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ABSTRACT: We have measured and calculated differential and integral cross sections for elastic and vibrationally inelastic electron scattering by diacetylene molecules at electron energies from 0.5 to 20 eV in the whole range of scattering angles from 0 to 180°. The calculations were carried out using the discrete momentum representation method (DMR), which is based on the two-channel Lippmann–Schwinger equation in the momentum space. The interaction between the scattered electron and the target molecule is described by the exact static-exchange potential. Correlation–polarization forces are included by a local density functional theory. Energy dependences of integral and differential cross sections are presented for all nine vibrational modes. A detailed comparison of theoretical and experimental electron energy loss spectra is presented for electron energies of 1, 5.5, 10, and 20 eV. The theory assigns symmetry of resonances that could not be determined by empirical analysis alone. The theory reveals, and quantitatively describes, the switching of partial waves accompanying excitation of nontotally symmetrical vibrations. Limitations of the theory in reproducing experimental data for the narrow π* resonance below 2 eV are mentioned.

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper represents a continuation of the previous work1,2 on diacetylene (1,3-butadiyne). The first of the two papers1 reported on the absolute angle-differential vibrational excitation cross sections, and the other one2 was a joint experimental and theoretical study on the absolute angle-differential elastic cross sections. As noted previously,1,2 electron collisions with diacetylene are relevant in many practical environments, such as formation of technological plasma,3,4 combustion,5–7 and astronomy.8,9 Vibrational excitation is important as a means of electron cooling and means of heating of molecules. Apart from this direct interest, vibrational excitation is also important because it is closely linked to the important electron-driven chemistry process of dissociative electron attachment—both are the result of relaxation of the nuclei on a resonant potential surface. Understanding vibrational excitation is, apart from the importance on its own, an important test of correct description of the resonant processes and thus in a certain sense a prerequisite for understanding dissociative electron attachment. We considered it therefore expedient to supplement the data published previously1 with some new experiments and to put the tentative assignments reported previously on a firmer basis by means of scattering calculations.

II. EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

The experimental conditions of the present work were the same as in our earlier study.2,10,11 Briefly, the measurements were performed with a spectrometer using hemispherical analyzers.

Absolute values of the cross sections were determined by the relative flow technique and normalized to the calculated helium elastic cross section of Nesbet.12 The confidence limit for the magnitudes of the inelastic cross sections is about ±25% (two standard deviations). The angular distributions were measured using the combined mechanical setting of the analyzer and magnetic deflection using a magnetic angle changer. The resolution was about 15 meV in the energy-loss mode.

III. THEORY AND COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

Our computational method called discrete momentum representation (DMR) is a rigorous ab initio method based13,14 on the two-channel Lippmann–Schwinger equation, which may be expressed as a set of two coupled matrix equations

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
T_{00} & T_{01} \\
T_{10} & T_{11}
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
U_{00} & U_{01} \\
U_{10} & U_{11}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
G_0 & 0 \\
0 & G_1
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
T_{00} & T_{01} \\
T_{10} & T_{11}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

(1)

where subscripts 0 and 1, respectively, denote the elastic and a vibrationally inelastic channel for a particular vibrational mode.
The matrix elements of the interaction potential $U$ were performed at the static-exchange-plus-polarization level (SEP):

$$U = U_{\text{SE}} + U_{\text{CP}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

The static-exchange part $U_{\text{SE}}$ of matrix elements was calculated rigorously in the \textit{ab initio} manner, whereas the correlation—polarization part $U_{\text{CP}}$ was modeled by a DFT-type potential corrected by a polarization asymptotic potential.\textsuperscript{15} The matrix form of eq 1 resulted from numerical discretization of the UGT term. The details of the procedure have been described previously.\textsuperscript{14}

The geometry of diacetylene was optimized with the valence-shell double-$\zeta$ and polarization (9s5p/4s1p)/(3s2p1d/2s1p) basis set\textsuperscript{16} and then used for analytical evaluation of normal modes, harmonic frequencies, dipole moment and its derivatives, and density matrix and its derivatives with respect to atomic coordinates by standard quantum chemical procedures.

