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Abstract

The mass-correction function is evaluated for selected excited states of the hydrogen molecule within a single-state non-adiabatic treatment. Its qualitative features are studied under the avoided crossing of the $EF$ with the $GK$ state and also for the outer well of the $H\bar{H}$ state. For the $H\bar{H}$ state, a negative mass correction is obtained for the vibrational motion near the outer minimum, which accounts for most of the deviation between experiment and earlier theoretical work.
This work represents the first steps towards a fully coupled non-adiabatic calculation of the $EF$–$GK$–$H\bar{H}$-etc. singlet-gerade manifold of $H_2$ including the formerly neglected mass-correction terms which appear in the multi-state effective non-adiabatic Hamiltonian recently formulated \cite{1}. Relying on the condition of adiabatic perturbation theory \cite{2} that the electronic band must be separated from the rest of the electronic spectrum by a finite gap over the relevant dynamical range, already a single-state treatment delivers insight into the extremely rich non-adiabatic dynamics of electronically excited hydrogen. Motivated by these ideas and after careful inspection of the singlet gerade manifold (Figure 1), we have selected the lower-energy region of the $EF$ and the outer well of the $H\bar{H}$ state, often labelled with $\bar{H}$, for a single-state non-adiabatic study.

Concerning the computational methodology, we used the QUANTEN computer program \cite{3–6} to accurately solve the electronic Schrödinger equation for the selected states using floating, explicitly correlated Gaussian functions. The mass-correction functions were also computed with QUANTEN according to the procedure described in Refs. \cite{5, 6}. The resulting non-adiabatic corrections to the (effective) vibrational and rotational mass are shown in Figures 2 and 3. These numerical examples shed light on qualitative properties of the mass-correction functions, which can be understood by remembering the appearance of the $R_{ij}$ reduced resolvent in the mass-correction tensor of the selected $a$ electronic state \cite{1, 2},

\begin{equation}
M_{aa,ij} = 2\langle \partial_j \psi_a | R_a | \partial_i \psi_a \rangle = 2\langle \partial_j \psi_a | (H_{el} - E_a)^{-1}(1 - P_a) | \partial_i \psi_a \rangle \quad (i, j = 1, \ldots, 6). \tag{1}
\end{equation}

Note that this is the Cartesian form of the tensor, and the general transformation of the KEO, including also the coordinate-dependent $M_{aa,ij}$ elements, to arbitrary curvilinear coordinates has been worked out in Ref. \cite{5}. From this general expression, the specific results for a diatomic molecule with spherical polar coordinates, giving rise to the vibrational and rotational corrections, were derived and used in Refs. \cite{5, 6}. The single-state non-adiabatic mass-correction term has been discovered- and rediscovered several times in the past and has been used for the ground electronic state of diatomics \cite{6, 7, 7–9}, for an approximate treatment of the water molecule.
and in example single-point computations of polyatomics \[11\] (for a detailed reference list see Ref. \[5\]).

Using the described methodology, we first studied the $EF \ 1\Sigma_g^+$ state of H$_2$ below ca. 110 000 cm$^{-1}$ (below the $GK$ minima), and computed the rotation and vibration mass correction functions (Figure 2). The effective vibrational mass of the proton becomes gigantic under the avoided crossing with the $GK \ 1\Sigma_g^+$ curve. The large correction value, $\delta m_{vib}^{(EF)} = 480 \ m_e$ near $R = 3$ bohr, which should be compared with the ca. 1836 $m_e$ mass of the proton, \[33\] indicates that it will be necessary to go beyond the single-state non-adiabatic treatment to achieve spectroscopic accuracy. For this purpose, one can either look for higher-order corrections—the third-order correction formulae can be found in Ref. \[1\]—, or for explicit coupling with the near-lying perturber state(s), in this case $GK$ (and other states), and to use the effective non-adiabatic Hamiltonian of Ref. \[1\] for a multi-dimensional electronic subspace. Note that in the single-state treatment only the $EF$ state is projected out from the resolvent, Eq. (1), whereas in a multi-state treatment the full explicitly coupled subspace will be projected out \[1\], which will result in smaller corrections from electronic states better separated in energy.

