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1. Introduction

The title of this review indicates the two main themes of the subject. The generality of “The Statistical Atom” emphasizes the ambition of dealing, not with a specific chemical element, but with the Periodic Table as a whole. And the word statistical points to the method applied in these investigations. Statistics has two different meanings here. First, many-electron systems obey Fermi–Dirac statistics, of course. Second, and more to the point, some properties of atoms can be studied by looking first at situations involving large numbers of electrons.

Let us supply some evidence for the practicality of such a statistical approach. The most primitive theoretical model neglects the inter-electronic interaction, thus treating the electrons as independently bound by the nucleus. But even if fermions do not interact they are aware of each other through the Pauli principle. Therefore, such noninteracting electrons (NIE) will fill the successive Bohr shells of the Coulomb potential with two electrons in each occupied orbital state. Since the degeneracy of the shell with principal quantum number \( n \) is \( 2n^2 \)-fold, the total number, \( N \), of electrons in \( n_s \) filled shells is

\[
N = \sum_{n=1}^{n_s} 2n^2 = \frac{2}{3} \left( n_s + \frac{1}{2} \right)^3 - \frac{1}{6} \left( n_s + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2.
\]

The total binding energy for a nucleus of charge \( Z \) is even simpler,

\[
-E = \sum_{n=1}^{n_s} 2n^2 \frac{Z^2}{2n^2} = Z^2 n_s,
\]

which uses the single particle binding energy \( Z^2/(2n^2) \). [Here and in the sequel we adopt atomic units, which measure energies in multiples of twice the Rydberg]

constant, \(me^4/\hbar^2 = 27.21\) eV, and distances in multiples of the Bohr radius, \(a_0 = \hbar^2/(me^2) = 0.5292\) Å. If we now invert Eq. (1) for large \(N\), we get the asymptotic energy formula

\[
-\frac{E}{Z^2} = \frac{3}{2} N^{1/3} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{3}{2} N\right)^{-1/3} + \cdots
\]  

(3)

This is certainly a good approximation if the number of electrons is large enough. But suppose we apply it for a small number, say \(N = 2\), where the exact value of \(n_s\) is one? Well, this asymptotic formula produces

\[
n_s \approx 1.0000297 \quad \text{for} \quad N = 2
\]  

(4)

which is in error by only 0.003%! For \(N = 10\), the deviation from \(n_s = 2\) is substantially smaller: just 0.0001%. We take this practically perfect agreement as strong encouragement for trying a similar large-\(N\) approximation for realistic atoms, where the electrons do interact. But before going into those details, we point out that the primitive NIE-atoms can supply realistic qualitative answers. For example, the total binding energy of neutral systems \((N = Z)\) can be written as

\[
-\frac{E}{Z^2} = 2.289 Z^{1/3} - 1 + 0.1456 Z^{-1/3} + \cdots
\]  

(5)

a structure that we shall meet again for real atoms, but with somewhat different numerical factors. Then consider atomic size. The dimension of a Bohr shell is specified by the square of the principal quantum number divided by the charge of the nucleus. For neutral atoms this says that

\[
\text{atomic size} \sim \frac{n^2}{Z} \sim Z^{-1/3}
\]  

(6)

which again is qualitatively correct for the main body of electrons.

Another kind of support for the statistical, i.e., large-\(N\) treatment of atoms comes from a look at properties of real atoms. A good example is the total binding energy, as presented in Fig. 1. Each individual circle in this figure represents the result of a Hartree–Fock (HF) calculation,\(^1\) which energies agree reasonably well with experimental values where they are available. Yet there is no understanding supplied by these individual calculations, at integer values of \(Z\), for the fact that these binding energies behave so remarkably regularly as a function of the atomic number \(Z\). Why then should one expect the large-\(N\) approximation to be useful? Simply because such a regular dependence on \(Z\) (or \(N\)) cries out for a formula like Eq. (5), and the statistical approach is likely to produce it.

2. General Approach

The basic simplification provided by the large number of electrons in the statistical atom is the possibility of introducing an average potential in which the electrons can be considered to be moving independently. That effective potential, \(V\), describes
both the interaction with the nucleus and the electron–electron interactions. We thus start with the one-particle Hamiltonian (atomic units again)

\[ H = \frac{1}{2}p^2 + V, \tag{7} \]

and use it to write down the total one-particle energy and the total number of electrons when all states with energy less than \(-\zeta\) are occupied,

\[ E_{1p} = \text{tr}\{H\eta(-H - \zeta)\}, \]
\[ N = \text{tr}\{\eta(-H - \zeta)\}. \tag{8} \]

The combination \(H + \zeta\), that appears in the argument of Heaviside's step function \(\eta\), invites rewriting \(E_{1p}\) as

\[ E_{1p} = \text{tr}\{(H + \zeta)\eta(-H - \zeta)\} - \zeta N \equiv E_1 - \zeta N. \tag{9} \]

This sum of single particle energies counts every electron pair interaction twice. In order to obtain the real energy, we therefore have to subtract the electron–electron interaction energy once. If we disregard the exchange interaction for a start, this is just the electrostatic energy of the electronic cloud. It is most advantageously evaluated in terms of the integrated square of the electric field. Thus, the total energy is given by

\[ E = E_1 - \int (dr) \frac{1}{8\pi} \left( \nabla \left( V + \frac{Z}{r} \right) \right)^2 - \zeta N, \tag{10} \]

where \(-Z/r\) is the potential of the nucleus, which has to be subtracted from \(V\) because only the field produced by the electrons is asked for.
The advantage of the particular combination of energies in Eq. (10) is its stationary property under variations of $V$ and $\zeta$. First notice that the response of $E_1$ to infinitesimal changes of $V$ exhibits the electron density $n$,

$$\delta_V E_1 = \int (d\mathbf{r}) n \delta V.$$  

(11)