The long-range correction to the DFT correlation potential requires knowledge of the static polarizability tensor $\alpha_{ij}$ and its derivatives with respect to nuclear positions.\textsuperscript{15} Sophisticated methods, such as the coupled cluster linear response method,\textsuperscript{17} are computationally too expensive when used for calculation of polarizabilities and polarizability gradients of polyatomic molecules, and therefore the Kohn–Sham density functional theory (DFT) approach was used instead. Performance of DFT methods was tested\textsuperscript{18} for a series of various exchange–correlation functionals. The molecule selected for testing was methane, and the derivatives of the polarizability tensor obtained with highly correlated wave function methods were taken as standard. This study and the unpublished test calculations on larger hydrocarbons showed that the best DFT results were obtained with the PBE0 exchange–correlation functional and Sadlej’s polarized valence triple-$\zeta$ basis.\textsuperscript{19} Dalton Release 2.0. was used for all calculations. The mean polarizability value of 47.56 au obtained for diacetylene compares reasonably well with the experimental value\textsuperscript{20} 46.63 au and with the value of 49.10 au, obtained by the CCSD(T) calculations with a large basis set of 380 Gaussians.\textsuperscript{21}

A direct output of scattering calculations is a manifold of calculated vibrational cross sections that can be taken as a theoretical line electron energy loss spectrum. The obtained lines were positioned at values of experimentally determined frequencies.\textsuperscript{22,23} For a direct comparison with the measured electron energy loss spectra we assumed a Gaussian shape for each line and a half-width of 15 meV, which corresponds to the resolution of the experimental apparatus.

IV. ELASTIC SCATTERING

Elastic scattering is not of our primary interest, but we present selected elastic cross sections in this paper because good results obtained by calculations for elastic scattering are a prerequisite for meaningful predictions of cross sections for vibrationally inelastic scattering. As may be noticed in eq 1, the vibrationally inelastic channels are coupled with the elastic channel, and the accuracy achieved for the former affects strongly the accuracy obtained for the latter. Hence, to have confidence in our vibrationally inelastic results, we wanted to see how our data obtained for elastic scattering compare with the respective experimental data\textsuperscript{1} and the results of sophisticated Schwinger multichannel (SMC) variational calculations.\textsuperscript{2} This comparison is presented in Figure 1 for elastic differential cross section as a function of electron energy for four scattering angles. The present DMR calculations are in agreement with the SMC calculations for energies between about 2 and 16 eV. The two theoretical lines match the shape of experimental curve in this range, though both calculations overestimate experiment by up to a factor of 2.

The peak calculated at 1.33 eV by the DMR theory is due to the $^2\Pi_u$ resonance (see the symmetry assignment below). This
resonance is manifested in the experimental spectrum as a broad band extending from about 0.6 to 1.3 eV, with vibrational (boomerang) structure. The agreement is very satisfactory in view of the fact that shape resonances are commonly calculated at slightly higher energies and that fixed-nuclei calculations yield bands narrower than experiment. A prototype case is the lowest $\pi^*$ resonance in benzene at about 1.2 eV. It is hardly observable by elastic scattering experiments, but energy dependences of the integral cross section calculated by Gianturco and Lucchese\textsuperscript{24} and Bettega and collaborators\textsuperscript{25} exhibited strong and narrow resonances at 1.82 and 2.3 eV, respectively. Our DMR unpublished calculations for benzene gave a similar result, a sharp resonance at 1.5 eV, slightly higher than in experiment. Gianturco and Lucchese\textsuperscript{24} proposed a plausible explanation for this discrepancy by the fact that their calculations (and also those by Bettega et al.\textsuperscript{25}) were performed at the fixed-nuclei level that does not reproduce the Franck–Condon profile of the band and thus leads to a narrower resonance than would be obtained if coupling to nuclear motion were included. The fact that shape resonances are generally calculated at higher energies than experiment is ascribed to incomplete inclusion of polarization. We note that this shift is only about 0.3 eV in the present calculation, less than in virtually all existing calculations on polyatomic molecules, and indicative of the proper treatment of polarization in the present model.

Next we check the angular dependences. In Figure 2 we compare the DMR calculations with experimental data\textsuperscript{2} and SMC calculations.\textsuperscript{2} Results of our calculations are in agreement with experimental data and are generally slightly better than the SMC calculations. The agreement is worse for the electron energy of 1 eV and scattering angles smaller than 90°. This discrepancy is not surprising. From Figure 1 we have already learned that theoretical data for electron energies below 2 eV should be taken with caution because the calculated and experimental resonance energies are slightly different and because the Franck–Condon broadening of the resonance is not taken into account by the fixed-nuclei calculation. The excellent agreement of our calculation for electron energy of 1 eV and the scattering angle of 135° must thus be taken as partly fortuitous.

