New calculation of the properties of the positronium ion

A. K. Bhatia and Richard J. Drachman

Laboratory for Astronomy and Solar Physics, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland 20771

(Received 14 March 1983)

The positronium negative ion (Ps⁻), the system composed of two electrons and a positron, has been reinvestigated theoretically. Using a Hylleraas wave function with two nonlinear parameters and more than 200 linear terms, we have obtained excellent values of binding energy and annihilation lifetime of the particle-stable ${}^{1}S^{e}$ ground state. In addition, we have examined the question of stability of the ${}^{3}P^{e}$ state discussed by Mills, and we agree with his conclusion that the state is probably not stable against breakup into Ps $(n = 2) + e^{-}$. Improved limits on the critical "positron" mass for binding the ${}^{3}P^{e}$ state have also been obtained.

As a result, in part, of the recent elegant experimental work of Mills,^{1,2} there has been a revival of interest in the simplest "polyelectron" system,³ the positronium negative ion (Ps⁻). Consisting of two electrons and a positron, this isotope of H⁻ has long been known⁴ to be particle stable, decaying only by e^+ - e^- annihilation into gamma rays. Mills has recently produced and detected this ion¹ and measured its lifetime,² while Ho has calculated with high accuracy its ground-state⁵ and resonant-state⁶ properties. In this paper we report some even more accurate results concerning the Ps⁻ ground state and confirm⁷ the probable nonexistence of an excited state analogous to the known ³P^e state in H⁻.

In reduced rydberg units $(R_{\mu} = \mu/m_e \text{ Ry})$ the Hamiltonian of the system is

$$H_{\rho} = -\nabla_{1}^{2} - \nabla_{2}^{2} - \frac{2}{1+\rho} \vec{\nabla}_{1} \cdot \vec{\nabla}_{2} - \frac{2}{r_{1}} - \frac{2}{r_{2}} + \frac{2}{r_{12}} , \quad (1)$$

where the reduced mass $\mu = m_+ m_-/(m_+ + m_-)$, $\rho = m_+/m_-$, and \vec{r}_1 , \vec{r}_2 are the vectors from the positive particle to each of the identical negative particles in units of $(m_e/\mu)a_0$. (For generality, we allow the masses m_+,m_- to differ from m_e .) We take as trial function the generalized Hylleraas form

Ψ(

functions involve the symmetric Euler angles⁸ describing the orientation in space of the vectors
$$\vec{r}_1$$
 and \vec{r}_2 . We follow Ref. 8 in the reduction of H_{ρ} to an operator in r_1 , r_2 , and r_{12} only, after which the usual variational type of calculation can be carried out.
In Table I we show the convergence of our ${}^1S^e$ results

where L = 0, 1 for ${}^{1}S^{e}$ and ${}^{3}P^{e}$ states, respectively, and the \mathscr{D}

In Table 1 we show the convergence of our 3^{-5} results under the restriction of setting the two nonlinear parameters equal $(\delta = \gamma)$, while the more general case $(\delta \neq \gamma)$ is shown in Table II. A considerable improvement in the energy is seen in the latter case; the optimum values for the two parameters differ by about a factor of 2. This reflects the basic structure of the Ps⁻ ground state which consists mainly of the Ps atom plus a loosely bound electron. Our best value of the binding energy against breakup of Ps⁻ into Ps + e^- is 0.024010113 Ry or 0.3266769(9) eV, where the quoted uncertainty is due to the error in converting rydberg units to electronvolts. This is greater by 4.4×10^{-6} eV than the previous best value calculated by Ho.⁵ By extrapolation, we estimate the converged value of the energy to be 0.024010130 ± 3×10^{-9} Ry.

