

ASSESSMENT OF THE FLUORESCENCE AND AUGER DATABASE USED IN PLASMA MODELING

T. W. GORCZYCA, C. N. KODITUWAKKU, K. T. KORISTA, AND O. ZATSARINNY
Department of Physics, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008;
gorczyca@wmich.edu

N. R. BADNELL
Department of Physics, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow G4 0NG, UK

E. BEHAR
Physics Department, Technion, Haifa 32000, Israel

M. H. CHEN
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA 94550

AND

D. W. SAVIN
Columbia Astrophysics Laboratory, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027
Received 2002 December 16; accepted 2003 March 25

ABSTRACT

We have investigated the accuracy of the $1s$ vacancy fluorescence database of Kaastra & Mewe resulting from the initial atomic physics calculations and the subsequent scaling along isoelectronic sequences. In particular, we have focused on the relatively simple Be- and F-like $1s$ vacancy sequences. We find that the earlier atomic physics calculations for the oscillator strengths and autoionization rates of *singly charged* B II and Ne II are in sufficient agreement with our present calculations. However, the substantial charge dependence of these quantities along each isoelectronic sequence, the incorrect configuration averaging used for B II, and the neglect of spin-orbit effects (which become important at high Z) all cast doubt on the reliability of the Kaastra & Mewe data for application to plasma modeling.

Subject headings: atomic data — atomic processes — line: formation — X-rays: general

1. INTRODUCTION

In collisionally ionized or X-ray photoionized plasmas, high-energy electrons or photons lead to the production of $1s$ vacancy ionic states which then decay via sequential emission of single or multiple electrons and/or photons. The exact strengths of these competing processes determine fundamentally important quantities of the plasma, such as the ionization balance and the observed spectra of emitted and/or absorbed photons. Hence, interpreting the properties of these plasmas requires accurate atomic physics calculations for the various autoionization and radiative rates. Here we are interested in assessing the accuracy of the available database that provides such computed (or inferred) Auger rates and fluorescence yields to the astrophysics community. The accuracy of these atomic data are crucial to the interpretation of the spectra of photoionized plasmas such as are found in X-ray binaries and active galactic nuclei. These data are also important for supernova remnants (SNRs) under conditions of nonequilibrium ionization (NEI).

Two of the more widely used spectral codes for modeling photoionized plasmas are CLOUDY (Ferland et al. 1998) and XSTAR (Kallman & Bautista 2001). A commonly used code for modeling NEI in SNRs is that of Borkowski, Lyerly, & Reynolds (2001). These all, in turn, rely on the table of electron and photon emission probabilities compiled by Kaastra & Mewe (1993). This comprehensive database considers the sequential multiple electron and/or photon ejections for all stages of all $1s$ vacancy ions in the periodic table up through zinc. In order to produce such a massive array of numbers, however, certain approximations, questionable from a purely theoretical atomic physics

standpoint, were invoked. First, the only rigorously computed atomic rates were taken from the early works of McGuire (1969, 1970, 1971, 1972) for *singly charged ions*, which furthermore neglected configuration interaction (CI) and spin-orbit effects. Due to the limited computational resources available at the time and the approximations thus needed to perform such calculations, even these cannot be considered as reliable as those that can be carried out with today's state-of-the-art capabilities. Second, these singly ionized results were then scaled along entire isoelectronic sequences, assuming constant autoionization rates and oscillator strengths: this approximation is the least valid for near-neutrals.

A third approximation used by Kaastra & Mewe (1993) is that the electron and photon emission yields were computed using radiative and autoionization rates that were configuration averaged over possible terms, and the fluorescence yield was then given as a ratio of the averaged radiative rate to the sum of the averaged radiative and averaged Auger rate. For modeling purposes, however, this is incorrect: the actual required value is the average of the term-specific yields—an average of ratios rather than a ratio of averages. In other words, the relative probability of producing each specific inner-shell vacancy term and its subsequent term-specific decay needs to be considered, and this was not done correctly for the data compiled by Kaastra & Mewe (1993; see also Chen, Craseman, & Matthews 1985 for a further discussion).

In this paper, we investigate the validity of the above three approximations in order to assess the accuracy of the resultant data base of Kaastra & Mewe (1993). To this end, we first study the simplest $1s$ vacancy system that can

radiate via a $2p \rightarrow 1s$ dipole-allowed transition. This is the removal of a $1s$ electron from the ground-state B-like sequence, or rather the $1s2s^22p$ Be-like inner-shell excited sequence, which is investigated in the next section and further simplified by the fact that only one electron or one photon can be emitted. We follow in § 3 with a study of the simplest closed- (outer-) shell case of F-like ions, corresponding to $1s$ vacancies from the Ne-like sequence. A summary of our findings and concluding remarks are then given in § 4.

