

BOUNDS ON INTERNAL AND FREE ENERGIES OF MANY-BODY SYSTEMS\*

by

G. Stell  
College of Engineering  
State University of New York at Stony Brook  
Stony Brook, N.Y., 11790

ABSTRACT

Upper and lower bounds on the internal energy and Helmholtz free energy of a many-body system are derived for power-law and Lennard-Jones potentials.

December, 1969

Report No. 157

\* This work was supported in part by the Research Foundation of State University of New York

Recently Kleban<sup>1</sup> and Kleban and Lange<sup>2</sup> have shown the way in which the Bogoliubov inequality, used with certain other relations including the virial theorem, leads to inequalities for the internal energy per particle  $u$  and the Helmholtz free energy per particle  $f$ . The systems considered in refs. [1] and [2] have a pair potential of the Lennard-Jones form

$$v(r) = \lambda (r^{-n} + \text{const } r^{-m}) \quad (1)$$

and of a generalized Coulomb form (between particles of species  $i$  and  $j$ )

$$v_{ij}(r) = e_i e_j r_{ij}^{-n}. \quad (2)$$

In this note we extend the work of Kleban<sup>1</sup> and of Kleban and Lange<sup>2</sup> by showing the way in which a somewhat different use of essentially the same inequality and/or the virial theorem leads to additional bounds, some of which are stronger than those of refs. [1] and [2]. Elsewhere<sup>3</sup> we have shown the way in which still another application of the inequality leads to upper bounds on  $f$  in terms of hard-sphere quantities.

In the interest of brevity we shall simply take over the more-or-less standard notation of refs. [1] and [2] with one minor change. In that notation, the virial theorem can be written

$$\frac{p}{\rho} = \frac{2}{d} e_{kin} - \frac{1}{2d\rho} \int g_T(r) (r \cdot \nabla) v(r) d^d r \quad (3)$$

for a mixture of species (as well as for the single-species system) in the absence of an external field, where  $p$  is the pressure,  $\rho$  the total number density,  $d$  the dimensionality,  $e_{kin}$  the average total kinetic energy per particle, and  $g_T(r)$  a total pair correlation (distribution) function. We shall write  $g_T(r)$  as  $\rho^2 \bar{g}(r)$  however, to conform to widely used notation in which  $g(r)$  represents a dimensionless

function. In a single-component, single-phase fluid,  $g(r)$  is then just the well-known radial distribution function that goes to 1 as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . For the generalized Coulomb potential given by (2), Eq. (3) immediately implies that

$$\frac{p}{\rho} = \frac{2-n}{d} \epsilon_{kin} + \frac{n}{d} u$$

so

$$\frac{p}{\rho} \geq \frac{n}{d} u \text{ for } n \leq 2; \quad \frac{p}{\rho} \leq \frac{n}{d} u \text{ for } n \geq 2, \quad (4)$$

which is one of our starting points. Since  $\frac{p}{\rho} = \rho \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial \rho} \right)_s = \rho \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho} \right)_T$  where  $s$  is the entropy per particle and  $T$  the temperature, we have for  $n \leq 2$ ,

$$\rho \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial \rho} \right)_s \geq \frac{n}{d} u, \quad (5)$$

and since  $f = u - Ts$ , Eq. (4) and the inequality  $s \geq 0$  further imply for  $n \leq 2$  that

$$\rho \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho} \right)_T \geq \frac{n}{d} f. \quad (6)$$

(We note that the postulate  $s \geq 0$  is only applicable to a quantum mechanical system.)

If we follow ref. [1] and [2] in further postulating that there exists a  $\rho_1$  such that  $u(\rho, s) \geq 0$  for  $\rho \geq \rho_1$ , and a  $\rho_0$  such that  $f(\rho, T) \geq 0$  for  $\rho \geq \rho_0$ , then from (5) and (6) we conclude that

$$u(\rho, s) \geq [u(\eta, s) / \eta^{n/d}] \rho^{n/d} \text{ for } \rho \geq \eta \geq \rho_1 \quad (7)$$

and

$$f(\rho, T) \geq [f(\eta, T) / \eta^{n/d}] \rho^{n/d} \text{ for } \rho \geq \eta \geq \rho_0. \quad (8)$$

These results are stronger than Eqs. (25) and (33) of ref. [2].