In Tables I and II we also show several other quantities. These include expectation values of $\delta(\vec{r}_i)$ and $\delta(\vec{r}_{12})$ and the two cusp quantities

$$\vec{\mathbf{r}}_{1}, \ \vec{\mathbf{r}}_{2}) = (\sin\theta_{12})^{L} \sum_{\substack{l \ge L, \\ m \ge L, \\ n \ge 0}} C_{lmn} [r_{1}^{l} r_{2}^{m} e^{-(\gamma r_{1} + \delta r_{2})} + (1 \leftrightarrow 2)] r_{12}^{n} \mathscr{D}_{L}^{0+}, \quad (2)$$

$$\nu_{i} = \left\langle \delta(\vec{r}_{i}) \frac{\partial}{\partial r_{i}} \right\rangle \left\langle \delta(\vec{r}_{i}) \right\rangle^{-1} ,$$

$$\nu_{12} = \left\langle \delta(\vec{r}_{12}) \frac{\partial}{\partial r_{12}} \right\rangle \left\langle \delta(\vec{r}_{12}) \right\rangle^{-1} .$$
(3)

TABLE I.	Convergence of ¹	S ^e results	for $\delta = \gamma$.	The notation	A(-B)	stands for 2	$A \times 10^{-B}$	
----------	-----------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	--------------	-------	--------------	--------------------	--

Expansion length	$\gamma = \delta$	Binding energy (Ry)	δ (ī ,)	δ (r ₁₂)	ν _i	v ₁₂	Γ (nsec ⁻¹)
125	0.3585	0.024 009 788	0.020722	1.7151(-4)	-0.499 10	0.497 11	2.0850
161	0.3700	0.024 010 026	0.020732	1.7136(-4)	-0.49986	0.496 95	2.0860
203	0.3800	0.024 010 089	0.020 730	1.7129(-4)	-0.499 64	0.497 40	2.0858

©1983 The American Physical Society

<u>28</u>

Expansion le	ength	γ	δ	Binding energy (Ry)	δ (ī,)	δ (r ₁₂)	ν	ν ₁₂	Γ (nsec ⁻¹)
120	0.	.604	0.296	0.024 009 966	0.020 733	1.7190(-4)	-0.500 00	0.493 47	2.0861
165	0.	604	0.314	0.024 010 079	0.020 733	1.7164(-4)	-0.499 99	0.49441	2.0861
220	0.	.604	0.313	0.024 010 113	0.020733	1.7150(-4)	-0.500 00	0.495 08	2.0861

TABLE II. Convergence of ${}^{1}S^{e}$ results for $\delta \neq \gamma$.

The cusp quantities test the accuracy of wave functions near points of coalescence, since $v_1 = v_2 = -\frac{1}{2}$ and $v_{12} = +\frac{1}{2}$ for exact solutions of the Schrödinger equation.⁹ Our solutions are seen to be quite good, with v_i lying closer to the exact value than v_{12} . To a sufficient accuracy the Ps⁻ decay rate is

$$\Gamma = 2\pi \alpha^4 (c/a_0) [1 - \alpha (17/\pi - 19\pi/12)] \langle \delta(\vec{r}_1) \rangle$$

= 100.6174 \langle \delta(\vec{r}_1) \rangle nsec^{-1} , (4)

where the correction term proportional to α is due to the triplet lifetime¹⁰ and the leading radiative correction to the singlet lifetime.¹¹ (There are some additional corrections of order α that have not yet been calculated.) Our theoretical value is in agreement with the measured² value $\Gamma = 2.09 \pm 0.09$ nsec⁻¹, although the experiment is not yet precise enough to test the theory critically. In fact, the crude picture of Ps⁻ as a loosely bound electron plus Ps discussed above leads to an estimated value of $\langle \delta(\vec{r}_1) \rangle = 1/16\pi$ or a rate of 2.0017 nsec⁻¹, still in agreement with experiment.

Mills⁷ recognized that the existence of a ${}^{3}P^{e}$ state in Ps⁻ lying below the n = 2 threshold of Ps would have very interesting experimental consequences: The state would be metastable against breakup since the process $Ps^{-}({}^{3}P^{e}) \rightarrow Ps({}^{1}S) + e^{-}$ is nonrelativistically forbidden, while the annihilation rate in *p* states is of order α^{2} smaller than for *s* states.¹² Such a state is known¹³ in H⁻, but is very weakly bound; it lies only 9.5×10^{-3} eV below the n = 2 threshold. Mills⁷ showed, by use of variational wave function with up to 70 terms, that the state is probably not bound in Ps⁻. Perhaps this should not be surprising since the ground state of Ps⁻ is bound by only about half as much as that of H⁻. We have, nevertheless, recalculated the energy of the ${}^{3}P^{e}$ state in Ps⁻ using the trial function of Eq. (2) with L = 1 and up to 120 terms and have failed to obtain an energy below $-\frac{1}{4}$ reduced rydbergs, the n = 2threshold. We tried to improve the convergence by adding long-range terms of several types,¹⁴ but the improvement was not noteworthy.

