High-Resolution Measurements of $e^+ + \text{H}_2\text{O}$ Total Cross Section
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Using a purely electrostatic positron beam, the total cross section of positrons scattering from H$_2$O has been measured for the first time with a high angular discrimination (=1°) against forward scattered projectiles. Results are presented in the energy range (10–300) eV. Significant deviations from previous measurements are found which are, if ascribed entirely to the angular variations of various experimental systems, in quantitative accord with ab initio theoretical predictions of the differential elastic scattering cross section.
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While the apparent imbalance between matter and antimatter in the Universe remains a major puzzle in science [1,2], much progress in the understanding of the interactions between the two has been achieved through studies of controlled collisions of positrons ($e^+$) and positronium (Ps, the short-lived atom made of an electron and a positron) with atoms and molecules [3–7].

At low energies, the static and polarization interactions tend to cancel for positrons reducing their scattering probability in comparison with electrons. However, polarization often enhances direct ionization by positrons, so that they can be more penetrating and more ionizing than electrons, a result of potential import in analyses of astrophysical (e.g., [8]) and atmospheric events (e.g., [9]) as well as in positron-track simulations for dosimetry in positron emission tomography (e.g., [10]). In turn, these studies contribute to the motivation for investigating the interaction of $e^+$ with water which accounts for about 60% of the human body and which is the most abundant greenhouse gas in the atmosphere.

Measurements of positron-water total cross section ($\sigma_T$) were first carried out 30 years ago [11,12]. Since then, only a few new results have been added, experimentally [13–15] and theoretically [16,17], without a satisfactory agreement emerging among them. The integral ($\sigma_\text{el}$) and differential ($d\sigma_\text{el}/d\Omega$) elastic (el) scattering cross sections for $e^+ + \text{H}_2\text{O}$ have also been measured recently [17], complementing theoretical determinations [18,19].

Because of the long-range forces involved in the scattering of charged projectiles from a polar molecule such as H$_2$O, one of the major difficulties in measuring $\sigma_T$ (even in the case of electrons, e.g., [20–23]) lies in discriminating against the considerable flux of small forward-angle scattered particles (FSPs) (e.g., [16,19]). The largest error associated with FSPs arises from elastic scattering and rovibrational inelastic processes which cannot be easily distinguished from the incident flux via energy loss discrimination since this is smaller than (or comparable to) typical beam energy resolutions (e.g., the first vibrational excitation from the ground state $J=0$ is $\approx 1595$ cm$^{-1}$ [24]). Detection of FSPs leads to a systematic underestimate of the beam attenuation and, thus, the measured total cross sections. In this respect, beams that employ magnetic fields are more likely to transport FSPs from the interaction region to the detector, with a dependence of $\sigma_T$ upon the magnetic field strength persisting even for weak fields (e.g., $\approx 4–9$ Gauss [11,12]). This type of systematic effect can be reduced by using electrostatic beams which enable both the interaction and detection regions to be field free, thus, facilitating the attainment of a smaller (energy-independent) angular acceptance [25–27].

For targets with a low polarizability, $\alpha$ (e.g., $\approx 1.38$ a.u. for He), FSPs effects are small (e.g., [25]). However, in the case of H$_2$O ($\alpha \approx 9.8$ a.u. and permanent dipole moment, $d = 1.85$ D), they are expected to result in large errors [16,19], e.g., $\approx 100\%$ of the measured $\sigma_T$ at 10 eV [28]. In order to remedy this, theoretical $d\sigma_\text{el}/d\Omega$, in conjunction with the experimental angular resolutions, are routinely employed to compute the FSPs contribution and to correct the measured $\sigma_T$ [15,17,28].

In this Letter, we present $\sigma_T$ for $e^+ + \text{H}_2\text{O}$ measured for the first time with a fully electrostatic positron beam characterized by an angular discrimination against FSPs of $\approx 1°$. The total cross sections have been measured in the energy range (10–300) eV. The lower limit is just below the first ionization threshold $E_i = 12.62$ eV and slightly above the Ps formation threshold, $E_{\text{Ps}} = 5.82$ eV.

The equipment used for this experiment has been described previously [29]. Briefly, positrons from a $^{22}\text{Na}$ source are moderated by a stack of three annealed tungsten meshes (20 μm wire and 70% transmission) [30]. A set of primary lenses transports the beam at 3 keV from the moderator and focuses it to a small beam spot ($R \approx 1$ mm) at the remoderator. This is an annealed W(100) foil (thickness $\approx 50$ nm) with a measured remoderation efficiency of 0.1 [29]. The remoderator (rm) is floated at a
potential \(V_{\text{rm}}\) to accelerate the positrons to the required beam energy \(E_+ = eV_{\text{rm}} + |\phi|\), where \(\phi = -2.7 \pm 0.1\) eV is the positron work function for the current remoderator \([29]\), and \(e\) is the elementary charge. The positrons are then transported around a 90° bend through a cylindrical mirror analyzer before reaching the interaction region. Here, an aluminium cylindrical cell is situated of length = 53 mm, inner radius = 25.4 mm, and aperture radius = 0.5 mm \([25]\). A position sensitive detector (PSD) terminates the flight path. In front of the detector, two grids are mounted that enable retarding potential analysis. The inner grid is also used, during the total cross section measurements, to reflect inelastically forward scattered particles and to bias the beam off during the background measurements, as explained later.

