

TRUE POTENTIAL ENERGY CURVES AND DISSOCIATION ENERGIES OF SiF AND GeF MOLECULES

T. V. RAMAKRISHNA RAO AND R. RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

Department of Physics, Post-Graduate Centre, Anantapur 515 003, India

ABSTRACT

The true experimental potential energy curves have been constructed for the different electronic states of astrophysically important molecule SiF and GeF molecules, by the method of Lakshman and Rao along with Jarmain method. The ground state dissociation energies for these two molecules have been estimated by curve fitting method using the H-H function. From these studies, it is concluded that the ionization potential of silicon is greater than that of silicon fluoride molecule.

INTRODUCTION

THE construction of potential energy curves is of considerable importance for the understanding of physical problems arising in astrophysics, gas kinetics and molecular spectra. Silicon monofluoride is of astrophysically interest and may be a constituent of the Sun¹. The rotational structure of the γ bands of SiF molecule has been completely analysed by Appelblad *et al.*² and Martin and Merer³ reexamined the $a^4\Sigma^- - X^2\Pi$ transition. Singh and Rai⁴ have computed a potential energy curve for the ground state of SiF molecule. The UV band system and emission spectra of GeF, SiF, SnF and PbF were observed by Barrow *et al.*^{5,6}. Recently Martin and Merer^{7,8} carried out rotational structure analysis of GeF molecule. The rotational and vibrational

constants required for the present work have been taken from Mizushima⁹ and Martin and Merer^{7,8}. The present paper deals with the construction of potential energy curves by the methods of Lakshman and Rao¹¹ along with Jarmain¹⁰.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The true potential energy curves have been drawn for eight states of SiF and ten different states of GeF molecules using these two methods. The authors' method¹⁰ was successfully verified in a number of cases¹²⁻¹⁴. The agreement between these two methods is excellent. For brevity, only alternate turning points for different electronic states of SiF and GeF molecules are presented in Table I. The maximum deviation between the two values is less than 3%.

TABLE I

The true potential energy curves for different electronic states of SiF and GeF molecules

| v | $U + Te$ (cm ⁻¹) | Authors' method | | Jarmain method | | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
| | | r_{\min} (Å) | r_{\max} (Å) | r_{\min} (Å) | r_{\max} (Å) | |
| SiF molecule | | | | | | |
| $Te = 0$ | | | | | | |
| 0 | 427·41 | 1·544 | 1·663 | 1·545 | 1·663 | |
| 2 | 2113·37 | 1·484 | 1·750 | 1·484 | 1·751 | |
| 4 | 3761·41 | 1·450 | 1·812 | 1·451 | 1·812 | |
| 6 | 5371·53 | 1·426 | 1·864 | 1·426 | 1·865 | |
| 8 | 6943·73 | 1·406 | 1·913 | 1·406 | 1·913 | |
| $Te = 22787·64$ | | | | | | |
| $X^2\Pi$ state | | | | | | |
| 0 | 23215·05 | 1·555 | 1·673 | 1·555 | 1·674 | |
| 2 | 24901·01 | 1·495 | 1·761 | 1·495 | 1·760 | |
| 4 | 26549·05 | 1·461 | 1·823 | 1·461 | 1·823 | |
| 6 | 28159·17 | 1·437 | 1·875 | 1·437 | 1·875 | |
| 8 | 29731·37 | 1·418 | 1·924 | 1·418 | 1·924 | |
| $A^2\Sigma^+$ state | | | | | | |

TABLE I (Contd.)

