

Long-range dispersion forces between molecules subject to ultra-short optical pulses from ab initio calculations

Micael J. T. Oliveira*

*nanomat/QMAT/CESAM, University of Liège, B-4000, Liège, Belgium and
European Theoretical Spectroscopy Facility <http://www.etsf.eu>*

Ksenia Komarova and Françoise Remacle

Theoretical Physical Chemistry, MolSys, University of Liège, B-4000, Liège, Belgium

Matthieu J. Verstraete[†]

*nanomat/QMAT/CESAM, allée du 6 août 19 B5a, University of Liège, B-4000, Liège, Belgium and
European Theoretical Spectroscopy Facility <http://www.etsf.eu>*

London-van der Waals dispersion forces are a fundamental component of condensed matter systems, biological processes, and self-assembly. In this letter we propose a method to calculate the C_6 coefficients that characterize dispersion forces in the non-retarded regime for molecules in a coherent superposition of excited states. Several ultrafast femtosecond pump-probe schemes are investigated. We apply the method to LiH molecules and show that their London-van der Waals interaction can change dramatically after the interaction with the pump pulse. The pulse modulates the C_6 coefficients, and the interplay between polarization, orientation of the molecules, and the dipole fields gives rise to a rich variety of combinations.

The London-van der Waals dispersion forces arising from instantaneously induced dipoles in molecules are a key ingredient in a wide range of phenomena in physics, chemistry, and biology. Among these, one finds the condensation of non-polar gases, the self-assembly of nanostructures, and the folding and dynamics of proteins [1]. Therefore, the ability to control and manipulate dispersion forces between atoms and molecules is of great importance. Because those dispersion interactions depend crucially on the electronic properties of the molecular systems, a simple route to achieve this would consist in manipulating their electronic states. Up to now, the vast majority of experimental and first-principles studies of dispersion forces focused interacting systems in their electronic ground-state. However, experimental measurements have been made of the van der Waals (vdW) interaction between Rydberg atoms [2] and the problem of calculating the interaction between excited atoms or molecules has attracted strong attention recently [3–6].

The recent development of ultra-short optical pulses has given researchers unprecedented control over electronic degrees of freedom [7]. These pulses, tailored in their frequency and envelope, allow the generation of a strongly out of equilibrium population of electronic states. Since the generation of the electron wave-packet happens before any significant movement of the atomic nuclei, this could be used to steer chemical reactions [8].

In this Letter, we show for the first time how the London interaction coefficients between molecules can be modified by an ultrafast laser pump pulse. We describe our method, which employs either standard quantum chemistry or time-dependent density functional theory (TD-DFT) to compute the excited states. We show how this method can be used to control the dispersion

interaction between LiH molecules subject to pulses of Infrared (IR) or Ultraviolet (UV) light. We find that dispersion coefficients can increase by orders of magnitude in a superposition of states, and even become negative.

There are many methods available to solve the time-dependent Schrödinger equation describing the interaction of a molecule with a pump pulse. One option is to do so numerically in a basis of multi-determinant field-free electronic states that diagonalize the stationary electronic Hamiltonian. The eigenvalues and wavefunctions of the field-free electronic states can be obtained using any suitable electronic structure method: configuration interaction (CI) [9–12], coupled-cluster [13, 14], CAS-SCF [15–19], etc. As an alternative, one could use methods with explicit propagation of orbitals in time, such as TD-DFT [20], TD-CI [21], or TD-CAS [22–25].

The London interaction energy between two molecules A and B in the non-retarded regime can be expanded in terms of the inter-molecular distance R . The coefficients of the expansion are known as Hamacker constants [26], and the leading term $-C_6^{AB}/R^6$ can be expressed using the dynamical polarizability tensors α of the molecules, at imaginary frequencies $i\omega$ [27]. The polarizability α can be obtained either using linear response theory as a sum over states involving the transition dipole moments and the energy differences. Alternatively, it can be obtained by solving explicitly the time-dependent equation for the molecule with an impulsive perturbation. The polarizability is then obtained from the induced dipole moment as a function of time [28].

The case of the polarizability of a molecule in which one or more excited states are populated is a less studied one. This problem is relevant in the context of transient spectroscopy, where the interaction of a molecule with a




FIG. 1: Schematic representation of different geometrical arrangements of molecules subject to ultra-short optical pump pulses: (a) Two molecules with fixed relative orientations with respect to each other and to the pump pulse. (b) Set of randomly oriented molecules. (c) Set of molecules aligned with respect to the pump pulse.

probe is preceded by the application of a pump pulse. As in the ground-state case, the dynamical polarizabilities can be either calculated through explicit real-time propagation of the time-dependent equations [29], or expressed as a sum over states [30].