2. CASE STUDY OF THE Be-LIKE FLUORESCENCE YIELDS

Inner-shell $1s$ vacancy of a Be-like ion, whether by photoionization or electron-impact ionization of B-like ions (or by photoexcitation or electron-impact excitation of Be-like ions) results in either the $1s2s^22p(^1P)$ state or the $1s2s^22p(^3P)$ state. From an independent particle perspective, in LS coupling (where spin-orbit and other relativistic effects are neglected so that the total orbital and spin angular momentum L and S , respectively, are conserved) the following competing decay processes can then occur:

$$1s2s^22p(^1P) \xrightarrow{A_r} 1s^22s^2(^1S) + \omega, \quad (1)$$

$$1s2s^22p(^{1,3}P) \xrightarrow{A_{a1}} 1s^22s^2(^2S)\epsilon p(^{1,3}P), \quad (2)$$

$$1s2s^22p(^{1,3}P) \xrightarrow{A_{a2}} 1s^22p(^2P)\epsilon s(^{1,3}P), \quad (3)$$

i.e., the $1s$ vacancy state can either fluoresce, if it is in the 1P state with a radiative rate A_r , or autoionize from either state, with a total state-dependent rate, $A_a = A_{a1} + A_{a2}$, yielding free electrons denoted by ϵl . (If left in the 3P state, the ion does not fluoresce. We consider CI and spin-orbit effects in the next section.) The radiative rate A_r in atomic units (1 a.u. = $4.1341 \times 10^{16} \text{ s}^{-1}$) is related to the dimensionless emission oscillator strength f by

$$A_r = 2\omega^2\alpha^3f, \quad (4)$$

where ω is the emitted photon energy in a.u. (1 a.u. of energy = 27.211 eV) and $\alpha \approx 1/137$ is the fine-structure constant. Here we define the emission oscillator strength as the absolute value of the oscillator strength from the upper $1s2s^22p(^1P)$ term j to the lower $1s^22s^2(^1S)$ term i :

$$f \equiv |f_{ji}|, \quad (5)$$

and can thus be related to the absorption oscillator strength f_{ij} from the lower term i to the upper term j via

$$g_i f_{ij} = g_j |f_{ji}|, \quad (6)$$

where $g_i = 1$ and $g_j = 3$ are the statistical weights of the initial and final Be-like terms, respectively.

Oscillator strengths are more convenient quantities to use along isoelectronic sequences because they exhibit certain bounds. Since the absorption oscillator strength is bounded by $0 \leq f_{ij} \leq N_i$, where $N_i = 2$ is the number of $1s$ electrons, the emission oscillator strength is bounded by $0 \leq f \leq (g_i/g_j)N_i = 2/3$ (for the present cases), and is a well-behaved function of the nuclear charge Z . In fact, if the hydrogenic approximation is valid, i.e., if the nuclear potential dominates over the interelectronic repulsive potential, then the emission oscillator strength is *independent* of Z ,

and the same is true for the autoionization rate A_a . Such an approximation is valid for highly charged ions but not for lower charged species.

The fluorescence yield ξ , from a given inner-shell vacancy state, is a measure of the relative probabilities of the radiative and autoionization decay pathways and is defined as

$$\xi \equiv \frac{A_r}{A_r + A_a} = \frac{\omega^2}{\omega^2 + (1/2\alpha^3)(A_a/f)}. \quad (7)$$

Thus, it depends only on the squared transition energy ω^2 and the ratio of the autoionization rate to the emission oscillator strength A_a/f . In the hydrogenic approximation, these scale respectively with nuclear charge as q^4 and q^0 (i.e., independent of q), where $q = Z - 3$ is the asymptotic ionic charge seen by the outermost electron of the Be-like ion (Cowan 1981). With these scaling properties, the expected behaviors at low Z and high Z are $\xi \approx 0$ and $\xi \approx 1$ (provided $f \neq 0$), respectively.

2.1. Initial Populations, Configuration Interaction, and Spin-Orbit Effects

As pointed out in § 2, both the 1P and 3P terms can be populated after $1s$ photoionization or electron-impact ionization. Following Cowan (1981) and using the sudden approximation, we have determined that the probability of populating each term can be deduced by considering the squared recoupling coefficient

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \langle [(1s1s)(^1S)]2p(^2P) | [(1s2p)(\{^{2\mathcal{S}+1}P\})]1s(^2P) \rangle \right|^2 \\ &= \left| (-1)^{1+\mathcal{S}} (2\mathcal{S}+1)^{1/2} \begin{Bmatrix} \mathcal{S} & 1/2 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 1/2 & 1/2 \end{Bmatrix} \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{2\mathcal{S}+1}{4}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\mathcal{S} = 0$ for the 1P state and $\mathcal{S} = 1$ for the 3P state. This means that the states are populated according to their statistical weights, and the 1P state is populated with a probability of $1/4$. (In general, there also should be a recoupling coefficient involving the orbital angular momenta of the three electrons in eq. [8]; however, the $l = 0$ values for two of the electrons' orbital momenta reduces the coefficient to unity for the present case.) We have also verified this computationally by performing R -matrix photoionization calculations using the Wigner-Eisenbud R -matrix method (Burke & Berrington 1993; Berrington, Eissner, & Norrington 1995). Using both approaches, we find that, in intermediate coupling, the states are also populated according to their statistical weights. (A similar expression to eq. [8], involving the total angular momentum values j for each electron, can be obtained.)

