

## Force constants for the ethylene molecule developed from the Green's function technique

C. D. Crowder

Citation: The Journal of Chemical Physics 76, 5655 (1982); doi: 10.1063/1.442882

View online: http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.442882

View Table of Contents: http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/jcp/76/11?ver=pdfcov

Published by the AIP Publishing

#### Articles you may be interested in

A recursive Green's function technique for acoustic scattering from heterogeneous objects

J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 103, 713 (1998); 10.1121/1.421197

### Solution of the vector wave equation using Green's function techniques

J. Appl. Phys. **71**, 4577 (1992); 10.1063/1.350756

### Quantum mechanical microcanonical rate constants from direct calculations of the Green's function for reactive scattering

J. Chem. Phys. 84, 2630 (1986); 10.1063/1.450334

### Quantum Monte Carlo for molecules: Green's function and nodal release

J. Chem. Phys. 81, 5833 (1984); 10.1063/1.447637

### Momentum autocorrelation functions from classical Green's functions

Am. J. Phys. 46, 507 (1978); 10.1119/1.11248



# Force constants for the ethylene molecule developed from Green's function technique<sup>a)</sup>

C. D. Crowder

Department of Physics, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, Missouri 65211 (Received 31 December 1981; accepted 22 January 1982)

There have been numerous determinations of the force constants (FC's) for the ethylene molecule,  $^{1-3}$  using different models or different sets of constraint equations. In this paper, we have calculated the FC matrix for ethylene in Cartesian coordinates  $(F_x)$  using the Green's function technique (GFT) developed by Wolfram and Asgharian. According to the GFT, a unique set of FC's is determined from isotopic frequency data without imposing any a priori constraints on the force field. The only FC's which are zero are those which vanish because of symmetry considerations. All others are determined uniquely by six mixing parameters. This is in contrast to many reported FC calculations which utilize less fundamental constraint relations to

reduce the number of FC's. The experimental geometry, mixing parameters, notation, and vibrational frequencies used in this paper are taken from Ref. 4. However, mixing parameter  $C_5$  was misprinted as 0.523; the correct value is 0.532.<sup>5</sup>

The Cartesian FC's  $(F_{jk})$  are calculated using  $F_{jk} = \sum\limits_{l} \lambda_{l} = U_{jl} U_{kl}^{*} (M_{j} M_{k})^{1/2}$ , where the matrix elements  $U_{jl}$  are given in Ref. 4 and  $M_{j}$  is the mass of the jth atom. The coordinate system used is shown in Fig. 1 of Ref. 4. The in plane (IP) and out of plane (OP) FC matrices for ethylene are given in Tables I and II, respectively. There is no coupling between the IP and OP modes. (As a consistency check, we verified that diagonaliza-