| <i>v</i> | $U + Te$ (cm^{-1}) | Authors' method | | Jarmain method | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | r_{\min} (\AA) | r_{\max} (\AA) | r_{\min} (\AA) | r_{\max} (\AA) |
| $Te = 29808.41$ | | | | | |
| 0 | 30238.65 | 1.548 | 1.666 | 1.549 | 1.666 |
| 1 | 31091.07 | 1.512 | 1.717 | 1.512 | 1.717 |
| 3 | 32763.69 | 1.470 | 1.787 | 1.470 | 1.787 |
| 5 | 34393.35 | 1.442 | 1.843 | 1.442 | 1.843 |
| $Te = 34561.50$ | | | | | |
| 0 | 35065.91 | 1.489 | 1.598 | 1.489 | 1.598 |
| 2 | 37109.42 | 1.432 | 1.679 | 1.433 | 1.678 |
| 4 | 39014.33 | 1.401 | 1.733 | 1.401 | 1.733 |
| 6 | 40930.64 | 1.378 | 1.780 | 1.378 | 1.780 |
| 8 | 42808.35 | 1.359 | 1.823 | 1.359 | 1.823 |
| 10 | 44647.46 | 1.344 | 1.863 | 1.344 | 1.863 |
| $Te = 39537.45$ | | | | | |
| 0 | 39981.90 | 1.516 | 1.632 | 1.517 | 1.632 |
| 1 | 40860.29 | 1.480 | 1.682 | 1.480 | 1.682 |
| 2 | 41724.66 | 1.457 | 1.720 | 1.457 | 1.720 |
| $Te = 41964.90$ | | | | | |
| 0 | 42479.69 | 1.477 | 1.584 | 1.477 | 1.585 |
| 2 | 44516.59 | 1.419 | 1.662 | 1.420 | 1.662 |
| 4 | 46517.88 | 1.387 | 1.715 | 1.387 | 1.715 |
| 6 | 48483.58 | 1.363 | 1.760 | 1.363 | 1.760 |
| $Te = 46606.70$ | | | | | |
| 0 | 47121.83 | 1.483 | 1.596 | 1.488 | 1.596 |
| 1 | 48144.17 | 1.450 | 1.635 | 1.454 | 1.642 |
| 2 | 49153.95 | 1.426 | 1.669 | 1.430 | 1.673 |
| $Te = 47418.60$ | | | | | |
| 0 | 47918.79 | 1.492 | 1.601 | 1.489 | 1.598 |
| 1 | 48910.71 | 1.458 | 1.648 | 1.455 | 1.644 |
| 3 | 50860.71 | 1.420 | 1.713 | 1.417 | 1.713 |
| GeF molecule | | | | | |
| $Te = 0$ | | | | | |
| 0 | 332.05 | 1.694 | 1.806 | 1.691 | 1.807 |
| 2 | 1644.99 | 1.633 | 1.895 | 1.631 | 1.892 |
| 4 | 2932.35 | 1.600 | 1.954 | 1.598 | 1.951 |
| 6 | 4195.63 | 1.575 | 2.004 | 1.573 | 2.001 |

TABLE I (Contd.)

