

# **Intermolecular Interactions: Physical Picture, Computational Methods and Model Potentials**

**Ilya G. Kaplan**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico*



**John Wiley & Sons, Ltd**



Intermolecular Interactions:  
Physical Picture,  
Computational Methods  
and Model Potentials



# **Intermolecular Interactions: Physical Picture, Computational Methods and Model Potentials**

**Ilya G. Kaplan**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico*



John Wiley & Sons, Ltd

Copyright © 2006

John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester,  
West Sussex PO19 8SQ, England

Telephone (+44) 1243 779777

Email (for orders and customer service enquiries): cs-books@wiley.co.uk

Visit our Home Page on [www.wiley.com](http://www.wiley.com)

All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning or otherwise, except under the terms of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 or under the terms of a licence issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency Ltd, 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 4LP, UK, without the permission in writing of the Publisher. Requests to the Publisher should be addressed to the Permissions Department, John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex PO19 8SQ, England, or emailed to [permreq@wiley.co.uk](mailto:permreq@wiley.co.uk), or faxed to (+44) 1243 770620.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The Publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold on the understanding that the Publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

#### ***Other Wiley Editorial Offices***

John Wiley & Sons Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA

Jossey-Bass, 989 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94103-1741, USA

Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH, Boschstr. 12, D-69469 Weinheim, Germany

John Wiley & Sons Australia Ltd, 42 McDougall Street, Milton, Queensland 4064, Australia

John Wiley & Sons (Asia) Pte Ltd, 2 Clementi Loop #02-01, Jin Xing Distripark, Singapore 129809

John Wiley & Sons Canada Ltd, 22 Worcester Road, Etobicoke, Ontario, Canada M9W 1L1

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

#### ***Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data***

Kaplan, I. G. (Il'ëina Grigor'evich)

[Vvedenie v teoriïu mezhmolekulëïarnykh vzaimodeïstviï. English]

Intermolecular interactions : physical picture, computational methods and model potentials / Ilya G. Kaplan.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN-13: 978-0-470-86332-9 (cloth : alk. paper)

ISBN-10: 0-470-86332-3 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Molecular dynamics. 2. Intermolecular forces. I. Title.

QD461.K29713 2006

541'.394 – dc22

2005021486

#### ***British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data***

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN-13 978-0-470-86332-9 (HB)

ISBN-10 0-470-86332-3 (HB)

Typeset in 10/12 Times by Laserwords Private Limited, Chennai, India

Printed and bound in Great Britain by TJ International, Padstow, Cornwall

This book is printed on acid-free paper responsibly manufactured from sustainable forestry in which at least two trees are planted for each one used for paper production.

*To my sons:*  
*Grigori and Vassili*





# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	xi
<b>1 Background Knowledge</b>	1
1.1 The Subject and its Specificity	1
1.2 A Brief Historical Survey	4
1.3 The Concept of Interatomic Potential and Adiabatic Approximation	11
1.4 General Classification of Intermolecular Interactions	17
References	21
<b>2 Types of Intermolecular Interactions: Qualitative Picture</b>	25
2.1 Direct Electrostatic Interactions	25
2.1.1 General expressions	25
2.1.2 Multipole moments	26
2.1.3 Multipole–multipole interactions	35
2.2 Resonance Interaction	39
2.3 Polarization Interactions	42
2.3.1 Induction interactions	42
2.3.2 Dispersion interactions	44
2.4 Exchange Interaction	50
2.5 Retardation Effects in Long-Range Interactions and the Influence of Temperature	57
2.6 Relativistic (Magnetic) Interactions	63
2.7 Interaction Between Macroscopic Bodies	69
References	75
<b>3 Calculation of Intermolecular Interactions</b>	81
3.1 Large Distances	81
3.1.1 Derivation of the general expression for the multipole expansion of the Coulomb interaction energy operator	81
3.1.2 Interaction energy of two atoms in S-states	87
3.1.3 Dispersion and induction interactions of molecular systems	91

3.1.4	Convergence of the multipole expansion	95
3.1.4.1	Perturbation series and the multipole expansion	95
3.1.4.2	Study of the convergence of the multipole expansion	99
3.1.5	Elimination of divergence in the multipole expansion	103
3.2	Intermediate and Short Distances	108
3.2.1	Perturbation theory with exchange	108
3.2.1.1	Ambiguity of the exchange-perturbation theory series	108
3.2.1.2	Symmetry adapted perturbation theories	110
3.2.1.3	Methods allowing the standard Rayleigh–Schrödinger perturbation theory to be applied	114
3.2.2	Variational methods	119
3.2.2.1	The Hartree–Fock approximation and accounting for the electron correlation	119
3.2.2.2	Basis set superposition error	124
3.2.2.3	Density functional theory	129
	References	132
<b>4</b>	<b>Nonadditivity of Intermolecular Interactions</b>	<b>141</b>
4.1	Physical Nature of Nonadditivity and the Definition of Many-Body Forces	141
4.2	Manifestations of Nonadditive Effects	146
4.3	Perturbation Theory and Many-Body Decomposition	150
4.3.1	General formulae	150
4.3.2	Proof of the additivity of the dispersion energy in the second order of PT	154
4.3.3	The dispersion energies of higher orders	155
4.4	Many-Body Effects in Atomic Clusters	158
4.4.1	Rare gas clusters	158
4.4.2	Metal clusters	159
4.4.3	Nature of binding in alkaline-earth clusters	164
4.4.3.1	Why the study of binding of alkaline-earth elements is important	164
4.4.3.2	Nature of binding in dimers and trimers	166
4.4.3.3	Population of vacant atomic orbitals	170
4.5	Atom–Atom Potential Scheme and Nonadditivity	174
	References	180
<b>5</b>	<b>Model Potentials</b>	<b>183</b>
5.1	Semiempirical Model Potentials	183
5.1.1	Hard-sphere model potentials	183
5.1.2	Lennard–Jones potential	184

