

Numerical Results for Antiproton – Hydrogen Atom Scattering

D. L. Morgan, Jr.

This article was submitted to
26th Summer School, 'Applications of Mathematics in Engineering
and Economics', Sozopol, Bulgaria, June 11-17, 2000

September 28, 2000

U.S. Department of Energy

Lawrence
Livermore
National
Laboratory

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor the University of California nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or the University of California, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

This is a preprint of a paper intended for publication in a journal or proceedings. Since changes may be made before publication, this preprint is made available with the understanding that it will not be cited or reproduced without the permission of the author.

This report has been reproduced
directly from the best available copy.

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from the
Office of Scientific and Technical Information
P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Prices available from (423) 576-8401
<http://apollo.osti.gov/bridge/>

Available to the public from the
National Technical Information Service
U.S. Department of Commerce
5285 Port Royal Rd.,
Springfield, VA 22161
<http://www.ntis.gov/>

OR

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Technical Information Department's Digital Library
<http://www.llnl.gov/tid/Library.html>

Numerical Results for Antiproton - Hydrogen Atom Scattering

David L. Morgan, Jr.

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Livermore, CA 94551, U.S.A.

morgan6@llnl.gov

Abstract

A great variety of numerical methods have been employed to solve the Schroedinger equation, the basic equation of theoretical atomic physics. Being a three body problem, the scattering of an incoming antiproton (p^-) by a hydrogen atom (H, consisting of an electron, e^- , bound to a proton, p) is one of the simplest problems in field of atomic theory that requires a numerical solution. Described and compared here are three methods, valid in essentially separate energy ranges from zero energy through MeV energies, that illustrate how numerical methods are employed in this field. In spite of this problem's seeming simplicity, much effort is required in terms of mathematical manipulation and use of approximations to render it capable of numerical solution.

1. Introduction

In quantum mechanics, as in classical mechanics, exact analytic solutions are yet to be found for real systems consisting of three or more bodies. Thus, in the field of theoretical atomic physics, where one must solve the Schroedinger equation to obtain quantum solutions for systems of particles, approximate methods are required, and these nearly always require some form of numerical solution.

The system consisting of three particles, a proton (p , with unit positive charge), an antiproton (p^- , unit negative charge), and an electron (e^- , unit negative charge) is one of the simplest systems for which the exact, analytic solutions of their quantum mechanical motion are presently unknown. Hence the need for a numerical solution to the particular problem considered here, the scattering of an incident p^- by a stationary hydrogen atom (designated H, consisting of an e^- bound in the ground state to a p). Computational methods for solving this problem vary considerably, depending in part on what physical processes are possible for the given incident energy of the p^- on the stationary H.

At all energies a possible outcome of the scattering is that the p^- is deflected with no permanent effect on the H (elastic scattering). At incident energies around and above about 40 electron volts (eV), other processes are possible in which the hydrogen atom

becomes excited (higher energy bound state) or ionized (e^- unbound to p). In these processes (forms of inelastic scattering) the p^- transfers part of its energy to the e^- . At lower energies, these inelastic processes rapidly decrease in probability of occurrence and then cease (at specific energies) when the p^- energy is insufficient to cause direct ionization or a particular level of excitation. However, for energies around and below 27.2 eV, another process is possible in which the p^- is captured into a bound state with the p , forming protonium. The electron then departs since it cannot be bound to protonium, so this is another form of ionization. In this latter process the e^- can absorb very little energy beyond the minimum required for ionization. That energy is 13.6 eV, so when the incident p^- energy is increasing in the vicinity of 27.2 eV, which corresponds to 13.6 eV when viewed in the center-of-mass frame of the particles, the probability of protonium formation and the accompanying indirect ionization drops rapidly to zero.

