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1. Introduction

To successfully predict transport properties of real fluids from molecular simulation, the most critical problem is to develop an accurate interaction potential model. For polyatomic molecules, a widely used potential model is to represent the intermolecular interactions by multi-center Lennard–Jones plus either quadrupole or dipole moments. The parameters in this potential model were normally adjusted or optimized to experimental vapor–liquid equilibria data [1–4]. These potential models usually predict static thermodynamic properties more accurately than transport properties. To get better transport properties predictions, transport properties need to be used directly in the parameterization of the molecular potential [5]. Therefore, the predictions of transport properties by these potential models strongly depend on the existence and accuracy of the experimental data. In the last decades, with the increasing computing power, accurate determinations of intermolecular potential of polyatomic molecules by ab initio methods become feasible. As an example, it was found from the ab initio calculation [6] that the CO2 molecule is a linear molecule with the C–O bond length 1.162 Å which agrees with the experimental result [7]. Based on the linear molecular structure, a number of potential surfaces have been proposed for CO2–CO2 interaction [8–10]. They were all determined by ab initio methods and validated by comparing with experimental second virial coefficients. The accurate ab initio potentials make it possible to predict a variety of physical properties of fluids without using any experimental data. Once the accurate intermolecular potential is available, appropriate molecular simulation techniques should be employed to calculate the required fluid transport properties. There exist two standard methodologies, i.e., equilibrium molecular dynamics (EMD) which is based on the Einstein relations or Green–Kubo integral formulas [11–13] and non-equilibrium molecular dynamics (NEMD) in which the transport properties are measured by creating a flow in the fluid under study [14]. A lot of researchers prefer using NEMD because NEMD simulations were considered to be more efficient [15–18]. However, NEMD simulations are normally able to provide only one transport property at once [14], whereas EMD is a multi-property method. The thermodynamic properties and transport properties such as self-diffusion coefficient, viscosity and thermal conductivity can be all obtained from the output of a single equilibrium run. Moreover, when an anisotropic potential is used for the calculations of transport properties of a polyatomic gas, the molecular model is much more complicated than the isotropic Lennard–Jones molecular model. In this case, the overall efficiency of non-equilibrium methods is not necessary to be higher than the equilibrium simulations allowing for the need to extrapolate the non-equilibrium simulation results to thermodynamic equilibrium [19]. Therefore, EMD simulations are used in this work.

Although both ab initio potential of CO2 molecules and molecular simulation techniques exist, most of the researchers only used the ab initio potential to validate phase equilibrium properties of carbon dioxide [9,20,21]. The amount of calculations of transport properties such as viscosity and thermal conductivity based on the ab initio potential is scarce. On the other hand, there are several calculations of CO2 transport properties based on potential models...
optimized to experimental data [3, 18, 22]. However, the deviations between the simulated results and experimental data still reached 10% for self-diffusion coefficient [22], 5% for shear viscosity and 10% for thermal conductivity at low temperature and high densities [3]. A deviation of up to 30% was even found for thermal conductivities at relatively high temperature and low densities [18]. The large deviations are mainly caused by not sufficient accurate potential and inappropriate treatment of molecular vibrations. The purpose of the present work is to use CO2 gas as an example to demonstrate that if quantum effects of molecular vibrations are treated appropriately, the self-diffusion coefficient, shear viscosity and thermal conductivity of a polyatomic gas in a wide range of temperature can all be accurately determined from EMD simulations by employing an \textit{ab initio} potential. The three transport properties of CO2 gas at 1 atm and in the temperature range of 300–1000 K are calculated in this work. In this range of temperatures, accurate experimental data are available and can be used to validate the calculation method and the \textit{ab initio} potential employed in the work.

The \textit{ab initio} potential surfaces proposed for carbon dioxide all treated CO2 molecules as linear rigid rotors. Hence, in this work we assume the structure of CO2 is unaffected by the interaction between molecules. The self-diffusion coefficient and shear viscosity measure the transports of mass and momentum in the fluid. The influence of vibrational motions can be neglected in those calculations since the transfer of vibrational energy to rotational and translational degrees of freedom is extremely slow [9] and the vibrational energy can be considered as frozen in the molecule in the simulation. The thermal conductivity, however, measures the transport of energy through the fluid. Hence, the vibrational energy must be considered in the calculation of thermal conductivity.