Our second set of inequalities are bounds for classical systems based upon the Gibbs-Bogoliubov inequality<sup>4</sup> plus certain scaling properties<sup>5,6</sup> that hold when (1) or (2) are satisfied if the system under consideration is a classical one. For simplicity we shall consider only the single-species case, for which Eq. (2) can be written

$$v(r) = \lambda r^{-n} \quad (9)$$

so that  $1/kT$  times the average potential energy per particle,  $e_{pot}/kT$ , becomes a function  $E(\rho^*)$  of the single variable  $\rho^* = \rho(\lambda/kT)^{d/n}$ ;

$$e_{pot}/kT = (\lambda\rho/2kT) \int g(r) r^{-n} d^d r = E(\rho^*). \quad (10)$$

We shall find it useful to introduce the function  $J(\lambda, R)$  where  $R = \rho(kT)^{-d/n} = \rho^*/\lambda^{d/n}$ , by writing  $J(\lambda, R) = (\rho/2kT) \int g(r) r^{-n} d^d r$  so that

$$E(\rho^*) = \lambda J(\lambda, R).$$

Let  $\lambda_0$  and  $R_0$  be such that  $\lambda_0^{d/n} R_0 = \rho^* = \lambda^{d/n} R$ . We have

$$J(\lambda_0, R_0) = (\lambda/\lambda_0) J(\lambda, R). \quad (11)$$

The form of the Gibbs-Bogoliubov inequality which we shall use in this note involves  $f$  and  $g(r)$  for a potential  $v(r) = v_0(r) + v_1(r)$  in a comparison with  $f$  and  $g(r)$  for the potential  $v_0(r)$  at the same  $\rho$  and  $T$ . In obvious notation, it can be written

$$f_{v_0} + \frac{1}{2}\rho \int g_{v_0}(r) v_1(r) d^d r \leq f_v \leq f_{v_0} + \frac{1}{2}\rho \int g_{v_0}(r) v_1(r) d^d r. \quad (12)$$

Let  $v_0 = \lambda_0 r^{-n}$  and  $v_r = (\lambda - \lambda_0) r^{-m}$  Eq. (12) directly implies that for  $\lambda_0 \leq \lambda$ ,

$$J(\lambda, R_0) \leq J(\lambda_0, R_0). \quad (13)$$

Eqs. (10), (11), and (13) yield, for  $R \leq R_0$ ,

$$(R/R_0)^{n/d} E(R_0 \lambda^{d/n}) \leq E(R \lambda^{d/n}). \quad (14)$$

For arbitrary fixed density  $\eta$  and fixed temperature  $T$ , Eq. (14) provides a lower bound on  $e_{pot}(\rho, T)$  when  $\rho \leq \eta$  (and an upper bound when  $\rho \geq \eta$ ) in terms of  $e_{pot}(\eta, T)$  as well as a lower bound on  $e_{pot}(\rho, T)$  when  $T \geq T$  (and an upper bound when  $T \leq T$ ) in terms of  $e_{pot}(\rho, T)$ .

The free energy is given by  $f_{id} + f_{ex}$  where  $f_{ex}/kT = I(\rho^*) = \int_0^{\lambda} J(\tilde{\lambda}, R) d\tilde{\lambda}$ . Here  $f_{ex}$  is the configurational free energy and  $f_{id}$  the ideal-gas contribution. Hence (11) and (13) yield the inequality, for  $R \leq R_0$ ,

$$(R/R_0)^{n/d} I(R_0 \lambda^{d/n}) \leq I(R \lambda^{d/n}). \quad (15)$$

Eq. (15) provides upper and lower bounds on  $f_{ex}(\rho, T)$  in terms of  $f_{ex}(\eta, T)$  and  $f_{ex}(\rho, T)$  corresponding to the bounds on  $e_{pot}(\rho, T)$  in terms of  $e_{pot}(\eta, T)$  and  $e_{pot}(\rho, T)$  that are provided by (14). For example, for  $T \geq T$ ,

$$f_{ex}(\rho, T) \geq f_{ex}(\rho, T). \quad (16)$$

In the case of a Lennard-Jones potential given by (1), Eq. (10) is no longer true since  $e_{pot}/kT$  is a function of a second parameter, say  $\lambda/kT$ , in addition to  $\rho^*$ . The parameters  $T$  and  $\lambda$  are still found only in the combination  $\lambda/T$  however, and as a result our previous results still go through for fixed  $\rho$ . Thus Eq. (16) remains true for a classical system with  $v(r)$  given by (1), as does  $e_{pot}(\rho, T) \geq e_{pot}(\rho, T)$  for  $T \geq T$ .