In this work we have chosen to solve the time-dependent Schrödinger equation describing the interaction of the system with the pump pulse numerically in the basis of the multi-determinant field-free electronic states, and to compute the polarizabilities at any given time-delay T after the pump pulse as a sum over states [30]:

$$\alpha(i\omega, T) = \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma} c_{\alpha}^{*}(T)c_{\beta}(T)d_{\alpha\gamma}d_{\gamma\beta} \times \left(\frac{1}{i(\omega + \eta) - E_{\gamma} + E_{\alpha}} - \frac{1}{i(\omega + \eta) + E_{\gamma} - E_{\beta}} \right), \quad (1)$$

where c are the expansion coefficients of the coherent superposition of states, d are the transition dipole moments, and E are the eigenenergies of the states. The quantity η is introduced to avoid the divergence of some terms at zero frequency, and it corresponds to assuming that the excited states have a finite lifetime [31]. Calculating α through the Laplace transform of an explicit real-time propagation [29] gives the same results, to within numerical accuracy, as using Eq. 1. The choice between the two methods is thus one of convenience.

Before proceeding with the calculation of the Hamacker constants, we consider the possible experimental set ups where these can be measured. In particular, one needs to consider how the molecules are oriented with respect to each other and to the pump pulse, that is, with respect to the lab frame. A schematic representation of the different cases considered is shown in Fig. 1. In the first case, a single measurement is done and the relative orientation of the molecules with respect to each

other and to the lab frame are known and remain fixed (Fig. 1(a)). This is probably the most difficult case to set up experimentally. The second case considered is a sample of randomly oriented molecules (Fig. 1(b)). In this case it is necessary to perform a rotational average of the Hamacker constants over all possible orientations of the molecules with respect to each other and to the lab frame. This yields the well known expression:

$$C_6^{AB} = \frac{3}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} d\omega \langle \alpha^A(i\omega) \rangle \langle \alpha^B(i\omega) \rangle, \quad (2)$$

where the brackets denote rotational averaging. In the case of molecules in their ground-state one obtains the simple analytical expression $\langle \alpha(i\omega) \rangle = \text{Tr}[\alpha(i\omega)]/3$ [32]. This expression is not valid in the presence of the pump pulse, as the polarizabilities of the molecules will now also depend on their relative orientation with respect to the lab frame: molecules with different orientations will interact differently with the pump and will thus be driven to a different superposition of states. This means that the rotational average needs to be performed numerically to sample all possible relative orientations.

We also consider a gas of molecules which have been aligned (e.g. as in Refs. [33, 34]) prior to the pump pulse (Fig. 1(c)). Their interaction will now only depend on relative positions, and experiments yield the corresponding partial average. This leads to a simple analytical expression and only needs to consider a single orientation of the molecules in the lab frame. (Formulae and derivations in the Supplemental Information (SI)). In all cases we assume that the distance between the molecules is large enough that there is no overlap between their electronic densities, but still small enough so that the long-range interaction is not in the retarded regime.

As a test system we have chosen the LiH molecule. Heteronuclear diatomics have well-separated excited states which obey simple selection rules. The Σ excited states exhibit different polarities and the Π states have a polarized electron density far from the internuclear axis [24, 25]. Using the pump frequency and polarization we can target specific excited states or superpositions. The LiH field-free states are determined using CAS-SCF [15–18], which for LiH is close to the full CI limit (details are the same as in Ref. [35]). We choose three pump pulses, with the same envelope, and different intensities and carrier frequencies, so as to excite coherent superpositions of states with different features in the beating electronic density, either along the molecular axis or with a perpendicular component. The first pulse has an IR frequency which will populate the 1Σ state by a two photon process (3.1 eV) when the polarization is parallel to the molecular axis. With a perpendicular polarization the 1Π transition is also accessible with two photons, given the pulse bandwidth, but it is further from resonance. The two other pulses carry UV frequencies resonant with the 1Σ and 1Π states (labeled 1Σ and

1II, resp.). As for the IR pulse, the character of the populated states depends on the pulse polarization having a component parallel (Σ) or perpendicular (Π) to the molecular axis. Note that Σ states can also be populated with a perpendicularly polarized pulse, through further transitions from populated Π states. All the pulse intensities are chosen such that no significant populations of excited states occur above the 1II excited state, and we avoid ionizing regimes which would complicate the dynamics. Detailed pulse parameters are in the SI.