Considering the relative populations of the $1s2s^22p$ $1s$ vacancy states, the desired quantity for plasma modeling purposes is the configuration-average fluorescence yield. If CI and spin-orbit effects are neglected, this can be defined as an average over LS single-configuration (SC) terms as

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{\text{LSSC}} &\equiv \frac{1}{4}\xi(^1P) + \frac{3}{4}\xi(^3P) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}\xi(^1P) \\ &\xrightarrow{Z \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

where fluorescence from the 3P state is zero so that the asymptotic behavior at large Z is $1/4$.

CI and spin-orbit effects modify this behavior, however. The largest CI effect is the intrashell mixing $c_1 1s2s^2 2p + c_2 1s2p^3$, where the mixing fraction $|c_2/c_1|^2$ is essentially term independent and Z independent for non-relativistic calculations: it varies between 0.067 for B II and 0.053 for Zn xxvii. This mixing affects the computed emission oscillator strength f and autoionization rate A_a at the near neutral end of the sequence, but changes the high- Z fluorescence yield by less than 10%. The more important CI effect is that the admixture of the $1s2p^3$ configuration in the 3P term allows it to radiate to the $1s^2 2p^2$ (3P) state. This $c_2 1s2p^3$ (3P) \rightarrow $1s^2 2p^2$ (3P) radiative rate is about a factor of 20 smaller than the $1s2s^2 2p$ (1P) \rightarrow $1s^2 2s^2$ (1S) rate, so it only increases the fluorescence yield by a few percent at low Z . As Z increases, however, eventually even this reduced radiative rate dominates the autoionization rate, giving

$$\xi_{\text{LS CI}} \equiv \frac{1}{4} \xi(^1P) + \frac{3}{4} \xi(^3P) \xrightarrow{Z \rightarrow \infty} 1. \quad (10)$$

The spin-orbit interaction also affects the computed fluorescence yield, primarily by mixing the 1P_1 and 3P_1 levels. The mixing fraction, while only about 6.3×10^{-6} at $Z = 5$, has a Z^4 dependence, and eventually becomes quite significant, reaching 0.117 at $Z = 30$. As a result, the 3P_1 level (this is now just a label used to indicate the dominant term of a level) has an increased fluorescence yield, and we get that the intermediate coupling (IC), configuration-averaged fluorescence yield, including CI, behaves as

$$\xi_{\text{IC CI}} \equiv \frac{3}{12} \xi(^1P_1) + \frac{1}{12} \xi(^3P_0) + \frac{3}{12} \xi(^3P_1) + \frac{5}{12} \xi(^3P_2) \geq \xi_{\text{LS CI}}. \quad (11)$$

Thus, we see that CI and the spin-orbit interaction each cause an increase in the computed fluorescence yield as Z is increased.

2.2. Earlier Be-like Fluorescence Data

The approach of Kaastra & Mewe (1993) for this particular Be-like series was to neglect spin-orbit and CI effects and to assume that the hydrogenic approximation is valid throughout the series. Furthermore, they used configuration-averaged values for the B II autoionization rate and emission oscillator strength (McGuire 1969) and the experimental values of ω from Lotz (1967, 1968) to obtain the ratio $A_r/(A_r + A_a)$ required for determining ξ using equation (7). This is not the same as the desired configuration-averaged fluorescence yield ξ_{LSSC} in equation (9): the ratio of the averages does not equal the average of the ratios,

$$\frac{\sum_{\mathcal{S}=0,1} [(2\mathcal{S}+1)/4] A_r(^{2\mathcal{S}+1}P)}{\sum_{\mathcal{S}=0,1} [(2\mathcal{S}+1)/4] [A_r(^{2\mathcal{S}+1}P) + A_a(^{2\mathcal{S}+1}P)]} \neq \sum_{\mathcal{S}=0,1} \left(\frac{2\mathcal{S}+1}{4} \right) \left[\frac{A_r(^{2\mathcal{S}+1}P)}{A_r(^{2\mathcal{S}+1}P) + A_a(^{2\mathcal{S}+1}P)} \right]. \quad (12)$$

We first address the accuracy of the computed autoionization rates and emission oscillator strengths in the next subsection and then address the validity of the hydrogenic approximation in the following subsection. Fluorescence yields are presented in the last subsection, where the incor-

rect averaging and neglect of CI and spin-orbit effects by Kaastra & Mewe (1993) are addressed.

2.3. Atomic Calculations for B II

In order to calculate the transition matrix elements appearing in the expressions for the radiative and autoionization rates (Cowan 1981), it is first necessary to produce atomic wave functions. McGuire (1969) used the Herman-Skillman approximation in determining the (single-configuration) wave functions, whereby *all* electrons (i.e., the $1s$, $2s$, $2p$, and continuum ones) are eigenfunctions of a common central potential; as stated by McGuire (1969), this “neglect(s) . . . exchange and correlation effects.” Furthermore, this potential $rV(r)$ is approximated by “a series of straight lines” in order to yield piece-by-piece analytic Whitaker functions. Here we are concerned with the validity of these approximations, given that more rigorous calculations can be easily performed using today’s state-of-the-art technologies.

