Collisional broadening and shifting of Raman lines, and the potential energy surface for H₂–Ar
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Abstract

Quantum mechanical close-coupling calculations of pressure broadened and pressure shifting coefficients for polarized vibrational Raman Q₁(1) and pure rotational S₀(1) Raman transitions of H₂–Ar and D₂–Ar have been performed using the empirically determined three-dimensional ‘XC(fit)’ potential energy surface. While the calculated Q₁(1) vibrational line shifting coefficients, and both the shifting and broadening coefficients for the pure rotational S₀(1) lines agree well with experiment, broadening coefficients calculated for the Q₁(1) transitions are substantially smaller than the measured values. Test calculations using ad hoc modifications of the XC(fit) potential indicate that the diatom stretching dependence of that potential energy surface needs further refinement.
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1. Introduction

The analysis of spectral line shapes of molecular gases in the high density (pressure broadening) regime has long been recognized as a useful source of information about intermolecular forces [1,2]. With advances in coherent Raman spectroscopy [3–11], accurate measurements have been made of the line broadening, shifting, and mixing parameters for Raman transitions of molecular hydrogen isotopomers. In particular, line broadening and line shifting coefficients have been obtained for the polarized Q₁(1) line of H₂–Ar over an extended range of temperature [4,8], and for the Q₁(1) lines of D₂–Ar at room temperature [3,6]. The present paper uses these data to access the quality of the recently proposed ‘XC(fit)’ potential energy surface for the H₂–Ar system [12].

At moderately high gas density, the shape of an isolated Raman line is Lorentzian, and the broadening and shifting parameters can be obtained from the real and imaginary parts of a complex cross section which can be computed from a given intermolecular potential by solving a set of closed-coupled equations for the radial wave functions [1,2]. At higher gas
densities, different spectral lines begin to overlap, resulting in non-Lorentzian profiles whose asymmetric line shape can be described by a set of line-mixing parameters, which can again be obtained from a close-coupled scattering calculation. For the H$_2$–He system an accurate ab initio intermolecular potential is available [13], and within the Born–Oppenheimer approximation, the same potential governs the interaction between D$_2$ and He. Using this potential, quantum mechanical close-coupled calculation of the line broadening, line shifting and line-mixing parameters have been reported for the Raman Q$_1$(j) lines [14–17]. Excellent agreement with experiment was found for both the pressure broadening and pressure shifting of the polarized Q$_1$(j) lines. While no experimental data is available for the line-mixing parameters of the polarized spectrum or for any spectral parameter of the depolarized lines for D$_2$–He to compare with the theoretical calculations, this clearly demonstrates the high quality of that [13] ab initio potential.

Analogous close-coupled calculations of the pressure broadening and shifting of the Q$_1$(j) lines of D$_2$–Ar were carried out by Green [18], employing an empirical potential energy surface determined by Le Roy and Hutson referred to as the ‘TT3’ potential [19]. He found discrepancies with experiment of 20–40% for the line broadening (except for excellent agreement for the j = 0 line, which may be accidental), and of about 40% for the line shifts. The TT3 potential had been determined from fits to discrete infrared spectra together with some data for collisional phenomena, including second virial coefficients and inelastic scattering cross sections. It was shown to be consistent with other scattering data, including total differential cross sections, thermal conductivity, and shear viscosity [19], although close-coupled calculations by Hutson [19] showed some discrepancy with experiment for pure rotational Raman linewidths and depolarized Rayleigh scattering cross sections, especially at low temperatures. Green suggested that this pointed to an inaccuracy in the vibrational dependence of the isotropic part of the potential at short range, which was not sufficiently sampled by the data used in its determination.

The more recent XC(fit) potential [12] was developed using the exchange-Coulomb model which was originally developed to describe the interactions of closed shell atoms [21–23], and the adjustable parameters in this model were determined by fitting to high resolution discrete infrared data and second virial coefficients. As expected, the XC(fit) potential proved as effective as the TT3 potential for predictions of the spectroscopic and bulk data used in the fits to determine both potentials, but with improved accuracy due to the higher resolution and greater extent of the data used in its determination. In addition, the XC(fit) surface proved equally capable of predicting elastic and rotationally inelastic differential cross sections, as well as the hyperfine transition frequencies which had been used in the fits to determine the TT3 potential, but not in those determining the XC(fit) potential. Furthermore, the XC(fit) potential was found to give fairly good agreement with experimental NMR spin–lattice relaxation times, especially at high temperatures (T ≥ 400 K) [24].

