arXiv:1911.04909v1 [physics.chem-ph] 9 Nov 2019

Comment on: "Tunneling of coupled methyl quantum rotors in 4-methylpyridine: Single rotor potential versus coupling interaction". J. Chem. Phys. **147**, 194303 (2017)

Paolo Amore*
Facultad de Ciencias, CUICBAS, Universidad de Colima,
Bernal Díaz del Castillo 340, Colima, Colima,Mexico
and
Francisco M. Fernández†
INIFTA, División Química Teórica,
Blvd. 113 y 64 (S/N), Sucursal 4, Casilla de Correo 16,
1900 La Plata, Argentina

December 10, 2021

Abstract

We analyze the results obtained recently by Khazael and Sebastiani (J. Chem. Phys. **147**, 194303 (2017)) for two coupled methyl rotors. We show that one of the avoided crossings obtained by those authors is in fact a true crossing between states of different symmetry. Present analysis is supposed to be clearer because it is based on an independent calculation of eigenvalues for each irreducible representation. The application of group

*e–mail: paolo@ucol.mx
†e–mail: fernande@quimica.unlp.edu.ar

theory also enables a more accurate calculation by means of smaller matrix representations of the Hamiltonian operator.

1 Introduction

In a recent paper Khazaei and Sebastiani [1] (KS from now on) studied the influence of rotational coupling between a pair of methyl rotors on the tunneling spectrum in condensed phase. They considered the simplest model in which two hindered C_3 rotors interact by means of a periodic potential. They calculated some of the eigenvalues of the model by means of the Rayleigh-Ritz variational method based on a Fourier basis set. The authors analyzed the lowest energy levels in different regions of coupling strength and found two avoided crossings between two pairs of them. According to KS the avoided crossing closest to the origin is due to a pair of energy levels of symmetry AE and EE. However, states of different symmetry are expected to undergo actual crossings and not avoided ones. Avoided crossings take place between states of the same symmetry [2–4] (and references therein). This confusion probably arose from the fact that KS did not calculate the energy levels for each irreducible representation (irrep) separately but used a Fourier basis set that contains all of them. Such a calculation is unnecessarily demanding because it leads to a much larger matrix representation of the Hamiltonian operator. In addition to it, it is not so easy to distinguish a true crossing from an avoided one in a calculation that includes all the irreps. If, on the other hand, one carries out a calculation for every irrep, then one immediately realizes that any pair of energy levels that approach each other will undergo an avoided crossing no matter how close they approach each other.

The purpose of this comment is to carry out a Rayleigh-Ritz variational calculation with a matrix representation of the Hamiltonian operator for every irrep. In section 2 we outline the coupled-rotors model and briefly discuss the symmetry of its states. In section 3 we compare present results with those of KS and draw conclusions.

2 The model and its symmetry

The Hamiltonian for two interacting rotors studied by KS is

$$\begin{aligned} H &= T_1 + T_2 + V_1(\phi_1) + V_2(\phi_2) + V_{12}(\phi_1, \phi_2), \\ T_i &= -B\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi_i},\ V_i(\phi_i) = V_3 \cos(3\phi_i),\ i = 1, 2, \\ V_{12}(\phi_1, \phi_2) &= W_3 \cos(3\phi_1 - 3\phi_2), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $B = \hbar^2/(2I)$ is the rotational constant, I is a suitable moment of inertia for an individual rotor, V_3 is a measure of the hindering potential for each rotor and W_3 is the strength of the interaction [1] (and references therein).

The Hamiltonian operator H is invariant under the unitary transformations $U_i^{-1}\phi_i U_i = \phi_i + 2\pi/3$, $i = 1, 2$; therefore the symmetry group is at least $C_3 \otimes C_3$. Since the symmetry species for C_3 are A and E (which may be separated into E_a and E_b because E is two-fold degenerate) [5] then the eigenfunctions of H can be classified as

	s_1	s_2
AA	0	0
AE_a	0	1
E_aA	1	0
AE_b	0	-1
E_bA	-1	0
E_aE_b	1	-1
E_bE_a	-1	1
E_aE_a	1	1
E_bE_b	-1	-1

, (2)

where s_1 and s_2 are symmetry quantum numbers that enable us to expand every eigenfunction $\psi(\phi_1, \phi_2)$ in a Fourier series of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{n_1,n_2,s_1,s_2}(\phi_1, \phi_2) &= \sum_{j_1=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j_2=-\infty}^{\infty} c_{j_1,j_2,n_1,n_2,s_1,s_2} \varphi_{j_1,s_1}(\phi_1) \varphi_{j_2,s_2}(\phi_2), \\ \varphi_{j,s}(\phi) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left[(3j + s)\, i\phi\right],\ s = 0, \pm 1. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Notice that we can separate the matrix representation of the Hamiltonian operator in 9 different and wholly independent cases which makes the calculation considerably more efficient. In this way, we obtain more accurate results with matrices of smaller dimension and the analysis of the spectrum is remarkably simpler as shown below. On the other hand, KS resorted to the basis set $B^{KS} = \{\exp\left[i\left(m\phi_1 + n\phi_2\right)\right]/(2\pi),\ m, n = 0, \pm 1, \ldots\}$ which may lead to some confusion in the analysis of the spectrum.