5.1.3	Modifications of the Lennard–Jones potential	185
5.1.3.1	(12–6–4) potential	185
5.1.3.2	(m–6–8) potential	185
5.1.3.3	Kihara potential	186
5.1.4	Buckingham potential	187
5.1.5	Modifications of the Buckingham potential	189
5.1.6	Potentials describing spectroscopic properties of diatomic molecules	190
5.1.6.1	Morse potential	190
5.1.6.2	Rydberg potential	191
5.1.6.3	Pöschl–Teller potential	192
5.1.6.4	Kratzer potential	193
5.1.6.5	Dunham expansion and its modification	196
5.1.7	Anisotropic potentials	197
5.1.7.1	Keesom potential	197
5.1.7.2	Stockmayer potential	197
5.1.7.3	Atom–linear molecule interaction potentials	197
5.1.7.4	Model potentials applied in water and aqueous-system studies	199
5.1.8	Screened Coulomb potential	202
5.1.9	Born–Mayer potential	204
5.1.10	Boys–Shavitt multi-parameter potential	205
5.1.11	Combined (piecewise) potentials	206
5.1.11.1	Erginsoy–Vineyard–Englert potential	206
5.1.11.2	ESMSV and MSV potentials	207
5.1.12	Model potentials applied in metal and semiconductor studies	208
5.1.12.1	Glue models	208
5.1.12.2	Explicit inclusion of the three-body term in model potential	212
5.1.13	Model potentials fitted to <i>ab initio</i> calculated potential surfaces	215
5.2	Determination of Parameters in Model Potentials	220
5.3	Reconstructing Potentials on the Basis of Experimental Data	224
5.3.1	Rydberg–Klein–Rees method	224
5.3.2	Inverse scattering problem	227
5.3.2.1	General statement of the problem	227
5.3.2.2	Quasi-classical treatment: the Firsov approach	229
5.3.3	Reconstructing potentials from thermophysical data	233
5.4	Global Optimization Methods	234
5.4.1	Introduction to the problem	234
5.4.2	Simulated annealing	235
5.4.3	Hypersurface deformation methods	238

5.4.3.1	Diffusion equation method	238
5.4.3.2	Basin-hopping algorithm	241
5.4.4	Genetic algorithm	243
References		247
<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>Fundamental Physical Constants and</b>	
	<b>Conversion Table of Physical Units</b>	255
<b>Appendix 2</b>	<b>Some Necessary Mathematical Apparatus</b>	257
A2.1	Vector and Tensor Calculus	257
A2.1.1	Definition of vector; the addition law	257
A2.1.2	Scalar and vector products; triple scalar product	259
A2.1.3	Determinants	261
A2.1.4	Vector analysis; gradient, divergence and curl	262
A2.1.5	Vector spaces and matrices	266
A2.1.6	Tensors	270
A2.2	Group Theory	272
A2.2.1	Properties of group operations	272
A2.2.2	Representations of groups	278
A2.2.3	The permutation group	291
A2.2.4	The linear groups. The three-dimensional rotation group	297
A2.2.5	Point groups	303
A2.2.6	Irreducible tensor operators. Spherical tensors	312
References		317
<b>Appendix 3</b>	<b>Methods of Quantum-Mechanical Calculations</b>	
	<b>of Many-Electron Systems</b>	319
A3.1	Adiabatic Approximation	319
A3.2	Variational Methods	323
A3.2.1	Self-consistent field method	323
A3.2.2	Methods taking into account the electron correlation	329
A3.2.2.1	$r_{12}$ -dependent wave functions	329
A3.2.2.2	Configuration interaction	330
A3.2.2.3	Coupled cluster method	333
A3.2.2.4	Density functional theory approach	335
A3.3	Perturbation Theory	340
A3.3.1	Rayleigh–Schrödinger perturbation theory	341
A3.3.2	Møller–Plesset perturbation theory	343
A3.3.3	Operator formalism and the Brillouin–Wigner perturbation theory	346
A3.3.4	Variational perturbation theory	349
A3.3.5	Asymptotic expansions; Padé approximants	351
References		354
<b>Index</b>		359

# Preface

The subject of this book – intermolecular interactions – is as important in physics as in chemistry and molecular biology. Intermolecular interactions are responsible for the existence of liquids and solids in nature. They determine the physical and chemical properties of gases, liquids and crystals, the stability of chemical complexes and biological compounds. Such universality is due to the universality of the laws of quantum mechanics, on which the theory of intermolecular interactions is based. Atoms, molecules and crystals obey the same quantum-mechanical regularities.

Usually in quantum-mechanical textbooks, the theory of the intermolecular interactions is reduced to a discussion on the long-range behavior of atom–atom interactions and the introduction of dispersion forces. In many textbooks, even dispersion forces are not included. Physicists attribute intermolecular forces to chemical interactions that should be considered within the scope of quantum chemistry. However, in quantum-chemical textbooks also, intermolecular forces are not discussed in detail.

In this book the detailed qualitative descriptions of different types of intermolecular forces at large, intermediate and short-range distances are presented (Chapters 1 and 2). For the first time in monographic literature, the temperature dependence of the dispersion forces is analyzed. It is argued that at finite temperatures, the famous asymptotic Casimir–Polder formula for the dispersion energy is correct only within a narrow distance range. I have tried to make the presentation understandable to a broad range of readers without oversimplification. In Chapter 3, the methods for quantitative calculation of intermolecular interactions are discussed and modern achievements are presented. This chapter should be helpful for scientists performing computer calculations of many-electron systems.

The table of contents indicates other specific topics covered. Chapter 4 is devoted to the manifestations of nonadditive effects and to many-body forces responsible for that. The largest chapter (Chapter 5) collects more than 50 model potentials exploited for processing experimental data and for computer simulation in different fields of physics, chemistry and molecular biology. To the best of my knowledge, it is the most comprehensive account of model potentials published in the last 30 years. I have also included in Chapter 5 a special section where the widely used (at present) global optimization methods: simulated annealing, diffusion equation method, basin-hopping algorithm and genetic algorithm are described.

My previous book on this topic, I.G. Kaplan ‘Theory of Molecular Interactions’ (Elsevier, Amsterdam) was published in 1986. It is still often cited by scientists and used in many universities for teaching. But for the last twenty years many new methods have been elaborated and new theoretical and experimental data obtained. This resulted in a reassessment of some accepted concepts in the field. The new book is not an up-to-date edition of the old one – it is much more comprehensive and written in another methodological way.

Significant efforts were made to present this book so that it is self-sufficient for readers. All necessary mathematical apparatus, including vector and tensor calculus and the elements of the group theory, are given in Appendix 2. The main methods used for quantal calculation of many-electron systems are presented in Appendix 3. In this Appendix, I discuss not only the ideas of the computational methods but present a critical survey of modern achievements; in particular, it relates to the rapidly developing DFT approach. Appendix 3 can help readers who employ in their studies modern suites of programs to learn the basic principles of the methods they use.

I would like to acknowledge Isaak Bersuker, Grzegorz Chałasiński, Frans van Duijneveldt, Serguei Fomine, David Grier, Boris Ivlev, Wim Klopper, Eugene Kryachko, Karo Michaelian, David Moule, Boris Plakhutin, Andrei Tchougreff, Anatoly Titov and Victor Tuguchev for sending preprints and reprints of their publications and for useful discussions of different aspects of intermolecular interactions. Especially, I would like to thank my wife, Larisa, for her ongoing patience and support.