The beam has an angular divergence of 1° and an energy spread of 1% of \(E_+\) \([29]\). During the course of the current work, beam rates were \((0.02–1.5) e^+ s^{-1}\) in the energy range \((10–300)\) eV.

The angular acceptance (\(\theta\)) for FSPs is energy independent. It is set by geometrical constraints and can be varied by selecting appropriate regions of interest within the beam spot at the PSD. If we consider the cell-to-detector distance \(D = 130\) mm, we can define \(\theta = \arctan(R_b/D) \approx 1^\circ\), where \(R_b\) is the beam spot radius at the PSD, typically \(<2\) mm.

The total cross section is determined by measuring the attenuation of the beam through the scattering cell containing water vapor. If \(I_0\) and \(I\) are, respectively, the incident and transmitted (unscattered) beam intensities, the total cross section is simply given by the Beer-Lambert law

\[
\sigma_T = \frac{k_B T}{P I} \ln \left( \frac{I_0}{I} \right),
\]

where \(P\) and \(T\) are the target gas pressure and temperature, respectively, \(I\) is the length of the positron path through the gas and \(k_B\) the Boltzmann constant. The temperature was \((291 \pm 1)\) K, the pressure was measured by a capacitance manometer (MKS 627D Baratron) temperature stabilized to 45°C. Thermal transpiration corrections (\(=3.5\%) have been applied using the method of \([31]\) with the parameters for H\(_2\)O of \([32]\). The gas flow into the cell was controlled by an electric valve; typical cell pressures were around \((0.1–0.4)\) Pa. During the \(I_0\) runs, a second valve was used to introduce gas directly into the system, bypassing the cell in order to maintain the same background pressure conditions of \(\approx2 \times 10^{-7}\) mbar throughout the \(I_0\) and \(I\) runs.

The measurements were carried out by alternating a run with gas introduced into the cell and a run with gas admitted through the bypass valve. A pause of 30 minutes, with both valves shut, allowed the cell and the system to be evacuated before a new run was started. Before recording the gas run, a wait of 15 minutes was imposed to let the

FIG. 1. (a) example of 2D image of the beam spot as seen at the PSD; (b) and (c) beam spot projections on PSD x axis and y axis: (red continuous line) \(I_0\) run, (blue dashed line) \(I\) run, (black dots) background. From this kind of plot, the beam center is extracted as explained in the text. (d) Example of the radial dependence of the total cross section for \(e^+ + H_2\)O scattering at 30 eV (green bullets, main figure), obtained by averaging the set of total cross section measurements (blue bullets, inset).
pressure stabilize in the cell. During this wait, a background run was started by applying to the inner grid a potential \( V = 9 \) V above \( V_{\text{rm}} \). This enabled multiple background acquisitions throughout the whole run. The same grid was biased at \( V_{\text{rm}} \) during the beam-on measurements in order to repel inelastically scattered particles.

The PSD at the end of the beam line allows for 2D imaging of the beam spot as seen in Fig. 1(a). The center was found by analyzing the projection of the beam spot on the \( x \) and \( y \) axes, as in Figs. 1(b) and 1(c). The \( Q^{(i)} \) coordinate of the center is calculated as

\[
Q^{(i)} = \sum_j g_j^{(i)} q_j^{(i)} \quad i = x, y, \tag{2}
\]

where \( g_j^{(i)} \) is the rate (after background subtraction) at the \( q_j^{(i)} \) coordinate.

In order to extract the total cross section, the beam rates were computed by summing the number of events in concentric disks of increasing radii around the center of the beam spot on the PSD. This analysis yields a radial profile of the beam rates and, hence, of the total cross section, as seen in Fig. 1(d). The total cross section radial profile shows large error bars at small radii mainly due to the low count rate within small sized domains. However, in addition to this statistical uncertainty, potential systematic errors may arise from a possible mismatch between the beam center for the \( I_0 \) and \( I \) runs which would be more significant at small radii. In the current work, the radius yielding the minimal statistical error on \( \sigma_T \) has been retained as the beam radius. This generally agrees well with the radius extracted from the intensity radial profiles [25].