In an earlier paper [25] we attempted to assess the predictive ability of the XC(fit) potential for the vibrational Raman line broadening and shifting of D$_2$ in Ar. Our close-coupled calculation of the shifting coefficients for the Q$_1$(j) lines for j = 0–5 were in good agreement with experiment. However, the predictions for the line broadening were less satisfactory. Although the j-dependence of the experimental broadening coefficients was qualitatively reproduced, the computed values were consistently smaller than the experimental ones. The present paper extends that work by examining the Raman line broadening and shifting coefficients for the H$_2$–Ar system in greater detail, in an attempt to delineate the deficiencies of the XC(fit) potential. Section 2 describes our application of the close-coupled scattering calculation method for computing the line broadening and shifting coefficients, while Section 3 presents our application of this method in predictions of the polarized Raman Q$_1$(1) line of H$_2$–Ar. The broadening and shifting coefficient calculations for the pure rotational Raman S$_0$(j) lines are reported in Section 4. Section 5 then describes calculations performed with modifications of the XC(fit) potential in an attempt to determine which parts of the potential function the width and shift parameter are most sensitive to, and our conclusions are presented in Section 6.
2. Scattering calculations

The theoretical expressions which relate the intermolecular potential to the line shape parameters, as well as the computational procedures for implementing them, were discussed previously [25]. The central object of the close-coupled scattering calculation is the complex cross section [1]

\[ \sigma_{j'i'j''l''}(E_k) = \frac{\pi}{k^2} \left( \frac{2j_i' + 1}{2j_i + 1} \right)^{1/2} \sum_{l,l'} (-1)^{l-i} \langle j_i'' l'' | j_i' l' \rangle \langle \delta_{i' j' l'} - S_{j_i' j_i l l'}(E_k + E_{\delta i l}) \rangle \]

\[ \times (2J_i + 1)(2J_i + 1) \left\{ J_i J_i' J_f J_f' l l' \right\} \right\} \]

\[ \times S_{j_i' j_i l l'}(E_k + E_{\delta i l}) \]  

(1)

which depends on the scattering matrix element \( S_{j_i' j_i l l'}(E_k + E_{\delta i l}) \) that couples the system with initial vibration–rotation state \( (v_i, j_i) \) orbital and total angular momentum quantum numbers \( l, J \), initial translational energy \( E_k \) and internal energy \( E_{\delta i l} \) to the final state \( (v_f' j_f' l', J_f') \). In Eq. (1), \( j_i = (v_i, j_i) \) and \( f = (v_f, j_f) \) refer to the initial and final spectroscopic states of the diatom before the collision, \( \delta_i \) \( \delta_i \), and \( \kappa \) to the corresponding states after collision, and \( \kappa \) is the tensorial rank of the multipole moment responsible for the spectral transition. For the polarized (isotropic) Raman spectrum, \( \kappa = 0 \), while \( \kappa = 2 \) for the depolarized Raman spectrum.

For an isolated \( Q(j) \) Raman line, \( v_i = 0, v_f = 1 \), and \( j_i = j_f = j \), while for the pure rotational Raman \( S_0(j) \) line, \( v_i = v_f = 0, j_i = j_f = j + 2 \). The line shifting and broadening coefficients of an isolated spectral line \( i-f \) are given by the imaginary and real parts of the thermal average of the diagonal complex cross section, respectively [2].

\[ \delta_\beta = n \bar{v} \text{Im}\left\{ \sigma_{j_i j_i l l}^{(\beta \gamma)} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_\beta = n \bar{v} \text{Re}\left\{ \sigma_{j_i j_i l l}^{(\beta \gamma)} \right\} \]

(2)

where \( n \) is the number density of the collision partner species, \( \bar{v} \) is the average thermal relative collision speed,

\[ \langle \sigma \rangle = \int_0^\infty x e^{-x} \sigma(E_k) dx \]

and \( x = E_k/k_B T \).