Mexico  
June 2005

Ilya G. Kaplan

---

# 1 Background Knowledge

---

## 1.1 The Subject and its Specificity

The importance of intermolecular forces<sup>1</sup> in Nature is very difficult to overestimate. It is sufficient to say that the existence of liquids and solids is due to intermolecular interactions. In the absence of intermolecular interactions our world would be a uniform ideal gas.

A knowledge of the physics of intermolecular interactions is required to solve a wide class of problems in physics, chemistry and biology. The thermodynamic properties of gases and liquids and their kinetic characteristics (the coefficients of heat conductivity, diffusion etc.) are determined by the nature of intermolecular interactions. Intermolecular forces also determine to a large degree the properties of crystals, such as the equilibrium geometry, the binding energy, phonon spectra, etc.

Intermolecular interactions are involved in the formation of complicated chemical complexes, such as charge-transfer and hydrogen-bond complexes. Study of the mechanism of elementary chemical reactions is impossible without knowledge of the exchange processes between the translational and electron-vibration energies, which depend on the interaction of particles under collisions. Knowledge of the potential surface, characterizing the mutual trajectories of the reactants, is necessary to obtain the rates of chemical reactions.

A knowledge of intermolecular interactions is of great importance also in biology. It is enough to say that intermolecular forces account for the stability of such important compounds as DNA and RNA and also play an essential role in muscle contraction. The coagulation theory of colloidal solutions is based on a balance of the repulsive electrostatic forces and the attractive dispersion forces.

The development of modern technology required a knowledge of the macroscopic properties of gases under conditions that are almost inaccessible for experimental measurement (supersonic velocities, high temperatures >1000 K, hyper-high pressures in shock waves). The theoretical prediction of these properties requires a knowledge of the potential energy curves for a wide range of separations, which have to be found independently.

<sup>1</sup> Here and in other chapters the term 'intermolecular forces' denotes also interatomic forces, which do not lead to the formation of chemical bond. Except for some special cases, no distinction will be made between intermolecular and interatomic interactions.

It should be emphasized that intermolecular forces are not measured directly in any experiment. It is other characteristics, such as the deviation angle under scattering, the transport coefficients, etc., which are connected functionally with the intermolecular forces, that are measured. The main source of experimental information about intermolecular interactions are:

- scattering experiments in atomic–molecular beams, which, in some cases, permit the potentials to be obtained directly from the experimental data;
- spectroscopic measurements (vibrational–rotational spectra, predissociation, broadening of lines by pressure, etc.);
- data on thermophysical properties of gases and liquids (virial coefficients, viscosity and transport coefficients, etc.);
- data on crystal properties (elastic constants, phonon spectra, sublimation energy, etc.);
- experiments on the formation of radioactive defects in solids (the focussing energy, the threshold displacement energy, etc.);
- nuclear magnetic resonance experiments in solids and liquids (the time of spin and spin-lattice relaxations).


To process the experimental data, different semiempirical model potentials with parameters obtained by fitting to the experimental data are usually used. The analytical form of these two-body potentials depends upon the system under study and the nature of the problem. Consider, as an example, the widely used (12–6) Lennard-Jones potential:

$$V^{LJ}(R) = \frac{a}{R^{12}} - \frac{b}{R^6} \quad (1.1)$$

This potential (see Section 5.1.2) has two parameters,  $a$  and  $b$ . At small distances  $V^{LJ}(R) > 0$ , the repulsive forces dominate; at large distances  $V^{LJ}(R) < 0$ , the potential becomes attractive. So, at some point  $R_0$ ,  $V^{LJ}(R_0) = 0$ . The point  $R_0$  corresponds to the distance where the repulsive forces are compensated by the attractive ones. The potential function (Equation (1.1)) has a minimum, which is found from the condition  $dV^{LJ}(R) / dR = 0$  (Figure 1.1) where  $\varepsilon$  denotes the depth of the potential well. The potential can be expressed via two other independent parameters,  $R_0$  and  $\varepsilon$ , having obvious physical and geometrical sense. These parameters are connected with the parameters  $a$  and  $b$  by the following relations:

$$R_0^6 = a/b \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon = b^2/4a$$





**Figure 1.1** The Lennard-Johns model potential (Equation (1.2))

and Equation (1.1) is transformed to:

$$V^{LJ}(R) = 4\varepsilon \left[ \left( \frac{R_0}{R} \right)^{12} - \left( \frac{R_0}{R} \right)^6 \right] \quad (1.2)$$

In general, a model potential can contain  $n$  parameters ( $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n$ ). To fit these parameters to experimental data, it is necessary to know a theoretical equation that expresses the measured property via a model potential, so that the theoretical equation for the measured property becomes a function of the parameters. Then the procedure that fits these parameters (see Section 5.2) is applied to obtain the best agreement of the calculated values of this function with the measured values.

It should be mentioned that semiempirical potentials cannot describe intermolecular potential adequately for a wide range of separations. A given potential with parameters calibrated for one property, often describes other properties inadequately, since different physical properties may be sensitive to different parts of the potential curve. Hence, to obtain more adequate potentials, the procedure of parameter matching must be carried out using as much of the experimental information as possible on the physical properties of the system under study. The use of high-speed computers brought about the possibility of the application of piecewise potentials that have different analytic form for different ranges of separations (Section 5.1.11).

Model potentials with different analytical forms can lead to the same observed relationship. In this case, experimental agreement with a given analytical dependence of model potential is not a sufficient indication of its correctness but merely a necessary condition. For example, the magnitude of the second virial coefficient is not sensitive to the form of the potential curve and its minimum position; it depends only on the ratio between the width and the depth of the potential well. In the same way, the viscosity coefficient is not sensitive to the dependence of the potential on the separation distance.

When estimating the reliability of the potential obtained, it is necessary to take into account not only the measurement errors but also the approximate nature of the formulae, which connect the measured characteristics with the molecular potential (an error of the theoretical approximation). It is also necessary to bear in mind that the optimized function is a nonlinear function of parameters. As a result, different sets of optimized parameters can give the same precision when fitted to experimental data.

In some cases, it is possible to solve the so-called inverse problem, i.e. to determine the potential directly from the experimental data without preliminary premises about its analytical form (as a rule, in a restricted range of distances). Different approaches to this complex problem are described in Section 5.3.

The discussion above emphasizes the importance of the theoretical determination of intermolecular potentials. The knowledge of the analytical dependence, which follows from the theory, permits more reliable model potentials to be constructed.