Then we indeed find a vanishing first order change of $E$, i.e., $\delta_V E = 0$, in consequence of Poisson’s equation

$$n = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \nabla^2 \left( V + \frac{Z}{r} \right).$$  

(12)

Likewise, the variation of $\zeta$ produces no first order change, because

$$N = \frac{\partial E_1}{\partial \zeta} = \int (d\mathbf{r}) n,$$  

(13)

where the last equality is a simple consequence of the fact that $V$ and $\zeta$ appear in $E_1$ only as the sum $V + \zeta$. Equation (12) is a differential equation for the potential $V$, while Eq. (13) is an algebraic equation that determines $\zeta$. We thus have just enough information to find both $V$ and $\zeta$ for given $Z$ and $N$.

Obviously, the essential difficulty in this general approach is the evaluation of the trace in Eq. (9) for an arbitrary potential $V$, and then the subsequent calculation of the density $n$, needed in Poisson’s equation (12). Hartree’s way of solving this problem is to write down the one-particle Schrödinger equation for $H$ of (7); look for eigenvalues and eigenfunctions; then square the wave functions to finally produce the density, which in turn leads to a new potential to be used for the next iteration. This method imitates the exact treatment of hydrogen. But the idea of the average potential is best justified at the other end of the Periodic Table, where there are many electrons. So a different way of evaluating the trace of Eq. (9) is called for. It was invented more than half a century ago by Thomas and, independently, by Fermi.²

3. The Thomas–Fermi Model

The Thomas–Fermi (TF) approximation is based on the following idea. Although it is true that the potential $V$ changes substantially from deep within the atom to far outside, it should not vary significantly over the range important for a single electron, provided there are many electrons. If that is so, it will be a reasonable approximation for $E_1$ to sum the classical single-particle energies $\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{p}^2 + V(\mathbf{r})$ over those cells in phase space that are occupied. The counting is left to quantum mechanics; two electrons per phase space volume of $(2\pi \hbar)^3$ [= $(2\pi)^3$ in atomic units]. Thus, we write

$$E_1 = 2 \int \frac{(d\mathbf{r})(d\mathbf{p})}{(2\pi)^3} \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{p}^2 + V + \zeta \right) q \left( -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{p}^2 - V - \zeta \right).$$  

(14)
The step function $\eta$ cuts off the momentum integral at the \((r\text{-dependent})\) maximal momentum, 

$$P = \sqrt{-2(V + \zeta)}, \quad (15)$$

so that

$$E_1 = \int (dr) \left( -\frac{1}{15\pi^2} \right) P^5 = \int (dr) \left( -\frac{1}{15\pi^2} \right) [-2(V + \zeta)]^{5/2}. \quad (16)$$

The density is found by differentiating the integrand with respect to \(V\), in accordance with (11), thus producing, after insertion into Poisson’s equation (12),

$$n = \frac{1}{3\pi^2} [-2(V + \zeta)]^{3/2} = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \nabla^2 \left( V + \frac{Z}{r} \right). \quad (17)$$

This is the TF equation for \(V\). It has some simple but fundamental implications.

Far inside the atom, the potential is that of the nucleus, \(-Z/r\), large and negative. Moving outwards the potential becomes less and less negative, finally equaling \(-\zeta\), after which the argument of the square root in (17) changes its sign. So there, at a certain distance \(r_0\), the TF atom has, in general, a sharp edge, beyond which the density is zero. The picture is too simple to describe the exponential decrease of the density in the outer regions of the atom. At the edge, the potential is just the Coulomb potential of the net charge \(Z - N\), implying

$$\zeta = \frac{Z - N}{r_0} = -V(r_0), \quad (18)$$

thus

$$\zeta = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad Z = N. \quad (19)$$

The differential equation (17) requires an additional condition at the otherwise undetermined distance \(r_0\). It is supplied by the continuity of the electric field, being the field of net charge \(Z - N\), or

$$\frac{dV}{dr}(r_0) = \frac{Z - N}{r_0^2} ; = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad Z = N. \quad (20)$$

The boundary conditions (18) and (20) are supplemented by the obvious one at \(r = 0\),

$$V \to -\frac{Z}{r} \quad \text{for} \quad r \to 0, \quad (21)$$

and together they specify a unique solution of (17) for every \(N \leq Z\). Equation (19) tells us that neutral TF systems are filled to the brim with electrons. There are no negative ions in this approximation.