All our calculations were carried out for the equilibrium geometry of the LiH ground-state, as no significant motion of the nuclei should occur within the time-delays considered. When calculating the polarizabilities, we have endowed each electronic wave-packet with the same lifetime $\tau = 50$ fs. This lifetime is large enough to characterize the time evolution of the London interaction, while processes causing dephasing of the electronic coherence, like luminescence, fragmentation, or non-adiabatic coupling induced by nuclear motion, should occur on longer time scales [36–38]. We note that the choice of the lifetime can have a significant effect when calculating the polarizabilities: Terms in Eq. 1 where $\gamma = \alpha$ or $\gamma = \beta$ will have a divergence when $\omega \rightarrow 0$ and $\eta = 2/\tau \rightarrow 0$ and will dominate the integral of Eq. 2 when the lifetime is sufficiently large. Calculations showing the dependence of the C_6 on the lifetime are included in the SI.




FIG. 2: Averaged C_6 a system of randomly oriented LiH molecules after interacting with an IR optical pump pulse and two UV pump pulses resonant with the 1Σ and 1Π excited states, as a function of the time delay.

The orientation averaged C_6 , as a function of the time delay, are presented in Fig. 2 for a system of randomly oriented LiH molecules subject to the IR pump pulse and to the UV pump pulses resonant with the 1Σ and 1Π states. The pump pulse builds a coherent superposition of the electronic states [24]. The oscillations as a function of the delay T originate in the expansion coefficients $c_\alpha(T)$: after the pump pulse, the populations of the different excited states remain constant, but the coefficients acquire a phase $c_\alpha(T) = c_\alpha(0)e^{-iE_\alpha T}$. Because the C_6 coefficients depend on the product of polarizabilities,

their dependence on T can be written as a linear combination of terms of the following form: $e^{-i(E_\alpha - E_\beta + E_\gamma - E_\delta)T}$. In Fig. 2 the main frequencies in the C_6 oscillations are $E_{1\Sigma} - E_{\text{GS}}$ and $2(E_{1\Sigma} - E_{\text{GS}})$ for the IR pump pulse (the Π state is further from resonance); $2(E_{1\Sigma} - E_{\text{GS}})$ for the 1Σ pulse; and $E_{1\Sigma} + E_{1\Pi} - 2E_{\text{GS}}$ for the 1Π pulse.




FIG. 3: Average C_6 coefficient of a system of aligned LiH molecules, as a function of delay time and angle between pump polarization direction and molecular axis. Upper panel: pump resonant with 1Σ ; Lower panel: resonant with 1Π .

The amplitude of the predicted C_6 coefficients can be several orders of magnitude larger than the ground state value of 243 a.u., and the time averaged value of the C_6 is quite different depending on the pump pulse. We therefore expect a large measurable effect in the vdW forces when the molecules are subject to specific pump pulses. This configuration (random orientations) is the most representative for gas phase experiments. Even in the pessimistic case of a short lifetime (tens or hundreds of fs), in light atom molecular dimers the resulting forces should have time to influence intermolecular distances, vibrational frequencies and other observables. The net classical momentum $F \cdot \delta t$ gained is equivalent to that of the ground state London force over many picoseconds. Longer lived electronic superpositions will have the double effect of increasing further the C_6 (integrating the divergence further towards $i\omega = 0$) and allowing for more time to move atoms subjected to enhanced vdW forces. Experiments by Despre et al.[39] recently demonstrated sustained coherence in the presence of atomic motion, over at least tens of femtoseconds. Recent calculations suggest electronic coherence can survive well over 100 fs in LiH in the presence of nuclear motion [37].

As a second example, we consider in Fig. 3 the C_6 of a gas of aligned LiH molecules, as a function of the time delay and of the angle between the polarization and the collective molecular axis. The amplitude of the oscillations is naturally largest when the population of the




FIG. 4: C_6 values between two LiH molecules as a function of delay time, for selected relative orientations co-planar with the field polarization \vec{E} . (a) The orientations of the molecules with respect to \vec{E} and to each other are given by the angles θ_A , θ_B , and θ_{AB} . (b)-(c) Pump resonant with the 1Σ state. (d)-(e) Pump resonant with the 1Π state. (f) IR pump which populates both states. In (b)-(e) only one molecule is rotated with respect to the lab frame, with the other angles fixed. In (f) the orientations of both molecules are fixed, while their relative position varies.

targeted excited state is maximized. For the 1Σ pump pulse, this corresponds to $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = 180^\circ$, while for the 1Π case the pulse polarization should be perpendicular to the molecules ($\theta = 90^\circ$). This setup is also experimentally within reach, using a pre-pulse which sets up the molecules in a rotational wave packet [33, 34].