For the present study, we use the program AUTO-STRUCTURE (Badnell 1986), which generates Slater-type $1s$, $2s$, $2p$, and distorted-wave continuum orbitals. In order to compare with the results of McGuire (1969) for B II and with Kaastra & Mewe (1993) as we scale from $Z = 5$ to $Z = 30$, we first performed single-configuration LS calculations. For the more rigorous calculations that we compare to other theoretical results and recommend as the definitive data, we also included CI ($1s2s^2 2p + 1s2p^3$ for the inner-shell vacancy state and $1s^2 2s^2 + 1s^2 2p^2$ for the final radiative decay state) and spin-orbit effects. The two accessible continua were described as $1s^2 2s \epsilon p$ and $1s^2 2p \epsilon s$, where ϵl denotes a continuum distorted wave.

Given atomic wave functions, McGuire (1969) computed the *configuration average* (CA) radiative and partial autoionization rates in equations (1)–(3). The emission oscillator strength given is thus

$$\begin{aligned} f(\text{CA}) &= \frac{1}{4} f(^1P) + \frac{3}{4} f(^3P) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} f(^1P) \\ &= 0.0377, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

whereas for the total autoionization rate, the CA rates for the processes in equations (2) and (3) were used, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} A_a(\text{CA}) &= A_{a1}(\text{CA}) + A_{a2}(\text{CA}) \\ &= 2.37 \times 10^{-3} \text{ a.u.}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{a1}(\text{CA}) &= \frac{1}{4} A_{a1}(^1P) + \frac{3}{4} A_{a1}(^3P) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left\{ 2\pi [R_0(1s, \epsilon p, 2s, 2p) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{2}{3} R_1(1s, \epsilon p, 2p, 2s)]^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{4} \left\{ 2\pi [R_0(1s, \epsilon p, 2s, 2p)]^2 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A_{a2}(\text{CA}) &= \frac{1}{4} A_{a2}(^1P) + \frac{3}{4} A_{a2}(^3P) \\ &= 2\pi [R_0(1s, \epsilon s, 2s, 2s)]^2, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

since our calculations indicate that $A_{a2}(^1P) = A_{a2}(^3P)$. Here $R_\lambda(n_1 l_1, n_2 l_2, n_3 l_3, n_4 l_4)$ is a Slater integral of multipole λ (Cowan 1981), and ϵl represents the outgoing l -wave

continuum electron orbital. (The expressions in eqs. [15] and [16] are equivalent to those in eq. [6] of McGuire 1969 for inequivalent electrons and single- p orbital occupation, considering the different continuum normalization used by McGuire 1967.) Note that the partial rate $A_{a1}(^1P)$ in equation (15) is greatly suppressed relative to the $A_{a1}(^3P)$ rate due to a near cancellation of monopole and dipole Slater integrals. [Indeed, it was due to this near cancellation of Slater integrals that Caldwell et al. 1990 explained why the inner-shell photoexcited $1s2s^22p(^1P)$ resonance in Be I preferentially decayed—by 2 orders of magnitude—to the $1s^22p(^2P) + e^-$ channel, compared to the $1s^22s(^2S) + e^-$ channel.] Thus, the configuration average partial rate $A_{a1}(CA)$ will be larger than the partial rate $A_{a1}(^1P)$ and, hence, the configuration average total rate $A_a(CA)$ will be larger than $A_a(^1P)$.

Since we are interested in computing $\xi(^1P)$, which requires $A_a(^1P)$ and $f(^1P)$, we have converted the reported values from McGuire (1969) to the 1P values. (The Slater integrals were also given in that work.) We get the following values:

$$f(^1P, \text{McGuire}) = 0.1508, \quad (17)$$

$$A_a(^1P, \text{McGuire}) = 1.692 \times 10^{-3} \text{ a.u.}, \quad (18)$$

which compare fairly well with our results obtained using AUTOSTRUCTURE,

$$f(^1P, \text{present}) = 0.1519, \quad (19)$$

$$A_a(^1P, \text{present}) = 1.045 \times 10^{-3} \text{ a.u.} \quad (20)$$

In summary, we find that the earlier results for B II of McGuire (1969) are consistent with ours. However, for the astrophysical plasma modeling purposes we have in mind, one really requires the configuration average fluorescence yield, not the ratio of the averaged radiative and total rates used by Kaastra & Mewe (1993),

$$\xi(\text{K\&M}) = \frac{A_r(\text{CA})}{A_r(\text{CA}) + A_a(\text{CA})} \xrightarrow{Z \rightarrow \infty} 1, \quad (21)$$

due to A_r and A_a scaling as q^4 and q^0 , respectively, in the hydrogenic approximation. Equation (21) differs from the correct ξ_{LSSC} given in equation (9). First, we have $A_a(\text{CA}) > A_a(^1P)$ due to the near cancellation in the 1P $2s2p \rightarrow 1s\epsilon p$ partial autoionization rate, so at low Z , where $A_r \ll A_a$, we have $\xi(\text{K\&M}) < \xi_{\text{LSSC}}$. Second, when CI and spin-orbit effects are ignored as they were in Kaastra & Mewe (1993), the fluorescence yields differ asymptotically by a factor of 4,

$$\lim_{Z \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\xi(\text{K\&M})}{\xi_{\text{LSSC}}} = 4, \quad (22)$$

as can be seen by comparing equations (9) and (21). Of course, CI needs to be included for all Z , whereas spin-orbit mixing needs to be included at higher Z , and both $\xi(\text{K\&M}) \rightarrow 1$ and $\xi_{\text{ICCI}} \rightarrow 1$ as $Z \rightarrow \infty$. However, in the intermediate Z range, it can be shown that the Kaastra & Mewe (1993) results are still larger than the ICCI results.