Following Mills⁷ we then varied the mass ratio ρ to bound the region in which the ${}^{3}P^{e}$ state is stable. In Table III we show the convergence for two cases: $\rho = 17$, for which binding definitely occurs, and $\rho = 16$, for which no binding was obtained. In Fig. 1, we plot the binding energy in reduced rydberg units versus ρ , showing that binding occurs¹⁵ for all values of ρ except 0.4047 $\leq \rho \leq 16.8$. The region for which binding does occur includes such interesting systems as H⁻, $e^{-}\mu^{+}e^{-}$, H₂⁺, and the muonic hydrogen molecular ions $(p\mu p, d\mu d, t\mu t)$, but excludes Ps⁻, for which $\rho = 1$.

TABLE III. Convergence of ${}^{3}P^{e}$ binding energies [E(n=2)-E] for two cases. Energies are in reduced rydbergs; $\rho = m_{+}/m_{-}$.

-				
Expansion length	$\rho = 17$	$\rho = 16$		
20	-1.950 52(-4)	-2.35843(-4)		
35	-6.7446(-5)	-1.044 28(-4)		
56	-1.8104(-5)	-5.2627(-5)		
84	-1.021 (-6)	-3.461 9(-5)		
120	+6.900 (-6)	-2.6029(-5)		



FIG. 1. Binding energy of ${}^{3}P^{e}$ state [E(n=2)-E] in reduced rydbergs as a function of the mass ratio ρ .

BRIEF REPORTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the help of James S. Sims which enabled us to extend our calculations to high N. We thank A. P. Mills, Jr. and Y. K. Ho for discussing their work before publication.

- ¹A. P. Mills, Jr., Phys. Rev. Lett. $\underline{46}$, 717 (1981). ²A. P. Mills, Jr., Phys. Rev. Lett. $\underline{50}$, 671 (1983).
- ³J. A. Wheeler, Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci. <u>48</u>, 219 (1946).
- ⁴E. A. Hylleraas, Phys. Rev. <u>71</u>, 491 (1947). The Ps⁺ system $(e^+e^-e^+)$ is, of course, also stable, but not experimentally accessible at present.
- ⁵Y. K. Ho, J. Phys. B <u>16</u>, 1503 (1983).
- ⁶Y. K. Ho, Phys. Rev. A <u>19</u>, 2347 (1979).
- ⁷A. P. Mills, Jr., Phys. Rev. A <u>24</u>, 3242 (1981).
- ⁸A. K. Bhatia and A. Temkin, Rev. Mod. Phys. <u>36</u>, 1050 (1964); Phys. Rev. 137, A1335 (1965).
- ⁹C. F. Lebeda and D. M. Schrader, Phys. Rev. 178, 24 (1969); T. Kato, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. <u>10</u>, 151 (1957); R. T. Pack

- and W. B. Brown, J. Chem. Phys. 45, 556 (1966).
- ¹⁰A. Ore and J. L. Powell, Phys. Rev. <u>75</u>, 1696 (1949).
- ¹¹I. Harris and L. M. Brown, Phys. Rev. <u>105</u>, 1656 (1957).
- ¹²A. I. Alekseev, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. <u>34</u>, 1195 (1958) [Sov. Phys. JETP 7, 826 (1958)]; 36, 1839 (1959) 9, 1312 (1959)].
- ¹³A. K. Bhatia, Phys. Rev. A 2, 1667 (1970); G. W. F. Drake, Phys. Rev. Lett. 24, 126 (1970).
- ¹⁴M. Rotenberg and J. Stein, Phys. Rev. <u>182</u>, 1 (1969).
- ¹⁵Close to these limiting values of ρ , the effect of the long-range term of Ref. 14 is more important. Its inclusion reduces the upper limit from $\rho = 16.8$ to $\rho = 16.1$. In addition, an extrapolation from N = 120 to $N = \infty$ further reduces the upper limit to $\rho = 15.8$, but this is not rigorous.