The S-matrix elements required in Eq. (1) can be obtained by solving the set of close-coupled equations for the radial wave functions [26]

\[ k^2 \left\{ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial R^2} + \frac{l(l+1)}{R^2} - k^2 \right\} u_{\nu j'' l''}(R) \]

\[ + \sum_{\nu j j' \kappa} \langle J v_i' j_i' l' | V | J v_f j_f' l_f' \rangle u_{\nu j'' l''}(R) \]

\[ = 0, \]

(4)

where \( \mu \) is the reduced mass of the colliding pair, \( V \) is the intermolecular potential, \( k_n \) is the wave vector after collision:

\[ k^2 = \frac{2 \mu}{E_k + E_{\nu j} - E_v j' l'}, \]

\( E_{\nu j} \) is the internal vibration–rotation energy of the molecule, and \( u_{\nu j'' l''}(R) \) satisfies the asymptotic boundary condition

\[ \lim_{R \to \infty} \delta_{\nu j} \delta_{\nu j'} \delta_{\nu j''} e^{-i(k R - i\pi/2)} \]

\[ - \sqrt{\frac{k^2}{k^2 + S_{j'' l'' j j'' l l''}(E_k + E_{\delta i l})}} e^{i(k R - i\pi/2)}. \]

(5)

Numerical values of the S-matrices and the cross sections \( \sigma_{j_i j_i l l}^{(\beta \gamma)}(E_k) \) were computed using the program MOLSCAT [28]. The matrix elements of the XC(fit) potential are decomposed as

\[ \langle v' l' l'| V(R, \theta, \xi) | v j j' \rangle = \sum_{\lambda \alpha} \langle v' l'| \xi | v j j' \rangle V_{\lambda \alpha}(R) P_\alpha(\cos \theta) j j', \]

(6)

where \( R \) is the distance between the Ar atom and the centre-of-mass of the hydrogen molecule, \( \theta \) is the angle between \( R \) and the axis of the molecule, \( P_\alpha(\cos \theta) \) is the Legendre polynomial of order \( \lambda \), and \( \xi = (r - r_0)/r_0 \) is the diatom stretching coordinate, where \( r \) is the hydrogen molecule bond length and \( r_0 \) the expectation value of \( r \) in the ground vibration–rotation level of H\(_2\). Further details regarding these calculations are presented in Refs. [25,27].
3. The polarized Raman Q₁(1) line of H₂–Ar

Experimental line broadening and shifting measurements for the H₂–Ar Q₁(1) line at temperatures between 298 and 1000 K have been reported by Farrow et al. [4] in 1989 and by Berger et al. [8] in 1994. The shifts measured by Berger et al. were the data used by Bissonnette et al. in their determination of the XC(fit) potential [12]. In that work, a simple one-dimensional quasistatic (QS) method was used to simulate the pressure shifting coefficients in the course of the potential optimization, since a full close-coupled calculation would have been far too cumbersome and time-consuming to be incorporated in the iterative multiparameter least-squares fitting procedure. In an attempt to account for errors in the approximate QS method, they adjusted the actual experimental data used in the fit by the differences between the close-coupled results which Green had obtained using the older TT₃ potential energy surface [18] and QS theory values generated for that same potential. The present close-coupled calculations of these shifts on the XC(fit) surface will provide a direct test of the validity of that correction procedure. Berger et al. [8] also reported high-resolution pressure broadening coefficients at 295 and 1000 K, which offer an independent test of the ability of the XC(fit) potential to predict the broadening of Raman Q-lines.

Table 1 lists our close-coupled results for the pressure broadening and shifting coefficients of the polarized H₂–Ar Q₁(1) line, together with the experimental data and the results of Green’s calculations using the older TT₃ potential surface. As discussed previously [25], computational errors due to basis size and numerical convergence limitations are estimated to be no more than ca. 1.2%. However, the theoretical predictions above 700 K should be considered somewhat less reliable, since the shifting and broadening cross sections were only calculated for total energies up to \( E_k = 2900 \text{ cm}^{-1} \), and were linearly extrapolated to higher energies. This was the highest kinetic energy possible without including another channel in the close-coupled calculation, and is similar to the maximum energy of \( E_k = 2500 \text{ cm}^{-1} \) used by Green [18]. However, the extrapolation region contributes 15% of the thermally averaged broadening cross section at 700 K, and 40% at 1000 K. The broadening cross sections are found to

---

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shifting coefficients (10^{-3} \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ amagat}^{-1})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>-12.0(1)</td>
<td>-11.82(20)</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>-12.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>-8.2(1)</td>
<td>-8.35(20)</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-5.39(25)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>-2.7(2)</td>
<td>-3.24(20)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>-3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-2.73(25)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.86(40)</td>
<td>0.30(30)</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadening coefficients (10^{-3} \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ amagat}^{-1})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>~4.6</td>
<td>4.42(13)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>~10.0</td>
<td>8.95(20)</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 1.** Polarized Q₁(1) line broadening (positive values) and shifting (negative values) coefficients for H₂–Ar and D₂–Ar (long-dash curves, triangular points); solid curves—present close-coupled values; dotted curve—QS results [12]; points with error bars—experimental values for H₂–Ar from Ref. [8], and for D₂–Ar from Ref. [6] for the shift and Ref. [3] for the width.
be very close to linear in energy at 2000 cm\(^{-1}\), but the shifting cross sections appear to have a slightly positive second derivative. Thus the linear extrapolation may result in shift predictions which are algebraically slightly smaller (i.e. more negative) than the true shifts. At these high temperatures, collisional vibrational transitions may also begin to contribute significantly.

