

Electron capture and scaling anomaly in polar molecules

Pulak Ranjan Giri* and Kumar S. Gupta†

Theory Division, Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, 1/AF Bidhannagar, Calcutta 700064, India

S. Meljanac‡ and A. Samsarov§

Rudjer Bošković Institute, Bijenička c.54, HR-10002 Zagreb, Croatia

(Dated: October 1, 2018)

We present a new analysis of the electron capture mechanism in polar molecules, based on von Neumann's theory of self-adjoint extensions. Our analysis suggests that it is theoretically possible for polar molecules to form bound states with electrons, even with dipole moments smaller than the critical value D_0 given by 1.63×10^{-18} esu cm. This prediction is consistent with the observed anomalous electron scattering in H_2S and HCl , whose dipole moments are smaller than the critical value D_0 . We also show that for a polar molecule with dipole moment less than D_0 , typically there is only a single bound state, which is in qualitative agreement with observations. We argue that the quantum mechanical scaling anomaly is responsible for the formation of these bound states.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ge, 11.30.-j, 31.10.+z, 31.15.-p

The experimentally observed anomalous scattering of electrons by a class of polar molecules [1, 2, 3] is often attributed to the electron capture by the dipole field of the polar molecules [4, 5, 6]. It is usually assumed that a dipole bound state of an electron is possible only if the coefficient of the inverse square interaction term is sufficiently negative, leading to a “fall to the centre” condition [7]. The point dipole model of the polar molecule predicts that the critical dipole moment [8] D_0 necessary for the electron capture has a value $D_0 = 1.63 \times 10^{-18}$ esu cm [9, 10, 11, 12], which continues to be valid for an extended dipole as well [9]. The captured electrons are usually weakly bound, which makes such bound states hard to detect unless the dipole moments are large compared to D_0 . Consequently, most of the experiments are performed with molecules having large dipole moments, for which the above value of D_0 is consistent with the experimental data.

However, there are certain polar molecules, e.g. H_2S and HCl which have dipole moments less than D_0 and yet exhibit anomalous electron scattering and can capture electrons [9, 13]. The simple model of the inverse square interaction which predicts the above value of D_0 , at the first sight, seems to be inconsistent with the data for H_2S and HCl . Moreover, the same theoretical model predicts an infinite number of bound states for dipole bound anions, whereas most experiments observe only a single bound state [14].

We may think that these inconsistencies arise from the fact that the pure dipole model of a polar molecule ignores various short range interactions that play a role in the electron capture. However, the inverse square interaction between the electron and the polar molecule encodes the main aspects of the long distance dynamics leading to the formation of weakly bound states [11]. Within this approximation, and without using any detailed knowledge of the short distance interactions, it is

reasonable to represent their effects through the boundary conditions obeyed by the Hamiltonian. Note that the molecular forces are usually not dissipative, and the corresponding Hamiltonian remains always self-adjoint [15]. Thus, the problem now reduces to finding all possible boundary conditions for a quantum system with inverse square interaction, such that the Hamiltonian is self-adjoint. This is usually achieved by using von Neumann's theory [15] of self-adjoint extensions, which provides all the possible boundary conditions such that the Hamiltonian maintains self-adjointness. The theory of self-adjoint extension of the inverse square potential [16] has a long and interesting list of applications ranging from microscopic physics to black holes [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22], and we shall apply this well established technique to explain the electron capture by polar molecules. Our approach is based on a detailed quantum mechanical treatment of the system, which suggests the possibility of the existence of bound states even though the dipole moment is less than D_0 . This analysis, which predicts a lower value of the critical dipole moment is consistent with all experimental data including that for H_2S and HCl . It also predicts the theoretical possibility of electron capture by a much larger class of polar molecules. Another interesting feature of our analysis is that when the dipole moment is less than D_0 , the system admits only a single bound state, which is in qualitative agreement with the experimental data [14]. It should be noted that our analysis presented below is not applicable to molecules with dipole moments greater than D_0 , for which the existing treatment in the literature is consistent with the experimental data.