In Fig. 4 we plot C_6 values, as a function of the time-delay, between two LiH molecules for different relative orientations and pump pulses. The aim is to decompose two main effects that contribute to the orientationally averaged results: the nature of the states present in the coherent superposition of electronic states and the relative orientations of the molecules over which the averages are done. To simplify the analysis, we only consider cases where the pulse polarization and the two molecules are co-planar. The relative orientations can then be specified by three angles in the lab frame set by the field polarization: the polar angles of the main molecular axis of each molecule, and the polar angle of the vector from one center of mass to the other (Fig. 4(a)). We will now decompose the dependencies of the net C_6 response on symmetry, geometry, and frequency resonance. In Fig. 4(b) the C_6 values are plotted as a function of the angle between the first molecule and the pump pulse. The population of the 1Σ excited state of the second molecule is maximized, with its axis parallel to the pump polarization, and a 1Σ resonant carrier frequency. As above, the C_6 values oscillate as a function of time, but the sign and amplitude of the oscillations depend strongly on the orientation of the first molecule. When the molecules are parallel ($\theta_A = 0^\circ$), they are driven to the same superposition of excited states, with a significant population

($\sim 20\%$) in the 1Σ state: the interaction between the molecules is then maximal. When the first molecule is perpendicular ($\theta_A = 90^\circ$), no Σ states are populated and the interaction is much smaller. When the molecules are anti-parallel ($\theta_A = 180^\circ$), the interaction is again large, but the populations and phases of the wave-packets are different. Therefore, contrary to the first impression conveyed by Fig. 4(b), an average over θ_A , for each time delay, will give a finite value. This also explains why the amplitude of the oscillations is smaller (but not zero) in the randomized case of Fig. 2 than in Fig. 4. In Fig. 4(c) we also keep molecule B fixed, but perpendicular to the polarization direction. As the frequency is further from resonance, the 1Π state is weakly populated. The dependence of the C_6 values with respect to the orientation of the first molecule is quite different, and there are long time beatings. The shorter beatings correspond to twice $E_{1\Sigma} - E_{GS}$ and the longer ones to twice $E_{1\Pi} - E_{1\Sigma}$. The next two cases (Figs. 4(d)-(e)) are similar, but populating the 1Π instead of the 1Σ state. This 1Π population is maximized when the molecule is perpendicular to the pump polarization. In the last panel (Fig. 4(f)) we show a case where the IR pulse populates the 1Σ state of molecule A ($\theta_A = 0^\circ$) and the 1Π state of molecule B ($\theta_B = 90^\circ$). The C_6 shows a maximum for relative orientation of the molecules at angles of 45° and 135° .

In this Letter we present a method to calculate the C_6 coefficients of molecules subject to ultra-short laser pulses. Using LiH molecules as a test case, we show that, by driving them to an appropriate superposition of excited states, it is possible to considerably increase their London-van der Waals interaction. The origin of the in-

crease is clear in the integral form of the C_6 for partially occupied states, and should carry over to other molecules. A denser set of excited states in other molecules may be detrimental if it induces quick decoherence, or beneficial if more transitions participate in the buildup of the interaction. The effects shown here should be measurable experimentally. We have addressed several experimental configurations (geometries, molecule alignments, laser frequencies), and our results are quite robust. As in any pump-probe experiment, electronic coherence is key, and we use conservative hypotheses for the wave packet lifetime. The efficiency of experimental probes of the modified C_6 will depend on their sensitivity to atomic positions or (better) acquired momentum. We have finally shown that it is possible to change selectively the interaction of molecules that have specific relative orientations. This could be exploited to control the self assembly of nanostructures, or to steer chemical reactions including steric or docking effects.

This work was funded by the Belgian Fonds de la Recherche Fondamentale Collective, through project number 2.4545.12 “Control of attosecond dynamics: applications to molecular reactivity”. F. R. acknowledges support from the Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique (Belgium) and partial support by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences (BES) under Award #DE-SC0012628. Computer time was provided on Zenobe by the Walloon Region under GA 1117545, and by PRACE on ARCHER (ThermoSpin and ACEID 3IP RI-312763). The authors thank COST Actions MP1306 EUSpec and CM1204 XLIC for support.