The choice of calculational method also depends on properties of the solution that can be foreseen without obtaining a full, accurate solution. As explained later, this suggests, at all but the lowest energies, treatment of the p^- as a classical particle interacting with the quantum mechanical H . Hence the designation, semiclassical approximation, which can be shown to have at least a significant level of validity for all energies around and above about 10^{-4} eV. Concurrently, it may be shown for energies in this same range that the p^- portion of the solution involves many waves of quantized angular momentum. Thus in this range, fully quantum methods that involve expansions in basis sets of p^- wave functions lead to a prohibitively large number of coupled differential equations for current numerical capabilities.

Described here are the equations that must be solved and three particular methods of solution that span the energy range of the incident p^- from zero to 1 MeV.

2. Equations to Solve

The ordinary Schrodinger equation determines the non-relativistic quantum mechanical motion of the three particles. Non-relativistic motion is present here because the mean speeds of the three particles is well below the speed of light. The Schrodinger equation for the system of the three particles is (using atomic units in which the unit of mass is the mass of the electron, of distance one Bohr radius, of charge the proton charge, and of angular momentum Planck's constant over 2π)

$$-i \partial\Psi/\partial t = H\Psi \quad (1)$$

for the time dependent form and

$$H\psi = E\psi \quad (2)$$

for the time independent form, where t is the time, H the Hamiltonian operator, E the total energy of the particles, and Ψ and ψ are the wave functions to be solved for. Ψ and ψ are both functions of the spatial coordinates of the particles, and Ψ is additionally a function of time. H is given by

$$H = K + V , \quad (3)$$

where K is the kinetic energy operator and V is the potential energy. Here, after the center of mass motion has been separated out (and employing atomic units), K is given by

$$K = - (1/2\mu_e)\nabla_r^2 - (1/\mu_p)\nabla_R^2 - (1/\mu_p)\nabla_r \cdot \nabla_R , \quad (4)$$

where $\mu_e = m_p/(m_e+m_p)$ and $\mu_p = m_p/m_e$, with m_e being the mass of the e^- and m_p the common mass of the p and p^- . The ∇ 's are gradient operators or, when squared, Laplacians. Their subscripts denote to which coordinate set they refer, with r denoting the coordinates of the e^- relative to the p and R the coordinates of the p^- relative to the p . Here, V is given by

$$V = -1/r - 1/R + 1/\rho , \quad (5)$$

where r is the distance between the p and e^- , R is the distance between the p and p^- , and ρ is the distance between the e^- and p^- . Some other choices of coordinates lead to only the Laplacians appearing in K , but the choice shown here, which includes the gradient product, is more convenient for expressing initial and final conditions in Eq. (1) and boundary conditions in Eq. (2).

Eq. (1) determines Ψ uniquely at all times if its form is known for one particular time. Likewise Eq. (2) determines ψ uniquely for a given E and a given set of boundary conditions. Eq. (1) and Eq. (2) are closely related in that Eq. (1) may be easily solved by expanding Ψ in the form $\Psi = \sum_j \exp[-iE_j t] \psi_j$, where ψ_j are the eigenstates that result from solving Eq. (2) for all possible values of E and relevant boundary conditions. Whether one chooses to solve Eq. (1) or Eq. (2) for a particular p^- -H scattering problem depends on the approximations and numerical methods chosen.

The approximations and numerical methods suitable for solving the Schroedinger equation (Eq. (1) or (2)) for p^- -H scattering depend on the energy of the incident p^- . Described and compared in the following sections are three particular methods that are valid in different portions of the energy range from zero to MeV energies.