With these observations in mind, we have nevertheless checked the rotation-vibration term values obtained within the second-order, single-state non-adiabatic model. We found that the vibrational energies improve upon the constant-mass adiabatic description (using either the nuclear mass of the proton or the atomic mass of hydrogen, which is commonly used as an ‘empirical’ means for modeling non-adiabatic effects): the ca. 30–35 cm$^{-1}$ root-mean-square deviation of the adiabatic energies from experiment is reduced to 10 cm$^{-1}$ when the rigorous non-adiabatic vibrational functions are used instead of the constant (nuclear or atomic) mass. More detailed numerical results will be reported within a coupled-state non-adiabatic treatment in future work.

Next, we have studied the $H\bar{H}$ state, for which already a single-state model turns out to be useful for spectroscopic purposes, at least for the outer-well states. The inner well of the $H\bar{H}$ potential energy curve (PEC) gets close to several other PECs, and for this reason a single-state treatment is not appropriate there. At the same
time, most of the outer-well state energies (below the barrier) can be accurately computed without considering delocalization to the inner well. This behaviour was pointed out already several times in the literature \cite{12-16}, and we have also checked it for every rovibrational state by solving the rovibrational Schrödinger equation with different $[R_{\text{min}}, R_{\text{max}}]$ intervals. In particular, we obtained the (adiabatic) inner-well state energies (below the barrier) with an accuracy better than 0.01 cm$^{-1}$ even if we used the restricted, $[R_{\text{min}}, R_{\text{max}}] = [6, 20]$ bohr, interval. This behavior was observed either with using constant (e.g., nuclear or atomic) or coordinate-dependent, non-adiabatic masses. The few exceptions (with energies nearer the top of the barrier which separates the inner and the outer wells) will be highlighted during the presentation of the numerical results.

The experimental term values for the outer-well rotation-vibration states of the $\text{H}\text{H}$ electronic state were first reported in 1997 \cite{17} and also later in 1999 together with an improved theoretical treatment \cite{13, 14}. The computations were carried out on an accurate, adiabatic PEC including relativistic corrections and were appended also with an estimate for the radiative effects \cite{12, 14}. The resulting term values were in a ca. 1 cm$^{-1}$ (dis)agreement with experiment (of ca. 0.04 cm$^{-1}$ uncertainty), which was attributed to the neglect of non-adiabatic effects.

We have repeated the rovibrational computations using the potential energy, diagonal Born–Oppenheimer correction, and relativistic correction curves computed and the radiative correction estimated by Wolniewicz \cite{12}, but we used the non-adiabatic mass correction functions for the rotational and the vibrational degrees of freedom computed in the present work (Figure 3). We obtained a somewhat better agreement with the experimental results, the 1–1.2 cm$^{-1}$ deviation of theory and experiment of Ref. \cite{14} was reduced to 0.3–0.4 cm$^{-1}$. (the computed values are larger than the experimental ones).

In order to identify the origin of the remaining discrepancy, we refined the potential energy curve using the QUANTEN program, which resulted in a few tenths of cm$^{-1}$ reduction for $R > 10$ bohr (the improved electronic energies are deposited in the Supplementary Material \cite{18}). Next, we have checked the accuracy of the earlier relativistic corrections and found to be sufficient for the present purposes. We have also explicitly evaluated the leading-order radiative correction (see for exam-
ple, Eq. (3) of Ref. [19],) instead of approximating it with the radiative correction
value of \( \text{H}^- \) proposed by Wolniewicz [12]. For this purpose, we used the one- and
two-electron Darwin integrals already available from the relativistic computations
[12] and estimated the non-relativistic Bethe-logarithm by \( \ln k_0 \approx 3 \) based on its
hydrogenic ground-state value (remember the strong \( \text{H}^-+\text{H}^+ \) ion-pair character of
the outer well and the observation that \( \ln k_0 \) is not very sensitive to the number
of electrons [20]). We also computed the Araki–Sucher term for the \( \text{H} \overline{\text{H}} \) state in
the present work, although it gives an almost negligible contribution at the current
level of precision. Based on these computations, the radiative correction curve takes
values between 0.27 and 0.29 cm\(^{-1}\) over the outer well of \( \text{H} \overline{\text{H}} \), and thus we confirm
the earlier estimate using the \( \text{H}^- \) value [12].

