Positron cooling via inelastic collisions in CF$_4$ and N$_2$ gases
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Positron cooling via inelastic collisions in CF$_4$ and N$_2$ gases is simulated, including positron-positron interactions. Owing to the molecular symmetries, cooling is assumed to be chiefly due to energy loss via vibrational (rotational) excitations for CF$_4$ (N$_2$). For CF$_4$, it is found that the inclusion of the dipole-inactive $\nu_1$ mode, in addition to the dipole-active modes $\nu_3$ and $\nu_4$, can provide room-temperature thermalization and an accurate cooling timescale. Combination cooling enabled by the $\nu_1$ mode, and positron-positron interactions both contribute to the Maxwellianization of the positron momentum distribution. For both gases the evolution of the positron temperature is found to be in excellent agreement with experiment.

The development of the positron buffer-gas trap in the 1980s [1] has enabled the routine trapping, accumulation, and delivery of positrons in beams [2, 3]; the study of low-energy antimatter-matter interactions with atoms and molecules, including scattering, binding, and annihilation [4, 5]; and the formation and exploitation of positronium [6, 7] and anthydrogen [8]. Positrons from a $^{22}$Na source (with energies 0–500 keV) are slowed to eV energies by passing through an ~8 K solid-neon moderator, then magnetically guided into the three-stage buffer-gas trap. The first two stages contain N$_2$ gas in which the positrons cool, typically through electronic excitation [9].

In the third stage, a mixture of N$_2$ and CF$_4$ (or SF$_6$) is used to complete the thermalization of the positrons to room temperature, typically via rotational and vibrational excitation of the molecules [10]. They can be cooled further in a cryogenic beam-tailoring trap which produces an ultra-high resolution (~7 meV FWHM) energy-tunable beam [11].

Optimization of current traps, and development of next-generation traps, accumulators, beams and positron-based technologies require theoretical insight. The theory of low-energy positron cooling in atomic and molecular gases, however, lags well behind experiment (see, e.g., Refs. [12, 13] for early reviews). Most existing theoretical work has been for noble gases, for which the dominant positron-energy-loss mechanism is momentum transfer in elastic collisions. Solutions of the Fokker-Planck equation using model scattering cross sections [14–19] yielded limited agreement with experiment. Recently, however, a Monte Carlo approach employed by one of us that used accurate many-body-theory scattering cross sections [14–19] yielded limited agreement with experiment. Recently, however, a Monte Carlo approach employed by one of us that used accurate many-body-theory scattering cross sections gave a complete description of positron cooling in noble gases, finding excellent agreement with experiment for cooling rates, time-dependent annihilation rates [20], and γ spectra [21]. Cooling at higher energies in noble gases via electronic excitation, ionization, and positronium formation has also been investigated [22]. For molecular gases, less progress has been made, with even cooling in N$_2$ and CF$_4$ not well understood, though some simulations exist [23, 24].

Natisin et al. [25] performed measurements of positron cooling following microwave heating to ~1500 K in CF$_4$, N$_2$, and CO gases, finding that their results were consistent with a positron momentum distribution (PMD) that remained Maxwellian throughout the cooling process. For CF$_4$, their theoretical model (a simple differential equation for the mean energy loss, assuming a Maxwellian PMD throughout) included only the dominant $\nu_3$ mode: with this single vibrational channel, one should, however, expect the PMD to deviate significantly from Maxwellian as positrons below the vibrational excitation threshold cannot cool further, leading to a “pileup” of positrons just below the threshold. The mechanism(s) causing “Maxwellianization” is not yet understood.

Here, we calculate the evolution of the PMD and temperature during cooling in CF$_4$ and N$_2$ gases via inelastic collisions. For CF$_4$, we show that even when both dipole-active vibrational modes ($\nu_3$ and $\nu_4$) are included [26], pileups indeed occur, resulting in a non-Maxwellian PMD, and moreover, that the positrons do not even thermalize to room temperature. We explore two mechanisms that could effect Maxwellianization:

1. Excitation of the dipole-inactive $\nu_1$ mode. We find that this has a significant effect on the cooling, providing a pathway for positrons below the lowest excitation threshold to continue to cool, mitigating the pileup and leading to thermalization on the timescale observed in the experiment. It does not appear to be sufficient, however, to fully Maxwellianize the PMD.

2. Positron-positron collisions. The relative importance of positron-positron and positron-gas collisions is governed by the ratio $R \equiv n_e/n_g$ of the positron number density $n_e$ to the gas number density $n_g$. While positron-positron collisions are known to be capable of effecting rapid Maxwellianization at high positron densities [27], it is not clear a priori what magnitude of $R$ is required for this to occur. We find that the density ratio in the CF$_4$ cooling experiment of Natisin et al. [25], $R \sim 10^{-7}–10^{-6}$ [28], may be sufficient to noticeably enhance the Maxwellianization of the PMD, beyond the effect of including the $\nu_1$ vibrational mode.

