

Energy and expectation values of the PsH system.

J.Mitroy

Faculty of Technology, Charles Darwin University, Darwin NT 0909, Australia

(Dated: July 23, 2018)

Close to converged energies and expectation values for PsH are computed using a ground state wave function consisting of 1800 explicitly correlated gaussians. The best estimate of the PsH^∞ energy was -0.789196740 hartree which is the lowest variational energy to date. The 2γ annihilation rate for PsH^∞ was $2.47178 \times 10^9 \text{ s}^{-1}$.

PACS numbers: 36.10.Dr, 36.10.-k, 31.15.Ar

The calculation of positronium hydride (PsH) represents one of the simplest possibilities for studying mixed electronic and positronic systems. Since its stability was first identified in 1951 by Ore [1], a variety of methods have been applied to determine its structure. These include variational calculations with Hylleraas type basis sets [2, 3, 4, 5], variational calculations with explicitly correlated gaussians (ECGs) [6, 7, 8, 9], quantum Monte Carlo methods [10, 11, 12, 13, 14] and most recently the configuration interaction method [15, 16, 17, 18]. The lowest variational energy for PsH^∞ prior to the present article was that of Yan and Ho [4]. Their largest calculation gave an energy of -0.7891967051 hartree. Bubin and Adamowicz used a 3200 dimension ECG basis to give an energy of -0.788870707 hartree for PsH^1 [19].

In this work, the stochastic variational method (SVM) is used to construct a wave function with a lower energy than the best wave function of Yan and Ho. Indeed, the best SVM energy of -0.789196740 hartree is even lower than the value estimated by Yan and Ho as the variational limit (e.g. $-0.7891967147(42)$ hartree).

The SVM used for this work has been described in a number of articles [20, 21, 22] and only the briefest description is given here. The SVM expands the wave function in a linear combination of ECGs. Such basis functions have Hamiltonian matrix elements that can be computed very quickly and the energy is optimized by performing a trial and error search over the exponential parameters that define the basis. The SVM has been used to solve a number of many-body problems in different areas of physics [20, 22].

For the present set of calculations a basis containing 1800 ECGs was used for the final calculation. All the optimizations of the ECG basis were done with the H mass set to ∞ . The annihilation rates given in Tables I and II are proportional to the probability of finding an electron and a positron at the same position in a spin singlet state according to

$$\Gamma = 4\pi r_e^2 c \langle \Psi | \sum_i O_{ip}^S \delta(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_p) | \Psi \rangle \quad (1)$$

$$= 1.009394 \times 10^{11} \sum_i \langle \delta(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_p) \rangle_S, \quad (2)$$

[7, 23, 24]. The sum is over the electron coordinates, the δ -function expectation is evaluated in a_0^3 , and Γ is given

numerically in s^{-1} . The operator O_{ip}^S is a spin projection operator to select spin singlet states for the ip electron-positron pair.

Table I lists a number of expectation values obtained from a sequence of increasingly larger calculations. The net energy improvement when the basis was increased from 900 to 1800 ECGs, while being subjected to additional optimization, was 1.98×10^{-7} hartree. It is worth noting that the energy of the largest calculation, namely -0.789196740 hartree, is lower than the previous best energy of Yan and Ho [4], namely -0.7891967051 hartree. Yan and Ho examined the convergence pattern associated with their sequence of increasingly larger calculations and estimated that the true energy was actually $9.6(4.2) \times 10^{-9}$ hartree lower (e.g. $-0.7891967147(42)$ hartree). The present calculation indicates that the actual correction should have been more than three times as large as that estimated by Yan and Ho. Although the sign of size of energy correction is not large, it is apparent that the procedure used to determine the energy correction is faulty. In Hylleraas calculations one typically does some sort of non-linear optimization to choose the exponential parameters that give the minimum energy. This has the unintended byproduct of distorting the convergence pattern of the energy and thus introducing large uncertainties in the extrapolation of the energy [25]. This problem is probably more widespread than just the PsH calculation of Yan and Ho. It could occur whenever one extrapolates a sequence of energies while using a family of basis functions that are characterized by a parameter which has been subjected to a non-linear optimization.

The coalescence matrix elements, $\langle \delta(e^- - e^-) \rangle$ and $\langle \delta(H^+ - e^+) \rangle$ were more sensitive to the increase in basis size than any other quantity. This sensitivity is due to the fact that the wave function amplitude between two repelling particles is expected to be small at their coalescence point and the ECG functional form is not the natural choice to describe the behavior of the relative wave function for two strongly repelling particles. With respect to the more physically interesting observables, the annihilation rate, Γ varied most as the basis dimension was increased. But, the increase in Γ was just larger than 0.1% when the basis was increased from 900 to 1800.