As far as the pressure shifting coefficients are concerned, the results in Table 1 clearly show that the XC(fit) potential is a substantial improvement over the TT\(_3\) surface used in Green’s calculations. This is not too surprising, since these pressure shifting data were used in the fits which determined the XC(fit) potential. However, the good agreement found for our close-coupling results does affirm the validity of the procedure of combining the approximate QS method with adjustments of the input data used in the fitting procedure of Ref. [12]. Moreover, as seen in Fig. 1, from room temperature to ca. 750 K the absolute differences between the exact close-coupling and approximate QS results is no more than 0.4 \(\times 10^{-3}\) cm\(^{-1}\) amagat\(^{-1}\), which in view of the simplicity of the latter, is surprisingly small.

The line broadening results, on the other hand, are a genuine prediction of the XC(fit) potential, since data of this type were not used in its determination. In this case Table 1 shows that the broadening coefficients generated using the XC(fit) potential are in worse agreement with experiment than are the predictions from the TT\(_3\) potential; similar discrepancies were found for the D\(_2\)−Ar system [25], where experimental values are available only at 298 K. This points to an inadequacy of the XC(fit) potential for predicting the pressure broadening of vibrational Raman lines for this system. Fig. 1 shows that at room temperature the line broadening coefficients for the two isotopomers are predicted to be approximately the same, while the magnitude of the line shifting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(T) (K)</th>
<th>(\gamma) (MHz m(^3) mol(^{-1}))</th>
<th>(\delta) (MHz m(^3) mol(^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(j = 0 \rightarrow 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.44(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.385(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.77(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(j = 1 \rightarrow 3)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.50(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.39(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.59(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(j = 2 \rightarrow 4)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.24(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.49(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. Comparison of pure rotational Raman \(S_0(j)\) broadening and shifting coefficients for H\(_2\)−Ar calculated from the XC(fit) potential (solid curves) with experimental data from Ref. [29] (points), and (for \(S_0(0)\)) also with earlier line shift coefficient predictions [20] based on the BC\(_3\)(6,8) (dotted curve) and TT\(_3\)(6,8) (dot-dashed curve) potential energy surfaces. Note that 1 MHz m\(^3\) mol\(^{-1}\) = 1.49 \(\times 10^{-3}\) cm\(^{-1}\) amagat\(^{-1}\).

coefficient for H₂–Ar is substantially larger than that for D₂–Ar. Note that the calculated line broadening coefficients for both isotopomers pass through minima as functions of temperature, the minimum occurring at a slightly lower temperature for D₂–Ar than H₂–Ar. These minima can be attributed to minima in pressure broadening cross sections as a function of collisional kinetic energy [25,27].

4. The pure rotational Raman S₀(j) lines of H₂–Ar

Experimental measurements of pressure broadening and shifting of the pure rotational S₀(j) Raman lines of H₂ in Ar for temperatures 120–300 K have also been reported [29]. These are interesting because with \( v₁ = v₂ = 0 \) (Eq. (1)), only purely rotational excitations contribute to the line shape cross sections, so these data are expected to be relatively insensitive to the diatom-stretching dependence of the intermolecular potential. The XC(fit) potential is expected to be accurate in predicting these pure rotational Raman line properties, since the vibrationally averaged potential for H₂ with Ar is particularly well probed by the experimental data used in determining the XC(fit) potential.

Table 2 lists the line broadening and shifting coefficients of pure rotational Raman S-branch lines computed using the XC(fit) potential, and compares them with the corresponding experimental values. Fig. 2 presents plots showing the temperature dependence of these results. As in Ref. [25], the accuracy of our computation is expected to be within 1.6%. The S₀-branch broadening and shifting coefficients are smaller in magnitude by a factor of four or more than those for the vibrational Q₁-branch, but the qualitative behaviour is similar. As with the Q₁-branch, the theoretical shifting coefficients decrease in magnitude with temperature in a nearly linear fashion in this temperature range, with similar slopes. However, the experimental values do not show such regular behaviour. The calculated broadening coefficients all pass through minima at temperatures between 130 and 170 K, distinctly lower temperatures than the minima of the H₂–Ar and D₂–Ar Q₁(1) broadening coefficients (see Fig. 1).