Let us take a closer look at the TF potential for neutral systems. It is useful to measure \(V\) as a multiple of the potential of the nucleus by introducing the TF function \(F(x)\),

$$V = -\frac{Z}{r}F(x), \quad (22)$$
the argument of which is related to the physical distance $r$ by

$$x = \frac{Z^{1/3}r}{a} \quad \text{with} \quad a = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{3\pi}{4}\right)^{2/3}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

The constant $a$ is chosen such that the differential equation for $F$,

$$\frac{d^2}{dx^2}F(x) = \frac{[F(x)]^{3/2}}{x^{1/2}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

also called the TF equation, is free of numerical factors. For neutral atoms, $\zeta = 0$, the boundary conditions (18) and (20) can be satisfied only at infinity,

$$F(\infty) = 0, \quad F'(\infty) = 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

and (21) translates into

$$F(0) = 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

Please notice that both the differential equation (24) and the boundary conditions (25, 26) do not refer to $Z$. The TF function is a universal function for all $Z$. The potential $V$ itself does, of course, depend on $Z$: first through the factor $Z/r$, but then also because of the $Z$ dependence of the TF variable $x$ of Eq. (23). The factor $Z^{1/3}$ there implies the same shrinking of larger atoms that we have already observed for NIE, see Eq. (6).

Figure 2 shows a plot of $F(x)$, which is well known numerically. For our purposes the initial slope $B$,

$$F(x) \cong 1 - Bx \quad \text{for} \quad x \ll 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

is important; its numerical value is (approximately)

$$B = 1.588.$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

The physical significance of $B$ is apparent when (27) is inserted into (22), producing

$$V(r) \cong -\frac{Z}{r} + \frac{B}{a} Z^{4/3} \quad \text{for} \quad r \gg 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)
inasmuch as the additive constant is the interaction energy of an electron, near the nucleus, with the main body of electrons. We can use it to immediately write down the change in energy caused by an infinitesimal change of the nuclear charge $Z$ to $Z + \delta Z$. It is the analogous electrostatic energy of that additional nuclear charge, where a minus sign is needed to connect with the known energy, which is that of an electron,

$$\delta E = -\frac{B}{a} \frac{Z^4}{\delta Z}.$$  \hfill (30)

The consequence

$$E = -\frac{3}{7} \frac{B}{a} Z^{7/3}$$ \hfill (31)

is the TF formula for the total binding energy of atoms. Comparison of the numerical factor in

$$\frac{-E}{\frac{1}{2}Z^2} = 1.537 Z^{1/3}$$ \hfill (32)

with the one of the leading term for NIE [Eq. (5)] shows that the electron-electron interaction reduces the atomic binding energy by roughly one third.

A look at Fig. 3 shows that Eq. (32) does reproduce the general trend of the atomic binding energies. Although the need for refinements is clear, it is remarkable how well TF works despite the crudeness of the approximation that it represents. In Fig. 3, the continuous statistical curve is closer to the integer-$Z$ HF circles at small $Z$ values than at large ones. This is deceptive, however, since it is the fractional difference that counts. This relative deviation decreases with increasing $Z$. For
Fig. 4. Radial density $D = 4\pi r^2 n$, as predicted by TF.

$Z = 10, 20, 30, 60, 90, \text{and} 120 \text{ its amount is } 29, 24, 21, 17, 15, \text{and} 13 \text{ percent, respectively.}$

There are also obvious deficiencies of the simple TF model, graphically demonstrated by a plot of the TF density in Fig. 4. At small distances the radial density grows like the square root of $r$, not proportional to the square of $r$ as required by a finite density at $r = 0$, whereas the drop off at large distances goes like $r^{-4}$, which is so slow that one never really gets outside the TF atom. We have noted earlier that neutral TF atoms have their edge, $r_0$, at infinity.

4. Validity of TF

Before we can improve TF we must find out where it fails. Recall that the derivation started with the assumption that $V$ is slowly varying. What does this mean? The quantum standard of length associated with an individual electron is its de Broglie wavelength, $\lambda$. The potential does not change significantly over this range, if

$$|\lambda \nabla V| \ll |V|. \quad (33)$$

Substantial changes in $V$ occur on a scale set by the distance $r$, so that criterion $^{33}$ requires that

$$\lambda \ll r. \quad (34)$$

On the other hand, $\lambda$ is the inverse momentum (we ignore factors of 2 or $\pi$ for this kind of reasoning), which in turn is given by the square root of the potential, see Eq. $^{15}$. In short, we have, as criterion for the validity of TF, the relation

$$r \sqrt{|V|} \gg 1. \quad (35)$$
5. Improving TF. Strongly Bound Electrons

Despite their relatively small number, the electrons close to the nucleus have such a large binding energy that the leading correction to the TF energy formula [32] stems from a better description of these strongly bound electrons. This can be achieved rather simply, with a very rewarding outcome. Here is how it goes.
In the region we are talking about now, the vicinity of the nucleus, the potential is well approximated by (29); it is the Coulomb potential plus a (small) constant. In other words, the strongly bound electrons feel practically only the force of the nucleus, while the interaction with other electrons is negligible. Consequently, we shall treat the neighborhood of the nucleus as occupied by NIE, filling a certain number, \( n_s \), of Bohr shells. Formally, the one-particle energy spectrum is divided at a binding energy \( \zeta_s \) which separates the strongly bound electrons from the rest, see Fig. 6. This \( \zeta_s \) is, of course, not a uniquely defined physical quantity. But it is not arbitrary. First, \( \zeta_s \) denotes a binding energy that is large on the TF scale, but small on the Coulomb scale, because we do not want to correct for just the 1s shell, but for all relevant Bohr shells. Symbolically this means

\[
Z^{4/3} \ll \zeta_s \ll Z^2. \tag{37}
\]