For N$_2$, we find that the PMD remains Maxwellian during cooling via rotational excitations of the molecules, even without positron-positron collisions.

Overall, we obtain excellent agreement with experiment for both CF$_4$ and N$_2$.

Simulation procedure.—The PMD $f(k, \tau)$, where $k$ is the momentum and $\tau \equiv n_e t$ is the time-density (t being the time), normalized as $\int_{k_\text{min}}^{k_\text{max}} f(k, \tau) dk = 1$, is calculated as follows. We use the ARTICCOOL program [29], modified to include vibrational and rotational inelastic positron-gas collisions, and positron-positron collisions. We employ a grid in $\tau$ with constant step size $\Delta \tau$. The initial momentum of...
each positron is sampled from a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution (MB) at ~1500 K, corresponding to the experiment [25]. In each time-density step, and for each positron, the probability of a collision with either a molecule or another positron is \( P = W \Delta \tau \), where \( W \) is the total collision rate: 
\[
W = n_g \left( \int u \sigma_{eg}(u) f_g(v') \, dv' + R \int u \sigma_{ee}(u) f_e(v') \, dv' \right),
\]
where \( u \equiv |v - v'| \) is the relative speed of the incident positron and target gas molecule or positron, \( \sigma_{eg} \) and \( \sigma_{ee} \) are the positron-gas and positron-positron scattering cross sections, respectively, \( f_g(v') \) and \( f_e(v') \) are the velocity distributions of the gas molecules and positrons, respectively, and \( \Delta \tau \) is chosen such that \( W \Delta \tau \ll 1 \) [30]. We approximate
\[
\int u \sigma_{eg}(u) f_g(v') \, dv' \approx v_{eg} \sigma_{eg}(v_{eg}),
\]
where \( v_{eg} \) is the relative speed of the positron and a single gas molecule whose velocity is sampled from a MB at room temperature, \( T_R = 300 \) K. To calculate \( \int u \sigma_{ee}(u) f_e(v') \, dv' \), we use the method of Weng and Kushner [31, 32]. A random number \( r_1 \in [0, 1] \) is drawn, and if \( r_1 < P \), then a collision is deemed to occur. If so, another random number \( r_2 \in [0, 1] \) determines the target type: if \( r_2 < \frac{v_{eg} \sigma_{eg}(v_{eg})}{W} \), the target is a molecule; otherwise, it is another positron. Finally, a random number \( r_3 \in [0, 1] \) determines the specific scattering channel, i.e., the initial and final states of the molecule for an inelastic positron-gas collision, or the velocity of the target positron for a positron-positron collision [32]. In a positron-gas collision, the energy lost by the positron is \( \varepsilon_f - \varepsilon_i \), where \( \varepsilon_i \) and \( \varepsilon_f \) are the energies of the initial and final states of the molecule, respectively; in a positron-positron collision, the energy change of the incident positron is determined by the relative speed of the two positrons and the scattering angle [31]. The temperature of the positrons at a given \( \tau \) is calculated as
\[
T = \frac{k_{\text{rms}}^2}{3m_e k_B},
\]
where \( k_{\text{rms}} \) is the root-mean-squared momentum of the positrons, \( m_e \) is the positron mass, and \( k_B \) is the Boltzmann constant.