| v | $U + Te$ (cm ⁻¹) | Authors' method | | Jarmain method | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | | r_{\min} (Å) | r_{\max} (Å) | r_{\min} (Å) | r_{\max} (Å) |
| Te = 934·33 | | | | | |
| 0 | 1267·21 | 1·692 | 1·808 | 1·689 | 1·805 |
| 2 | 2582·97 | 1·626 | 1·895 | 1·629 | 1·890 |
| 4 | 3874·15 | 1·598 | 1·952 | 1·596 | 1·949 |
| 6 | 5138·69 | 1·573 | 2·002 | 1·571 | 1·999 |
| 8 | 6387·40 | 1·554 | 2·048 | 1·551 | 2·045 |
| Te = 23316·65 | | | | | |
| 0 | 23522·18 | 1·799 | 1·947 | 1·797 | 1·945 |
| 2 | 24342·00 | 1·725 | 2·056 | 1·722 | 2·053 |
| 4 | 25151·35 | 1·685 | 2·132 | 1·683 | 2·128 |
| 6 | 25950·31 | 1·657 | 2·196 | 1·654 | 2·193 |
| 8 | 26738·27 | 1·635 | 2·255 | 1·632 | 2·252 |
| 10 | 27514·61 | 1·617 | 2·311 | 1·614 | 2·307 |
| Te = 35010·85 | | | | | |
| 0 | 35408·44 | 1·620 | 1·724 | 1·621 | 1·722 |
| 2 | 36980·93 | 1·577 | 1·817 | 1·575 | 1·814 |
| 4 | 38525·28 | 1·547 | 1·871 | 1·544 | 1·867 |
| 6 | 40042·04 | 1·527 | 1·915 | 1·522 | 1·912 |
| 8 | 41531·84 | 1·505 | 1·956 | 1·503 | 1·953 |
| 10 | 42995·26 | 1·489 | 1·994 | 1·487 | 1·992 |
| Te = 35194·68 | | | | | |
| 0 | 35513·83 | 1·691 | 1·810 | 1·688 | 1·808 |
| 2 | 36757·13 | 1·621 | 1·910 | 1·619 | 1·907 |
| 4 | 37947·15 | 1·598 | 1·967 | 1·595 | 1·964 |
| Te = 43369·61 | | | | | |
| 0 | 43767·19 | 1·623 | 1·729 | 1·620 | 1·727 |
| 2 | 45359·67 | 1·561 | 1·805 | 1·563 | 1·802 |
| 4 | 46948·65 | 1·533 | 1·859 | 1·532 | 1·854 |
| 6 | 48534·90 | 1·508 | 1·905 | 1·507 | 1·899 |
| Te = 43977·49 | | | | | |
| 0 | 44326·47 | 1·646 | 1·760 | 1·643 | 1·756 |
| 1 | 45010·48 | 1·612 | 1·810 | 1·609 | 1·808 |
| 2 | 45675·87 | 1·591 | 1·851 | 1·588 | 1·848 |
| Te = 46645·41 | | | | | |
| 0 | 47024·70 | 1·624 | 1·732 | 1·621 | 1·730 |
| 2 | 48527·06 | 1·565 | 1·810 | 1·563 | 1·807 |
| 4 | 50005·69 | 1·532 | 1·863 | 1·530 | 1·860 |
| Te = 47920·73 | | | | | |
| 0 | 48321·86 | 1·620 | 1·726 | 1·618 | 1·723 |
| 1 | 49119·06 | 1·586 | 1·770 | 1·584 | 1·767 |
| Te = 49412·89 | | | | | |
| 0 | 49770·19 | 1·653 | 1·765 | 1·651 | 1·762 |
| 2 | 51185·29 | 1·588 | 1·841 | 1·590 | 1·842 |
| 3 | 51884·38 | 1·574 | 1·873 | 1·572 | 1·871 |

The true potential energy curves have been used to estimate the dissociation energies of diatomic molecules in a number of cases by fitting an empirical potential energy curve. The Hulbert-Hirschfelder function¹⁵ has been shown to fit to a good extent to the true potential energy curves. Using H-H function the dissociation energy D_e , in the ground state of SiF molecule, is estimated to be 4.846 eV, which is in good agreement with the values given by Gaydon¹⁶ (5.0 ± 0.5 eV) and Herzberg¹⁷ (4.80 eV). Following the same procedure the D_e value, for the ground state of GeF molecule has been evaluated as 4.422 eV, which is comparable with the values suggested by Gaydon¹⁶ (5.0 ± 1.0 eV) and Herzberg¹⁷ (4.90 eV).

The values cited in the literature for the ionization potential of SiF are quite harmonious. Keeping this aim in mind, the authors took up the calculations of the ionization potential of SiF and GeF molecules. O'Hare and Wahl¹ have shown the difference between SiF⁺ and SiF bond energies by the relation

$D_0(\text{SiF}^+) - D_0(\text{SiF}) = I(\text{Si}) - I(\text{SiF})$ is 0.8 ± 0.3 eV, which is consistent with the ionization of a anti-bonding electron. It expresses that SiF⁺ has one anti-bonding electron fewer than SiF and so one would expect $D_0(\text{SiF}^+)$ to be larger than $D_0(\text{SiF})$.