Second, \( \zeta_s \) is related to the number of shells, \( n_s \), that are treated specially. So \( \zeta_s \) has to be sandwiched by the binding energies of the \( n_s \)th and the \( (n_s + 1) \)th shell. This can be expressed by

\[
n_s < \frac{Z}{\sqrt{\zeta_s}} < n_s + 1, \tag{38}
\]

which exhibits the combination of \( Z \) and \( \zeta_s \) that will be relevant in a moment. The union of (37) and (38) shows that the total number of specially treated strongly bound electrons, \( N_s \) \([\sim n_s^2, \text{cf. Eq. (1)}]\), is a small fraction of all electrons,

\[
N_s \ll Z. \tag{39}
\]

To obtain the change in the binding energy generated by the improved description of the innermost electrons, we have to do two things: remove the wrong TF value, which is \( Z^2(\frac{Z}{\sqrt{\zeta_s}}) \), and then add the correct Bohr energy of Eq. (2). Thus the
correction to the binding energy is
\[ \Delta(-E) = -Z^2 \frac{Z}{\sqrt{2}\zeta_s} + Z^2 n_s . \] (40)

This looks ambiguous, inasmuch as it contains \(n_s\) and \(\zeta_s\), both being quantities that lack a unique value. However, for fixed \(n_s\), the possible range for \(\zeta_s\) is given in (38), so that averaging over this range assigns the value \(-Z^2(n_s + \frac{1}{2})\) to the first term on the right of (40). This implies
\[ \Delta(-E) = -\frac{1}{2} Z^2 . \] (41)

What we have found is the next term in the energy formula; it now reads
\[ \frac{-E}{\frac{1}{2}Z^2} = 1.537Z^{1/3} - 1 . \] (42)

Since the strongly bound electrons involved in this correction are basically noninteracting, it could have been anticipated that the additional term is identical with the respective one in the formula for NIE, Eq. (5).

Again we compare with the HF energies. Figure 7 also gives a plot of the previous TF curve to emphasize the significant improvement.

6. Improving TF. Quantum Corrections and Exchange

The corrections we discuss next come from the main body of the electrons. First we remark that Eq. (14) is in error to the extent that the quantum effects introduced in (33) are significant. So we now consider corrections associated with the finiteness
of $\nabla V$. Inasmuch as this is a vectorial quantity, the leading energy correction is of second order in the parameter of (33), $|\lambda \nabla V|/|V|$, and therefore produces an energy change $\sim Z^{5/3}$. For details the reader is referred to Ref. 5, from which we quote the leading quantum correction to the energy,

$$\Delta E_{\text{qu}} = -\frac{1}{18\pi^3} \int (dr) \left[ -2(V + \zeta) \right]^2 .$$

(43)

The derivatives of the potential that occur initially have been removed both by partial integrations and by utilizing the TF equation for $V$, Eq. (17). For neutral atoms, the corresponding supplement to (42) is now obtained by inserting the TF potential (and $\zeta = 0$, of course) into (43), which leads to

$$\Delta E_{\text{qu}} = -\frac{Z^{5/3}}{16a^2} \int_0^\infty dx F(x)^2 = \frac{2}{11} (-0.2699 Z^{5/3}) .$$

(44)

[The integral has the numerical value 0.6154.] Again, as for the leading $Z^{7/3}$ term, this $Z^{5/3}$ contribution is roughly two thirds of the $Z^{5/3}$ term for NIE in Eq. (5).

There is a second effect that also produces a $Z^{5/3}$ correction to the energy — the exchange interaction of the electrons. In contrast with the electrostatic interaction energy of each electron with the other electrons, constituting $Z$ electrons at a distance $\sim Z^{1/3}$, which is of order $Z/Z^{1-1/3} = Z^{4/3}$, exchange is limited to electrons with overlapping wave functions at a distance $\sim \lambda \sim 1/|V|^{1/2} \sim Z^{-2/3}$; thus the exchange energy of each electron is of the order $1/Z^{-2/3} = Z^{2/3}$. The explicit result of the calculation is\(^5, 6\)

$$\Delta E_{\text{ex}} = -\frac{1}{4\pi^3} \int (dr) \left[ -2(V + \zeta) \right]^2 = \frac{9}{2} \Delta E_{\text{qu}} = \frac{9}{11} (-0.2699 Z^{5/3}) .$$

(45)

It supplements (44) and yields the final statistical energy formula

$$\frac{-E_{\text{stat}}}{2Z^2} = 1.537 Z^{1/3} - 1 + 0.5398 Z^{-1/3} .$$

(46)

A plot of the successive levels of approximation is given in Fig. 8. The marvelous agreement of (46) with HF — the curve goes right through the circles — is a great triumph of the statistical method. One now understands why these atomic binding energies are so regular. They are a property of the ensemble of electrons, no individuality is (yet!) recognizable.

7. History

The three terms of (46) are associated with certain names, and we welcome the opportunity to give a brief historical account. The subject started with Thomas's paper of November 1926.\(^2\) He could have, but did not derive the leading term of the binding energy formula. The first to write down Eq. (32) in July 1927, was Milne\(^7\), who — being an astrophysicist — recognized the similarity of the TF equation 24
with Emden’s equation for spheres of polytropic perfect gases, held together by gravitation. Milne’s numerical factor was about twenty percent too small, which accidentally improved the agreement with the then available experimental data. Fermi’s first paper on the statistical theory of atoms was published in December 1927.\textsuperscript{2} It contains a remarkably good numerical solution for $F(x)$ [he calls it $\varphi$]; e.g., the initial slope $B$ is given as 1.58. Fermi also noticed the connection between the total binding energy and this constant, so that he can claim fatherhood of Eq. (31).