Nevertheless, we may conclude this section by stating that, although agreement with experiment is not perfect, it is good enough to reproduce the shapes of dependences of differential cross sections with respect to electron energies and scattering angles for which the experiments on vibrationally inelastic scattering were done. Hence we think that this is a good prerequisite for valuation of cross sections for vibrationally inelastic scattering.

V. VIBRATIONALLY INELASTIC SCATTERING

Electron energy dependences of vibrational data exhibit more distinct peaks than elastic data and hence provide firmer grounds for finding positions of resonances and identification of their nature. This property may be explained by a weaker background contribution to the cross section in inelastic channels. We start our exploration of resonances by Figure 3 in which we present calculated electron energy dependences of integral cross sections for the nine normal modes of diacetylene.

We are using the energy dependence of the integral cross sections for vibrational modes as a tool for getting the first rough idea about positions of resonances. An immediate observation from Figure 3 is that the curves reveal positions of resonances by clear-cut maxima. This is in contrast to the energy dependences of elastic scattering, where observation of resonances may be obscured by a strong background nonresonant scattering. As experimental data on inelastic integral cross sections are not available, we will deal hereafter with differential cross sections only.

In Figure 4 we present the calculated energy dependence of differential cross sections for the scattering angle of 180°. This angle was chosen intentionally because the curves presented in Figure 4 are used below in our attempt to reconstruct experimental differential cross sections at two selected energy losses (shown in Figure 5). We have also calculated data for scattering angles 45° and 135°. The corresponding figures can be found in the Supporting Information. The not yet published experimental data for the scattering angle 135° has been included in the Supporting Information, too. The respective plots of differential cross sections $\nu$ vs electron energy are displayed there for the $\nu_{\Pi}$, $\nu_{\sigma}$, and $\nu_{\Pi}$ modes, and also for several overtones and combination bands.

At higher energies the vibrational energy loss spectrum of diacetylene is dominated by the C–H stretch band centered at 413 meV. It consists of the symmetric and asymmetric C–H stretch vibrations, $\nu_1$ and $\nu_3$, respectively. The two modes are separated by 1 meV only, and hence they are not resolved in the experiment. Absolute experimental values of the differential cross section for excitation of these two modes as a function of collision energy are shown in the left panel of Figure 5. It is clear that the excitation of these stretch modes is governed by several resonances. The highest peak was assigned in ref 1 to the $\Pi_{\Pi}$ resonance, which is followed by three bands at 4.4, 6.9, and 9.8 eV, not assigned previously.

Our calculations (black curves in Figure 5) confirm the presence of all four resonances. Computed energy positions are fairly close to the energies determined experimentally. The strongest one, the $\Pi_{\Pi}$ resonance, was calculated at 1.33 eV,
Figure 5 indicates that this resonance is prominent in the cross section for exciting the $\sigma_g^+$ symmetric stretch mode $\nu_1$, but nearly absent in the cross section for exciting the $\sigma_u^+$ asymmetric stretch mode $\nu_4$, as expected on symmetry grounds. Figure 5 also shows that the calculation reproduces resonances in the 3–12 eV range, which excite both C–H stretch modes. A shoulder and four strongly overlapping peaks can be discerned in the $\nu_1$ cross section, but a clear-cut correspondence with experiment is provided by the line for the $\nu_4$ cross section with its three distinct peaks.