The simple quantum mechanical model of inverse square interaction does not contain any dimensionful parameter. It has been argued that such a system exhibits quantum mechanical scaling anomaly [12], leading to the formation of bound states. It is known that the self-

adjoint extensions can lead to anomalies [23], which in this case allows the polar molecule to capture an electron. We shall show that the scaling anomaly exists even for systems with dipole moments less than D_0 , thus allowing a much larger class of polar molecules to form bound states with electrons.

Consider an electron of charge e and mass μ moving in a point dipole field with dipole moment D . We take the z axis along the dipole moment. Schrödinger equation for the electron in the spherical polar coordinates (r, θ, ϕ) can be written as

$$\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu}\nabla^2 + \frac{eD}{r^2}\cos\theta \right] \Psi = E\Psi, \quad (1)$$

where E is the energy. In these coordinates, the wavefunction can be separated as $\Psi(r, \theta, \phi) = \frac{1}{r}R(r)\Theta(\theta)e^{im\phi}$, which leads to the radial equation

$$H_r R(r) \equiv \left[-\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{\lambda}{r^2} \right] R(r) = \epsilon R(r), \quad (2)$$

where H_r is the radial Hamiltonian, $\epsilon = \frac{2\mu E}{\hbar^2}$ is the eigenvalue of the radial eqn. (2) and λ is the eigenvalue of the angular equation, given to $\mathcal{O}((\frac{1}{6}d^2)^3)$ by [9]

$$\lambda = -\frac{1}{6}d^2 + \frac{11}{1080}d^4 - \frac{133}{97200}d^6 + \dots, \quad (3)$$

with $d = \frac{2\mu e D}{\hbar^2}$. It is usually assumed in the literature that in order for the operator H_r in eqn. (2) to admit a bound state, the ‘‘fall to the centre’’ condition [7] given by $\lambda < -\frac{1}{4}$ must be satisfied [9]. This assumption leads to the critical dipole moment $D \geq D_0 = 1.63 \times 10^{-18}$ esu cm. Using von Neumann’s approach, and with a very general assumption that the Hamiltonian is self-adjoint, we shall now show that it is possible to form bound states in this system with a weaker condition on λ and correspondingly for smaller values of D_0 .

The Hamiltonian H_r is a real symmetric (Hermitian) operator on the domain $D(H_r) \equiv \{\phi(0) = \phi'(0) = 0, \phi, \phi' \text{ absolutely continuous}\}$. Following von Neumann’s method [15], in order to determine whether H_r is self-adjoint in $D(H_r)$, we have to first look for square integrable solutions of the equations

$$H_r^* \phi_{\pm} = \pm i \phi_{\pm}, \quad (4)$$

where H_r^* is the adjoint of H_r (note that H_r^* is given by the same differential operator as H_r although their domains might be different). Let $n_+(n_-)$ be the total number of square-integrable, independent solutions of (4) with the upper (lower) sign in the right hand side. The quantities n_{\pm} are called the deficiency indices of H_r . Now H_r falls in one of the following categories :

- 1) H_r is (essentially) self-adjoint iff $(n_+, n_-) = (0, 0)$.
- 2) H_r is not self-adjoint in $D(H_r)$ but admits self-adjoint extensions iff $n_+ = n_- \neq 0$.

3) H_r has no self-adjoint extensions if $n_+ \neq n_-$.