Two other symmetry operations, parity $P_a : (\phi_1, \phi_2) \rightarrow (-\phi_1, -\phi_2)$ and permutation $P_e : (\phi_1, \phi_2) \rightarrow (\phi_2, \phi_1)$, also leave the Hamiltonian invariant $PHP^{-1} = H$, where P^{-1} stands for the inverse of P. Notice that for these operators it also follows that $P^{-1} = P^{\dagger} = P$ and that $[H, P] = 0$. Therefore, if ψ is an eigenfunction of H with eigenvalue ϵ then $P\psi$ is also an eigenfunction of H with the same eigenvalue as shown by $PH\psi = PHP^{-1}P\psi = HP\psi = \epsilon P\psi$. It is clear that if ψ and $P\psi$ are linearly independent, then they are degenerate solutions of the Schrödinger equation. If we take into account the effect of these operations on the symmetry of the states

$$\begin{array}{lrr} & P_a & P_e \\ AA & AA & AA \\ AE_a & AE_b & E_aA \\ E_aA & E_bA & AE_a \\ AE_b & AE_a & E_bA \\ E_bA & E_aA & AE_b \\ E_aE_b & E_bE_a & E_bE_a \\ E_bE_a & E_aE_b & E_aE_b \\ E_aE_a & E_bE_b & E_aE_a \\ E_bE_b & E_aE_a & E_bE_b \end{array} , \tag{4}$$

we conclude that each state AA is nondegenerate, $\{AE_a, AE_b, E_aA, E_bA\}$ are four-fold degenerate, $\{E_aE_b, E_bE_a\}$ are two-fold degenerate as well as $\{E_aE_a, E_bE_b\}$ in agreement with the statement of Häusler and Hüller [6]. For brevity, from now on we refer to these states simply as AA, AE, EE' and EE, respectively.

When $W_3 = 0$ the two rotors are uncoupled and the Hamiltonian operator $H = H_1 + H_2$ is a sum of the Hamiltonian operators H_i for the individual rotors. The energy levels are sums of eigenvalues $\epsilon_k^{(i)}$ of each H_i, $i = 1, 2$, so that we may have combinations like $\epsilon_{mn}(E_X E_Y) = \epsilon_m^{(1)}(E_X) + \epsilon_n^{(2)}(E_Y)$. Each of these levels is four-fold degenerate because $E_X E_Y$ can be $E_a E_a, E_a E_b, E_b E_a, E_b E_b$ and, according to what was said above, the interaction partially splits it into two two-fold degenerate levels (namely EE and EE'). Curiously, KS state that this rigorous analysis based on group theory is a *speculation* confirmed by their numerical calculations.

The approximate finite matrix representation of the Hamiltonian can be written in terms of sums of Kronecker products

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H} &= \mathbf{T}_1 \otimes \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{T}_2 + V_3 \left(\mathbf{C}_1 \otimes \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{C}_2 \right) \\ &\quad + W_3 \left(\mathbf{C}_1 \otimes \mathbf{C}_2 + \mathbf{S}_1 \otimes \mathbf{S}_2 \right), \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $\mathbf{T}$, $\mathbf{C}$, $\mathbf{S}$ are $(2N+1) \times (2N+1)$ matrix representations of the operators $-B\partial^2/\partial\phi^2$, $\cos(\phi)$ and $\sin(\phi)$, respectively, in the basis set $\{\varphi_{j,s}(\phi),\ j = -N, -N+1, \ldots, N\}$ and $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix of the same dimension. Consequently, the dimension of the matrix representation $\mathbf{H}$ is $(2N+1)^2 \times (2N+1)^2$ and the pair of symmetry quantum numbers s_1 and s_2 for the left and right factors in each product determines the symmetry of the state as shown in equation (2).

3 Results and conclusions

In order to compare present results with those of KS we calculate the energy differences $\Delta\epsilon_j(XY) = \epsilon_j(XY) - \epsilon_0(AA)$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots$, where $X, Y = A, E_a, E_b$. Besides, we choose $B = 0.654\, meV$, $V_3 = 5\, meV$ and a wide range of values of $W_3 \geq 0$ in agreement with the calculation of KS.