Based on the above assumptions, the MD simulations are carried out in the microcanonical ensemble. The statistical errors in the calculations of the time correlation functions are inversely proportional to the square root of the simulation length. To obtain a relative precision of less than 1% in the time correlation function, it is necessary to conduct a run of $10^4$ correlation time [23]. An estimation based on the preliminary results in this work shows the correlation time for a CO2 gas in the temperature range of 300–1000 K is in the order of $10^5$ ps. Hence, long simulations up to the order of 100 μs are required to obtain accurate results. To save the total computational cost, the original \textit{ab initio} potential is employed with a small modification so that large time step sizes can be used without causing the energy conservation problem.

This paper is organized as follows. The following section provides the theoretical background of Green–Kubo formula. In Section 3, the \textit{modified ab initio} intermolecular potential and force are presented. In Section 4, we describe the MC method used for initializing the MD simulations. The results of the MD simulations compared to experimental results are given in Section 5. Finally, the conclusions are drawn in Section 6.

2. Theoretical background

In the time-correlation function theory, the three transport properties considered can be all calculated by either the Green–Kubo integral formulas or the Einstein–Helfand relations. Also, additional terms must be included allowing for discontinuous particle trajectories in a finite-system simulation with PBCs [25]. Hence, in this work we use the Green–Kubo formulas. The Green–Kubo formula for self-diffusion coefficient $D$ can be expressed as [14]

$$D = \frac{1}{V} \int_0^\infty dt \langle \hat{v}_i(t) \cdot \hat{v}_i(0) \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where \( \hat{v}_i \) is the translational velocity of \( i \)th molecule; \( t \) is the time; and \( \langle \cdot \rangle \) denotes ensemble average. To improve statistical accuracy, the velocity time correlation function is computed by averaging over 1000 molecules in the simulation.

The shear viscosity $\eta$ given by the Green–Kubo formula is [14]

$$\eta = \frac{V}{k_BT} \int_0^\infty dt \langle P_{\alpha\beta}(t) \cdot P_{\alpha\beta}(0) \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where

$$P_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{V} \left( \sum_i m v_i \nu_i \delta_{\alpha\beta} + \sum_{i>j} r_{ij} \delta_{\alpha\beta} \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

In Eqs. (2) and (3), the subscript $\alpha$ and $\beta$ denote the vector component. Due to the PBCs used in the simulation, the minimum-image convention is employed to find all interacting pairs. Since the viscosity is a multi-particle property, no additional averaging over the $N$ particles is possible to improve the statistical accuracy. The viscosity, therefore, requires much longer simulations than the self-diffusion coefficient to get accurate results.

The Green–Kubo formula relates the thermal conductivity $\lambda_T$ to the time autocorrelation function of the energy current via the following relation [14]

$$\lambda_T = \frac{V}{k_BT^2} \int_0^\infty dt \langle j_{\alpha}(t) j_{\alpha}(0) \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $j_{\alpha}$ is a component of the energy current, i.e., the time derivative of

$$\delta E = \frac{1}{V} \sum_i r_{i\alpha} (E_i - \langle E_i \rangle).$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

It is shown in the Appendix A that $j_{\alpha}$ can be expressed as

$$J_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{V} \left( \sum_i v_{i\alpha} E_i + \sum_i \sum_{j>i} r_{ij} \frac{dE_j}{dt} \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where $E_i$ is the energy of the molecule $i$ which contains the translational, rotational, vibrational and intermolecular potential energies

$$E_i = \frac{1}{2} m v_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} I_{ij} \omega_i^2 + E_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} U_{ij},$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

and $dE_{\alpha}/dt$ represents the time rate of the change of the energy in the molecule $i$ due to the interactions between molecule $i$ and molecule $j$ which can be expressed as

$$\frac{dE_{\alpha}}{dt} = \frac{1}{2} (\hat{v}_i + \hat{v}_j) \cdot \hat{F}_i + \frac{1}{2} (\hat{v}_i \cdot \hat{C}_{ij}^{-1} - \hat{u}_i \cdot \hat{G}_{ij} - \hat{u}_j \cdot \hat{G}_{ij}^{-1}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