To proceed, we note from eqn. (3) that for any non-zero value of the dipole moment, the parameter $\lambda < 0$. We restrict our analysis to the range $-\frac{1}{4} \leq \lambda < 0$, as the analysis for bound states in polar molecules with $\lambda < -\frac{1}{4}$ already exists in the literature [9, 24]. In terms of the variable $\nu = \sqrt{\lambda + \frac{1}{4}}$, the solutions of eqn. (4) which are square integrable at infinity are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_+(r) &= r^{\frac{1}{2}} H_{\nu}^{(1)}(r e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}}), \\ \phi_-(r) &= r^{\frac{1}{2}} H_{\nu}^{(2)}(r e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}}), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where H_{ν} ’s are Hankel functions [25]. For the moment we consider the case $\lambda \neq -\frac{1}{4}$, i.e. $\nu \neq 0$. The functions ϕ_{\pm} are bounded as $r \rightarrow \infty$. When $r \rightarrow 0$, they behave as

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_+(r) &\rightarrow \mathcal{C}_1(\nu) r^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}} + \mathcal{C}_2(\nu) r^{-\nu+\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \phi_-(r) &\rightarrow \mathcal{C}_1^*(\nu) r^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}} + \mathcal{C}_2^*(\nu) r^{-\nu+\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_1(\nu) = \frac{i}{\sin \nu \pi} \frac{1}{2^{\nu}} \frac{e^{-i\frac{3\nu\pi}{4}}}{\Gamma(1+\nu)}$, $\mathcal{C}_2(\nu) = -\frac{i}{\sin \nu \pi} \frac{1}{2^{-\nu}} \frac{e^{-i\frac{\nu\pi}{4}}}{\Gamma(1-\nu)}$ and $\mathcal{C}_1^*(\nu)$ and $\mathcal{C}_2^*(\nu)$ are complex conjugates of $\mathcal{C}_1(\nu)$ and $\mathcal{C}_2(\nu)$ respectively. We see that ϕ_{\pm} are not square integrable near the origin when $\nu^2 \geq 1$. In this case, $n_+ = n_- = 0$ and H_r is (essentially) self-adjoint in the domain $D(H_r)$ [15]. On the other hand, both ϕ_{\pm} are square integrable when either $-1 < \nu < 0$ or $0 < \nu < 1$. We therefore see that for any value of ν in these ranges, H_r has deficiency indices (1, 1). In this case, H_r is not self-adjoint on the domain $D(H_r)$ but admits self-adjoint extensions. The domain $D_{\omega}(H_r)$ in which H_r is self-adjoint contains all the elements of $D(H_r)$ together with elements of the form $\phi_+ + e^{i\omega} \phi_-$, where $\omega \in R \pmod{2\pi}$ [15]. We now proceed to obtain the spectrum of H_r in the domain $D_{\omega}(H_r)$.

The solution of the differential equation Eq. (2) can be written as

$$R(r) = B r^{\frac{1}{2}} H_{\nu}^{(1)}(qr), \quad (7)$$

where $q^2 = \epsilon$. Note that in the limit $r \rightarrow 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_+(r) + e^{i\omega} \phi_-(r) &\rightarrow [\mathcal{C}_1(\nu) + e^{i\omega} \mathcal{C}_1^*(\nu)] r^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}} \\ &+ [\mathcal{C}_2(\nu) + e^{i\omega} \mathcal{C}_2^*(\nu)] r^{-\nu+\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and

$$R(r) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_1(\nu, q) r^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}} + \mathcal{D}_2(\nu, q) r^{-\nu+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (9)$$

where $\mathcal{D}_1(\nu, q) = \frac{i}{\sin \pi \nu} \frac{e^{-i\pi \nu} q^{\nu}}{2^{\nu} \Gamma(1+\nu)}$ and $\mathcal{D}_2(\nu, q) = -\frac{i}{\sin \pi \nu} \frac{q^{-\nu}}{2^{-\nu} \Gamma(1-\nu)}$. If $R(r) \in D_{\omega}(H_r)$, then the coefficients of $r^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}}$ and $r^{-\nu+\frac{1}{2}}$ in Eq. (8) and (9) must match. Comparing these coefficients we get the bound state energy as

$$E = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \left[\cos \frac{\pi \nu}{2} + \cot\left(\frac{\omega}{2} + \frac{\pi \nu}{4}\right) \sin \frac{\pi \nu}{2} \right]^{\frac{1}{\nu}}. \quad (10)$$