3. Semiclassical Method for p^- Energy Above 10 eV

When that energy of the p^- is high, the dependence of the wave function Ψ or ψ on the position of the p^- is very strong, so a superposition of solutions in a narrow range of energies around a mean value, E , makes the p^- portion of the wave function very compact. Thus, the p^- can be represented, to a good approximation as a classical point particle. The p^- is then taken to move on a classical trajectory, and Eq. (1) is solved for the H atom only, under the time dependent influence of the p^- . Thus, for the hydrogen atom, one solves

$$-i \partial \Psi[\mathbf{r}, t] / \partial t = (- (1/2\mu_e)\nabla_r^2 - 1/r - 1/R[t] + 1/\rho[t]) \Psi[\mathbf{r}, t] , \quad (6)$$

where $\rho[t] = |\mathbf{R}[t] - \mathbf{r}|$, with \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{r} being the vectors corresponding to R and r , and concurrently, one calculates $\mathbf{R}[t]$ (and thus $R[t]$) by calculating the classical trajectory of the p in a potential energy field given by

$$V[t] = -1/R + \int \Psi^*[\mathbf{r},t](1/\rho)\Psi[\mathbf{r},t] d\tau_r. \quad (7)$$

Eq. (6) and the classical trajectory are solved simultaneously by numerical methods in increments of time. Eq. (6) may be solved directly or one may use $\Psi = \sum_i c_i[t]\psi_i$, where the ψ_i are a limited set of bound and unbound states of H , and then solve for the $c_i[t]$. At sufficiently high energies the p^- may be simply presumed to move on a straight line with a constant speed.




Fig. 1. Protonium formation and e^- ionization cross sections in atomic units for p^- -H scattering as functions of the kinetic energy in eV in the lab frame of reference. a: Schultz et al. [1] using the semiclassical method and solving the time dependent Schroedinger equation. b: Morgan and Hughes [4] and Morgan [5] using the semiclassical method and the adiabatic approximation. c: Voronin and Carbonell [7,8] using a fully quantum mechanical method to solve the time independent Schroedinger equation.

An example of results employing this semiclassical, time dependent approximation are shown in Fig. 1. as curves a. Experimental data on the ionization exists above 30 eV and the calculation agrees fairly well with them. These results were obtained by Schultz et al. [1] by solving Eq. (6) on a 135^3 3D cartesian spatial lattice with a constant spacing of 0.385 atomic units. Spatial differencing was accomplished by either a low order 3-point scheme or by using a high order Fourier collocation representation. Time

propagation from time to t_0 time t was handled by a unitary, implicit method involving expansion of the exponential time propagator, $\exp[-iH[(t+t_0)/2](t-t_0)]$. Various approximations in the numerical methods were employed. The numerical calculation was at the limit of being doable, and appears to be prohibitive for energies below 10 eV. Equation (7) was not solved directly. The p^- was assumed to move on a trajectory determined from the ground state adiabatic potential energy curve (see following section). This approximation appears to be valid at energies where the trajectory departs significantly from a straight line with the p^- moving at constant speed. This method is also valid for $E > 1\text{MeV}$.

Variations of the above method has been applied to other systems by a number of authors including Ritchie [2]. It should be noted that, for these calculations, the numerical mesh employed is Cartesian with fixed spacing. It might be possible to use meshes for other coordinate systems and/or other variable spacing to improve the efficiency of the calculations.

4. Semiclassical Method for p^- Energy Below 10 eV

For energies around and below 10 eV another approximation is valid. That is the adiabatic approximation, which applies when the p^- is moving so slowly that the time dependent solution, Ψ , to Eq. (6) differs little (except for an insignificant multiplication factor, $\exp[iEt]$) from the ground state solution, ψ , of the time independent equation,

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2\mu_e} \nabla_r^2 - \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{R} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \psi[\mathbf{r}] = E\psi[\mathbf{r}], \quad (8)$$

which is just the time independent Schroedinger equation for H in the presence of a stationary p^- . Equation (8) has been considered and solved, using nearly analytic numeric means, by a number of authors including those listed in Ref. [3]. In Eq. (8), R acts as a parameter upon which ψ and E depend. The potential energy felt by the p^- is $E[R] - E[\infty]$, where $E[\infty] = -1/2$ is the ground state energy of H (atomic units). The results of solving equation (8) may be combined with the semiclassical approximation to considerably simplify obtaining the cross section for protonium formation below 10 eV.

