

Potential Energy Curves of Hydrogenic Halides HX(F,Cl,Br) and i-DMFT Method

Horacio Olivares-Pilón*

*Departamento de Física, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa,
Apartado Postal 55-534, 09340 México, D.F., Mexico*

Alexander V. Turbiner†

*Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,
Apartado Postal 70-543, 04510 México, D.F., Mexico*

(Dated: March 12, 2026)

Abstract

A comparison of the *ab initio* calculations using the i-DMFT Method by Di Liu et al. (2025) with benchmark potential curves for three HX(F,Cl,Br) halides shows their inaccuracy in the domain around equilibrium - they do not reproduce quantitatively the results of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation - and also they predict a qualitatively wrong behavior in the Van der Waals region of large distances, thus, contradict the multipole expansion.

Recently, the ground state potential curves for diatomic molecules HF/DF/TF [1], HCl/DCl/TCl [2], HBr/DBr/TBr and HI/DI/II [3] were constructed analytically with a relative accuracy $\sim 10^{-4}$ (or four significant digits (s.d.)). This was based on the interpolation of perturbation theory at small internuclear distances R with the multipole expansion at large internuclear distances (Van der Waals regime) by using a two-point Padé approximation

$$E_d(R) = \frac{1}{R} \text{Pade}[N/N + 5](R) \equiv \frac{1}{R} \frac{P_N}{Q_{N+5}}, \quad (1)$$

which is ratio of two polynomials, where $N = 5$ was chosen. The parameters of the employed Padé approximant Pade[5/10] were fixed by requiring the exact reproduction of the first three theoretically-known coefficients of perturbation theory at $R \rightarrow 0$ and the two theoretically-known coefficients at $R \rightarrow \infty$ expansions as well as three spectroscopic, experimentally-known parameters/constants. The eight remaining free parameters of $E_d(R)$ (1) were fixed by describing accurately the four low-lying vibrational energies of the HF, HCl, HBr and HI molecules with relative accuracy $\sim 10^{-4}$ (or four s.d.), respectively, via the nuclear (two-body) Schrödinger equation by adjusting the corresponding eight turning points. The quality of the obtained potential curves was checked by solving the nuclear (two-body) radial Schrödinger equation (without breakdown functions!) ¹ with $E_d(R)$, see (1) at $N = 5$, taken as a potential. This led to a description of *all* available experimental rovibrational energies with relative accuracy $\sim 10^{-4}$ (or four s.d.) for *all* above mentioned molecules and its isotopomers collected in [4]. This result was in agreement with the domain of validity of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation [5], where mass corrections $\sim m_e/M_{nuclei}$, QED corrections $\sim \alpha^2$, relativistic corrections $\sim v^2/c^2$ - all of the order $\lesssim 10^{-4}$ - can be neglected. Hence, the obtained potential curves are benchmark curves written in the form (1) inside of

* horop@xanum.uam.mx

† turbiner@nucleares.unam.mx

¹ Hence, without modification of the kinetic energy, potential energy and centrifugal potential.

the Born-Oppenheimer approximation. It must be emphasized that the obtained potential curves were in agreement with the turning point positions, found in [4], on the level of 3-4 s.d. Hence, the potential energy curves (1) at $N = 5$ approximate the lowest eigenvalue of the electronic Hamiltonian with relative accuracy $\sim 10^{-4}$.

Solving the electronic Schrödinger equation in order to find the potential energy curves (equivalently, their eigenvalues) is usually the subject of the so-called *ab initio* calculations, which is a difficult problem *per se*, even for the two center case, even for a few electron case, especially in the evaluation of the rate of convergence of the employed method and the accuracy of obtained results. In fact, the only real way of evaluation (at present) is by making a comparison with the firmly established results obtained earlier.

In this short Article we compare the results by Di Liu et al. [6], see Figs. 3-4 therein ², based on the recently-proposed the so-called i-DMFT method [7], with the ground state potential curves for HF, HCl and HBr molecules obtained in [1-3], see Tables 1-3 below, based on the potential (1) at $N = 5$.




Figure 1: Potential energy curve (or electronic term) for the ground state $X^1\Sigma^+$ for the HCl molecule *vs.* internuclear distance R : Left panel (a) for domain $R \in [1, 9]$ a.u. with data from: (i) Di Liu et al.[6], see footnote 2 on p.3 (black bullets), (ii) the potential curve from [2]. Right panel (b) is for $R \in [5, 15]$ a.u., the vertical axis given by $\log(E + |E_{min}|)$, the horizontal line corresponds to $\log(|E_{min}|)$, E_{min} is dissociation energy.

One can see that systematically the i-DMFT method does *not* reproduce four s.d. in the benchmark potential energy curves (1), thus, it deviates from the turning points obtained in [4], even in a domain in the vicinity of the minimum close to equilibrium , where there is

² We thank Dr. Di Liu for mailing us the numerical results on the potential curves for HF, HCl and HBr diatomic molecules, which were used to construct Figs 3-4.

