$\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^$

THE ZEEMAN SPECTRUM OF THE OH ²II_{1/2} STATE

W-M_ VAN HERPEN, W. Leo MEERTS

Fysisch Laboratorium, Katholieke Universiteit, Toernooiveld, 6525 ED Nijmegen, The Netherlands

and

L. VESETH

Insrirure of *Phpics, UniuersiI_;- 01 Oslo. Oslo* **3. Nonva_s**

Received 10 May 1985; in final form 8 July 1985

The $J = 1/2$ and $J = 3/2$ states of the X² $\Pi_{1/2}$ level of OH have been studied in magnetic fields up to 0.8 T. The molecular beam electric resonance method was used. The A-doubling Zeeman transitions have been observed for the $J = 1/2$ singular level for the first time. The results were combined with data from the literature, which enabled a rathe: uncorrelated fit of all the g-factors with improved accuracies. The experimental value of the electronic spin g-factor is compared with the theoretical **prediclion.**

1. Introduction

The OH radical in its ²II ground state has been ex**tensively investigated by various high-precision spectroscopic techniques. The list of accurate molecular parameters obtained from the OH data in the literature might seem quite complete, and the theoretical model well understood. There is, however, one crucial parameter which is not well determined from experiment so** far, and that is the electronic spin g-factor, g_s . An accurate set of values for all the six g-factors needed to describe the Zeeman effect of a ²II state is further**more required to extract accurate rotational and fine structure constants from laser magnetic resonance spectra [l]** _

A fitted value of g_s was presented by Brown and co**workers [2]** _ **However, with the data available very high correlations among the g-factors were encounter**ed, and their result $g_s = 2.00152(36)$ is not accurate **enough to enable a significant comparison with theory.** The ab initio result $g_s = 2.002114$ is expected to be accurate to about 5 ppm $[3]$. The fitted value of g_s is **very sensitive to deficiencies in the theoretical model as well as to inaccuracies in the magnetic field measure-**

0 009-2614/85/S 03.30 0 Blsevier Science Publishers B.V. (North-Holland Physics Publishing Division)

ments. Hence, the electronic spin g-factor g, yields the opportunity to compare an experimentally derived parameter with more reliable theoretical prediction.

The main objective of the present work is to reinvestigate the Zeeman spectrum of the OH $\rm ^2H_{112}$ sub**state. A-doubling Zeeman transitions have been observ**ed for the $J = 1/2$ singular level for the first time, and Zeeman data of improved quality are presented for the *J=* **3/2 level. Combining the zero-field and Zeeman data available in the literature with the present observations has enabled a rather uncorrelated fit of all the gfactors, and thereby individual g-factors of improved accuracy.**

2. Experimental details

The experiments were performed with a molecular beam electric resonance spectrometer, previously used for obtaining Zeeman dsta on NO [4] and described in detail elsewhere [5] _ **We will only discuss some features relevant to the present work.**

OH radicals have been produced in a number of different reactions. Under optimized conditions we found DISCHARGE CAVITY

Fig. 1. Diagram of the reaction source for OH molecular beam **production.**

the reaction

 $H + NO₂ \rightarrow OH + NO$

described by Del Greco [6] to be effective in producing OH radicals [7] _ The molecular beam was formed in a reaction source (fig. 1) also used in experiments on the iodine oxide radical ^[8]. Hydrogen atoms were pro**duced in a 2.45 GHz microwave discharge in water vapour flowing through a 10 mm inner diameter tube. Typically 100 W of microwave power was dissipated. The NO, gas was injected at the reaction zone close to** the end of the source. This end, contracted to a diam**eter of 6 mm, was placed some 15 mm in front of a conical skimmer with a 2 mm aperture. This distance could be varied to optimize the conditions. The source chamber (pumped by a 500 m3/h Roots pump) was at a typical pressure of** 4×10^{-2} **mbar.**