A comprehensive set of the best set of expectation values are listed in Table II. They are compared with the

TABLE I: Behavior of some PsH expectation values for a sequence of ECG type variational calculations of increasing size. All quantities are given in atomic units with the exception of the 2γ annihilation rates which are in units of 10^9 s^{-1} . Some of the data for the earlier calculation [7] have not been published before, the data attributed to these calculations were computed using the same ECG basis.

N	$\langle r_{\text{H}^+e^+} \rangle$	$\langle r_{\text{H}^+e^-}^2 \rangle$	$\langle 1/r_{e^-e^-} \rangle$	$\langle r_{e^+e^-} \rangle$	$\langle \delta(e^- - e^-) \rangle$	$\langle \delta(\text{H}^+ - e^+) \rangle$	Γ	$\langle V \rangle / \langle T \rangle + 2$	E
750 [7]	3.661596	7.812895	0.3705556	3.480249	4.39845×10^{-3}	1.63863×10^{-3}	2.46852	5.51×10^{-7}	-0.789195993
900	3.661613	7.812961	0.3705554	3.480263	4.39321×10^{-3}	1.63635×10^{-3}	2.46879	7.96×10^{-7}	-0.789196542
1200	3.661621	7.813024	0.3705550	3.480270	4.38188×10^{-3}	1.63153×10^{-3}	2.47129	2.21×10^{-7}	-0.789196673
1500	3.661624	7.813040	0.3705549	3.480271	4.37628×10^{-3}	1.62850×10^{-3}	2.47134	1.30×10^{-7}	-0.789196718
1800	3.661624	7.813046	0.3705549	3.480272	4.37639×10^{-3}	1.62828×10^{-3}	2.47178	7.3×10^{-8}	-0.789196740
Hylleraas $N = 5741$ [4, 5]							2.47258		-0.789196705
Hylleraas $N \rightarrow \infty$ extrapolation [4, 5]							2.47264(2)		-0.789196715(5)

results of another, but completely independent, large basis SVM calculation [9]. The expectation value for the virial theorem $\langle V \rangle / \langle T \rangle$ provides an estimate of the wave function accuracy and the deviation of $\langle V \rangle / \langle T \rangle$ from -2 was only 7.3×10^{-8} hartree.

The energies of the different mass variants of PsH were computed by re-diagonalizing the Hamiltonian with the same basis but with m_{H^1} set to $1836.1527 m_e$, m_{H^2} set to $3670.483 m_e$ and m_{H^3} set to $5496.899 m_e$. The energies of PsH¹, PsH² and PsH³ were -0.788870618 hartree, -0.789033556 hartree and -0.789087767 hartree respectively. The energy of the 3200 ECG wave function of Bubin and Adamowicz [19] for PsH¹ was -0.788870707 hartree, which is 1.0×10^{-7} hartree below the present energy.

To summarize, a close to converged binding energy is

reported for the PsH ^{∞} ground state. The present energy is 2.5×10^{-8} hartree lower than the estimated variational limit of Yan and Ho. The procedure by Yan and Ho to estimate the variational limit probably tends to underestimate the size of the necessary energy correction.

Although the present energy is better than that of Yan and Ho, this does not necessarily mean that the present SVM annihilation rate is more accurate. Any basis of ECGs (which cannot satisfy the exact inter-particle cusp conditions) will have a tendency to underestimate the electron-positron coalescence matrix element. Table I shows a consistent increase in Γ as the size of the calculation is increased.

This work was supported by a research grant from the Australian Research Council. The authors would like to thank S Caple for access to additional computer facilities.