In Eq. (7), $I$ and $m$ are, respectively, the moment of inertia and mass of the CO2 molecule; $E_{ij}$ and $U_{ij}$ are, respectively, the vibrational energy of the molecule $i$ and the intermolecular potential energy between the molecule $i$ and molecule $j$. The vibrational energies in Eq. (7) cannot be neglected especially for polyatomic molecules like CO2 which contain low-lying vibrational states. In Eq. (8), $\hat{u}_i$ is the rotational velocity of the molecule $i$ which is defined as $\hat{e}_i$, the time derivative of the unit vector along the molecular axis. $\hat{C}_{ij}$ and $\hat{G}_{ij}$ can be determined from the intermolecular forces by Eq. (9)

$$\bar{C}_{ij} = \sum_{\alpha} d_{ij\alpha} \hat{f}_{ij\alpha},$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)
where $d_{ia}$ is the distance of the site $a$ in the molecule $i$ relative to the center of mass. $f_{ia}$ is the force acting on the site $a$ in the molecule $i$ due to the interaction between the molecule $i$ and molecule $j$. $G_{ij}^p$ is the component of $G_{ij}$ perpendicular to $e_i$, i.e., the axis of the molecule $i$. Each time autocorrelation function is averaged over the autocorrelation functions of the energy currents in three directions, i.e., $J_x$, $J_y$, and $J_z$ to reduce the statistical uncertainty of the calculated thermal conductivity.

Due to the interactions among molecules in the system, the translational, rotational and intermolecular potential energies all vary with time. However, the vibrational energies are assumed as frozen in the molecules so that they have no influence on the molecular interactions.

3. Intermolecular potential

The intermolecular potential employed in the work was proposed by Bukowski et al. (BUK) [8]. The BUK potential was computed using the many-body symmetry-adapted perturbation theory (SAPT) and a large 5s3p2d1f basis set. In addition to BUK potential, there are two more $ab$ initio potentials proposed for the carbon dioxide dimer which were proved to have good qualities. One is Steinebrunner et al. potential based on the MP2 level of theory including full counterpoise corrections. The shapes of Bock et al. potential and the BUK potential are practically the same. They both used a site–site representation of the intermolecular potential, but in different analytical forms. From our preliminary tests, the application of the Bock et al.’s potential is more time-consuming in the calculations of intermolecular potentials and forces than that of the BUK potential. To save computational time, the BUK potential is employed in this work.

The site–site fit BUK potential reads

$$U_{BUK} = \sum_{a \in A, b \in B} \left[ \exp(\alpha_{ab} - \beta_{ab} r_{ab}) + \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{\alpha^{(k)}_{ab} q_{ab}^{(k) r_{ab}}}{r_{ab}^k} - f_{\alpha_{ab}}(\delta_{ab}^{(k) r_{ab}} r_{ab}^{(k)}) - f_{\beta_{ab}}(\delta_{ab}^{(k) r_{ab}} r_{ab}^{(k)}) \right],$$

where

$$f_n[x] = 1 - e^{-x} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{x^k}{k!}.$$

Here, sites $a$ belong to monomer A, sites $b$ belong to monomer B and $r_{ab}$ is the distance between $a$ and $b$. Each monomer contained five sites, with three corresponding to the centers of the atoms in CO$_2$ and the remaining two on the C–O bonds 0.8456 Å away from the C atom. Parameters $\alpha_{ab}, \beta_{ab}, \delta_{ab}^{(k) r_{ab}}, q_{ab}$ and $r_{ab}$ are given in Ref. [8].