His numerical factor is, of course, much better than Milne’s—only half a percent short of the modern value. We are told that Fermi was unaware of Thomas’s work until late in 1928, “when it was pointed out to him by one (now unidentified) of the foreign theoreticians visiting Rome.”\textsuperscript{8} There are two probable candidates for this anonymous person: Bohr and Kramers, whose encouragement is acknowledged by Thomas in his paper.\textsuperscript{2}

The credit for the first highly accurate calculation of $F(x)$ belongs to Baker.\textsuperscript{9} His work was published in 1930, long before the age of high-speed computers, and contains a value for $B$ which is exact to 0.03%. We honor Baker by assigning his initial to this number.

Now to the next term in (46), the correction for strongly bound electrons. While it has, of course, always been recognized how badly the innermost electrons are represented by TF, it would take the surprisingly long time of 25 years until Scott came up with the energy correction of Eq. (41), in 1952.\textsuperscript{10} However, his derivation— he calls it a “boundary effect” and treats it accordingly— has not been widely accepted. The general feeling concerning Scott’s correction was that “it seems diffi-
cult to give a completely clearcut demonstration of the case.”\textsuperscript{11} This was delivered — in the spirit of the treatment reported above — by one of us in 1980,\textsuperscript{12} another 28 years later. Recently, we showed an elegant derivation of Scott’s term by making use of the scaling properties of TF with corrections for strongly bound electrons.\textsuperscript{13}

Scott, in the very same paper,\textsuperscript{10} was also the first to give a $Z^{5/3}$ term in the energy formula. However, being unaware of the quantum corrections, he considered merely the exchange contribution of Eq. (45), thus accounting for nine elevenths of the last term in (46). Again it took many years before, in 1981, the quantum correction, Eqs. (43, 44), was evaluated by one of us.\textsuperscript{5} From then on, the statistical energy formula was known.\textsuperscript{14} Of course, there has been important work on extensions of TF by other authors. The exchange interaction was first considered by Dirac, as early as 1930.\textsuperscript{15} [He was possibly reacting to a remark by Fermi at the end of a talk presented at a 1928 conference in Leipzig,\textsuperscript{16} which Dirac also attended.] But Dirac did not deal with exchange energy, just with the implied modification of the TF equation. An expression for this energy, equivalent to (43), was first given by Jensen in 1934,\textsuperscript{17} who also on this occasion corrected for an inadvertance of Dirac, whose exchange effect was too large by a factor of 2. However, there is no doubt that it was Scott who for the first time evaluated the exchange energy perturbatively, arriving at (45). Maybe both Dirac and Jensen were just thinking that one should not talk about the second correction before the first one is known . . .

The first attempt at including the nonlocality of quantum mechanics was performed by v. Weizsäcker in 1935.\textsuperscript{18} He derived a correction to the kinetic energy which has the serious drawback that it cannot be evaluated in perturbation theory — the outcome would be infinite. From our investigations of quantum corrections\textsuperscript{5, 6} it has become clear that a consistent treatment requires a simultaneous, correct handling of the strongly bound electrons. Why didn’t Scott do exactly that? There are two reasons. First, Scott’s “boundary effect” theory of the vicinity of the nucleus cannot be directly implemented into the energy functional. And second, the language used by v. Weizsäcker, Scott, and others is based on the electron density as the fundamental quantity, whereas these problems are most conveniently discussed by giving the potential the fundamental role.

8. Shell Effects

Although we were justifiably pleased with the striking agreement of the statistical curve and the HF crosses in Fig. 8, the story is not yet finished. Let us now look at this plot as though through a microscope. Figure 9 shows the relative deviation between Eq. (46) and HF. One sees that from $Z = 22$ on, the 0.2% level is reached; after $Z = 56$ the accuracy is better than 0.1%. There is an obvious, steady increase in agreement as $Z$ becomes larger, but this is accompanied by interesting fluctuations. It turns out that Fig. 9 is not the appropriate way of looking at these oscillations. Instead of the relative difference between HF and Eq. (46) we now present the absolute deviation, divided by $Z^{4/3}$, which is the anticipated order of
the next term in the binding energy formula, and plotted not as a function of $Z$ itself, but against $Z^{1/3}$ which is the significant measure of the number of electrons. This is Fig. 10. We are confronted with an unexpectedly regular oscillatory curve that is not only well defined for large $Z$ but even reaches all the way down to hydrogen, $Z = 1$. Can the statistical approach be employed at all to explain such a behavior? Well, although oscillatory, the $Z$-dependence is still smooth and certainly not irregular. However, before embarking on a calculation, we first have to gain a qualitative physical understanding of the underlying phenomena.

Everybody’s immediate reaction to Fig. 10 is that the oscillations are the filling of atomic shells. If this were true, surely the atoms with closed shells, the inert gases — He ($Z = 2$), Ne (10), Ar (18), Kr (36), Xe (54), Rn (86), and another one with $Z = 118$ for which the chemists have not yet invented a name — would sit on

Fig. 9. Relative deviation, in %, between HF binding energies and the statistical formula [46].