As a summary, we collect in Table I the best rovibrational term values (‘\( T_{\text{nad}} \)’
column) and their deviation from experiment (‘\( \text{nad} \)’ column) resulting from the
computations carried out within the present work. Inclusion of the non-adiabatic
masses in the rovibrational treatment and further refinement of the potential energy
curve reduces the earlier ca. 1–1.5 cm\(^{-1}\) deviation to ca. 0.1–0.2 cm\(^{-1}\). The \( v \geq 14 \)
states are shown in grey in the table, because for these states tunneling to the inner
well has an important effect on the energy and should not be neglected. We also
note that the experimental term values for the \( v = 2 \) states with \( N = 0, 1, \ldots, 4 \) and
the \( v = 2 \) and 3 states for \( N = 5 \) are an order-of-magnitude less accurate than for
the other states [14, 17].

In the table, we also also compare with experiment the adiabatic energies (a)
computed rigorously with the nuclear masses (‘\( \text{ad}_n \)’ column)—these values are al-
most identical with the values in Table VI of Ref. [14]—, and (b) with the hydrogenic
atomic mass (‘\( \text{ad}_H \)’ column), which is often used as to capture some non-adiabatic
effects in the spectrum. In the present case, this atomic-mass model does not per-
form well, which can be understood by noticing that the rigorous non-adiabatic
(vibrational) correction to the nuclear mass is negative over most of the outer well.

Finally, we mention that Andersson and Elander [15], by extending earlier work
of Yu and Dressler [21], solved the coupled-state equations, including the coupling
of the six lowest-energy \( ^1\Sigma_g^+ \) states, and studied also the outer-well region of \( \text{H} \overline{\text{H}} \).
They found that it was necessary to include all six \( ^1\Sigma_g^+ \) states to converge the \( \overline{\text{H}} \)
vibrational energies better than 0.1 cm$^{-1}$ whereas the 15th and 16th vibrational states ($v = 14$ and 15 in Table I) changed by 0.12 and 24.11 cm$^{-1}$ between the five- and six-state treatment. Although their computed values are off by 10–35 cm$^{-1}$ from experiment, probably due to the fact that they used less accurate potential energy curves, their results seem to underline the general observation that the many-state Born–Oppenheimer (BO) expansion converges relatively slowly when one aims to achieve spectroscopic accuracy.

Because of the slow convergence of the BO expansion, it is important to think about the truncation error. Direct truncation of the electronic space introduces an error of $O(\varepsilon)$ in the rovibronic energies, where $\varepsilon = (m_e/m_{\text{nuc}})^{1/2}$ is the square root of the electron-to-nucleus mass ratio [1, 2, 22]. This truncation error can be made lower order in $\varepsilon$ by using adiabatic perturbation theory [2, 22]. For an isolated electronic state, the first-order corrections can be made to vanish. The second-order non-adiabatic effective Hamiltonian, used in the present work, reproduces eigenvalues of the full electron-nucleus Hamiltonian with an error of $O(\varepsilon^3)$, but it contains corrections both to the potential energy as well as to the kinetic energy of the atomic nuclei [1], which gives rise to effective coordinate-dependent masses to the different types of motions.