The transitions were induced by microwave power from two backward wave oscillators (BWO) in the region 4-8 and 8-12 GHz (Varian type VA-185M and **VA-175T, respectively). For stabilization the 30 MHz beat signal of the BWO frequency and of a synthesizer (Hewlett-Packard 8660B) was phase-locked to a 30 MHz reference signal by means of a syncrirninator (Schomandl FDS 30). Transitions in NO below 500 MHz, used for field calibration purposes, could be induced directly by the synthesizer. In most cases four scans (each scan took about one minute at a 1 s time constant) were averaged yielding a signal-to-noise ratio of3.**

tric dipole allowed transitions between the two A-dou- on the frequencies are determined by a combination bling components in the $J = 1/2$ and $J = 3/2$ rotational of the spectral linewidths and stability of the magnetic

states of the 2 $\Pi_{1/2}$ level. In the magnetic field region **three different configurations were used to induce transitions, depending on the frequency range and** transition type. In the $J = 1/2$ state Λ -doubling transi**tions were studied by a stripline system. Two parallel conducting plates (10 mm spaced and 50 mm wide) acted as a transmission line with the electric field component perpendicular to the molecular beam and parallel to the homogeneous magnetic field, thus allowing** ΔM_F = 0 transitions. The observed linewidths were **10-l 5 kHz.**

For the $\Delta M_F = 0$ transitions in the $J = 3/2$ state we **used a rectangular waveguide with the end expanded in the direction parallel to the beam and contracted in the magnetic field direction- The microwave power was launched between two parallel plates (10 mm spaced, 10 cm wide)_ A travelling wave was obtained by obstructing reflections at the end of the parallel plate system with the help of foam microwave absorbers. The electric component of the microwave field was parallel to the magnetic field direction. We observed linewidths of lo-15 kHz with this apparatus.**

To induce $\Delta M_F = \pm 1$ transitions in the $J = 3/2$ state, **the waveguide was rotated 90" to obtain an electric component perpendicular to the magnetic field direction. The waveguide was again expanded in the beam direction; however, so as not to affect the cutoff frequency it is not allowed to contract in the magnetic field direction_ The parallel plates were now separated by 23 mm and the observed Linewidths 20-25 kHz.**

The magnetic field was produced by an electromagnet (Bruker Physik) capable of yielding a homogeneous field up to 0.87 T in the transition region. The magnetic fields have been calibrated relative to previ f ous Zeeman measurements on NO [4] in the X $^2\Pi_{1/2}$ *J=* **l/2 state around 430 MHz: Transitions at these frequencies could be induced. directly by the stripline system. For the waveguide systems we had to connect the rf signal separately to the parallel plates. The NO molecule is formed in a sufficient amount in the same reaction as the OH radical. With this method the magnetic field strength could be determined to 4 parts in lo5 for relative purposes. However, the absolute field uncertainty was limited to 2 parts in 104 inherent to the calibration of the NO measurements [4].**

The observed Zeeman spectra involve $\Delta J = 0$ elec-
Table 1 presents the results. The errors indicated

Table 1 Observed transition fre uencies and magnetic flux densities of the ${}^{2}\Pi_{1/2}$, $J = 1/2$ and ${}^{2}\Pi_{1/2}$, $J = 3/2$ states in OH

	\bm{F}'	M_F^{\cdot}	$F^{\prime\prime}$	Мë	B (T)	ν (MHz)
1/2	1	1	1	1	0.80003(16)	4717.874(5)
	1	0	1	0		4721.656
	1	$^{-1}$	1	-1		4783.040
	1	o	0	o		4794.353
	0	0	1	0		4631.052
3/2	2	2	2	2	0.79991(16)	7802.352(4)
	2	1		1		7799.887
	2	0	$\frac{2}{2}$	0		7797.150
	2	-1	2	-1		7794.107
	$\mathbf{2}$	-2	2	-2		7837.196
	1	1	1	$\mathbf{1}$	0.79994(16)	7757.913
	1	0	$\mathbf{1}$	0		7783.766
		- 1	I	-1		7810.180
	1	0	2 0	0.022567(90)	7728.721(5)	
	2	0	2	-1	0.39994(8)	7052.693(8)
	2	0	$\overline{2}$	1		8539.505(5)
	$\overline{2}$	1	2	2		8549.298(8)
	1	0	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$		8537.745(5)
	2	2	2	ı	0.59998(11)	6685.782(4)
	1	0	1	-1		6661.485(4)

field, while the field strength uncertainties represent the absolute error.