Fig. 1 shows the shapes of the BUK potential for the parallel configuration and the slipped parallel configuration. Although the potential always tends to approach to zero at large intermolecular distances, it could be either a positive or a negative value around zero depending on the relative orientations of two molecules as shown in Fig. 1. Hence, a truncation and shifted procedure is not applicable to the BUK potential no matter the cut-off criterion is based on distance or energy. Hence, the original BUK potential is modified as follows

$$U_{AB} = \begin{cases} U_{BUK} & \text{if } r_{AB} \leq r_{cut} \\ 0 & \text{if } r_{AB} > r_{cut} \end{cases},$$

where $r_{AB}$ is the intermolecular distance and $r_{cut}$ is the cut-off distance. Both $r_{cut}$ and $r_{AB}$ are in atomic units. In this work, we set $r_{cut} = 12$ Å. With such a large cut-off distance, the use of an Ewald sum to treat long range Coulomb interactions is not necessary [9,21] which is assisted by the fact that CO$_2$ molecules are neither charged nor have a permanent dipole moment. The modified potential makes the intermolecular potential go smoothly to zero at the cut-off distance.

The modified potential also ensures the continuity of the intermolecular forces near the cut-off distance. In addition to the forces acting on five sites of each molecule, there is one more force acting on the center of mass of the molecule as shown below

$$\tilde{F}(r_{AB}) = U_{BUK} \left[ -\frac{f_{\alpha_{AB}}(\delta_{AB}^{(k) r_{AB}} r_{AB}^{(k)})}{r_{AB}} \right],$$

In a CO$_2$ molecule, the center of mass happens to be the carbon atom. Hence, this additional force is actually acting on the carbon atom. Using the modified potential, the forces and torques acting on molecules both go smoothly to zero at the cut-off distance. Thus, the problems in energy conservation and numerical instability in the equations of motion are both eliminated by the modified potential. A simple test of the modified potential shows the second virial coefficient calculated from the modified BUK potential at 300 K is only 0.4% higher than that calculated from the original truncated BUK potential. Hence, the macroscopic properties calculated from the modified BUK potential will not significantly deviate from the corresponding properties from the original potential.

4. Initialization and equilibration

Before attempting to compute proper simulation averages, the system must be equilibrated to both configuration and velocity...
distributions appropriate to a gas at the desired temperature and pressure. To save the simulation time for the equilibration process, the configuration of centers of mass and molecular orientations, the translational and rotational velocities should all be initialized at the desired temperature and pressure so that they can relax quickly to the appropriate configuration and velocity distributions.

4.1. The initial configuration and initial energies

The volume of the cubic simulation box is initialized by the ideal gas law

\[ V = \frac{Nk_BT}{P}, \]  

where \( P \) and \( T \) are the desired pressure and temperature of the gas; \( N = 4096 \) is the number of molecules in the system which has the same value in all simulations in this work. The center of mass coordinates \( r \) is initialized randomly inside the simulation box. The molecular orientations are initialized as random vectors with uniform solid angle.

The initial translational and rotational velocities are given by the Maxwell–Boltzmann distribution at a given temperature. Different from translational and rotational motions, the quantum effects of molecular vibrational motions cannot be neglected. The \( \text{CO}_2 \) molecule has four vibrational modes. The corresponding vibrational energy eigenvalues can be determined by solving the rovibrational Schrödinger equation of the molecule. To solve the rovibrational Schrödinger equation, it is necessary to calculate the intramolecular potential energy surface (PES) by ab initio method. An accurate \( \text{CO}_2 \) intramolecular PES has been calculated by Leonard et al. [26] using the coupled-cluster singles and doubles excitation with perturbative treatment of triple excitations method and the multi-reference configuration interaction method. Based on this result, the calculated vibrational energy eigenvalues corresponding to the 1st excited states of the symmetric stretching mode, the asymmetric stretching mode and the doubly degenerated bending mode are 1387.9 cm\(^{-1}\), 2348.8 cm\(^{-1}\) and 667 cm\(^{-1}\), respectively. Although the energy differences between any two neighboring energy states of each vibrational mode are not exactly constant due to the anharmonic component of the intramolecular potential and the Fermi resonance between different vibrational modes, we can still assume the vibrational energies of each mode are equally spaced without causing too much error in the calculations of thermal properties of \( \text{CO}_2 \) gas. Based on the quantum harmonic oscillator assumption, the vibrational energy of each molecule can be calculated by Eq. (15)

\[ E_V = \sum_{j=1}^{4} \left( n_j + \frac{1}{2} \right) E_{o,j}, \]  

where \( n_j \) means the vibrational energy level of \( j \)th vibrational mode; \( E_{o,j} \) is the fundamental vibrational transition energy of mode \( j \).