To employ this semiclassical, adiabatic method one proceeds as follows. First, one notes that solving Eq. (8) shows that for R less than $R_c = 0.639$ a.u. (atomic units) the electron becomes unbound. Thus, if the inner turning point of the p^- orbit is less than this value, the e^- leaves, and to conserve energy the p^- must become bound to the p and protonium is formed (p^- capture). Thus, one can determine the maximum value of impact parameter (R_1 , distance of closest approach to the p if the p^- were moving on a straight path) which leads to the inner turning point being less than R_c . The cross section for protonium formation, σ , is then just given by

$$\sigma = \pi R_1^2. \quad (9)$$

Morgan and Hughes [4] employed this method to determine σ and those results were later extended by Morgan [5] to somewhat higher energies. They are shown as curve b in Fig. 1. These are evidently the only results in this energy range.

Considerations concerning the accuracy and range of validity of the results are as follows. First, the adiabatic approximation breaks down as the p^- speeds up while approaching the p . This breakdown is what allows the e^- to escape and p^- to become bound, since otherwise the e^- would return and the p^- leave. There is nevertheless a probability that this reversion to the original state may occur. Morgan has made a rough estimate of this and found the probability of reversion to be nearly independent of energy below about 2 eV and about equal to 20% [6].

Second, below about 2 eV and due to the effect of the R^{-4} dependence of the long range potential energy between the p^- and H, the inner turning point is a discontinuous function of the impact parameter such that it is either well outside of R_c or well within it. Thus, around and above 2 eV, the border between protonium forming or not is less well defined, there is less time for it to occur, and calculation of the reversion probability is suspect. Thus, the results for p^- energies around and above 2 eV are probably less accurate than for those below. Further, Eq. (9) does not account for the fact that around and above 25 eV the cross section drops rapidly to zero because the electron cannot take away the larger excess energy required for protonium formation. The upper end of validity for Eq. (9) and curve b of Fig. 1 is probably, therefore, a few to 10 eV.

The lower end of the energy range of validity is determined by the point at which assuming classical motion for the p^- becomes invalid. This lower end may be at about 10^{-4} eV where the p^- wave packet is about the same size as the H atom. However, as the p^- approaches the p , it speeds up considerably, attaining a kinetic energy well above that value, and it becomes more compact. Thus, the semiclassical, adiabatic approximation may be valid at still lower energies. It should be noted that it agrees at least roughly with the other two curves in Fig. 1 near both of its limits.

Another possible problem with this method is that it makes no account of the discrete energy states in which the protonium is formed (principal quantum numbers of about 25 to 30). A more fully quantum mechanical method for this energy range could take that into consideration. A colleague, Burke Ritchie, and I are currently searching for such a method that is capable of numerical solution with available computational methods and computers.

5. Fully Quantum Method for p^- Energy Below 10^{-4} eV

For p^- energies below 10^{-4} eV only a few p^- angular momentum waves are involved in the interaction, so it is possible to do fully quantum mechanical calculations. A. Yu. Voronin and J. Carbonell have carried out a successful, and evidently the only, such calculation [7,8].

They start by employing a unitary coupled-channel approach in which the time independent ψ is expressed as an expansion,

$$\psi[\mathbf{r},\mathbf{R}] = \phi[\mathbf{r}] \chi[\mathbf{R}] + \sum_i g_i[\mathbf{r}] f_i[\mathbf{R}], \quad (10)$$

which is to be a solution of Eq. (2) and where ϕ is the ground state wave function of H, χ is unknown, the g_i are unknown (except they are orthogonal to ϕ), and the f_i are the complete set of wave functions (eigenstates) of protonium. In Eq. (10) \mathbf{r} is defined as in Section 2. above, while \mathbf{R} is initially defined as the distance from the p^- to the center of mass of the p and e^- . This alternative definition leads to the absence of the gradient product in Eq. (4) and a slight change in the coefficient of $\nabla_{\mathbf{R}}^2$ there, if the \mathbf{R} there is replaced by this alternative one. As it stands, there are no approximations in Eq. (10).