-
- [1] A. Ore, Phys. Rev. **83**, 665 (1951).
[2] C. F. Lebeda and D. M. Schrader, Phys. Rev. **178**, 24 (1969).
[3] Y. K. Ho, Phys. Rev. A **34**, 609 (1986).
[4] Z. C. Yan and Y. K. Ho, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 2697 (1999).
[5] Z. C. Yan and Y. K. Ho, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 5098 (1999).
[6] K. Strasburger and H. Chojnacki, J. Chem. Phys. **108**, 3218 (1998).
[7] G. G. Ryzhikh and J. Mitroy, J. Phys. B **32**, 4051 (1999).
[8] A. M. Frolov and V. H. Smith, Jr., Phys. Rev. A **56**, 2417 (1997).
[9] J. Usukura, K. Varga, and Y. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 1918 (1998).
[10] D. Bressanini, M. Mella, and G. Morosi, J. Chem. Phys. **108**, 4756 (1998).
[11] D. Bressanini, M. Mella, and G. Morosi, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 1678 (1998).
[12] N. Jiang and D. M. Schrader, J. Chem. Phys. **109**, 9430 (1998).
[13] T. Yoshida and G. Miyako, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 4571 (1996).
[14] S. Chiesa, M. Mella, and G. Morosi, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 022701 (2004).
[15] J. Mitroy, M. W. J. Bromley, and G. G. Ryzhikh, *Positronic Atoms*, p. 199, in [26] (2001).
[16] M. W. J. Bromley and J. Mitroy, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 012505 (2002).
[17] S. L. Saito, J. Chem. Phys. **118**, 1714 (2003).
[18] M. W. J. Bromley, J. Mitroy, and G. G. Ryzhikh, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. B **171**, 47 (2000).
[19] S. Bubin and L. Adamowicz, J. Chem. Phys. **120**, 6051 (2004).
[20] G. G. Ryzhikh, J. Mitroy, and K. Varga, J. Phys. B **31**, 3965 (1998).
[21] K. Varga and Y. Suzuki, Comput. Phys. Commun. **106**, 157 (1997).
[22] Y. Suzuki and K. Varga, *Approach to Quantum-Mechanical Few-Body Problems*, 172 (Springer, New York, 1998).
[23] C. Lee, Sov. Phys. JETP **6**, 281 (1958), zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **33** 365 (1957).
[24] S. M. Neamtan, G. Darewych, and G. Oczkowski, Phys. Rev. **126**, 193 (1962).
[25] J. Mitroy and M. W. J. Bromley, p. in preparation (2006).
[26] C. M. Surko and F. A. Gianturco, eds., *New Directions in Antimatter Physics and Chemistry* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, The Netherlands, 2001).

TABLE II: Properties of the PsH ground state. Data are given for H assuming infinite mass. All quantities are given in atomic units with the exception of the annihilation rates which are in units of 10^9 s^{-1} . The positron and electron kinetic energy operators are written as T_+ and T_- .

Property	Present SVM	SVM [9]
N	1800	1600
$\langle V \rangle / \langle T \rangle + 2$	7.3×10^{-8}	6×10^{-7}
E	-0.789196740	-0.789165554
$\langle T_- \rangle$	0.3261733	0.3261732
$\langle T_+ \rangle$	0.1368503	0.1368501
$\langle r_{\text{H}^+e^-} \rangle$	2.311526	2.311525
$\langle r_{\text{H}^+e^+} \rangle$	3.661624	3.661622
$\langle r_{e^-e^-} \rangle$	3.574787	3.574783
$\langle r_{e^+e^-} \rangle$	3.480272	3.480271
$\langle 1/r_{\text{H}^+e^-} \rangle$	0.7297090	0.7297087
$\langle 1/r_{\text{H}^+e^+} \rangle$	0.3474618	0.3474618
$\langle 1/r_{e^-e^-} \rangle$	0.3705549	0.3705549
$\langle 1/r_{e^+e^-} \rangle$	0.4184961	0.4184960
$\langle r_{\text{H}^+e^-}^2 \rangle$	7.813046	7.813015
$\langle r_{\text{H}^+e^+}^2 \rangle$	16.25453	16.25448
$\langle r_{e^-e^-}^2 \rangle$	15.87546	15.87538
$\langle r_{e^+e^-}^2 \rangle$	15.58427	15.58423
$\langle 1/r_{\text{H}^+e^-}^2 \rangle$	1.207067	1.207063
$\langle 1/r_{\text{H}^+e^+}^2 \rangle$	0.1721631	0.1721637
$\langle 1/r_{e^-e^-}^2 \rangle$	0.2139099	0.2139106
$\langle 1/r_{e^-e^+}^2 \rangle$	0.3491440	0.3491428
$\langle \delta(\text{H}^+ - e^-) \rangle$	0.177279	0.177186
$\langle \delta(\text{H}^+ - e^+) \rangle$	1.62828×10^{-3}	1.63857×10^{-3}
$\langle \delta(e^- - e^-) \rangle$	4.37639×10^{-2}	4.3867×10^{-3}
$\langle \delta(e^+ - e^-) \rangle$	0.0244877	0.024461
Γ	2.47178	2.46909