Thus we see that for a given value of ν within the allowed range, H_r admits a single bound state with energy given by Eq. (10). It may be noted that for a fixed ν , the bound state exists only for those values of ω such that the quantity in first bracket in Eq. (10) is positive. From Eq. (7) and keeping in mind that ϵ is negative, we see that the the bound state eigenfunction is given by

$$R(r) = Br^{\frac{1}{2}}H_{\nu}^{(1)}(i\sqrt{|\epsilon|r}), \quad (11)$$

where B is the normalization constant. The bound state energy and the eigenfunction depends on the choice of the self-adjoint extension parameter ω , which classifies the inequivalent boundary conditions.

The case for $\nu = 0$ or $\lambda = -\frac{1}{4}$ can be handled in a similar fashion. The bound state energy and the wave function in this case are given by

$$E = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \exp\left[\frac{\pi}{2} \cot\frac{\omega}{2}\right], \quad (12)$$

and

$$\psi(x) = \sqrt{-2\epsilon x} K_0(\sqrt{-\epsilon x}). \quad (13)$$

respectively, where K_0 is the modified Bessel function [25].

We now come to the important issue of critical dipole moment of polar molecules, which is required to bind an electron. The above analysis shows that for $-1 < \nu < 1$, the radial Hamiltonian describing an electron in the field of a polar molecule admits a single bound state. This implies that if constant λ is in the range $-1/4 \leq \lambda < 3/4$, the system admits a bound state. Now recall from eqn. (3) that λ must be negative. Combining these, we can conclude that for any real value of λ such that $-\frac{1}{4} \leq \lambda < 0$, the system describing an electron in a dipole field admits a single bound state. This conclusion is remarkably different from the statement in the literature that λ must be less than $-\frac{1}{4}$ for bound states to exist [9]. Thus the mathematical analysis suggests that any molecule with a non-zero but arbitrarily small dipole moment may be able to capture an electron to form a bound state. In particular, this argument shows that molecules such as H_2S and HCl , whose dipole moments are smaller than the critical dipole moment obtained from the usual analysis can also capture electrons. This is consistent with the experimentally observed anomalous electron scattering in these molecules [9, 13], which the previous analysis [9] was not able to account for. Our model also predicts the existence of a single bound state, which is again in qualitative agreement with the experimental observations, in contrast to the usual treatment which predicts an infinite number of bound states [24].

The exact numerical value of the bound state energy would depend on the choice of the self-adjoint extension parameter ω which characterizes the boundary conditions




FIG. 1: A plot of binding energy of electron as a function of $d = \frac{2\mu\epsilon D}{\hbar^2}$ of the polar molecules for three different values of the self-adjoint extension parameter ω . From top to bottom $\omega = \frac{\pi}{10}, \frac{\pi}{8}, \frac{\pi}{6}$ respectively.

at the origin. Taking into account Eq. (3), Eq.(10) and the condition $-\frac{1}{4} \leq \lambda < 0$, we have plotted the binding energy as a function of the dipole moment d in FIG. 1. It is clear that molecules with arbitrary small dipole moment can bind electron, and that the bound state energies may also be very small.

We now address the issue of breaking of scale invariance due to quantization in this system, leading to a quantum mechanical anomaly. This feature is crucial for the formation of any bound state in this system, which is classically scale invariant. The relevance of quantum anomaly for the formation of bound states in polar molecules, with dipole moments greater than D_0 , has been discussed in the literature [12]. Our analysis of the scaling anomaly applies even when the dipole moment is less than D_0 . Consider the case for $\nu \neq 0$. The anomaly arises as the scaling operator $\Lambda = \frac{-i}{2}(r\frac{d}{dr} + \frac{d}{dr}r)$ acting on an arbitrary element $\phi \in D_{\omega}(H_r)$, takes the wavefunction out of the domain of the Hamiltonian. This can be seen as follows. In the limit $r \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda\phi(r) \rightarrow & \frac{(1+\nu)}{i} [\mathcal{C}_1(\nu) + e^{i\omega}\mathcal{C}_1^*(\nu)] r^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}} \\ & + \frac{(1-\nu)}{i} [\mathcal{C}_2(\nu) + e^{i\omega}\mathcal{C}_2^*(\nu)] r^{-\nu+\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