The average population distribution of vibrational energies fulfills the Boltzmann distribution. At a given temperature, the molecular vibrational energies are initialized by the Metropolis MC method [27]. At the beginning of the initialization, all molecules are on their ground vibrational energy states. Then, the Metropolis scheme is applied to each vibrational mode of each molecule in the system so that the molecules may be excited to higher energy states or decay to lower energy states. After tens of trial transitions, the average vibrational energy per molecule in the system started to fluctuate around a constant value as shown in Fig. 2. The fluctuating average vibrational energies correspond to different distributions of vibrational energies in the molecules. The average of these distributions is the Boltzmann distribution at the given temperature. Two thousands of these distributions are used to initialize the vibrational energies of the molecules in the system. Hence, each MD simulation actually starts with 2000 different initial vibrational energy distributions but with the same initial configuration and initial translational and rotational velocities. Once the vibrational energies are initialized, they do not change during the simulation. Therefore, 2000 time correlation functions of the energy current corresponding to 2000 different initial vibrational energy distributions are obtained from each MD simulation. These time correlation functions calculated from different initial states are then averaged to determine the final time autocorrelation function at the given temperature.

4.2. Equilibration

To equilibrate the system to the desired temperature and pressure, the system is coupled to a constant temperature and pressure bath using the approach proposed by Berendsen et al. [28]. At each
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Time step, translational velocities are scaled by a factor

\[ \lambda = \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{\tau_T} \left( \frac{T_0}{T} - 1 \right) \right)^{1/2}, \]  

where \( T_0 \) is the desired temperature varying from 300 K to 1000 K; \( \tau_T \) is the current translational temperature; \( \Delta t \) is the time step; and \( \tau_T \) is a preset time constant. The energy exchanges between the translational motion and rotational motion are fast. Hence, the scale factor can force both translational and rotational kinetic temperatures to the desired temperature. Simultaneously, the molecular center of mass coordinates is scaled by a factor of \( \mu \), and the volume of the simulation box is scaled by a factor of \( \mu^3 \) where

\[ \mu = \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{\tau_p} \beta_T (P - P_0) \right)^{1/3}. \]  