The current results for the total cross sections of \( e^+ + \text{H}_2\text{O} \) are displayed in Fig. 2 together with (a) earlier experimental and (b) theoretical determinations. Previous results for the elastic scattering cross sections are shown in the inset of Fig. 2(b). In all cases, the direct measurements are illustrated as solid symbols, those corrected for FSPs effects (using various theoretical \( d\sigma/d\Omega \) and experimental angular resolutions as in the original works) are shown as hollow symbols.

Considering the direct measurements of \( \sigma_T \) first, the discrepancy between the present and previous determinations [11,13–15] is evident across the whole energy range; for instance the current measurement being a factor of 1.4–2 higher at 10 eV. Two theoretical predictions of \( \sigma_T \) are shown in Fig. 2(b). The spherical complex optical potential (SCOP) [16] employed an isotropic complex potential to describe the interaction between positron and water molecule, the imaginary component of the potential chosen of the same form as for electrons and empirically scaled using \( e^+ \) data. The independent atomic model (IAM) [17] calculated the scattering amplitudes for each of the atoms independently using the optical potential theory, then adding them in order to obtain \( \sigma_T \) for the molecule. The internal structure of the molecule was considered by applying the screen corrected additive rule (SCAR), previously used to calculate electron-molecule scattering with good accuracy in the energy range (10–1000) eV (e.g., [34,35]) and, more recently, adapted to describe positron-molecule scattering [17,36,37]. The model does not include vibrational and rotational cross sections, which have been calculated using the first Born approximation. Our direct measurements display a similar energy dependence to the results of the SCOP calculation above 50 eV and to the IAM-SCAR results above 30 eV, consistently with the expected range of validity of each theory [16,17]. In these ranges, the measurements are, respectively, \( \simeq 20\% \) higher and \( \simeq 15\% \) lower than the theories.

![Figure 2](image-url)
TABLE I. Angular acceptance \( \theta \) and corresponding total cross section measurements at 10 eV. The errors deriving from FSPs, \( \Delta = 2\pi \int_0^\theta (\sin(\theta')d\sigma_{el}/d\Omega)d\theta' \) are calculated using the theoretical differential elastic scattering cross section of [33]. (The angular acceptance of [11] has not been found in the literature).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>( \theta )</th>
<th>( \sigma_T \times 10^{-20} , \text{[m}^2] )</th>
<th>( \Delta \times 10^{-20} , \text{[m}^2] )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current work</td>
<td>1°</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zscca et al., [13]</td>
<td>6°</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makochekanwa et al., [15]</td>
<td>7°</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beale et al., [14]</td>
<td>12°</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also depicted in Fig. 2(a) are the \( \sigma_T \) obtained in [11] and corrected by [28] using the theoretical electron-water \( d\sigma_{el}/d\Omega \) of [38]. For positrons, elastic scattering cross sections have been calculated using \( \text{ab initio} \) methods, namely, a close coupling single center approach [19] and a (rotationally summed) \( R \)-matrix method [18,33]. In the latter, a correction was applied (via the first Born approximation) to account for the large angular momentum terms involved in the long range dipole interaction [18,33]. The correction was not needed in the close coupling single center method as many partial wave terms were directly included in the wave function expansion yielding a convergence of the series [19]. As displayed in the inset of Fig. 2(b), the predictions of the two theories are close. The only measurement of \( \sigma_{el}(e^+) \) [17] is also included in the figure and is consistent with theory [17,33] after applying FSPs corrections of, e.g., \( \approx 200\% \) at 5 eV [17]. Makochekanwa et al [15] corrected their \( \sigma_T \) measurements using the theoretical \( d\sigma_{el}/d\Omega \) of [39]. Both sets of corrected \( \sigma_T \) results [15,28] are seen to be in broad agreement with the present direct measurements. In fact, at 10 eV, where the range of validity of the \( R \)-Matrix theory [33] overlaps the range investigated in the present work, the deviations among the various measurements are entirely resolved if allowance is made for FSPs effects using the angular resolutions of the experimental systems and the theoretical predictions of \( d\sigma_{el}/d\Omega \) [33], as computed in Table I and illustrated in Fig. 3. This implies that, at this energy, elastic scattering accounts for \( \sigma_{el}/\sigma_T \approx 80\% \) of all collision processes.

In conclusion, the total cross section of \( e^+ + \text{H}_2\text{O} \) has been measured; for the first time, in field-free interaction and detection regions in the energy range (10–300) eV. The high angular discrimination of the current experiment (\( \approx 1\degree \)) greatly reduces the systematic errors arising from forward scattered projectiles enabling, for the first time, a direct comparison with theories. The experiment has yielded values 50%–100% higher than previous measurements, in quantitative agreement with theoretical predictions in their range of validity. Further high-resolution measurements of \( \sigma_T \) and first \( d\sigma_{el}/d\Omega \) (\( \theta \leq 10\degree \)) are planned.

The data supporting this publication are available at UCL Discovery at [40].
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