In order for $\Lambda\phi(r) \in D_{\omega}(H_r)$, we must have $\Lambda\phi(r) \sim C\phi(r)$ where C is a constant. However, the two terms on the r.h.s. of Eq. (14) are multiplied by two different factors, i.e. $(1+\nu)$ and $(1-\nu)$. Due to the presence of these different multiplying factors, we see that $\Lambda\phi(r)$ in general does not belong to $D_{\omega}(H_r)$. Scale invariance is thus broken at the quantum level for generic values of ω , due to the choice of the domains of self-adjointness. Since the domains encode the boundary conditions, which in turn capture the effects of the short-range interactions in the polar molecules, we can qualitatively say that the short distance physics is responsible for breaking the scale invariance. However, from Eq. (14) it is clear that for spe-

cial choice of $\omega = -\frac{\nu\pi}{2}$ and $\omega = -\frac{3\nu\pi}{2}$, $\Lambda\phi(r) \in D_\omega(H_r)$ and the scaling symmetry is recovered [18, 19, 20]. For these choices of ω , the bound states do not exist. A similar analysis can be performed when $\nu = 0$ as well.

Finally, we would like to mention that the usual analysis assuming $\lambda < -\frac{1}{4}$ produces an unphysical Hamiltonian which is unbounded from below. This is not to be taken too seriously as the short distance physics would certainly cure this problem. Again, without any detailed knowledge of the short distance physics, and with $\lambda < -\frac{1}{4}$, it is possible to use renormalization group techniques to analyze this problem with a cutoff in the radial variable r [26]. In the limit of the vanishing cutoff, such an analysis produces a beta function for the coupling λ , which indicates an ultraviolet stable fixed point at $\lambda = -\frac{1}{4}$. Thus a renormalization group analysis of the strong coupling regime indicates that the coupling in the parameter space would flow to a value $\lambda = -\frac{1}{4}$.

In conclusion, here we have shown that it is possible for polar molecules to form bound state with electrons even though their dipole moments are arbitrarily small. This is possible through proper choice of domains which makes the corresponding Hamiltonian self-adjoint. In our interpretation, the domains or equivalently the boundary conditions obtained using von Neumann's theory of self-adjoint extensions capture some of the short distance physics, which in turn leads to a quantum mechanical scaling anomaly thereby producing the bound state. Our approach is consistent with the experimentally observed anomalous electron scattering by molecules such as H_2S and HCl , which could not be explained by the critical dipole moment obtained in ref. [9]. Moreover, our method predicts a single bound state for each molecule, which is also in qualitative agreement with experimental observations. The detection of such anions in systems with low value of dipole moments would be an experimental challenge, as the binding energies in such systems are usually very small.

Acknowledgment

K.S.G. would like to thank A. Mullin for providing her Ph.D. thesis and for helpful comments. This work was done within the framework of the Indo-Croatian Joint Programme of Cooperation in Science and Technology sponsored by the Department of Science and Technology, India (DST/INT/CROATIA/P-4/05), and the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports, Republic of Croatia.