* Present address: Max Planck Institute for the Structure and Dynamics of Matter, Luruper Chaussee 149, 22761 Hamburg, Germany

† Electronic address: matthieu.verstraete@ulg.ac.be

- [1] J. N. Israelachvili, *Intermolecular and Surface Forces* (Academic Press, 2011), 3rd ed.
- [2] L. Béguin, A. Vernier, R. Chicireanu, T. Lahaye, and A. Browaeys, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 263201 (2013).
- [3] E. A. Power and T. Thirunamachandran, *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 3660 (1995).
- [4] Y. Sherkunov, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 052703 (2005).
- [5] M. Donaire, R. Guérout, and A. Lambrecht, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 033201 (2015).
- [6] P. Barcellona, R. Passante, L. Rizzuto, and S. Y. Buhmann, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 012705 (2016).
- [7] M. J. J. Vrakking, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **16**, 2775 (2014).
- [8] F. Remacle and R. D. Levine, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **103**, 6793 (2006).
- [9] P. Krause, T. Klamroth, and P. Saalfrank, *J. Chem. Phys.* **123**, 074105 (2005).
- [10] J. A. Sonk and H. B. Schlegel, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **116**, 7161 (2012).
- [11] S. Raghunathan and M. Nest, *J. Chem. Phys.* **136**, 064104 (2012).
- [12] S. Bauch, L. K. Sørensen, and L. B. Madsen, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 062508 (2014).
- [13] J. A. Sonk, M. Caricato, and H. B. Schlegel, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **115**, 4678 (2011).
- [14] J. A. Sonk and H. B. Schlegel, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **115**, 11832 (2011).
- [15] R. H. A. Eade and M. A. Robb, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **83**, 362 (1981).
- [16] P. Jorgensen, J. Olsen, and D. L. Yeager, *J. Chem. Phys.* **75**, 5802 (1981).
- [17] B. O. Roos, *The Complete Active Space Self-Consistent Field Method and Its Applications in Electronic Structure Calculations* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA, 1987), vol. 69, pp. 399–445.
- [18] H.-J. Werner, *Matrix-Formulated Direct Multiconfiguration Self-Consistent Field and Multiconfiguration Reference Configuration-Interaction Methods* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA, 1987), vol. 69, pp. 1–62.
- [19] B. Mignolet, A. Gijsbertsen, M. J. J. Vrakking, R. D. Levine, and F. Remacle, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **13**, 8331 (2011).
- [20] M. A. Marques, N. T. Maitra, F. M. Nogueira, E. Gross, and A. Rubio, eds., *Fundamentals of Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory*, vol. 837 of *Lecture Notes in Physics* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2012).
- [21] N. Rohringer, A. Gordon, and R. Santra, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 043420 (2006).
- [22] T. Sato and K. L. Ishikawa, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 023402 (2013).
- [23] H. Miyagi and L. B. Madsen, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 063416 (2014), 1304.5904.
- [24] F. Remacle, M. Nest, and R. D. Levine, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 183902 (2007).
- [25] M. Nest, F. Remacle, and R. D. Levine, *New J. Phys.* **10**, 025019 (2008).
- [26] H. Hamaker, *Physica* **4**, 1058 (1937).
- [27] A. D. McLachlan, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **271**, 387 (1963).
- [28] D. A. Strubbe, L. Lehtovaara, A. Rubio, M. A. L. Marques, and S. G. Louie, in *Fundamentals of Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory*, edited by M. A. L. Marques, N. T. Maitra, F. M. S. Nogueira, E. K. U. Gross, and A. Rubio (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2012), vol. 837 of *Lecture Notes in Physics*, chap. 7, pp. 139–166.
- [29] U. De Giovannini, G. Brunetto, A. Castro, J. Walkenhorst, and A. Rubio, *ChemPhysChem* **14**, 1363 (2013).
- [30] E. Perfetto and G. Stefanucci, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 033416 (2015).
- [31] J. J. Sakurai, *Modern Quantum Mechanics* (Addison Wesley, 1993), revised ed., ISBN 0805382917.
- [32] S. S. Andrews, *J. Chem. Educ.* **81**, 877 (2004).
- [33] H. Stapelfeldt and T. Seideman, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 543 (2003).
- [34] M. Artamonov and T. Seideman, *Mol. Phys.* **110**, 885 (2012).
- [35] M. J. T. Oliveira, B. Mignolet, T. Kus, T. A. Papadopoulos, F. Remacle, and M. J. Verstraete, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **11**, 2221 (2015).
- [36] J. Ajay, J. Śmydke, F. Remacle, and R. D. Levine, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **120**, 3335 (2016).
- [37] A. Nikodem, R. D. Levine, and F. Remacle, *J. Phys.*

- Chem. A **120**, 3343 (2016).
- [38] A. Nikodem, R. D. Levine, and F. Remacle, *Physical Review A* **95**, 053404 (2017).
- [39] V. Despré, A. Marciniak, V. Lorient, M. C. E. Galbraith, A. Rouzée, M. J. J. Vrakking, F. Lépine, and A. I. Kuleff, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **6**, 426 (2015).