In a similar manner, we compare theoretical and experimental cross sections measured at the energy loss of 78 meV in the right panel of Figure 5. At this energy loss, a contribution to the inelastic signal comes from the excitation of the two bending modes $\nu_6$ ($\pi_g$) and $\nu_8$ ($\pi_u$), both having a vibrational energy of 78 meV. We estimate that the CCC bending mode $\nu_7$ ($\pi_g$), located at 60 meV, contributes only about 3% of the signal at the energy loss at 78 meV, and we therefore did not include this mode in our analysis in Figure 5. Theory confirms the presence of the resonance seen on the experimental curve at 5.2 eV, although it is calculated about 1 eV above the experimental value. Figures 4 and 5 reveal that this resonance excites both bending modes. Theory and experiment also agree about the very broad band in the 10–20 eV range. A discrepancy in this comparison is the strong $^2\Pi_u$ resonance peak calculated at 1 eV in the $\nu_8$ cross section, which is not as high (but broadened by Franck–Condon width) in the experimental data. We assume that the overestimated presence of the 1 eV $^2\Pi_u$ resonance in the calculated excitation of the $\nu_8$ $\pi_u$ mode can be explained by a “leak” from our elastic channel data where this resonance also appears stronger than in the experiment (Figure 1). Another difference concerns the weak narrow resonance calculated at 3 eV in the excitation of the $\nu_8$ mode, absent in the experiment.

In this paragraph we examine angular dependences of inelastic cross sections at the energy of the 1 eV $^2\Pi_u$ resonance. In Figure 6 we present the angular dependence of the differential cross section for the vibrational mode $\nu_2$. The observed dependence is compared with theoretical curves calculated for several electron energies in the 1 eV region. The purpose of this figure is to show that the excitation of the $\nu_2$ mode is strongly dependent on both the electron energy and the scattering angle. It is evident that a resonance-dominated cross section cannot be well reproduced unless both the calculation and the experiment are performed at the center of the resonance, which is slightly higher in the theory (Figures 3–5). This is confirmed in Figure 6 where the best agreement...
is obtained for calculation at the energy of 1.33 eV, the calculated position of the resonance. This problem that arises when theory is compared to experiment at, or close to, energies of sharp resonances, has been known for a long time. A detailed discussion with sound physical arguments can be found in the paper by Sun et al.26

Angular distributions for the C–H bending modes $\nu_6$ and $\nu_8$ are displayed in Figure 7. As mentioned above, they cannot be
resolved experimentally and we therefore compare the experimental data with the sum of the theoretical cross sections in Figure 7. We neglect a small contribution from the $\nu_7$ mode.

Our computed $\nu_6 + \nu_8$ differential cross section underestimates the experimental signal for larger scattering angles, whereas the agreement is very good for scattering angles under 60°. The difference can again be explained by the chosen collision energy of 1 eV, which is the experimental position of the $^2\Pi_u$ resonance but it is shifted from the computed resonance position by 330 meV. Here the scattering at small scattering angles is dominated by the infrared activity of the $\nu_8$ mode whereas the large scattering angles are strongly influenced by the resonance mechanism.

In Figures 8 and 9 we attempt to reconstruct computationally the electron energy loss spectra for electron energies of 1, 5.5, 10, and 20 eV. As already noted in the section on elastic scattering, and documented by Figure 1, the energy region below 2 eV is difficult for the theory to treat. First, the $^2\Pi_u$ resonance is calculated at 1.33 eV instead of 1.0 eV as observed experimentally, and second, the fixed-nuclei approximation cannot reproduce the Franck–Condon profile of the band, making it too narrow and high. Hence, the results of the theory in Figure 8 for the electron energy of 1 eV should be taken with caution. With these limitations in mind, it is seen in Figure 8 that for 1 eV the DMR theory is close to experiment in terms of the relative intensities of the different modes, but about by a factor of 3 too low.

The energy-loss regions between 130 and 200 and from 300 to 400 meV are due to overtones and combination bands and cannot be supported by the present calculations based on harmonic approximation. The predictive power is limited, therefore, to $1 \leftrightarrow 0$ vibrational transitions only. This limitation is more important in the present case, where the electron energy loss spectra are rich in overtones and combination bands, than in molecules with exclusively broad resonances like methane.27 The spectra at the 1 eV electron energy were also measured at the scattering angles 0, 20, 45, 90, and 180°, and the respective plots are contained in the Supporting Information. The experimental electron energy loss spectrum for 5.5 eV has a rich region of overtones and combination bands between 450 and 1000 meV and we considered it expedient to show it in Figure 8, even though it cannot be
interpolated by our calculations because of the use of harmonic approximation.