In particular, we have found a non-trivial, negative mass-correction to the nuclear mass of the proton for the vibrations in the outer well of the $\bar{H}H$ $^1\Sigma_g^+$ electronic state. This negative value, i.e., an effective vibrational mass smaller than the nuclear mass, is dominated by the interaction with the $\text{H}(1)+\text{H}(2)$ dissociation channel to which $\bar{H}H$ gets close near its outer minimum. Of course, the precise value of the mass correction is the result of an interplay of the interaction of the nuclear dynamics on $\bar{H}H$ with all the other (discrete and continuous) electronic states. It is interesting to note that, whereas the vibrational mass shows this special behaviour for $\bar{H}H$, the non-adiabatic value of the rotational mass remains close to the atomic mass of the hydrogen (proton plus electron, see Figure 3). Due to these properties, $\bar{H}H$ makes a counter-example to the simple, empirical recipe according to which small non-adiabatic effects can be ‘approximately modeled’ by using (near) the atomic mass value for vibrations and the nuclear mass for rotations [23, 25]: in the case of the outer well of $\bar{H}H$, the vibrational mass is better approximated by the nuclear mass,
and the rotational mass equals the atomic mass to a good approximation. Using the
rigorous non-adiabatic, mass-correction functions computed in the present work, the
non-adiabatic rovibrational energies are $1 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ($2 \text{ cm}^{-1}$) larger than the energies
obtained with using the nuclear (atomic) mass. This, together with the relativistic
and radiative corrections as well as with a minor, $0.1-0.2 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ improvement for
the outer-well electronic energies, allows us to achieve a $0.1-0.2 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ agreement, an
order of magnitude better than earlier theory, with experiment $[14, 17]$.

All in all, we have demonstrated that small, non-adiabatic corrections in the (high-
resolution) spectrum can be efficiently described using the effective non-adiabatic
Hamiltonian which accounts for the truncation error in the electronic space pertur-
batively. For the particular case of the outer well of the $\mathrm{H} \bar{\mathrm{H}} \ ^1\Sigma_g^+$ electronic state,
the discrepancy of earlier theoretical work with experiment can be accounted for by
a non-trivial decrease in the effective, non-adiabatic vibrational mass of the protons
as they pass along near-lying electronic states.
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TABLE I: Term values and deviation from experiment, in cm⁻¹, for the outer-well rovibrational states of the $HH \ ^1\Sigma^+_g^-$ electronic state of the hydrogen molecule.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{cccccccccccc}
\hline
\multicolumn{2}{c}{J = 0} & \multicolumn{4}{c}{J = 1} & \multicolumn{4}{c}{J = 2} \\
\hline
$v$ & $T_{\text{obs}} - T_{\text{calc}}$ & $T_{\text{obs}} - T_{\text{calc}}$ & $T_{\text{obs}} - T_{\text{calc}}$ & $T_{\text{obs}} - T_{\text{calc}}$ & $T_{\text{obs}} - T_{\text{calc}}$ & $T_{\text{obs}} - T_{\text{calc}}$ & $T_{\text{obs}} - T_{\text{calc}}$ & $T_{\text{obs}} - T_{\text{calc}}$ & $T_{\text{obs}} - T_{\text{calc}}$ & $T_{\text{obs}} - T_{\text{calc}}$ & $T_{\text{obs}} - T_{\text{calc}}$ \\
\hline
& $T_{\text{nad}}^b$ & $T_{\text{nad}}^b$ & $T_{\text{nad}}^b$ & $T_{\text{nad}}^b$ & $T_{\text{nad}}^b$ & $T_{\text{nad}}^b$ & $T_{\text{nad}}^b$ & $T_{\text{nad}}^b$ & $T_{\text{nad}}^b$ & $T_{\text{nad}}^b$ & $T_{\text{nad}}^b$ \\