The basic concepts of the quantum-mechanical theory of intermolecular forces were formulated about 75 years ago. Nevertheless, it was only the last several decades that the number of studies on intermolecular interactions increased rapidly. This development has emerged for two reasons. Firstly, a general development of quantum-chemical methods of calculating the electronic structure of molecules has taken place, partly due to the availability of high-speed computers and the use of more refined mathematical methods. Secondly, more reliable experimental methods have appeared, which have allowed the theoretical predictions to be verified.

Before presenting the modern concepts about the nature of intermolecular forces, it is instructive to follow the evolution of these concepts. The discovery of the laws of intermolecular interactions, as any other discovery, was not a straightforward process. A great number of fallacies and wrong trends occurred along the way.

## 1.2 A Brief Historical Survey

Development of concepts about the nature of intermolecular forces is linked with the development of ideas about the atom. Concepts about the atomic structure of matter were formulated by the ancient philosophers. According to Democritus (fifth century BC) and to his semilegendary colleague Leukippos, all bodies consist of finest indivisible particles or *atoms*, separated by a vacuum (emptiness). A vacuum is required for the existence of motion. In the absence of a vacuum, the bodies would interfere under collisions, and motion would be impossible. Bodies differ from each other by the form of the atoms, their arrangement and their mutual orientation.

Introducing the concept of atoms required answering the question: In what manner are atoms linked to form different bodies? Since the interaction was considered to occur only by their direct contact, the problem was solved at the level of the simplest mechanical models, such as hooks, notches, and other devices, as described, for example, by Lucretius (first century BC) in his poem *De Rerum Natura* [1].


In the Middle Ages, the problem of the atomic structure of matter did not attract any attention. An interest in science was completely lost and the scholastic mentality dominated. One of widely discussed ‘actual’ problems was: How many angels can be accommodated on the edge of a needle? The interest in the doctrine of the ancient atomistics arose only from the middle of the seventeenth century. This process occurred very gradually. For example, Galileo, who worked successfully in the field of the dynamics of bodies, became very abstract when was discussing the structure of these bodies. He reduced the particles, which compose the matter, to mathematical points separated by a vacuum and explained the strength of bodies as the disgust to vacuum, i.e. as the resistance of small emptinesses to their expansion.

The ideas of Descartes greatly influenced the development of concepts about the internal structure of matter. These ideas were presented in his treatise ‘*Les Passions de l’Ame*’, finished in 1633 but published only in 1664–1667 after his death. Descartes assumed that matter is equivalent to its extent but that, on the other hand, an extent does not exist without matter (cf. with the modern concept of space and matter!). In contrast to the ancient atomistics, Descartes suggested that matter is, in principle, infinitely divisible. This idea was also accepted by Leibniz, who assumed that there is no last small body because each body, even very small, is a whole world with an infinite number of creations.

According to Descartes, matter consists of particles, which differ from each other in form and size, and that they are also divisible. Descartes suggested that solids consist of fixed bodies, which are densely packed, and that liquids consist of particles, which move relative to each other. All motions are represented exclusively by mechanical displacements. Descartes assumed that ‘hidden’ interactive forces are absent.

Newton is known as the creator of Newton’s laws in classical mechanics and Newton’s gravitational law. But he considered also forces existing in material medium. A principal difference between Newton and his predecessors was in postulating, in addition to mechanical interaction, the existence of gravitational, magnetic and electric forces, as well as other attractions effective only at very small distances [2].

However, the concrete form of the dependence of interatomic forces upon the distance was not discussed neither by Newton nor by his predecessors. The law of the interaction between particles was introduced for the first time by the Croatian physicist Boscovich (1711–1787) in a work entitled ‘*Theory of Natural Science Reduced to the Single Law of Forces Existing in Nature*’ [3]. According to Boscovich, all bodies consist of point particles. The oscillating force between any two point particles increases infinitely as they approach each other and tends to the Newton gravitational forces ( $\sim 1/R^2$ ) at large distances (Figure 1.2). The existence of repulsive and attractive forces and their alternation is necessary, in Boscovich’s opinion, in order to explain the physical properties of gases as well as the deformation of plastic bodies. The Boscovich interaction law was the first interatomic potential used to explain physical properties.



**Figure 1.2** The Boscovich universal potential

At approximately the same time, in 1743, the French physicist Clairault introduced the concept of forces interacting between molecules to explain the rising of liquids in capillaries [4]. The studies by Clairault in this field were developed further by Laplace [5] and by Gauss [6]. The intermolecular potential  $V(R)$  was used in their papers in a most general functional form. Gauss studied the problem of liquids in capillaries using the principle of virtual work, requiring equilibrium of every mass point under acting forces. He considered three types of forces acting on molecules in liquid: 1. the force of gravity, 2. the mutual attractive forces between the molecules and 3. attractive forces between the molecules of the liquid and the molecules composing the walls of the capillary tube. Gauss showed that for the appearing integrals to be finite, the potential must behave at  $R \rightarrow \infty$  as  $1/R^n$  with  $n$  not smaller than six.

The kinetic theory of gases was developed by Clausius [7], Maxwell [8, 9] and Boltzmann [10] in the second half of the nineteenth century. Clausius [7] accepted that molecules repel each other at small distances and attract each other at large distances (at present, this concept is well established). Maxwell presumed that the intermolecular forces are entirely repulsive at all distances. He used an analytical form for the interaction potential,  $V(R) = A/R^n$ , which corresponds to a repulsion, and obtained the expressions for the diffusion, heat capacity and elasticity coefficients. At that time it was known that the elasticity is proportional to the absolute temperature and does not depend on the gas density. The second property can be explained for any value of  $n$ , it had been derived previously on the assumption that the molecules are rigid spheres not interacting with each other except on direct contact. For an explanation of the first property, Maxwell concluded that  $n = 4$ . He assumed that the dependence  $A/R^4$  is also valid at very small distances.

Today, it is well known that the repulsive part of potential is not described by the  $A/R^4$  dependence. As Margenau and Kestner [11] remarked, Maxwell made a logical fallacy: from the fact that some premise led to the correct result, he concluded that the premise was valid, without testing the corollaries resulting from other premises. In the case considered, the proportionality of the elasticity to the temperature can be obtained from an infinite number of different potentials  $V(R)$ .

Although Maxwell's concept for a analytical form of model potential was erroneous, it represented a mathematically useful expression that allowed closed formulae for various kinetic characteristics of gases to be obtained and played a fundamental role in the subsequent development of the kinetic theory.