**Positron cooling in CF\(_4\) gas.**—Since CF\(_4\) has \( T_d \) symmetry, its electric dipole and quadrupole moments are zero. Thus, positron cooling in CF\(_4\) is expected to be predominantly via vibrational, rather than rotational, excitations of the molecules. CF\(_4\) possesses four fundamental vibrational modes. Modes \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \), with energies \( \varepsilon_1 = 113 \) meV and \( \varepsilon_2 = 53.9 \) meV, are dipole active, while modes \( v_3 \) and \( v_4 \), with energies \( \varepsilon_3 = 159 \) meV and \( \varepsilon_4 = 78.4 \) meV, are dipole active [33]. We investigate cooling of the positrons from 1700 K (\( k_BT = 146 \) meV) to 300 K (\( k_BT = 26 \) meV). For simplicity, we consider only fundamental transitions, and initially, we neglect the role of positron-positron collisions. We use the Born-dipole approximation for the transition cross sections \( \sigma_{0 \rightarrow 1,3,4} \) between the vibrational ground state \( v_0 \) and dipole-active modes \( v_1 \) and \( v_4 \) [32, 34]. Semiempirical coupled-channel calculations [35] found \( \sigma_{0 \rightarrow 3} \) to be similar in shape and magnitude to the corresponding Born-dipole calculation, but \( \sigma_{0 \rightarrow 4} \) to be approximately four times larger than the corresponding Born-dipole calculation (see Fig. 6 in Ref. [35]). Therefore, we also perform calculations using the Born-dipole \( \sigma_{0 \rightarrow 4} \) scaled by 4. For \( v_1 \), we are unaware of any theoretical or experimental investigation of positron-impact excitation, so we turn to a set of measurements of \( \sigma_{0 \rightarrow 1,3,4} \) for electron impact [36] and assume the positron-impact cross sections to be similar in shape and magnitude to the electron-impact ones (as predicted for \( v_3 \) and \( v_4 \) [35]). The overall shape of each measured cross section is similar, differing in the threshold energy and magnitude. The peak in the measured \( \sigma_{0 \rightarrow 1} \) is approximately 3.1 times higher than the peak in the measured \( \sigma_{0 \rightarrow 4} \) (see Fig. 1 in Ref. [36]). Thus, we estimate \( \sigma_{0 \rightarrow 21} \) using the Born-dipole expressions for \( \sigma_{0 \rightarrow 24} \), scaled by 3.1. We carry out a second set of calculations where we scale \( \sigma_{0 \rightarrow 21} \) by a further factor of 4, to account for the fact that the Born-dipole calculation of \( \sigma_{0 \rightarrow 4} \) is approximately four times smaller than the corresponding coupled-channel calculation [35] (see above). We are unaware of any existing calculations or measurements of \( \sigma_{0 \rightarrow 21} \), so we neglect these transitions entirely.

![FIG. 1. Positron temperature during cooling in CF\(_4\). Calculations in \( v_3 \) (dashed red), \( v_3 + v_4 \) (dot-dashed blue), \( v_3 + 4v_4 \) (dotted green), \( v_3 + v_4 + v_1 \) (dot-dash-dotted magenta) and \( v_3 + 4v_4 + 4v_1 \) (solid black) approximations (see text), and experiment [28] (red circles).](image-url)
been reached, we observe a pileup in $f(k, \tau)$ just below this threshold, with $f(k, \tau) \sim 0$ above the threshold. The positron temperature can thus decrease no further. In the $v_3 + v_4$ and $v_3 + 4v_4$ approximations, at $\tau = 0.06$ ns amg, we observe pileups below both thresholds. Both diminish on longer timescales than considered here: those just below the $0 \rightarrow 3$ threshold can cool via $0 \rightarrow 4$ excitation; those below the $0 \rightarrow 4$ threshold can cool, but only via multiple $4 \rightarrow 0$ deexcitations (since $2\varepsilon_3 < \varepsilon_4$) followed by a $0 \rightarrow 3$ excitation. The $v_3 + v_4 + v_1$ and $v_3 + 4v_4 + 4v_1$ approximations are notably different. The additional $v_1$ mode enables positrons below the lowest ($0 \rightarrow 4$) excitation threshold to cool further via a single deexcitation and excitation of the molecule. For example, a positron with energy $\varepsilon$ where $\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_4 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_4$ can induce a $4 \rightarrow 0$ deexcitation followed by a $0 \rightarrow 1$ excitation, thus reducing its energy by $\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_4$; another pathway is via a $1 \rightarrow 0$ deexcitation followed by a $0 \rightarrow 3$ excitation. Since the deexcitation cross sections are orders of magnitude smaller than the excitation ones above the vibrational excitation thresholds [32], such cooling via a single deexcitation and excitation is much more probable than via multiple deexcitations followed by excitation. Indeed, the peak in $f(k, \tau)$ (at $k \approx 0.05$ a.u.) corresponds to the energy $\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_4$, below which positrons can cool further only via the improbable multiple deexcitations pathway. The doorway provided by the $v_1$ mode thus appears to provide an accurate cooling timescale and room-temperature thermalization.