3. Determination of molecular parameters

The present Zeeman data on the ${}^2\Pi_{1/2}$, $J=1/2$ **and** *J=* **3/2 levels were combined with all available high-precision data for the lowest vibrational level in** a weighted non-linear least-squares fit. The experimen**tal data used in addition to the present ones are as fol**lows: microwave A-doubling transitions for the ²II_{I/2} **and 2"3/2 substates (as compiled by Coxon et al. [9]), laser magnetic resonance (LMR) rotational and fine structure transitions [l], electron pararnagnetic resonance (EPR) data for the 2111,2 and 'rI3/2 substates [2], and combination differences from the** $v = 1 \leftarrow 0$ **band observed by difference frequency laser spectroscopy [lo].**

neously by the fit, including 2 rotational, 2 fine strucspectively 0.98 and 0.94 between the higher-order Λ -

doubling parameters p_H and p_L , and between q_L and **pL (cf. ref- [9]). Among the g-factors the highest cor**relation (0.89) was found between g_s and g_T . The **weighted rms error of the fit was 1.60, indicating that the frequency residuals on an average exceed the estimated measurement errors by a factor' of 1.6. We were in particular unable to fit the combination differences** from the $v = 1 \leftarrow 0$ band within the experimental ac**curacy of 0.001 cm-l claimed by Amano [lo]. Systematic residuals up to five times the experimental ac**curacy were found for the highest J value $(J = 7.5)$.

The model used to fit the OH data was described in a previous paper [4] (and references therein). Table 2 presents molecular parameters and g-factors as determined from the present fit. No new information was obtained on the A-doubling and hypetime parameters, and their fitted values are not reproduced here. The rotational constants *B* **and D and the fine structure** constants A and A'_D are mainly determined by the **LMR data, which in turn requires precise knowledge** of the g-factors. The present work seems to be the first **investigation for OH in which zero-field parameters and g-factors are determined simultaneously. Hence, the present values of the rotational and fine structure** constants including their standard deviations should **be the most reliable ones available_ The values of** *B, D, and A* **obtained by Brown et al. [l] from the LMR data with constrained values of all A-doubling and hyperfiie parameters and all g-factors are, however, in good agreement with those presented in table 2 (see also comparison by Arnano [lo])_**

The effective spin—orbit parameter A'_D and the gfactor g_T take care of the well known correlation between A_D and the spin-rotation interaction constant γ [3,4]. The present value of A_D^\prime was obtained with γ constrained to its theoretical estimate $\boldsymbol{\gamma}\approx\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(1)}-\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{p}=0$ **- 3502 MHz, with the first-order spin-rotation con**stant $\gamma^{(1)}$ equal to 22 MHz [11]. For A_D the most re**liable estimate seems to be the value** $\overline{A}_D = -21.39(50)$ **MHz obtained by Brown et al. [12] from a combination** of data on OH and OD. Hence, the definition of A_D' ,

$$
A'_D = A_D - 2[\gamma(\text{true}) - \gamma(\text{est.})]/(A - 2B),
$$

A total of 25 parameters were determined simulta- indicates that the estimated value of γ is in error by α by the fit, including 2 rotational. 2 fine struc- α is the but 1%. The estimated constrained value of **ture, 8** A-doubling, 7 hyperfine, and 6 g-factors. The could be changed by as much as 5% with no significant **highest** correlation coefficients encountered were reeffect on the fitted g-factors, except for g_T which has
an explicit dependence on γ .