Boltzmann's work [10] was stimulated by his doubts on the simplicity of the interaction law proposed by Maxwell. Boltzmann repeated all the calculations using different attractive model potentials. He favored the existence of attractive forces since they provided the condensation of gases. All the models led to results which were similar to those of Maxwell and consistent with experimental data.

The attractive forces, which act between neutral atoms and molecules at large distances, were to be later named as the *van der Waals forces*. This name is not connected with the concrete studies by van der Waals on the nature of intermolecular forces, but with his well-known state equation [12], which accounts for the deviations from the ideal gas behavior:

$$\left(P + \frac{a}{V^2}\right)(V - b) = RT \quad (1.3)$$

where  $a$  is a constant that accounts for the attraction between molecules of gas. That is, at constant volume and temperature, the pressure decreases with increasing  $a$ , in agreement with the fact that the attraction between the molecules must reduce the pressure on the vessel walls. The necessity of introducing a correction due to an attraction, in order to make the equation of state consistent with the experimental data, indicates the existence of the attractive forces between molecules.

In subsequent studies, different empirical potentials were used for the explanation of physical properties of gases and liquids. In a series of papers, Sutherland [13, 14] examined some analytical forms of the attractive potential between molecules in the gas phase (in particular,  $V(R) \sim -A/R^3$ ) with parameters determined by fitting to experimental data. This kind of phenomenological approach became typical for subsequent studies in this field. The semiempirical procedure of fitting the potential parameters using experimental data has appeared to be very useful and was developed in the twentieth century, beginning with the paper by Lennard-Jones [15]. The well-known Lennard-Jones potential:

$$V(R) = \frac{\lambda}{R^n} - \frac{\mu}{R^m} \quad (1.4)$$

has been applied widely in studies on gases and condensed matter.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century, in addition to the phenomenological approaches based on the application of empirical potentials, attempts were made to elucidate the physical nature of intermolecular forces. Some authors connected the intermolecular forces with gravitational ones. For instance, the Newton potential was corrected by a screening factor:

$$V(R) = -G \frac{m_1 m_2}{R} \exp\left(-\frac{R}{a}\right) \quad (1.5)$$

However, the small magnitude of the gravitational forces has resulted in a rejection of their use in the theory of intermolecular forces. Appearing at the same time, the data about the existence of electrical charges in atoms and molecules led to an assumption about the electromagnetic nature of intermolecular forces.

Reinganum [16] was the first to consider the interaction of two neutral molecules as the interaction of two permanent electric dipoles. According to the electrostatic theory, the interaction energy of two electric dipoles with moments  $\mathbf{d}_1$  and  $\mathbf{d}_2$ , respectively, which are located at a distance  $R$  from each other, depends on their mutual orientation and has the following form:

$$E_{dd} = \frac{1}{R^5} [R^2 (\mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \mathbf{d}_2) - 3(\mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \mathbf{R})(\mathbf{d}_2 \cdot \mathbf{R})] \quad (1.6)$$

Introducing the spherical angles  $\theta_1, \varphi_1, \theta_2, \varphi_2$ , characterizing the directions of dipoles  $\mathbf{d}_1$  and  $\mathbf{d}_2$ , with the z-axis along a line connecting their centers, Equation (1.6) becomes:

$$E_{dd} = -\frac{d_1 d_2}{R^3} [2 \cos \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 - \sin \theta_1 \sin \theta_2 \cos(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)] \quad (1.7)$$

The energy  $E_{dd}$  becomes positive (corresponds to the repulsive forces), if one of the dipole moments is perpendicular to the z-axis, and has a minimum corresponding to the attractive forces with the value:

$$(E_{dd})_{\min} = -\frac{2d_1 d_2}{R^3} \quad (1.8)$$

for the dipole orientation along the z-axis. Reinganum carried out a statistical calculation of dipole–dipole interactions, averaging all the orientations. Such an average, under the condition that all orientations are equally probable, leads to the zeroth interaction energy:

$$\langle E_{dd} \rangle = 0 \quad (1.9)$$

where the bracket notation denotes an average over orientations. But the probability of the dipole orientation, corresponding to the energy  $E$ , is determined by the Boltzmann factor  $\exp(-E/kT)$ . Taking this into account and  $E_{dd}$  in the form of Equation (1.7), one obtains, at the condition  $E_{dd} \ll kT$ :

$$\left\langle E_{dd} \exp\left(-\frac{E_{dd}}{kT}\right) \right\rangle = \langle E_{dd} \rangle - \frac{1}{kT} \langle E_{dd}^2 \rangle = -\frac{2}{3kT} \frac{d_1^2 d_2^2}{R^6} \quad (1.10)$$

So, the attraction forces between dipoles, obtained by Reinganum, decrease as the temperature increases and approach zero at high temperature. These forces were called *orientational forces*.

Intermolecular forces exist also at high temperatures. Therefore, the introduction of the orientational forces does not provide a complete answer to the question of the nature of intermolecular forces. Moreover, the existence of orientation forces requires the existence of permanent dipole moments in molecules. In fact, it was assumed at that time that all atoms and molecules possess dipole moments. This concept was strengthened by the early Debye studies on the theory of the dielectric

permittivity [17]. According to that theory, the molecular dipoles align in an electric field. Debye verified his theory on five liquids, which accidentally occurred to be polar (alcohols), and arrived at the amusing (but not for his time!) conclusion that all molecules are polar.

In later studies it was found, however, that the simplest homoatomic molecules, such as hydrogen ( $H_2$ ), nitrogen ( $N_2$ ) and oxygen ( $O_2$ ) molecules, have no dipole moments. In order to explain the interaction between non-dipole molecules, it was Debye [18] who made the next important step towards the understanding the nature of intermolecular forces. He assumed that the charges in a molecule are not fixed rigidly, but are able to move under the influence of the field produced by a permanent moment of the other molecule.