* Electronic address: pulakranjan.giri@saha.ac.in

† Electronic address: kumars.gupta@saha.ac.in

‡ Electronic address: meljanac@irb.hr

§ Electronic address: asamsarov@irb.hr

- [1] G. S. Hurst, L. B. O'Kelly and J. A. Stokdale, *Nature* **195**, 66 (1962).
- [2] G. S. Hurst, J. A. Stokdale and L. B. O'Kelly, *J. Chem. Phys.* **38**, 2572 (1963).
- [3] S. Altshuler, *Phys. Rev.* **107** 114 (1957); M. H. Mittleman and R. E. von Holdt, *Phys. Rev.* **140**, A726 (1965).
- [4] J. E. Turner, *Phys. Rev.* **141**, 21 (1966).
- [5] K. Fox and J. E. Turner, *Am. J. Phys.* **34**, 606 (1966).
- [6] K. Fox and J. E. Turner, *J. Chem. Phys.* **45**, 1142 (1966).
- [7] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics*, (Pergamon Press, London, 1959).
- [8] E. Fermi and E. Teller, *Phys. Rev.* **72**, 399 (1947).
- [9] J. M. Lévy-Leblond, *Phys. Rev.* **153**, 1 (1967); O. H. Crawford, *Proc. Phys. Soc. London* **91**, 279 (1967).
- [10] J. E. Turner, *Am. J. Phys.* **45**, 758 (1977).
- [11] W. R. Garrett, *J. Chem. Phys.* **69**, 2622 (1978).
- [12] H. E. Camblong, L. N. Epele, H. Fanchiotti and C. A. G. Canal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** 220402 (2001); H. E. Camblong, C. R. Ordonez, *Phys. Rev.* **D68**, 125013 (2003).
- [13] K. Rohr and F. Linder, *J. Phys.* **B9**, 2521 (1976).
- [14] O. H. Crawford and W. R. Garrett, *J. Chem. Phys.* **66**, 4968 (1977); A. S. Mullin, *Autodetachment and Photofragment Spectroscopy of Metastable Molecular Ions*, Ph. D. Thesis, University of Colorado, Boulder, 1991; A. S. Mullin, K. K. Murray, C. P. Schulz and W. C. Lineberger, *J. Phys. Chem.* **97**, 10281 (1993).
- [15] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness* (New York :Academic, 1975); Dunford and J. T. Schwartz, *Linear Operators, Spectral Theory, Self Adjoint Operators in Hilbert Space, Part 2* (Wiley-Interscience; Wiley Clas edition, 1988).
- [16] E. S. Titchmarsh, *Eigenfunction Expansion Associated with Second-Order Differential Equations* (Clarendon Press, 1946); K. Meetz, *Nuovo Cimento* **34**, 690 (1964); A. M. Perelomov and V. S. Popov, *Theor. Math. Phys. (USSR)* **4**, 664 (1970); H. Narnhofer, *Acta Physica Austriaca* **40**, 306 (1974); J. Audretsch, V. D. Skarzhinsky and V. L. Voronov, *Jour. Phys.* **A34**, 235 (2001).
- [17] B. Basu-Mallick and Kumar S. Gupta, *Phys. Lett.* **A292**, 36 (2001).
- [18] B. Basu-Mallick, Pijush K. Ghosh and Kumar S. Gupta, *Nucl. Phys.* **B659**, 437 (2003).
- [19] B. Basu-Mallick, Pijush K. Ghosh and Kumar S. Gupta, *Phys. Lett.* **A311**, 87 (2003).
- [20] Kumar S. Gupta, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A18**, 2355 (2003).
- [21] D. Birmingham, Kumar S. Gupta and Siddhartha Sen, *Phys. Lett.* **B505**, 191 (2001); Kumar S. Gupta and Siddhartha Sen, *Phys. Lett.* **B526**, 121 (2002).
- [22] S. Meljanac, A. Samsarov, B. Basu-Mallick and Kumar S. Gupta, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C49**, 875 (2007).
- [23] J. G. Esteve, *Phys. Rev.* **D34**, 674 (1986); *Phys. Rev.* **D66**, 125013 (2002).
- [24] K. M. Case, *Phys. Rev.* **80**, 797 (1950); P. M. Morse and H. Feshbach, *Methods of Theoretical Physics*(McGraw-Hill, New York, 1953).
- [25] M. Abramowitz, I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions* (Dover, New York, 1970).
- [26] K. S. Gupta and S. G. Rajeev, *Phys. Rev.* **D48**, 5940 (1993).