Table I: Electronic ground state $X^1\Sigma^+$ for the diatomic molecule HF: potential curve (in Hartree) vs. internuclear distance R with the equilibrium at $R_{eq} = 1.73254$ a.u. Second column from Di Liu et al.[6], see footnote 2 on p.3, third one from fit (1) [1].

R (a.u.)	Di Liu [6]	Potential (1) [1]
0.37795	8.92077	8.80605
0.75589	1.37778	1.36769
1.03935	0.21252	0.21644
1.22832	-0.06327	-0.05862
1.41729	-0.18064	-0.17692
1.60627	-0.22104	-0.21906
1.70075	-0.22557	-0.22459
1.71549	-0.22564	-0.22482
1.79524	-0.22374	-0.22379
1.98421	-0.20844	-0.21048
2.07870	-0.19744	-0.20038
2.55113	-0.13478	-0.14026
3.02356	-0.08239	-0.08609
3.59048	-0.04338	-0.04093
4.06291	-0.02694	-0.01937
4.53534	-0.01875	-0.00836
5.00777	-0.01444	-0.00342
5.57469	-0.01151	-0.00115
6.04712	-0.00994	-0.00047
6.51956	-0.00880	-0.00020
7.08647	-0.00779	-0.00008
7.55890	-0.00713	-0.00004
8.03134	-0.00659	-0.00002
8.50377	-0.00611	-0.00001
9.07069	-0.00560	-6.53E(-6)
10.01555	-0.00487	-3.39E(-6)
12.09425	-0.00374	-1.30E(-6)
14.07846	-0.00307	-6.19E(-7)
16.06267	-0.00257	-3.16E(-7)
18.89726	-0.00206	-1.33E(-7)
37.79452	-0.00073	-2.52E(-9)
56.69178	-0.00032	-2.28E(-10)
75.58905	-0.00012	-4.11E(-11)

an agreement in 3 s.d. The absolute deviation becomes truly significant beyond equilibrium, at small and especially at large internuclear distances. In particular, at $R > 5a.u.$ for the HF molecule, $R > 7a.u.$ for the HCl molecule and at $R > 9a.u.$ for the HBr molecule the deviation is growing fast with the increase of R and can reach several orders of magnitude for a large R , see Tables 1-3; in particular, at $R \sim 50 - 75 a.u.$ it reaches five orders of magnitude! Hence, this indicates that the behavior of the potential energy curves obtained in [6] in the Van der Waals regime does *not* agree with the multipole expansion. This implies that by taking the turning points found using the i-DMFT method as basic ones and placing them on some potential curve will lead to inaccurate rovibrational spectra, even for low-lying

Table II: Electronic ground state $X^1\Sigma^+$ of the diatomic molecule HCl: potential curve (in *Hartree*) vs. internuclear distance R with the equilibrium at $R_{eq} = 2.408542$ *a.u.* Second column from Di Liu et al.[6], see footnote 2 on p.3, third one from fit (1) [2].

R (a.u.)	Di Liu [6]	Potential (1) [2]
0.944863	2.228391	2.050960
1.133836	1.170356	1.093860
1.511781	0.214895	0.201806
2.078699	-0.143275	-0.144284
2.408645	-0.169691	-0.169600
3.023562	-0.132582	-0.133642
4.062911	-0.049204	-0.051095
5.007774	-0.013979	-0.013794
6.047124	-0.004411	-0.002485
7.086473	-0.002508	-0.000504
7.464418	-0.002233	-0.000304
8.031336	-0.001956	-0.000154
8.598254	-0.001764	-0.000085
9.070685	-0.001639	-0.000055
9.448631	-0.001554	-0.000040
10.015548	-0.001446	-0.000026
10.582466	-0.001353	-0.000018
11.054898	-0.001284	-0.000013
12.094247	-0.001150	-7.39E(-6)
12.566679	-0.001096	-5.81E(-6)
13.039110	-0.001048	-4.62E(-6)
13.511542	-0.001004	-3.71E(-6)
14.078460	-0.000957	-2.89E(-6)
14.550891	-0.000920	-2.36E(-6)
15.023323	-0.000886	-1.95E(-6)
15.495754	-0.000853	-1.62E(-6)
16.062672	-0.000814	-1.30E(-6)
16.535104	-0.000784	-1.10E(-6)
17.007535	-0.000754	-9.26E(-7)
17.952398	-0.000700	-6.71E(-7)
18.897261	-0.000650	-4.94E(-7)
37.794523	-0.000225	-7.93E(-9)
56.691784	-0.000097	-7.01E(-10)
75.589045	-0.000036	-1.25E(-10)

states. It is confirmed by making a comparison of the vibrational energies $E_{\nu 0}$ obtained in [6] (see *Supporting information* therein) with the results from [1-4]³: one can see that for small ν three s.d. are reproduced only (as expected), then for larger $\nu < 17$ - one-two s.d. while for $\nu = 17 - 20$ not even single s.d. is reproduced!⁴ This indicates shortcomings of the i-DMFT method. The question, of how intrinsic to the method used these shortcomings are, needs to be investigated and clarified before drawing conclusions about the heuristic

³ which are in agreement with experimental vibrational spectra in, at least, four s.d.