In contrast to the 1 eV case, at 5.5 eV the agreement between experiment and theory for the region of normal modes is very good even in terms of absolute values, except perhaps that the differential cross sections for the weak \( \nu_2 \) and \( \nu_4 \) modes are calculated slightly too low. Again, the observed signal between 130 and 200 meV, assigned tentatively to 2, calculated slightly too low. Again, the observed signal between 130 and 200 meV, assigned tentatively to 2, other electron energies assumed in this paper, the observed well reproduced for the 1. Intensities of vibrational bands relative to the elastic peak are overestimated by about a factor of 2, in accordance with Figure 9. The di

The di

Figure 9. Electron energy loss spectra for collision energies of 10 eV (left panel) and 20 eV (right panel). Upper panels show present experimental data, and lower panels display calculated spectra.

VI. ASSIGNMENT OF SYMMETRIES TO RESONANCES

In this section we show that explicit inclusion of the vibrationally inelastic channel into the theoretical model is profitablen for examination of energy positions and symmetries of shape resonances. The background cross section is low and it enables us to see the positions of resonances more distinctly than is possible with elastic scattering. On the other hand, allowing for vibrational motion makes the assignment more complex. We will show that more than one resonance and more than one symmetry component may be involved in the resonant vibrational excitation of polyatomic molecules. We will be dealing with one-electron (shape) resonances only, and hence, for simplicity, we drop the doublet symbol attached to the symmetry component, e.g., \( \Pi_u \) will be denoted hereafter as \( \Pi_u \).

Our aim is to analyze the resonances shown in Figure 5 and also to determine the dominant symmetry components that drive the resonant processes. The left panel of Figure 5 suggests that there are at least four resonances connected with the vibrational modes \( \nu_1 \) and \( \nu_4 \). On the calculated curve for \( \nu_4 \) we see them at energies 3.8, 7.6, and 10.5 eV; on the calculated curve for \( \nu_1 \) there are even more, but less pronounced, resonances. The overall shape of the calculated sum (\( \nu_1 \) and \( \nu_4 \)) curve is in good agreement with the experiment. The respective differences in calculated and observed resonance energy positions do not exceed 0.7 eV. In the right panel of Figure 5 we will analyze the resonance enhancing the calculated excitation of \( \nu_6 \) and \( \nu_8 \) modes around 6.4 eV. Experimentally, the resonance is observed at 5.2 eV.

The tool for examination of symmetries of the resonances exploits the data provided by the DMR method. In particular, the tool is based on postprocessing the matrix elements of the inelastic \( T \)-matrix block \( T_{10} \) obtained by solving the Lippmann–Schwinger equation (eq 1). Although the elements are evaluated on a numerical angular grid (specified by Lebedev quadrature), their transformation to partial-wave representation \( T_{lm} \) is straightforward. Then the partial waves, specified by the pair \( (lm) \), may be combined in such a way that they belong to irreducible representations of the point group \( D_{inh} \). In the present analysis of the resonance symmetries we have limited our angular space by \( l \leq 3 \), i.e., we included the lowest 16 partial waves. They can be combined into 7 irreducible representations \( \Gamma \) ordered as follows: \( \Sigma_u, \Sigma_d, \Pi_u, \Pi_d, \Delta_u, \Delta_d, \Phi_u \). The transformation may be written as

\[
T_{\gamma}^\Gamma = \sum_{lm,l'} b_{\gamma lm}^\Gamma T_{lm,l'm} b_{\gamma,l'm'}^\Gamma
\]  

(3)
where the coefficients $b_{\text{lin}}^{\Gamma}$ form a unitary matrix and can be found in the literature for most of the point groups. Sum of the squared elements $|T_{ij}^{\Gamma}|^2$ (with all the partial waves included) forms the inelastic integral cross section. The individual squared elements $|T_{ij}^{\Gamma}|^2$ in the limited angular space $l \leq 3$ are displayed in Figure 10 as vertical bars for the symmetric C–H stretch mode $\nu_1$. We displayed them for four energies, for which we observe resonant behavior in excitation of the mode $\nu_1$ (Figure 5). Figure 10 demonstrates that only very few partial waves have a non-negligible contribution to the inelastic cross section at the resonant energies.

The top left panel of Figure 10 clearly shows that at the 1.33 eV resonance, the dominant contribution to the computed cross section, comes from the $\Pi_u$ symmetry with a weak contribution from the $\Sigma_g$ component. The $\Pi_u$ symmetry was already assigned previously. Thus, the top left panel of Figure 10 gives more detailed information, according to which the incoming flux of the scattered electron is divided into the dominant $\Pi_u$ symmetry component and a less important $\Sigma_g$ component. After the excitation of symmetric $\nu_1$ mode, the electron leaves the molecule keeping its symmetry components.