TABLE I. In-plane force constants of ethylene in Cartesian coordinates. a,b

	$C_{1_{\mathbf{x}}}$	$C_{1_{\mathbf{y}}}$	$C_{2_{_{\mathbf{x}}}}$	$C_{2_{\mathbf{y}}}$	$H_{3_{\mathbf{x}}}$	$H_{3_{\mathbf{y}}}$	$H_{4_{\chi}}$	$H_{4_{\mathbf{y}}}$	$H_{5_{\mathbf{x}}}$	$H_{5}$	$H_{6_{_{\mathbf{x}}}}$	$H_{6_{\mathbf{y}}}$
$C_{1_x}$	12.896	0.0	-8.486	0.0	-0.177	-0.036	-2.028	1.934	-0.177	0.036	-2.028	-1.934
$C_{1_{\mathbf{y}}}$	0.0	9.739	0.0	-0.782	1.110	-4.281	0.891	-0.197	-1.110	-4.281	-0.891	-0.197
$C_{2_{\mathbf{x}}}$	-8.486	0.0	12.896	0.0	-2.028	1.934	-0.177	-0.036	-2.028	-1.934	-0.177	0.036
$C_{2_{\mathbf{y}}}$	0.0	-0.782	0.0	9.739	0.891	-0.197	1.110	-4.281	-0.891	-0.197	-1.110	-4.281
$H_{3_{\mathbf{x}}}$	-0.177	1.110	-2.028	0.891	1.788	-1.874	0.012	-0.076	0.531	0.054	-0.126	-0.105
$H_{3_{\mathbf{y}}}$	-0.036	-4.281	1.934	-0.197	-1.874	4.647	-0.076	-0.132	-0.054	0.150	0.105	-0.187
$H_{\mathbf{4_{x}}}$	-2,028	0.891	-0.177	1.110	0.012	-0.076	1.788	-1.874	-0.126	-0.105	0.531	0.054
$H_{4_{\mathbf{y}}}$	1,934	-0.197	-0.036	-4.281	-0.076	-0.132	-1.874	4.647	0.105	-0.187	-0.054	0.150
$H_{5_{\mathbf{x}}}$	-0.177	-1.110	-2.028	-0.891	0.531	-0.054	-0.126	0.105	1.788	1.874	0.012	0.076
$H_{5_{\mathbf{y}}}$	0,036	-4.281	-1.934	-0.197	0.054	0.150	-0.105	-0.187	1.874	4.647	0.076	-0.132
$H_{6_{\mathbf{x}}}$	-2,028	-0.891	-0.177	-1.110	-0.126	0.105	0.531	-0.054	0.012	0.076	1.788	1.874
H <sub>6</sub> ,	-1.934	-0.197	0.036	-4.281	-0.105	-0.187	0.054	0.150	0.076	-0.132	1.874	4.647

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>All force constants are in mdyn/Å.

TABLE II. Out-of-plane force constants of ethylene in Cartesian coordinates. a,b

	$C_{i_{\mathbf{z}}}$	$C_{2_{\mathbf{g}}}$	$H_{3_{\mathbf{g}}}$	$H_{4_{g}}$	H <sub>5g</sub>	H <sub>6</sub>
$C_{1_{R}}$	1.658	-0.707	-0.560	0.084	-0.560	0.084
$C_{2}$	-0.707	1.658	0.084	-0.560	0.084	-0.560
$H_{3_{\mathbf{g}}}$	-0.560	0.084	0.368	0.193	0.045	-0.131
$H_{4_{\mathbf{z}}}$	0.084	-0.560	0.193	0.368	-0.131	0.045
$H_{5_{_{R}}}$	-0.560	0.084	0.045	-0.131	0.368	0.193
$H_{6_{\mathbf{z}}}$	0.084	-0.560	-0.131	0.045	0.193	0.368

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>All force constants are in mdyn/Å.

bCoordinates are defined in Ref. 4.

bCoordinates are defined in Ref. 4.

TABLE III. Force constants of ethylene in internal coordinates. a

	$q_1$	$q_2$	$q_3$	$q_4$	$oldsymbol{q}_5$	$q_6$	$q_7$	$q_8$	$q_9$	$q_{10}$	<b>q</b> 11	$q_{12}$
ι	16.825	2.787	2.787	2.787	2.787	0.890	0.890	0.890	0.890	0.0	0.0	0.0
2	2.787	5.313	0.308	-0.202	0.218	-0.106	-0.112	0.208	0.038	0.0	0.0	0.0
3	2.787	0.308	5.313	0.218	-0.202	0.038	0.208	-0.112	-0.106	0.0	0.0	0.0
1	2.787	-0.202	0.218	5,313	0.308	0.208	0.038	-0.106	-0.112	0.0	0.0	0.0
- 5	2.787	0.218	-0.202	0.308	5.313	-0.112	-0.106	0.038	0.208	0.0	0.0	0.0
3	0.890	-0.106	0.038	0.208	-0.112	1.018	-0.026	0.077	0.388	0.0	0.0	0.0
7	0.890	-0.112	0.208	0.038	-0.106	-0.026	1.018	0.388	0.077	0.0.	0.0	0.0
3	0.890	0.208	-0.112	-0.106	0.038	0.077	0.388	1.018	-0.026	0.0	0.0	0.0
9	0.890	0.038	-0.106	-0.112	0.208	0.388	0.077	-0.026	1.018	0.0	0.0	0.0
.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.259	0.039	0.0
1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.039	0.259	0.0
2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.559

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>In units of mdyn/Å, mdyn/rad, and mdyn Å/rad<sup>2</sup> for stretching-stretching, stretching-bending, and bending-bending FC's, respectively.

tion of the FC matrix yields the input vibrational frequencies exactly.)