⁴ Note that in similar manner the low accuracy results for vibrational energies for F_2 , Cl_2 , and Br_2 molecules, obtained in the i-DMFT method, are reported in [8].

Table III: Electronic ground state $X^1\Sigma^+$ of the diatomic molecule HBr: potential curve (in *Hartree*) vs. internuclear distance R with the equilibrium at $R_{eq} = 2.67288$ *a.u.* Second column from Di Liu et al.[6], see footnote 2 on p.3, third one from fit (1) [3].

R (<i>a.u.</i>)	D.Liu [6]	Potential (1) [3]
0.944863	3.157199	2.844940
1.039349	2.393633	2.183360
1.606267	0.349469	0.327671
2.078699	-0.054857	-0.059769
2.456644	-0.135701	-0.136453
2.645617	-0.143933	-0.143925
3.023562	-0.132205	-0.132035
3.590480	-0.090917	-0.091634
4.062911	-0.057631	-0.058866
4.535343	-0.032510	-0.033843
5.007774	-0.016445	-0.017690
5.669178	-0.005742	-0.006566
6.047124	-0.003210	-0.003725
6.614041	-0.001516	-0.001659
7.086473	-0.000957	-0.000891
7.653391	-0.000681	-0.000452
8.031336	-0.000599	-0.000299
8.598254	-0.000537	-0.000170
9.070685	-0.000507	-0.000110
9.448631	-0.000488	-0.000080
10.015548	-0.000465	-0.000052
10.582466	-0.000450	-0.000034
11.054898	-0.000444	-0.000025
11.527329	-0.000440	-0.000019
12.094247	-0.000436	-0.000013
12.566679	-0.000431	-0.000010
13.039110	-0.000424	-8.06E(-6)
14.078460	-0.000407	-4.85E(-6)
15.023323	-0.000393	-3.18E(-6)
17.007535	-0.000353	-1.44E(-6)
18.897261	-0.000308	-7.47E(-7)
37.794523	-0.000105	-1.09E(-8)
56.691784	-0.000046	-9.49E(-10)
75.589045	-0.000017	-1.68E(-10)

value of the i-DMFT method if any.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is partially supported by DGAPA grant IN113025 (Mexico). We are grateful to J. Karwowski and A. Orr-Ewing, for suggestions which led to the improvement and the




Figure 2: Potential energy curve (or electronic term) for the ground state $X^1\Sigma^+$ for the HBr molecule *vs.* internuclear distance R : Left panel (a) for domain $R \in [1, 10]$ a.u. with data from: (i) Di Liu et al.[6], see footnote 2 on p.3 (black bullets), (ii) the potential curve from [2]. Right panel (b) is for $R \in [6, 15]$ a.u., the vertical axis given by $\log(E + |E_{min}|)$, the horizontal line corresponds to $\log(|E_{min}|)$, E_{min} is dissociation energy.

further clarity of the presentation.

-
- [1] L.E. Angeles-Gantes and H. Olivares-Pilón,
HF, DF, TF: approximating potential curves, calculating rovibrational states,
J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **55** (16), 165101 (2022)
- [2] H. Olivares-Pilón and A.V. Turbiner,
HCl, DCl and TCl diatomic molecules in their ground state:
the Born-Oppenheimer rovibrational spectra,
J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **56**, 165101 (2023)
- [3] D. Aguilar-Díaz and H. Olivares-Pilón,
Hydrogen halides HBr/DBr/TBr and HI/DI/II:
the Born-Oppenheimer rovibrational spectrum,
J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **57**, 215101 (2024)
- [4] J.A. Coxon and P.G. Hajigeorgiou,
Improved direct potential fit analyses for the ground electronic states
of the hydrogen halides: HF/DF/TF, HCl/DCl/TCl, HBr/DBr/TBr and HI/DI/II,
J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf. **151**, 133-154 (2015)

- [5] M. Born and R. Oppenheimer,
Zur Quantentheorie der Molekeln,
Ann. Phys. **389**, 457-484 (1927)
- [6] Di Liu, M Irimia, Jian Wang, and Bing Yan,
Potential Energy Curves of Hydrogen Halides HX(F,Cl,Br)
*with the *i*-DMFT Method,*
J. Phys. Chem. A **129**, 415-422 (2025)
- [7] J. Wang, E.J. Baerends,
Self-Consistent-Field Method for Correlated Many-Electron Systems
with an Entropic Cumulant Energy,
Phys. Rev. Lett. **128** (2022) No. 013001
- [8] Di Liu, M Irimia, Jian Wang, and Bing Yan,
*Potential energy curves for F₂, Cl₂, and Br₂ with the *i*-DMFT method,*
J. Chem. Phys. **161**, 044118 (2024)