Here, \( P_0 \) is the desired pressure which is equal to 1 atm in this work; \( P \) is the instantaneous pressure; \( \tau_p \) is a time constant; and \( \beta_T \) is the isothermal compressibility. Since \( \beta_T \approx 1/P_0 \) for a gas, Eq. (17)
Table 1
The calculated and experimental values \cite{32,33} of self-diffusion coefficient and shear viscosity of CO₂ gas at 1 atm and in the temperature range of 300–1000 K. The deviations (%) are determined by calculated value – experimental value/ experimental value × 100. The experimental self-diffusion coefficients are obtained by linear interpolation of experimental data in Ref. \cite{33}. Statistical uncertainty of the simulation results is 0.1% for self-diffusion coefficient and 1% for both shear viscosity and thermal conductivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature (K)</th>
<th>Self-diffusion coefficient (D) (cm²/s)</th>
<th>Shear viscosity (\eta) (μPas)</th>
<th>Thermal conductivity (\lambda_T) (W/m K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300 K</td>
<td>Calculated 0.1142, Experimental 0.1192, % Deviation 4.19</td>
<td>Calculated 15.34, Experimental 15.13, % Deviation 1.39</td>
<td>Calculated 0.01646, Experimental 0.01679, % Deviation 1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 K</td>
<td>Calculated 0.2028, Experimental 0.2063, % Deviation 1.70</td>
<td>Calculated 19.79, Experimental 19.70, % Deviation 0.46</td>
<td>Calculated 0.02445, Experimental 0.02514, % Deviation 2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 K</td>
<td>Calculated 0.3116, Experimental 0.3103, % Deviation 0.42</td>
<td>Calculated 23.91, Experimental 24.02, % Deviation 0.46</td>
<td>Calculated 0.03237, Experimental 0.03350, % Deviation 3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 K</td>
<td>Calculated 0.4358, Experimental 0.4299, % Deviation 1.37</td>
<td>Calculated 28.51, Experimental 28.00, % Deviation 1.82</td>
<td>Calculated 0.04041, Experimental 0.04156, % Deviation 2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 K</td>
<td>Calculated 0.5771, Experimental 0.5640, % Deviation 2.32</td>
<td>Calculated 31.90, Experimental 31.68, % Deviation 0.69</td>
<td>Calculated 0.04851, Experimental 0.04930, % Deviation 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 K</td>
<td>Calculated 0.7310, Experimental 0.7123, % Deviation 2.63</td>
<td>Calculated 35.06, Experimental 35.09, % Deviation 0.09</td>
<td>Calculated 0.05536, Experimental 0.05671, % Deviation 2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 K</td>
<td>Calculated 0.8976, Experimental 0.8725, % Deviation 2.88</td>
<td>Calculated 38.18, Experimental 38.27, % Deviation 0.24</td>
<td>Calculated 0.06185, Experimental 0.06380, % Deviation 3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 K</td>
<td>Calculated 1.0770, Experimental 1.0448, % Deviation 3.06</td>
<td>Calculated 41.04, Experimental 41.26, % Deviation 0.53</td>
<td>Calculated 0.07034, Experimental 0.07057, % Deviation 0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \mu = \left[ 1 + \frac{\Delta t}{\tau_T} \left( \frac{P}{P_0} - 1 \right) \right]^{1/3} \]  \hspace{1cm} (18)

In the simulations, the time constants \(\tau_T\) and \(\tau_P\) are set to be 100 ps and 30 ps, respectively. At 1 atm, the long range correction to the pressure of CO₂ gas is negligible. Thanks to all these methods we use in the initialization and equilibration, the system is well equilibrated in 500 ps. After the system reaches the thermal equilibrium at the desired temperature and pressure, the coupling to the external bath is turned off and the MD simulation is carried out in a microcanonical ensemble. The translational temperature, the rotational kinetic temperature, and the pressure of the system all fluctuate around the desired values during the simulation as shown in Fig. 3. The energy exchange between the translational and rotational motions is evident. Fig. 4(a) and (b) depicts the distributions of translational energy and rotational energy obtained from simulations and the corresponding Boltzmann energy distributions at the desired temperature. The good agreement between the calculated results and the theoretical results proves the system is in thermodynamic equilibrium.

5. Simulation details and results

We carried out MD simulations in microcanonical ensembles for pure CO₂ gas in the temperature range of 300–1000 K to calculate the self-diffusion coefficients, shear viscosity and thermal conductivity. The equations of molecular translational motions are integrated by the Verlet leap-frog algorithm. The Singer leap-frog algorithm \cite{29} which constrains the bond length to be a constant is applied to integrate the equations of molecular rotational motions. The modified BUK potential is used for molecular interactions. Compared to the standard LJ potential, the BUK potential has a much more complex form. Therefore, the calculations of forces and potentials are much more time-consuming. To ensure the time step size does not significantly influence the results for the macroscopic properties of the system, the total energy of the system should be kept constant within two parts in \(10^5\) \cite{30}. Thanks to the modified BUK potential, a time step of 12.5 fs can be used for low temperatures up to 500 K and a 10-fs time step is appropriate for the gas temperature up to 800 K. For higher temperatures, smaller step size of 8.5 fs should be chosen to assure the energy conservation.