2.4. Validity of the Hydrogenic Approximation

In order to assess the validity of scaling the B II results along the isoelectronic series, we computed both the 1P




FIG. 1.—Present LS autoionization rates A_a (in units of 6.88×10^{-3} a.u.; open squares) and emission oscillator strengths f (dimensionless; open circles) for Be-like $1s2s^22p(^1P)$ ions as a function of the nuclear charge Z . Filled square and circle: Autoionization rate and emission oscillator strength, respectively, from McGuire (1969) for B II.

autoionization rate A_a and emission oscillator strength f for all Be-like ions up through zinc, first neglecting spin-orbit effects. In Figure 1, it is seen that neither of the two is independent of the nuclear charge Z at the lowest stages of ionization—the emission oscillator strength increases by about 2/3 in going toward the highly ionized regime, whereas the autoionization rate more than doubles. Furthermore, by choosing the scale so that our two quantities coincide for B II, it is seen that the important ratio A_a/f appearing in equation (7) increases by roughly 25% by the time Zn xxvii is reached. Thus, the assumption of pure hydrogenic scaling by Kaastra & Mewe (1993) alone introduces an uncertainty at the highly charged end of this series. Due to the stronger Z dependence at the near-neutral end together with the greater sensitivity to the atomic basis used in this region, we recommend that if scaling along an isoelectronic sequence is to be performed, the better starting point would be at the highest Z desired, extrapolating the rates to lower Z members. Of course, given the ease of determining atomic rates with modern computing capabilities, the most reliable approach is to calculate the fluorescence yield directly rather than resort to questionable scaling methods.

2.5. Fluorescence Yield Results

While the assumption of hydrogenic scaling introduces an $\approx 25\%$ inaccuracy in A_a/f , the initial quantity being scaled in Kaastra & Mewe (1993)—the ratio of averages rather than the average of ratios—is really not the desired quantity to be scaled in the first place. Together, these approximations lead to an uncertain prediction for the fluorescence yield. In Figure 2 (and Table 1), we compare various results for ξ along the Be-like sequence, where it can be seen that our single-configuration LS results differ greatly from those of Kaastra & Mewe (1993), especially at higher Z ; here, especially, their results are expected to differ from the correct single-configuration values due to their incorrect asymptotic value given by equation (21). A more disturbing result was found when we tried to repeat their




FIG. 2.—(a) Comparison of various computed and inferred fluorescence yields ξ for Be-like $1s2s^2 2p$ ions. *Filled diamonds*: *LS* results in the single-configuration (SC) approximation. *Filled squares*: *LS* results with configuration interaction (CI) included. *Filled circles*: Intermediate coupling (IC) results with CI included. *Open squares*: HULLAC results from Behar & Netzer (2002). *Open diamonds*: MCDF results from Chen (1985). *Open circles*: Kaastra & Mewe (1993). *Open triangles*: Results when we scale McGuire (1969) B II results, using eq. (7) and the ω from Lotz (1967, 1968). (b) Same as (a), focusing on the low-*Z* region.

TABLE 1
EMISSION OSCILLATOR STRENGTHS, AUTOIONIZATION RATES, FLUORESCENCE YIELDS, AND PHOTON ENERGIES FOR Be-LIKE $1s2s^2 2p$ IONS