Figure 1 shows values of $\Delta\epsilon_j$ for the first 15 states and is equivalent to Figure 3 of KS. $\Delta\epsilon_0(AA)$ is nondegenerate and, by definition, identical to zero for all W_3. The four-fold degenerate $\Delta\epsilon_0\,(AE)$ exhibits a maximum. The set of four states $\{EE', EE\}$ splits when $W_3 > 0$ in such a way that $\Delta\epsilon_0\,(EE)$

increases and $\Delta\epsilon_0\,(EE')$ reaches a maximum after which it decreases with W_3. The latter crosses $\Delta\epsilon_0\,(AE)$ at $W_3 = W_3^c$ so that $\Delta\epsilon_0\,(AE) < \Delta\epsilon_0\,(EE')$ when $W_3 < W_3^c$ and $\Delta\epsilon_0\,(AE) > \Delta\epsilon_0\,(EE')$ otherwise. This is a true crossing and not an avoided one as stated by KS. The two-fold degenerate levels $\Delta\epsilon_0\,(EE')$ and $\Delta\epsilon_1\,(EE')$ approach each other quite closely and exhibit and avoided crossing but always $\Delta\epsilon_0\,(EE') < \Delta\epsilon_1\,(EE')$ (they have a maximum and a minimum, respectively, at the avoided crossing). It can be proved that they coalesce at an exceptional point W_3^{EP} in the complex W_3 plane [7]. This is the avoided crossing closest to the origin and the only one in Figure 3 of KS. This avoided crossing is magnified in Figure 2. In Figure 1 we also appreciate the four-fold degenerate level $\Delta\epsilon_1\,(AE)$ (the highest one shown by that energy scale).

Figure 3 shows some more energy levels that exhibit crossings (different symmetry) and avoided crossings (same symmetry). Because of the former the order of several energy levels changes with W_3 and for this reason we prefer to label the members of each irrep separately so that $\Delta\epsilon_j\,(XY) < \Delta\epsilon_{j+1}\,(XY)$ for all W_3.

As stated in the introduction, the purpose of this comment is the analysis of the energy levels of the simple coupled-rotors model (1) in a clearer way than that provided by KS. To this end we resorted to a separate calculation of the energy levels for each irrep because it is difficult to distinguish a true crossing from an avoided one if one uses the Fourier basis set B^{KS} chosen by KS. The reason lies in the difficulty of tracking a pair of energy levels through a crossing or when they approach each other too much. It is not surprising that KS confused a true crossing for an avoided one when they based their conclusions only on numerical calculations with the basis B^{KS}. Our figures clearly display crossings and avoided crossings because it is possible to use different kinds of lines or symbols for different irreps when one treats them separately.

Another relevant point of this comment is the analysis of the spectrum of the model in terms of group theory that is a useful tool for the prediction of degeneracies and their splitting when a Hamiltonian operator is perturbed by a known interaction. Without any calculation one knows that states of different

symmetry are not expected to give rise to avoided crossings [2–4]. In fact, different irreps behave as if they were completely independent problems because they do not exhibit any interaction. They can, therefore, be treated separately reducing the dimension of the matrix representation $\mathbf{H}$ that increases with N as $(2N+1)^2$. In the present case we roughly need $N/9$ for each irrep to achieve the same accuracy.

Acknowledgements

The research of P.A. was supported by Sistema Nacional de Investigadores (México).

References

[1] S. Khazaei and D. Sebastiani, J. Chem. Phys. **147**, 194303 (2017).

[2] M. Teller, J. Phys. Chem. **41**, 109 (1937).

[3] K. Razi Naqvi and W. Byers Brown, Int. J. Qunatum Chem. **6**, 271 (1972).

[4] F. M. Fernández, J. Math. Chem. **52**, 2322 (2014).

[5] F. A. Cotton, Chemical Applications of Group Theory, Third ed. (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1990).

[6] W. Häusler and A. Hüller, Z. Phys.B: Condens Matter **59**, 177 (1985).

[7] W. D. Heiss and A. L. Sannino, J. Phys. A **23**, 1167 (1990).




Figure 1: Lowest $\Delta\epsilon$ for the symmetries AE (solid line, red), EE' (dashed line, blue) and EE (dashed line, green)




Figure 2: Avoided crossing closest to the origin




Figure 3: Lowest $\Delta\epsilon$ for the symmetries AA (solid line, orange), AE (solid line, red) EE' (dashed line, blue) and EE (dashed line, green)