Voronin and Carbonell then argue that it is a good approximation to replace their initial \mathbf{R} with the one of Section 2. while keeping the simplifying changes to the equations there that their initial choice provided. Doing so leads to simplification of the boundary conditions that were inherent in their initial choice.

Substitution of Eq. (10) into Eq. (2) and subsequent projection onto ϕ and each of the f_i then results in an infinite set of coupled 3-coordinate partial differential-integral equations which, of course, cannot be solved numerically at present. Thus they proceed through a number of approximations and substitutions to render the system tractable to solution. First they truncate the expansion in Eq. (10) and approximate the effect of the dropped terms by adding a long range potential energy term to the equation for χ . Next they separate out the dependences of χ and the f_i on the angles of \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{R} (temporarily greatly multiplying the number of equations) while noting that, due in part to the low p^- energy, the f_i need only include states of low angular momentum and a limited range of principal quantum numbers. Thus, the equations are reduced to a set of coupled ordinary differential-integral equations.

That set is still numerically difficult, but the full set need only be solved once, for zero p^- energy, because a number of terms can be grouped into a complex potential energy that is nearly independent of the p^- energy. The zero-energy solution provides an evaluation of that potential energy, and when it is substituted in for other energies, the set of equations reduces to a single one which can be readily solved numerically. Considering only protonium states with angular momentum quantum numbers of zero through three, their results for the protonium formation cross section are shown as curve c in Fig. 1. (Inclusion of direct nuclear annihilation raises the cross section by about 30% at the left end of the curve and by an imperceptible amount at the right end.) Accurate values for energies higher than shown require consideration of higher angular momentum values. Where they overlap with these results, the more approximate adiabatic, semiclassical results are too high by a factor of about two. This is encouraging for those results since they are expected to be more accurate at higher energies.

5. Conclusion

At the present time, the p^- -H scattering problem has required a great amount of effort to render it tractable to numerical solution. This is in considerable contrast to bound state problems involving even larger numbers of particles, such as the energy states of atoms, where tractable and accurate numerical methods (variational, Hartree-Fock,....) have existed for many years.

Acknowledgments

Helpful discussions were had with Burke Ritchie and Alex Yu. Voronin.

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by the University of California Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under contract No. W-7405-ENG-48.

References

- [1] D.R. Schultz, P.S. Krstic, C.O. Reinhold, and J.C. Wells, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 2882 (1996); J.C. Wells, D.R. Schultz, P. Garvis, and M.S. Pindzola, Phys. Rev. A 54, 593 (1996).
- [2] B. Ritchie and Charles Weatherford, International Journal of Quantum Chemistry 70, 627 (1998); M.E. Riley and B. Ritchie, Phys. Rev. A 59, 3544 (1998).
- [3] E. Fermi and E. Teller, Phys. Rev. 72, 399 (1947); I. Shimamura, Phys. Rev. A 46, 3776 (1992).
- [4] D.L. Morgan, Jr. and V.W. Hughes, Phys. Rev. A 7, 1811 (1973); Phys. Rev. D 2, 1389 (1970).
- [5] D.L. Morgan, Jr., in Proceedings, International School of Physics of Exotic Atoms, 6th Workshop: Exotic Atoms, Molecules and Their Interactions, Erice, Sicily, Italy, 21-30 March 1994, Ed. C. Rizzo and E. Zavattini, INFN/AE-94/24 (Servizio di Riproduzione della Sezione dell'I.N.F.N. di Trieste) p 205 (1994).
- [6] D.L. Morgan, Jr., Antiproton - Hydrogen Atom Annihilation, AFRPL TR-86-019 (Air Force Astronautics Laboratory, Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., U.S.A.) (1986).
- [7] A. Voronin and J. Carbonell, Phys. Rev. A57, 4335 (1998); Few-Body Systems Suppl. 10, 207 (1999).
- [8] A. Voronin, Private communication (May, 2000).