In all of the approximations, the PMD at equilibrium is markedly non-Maxwellian. This is because in inducing the vibrational transitions, the positrons lose or gain energy in large amounts relative to the overall energy spread of the PMD, e.g., the energy lost in a $0 \rightarrow 4$ excitation is $\sim 10\%$ of the initial overall spread of positron energies (assuming an initial momentum spread of $0 \leq k \leq 0.25$ a.u.; see Fig. 2). Figure 3 shows $f(k, \tau)$ for the best approximation, $v_3 + 4v_4 + 4v_1$, for several $\tau$ [see also the video CF4-video in Supplemental Material [38]]. The PMD for $\tau = 0.06$ ns amg (the final value of $\tau$ displayed), though close in shape and magnitude to the MB for $T_R = 300$ K, has a lingering pileup at the $0 \rightarrow 4$ threshold, precluding full Maxwellianization of the PMD. We now consider, therefore, the possible role of positron-positron collisions. Figure 4 shows $f(k, \tau)$ for $\tau = 0.06$ ns amg in the $v_3 + 4v_4$ and $v_3 + 4v_4 + 4v_1$ approximations, using 50 000 positrons, with the inclusion of positron-positron interactions, for $R = 10^{-8} - 10^{-6}$. For $R = 10^{-6}$, the positron-positron collisions clearly Maxwellianize the PMD in both approximations, eliminating the pileup at the $0 \rightarrow 4$ threshold almost completely. For $R = 10^{-7}$, however, the effect of positron-positron collisions is much smaller, and for $R = 10^{-8}$, the PMD in both approximations is essentially the same as it was without positron-positron collisions (cf. Fig. 2). Thus, in the experiment of Natisin et al. [25], since $R$ is estimated to be $\sim 10^{-7} - 10^{-6}$ [28], positron-positron collisions may or may not play a significant role. Figure 5 shows the time dependence of the positron temperature in the $v_3 + 4v_4$ and $v_3 + 4v_4 + 4v_1$ approximations, with the inclusion of positron-positron interactions. For all values of $R$ considered, even $R = 10^{-6}$, the $v_3 + 4v_4 + 4v_1$ approximation...
and corresponding to the experiment [25, 41]). We use 200,000 positrons during cooling from an initial MB at 1200 K (correction cross sections. N2 in approximation may underestimate the true rotational excitation cross sections. N2 is in gas—the buffer gases of choice in the ubiquitous Surko traps—has been studied via a Monte Carlo approach. Specifically, we simulated the experiment of Natisin et al. [25], where positrons cooled following microwave heating to ~1500 K. Cooling in CF4 (N2) was assumed to proceed via vibrational (rotational) excitations. For CF4, we found that including the two dipole-active modes ν1 and ν4 was insufficient. Because of the relatively large amounts of energy lost by the positron in inducing a discrete vibrational excitation, the PMD does not remain Maxwellian: pileups are observed near each of the vibrational excitation thresholds. We found that inclusion of the ν1 mode can provide a doorway for further cooling, diminishing the pileups below the dipole-active thresholds and ultimately providing excellent agreement with experiment for the time dependence of the positron temperature. However, even with the inclusion of ν1, the PMD remains markedly non-Maxwellian. We found that positron-positron collisions can effect efficient Maxwellianization of the PMD.
for $R = 10^{-6}$, but not for $R = 10^{-7}$ (or smaller), where $R$ is the ratio of the positron and gas number densities. In the experiment, $R \sim 10^{-7}$-$10^{-6}$ is estimated [28], so the importance of positron-positron collisions in the experiment is unclear. For N$_2$, the energy spacing between the rotational levels is much smaller than that between the vibrational levels of CF$_4$, so the distribution remains near-Maxwellian throughout the cooling. Improved calculations or measurements of the positron-impact transition cross sections between vibrational levels would enable more definitive calculations of cooling. In principle, anisotterization of positrons during the cooling is another process that can affect the overall PMD and positron temperature, but this is not expected to play a significant role for cooling in CF$_4$ and N$_2$ [45].
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11. N$_2$ is chosen as the buffer gas because it is the only known molecule for which the threshold for electronic excitation ($\approx 8.5$ eV) is sufficiently below the threshold for positronium formation ($\approx 8.8$ eV) [10].
26. As far as we are aware, the only existing calculations of positron-impact vibrational excitation of CF$_4$ are the Born-dipole calculation [34] and a semiempirical coupled-channel calculation [35], for positron-impact rotational excitation of N$_2$, apart from the Born-quadropole calculation [40], other calculations present only cross sections for excitations $0 \rightarrow J$ for a few values of the angular momentum $J$ or summed cross sections [46, 47].
See also N2_video.mov (https://youtu.be/wR1zdg_9gtc) in the Supplementary Material for a video showing the time evolution of $f(k, \tau)$ for cooling in N$_2$.

The annihilation cross section is $\sigma_{\text{ann}} = \pi r_0^2 c Z_{\text{eff}}/v$, where $r_0$ is the classical electron radius, $c$ is the speed of light, $v$ is the positron velocity, and $Z_{\text{eff}}$ is the effective number of electrons contributing to annihilation. Measurements and calculations of $Z_{\text{eff}}$ for CF$_4$ and N$_2$ indicate $Z_{\text{eff}} \sim 10^4$ for both species [13, 48, 49], which makes $\sigma_{\text{ann}}$ negligible in comparison to the total vibrational (for CF$_4$) or rotational (for N$_2$) cross section [32].