Although most of the predicted S₀-branch broadening and shifting coefficients lie outside the reported experimental error bars, the differences are not systematic or as large as in the case of the Q₁(j)-branch results. Our theoretical values are generally within 20% of the experimental values, with a maximum difference of 38%. Moreover, the lower segment of Fig. 2 shows that the S₀(0) line broadening coefficients calculated by the close-coupling method using two previous potentials [20] are in good agreement with those obtained here for the XC(fit) potential. This is, perhaps, not surprising, since \( v = 0 \) pure rotational Raman line broadening is expected to be most sensitive to the regions of the potential energy surface which have been most accurately determined by the discrete IR spectra of Van der Waals complexes and virial coefficient data used to determine those surfaces. On the other hand, those three surfaces do have very different analytic forms, and the fact that their predictions are in such close agreement lends credence to their validity. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that the pure rotational Raman lineshape parameters calculated from the XC(fit) potential predictions are indeed reliable, and that the apparent discrepancies with experiment seen in Table 2 and Fig. 2 reflect overly optimistic estimation of experimental uncertainties.

5. Effect of modifying the XC(fit) potential energy surface

Fig. 2 shows that the magnitude and temperature dependence of the S₀(0) line broadening coefficient calculated from the XC(fit) potential are very similar to those generated from the earlier TT₃ and BC₃(6,8) surfaces. Since the S₀(j) pure rotational Raman transitions occur entirely within the ground vibrational state of the diatom, this suggests that the large differences between the Q₁-branch line broadening and shifting coefficients calculated from the XC(fit) and TT₃ potential energy surfaces (see Table 1) are due to differences in the diatom bond-length dependence of those surfaces, which make the effective anisotropic potential for H₂(\( v = 1 \))–Ar different from that for H₂(\( v = 0 \))–Ar. One reason for these differences will certainly be the fact that the Q₁(j) lineshift data were used in determining the XC(fit) potential, but not the earlier surfaces.
In general potential energy surfaces for an atom–diatom system may be expanded in the form

$$V(R, \theta, r) = \sum_{\lambda} \sum_{k} \xi_{\lambda} V_{\lambda,k}(R) P_{\lambda} (\cos \theta).$$  \hfill (7)

As shown by Figs. 3 and 4 of Ref. [12], the most dramatic differences between the TT 3 and XC(fit) surfaces is in the radial strength functions $V_{0,1}(r)$ and $V_{2,1}(r)$ defining the linear diatom-stretching dependence of the isotropic and leading anisotropy terms in the potential, at small values of the atom–diatom separation coordinate $R$ (at $R \leq 3.3$ Å for $V_{0,1}(r)$ and $R \leq 4$ Å for $V_{2,1}(r)$). Thus, it seems appropriate to focus on these two components of the potential when trying to understand the discrepancies with experiment.

Some calculations by Green [18] using modifications of the TT 3 potential led him to conclude that the deficiencies of its line shifting and broadening coefficient predictions (see Table 1) were due to deficiencies in its isotropic stretching-dependence radial strength function $V_{0,1}(R)$. In particular, he found that adding a smoothly connected ad hoc quadratic correction to this function for distances $R > 3.05$ Å gave changes in the shift cross sections of about the right magnitude and sign to remove the discrepancies of the TT 3 pressure shifting coefficients. Unfortunately, the quality of the experimental $Q_{1}(1)$ line broadening data available at that time did not allow meaningful tests of that property.