Mechanism of resonant excitation for the band at 3.8 eV in Figure 5 is similar, but here the dominant contribution comes from the $\Sigma_u$ symmetry with a weak contribution of the $\Sigma_g$ component. The resonant mechanism at 7.6 eV is also driven by the $\Sigma_u$ symmetry; however, there is a weak presence of the $\Sigma_g$ and $\Pi_g$ components as well. Finally, at the last resonant energy of 10.5 eV (bottom right panel of Figure 10), the
vibrational excitation of the ν₁ mode is again driven mainly by the Σ_u symmetry resonance with a weak Σ_g contribution. The visible contribution of higher symmetries reflects a simple fact that the resonant process at 10.5 eV is less pure and the inelastic cross section contains also a non-negligible background. We conclude the symmetry analysis of resonances for ν₁ mode by a note that all the symmetries involved in these resonant processes are in accord with the resonance symmetry selection rules of Wong and Schulz.29

The second vibrational mode that contributes to the inelastic cross section shown in the left panel of Figure 5 is the antisymmetric C–H stretch mode ν₄. Results of the analysis for this mode are shown in Figure 11, similarly as was done for the ν₁ in Figure 10. When comparing it to Figure 10, we observe two major differences:

1. The cross section at 1.33 eV (top left panel of Figure 11) is scattered into many partial wave contributions and this feature suggests there is no resonant mechanism available. This observation is in agreement with the shape of the Π_u orbital.1 Accordingly, Figure 4 does not show any peak at 1.33 eV in the ν₄ cross section.

2. The mechanisms at 3.8, 7.6, and 10.5 eV are clearly resonant, but in contrast to excitation of ν₁ mode, they are not diagonal and they couple Σ_u and Σ_g symmetry components. At these energies, Figure 11 describes a resonant process in which the scattered electron enters the molecular system in the Σ_u symmetry, excites the antisymmetric C–H stretch mode ν₄ and then leaves the molecule in the Σ_g symmetry component. The fact that there are two groups of columns, arranged symmetrically across the diagonal, is due to the principle of microscopic reversibility; i.e., the symmetries of the incoming and outgoing waves can be switched. All the three resonances are exempt from the symmetry selection rules of Wong and Schulz.29

Figure 12 displays a symmetry analysis of a single resonance that dominates the cross section for excitation of the C–H bending modes ν₆ and ν₈ shown on the right panel of Figure 5. The results demonstrate that the excitation of C–H bending modes requires coupling between the Σ and Π symmetries. The scattering calculations show (Figure 12) that the Π_u resonance drives the excitation of both modes; however, in the case of the π₆ mode ν₆ it couples with the Σ_g resonance, whereas in the case of the π₈ mode ν₈ it couples with the Σ_u resonance. A summary of the above analysis for all the four modes ν₁, ν₄, ν₆, and ν₈ is displayed in Table 1.

Hence, the calculations predict that the resonant excitation of the ν₁ and ν₄ C–H stretch modes is rather complex. The partial wave analysis reveals Σ_u incoming ↔ Σ_u outgoing waves for ν₁ (σ_g) excitation and Σ_u incoming ↔ Σ_u outgoing waves for ν₄ (σ_u) excitation, at three energies (3.8, 7.6, and 10.5 eV) within the 3–12 eV range. The presence of several relatively narrow σ_u resonances at the relatively high energies is unusual and in contrast to what is found, for example, in saturated hydrocarbons, where only one extremely broad band is observed in the C–H stretch excitation. We ascribe it to the relatively high symmetry of diacetylene, which prevents the electron from leaking out as s-wave in the elastic channel for the Σ_u resonances. Recall that the present model does not permit calculation of core-excited resonances.