Fig. 10. Absolute deviation between HF binding energies and the statistical formula [46]. Stars mark the location of inert gas atoms, and the arrows point to them.
prominent places of the curve? Figure 10 shows these locations, and on first sight
the inert gas atoms do not seem to follow any pattern related to the oscillatory
curve. They are, however, also not randomly distributed over the oscillatory curve,
but show a clear tendency to be close to its maxima. We infer, therefore, that there
is a connection between the energy oscillation and the existence of closed atomic
shells. These two phenomena are manifestations of one underlying physical effect.

To answer the question what effect that is, let us recall the origin of atomic shells.
The reason for their being is the existence of quantum numbers in a spherically
symmetric potential: angular quantum number $\ell$, and radial quantum number $n_r$.
But $\ell$ and $n_r$ alone would not account for shells; we also need the fact of energetic
degeneracy. States with differing quantum numbers may have almost the same
binding energy. This is, of course, familiar for the Coulomb potential where the
ergies depend only on the principal quantum number $n = n_r + \ell + 1$, leading to
the $2n^2$ fold degeneracy that we have made use of in Eqs. (1) and (2). Thus,
in atoms containing NIE, the maximal radial quantum number and the maximal
angular quantum number are equal. Not so in the real world, where the ratio of the
two is roughly $2:1$ [uranium, e.g., possesses $7s$ electrons ($n_r = 6$) and $5f$ electrons ($\ell = 3$)]. The degeneracy of the weakly bound outermost electrons is certainly not
of Coulombic type. We can learn more about it from another look at the Periodic
Table, this time at the last row. There the $7s$, $6d$, and $5f$ electrons are filled in,
but not in a given order, instead they compete with each other — a sure sign of
degeneracy. In an $\ell$-$n_r$ diagram, Fig. 11, these three states do not lie on a straight
line; degenerate states are connected by bent curves which are the steeper, the
larger $\ell$ is. Deep inside the atom, we expect Coulombic degeneracy for the strongly
bound electrons. In this situation, states with the same binding energy do lie on a
straight line in the $\ell$-$n_r$ diagram. In Fig. 11 this is illustrated by the $2s$ and the $2p$
state.

It is clear that a theoretical description of the oscillations in Fig. 10 must be
based on a detailed energetic treatment of the few electrons with least binding
energy. This view is supported by the relative size of the effect we are looking for,
which is of order $1/Z$ as compared to the leading $Z^{7/3}$ term, or, like one electron
compared to the totality of $Z$ electrons.

After these preparatory remarks, it is no surprise that we now attempt to evalu-
ate the effective (i.e., including $\zeta$) single particle energy $E_1$ of Eq. (9) by performing
the sum over the quantum numbers,

$$E_1 = \sum_{n_r, \ell} 2(2\ell + 1)(E_{n_r, \ell} + \zeta) \eta(-E_{n_r, \ell} - \zeta). \quad (47)$$

Here we exhibit the spin and angular momentum multiplicity, and have the step
function select those states with $E_{n_r, \ell} < -\zeta$. We shall relate the individual en-
ergies to the potential $V$ and the quantum numbers, not through the eigenvalue
problem associated with Schrödinger’s equation, but by means of the semiclassical
quantization rule,
\[ n_r + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int dr \left[ 2 \left( E_{n_r,\ell} - V - \left( \ell + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \right) \right]^{1/2}, \tag{48} \]
which is usually derived by the WKB method. Equation (48) is known to produce the exact energy eigenvalues for a few simple potentials, notably the Coulomb and the oscillator potential. The exactness for Coulombic potentials is significant, since it assures correct treatment of the strongly bound electrons. For other "smooth" potentials, (48) gives very good approximate values for \( E_{n_r,\ell} \). Certainly, for our purposes, Eq. (48) is good enough. But even with the simplifications provided by employing (48), the double sum of (47) is not easily evaluated. The main reason for that is the implicit definition of \( E_{n_r,\ell} \) in (48) where it is the radial quantum number that is expressed as a function of \( \ell \) and \( E_{n_r,\ell} \).

Both quantum numbers are accompanied by an added \( \frac{1}{2} \) in Eq. (48); we shall therefore simplify matters by introducing new variables according to
\[ \nu \equiv n_r + \frac{1}{2}, \quad \lambda \equiv \ell + \frac{1}{2}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{\nu,\lambda} \equiv E_{n_r,\ell}, \tag{49} \]
so that now
\[ \nu = \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{dr}{r} \left[ 2r^2 (\mathcal{E}_{\nu,\lambda} - V) - \lambda^2 \right]^{1/2}. \tag{50} \]
In both equations, (48) and (50), the domain of integration is the classically allowed region where the argument of the square root is positive.

Before proceeding with our investigations of Eq. (47) let us make sure that the TF potential can be expected to be useful here. Its insertion into (50) produces the
Fig. 12. (a) Energetic degeneracy in the TF potential. (b) TF prediction for occupied states in Ra (Z = 88).