0 & 122883.4 & n.a.$^f$ & 122885.3 & n.a.$^f$ & 122889.1 & n.a.$^f$ & 123575.8 & 0.1$^g$ & 1.1$^g$ & 0.9$^g$ & 123577.7 & 0.0$^g$ & 1.0$^g$ & 0.8$^g$ & 123581.5 & 0.2$^g$ & 1.1$^g$ & 0.9$^g$ \\
1 & 123234.5 & n.a.$^f$ & 123236.4 & n.a.$^f$ & 123240.2 & n.a.$^f$ & 123907.5 & -0.2 & 1.1 & 0.8 & 123909.4 & -0.2 & 1.1 & 0.8 & 123913.3 & -0.2 & 1.1 & 0.8 \\
2 & 123575.8 & 0.1$^g$ & 1.1$^g$ & 0.9$^g$ & 123577.7 & 0.0$^g$ & 1.0$^g$ & 0.8$^g$ & 123581.5 & 0.2$^g$ & 1.1$^g$ & 0.9$^g$ & 123577.7 & 0.0$^g$ & 1.0$^g$ & 0.8$^g$ & 123581.5 & 0.2$^g$ & 1.1$^g$ & 0.9$^g$ \\
3 & 124229.9 & -0.2 & 1.3 & 0.9 & 124231.8 & -0.2 & 1.3 & 0.9 & 124237.7 & -0.3 & 1.4 & 0.9 & 124544.9 & -0.3 & 1.4 & 0.9 & 124548.8 & -0.3 & 1.4 & 0.9 \\
4 & 124543.0 & -0.3 & 1.4 & 0.9 & 124544.9 & -0.3 & 1.4 & 0.9 & 124548.8 & -0.3 & 1.4 & 0.9 & 124849.1 & -0.2 & 1.6 & 1.0 & 124853.0 & -0.2 & 1.6 & 1.0 \\
5 & 124847.2 & -0.2 & 1.6 & 1.1 & 124849.1 & -0.2 & 1.6 & 1.0 & 124853.0 & -0.2 & 1.6 & 1.0 & 125144.5 & -0.2 & 1.7 & 1.1 & 125148.4 & -0.2 & 1.7 & 1.1 \\
6 & 125142.5 & -0.2 & 1.7 & 1.1 & 125144.5 & -0.2 & 1.7 & 1.1 & 125148.4 & -0.2 & 1.7 & 1.1 & 125431.3 & -0.1 & 1.8 & 1.2 & 125435.1 & -0.2 & 1.8 & 1.1 \\
7 & 125429.3 & -0.2 & 1.8 & 1.2 & 125431.3 & -0.1 & 1.8 & 1.2 & 125435.1 & -0.2 & 1.8 & 1.1 & 125709.6 & -0.1 & 1.9 & 1.2 & 125713.5 & -0.1 & 1.9 & 1.2 \\
8 & 125707.6 & -0.1 & 1.9 & 1.2 & 125709.6 & -0.1 & 2.0 & 1.3 & 125713.5 & -0.1 & 1.9 & 1.2 & 125975.5 & -0.1 & 2.0 & 1.2 & 125983.4 & -0.1 & 1.9 & 1.2 \\
9 & 125977.6 & -0.1 & 1.9 & 1.2 & 125709.6 & -0.1 & 2.0 & 1.3 & 125713.5 & -0.1 & 1.9 & 1.2 & 126241.1 & -0.1 & 2.0 & 1.2 & 126245.0 & -0.2 & 1.9 & 1.1 \\
10 & 126239.1 & -0.1 & 1.9 & 1.1 & 126241.1 & -0.1 & 2.0 & 1.2 & 126245.0 & -0.2 & 1.9 & 1.1 & 126494.4 & -0.2 & 1.9 & 1.0 & 126498.3 & -0.2 & 1.9 & 1.0 \\
11 & 126492.4 & -0.2 & 1.9 & 1.1 & 126494.4 & -0.2 & 1.9 & 1.0 & 126498.3 & -0.2 & 1.9 & 1.0 & 126739.1 & -0.2 & 1.8 & 0.9 & 126743.1 & -0.3 & 1.8 & 0.9 \\
12 & 126739.1 & -0.2 & 1.8 & 0.9 & 126739.1 & -0.2 & 1.8 & 0.9 & 126743.1 & -0.3 & 1.8 & 0.9 & 126975.0 & -0.5 & 1.5 & 0.6 & 126979.1 & -0.6 & 1.4 & 0.5 \\
13$^b$ & 126972.9 & -0.5 & 1.5 & 0.6 & 126975.0 & -0.5 & 1.5 & 0.6 & 126979.1 & -0.6 & 1.4 & 0.5 & 127201.4 & -1.7 & 0.3 & -0.7 & 127205.6 & -1.5 & 0.4 & -0.5 \\
14$^b$ & 127199.3 & -1.8 & 0.2 & -0.8 & 127201.4 & -1.7 & 0.3 & -0.7 & 127205.6 & -1.5 & 0.4 & -0.5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