Since dipoles did not appear to be universal, Debye studied the induction of the dipole electric moment in one molecule by the permanent quadrupole moment of the other molecule. He evaluated the electrical field  $D_A(R)$  created by the quadrupole moment  $Q_A$  of molecule A at a distance R from it,  $D_A = Q_A/R^4$ . This field induces a dipole moment  $\mathbf{d}_B$  in molecule B,  $\mathbf{d}_B \sim \alpha_B \mathbf{D}_A$ , where  $\alpha_B$  is the polarizability of molecule B. The interaction energy of the induced dipole moment  $\mathbf{d}_B$  with the electric field  $\mathbf{D}_A$  is equal to  $E_{qd} = -\mathbf{d}_B \cdot \mathbf{D}_A = -\alpha_B D_A^2$ . Taking into account that a similar effect on molecule A is produced by the quadrupole moment of molecule B and carrying out an averaging over all the equally probable mutual orientations, Debye obtained the following expression for the interaction energy:

$$\langle E_{qq} \rangle = -\frac{2}{3} \left( \alpha_A \frac{Q_B^2}{R^8} + \alpha_B \frac{Q_A^2}{R^8} \right) \quad (1.11)$$

where the quantities  $Q_A$  and  $Q_B$  are components of the quadrupole moments of the molecules A and B, respectively. It is evident that Expression (1.11) does not depend on the temperature. Therefore, it provides an attractive interaction even at high temperatures when the effect of the orientational forces is almost zero. The induction interaction, induced by dipole moments, was studied later by Falkenhagen [19], who found it to be proportional to  $1/R^6$ . The forces of this type were then called the *Debye–Falkenhagen induction forces*.

While studying the induction interactions of molecules with quadrupole moments, Debye did not, however, consider the direct electrostatic interaction of quadrupole moments of molecules. This was done by Keesom [20] who generalized Reinganum's calculations by considering, in addition to the dipole–dipole interaction, the dipole–quadrupole and quadrupole–quadrupole ones. Sometimes the orientational forces are named the *Keesom forces*, although it is more correct to call them the *Reinganum–Keesom forces*.

Thus, classical physics has been able to explain, at least qualitatively, two types of interactions: the interactions between molecules with permanent multipole moments and the interactions between permanent and induced moments in molecules. This was achieved by introducing orientational forces that decrease with increasing temperature, and induction forces that do not depend on temperature.

In the case of some polar molecules, e.g. water, these forces make a considerable contribution to the intermolecular interaction. Although they constitute only a small part of the interaction for some other molecules, such as hydrogen chloride.

However, classical physics has completely failed to explain the origin of interaction among rare gas atoms. The electron shells of these atoms are spherically symmetric, which means that such atoms possess neither dipole nor other multipole moments, although the attractive forces in these systems are not negligible. At that time it was already known that at low temperatures rare gases undergo the transitions in liquid and solid states. In the framework of classical physics, one has been also unable to obtain the analytic form of a repulsion law at short distances.

The systematic and correct theory of intermolecular forces, which describes their behavior both at short and large distances, could be constructed only after the development of quantum mechanics between 1925 and 1927 (Bohr, Heisenberg, Schrödinger, Born, Dirac, Pauli). In 1927, Heitler and London [21] carried out the quantum-mechanical calculation of the potential curve for the simple system consisting of two hydrogen atoms. The Heitler–London calculation laid the foundation of the quantum theory of valence. As follows from their results, the repulsive behavior of the potential curve at short distances is determined by the antisymmetry of the wave function with respect to the permutations of electrons that stems from the Pauli exclusion principle. It causes the appearance of the specific *exchange interaction*. The repulsive exchange forces decrease exponentially with the distance.

In the same year, Wang [22] considered the quantum-mechanical attraction arising between two hydrogen atoms at large distances. He showed that it is proportional to  $1/R^6$ . These forces were called the *dispersion forces* and have a pure quantum-mechanical origin. The general theory of the dispersion forces was formulated in 1930 by Fritz London [23, 24]. The theory of dispersion forces resolved the problem of origin of the attraction between rare gas atoms. The leading term in the dispersion interactions for all systems falls down with distance as  $1/R^6$ . The dispersion forces are called also the *London forces*, or the *van der Waals forces*.

In 1948, while working on the problems of the coagulation theory of colloidal solutions, the Dutch theoretical physicists Casimir and Polder [25] took into account the retarding effects of the interaction between colloidal particles at large distances. They revealed that in this case, instead of the dependence  $1/R^6$ , there is a more rapid decrease of the dispersion forces with the distance, namely, the  $1/R^7$ –law (*the Casimir–Polder interaction*). In the same year, Casimir [26] found the analytical expression for the forces between two parallel metallic plates studying the zero-point energy of the vacuum electromagnetic field between plates. Finally, Lifshitz [27, 28] has created the general theory of the attractive van der Waals forces between macroscopic bodies with arbitrary permittivity.

At this point it is reasonable to conclude our brief historical survey of the evolution and main advances in the theory of intermolecular interactions. Their detailed



account and the contemporary achievements are presented in the following parts of this book.

### 1.3 The Concept of Interatomic Potential and Adiabatic Approximation

A consistent theory of intermolecular forces can only be developed on the basis of quantum-mechanical principles. Because of the quantum nature of the electronic and nuclear motions, the solution of the intermolecular interaction problem reduces to solving the Schrödinger equation for a system of interacting molecules. Such a problem may be solved only after adopting some approximations. A substantial simplification may be achieved because of the possibility of separating the electronic and nuclear subsystems and introducing the concept of the *adiabatic potential*. This approach, denoted as the *adiabatic approximation*, is based on a large difference between the masses of electrons and nuclei (the detailed derivation is presented in Section A3.1).

Within the adiabatic approach, the electron subsystem is studied with fixed nuclei. In the Schrödinger equation, the nuclear kinetic energy operator is neglected and the nuclear coordinates are treated as fixed parameters. The Schrödinger equation splits into two: one for the electron motion with fixed nuclei and the other for the nuclear motion with the electron energy as the potential energy.

Below, we represent the basic equations for the system of two atoms A and B with  $N_A$  and  $N_B$  electrons, respectively, and the total number of electrons in the system  $N = N_A + N_B$ . Let us denote the set of  $3N$  electron coordinates as  $r$  and the distance between nuclei as  $R$ . The total wave function in the adiabatic approximation is written as a simple product:

$$\Psi_{mv}(r, R) = \chi_{mv}(R)\Psi_m(r, R) \quad (1.12)$$

where we denote the wave function describing the nuclear motion as  $\chi_{mv}(R)$  and the wave function of the  $N$ -electron system in a quantum state  $m$  as  $\Psi_m(r, R)$ ; for each electronic quantum state  $m$  there is a corresponding set of nuclear quantum states  $v$ .