The following ratio of maximal values for \( \nu \) and \( \lambda \):

\[
\frac{\nu(\mathcal{E} = 0, \lambda = 0)}{\lambda(\mathcal{E} = 0, \nu = 0)} = \frac{1.659 Z^{1/3}}{0.928 Z^{1/3}} = 1.79,
\]

which is in reasonable agreement with the corresponding number for a large atom, e.g., uranium,

\[
\frac{\nu_{\text{max}}}{\lambda_{\text{max}}} = \frac{6 + \frac{1}{2}}{3 + \frac{1}{2}} = 1.86.
\]

In Fig. 12(a) we see \( \nu/Z^{1/3} \) as a function of \( \lambda/Z^{1/3} \) for several \( \mathcal{E} \), demonstrating the different character of degeneracy for small and large binding energies; a plot that has a striking similarity with Fig. 11. This becomes even more convincing when we ask for the specific states available in a large atom, say radium, \( Z = 88 \). Figure 12(b) shows perfect agreement between the TF prediction and experimental observations; the \( \mathcal{E} = 0 \) curve of Fig. 12(a) separates the occupied states from the unoccupied ones, selecting exactly those that are spectroscopically known to be available. This is another way of presenting the results of Fermi’s application of the statistical theory of atoms to the systematics of the Periodic Table, the great historical triumph of TF, published in his second paper on the subject in January 1928.19

With this reassurance, the discussion of Eq. 17 is now continued. A more useful way of writing this sum over quantum numbers employs \( \nu \) and \( \lambda \) of (19) and replaces the summation, e.g., over \( \ell \), by an equivalent integration over \( \lambda \), with the
We got rid of the step function by making the limits of integration explicit; the
\begin{align*}
\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} 2(2\ell + 1) A_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} &= 4 \int_{0}^{\infty} d\lambda \lambda \sum_{\ell=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(\lambda - \ell - \frac{1}{2}) A_{\lambda} \\
&= 4 \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^k \int_{0}^{\infty} d\lambda \lambda e^{i2\pi k\lambda} A_{\lambda}.
\end{align*}

This, with the analogous procedure for \( n_c \) and \( \nu \), turns \([47]\) into
\begin{equation}
E_1 = 4 \sum_{k,j=-\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^{k+j} \int_{0}^{\lambda_\nu} d\lambda \lambda e^{i2\pi k\lambda} \int_{0}^{\nu(\mathcal{E}=-\zeta,\lambda)} d\nu e^{i2\pi j\nu(\mathcal{E}_{\nu,\lambda} + \zeta)}.
\end{equation}

We got rid of the step function by making the limits of integration explicit; the
domain of integration is the area between the \( \nu, \lambda \) axes and the curve belonging to
\( \mathcal{E} = -\zeta \) in Fig. [13] So far we have done nothing but rewrite Eq. [47]. Now we
shall illustrate this structure by picking out the \( j = 0 \) terms. In other words, we
concentrate on \( \lambda \) oscillations only, disregarding \( \nu \) oscillations, which corresponds to
a simplified picture in which only angular momentum is quantized, not the radial
motion. We call this \( \ell \)-TF, short for \( \ell \)-quantized Thomas–Fermi.

The absence of the exponential in the \( \nu \) integral for \( j = 0 \) enables us to change
variables from \( \nu \) to \( \mathcal{E} \) (for fixed \( \lambda \)) which is desirable in view of the implicit definition
of \( \mathcal{E}_{\nu,\lambda} \) in Eq. [50]. Here is how it goes:
\begin{equation}
d\nu (\mathcal{E} + \zeta) = d[\nu (\mathcal{E} + \zeta)] - \nu d\mathcal{E};
\end{equation}
the total differential has zero value at both limits of the integral, and \( \nu \) possesses a
simple algebraic dependence on $E$, allowing further integration,

$$\text{d} \nu (E + \zeta) \rightarrow \text{d} E \frac{\partial}{\partial E} \left( -\frac{1}{3\pi} \int \frac{\text{d}r}{r^3} [2r^2(E - V) - \lambda^2]^{3/2} \right).$$  \hfill (56)

The $\ell$TF result for $E_1$ is then

$$E_1^{\ell\text{TF}} = -\frac{4}{3\pi} \sum_{k = -\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^k \int \frac{\text{d}r}{r^3} \int \frac{\text{d}\lambda}{\lambda} \lambda e^{i2\pi k\lambda} \int \frac{\text{d}r}{r^3} [2r^2(-\zeta - V) - \lambda^2]^{3/2}. \hfill (57)$$

This equation was, in some sense, known to Hellmann in 1936,\textsuperscript{20} but certainly not in this form. His formula used the original sum over $\ell$ [easily obtained by reversing \textsuperscript{53}], and was expressed in terms of densities, one for each value of $\ell$. This was a clumsy way of writing it, which unfortunately kept both Hellmann and Gombás, who devoted a chapter in his classical textbook\textsuperscript{21} to the matter, from realizing the important fact that the $k = 0$ contribution to this sum is just the TF expression \textsuperscript{16}, once the $\lambda$ integration is carried out.\textsuperscript{22}

With that essential piece of information, we split $E_1^{\ell\text{TF}}$ into $E_1^{\text{TF}}$ and the rest,

$$E_1^{\ell\text{TF}} - E_1^{\text{TF}} = \frac{8}{3\pi} \sum_{k = 1}^{\infty} (-1)^{k-1} \int \frac{\text{d}r}{r^3} \int \frac{\text{d}\lambda}{\lambda} \lambda [2r^2(-\zeta - V) - \lambda^2]^{3/2} \cos(2\pi k\lambda), \hfill (58)$$

and, since this right-hand side must be a small correction to TF, we are justified in using the TF potential for its evaluation. The leading $\ell$TF oscillation can be easily identified. To that end, we first replace $\lambda$ by its maximum value times the cosine of an angle $\theta$,