Similar tests performed in this work show that the broadening coefficients are also sensitive to the $V_{0,1}(R)$ part of the potential, and also that changes to the short-range behaviour of the anisotropy stretching-dependence function $V_{2,1}(R)$ mainly affect the shifting coefficients. Fig. 3 compares the short-range behaviour of the $V_{1,0}(R)$ functions for the XC(fit) and the TT 3 potentials with each other and with a modification of the XC(fit) $V_{1,0}(R)$ function, labelled XCmod, which was obtained by adding the quadratic term $\Delta V_{\alpha}(R) = \alpha_{\xi}(R_{\alpha} - R)^2$ to $V_{1,0}^{XC}(R)$ for $R < R_{\alpha}$, where $\alpha_{\xi} = 1500 \text{ cm}^{-1}/\text{Å}^2$ and $R_{\alpha} = 3.2$ Å were chosen to make the resulting function similar to the corresponding term in the TT 3 potential. Fig. 4 shows that broadening and shifting coefficients for the $H_{2}$–Ar $Q_{1}(1)$ line calculated using this surface both become similar to the TT 3 predictions, with the agreement being relatively much better for the
broadening coefficients. This does tend to confirm Green’s suggestion that the differences in the Raman Q-branch predictions of the XC(fit) potential and the TT3 potential are largely due to differences in the $V_{10}(R)$ isotropic stretching radial strength function, but it also shows that modifying this function has significant effects on the broadening coefficients. In particular, the more repulsive wall of the TT3 and XC mod potentials for $H_2(v = 1)$ makes their Q-branch line broadening predictions closer to experiment, while the less repulsive wall of the XC(fit) potential for $H_2(v = 1)$ yields shifting coefficients in better agreement with experiment. However, we were not successful in getting agreement with experiment for both the broadening and shifting coefficients correct simply through ad hoc modifications only to this part of the potential.

In a further study, this same quadratic correction term $\Delta V_{0a}(R)$ was added to the $V_{21}(R)$ term of the XC(fit) potential, and close-coupled calculations were performed at a small number of collisional kinetic energies between $E_k = 265$ and $920 \text{ cm}^{-1}$. Compared to the effect of modifying the $V_{01}(R)$ term, this produced only ca. 5–10% changes in the shifting cross sections, and less than 2% changes in the broadening cross sections. Moreover, adding this term to the XC(fit) potential $V_{21}(R)$ term causes the predicted line shifting coefficients to become more negative, which is in the opposite direction to the effect of increasing the $V_{10}(R)$ repulsive wall.

In further testing, the XC(fit) surface $V_{01}(R)$ and $V_{21}(R)$ functions in the attractive potential well region were modified by adding a term of the form $\alpha_{0a}(R - R_0)(R - R_c)$ on the subinterval $R_0 < R < R_c$. The values $R_0 = 3.3 \text{ Å}$, $R_c = 4.1 \text{ Å}$ and $\alpha_{0a} = -20 \text{ cm}^{-1}/\text{Å}^2$ yield a correction function with an extremum of $-3.2 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ at $3.7 \text{ Å}$. Adding this term to the XC(fit) potential $V_{10}(R)$ function changed the shifting and broadening cross sections by 5–10%, while application to $V_{21}(R)$ changed them by less than 0.5%. Note, however, that while interesting as a model calculation, this type of modification of $V_{02}(R)$ is physically unrealistic, as it would cause completely unacceptable changes in the discrete infrared spectra. Modifications to the long-range stretching dependence were not considered because the overall interaction is sufficiently weak there that plausible modifications would have negligible effects on the lineshape coefficients.

6. Discussion and conclusions

It is clear that the ad hoc modifications of the XC(fit) potential energy surface described above were not fully successful in getting both the broadening and shifting coefficients for the $Q_1$-branch transitions to agree with experiment. However, it is interesting to note (see Figs. 3 and 4 in Ref. [12]) that the most dramatic differences between the leading components of the XC(fit) and TT3 potential energy surfaces were the differences in their short-range stretching dependence of the potential anisotropy, $V_{21}(R)$, and that the onset of those differences occurred at the relatively large intermolecular distance of 4 Å. Thus, it may be that the correction function $\Delta V_{01}(R)$ considered above is too modest a change as far as $V_{21}(R)$ is concerned.

Perhaps the most interesting feature of the present results is their demonstration that changes to the short-range behaviour of $V_{01}(R)$ significantly affect both broadening and shifting coefficients, while modifications to $V_{21}(R)$ mainly affect the latter. Although the QS model for predicting the shifting coefficients used in the analysis of Ref. [12] could in principle take account of diatomic stretching-dependence of the potential anisotropy, that analysis used a strictly one-dimensional QS simulation, and hence attributed the pressure shifting coefficients solely to the stretching dependence of the isotropic potential. The present work shows that this was not correct. Moreover, since modification of $V_{21}(R)$ mainly affects the shifting coefficients, it seems likely that a resolution of the discrepancies for the lineshape coefficients of the XC(fit) potential could be achieved by correlated modifications of the short-range behaviour of both $V_{01}(R)$ and $V_{21}(R)$.
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