The correlation time \(\tau_c\) for the three properties of interest can be calculated by Eq. (14) \cite{23}

\[ \tau_c = \int_0^{\infty} dt \frac{\langle A \partial A(t) \rangle}{\langle A^2(0) \rangle}, \]  \hspace{1cm} (19)

where \(A = v_i\) for self-diffusion coefficient; \(A = P_{ij}\) for shear viscosity; and \(A = J_{ij}\) for thermal conductivity. Fig. 5 shows the relation between the correlation times and temperature. It can be seen from Fig. 5 that the velocity correlation times are close to the energy current correlation times and are about 50% higher than the correlation time of off-diagonal element of pressure tensor in the temperature range from 300 K to 1000 K. The correlation times of CO₂ gas are generally on the order of 100 ps. The total simulation length of...
order 10 ps, therefore, must be run in order to reduce the statistical errors to less than 1%. If the time step is 10 fs, the total number of steps is about $10^9$. This means a very computational demanding simulation is required. As suggested by Hess and Evans [31], the ensemble average can also be obtained from shorter parallel runs starting from statistically independent initial states. Hence, at each temperature, the long simulation is divided into 100 shorter parallel runs which are independently initialized and equilibrated at the given temperature by the method described in Section 4. Depending on the temperature of the system (300–1000K), the length of each parallel run varies between 60 ns and 140 ns to assure low statistical errors. The final time correlation functions are obtained by averaging the time correlation functions calculated from shorter parallel runs.

Figs. 6(a), 7(a) and 8(a) depict, respectively, the calculated normalized correlation functions of the velocity, the off-diagonal element of pressure tensor and the energy current at 300 K, 600 K and 900 K. The self-diffusion coefficients $D$, shear viscosities $\eta$ and thermal conductivities $\lambda T$ are determined by the time integrals of the corresponding correlation functions. The results are depicted, respectively, in Figs. 6(b), 7(b) and 8(b). After $10 t_c$, no significant contribution to time integrals of correlation functions is observed and the integrals fluctuate around a constant. We evaluate the three transport properties by the averages of those fluctuating values between $10 t_c$ and $30 t_c$ at each temperature. The statistical errors are obtained from the mean-square deviation of the time correlation functions. Due to the large statistics in the calculations, the statistical error of the self-diffusion coefficient $D$ is less than 0.1%, while the shear viscosity $\eta$ and thermal conductivity $\lambda T$ has a statistical error of about 1%. The magnitude of the statistical errors can be further reduced by longer simulations if larger computational resources are available.

The results of all transport properties between 300 K and 1000 K are summarized in Table 1. The experimental data [32,33] at different temperatures are also included in Table 1 to compare with the calculated results. The uncertainty of the experimental data was estimated to be 5% for self-diffusion coefficients and 0.9% for shear viscosity [32]. The accuracy of the experimental thermal conductivity of carbon dioxide is estimated to be $\pm 1\%$ near room temperature and $\pm 2\%$ at the higher temperatures [33]. From Table 1 we can see the average deviations between the calculated and experimental values for self-diffusion coefficient and shear viscosity are 2.32%, and 0.71%, respectively. The excellent agreement indicates the linear rigid rotor assumption of the CO$_2$ molecule is valid even at 1000K. As shown in Table 1, the calculated thermal conductivities underestimate the experimental values by 2.30% averagely. The deviation can be further reduced if the aharmonic vibrations of molecules are taken into account. Compared to the calculated CO$_2$ thermal conductivities from other authors who obtained a deviation of 35% without considering the vibrational energies and a deviation of 22% with a classical treatment of the vibrational motions [18], our quantum mechanical treatment of the vibrational energies greatly improves the accuracy of the calculated thermal conductivity. Overall, excellent agreements are achieved for all the three transport properties of interest.

6. Conclusions

The EMD and the time correlation theory are employed in this work to determine the transport properties of CO$_2$ gas. The calculations demonstrate a procedure of determination of self-diffusion coefficient, shear viscosity and thermal conductivity of a polyatomic gas without using any experimental data. All the parameters used in the calculations such as the C–O bond length, moment of inertia, intermolecular potential and vibrational energy eigen values are determined by $ab\text{ initio}$ method. In order to take into account the quantum effects of molecular vibrations, a MC method is used to initialize the vibrational energies at the given temperature. The good agreement of calculated values with the experimental data validates the rigid rotor and frozen vibrational energy assumptions we made at the beginning of the calculations. Since the vibrational energies do not vary with time in the simulation after they are initialized, the vibrational contribution to the thermal conductivity might be reduced to a simpler form by separating the terms involving the vibrational energies from those involving other energies which vary continuously with time. If this simplification can be achieved, a more efficient calculation of the thermal conductivity will be possible.