Z	f (Present) ^a	A_a (Present) ^b	ξ (Present) LSSC ^c	ξ (K&M) ^d	ω (Lotz) ^e	ξ (Scaled) ^f	ξ (HULLAC) ^g	ξ (MCDF) ^h	ξ (Present LSCI) ⁱ	ξ (Present ICCI) ^j
5.....	0.1519	0.1045	0.0014	0.0006	6.751	0.0006	0.0011	0.0011
	0.1508 ^k	0.1692 ^k
6.....	0.1712	0.1194	0.0032	0.0019	10.349	0.0013	...	0.0024	0.0025	0.0025
7.....	0.1859	0.1328	0.0061	0.0052	14.721	0.0027	...	0.0045	0.0048	0.0048
8.....	0.1972	0.1442	0.0106	0.0096	19.866	0.0049	...	0.0079	0.0083	0.0083
9.....	0.2062	0.1540	0.0168	0.0154	25.753	0.0081	...	0.0128	0.0132	0.0133
10.....	0.2134	0.1622	0.0250	0.0229	32.379	0.0128	0.0209	0.0191	0.0199	0.0201
11.....	0.2193	0.1693	0.0352	0.0352	39.782	0.0192	0.0285	0.0287
12.....	0.2243	0.1754	0.0474	0.0424	47.924	0.0276	0.0414	0.0377	0.0390	0.0393
13.....	0.2285	0.1808	0.0612	0.0484	56.806	0.0384	0.0538	...	0.0514	0.0518
14.....	0.2320	0.1854	0.0761	0.0768	66.465	0.0518	0.0685	...	0.0653	0.0658
15.....	0.2351	0.1896	0.0916	0.1102	76.862	0.0681	0.0805	0.0812
16.....	0.2378	0.1933	0.1073	0.1446	88.034	0.0874	0.0984	...	0.0965	0.0974
17.....	0.2402	0.1965	0.1225	0.1656	99.982	0.1100	0.1129	0.1141
18.....	0.2423	0.1995	0.1369	0.1671	112.664	0.1357	0.1273	0.1237	0.1295	0.1309
19.....	0.2442	0.2022	0.1502	0.1626	126.122	0.1644	0.1458	0.1478
20.....	0.2459	0.2046	0.1623	0.1984	140.348	0.1958	0.1569	...	0.1616	0.1646
21.....	0.2475	0.2068	0.1732	0.2963	155.342	0.2298	0.1769	0.1813
22.....	0.2488	0.2089	0.1828	0.3438	171.107	0.2658	0.1916	0.1982
23.....	0.2501	0.2108	0.1912	0.3838	187.645	0.3033	0.2058	0.2154
24.....	0.2513	0.2125	0.1985	0.4214	204.991	0.3419	0.2194	0.2333
25.....	0.2523	0.2141	0.2049	0.4562	223.108	0.3810	0.2327	0.2518
26.....	0.2533	0.2156	0.2105	0.4903	241.998	0.4200	0.2394	0.2633	0.2457	0.2713
27.....	0.2542	0.2169	0.2153	0.5267	261.659	0.4584	0.2585	0.2916
28.....	0.2551	0.2182	0.2194	0.5836	282.129	0.4960	0.2712	0.3125
29.....	0.2559	0.2194	0.2230	0.6215	303.333	0.5322	0.2840	0.3339
30.....	0.2566	0.2205	0.2261	0.6322	325.310	0.5668	0.2969	0.3553

^a Present *LS* results for emission from the $^1 P$ term (dimensionless).

^b Present *LS* results, autoionization from the $^1 P$ term (in units of 10^{-2} a.u.; 1 a.u. = 4.13×10^{16} s $^{-1}$).

^c Present *LS* results using a single configuration, one fourth the $^1 P$ term fluorescence yield (dimensionless).

^d Kaastra & Mewe 1993.

^e Lotz 1967, 1968 (in a.u.; 1 a.u. = 27.211 eV).

^f Obtained using eq. (7) with $A_d(\text{CA})/f(\text{CA})$ for B II from McGuire 1969 and ω from Lotz 1967, 1968.

^g Behar & Netzer 2002, averaged over the $^1 P_1$ and $^3 P_{0,1,2}$ levels.

^h Chen 1985, averaged over the $^1 P_1$ and $^3 P_{0,1,2}$ levels.

ⁱ Present *LS* results, including configuration interaction (CI), averaged over the $^1 P$ and $^3 P$ terms.

^j Present intermediate-coupling (IC) results, including CI, averaged over the $^1 P_1$ and $^3 P_{0,1,2}$ levels.

^k McGuire 1969.

calculations, i.e., when we used equation (7), with the ratio of $A_a(\text{CA})/f(\text{CA})$ taken from McGuire (1969), and the energies ω taken from Lotz (1967, 1968). Whereas these scaled results exhibit a smooth monotonic increase with nuclear charge Z , those of Kaastra & Mewe (1993) are somewhat irregular, showing unphysical dips, and do not agree with what we tried to reproduce, given their stated method. Either way, the results of Kaastra & Mewe (1993) or our scaled ones using the B II results of McGuire (1969) initially underestimate our results at lower Z and then overestimate our (LSSC) results by almost a factor of 3 for the highest $Z = 30$.

To our knowledge, there have been two other calculations for the fluorescence yields of some members of the Be-like sequence: those of Behar & Netzer (2002) using the HULLAC codes (Bar-Shalom, Klapsich, & Oreg 2001) and those of Chen (1985) using a multiconfiguration Dirac-Fock (MCDF) method. In both cases, CI and spin-orbit effects were included. Here we do the same, first adding the important $2s^2 \rightarrow 2p^2$ CI discussed earlier to the LS calculations in order to see that this effect increases the $Z = 30$ fluorescence yield by about 30%. Then when spin-orbit effects (and other higher order, relativistic effects) are included in our intermediate coupling calculation, there is a further increase in the fluorescence yield by about 20% more. In comparison with the other two calculations along this series, there is overall good agreement with these IC results.

3. CASE STUDY OF THE F-LIKE FLUORESCENCE YIELDS

We turn now to the simplest closed- (outer-) shell case of a $1s$ vacancy in F-like ions, giving the $1s2s^22p^6(^2S)$ state, which decays as

$$1s2s^22p^6(^2S) \xrightarrow{A_r} 1s^22s^22p^5(^2P) + \omega \quad (23)$$

$$\xrightarrow{A_a} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1s^22p^6(^1S)\epsilon s \\ 1s^22s2p^5(^1,^3P)\epsilon p \\ 1s^22s^22p^4(^3P, ^1D, ^1S)\epsilon s, \epsilon d . \end{array} \right\} \quad (24)$$