(Please find the footnotes on the next page)
Footnotes to Table \[1\]

\textsuperscript{a} Deviation of experiment and theory. The $T_{\text{obs}}$ experimental term values were taken from Refs. [14, 17].

\textsuperscript{b} Calculated term value, $T_{\text{nad}} = E_{\text{nad}} - E_0$, referenced to the ground-state energy, $E_0$ [26, 27]. $E_{\text{nad}}$ was obtained using the rigorous non-adiabatic masses computed in the present work (Figure 3), including the relativistic and diagonal Born–Oppenheimer corrections of Ref. [12, 13], as well as the radiative corrections and an improved PEC computed in this work.

\textsuperscript{c} $T_{\text{calc}} = T_{\text{nad}}$.

\textsuperscript{d} $T_{\text{calc}} = T_{\text{adH}} = E_{\text{adH}} - E_0$, where $E_{\text{adH}}$ was obtained as $E_{\text{nad}}$ but using the constant, atomic mass of hydrogen.

\textsuperscript{e} $T_{\text{calc}} = T_{\text{adp}} = E_{\text{adp}} - E_0$, where $E_{\text{adp}}$ was obtained as $E_{\text{nad}}$ but using the constant, nuclear mass of the proton.

\textsuperscript{f} Experimental data not available.

\textsuperscript{g} Note that the experimental uncertainty is an order-of-magnitude larger for these term values than for the others.

\textsuperscript{h} Neglect of delocalization to the inner well introduces an at least 0.1 cm$^{-1}$ error in the computed energy.
FIG. 1: Single-state non-adiabatic treatment for the lower-energy part of the $EF \, ^1\Sigma_g^+$ electronic state, highlighted in red. Results are obtained within the single-state non-adiabatic framework also for the outer well of the $H\tilde{H} \, ^1\Sigma_g^+$ electronic state, which is highlighted in blue (see also Table I). The Born–Oppenheimer potential energy curves shown in the figure were compiled from Refs. [28–32].
FIG. 2: Non-adiabatic mass correction functions to the rotational and the vibrational degrees of freedom, $\delta\tilde{m}_{\text{rot}}$ and $\delta\tilde{m}_{\text{vib}}$, computed for the $EF\, ^1\Sigma^+_g$ electronic state of the hydrogen molecule [5, 6]. (The thin, solid black line indicates the mass of the electron, which together with the proton mass gives the atomic mass.)

FIG. 3: Non-adiabatic mass correction functions to the rotational and the vibrational degrees of freedom, $\delta\tilde{m}_{\text{rot}}$ and $\delta\tilde{m}_{\text{vib}}$, computed for the $H\tilde{H}\, ^1\Sigma^+_g$ electronic state of the hydrogen molecule [5, 6]. (The thin, solid black line indicates the mass of the electron, which together with the proton mass gives the atomic mass.)


[18] The supplementary material contains the improved electronic energies for the outer well of the $HH \ ^1\Sigma_g^+$ electronic state obtained in the present work.

[19] D. Ferenc and E. Mátys, Precise computation of rovibronic resonances of molecular hydrogen: $EF \ ^1\Sigma_g^+$ inner-well rotational states. [arXiv:1904.08609].


[33] In the computations we used the precise values of the CODATA14 constants and conversion factors, http://physics.nist.gov/cuu/Constants (last accessed on 3 May 2019).