Interesting insight has also been gained into the excitation via the "second π_u" resonance 2Π_u originally observed as a band at 6.2 eV in the ν₂ C≡C stretch excitation.1 The present calculation places it at 6.4 eV, in good agreement with the experiment, and shows that it is, unexpectedly, also very efficient in the excitation of the non-totally symmetrical C–H bend vibrations ν₆ (π₆) and ν₈ (π₈), but that in this case the vibrational excitation couples the incoming Π_u wave with an outgoing Σ_u (for ν₆) or Σ_u (for ν₈) waves (or going from Σ_u or Σ_u to Π_u because of the microscopic reversibility). The experimental band in the ν₂/nπ excitation cross section is at a lower energy (at 5.2 eV) and we propose that dependence of the peak position on the final channel, quite common in electron scattering, is due to Franck–Condon effects. The (real part of) the potential hypersurface of the 2Π_u anion state has a complex shape. It goes up along the ν₂ normal coordinate but goes down along the ν₆ and ν₈ normal coordinates (simple electronic structure calculation reveals that the C–H bonds are bent in the diacetylene anion). This is likely to cause the cross

Table 1. Comparison of Calculated and Experimental Resonance Positions Together with the Symmetries Relevant for the Resonant Vibrational Excitation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy (eV)</th>
<th>ν₁</th>
<th>ν₄</th>
<th>ν₆</th>
<th>ν₈</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental resonant energies</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical resonant energies</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symmetry for ν₁</td>
<td>Π_u</td>
<td>Σ_u</td>
<td>Π_u</td>
<td>Σ_u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symmetry for ν₄</td>
<td>Σ_u ↔ Π_u</td>
<td>Σ_u ↔ Π_u</td>
<td>Π_u ↔ Π_u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symmetry for ν₆</td>
<td>Π_u ↔ Π_u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symmetry for ν₈</td>
<td>Π_u ↔ Π_u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. C–H bend modes ν₆ (left panel) and ν₈ (right panel). Details are explained in caption of Figure 10.
sections to peak at different energies for the same resonance but different final normal modes.

VII. SUMMARY
This paper presents a thorough theoretical analysis of elastic and, primarily, vibrationally inelastic electron scattering by diacetylene. The results are compared to experimental cross sections, in part published previously, in part presented here for the first time. The calculations support and extend previous tentative assignments and provide detailed information on the observed resonances. The strengths of the present calculations are an advanced determination of the target polarization resulting in good accuracy of calculated resonance energies, absolute cross section values, and partial wave analysis which calculates which incoming and outgoing partial waves are responsible for the excitation of a given vibrational mode at a given energy, thus providing a detailed insight into the excitation mechanism.

The lowest resonance is calculated at 1.33 eV, only slightly above the experimental value of 1.0 eV. The partial wave analysis confirms the assignment as the $2\Pi_u$ resonance, with a temporary occupation of the lowest virtual orbital $\pi_u$. This low-lying $2\Pi_u$ resonance makes the diacetylene molecule a difficult case for a theoretical treatment, because, presumably, for its quantitative treatment it is necessary to go beyond the fixed-nuclei approximation.

The overall calculated profile in the 3–12 eV range is in good agreement with experiment although the band overlap prevents observation of all the calculated bands individually. The partial wave analysis reveals resonances for $\nu_4$ ($\sigma_g$) excitation and $\nu_4$ ($\sigma_u$) excitation, at three energies (3.8, 7.6, and 10.5 eV), and the "second $\pi^*"$ resonance $3\Pi_g$ originally observed as a band at 6.2 eV in the $\nu_1$ $C\equiv C$ stretch excitation. According to the present calculations it is coupled with the symmetrical $C\equiv C$ bend vibrations $\nu_6$ ($\pi_g$) and $\nu_8$ ($\pi_u$). On the basis of our calculations, we thus suggest that the present commonly accepted understanding of resonant vibrational excitation of polyatomic molecules should be extended. We observe that in the case of the $\nu_4$, $\nu_6$, and $\nu_8$ modes, the symmetry of the resonant wave function changes during the collision. Such a mechanism allows for resonant vibrational excitation of these modes.

Although the diacetylene molecule is a difficult case for a theoretical treatment, the DMR calculations provided a good account for all scattering phenomena observed in this study for normal modes. They are beneficial in providing additional information not amenable to experiment, in particular for normal modes close in energy that cannot be distinguished because of a limited resolution of the experimental setup. A major asset is the capacity of the present theory to qualitatively calculate excitations with symmetry change and its ability to determine symmetry of resonances on sound theoretical grounds.
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