Again, only 1 photon, or 1 electron can be emitted, which simplifies the analysis considerably. [When spin-orbit effects are considered, the final ionic term in eq. (23) is fine-structure split into the ground $1s^22s^22p^5(^2P_{3/2})$ level and the metastable $1s^22s^22p^5(^2P_{1/2})$ level.] Since this is a closed-shell system, the Herman-Skillman method for the important $2p$ electrons is expected to be more accurate than for B II. Indeed, as stated by McGuire (1969), “in stripping away electrons (in reducing to a closed-shell system). . . we should be increasing the applicability of the common central-field approximation.” Furthermore, there is only one $1s$ vacancy state ($1s2s^22p^6$) rather than the two we had for the Be-like sequence, and no other intrashell configurations to CI mix with, so we do not need to consider population of nonfluorescing states by CI or spin-orbit mixing, nor do we have to consider configuration averaging issues. Consequently, a single configuration LS coupling calculation is sufficient to determine accurate A_a , f , and ξ values for the 2P term.

As a result, the computed values of the autoionization rate and emission oscillator strength given by McGuire (1969) agree quite well with our values, as seen in Figure 3 and Table 2. However, both of these values depend on the internuclear charge Z , giving a ratio A_a/f that increases by




FIG. 3.—Present LS emission oscillator strengths f (dimensionless: *open circles*) and autoionization rates A_a (in units of 4.89×10^{-2} a.u.; *open squares*) for F-like $1s2s^22p^6(^2S)$ ions as a function of the nuclear charge Z . *Solid circle and square*: Emission oscillator strength and autoionization rate, respectively, from McGuire (1969) for Ne II, as used by Kaastra & Mewe (1993).

about a factor of 1/2 in going from Ne II to Zn XXII. Thus, the scaled fluorescence yield ξ , using equation (7), the ratio A_a/f from McGuire (1969), and ω from Lotz (1967, 1968) increases relative to the actual computed value, as is seen in Figure 4 and Table 2. The more troublesome news in this figure is the actual tabulated values of Kaastra & Mewe (1993): their values do not follow our attempt at reproducing those results, but rather tend to follow our computed values, except for certain unphysical dips. Nevertheless, the results reported by Kaastra & Mewe (1993) for F-like ions are not plagued by as many uncertainties as those for Be-like ions. We also see in Figure 4 that the HULLAC results are in good agreement with our present ones. [The results reported earlier by Behar & Netzer 2002 considered only fluorescence into the $1s^22s^22p^5(^2P_{3/2})$ level, which includes only four of all six magnetic sublevels of the $1s^22s^22p^5(^2P)$ configuration; therefore, those values must be multiplied by about 3/2 to account for fluorescence into the two $1s^22s^22p^5(^2P_{1/2})$ sublevels as well. Furthermore, the earlier HULLAC result for F^+ was erroneously listed incorrectly, and here we have given the actual computed value that should have appeared.]

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The inaccuracies we have discovered in the reported results of Kaastra & Mewe (1993) for Be-like ions are as follows:

1. The computed atomic data for B II are used in the form $A_a(\text{CA})/f(\text{CA})$, i.e., the radiative and autoionization rates have been averaged over the 1P and 3P configurations, whereas the desired quantity for plasma modeling applications is ξ_{CCI} and is not the same thing, differing qualitatively and quantitatively, especially in the asymptotic high- Z limit.

2. The hydrogenic scaling assumed is invalid. The autoionization rates, the emission oscillator strengths, and even the ratio A_a/f are not independent of nuclear charge Z .

TABLE 2
EMISSION OSCILLATOR STRENGTHS, AUTOIONIZATION RATES, FLUORESCENCE YIELDS, AND PHOTON ENERGIES FOR F-LIKE $1s2s^22p^6(^2S)$ IONS

Z	f (Present) ^a	A_a (Present) ^b	ξ (Present) ^a	ξ (K&M) ^c	ω (Lotz) ^d	ξ (Scaled) ^e	ξ (HULLAC) ^f
10.....	0.2159	0.1056	0.0147	0.0182	31.184	0.0169	0.0215
	0.216 ^g	0.0948 ^g
11.....	0.2286	0.1164	0.0214	0.0263	38.723	0.0258	...
12.....	0.2406	0.1273	0.0298	0.0346	47.035	0.0376	0.0380
13.....	0.2515	0.1377	0.0402	0.0397	56.081	0.0526	0.0493
14.....	0.2615	0.1477	0.0528	0.0449	65.864	0.0712	0.0630
15.....	0.2705	0.1571	0.0679	0.0634	76.422	0.0936	...
16.....	0.2786	0.1659	0.0855	0.0875	87.720	0.1197	0.0983
17.....	0.2859	0.1741	0.1058	0.1019	99.795	0.1497	...
18.....	0.2926	0.1817	0.1286	0.1305	112.646	0.1832	0.1443
19.....	0.2987	0.1888	0.1540	0.1253	126.276	0.2199	...
20.....	0.3042	0.1954	0.1818	0.1505	140.682	0.2592	0.2001
21.....	0.3093	0.2016	0.2118	0.2073	155.863	0.3004	...
22.....	0.3139	0.2073	0.2437	0.2411	171.820	0.3429	...
23.....	0.3182	0.2127	0.2771	0.2751	188.552	0.3860	...
24.....	0.3221	0.2177	0.3116	0.3068	206.093	0.4289	...
25.....	0.3258	0.2224	0.3469	0.3386	224.395	0.4710	...
26.....	0.3291	0.2269	0.3825	0.3692	243.504	0.5118	0.4041
27.....	0.3324	0.2309	0.4180	0.3942	263.386	0.5513	...
28.....	0.3353	0.2348	0.4531	0.4438	284.040	0.5883	...
29.....	0.3380	0.2385	0.4874	0.4734	305.465	0.6230	...
30.....	0.3406	0.2420	0.5207	0.4758	327.735	0.6554	...