$$\lambda = \left[2r^2(-\zeta - V)\right]^{1/2} \cos \theta; \hfill (59)$$

this leads to

$$E_1^{\ell\text{TF}} - E_1^{\text{TF}} = \frac{8}{3\pi} \sum_{k = 1}^{\infty} (-1)^{k-1} \int \frac{\text{d}r}{r^3} \left[2r^2(-\zeta - V)\right]^{5/2} \cos(z \cos \theta) \hfill (60)$$

with

$$z = 2\pi k \left[2r^2(-\zeta - V)\right]^{1/2}. \hfill (61)$$

Then the asymptotic form of the $\theta$-integral in Eq. \textsuperscript{60} for large $z$ [compare Eq. \textsuperscript{35}] is employed in identifying the leading oscillatory term,

$$E_{\text{osc}}^{\ell\text{TF}} = -\frac{1}{\pi^3} \sum_{k = 1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k-1}}{k^{5/2}} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{\text{d}r}{r^3} \left[2r^2(-\zeta - V)\right]^{5/4} \cos\left(z - \frac{1}{4\pi}\right). \hfill (62)$$

The last step is a stationary phase evaluation of the remaining $r$-integral for $V = V_{\text{TF}}$ and $\zeta = 0$. The explicit form of the resulting leading $\ell$TF oscillation is

$$E_{\text{osc}}^{\ell\text{TF}} = -0.4805 Z^{4/3} \sum_{k = 1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(\pi k)^3} \sin(2\pi k\lambda_0) \hfill (63)$$
wherein $\lambda_0$ is the maximal value of $\lambda$ [cf. Eq. (51)],

$$\lambda_0 = \max_r \left[ 2r^2(-V_{\text{TF}}) \right]^{1/2} = 0.928Z^{1/3}. \quad (64)$$

The high power of $k$ in the denominator in the sum of Eq. (63) assures us that a smooth function is represented by this Fourier series; indeed, it is a repeated piece of a cubic polynomial. Let us compare $E_{\text{osc}}^{\text{TF}}$ with the HF oscillations of Fig. 10 which is plotted in Fig. 14. It looks very encouraging because a number of details are quite right: first, the overall amplitude factor $Z^{4/3}$; second, the periodicity $Z^{1/3} \to Z^{1/3} + 1.08$; third, the phase.

Obviously, $E_{\text{osc}}^{\text{TF}}$ of Eq. (63) is not the entire oscillation. It accounts for roughly half the amplitude, but does not show any sign of the intriguing structure that evolves at the maxima with increasing $Z^{1/3}$. On the other hand, Eq. (63) was obtained by picking out only the leading contribution to the $j = 0$ term of the double sum in Eq. (54). Naturally, a better result should be obtained by evaluating the whole sum. This is somewhat involved, however, and we have described details elsewhere. We restrict the present discussion to general aspects. The analysis shows that one has to pay attention to two major things. One is that the leading contribution of asymptotic amplitude $\sim Z^{4/3}$ does not suffice, the next-to-leading oscillation ($\sim Z^{5/3}$ for large $Z$) is also needed; this is reminiscent of the smooth part of the energy formula, where the leading TF term also did not give satisfactory results. The other one is the fact that extrapolation from the large-$Z$ domain to the small-$Z^{1/3}$ region in question has to be done with extreme care; this is contrary to the situation of the smooth curve, where extrapolating was easy. Here then is the final semiclassical oscillation: Fig. 15

No doubt, our calculation provides a clear understanding of these binding energy oscillations. Both the HF curve and the semiclassical one have the same period-

![Graph showing HF oscillations and TF oscillations compared to smooth curve.](image-url)
iciety, the same amplitude, the same phase, and the same general shape of plain minima, and maxima with an evolving structure. True, the HF oscillations show less of this structure, but we never expected perfect agreement. [One should not be misled by the obviously missing constant \( \sim Z^{4/3} \) that shifts the semiclassical curve down. The calculation concentrated on oscillatory terms, systematically discarding all smooth contributions.] While this comparison of two independent theoretical predictions is entertaining, more to the point is to see what experiment tells. Total binding energies of atoms have been measured (by stepwise ionization) for the first 20 members of the Periodic Table only.\(^{24}\) After correcting for relativistic effects and subtracting the smooth background of Eq. (46) these experimental values are given by the crosses in Fig. 15. They demonstrate that the oscillations we have been considering are really present in nature, both period and amplitude being of the theoretically predicted size. Neither HF nor the semiclassical curve represent an exact quantitative description of experiment, while the qualitative agreement is about the same.

9. Concluding Remarks

We have been focusing on nonrelativistic binding energies throughout this review. Naturally, there has been work on relativistic corrections to the statistical binding energy formula (46), although the results are not yet quite satisfactory.\(^{12, 26}\) This field remains to be tilled.
Other aspects of the theory concern various properties of atoms, such as densities, diamagnetic susceptibilities, electric polarizabilities, etc. Here one encounters different problems. For the described energy considerations it was sufficient to treat all modifications of TF in first order perturbation theory (even the oscillations). For the investigation of a given atomic system with specified $Z$ and $N$, this approach is not practicable. Instead, the corrections for strongly bound electrons, the quantum improvements, and exchange have to be incorporated consistently into the energy functional, thus leading to a new differential equation for the potential [with only a remote resemblance to the TF equation (17)]. This is an entirely different story; we told it recently.\textsuperscript{6, 13, 25}

Then there are generalizations of the statistical theory to other objects than atoms: molecules, solids, nuclei, even neutron stars, etc. We do no more than mention them.
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