The electronic wave function  $\Psi_m(r, R)$  has to satisfy the Schrödinger equation for the electronic motion:

$$H_e \Psi_m(r, R) = E_m(R)\Psi_m(r, R) \quad (1.13)$$

with the Hamiltonian:

$$H_e = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i^2 - \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{Z_a e^2}{r_{ai}} + \frac{Z_b e^2}{r_{bi}} \right) + \sum_{i < j} \frac{e^2}{r_{ij}} + \frac{Z_a Z_b e^2}{R} \quad (1.14)$$

where  $r_{ai}$  and  $r_{bi}$  are the distances between electron  $i$  and nuclei  $a$  and  $b$ , having the charges  $Z_a$  and  $Z_b$ , respectively, and  $R$  is the fixed interatomic distance (see

Equation (A3.8)). The wave function  $\Psi_m(r, R)$  describes the electronic motion at fixed nuclear coordinates or at an infinitely slow change of nuclear coordinates (adiabatic change). So, the eigenvalues  $E_m$  of Equation (1.13) depend upon the value of parameter  $R$ . The solution of Equation (1.13) at different values of  $R$  allows to obtain the function  $E_m(R)$ . This function plays the role of the potential energy in the Schrödinger equation for the nuclear motion, which in the so-called *Born–Oppenheimer approximation* [29] is presented as:

$$\left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \nabla_R^2 + E_m(R) \right] \chi_{mv}(R) = E_{mv} \chi_{mv}(R) \quad (1.15)$$

As was noted by Born [30, 31], the adiabatic potential energy  $E_m(R)$  can be corrected by adding the diagonal contribution of the electron-nuclear interaction (*vibronic interaction*) (see Section A3.1). In this *Born adiabatic approximation*, the Schrödinger equation for the nuclear motion is written as:

$$\left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \nabla_R^2 + V_m(R) \right] \chi_{mv}(R) = E_m \chi_{mv}(R) \quad (1.16)$$

$$V_m(R) = E_m(R) - W_{mm}(R) \quad (1.17)$$


The adiabatic potential energy  $V_m(R)$  is named the *interatomic potential*. The second term in Equation (1.17),  $W_{mm}(R)$ , is called *adiabatic correction*. The methods for calculating it are given in references [32–38]. Because of calculation difficulties, the adiabatic correction is often neglected and the interatomic potential is approximated by the energy  $E_m(R)$  found in solution of the Schrödinger equation for the electronic motion at different values of the interatomic distance  $R$  (Equation (1.13)).

In the vicinity of the minimum of the potential energy, the nuclear motion can be separated in the *vibration* motion of nuclei and the *rotation* motion of the system as a whole. The nuclear wave function is factorized as:

$$\chi_{mv}(R) = \Lambda_{mv}(Q) \Theta_{MK}^J(\vartheta) \quad (1.18)$$

where  $\nu$  enumerates the vibrational states,  $Q$  is the normal coordinate,  $J$  is the rotational angular momentum,  $M$  and  $K$  are its projections on z-axes of the laboratory frame and molecular frame, respectively, and  $\vartheta$  is the set of the Euler angles. Vibrational energy levels  $E_{mv}$  for some electronic quantum state  $m$  are depicted in Figure 1.3.

The knowledge of interatomic potentials is necessary for studying the behavior of interacting atoms (molecules) at different distances and at different temperatures. But it must be kept in mind that the adiabatic approximation is not valid for degenerate electronic states, which are often the case for excited electronic states. It is also a bad approximation when the electronic terms are close to each other. In these cases the electron-nuclear interaction terms in the coupled equations (Equation (A3.13)) cannot be neglected. The adiabatic potential loses its physical meaning as the potential energy for the nuclear motion. The physical and chemical phenomena associated with the degeneracy and quasi-degeneracy of electronic



**Figure 1.3** Vibrational energy levels in a potential well formed in an electronic quantum state (m)

states are called the *Jahn–Teller effect* [39–43]. In Jahn–Teller systems, the adiabatic approach cannot be applied and the role of the vibronic interactions becomes crucial. Among such systems a very important role is played by molecular systems with potential surfaces characterized by so-called *conical intersections* [44], in which the nonadiabatic coupling terms are singular at isolated points. In the last decade, conical intersection effects have attracted great attention in theoretical and experimental studies as an essential aspect of various electronically nonadiabatic processes (see reviews by Baer [45] and Yarkony [46], and references therein).

For the nondegenerate ground electronic state, the adiabatic approximation works surprisingly well. The discussion of the accuracy of the adiabatic approximation is presented in reviews by Kołos [47] and Rychlewski [48]. For a good check, a most precisely calculated molecular system has to be chosen. The best choice is the hydrogen molecule. On one hand, it is the simplest molecular system for which the numerous precise theoretical and experimental studies have been performed. On the other hand, it contains the lightest nuclei; so, it can be expected that the obtained error of the adiabatic approximation will be an upper limit.

In Table 1.1, the most precise theoretical and experimental values of the dissociation energy and the ionization potential for the hydrogen molecule are presented. The discrepancy is smaller than the experimental error. It is a great success of computational chemistry based on quantum-mechanical concepts of chemical bonding. It should be stressed that this excellent agreement between theory and experiment is a result of more than six decades of research on both sides—theoretical and experimental. Thus, the calculations for hydrogen are the most trustworthy and can be used to check the adiabatic approximation.

**Table 1.1** Comparison of theoretical calculations with experimental values for the hydrogen molecule in (in  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ )

	Theory	Experiment	Discrepancy
a) Dissociation energy			
Kołos–Rychlewski [49]	36 118.049		$0.006 \pm 0.08$
Wolniewicz [50]	36 118.069		$0.004 \pm 0.008$
		$36\,118.11 \pm 0.08^a$	
b) Ionization potential			
Kołos–Rychlewski [49]	124 417.471		$0.017 \pm 0.017$
Wolniewicz [50]	124 417.491		$0.003 \pm 0.017$
		$124\,417.488 \pm 0.017^b$	

<sup>a</sup>Reference [51]<sup>b</sup>Reference [52]

According to the calculation of the nonadiabatic corrections to the hydrogen ground state dissociation energy by Wolniewicz [50, 53], the nonadiabatic correction to the lowest vibrational level  $\Delta D_0(\nu=0)^{\text{nonad}} = 0.50 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and the maximum nonadiabatic correction was found for the vibrational level  $\nu=9$ ,  $\Delta D_0(\nu=9)^{\text{nonad}} = 5.20 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The precise value of  $D_0$  is equal to  $36\,118.069 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  [50]. Hence, the relative error of the adiabatic approximation in the ground state of the hydrogen molecule is  $\Delta D_0^{\text{nonad}}/D_0 = 10^{-5}$  to  $10^{-4}$ . From this follows that the accuracy of the adiabatic approximation is very high. It is considerably higher than the value of the small parameter  $(m_e/M_p)^{1/4} = 0.15$ , on which the Born–Oppenheimer adiabatic approximation [29] was based. For molecules with heavier atoms one can expect even larger precision. But it is difficult to check because of calculation problems.