Table 2

Molecular parameters for the ²II ground state ($u = 0$ **) in OH as determined from the present fit. The lower part of the table presents derived quantities**

Quantity	Experimental value a)	Theoretical value
B(MHz)	555546.20(12)	
D(MHz)	57.1369(99)	
A (MHz)	-4172215.96(53)	
A_D (MHz)	$-13.18(15)$	
$g_{\rm Leff}$	1.000870(25)	0.999825 ^{b)}
εç	2.001945 (50)	2.002114 ^{b)}
$10^3 g_R$	0.6411(70)	
10^3 s_B^*	$-1.02485(82)$	
$10^3 g_A^*$	4.36890(71)	
10 ³ g _T	$-0.041(11)$	
$10^3 g_{\rm R}^{\rm N}$		-0.5286
10^3 g_R^c	$-1.1697(70)$	
$10^3 g_R^e (2 \Sigma^+)$	$-1.0661(74)$	-1.040 ^{c)}
$10^3 g_R^2$ (² Σ)	$-0.0412(74)$	
$10^3 g_R^2(^2\Delta)$	$-0.062(13)$	

a) Numbers in parentheses represent one standard deviation. The standard deviations in $g_{l,eff}$ and g_s have been enhanced to take account of the absolute uncertainties in the mag**nctic field measurements. The fit uncertainties ye 1.1 x**

 10^{-3} and 2.2 X 10^{-3} , respectivel
^{b)} Ab initio value of g_1 and g_5 [3].

 $c)$ Contribution (ab initio) from the A² Σ ⁺ state [13].

In NO a combination of the fitted values of A_D and g_T led to separate values of A_D and γ [4]. The accuracy of the fitted g_T value for OH is, however, too low for **a similar successful separation in this case.**

A complete set of six fitted g-factors is presented in table 2. The error bars given also include the absolute uncertainties in the magnetic field measurements of the present work, and in the EPR spectrum. The fitted effective rotational g -factor g_R contains both a **nuclear and an electronic part [4],**

 $g_R = g_R^N - g_R^c$,

$$
g_{R}^{c} = g_{R}^{c}(2\Delta) + g_{R}^{c}(2\Sigma^{+}) + g_{R}^{c}(2\Sigma^{-}) = (g_{l} - g_{R}^{N})
$$

$$
\times \left(\sum_{2\Delta,\nu'} \frac{\langle^{2}\Delta\nu'|L_{+}|^{2}\Pi\nu\rangle\langle^{2}\Delta\nu'|BL_{+}|^{2}\Pi\nu\rangle}{E_{\Pi\nu} - E_{\Delta\nu'}}
$$

+
$$
\sum_{2\Sigma,\nu'} \frac{\langle^{2}\Pi\nu|L_{+}|^{2}\Sigma\nu'\rangle\langle^{2}\Pi\nu|BL_{+}|^{2}\Sigma\nu'\rangle}{E_{\Pi\nu} - E_{\Sigma\nu'}}\right).
$$

In previous work on NO [4] the fitted values of gR, $g_{\ell, \text{eff}}$, and g_B^* were combined with the ab initio value of g_1 to yield separate values of $g_R^e(^2\Delta)$, $g_R^e(^2\Sigma^+)$, and $g_R^e(2\Sigma^-)$. A similar successful separation of the contributions to g_R^e was obtained for OH, and the results **are presented in the lower part of table 2. The present results are also in reasonable agreement with those of an earlier investigation based on a smaller set of exper**imental data, and in which the g-factor g_s had to be **constrained to its ab initio value [3]** _ **The derived value** of $g_R^e({}^2\Sigma^+)$ is seen to be in reasonable agreement with **thz ab initio prediction [13]; the small difference may indicate a significant contribution from excited 2x+ states** different from the prominent A² Σ ⁺ state. Furthermore, the good agreement obtained for $g_R^e({}^2\Sigma^+)$ also tends to confirm the fitted value of g_{left} , and in particular its deviation from the adiabatic ab initio predic**tion.**

4. Discussion

The great puzzle presented by the present results is the clear discrepancy between the fitted value of gs and the ab initio prediction. Ab initio values of g_l and **gs are obtained by computing the Hartree-Fock expectation values of the relativistic and diamagnetic corrections to the Zeeman Hamiltonian [3,4]** _ **From atom**ic work the accuracy of the ab initio value of g_s is expected to be 1×10^{-5} or better, whereas the present **difference between the experimental and theoretical** values is $-1.69(50) \times 10^{-4}$. Hence, it seems safe to **rule out inaccuracy in the ab initio prediction as an ex**planation for the discrepancy.