Having known the D_e values of SiF, GeF, the ionization potentials for these molecules are calculated assuming ionization potentials of silicon, germanium and D_e values of SiF⁺, GeF⁺ from Gaydon¹⁶

$$\begin{aligned} I(\text{SiF}) &= I(\text{Si}) + D_e(\text{SiF}) - D_e(\text{SiF}^+) \\ &= 8.15 + 4.85 - 5.90 \\ &= 7.10 \text{ eV.} \end{aligned}$$

The ionization potential 7.10 eV for SiF is in excellent agreement with the value of 7.4 ± 0.2 eV proposed by O'Hare and Wahl¹. Similarly the ionization potential of GeF is estimated as 6.70 eV which is in close agreement with the value 7.2 eV proposed by Harland *et al.*¹⁸ and 7.46 eV given by Martin and McRee⁸.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to express their thanks to Prof. S. V. J. Lakshman and Prof. S. V. Subrahmanyam for their interest in this work.

1. O'Hare, P. A. G. and Wahl, Arnold, C., *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1971, **55**, 666.
2. Appelblad, O., Barlow, R. F. and Verma, R. D., *J. Phys. B. (Proc. Phys. Soc.)*, 1968, **1**, 274.
3. Martin, R. W. and Merer, A. J., *Cand. J. Phys.*, 1973, **51**, 634.
4. Singh, R. B. and Rai, D. K., *Ind. J. Pure and Appl. Phys.*, 1966, **4**, 102.
5. Barlow, R. F. and Lagerqvist, A., *Ark. Phys.*, 1949, **1**, 221.
6. —, Butler, D., Johns, J. W. C. and Powell, J. L., *Proc. Phys. Soc.*, 1959, **73**, 317.
7. Martin, R. W. and Merer, A. J., *Cand. J. Phys.*, 1973, **51**, 125.
8. — and —, *Ibid.*, 1974, **52**, 1458.
9. Mizushima, Masataka, *Rotating Diatomic Molecules*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1975.
10. Lakshman, S. V. J. and Ramakrishna Rao, T. V., *Jol. Phys., B*, 1971, **4**, 269.
11. Jarmain, W. R., *Cand. J. Phys.*, 1960, **38**, 217.
12. Ramakrishna Rao, T. V. and Lakshman, S. V. J., *Physica*, 1971, **56**, 332.
13. — and —, *Jol. Quant. Spectro. Radi. Trans.*, 1972, **12**, 1063.
14. Lakshman, S. V. J., Ramakrishna Rao, T. V. and Naidu, G. T., *Curr. Sci.*, 1978, **47**, 7.
15. Hulbert, H. H. and Hirschfelder, J. O., *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1941, **9**, 61; *Ibid.*, 1961, **35**, 1901.
16. Gaydon, A. G., *Dissociation Energies*, Chapman and Hall, Ltd., London, 1968.
17. Herzberg, G., *Mol. Spectra and Mol. Structure, I*, Van Nostrand Company, New York, 1967.
18. Harland, P. W., Cradock, S. and Thynne, J. C. J., *Inorg. Nucle. Chem. Lett.*, 1973, **9**, 53.

CONFERENCE ON ALUMINIUM METALLURGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENTS AND TECHNOLOGY

The Metallurgical Society and The Department of Metallurgy, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560 012, have organized a Conference on the above subject during September 1979. The Conference deals with a variety of topics connected with aluminium extraction, physical metallurgy, corrosion, powder

metallurgy, casting, applications in industries, alloys, etc. The last date for sending abstracts is March 15, 1979. Details can be had from the Convener, Conference on 'Aluminium Metallurgy', Department of Metallurgy, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560 012.