For two atoms, the interatomic potential is represented by a potential curve  $V(R)$ . In the ground electronic state of two-atom systems, the interatomic potential  $V_0(R)$  usually has a minimum. The depth of potential well,  $E_0$ , depends upon a system under study. In covalent bonded molecules, the well depth is equal to several electron-volts (eV) in the van der Waals dimers of noble gas atoms, it is equal to  $10^{-2}$  to  $10^{-3}$  eV. The ratio of the well depths in helium and hydrogen molecules (the two extreme cases) is about  $10^{-4}$ . The helium dimer was observed experimentally only recently [54]. It is the most weakly bound molecule known at present. Its dissociation energy ( $D_0 = E_0 - (1/2)\hbar\omega_0$ ) is equal to  $1.2 \text{ mK} \simeq 10^{-7} \text{ eV}$ , while in hydrogen the dissociation energy  $D_0 = 4.48 \text{ eV}$ . Also the great difference is in the optimal (equilibrium) distances: from  $1.4 a_0$  in the hydrogen molecule to  $5.6 a_0$  in the helium dimer.

The potentials describing the interaction between two molecules may be, as in the two-atom case, represented by a potential curve depending only on one variable, if the interaction is averaged over all molecular orientations in space. This potential,  $V(R)$ , where  $R$  is the distance between the centers of masses of the molecules,

is named the *potential of intermolecular interaction*, or briefly, the *intermolecular potential*. When the interacting molecules are fixed in space, the intermolecular potential,  $V(R, \vartheta)$ , depends on a set of Euler's angles,  $\vartheta$ , which determines the mutual orientation of the molecules. In addition, the interaction depends on the electronic state of the interacting systems. Therefore, for any pair of molecules there is a set of intermolecular potentials,  $V_m(R, \vartheta)$ , where  $m$  labels the quantum states of the systems.

For three atoms taking part in a substitution reaction:



the adiabatic potential is represented by a potential surface depending on three interatomic separations:

$$V_m = V_m(R_{AB}, R_{BC}, R_{AC}) \quad (1.20)$$

If two of the interatomic separations remain constant, the resulting potential curve represents a cross section of this surface. Similarly to a two-atom case, in a three-atom system there is a set of potential surfaces that depends on the quantum states of the reacting atoms.

In a system with three (or more) atoms, there is the problem of nonadditivity. It is necessary to study the deviations from the additive approach, in which the potential of the system can be presented as a sum of pair potentials  $V_{ab}$ :

$$V(ABC \dots) = \sum_{a < b} V_{ab} \quad (1.21)$$

This problem will be discussed in Chapter 4.

As shown in the preceding text, the concept of interatomic potential is based on the adiabatic approximation. Some authors studying the pairwise atom-atom potentials consider them as a classical concept. This is an incorrect statement. Even in the case where the motion of atoms is treated classically, as it is often done in the molecular dynamic studies, the interatomic potentials applied in these approaches have a quantum mechanical origin. The analytical form of numerous semiempirical model potentials (see Chapter 5) is based on the analytical expressions for different types of intermolecular forces (exchange, dispersion etc.) found by an approximate solution of the Schrödinger equation in the adiabatic approximation.

It should be noted that the adiabatic approximation may be invalid in high-energy collisions if the magnitude of energy is so high that the nuclear kinetic energy operator cannot be neglected. In this case, the electrons will not be able to adjust adiabatically to the nuclear rearrangement. In the theory of atomic collisions [55, 56] it is shown that the adiabatic approximation is valid only for large values of the so-called the Massey parameter  $\zeta_{mn}$ :

$$\zeta_{mn} = \omega_{mn}a/v \quad (1.22)$$

where  $\omega_{mn}$  is the frequency of electronic transitions between states  $m$  and  $n$ ,  $v$  is the velocity of the atomic motion, and  $a$  is the distance at which the adiabatic

electronic wave function undergoes essential changes. Parameter  $a$  is defined as a characteristic distance such that a shift by  $a$  results in an appreciable change of the matrix element with a semiclassical analogue of the nonadiabatic operator. The essence of the Massey criterion may be reduced to a requirement for the collision time,  $\sim a/v$ , to be much larger than the transition time,  $\sim \omega_{mn}^{-1}$ , between the adiabatic terms of the interacting system. When the equality (Equation (1.22)) breaks down, a large probability of nonadiabatic transitions exists, that is, the mixing of adiabatic terms of the system takes place.

In the early 1960s, the validity of applying the adiabatic approximation in elastic atomic collisions was discussed in connection with the high-energy helium (He) collision experiments by Armdur and Bertrand [57]. The experimental repulsive part of the He-He potential at distances  $R \simeq 0.5 \text{ \AA}$  was 9 eV lower than published theoretical values. The accurate quantum-mechanical calculation, with the inclusion of configuration interaction, carried out by Philipson [58], led to a lowering of the theoretical curve by 2 to 3 eV only. It was suggested that the adiabatic approximation breaks down in the experiment since the energy of the helium atoms was of order of 1000 eV. However, inclusion of nonadiabatic corrections resulted in an insignificant lowering of the theoretical curves, due to some compensating factors [59]. It is instructive that the reason for the discrepancy was found to be in the experimental measurements. After revising all the details of the experiment, Armdur [60] obtained a good agreement between the new experimental curve and the curve calculated by Philipson. Thus, the experimental data in such elastic atomic collisions, at least in the range of energies of a few keV, are described adequately within the frame of the adiabatic approximation. But it can be expected that the adiabatic approach will break down for higher collision energies.

In collision experiments with the helium beam [57], the helium atoms stayed in the ground electronic state. So, it was the elastic scattering process. The adiabatic approximation is not adequate for most of inelastic scattering processes (the charge exchange, predissociation etc.) even at low energy. For a non-negligible probability of transition from some electronic state to another, the adiabatic potential curves have to be located at a transition point  $R$  sufficiently close to each other. Hence, the system will correspond to quasi-degenerate case and it is the vibronic interaction that causes such kind of inelastic transitions. This was realized in 1932 in three independent studies: Landau [61], Zener [62] and Stueckelberg [63].

Thus, the adiabatic representation, in which the electronic Hamiltonian matrix is diagonal, cannot be a satisfactory basis for study most inelastic scattering processes. At present in these studies, the so-called *diabatic representation* is used. It was introduced by Lichten [64] and rigorously formulated by Smith [65]. The diabatic electronic states are defined by an unitary transformation chosen in a such manner that the first derivative couplings in coupled equations for the nuclear motion, Equation (A3.13), become sufficiently small to be neglected. In the diabatic representation, the electronic Hamiltonian matrix is nondiagonal. Its nondiagonal