Our third set of inequalities are upper bounds based on the use of (4).

If  $n \geq 2$  in (9), we have, instead of (5),

$$\rho \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial \rho} \right)_A \leq \left( \frac{n}{d} \right) u. \quad (17)$$

So if  $u, \geq 0$  for  $\rho \geq \rho_1$ , then integration of (17) yields

$$u(\rho, A) \leq u(\eta, T) \rho^{n/d} / \eta^{n/d} \quad \text{for } \rho \geq \eta \geq \rho_1. \quad (18)$$

If  $n=2$ , then (18) is a strict equality for all  $\rho$  and all  $\eta$ . Eq. (18) complements Eq. (21) of ref. (1). When  $n \geq 2$  we also have

$$\rho \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho} \right)_T \leq \frac{n}{d} u = \frac{n}{d} f + \frac{n}{d} T A. \quad (19)$$

Let  $A = A_{ex} + A_{id}$  where  $T A_{id} = kT d/2 - f_{id}$ . Here  $A_{id}$  is the ideal-gas contribution to  $A$  for a given  $\rho$  and  $T$ ; in the classical case  $A = A_{id,c} = k[d/2 + 1 - \ln \Lambda^d \rho]$  where  $\Lambda$  is a thermal wavelength. We also introduce  $f_{id,c}/kT = \ln \Lambda^d \rho - 1$ .

From Eq. (12), with  $v_0$  set equal to zero, it follows that  $u_{pot} \leq f_{ex}$ . Since

$f_{ex} = u_{pot} - T A_{ex}$ , this means  $A_{ex} \leq 0$ , which implies

$$\rho \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho} \right)_T \leq (n/d) f + (n/d) T A_{id}. \quad (20)$$

Let  $\tilde{f} = f - f_{id,c} + (d/2) kT$ . Then (20) can be rewritten as  $\rho \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \rho} \right) \leq (n/d) \tilde{f}$ , and if  $\tilde{f} \geq 0$  for  $\rho \geq \rho_2$ , it follows that

$$\tilde{f}(\rho, T) \leq \tilde{f}(\eta, T) \rho^{n/d} / \eta^{n/d} \quad \text{for } \rho \geq \eta \geq \rho_2. \quad (21)$$

This is a stronger result than Eq. (27) of ref. [1] for  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ . In the classical

case, for which  $f - f_{id} = f_{ex}$ , it reduces to a result for  $f_{ex}$  that is slightly weaker than our Eq. (15) as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ , owing to the extra  $(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{n})dkT(\rho\sigma)^{n/d}$  that is present when (21) is written in terms of  $f_{ex}$ .

Finally, we note that if  $v$  is the Lennard-Jones potential given by (1), with  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $const < 0$ ,  $n > m > d$ , and if  $v_0$  is the repulsive power-law potential  $\lambda r^{-n}$ , then (12) implies that any upper bound on  $f$  for the repulsive power-law potential is also an upper bound on  $f$  for the Lennard-Jones potential at a given  $\rho$  and  $T$ . As reported by us elsewhere<sup>3</sup> Eq.(12) also directly provides upper bounds in the Lennard-Jones case (as well as the power-law case) if one lets  $v_0$  be a hard-sphere potential.

We are indebted to G.A. Baker, Jr., and J. Groeneveld for helpful discussions.

#### REFERENCES

1. P. Kleban, Phys. Rev. Letters 22, 587 (1969).
2. P. Kleban and R.V. Lange, Phys. Rev. Letters 22, 1045 (1969).
3. G. Stell, Chem. Phys. Letters (to appear), J. Rasaiah and G. Stell, Mol. Phys. (to appear).
4. See for example A Isihara, J. Phys. A (Proc. Phys. Soc.) 1, 539 (1968).
5. G.A. Baker, Jr., Am. Journal Phys. 27, 29 (1959).
6. J.L. Lebowitz, Phys. Letters 28A, 596 (1969).