The reason may be sought within the theoretical model used to fit the data. However, the model used is able to reproduce the observed frequencies down to their estimated accuracies for a wide variety of transitions and field strengths. Furthermore, no alarming

correlation coefficients were encountered in the leastsquares fit.

Finally, it remains to question the accuracy of the experimental data, in particular the absolute uncertainties in the magnetic field measurements. The estimated absolute uncertainty in the present magnetic field measurements of 2×10^{-4} affects the fitted value of g_s well within its error limits. For determining $g_{l,eff}$ and g_s **the crucial data are the EPR measurements of the** ²II_{3/2} state, in particular those of the lowest rotation al level. The error limits \pm 5 X 10^{$-$ 5} given for g_s in **table 2 stem from the absolute uncertainties in the** 2 $\Pi_{3/2}$ EPR magnetic field measurements, estimated to **be 2 X 10-S by Radford [14]. Hence, unless considerably underestimated, the magnetic field strength uncertainties do not provide a plausible explanation either.**

Various refinements of the theoretical model were tried, e.g. to include adjustable centrifugal distortion corrections in the second-order g-factors g_R^e , g_A^* , and **& which depend on the molecular moment of inertia. No significant centrifugal distortion effect was, how**ever, detected. In NO a significant value of the electronic quadrupole moment $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathsf{u}}^{\mathsf{e}}$ was obtained [4] . For OH a similar attempt to obtain $Q_\mathfrak{t}^{\mathsf{c}}$ failed due to insuf **ficient accuracy of the fitted value of the anisotropy** in the magnetic susceptibility $\chi_{\parallel} - \chi_{\perp}$ [4]. An attempt **was also made to fit the higher-order centrifugal distor**tion constant H. Its significance turned out to be mar**ginal, and in the final fit it was constrained io the value 0.424X lo-? MHz obtained by Coxon [15] from W data.**

References

- **[l] J.M. Brown, C.M.L. Kerr, F.D. Wayne, KM. Evenson and HE. Radford, J. Mol. Spectry. 86 (1981) 544.**
- [2] J.M. Brown, M. Kaise, C.M.L. Kerr and D.J. Milton, Mol. **Phys. 36 (1978) 553.**
- **(31 L. Veseth, J. hfol. Spectry. 77 (1979) 195.**
- **[4] W.L. Meerts and L. Veseth, J. Mol. Spectry. 82 (1980) 202.**
- [5] F.H. de Leeuw and A. Dymanus, J. Mol. Spectry. 48 **(1973) 427.**
- **[6] F.P. De1 Greco and F. Kaufman, Discussions Faraday Sot. 33 (1962) 128.**
- **[7] W.L. Meerts, J.P. Bekooy and A. Dymanus, Mol. Phys. 37 (1979) 425.**
- **[8] J.P. Eiekooy, W.L. Meerts and A. Dymanus, J. Mol. Spectry. 102 (1983) 320.**
- **[9] J.A. Coxon, K.V.L.N. Sastry, J.A. Austin and D.H. Levy, Can. J. Phys. 57 (1979) 619.**
- **[lo] T. Amano. J_ Mol. Spectry. 103 (1984) 436.**
- [11] S. Green and R.N. Zare, J. Mol. Spectry. 64 (1977) 217.
- **[12] J.M. Brown and J.E. Schubert, J. Mol. Spcctry. 95 (1982) 194.**
- **[13] P.R. Hinkley, J.A. Hall, T.E.H. Walker and W.G. Richards, J. Phys. B5 (1972) 204.**
- **[14] H-E. Radford, Phys. Rev. 122 (1961) 114.**
- **[15] J.A. Coxon, Can. J. Phys. 58 (1980) 933.**