.A. Dantas and V. S. Bagnato, Phys. Lett. A **187**, 281-283 (1994);
- [15] C. F. Lo and D. Kian, Phys. Lett. A **195**, 121-124 (1994);

- [16] F. G. Perey and B. Buck, *Nucl. Phys. A* **32** , 353 (1962);
- [17] L. C. Chamon *et al.* Phys. Rev. C 66, 014160 (2002);
- [18] S. -Y. Kang, I. Koltracht and G. Rawitscher, Math. Comp. **72**, 729 (2003);
- [19] George Rawitscher, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 026901 (2012);
- [20] L. Canton, G. Pisent, J. P. Svenne, D. van der Kniff, K. Amos and S. Karataglidis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**,122503 (2005); K. Amos, S. Karataglidis, D. van der Kniff, L. Canton, G. Pisent, and J. P. Svenne, Phys. Rev. C **72**, 064604 (2005);
- [21] W. E. Frahn and R. H. Lemmer, Nuovo Cim. **5**, 523 (1957);
- [22] G. Rawitscher and J. Liss, Am. J. of Phys.**79**, 417-427 (2011);
- [23] G. Rawitscher and I Koltracht, Eur. J. of Phys. **27**, 1179 (2006);
- [24] D. A. McQuarrie, *Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers*, (University Science Books, Sausalito, CA, 2003)