The present method can be readily extended to the calculations of transport properties of other gases or gas mixtures which contain monatomic, diatomic or polyatomic molecules at different temperatures as long as the accurate intermolecular potentials are available.

List of symbols

\[ d_{ia} \] the distance of the site $a$ in the molecule $i$ relative to the center of mass
Greek letters

- \( \beta \): isothermal compressibility
- \( \eta \): shear viscosity
- \( \lambda \): scale factor of velocity
- \( \lambda_T \): thermal conductivity
- \( \mu \): scale factor of intermolecular distance
- \( \beta_{\alpha \beta} \): off-diagonal element of pressure tensor
- \( \tau_T \): time constant for temperature relaxation
- \( \tau_p \): time constant for pressure relaxation
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Appendix A.

Derivation of the expression for the energy current

\[
J_a = \frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{1}{V} \sum_i r_{a i} (E_i - \langle E_i \rangle) \right). \tag{A1}
\]

In a constant NVE ensemble, volume \( V \) and average energy \( \langle E_i \rangle \) are both constant.

\[
J_a = \frac{1}{V} \left( \sum_i r_{a i} (E_i - \langle E_i \rangle) + \sum_i \frac{dE_i}{dt} \right) = \frac{1}{V} \left( \sum_i r_{a i} E_i + \sum_i \frac{dE_i}{dt} \right). \tag{A2}
\]

The total momentum of the system is kept constant during the simulation. The initial value of the total momentum is set to zero so that \( \sum_i r_{a i} = 0 \). Hence, the term \( \sum_i r_{a i} (E_i - \langle E_i \rangle) \) vanishes. The time derivative of \( E_i \) is

\[
\frac{dE_i}{dt} = m_i \frac{d\mathbf{v}_i}{dt} + \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{u}_i}{dt} - E_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} \left[ \frac{\partial U_{ij}}{\partial r_{ij}} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_j}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial U_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{u}_j} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{u}_j}{dt} + \frac{\partial U_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{u}_i} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{u}_i}{dt} \right] = \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{F}_{ij} + \sum_{j \neq i} \left[ \mathbf{F}_{ij} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j) + \mathbf{G}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{G}_{ji} \cdot \mathbf{u}_j \right], \tag{A3}
\]

where \( dE_i/dt = 0 \) because the vibrational energy is assumed as frozen in the molecule. The intermolecular potential \( U_{ij} \) is not only a function of \( r_{ij} \), the distance between the centers of mass, but also a function of molecular orientations \( \mathbf{v}_i \) and \( \mathbf{v}_j \). Therefore, the chain rule is used to determine the time derivative of \( U_{ij} \). Note \( \mathbf{G}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{G}_{ji} \cdot \mathbf{u}_j \) since \( \mathbf{u}_i \) is perpendicular to the molecular axis \( \mathbf{e}_i \) and \( \mathbf{e}_j \). Therefore, the second summation in Eq. (A2) is

\[
\sum_i \frac{dE_i}{dt} = \sum_i \frac{dE_i}{dt} \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} \left[ \mathbf{F}_{ij} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j) + \mathbf{G}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{G}_{ji} \cdot \mathbf{u}_j \right] \right) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{k \neq j} \sum_{l \neq j} \left[ \mathbf{F}_{ij} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j) + \mathbf{G}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{G}_{ji} \cdot \mathbf{u}_j \right] \]

where \( \mathbf{F}_{ij} = -\mathbf{F}_{ji} \) according to Newton’s third law and \( r_{ij} = r_{ji} \).

Note \( \mathbf{G}_{ij} \neq \mathbf{G}_{ji} \). Comparing Eq. (A4) to the second term of Eq. (6), one gets

\[
\frac{dE_{\text{ij}}}{dt} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j) \cdot \mathbf{F}_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{G}_{ij} - \mathbf{u}_j \cdot \mathbf{G}_{ji}), \tag{A5}
\]
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