^a Present results (dimensionless).
^b Present results (in units of 10^{-1} a.u.; 1 a.u. = 4.13×10^{16} s⁻¹).
^c Kaastra & Mewe 1993.
^d Lotz 1967, 1968 (in a.u.; 1 a.u. = 27.211 eV).
^e Obtained using eq. (7) with $A_a(\text{CA})/f(\text{CA})$ for B II from McGuire 1969 and ω from Lotz 1967, 1968.
^f Behar & Netzer 2002.
^g McGuire 1969.

3. The tabulated data of Kaastra & Mewe (1993) do not seem to follow the results we obtain when we try to reproduce their stated method using equation (7) with $A_a(\text{CA})/f(\text{CA})$ from McGuire (1969) and ω from Lotz (1967, 1968).

4. The calculations of Kaastra & Mewe (1993) neglected CI and spin-orbit effects as they scaled to higher Z.

For F-like ions, items 1 and 4 are not issues since there is only one inner-shell vacancy term. However, points 2 and 3 still apply for the F-like sequence. For plasma modeling purposes, we recommend our ξ_{ICCI} for the Be-like sequence and our ξ for the F-like sequence.

In conclusion, we propose that, given the many uncertainties discovered, the entire database of Kaastra & Mewe




FIG. 4.—(a) Comparison of various computed and inferred fluorescence yields ξ for F-like $1s2s^22p^6(^2S)$ ions. Filled circles: LS results. Open circles: Kaastra & Mewe (1993). Open triangles: Results when we scale McGuire (1969) Ne II results using eq. (7) and the ω from Lotz (1967, 1968). Open squares: HULLAC results of Behar & Netzer (2002). (b) Same as (a), focusing on the low-Z region.

(1993) should be reevaluated. While we have focused on systems that can emit only 1 photon or 1 electron, their comprehensive tabulation also includes data for ions with $n \geq 3$ shells occupied: these can emit multiple electrons and/or photons through numerous cascading channels, compounding the inaccuracies we have discovered.

We would like to thank E. J. McGuire for careful reading of, and extremely helpful comments on, an earlier version of this manuscript. T. W. G., C. N. K., K. T. K., and O. Z.

were supported by NASA Space Astrophysics Research and Analysis Program grant NAG5-10448. E. B. was supported by the Yigal-Alon Fellowship and by the GIF Foundation under grant 2028-1093.7/2001. The work of M. H. C. was performed under the auspices of US Department of Energy by the University of California, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, under contract W-7405-ENG-48. D. W. S. was supported in part by NASA Space Astrophysics Research and Analysis Program grant NAG5-5261 and NASA Solar Physics Research, Analysis, and Suborbital Program grant NAG5-9581.

REFERENCES

- Badnell, N. R. 1986, *J. Phys. B*, 19, 3827
 Bar-Shalom, A., Klapisch, M., & Oreg, J. 2001, *J. Quant. Spectr. Radiat. Transfer*, 71, 169
 Behar, E., & Netzer, H. 2002, *ApJ*, 570, 165
 Berrington, K. A., Eissner, W. B., & Norrington, P. H. 1995, *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, 92, 290
 Borkowski, K. T., Lyerly, W. J., & Reynolds, S. P. 2001, *ApJ*, 548, 820
 Burke, P. G., & Berrington, K. A. 1993, *Atomic and Molecular Processes: An R-Matrix Approach* (Bristol: IOP Publ.)
 Caldwell, C. D., Flemming, M. G., Krause, M. O., van der Meulen, P., Pan, C., & Starace, A. F. 1990, *Phys. Rev. A*, 41, 542
 Chen, M. H., Craseman, B., & Matthews, D. L. 1985, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 34, 1309
 Cowan, R. D. 1981, *The Theory of Atomic Structure and Spectra* (Berkeley: Univ. California Press)
 Ferland, G. J., Korista, K. T., Verner, D. A., Ferguson, J. W., Kingdon, J. B., & Verner, E. M. 1998, *PASP*, 110, 761
 Kaastra, J. S., & Mewe, R. 1993, *A&AS*, 97, 443
 Kallman, T. R., & Bautista, M. 2001, *ApJS*, 133, 221
 Lotz, W. 1967, *J. Opt. Soc. Am.*, 57, 873
 ———. 1968, *J. Opt. Soc. Am.*, 58, 915
 McGuire, E. J. 1967, *Phys. Rev.*, 161, 51
 ———. 1969, *Phys. Rev.*, 185, 1
 ———. 1970, *Phys. Rev. A*, 2, 273
 ———. 1971, *Phys. Rev. A*, 3, 587
 ———. 1972, *Phys. Rev. A*, 5, 1052