In order to compare  $F_x$  with the internal FC's of other authors, we chose the following internal coordinates  $q_i$ :  $q_1$ =C-C stretch,  $q_2$ =C<sub>1</sub>-H<sub>3</sub> stretch,  $q_3$ =C<sub>1</sub>-H<sub>5</sub> stretch,  $q_4$ =C<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>4</sub> stretch,  $q_5$ =C<sub>2</sub>-H<sub>6</sub> stretch,  $q_6$ =  $\alpha_{312}$  H<sub>3</sub>C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub> bend,  $q_7$ =  $\alpha_{126}$  C<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>6</sub> bend,  $q_8$ =  $\alpha_{421}$  H<sub>4</sub>C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>1</sub> bend,  $q_9$ =  $\alpha_{215}$  C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>1</sub>H<sub>5</sub> bend,  $q_{10}$ =  $\theta_{2153}$  out-of-plane wag of atom  $C_2$ ,  $q_{11}$ = $\theta_{1264}$  out of plane wag of atom  $C_1$ ,  $q_{12}$ = $\tau$  torsion about  $C_1$ -C<sub>2</sub> axis. These coordinates are defined in the manner specified in QCPE program #342,6 which was used to develop the appropriate B matrix. Since the B matrix is not square, it was inverted using the technique described by Pulay, 7 Next, the FC matrix in internal coordinates ( $F_{int}$ ) was calculated using:  $F_{int}$ =( $B^{\dagger}$ )-1 $F_x$ B<sup>-1</sup>. The results are given in Table III.

These FC's are calculated with the experimental frequencies used by Duncan  $et\ al.^2$  and the mixing parameters of Ref. 4. We obtained values of 16.825, 5.313, and 2.787 mdyn/Å for the CC stretch, CH stretch, and CC stretch CH stretch interaction FC's, respectively. The corresponding values obtained by Duncan  $et\ al.$  are 9.395, 5.598, and 0.182. While the CH stretch FC's are in reasonable agreement, the CC stretch and CC stretch CH stretch interaction FC's obtained from the GFT are nearly 2 and 15 times the respective FC's obtained by Duncan  $et\ al.$  The source of these discrepancies is not clear; however, it may be an effect of the

constraint equations used in conventional FC calculations. An interesting comparison can be made between our torsional FC and that of Duncan  $et\ al$ . We obtained 0.559 mdyn Å/rad² while they obtained 0.760 (after removing the CH bond length scaling factor). The torsional FC is completely determined by group theory and its value depends solely on the input vibrational frequency. Since we used the same frequencies as Duncan  $et\ al$ ., it is difficult to resolve this discrepancy.

I thank T. Wolfram for suggesting this project and G. P. Alldredge for supplying a copy of QCPE Program #342. I thank them both for their helpful discussions.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>This work was supported by the National Science Foundation, Grant No. SPI 8166360.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>P. Pulay and W. Meyer, J. Mol. Spectrosc. 40, 59 (1971). <sup>2</sup>J. L. Duncan, D. C. McKean, and P. D. Mallinson, J. Mol. Spectrosc. 45, 221 (1973).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>W. H. Fletcher and W. T. Thompson, J. Mol. Spectrosc. 25, 240 (1968).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>T. Wolfram and A. Asgharian, J. Chem. Phys. 74, 1661 (1981).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>T. Wolfram (private communication).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>D. F. McIntosh and M. R. Peterson, QCPE 11, 342 (1977).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>P. Pulay, in *Application of Electronic Structure Theory*, edited by H. F. Schaefer III (Plenum, New York, 1977), pp. 165.