

SINGLE ELECTRON CAPTURE FROM ATOMIC AND MOLECULAR COLLISIONS USING  
ADVANCED THEORETICAL METHODS

by

DAVID LYONS

(Under the Direction of Philip Stancil)

ABSTRACT

Cross sections for single electron capture (SEC), or charge exchange (CX), in collisions of  $\text{Ne}^{(8-10)+}$  and  $\text{Mg}^{(8-12)+}$  with H and He, and  $\text{Fe}^{(8-9)+}$  with H,  $\text{H}_2$ , He,  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , CO,  $\text{CO}_2$ , and  $\text{N}_2$ , are computed using an approximate multichannel Landau-Zener (MCLZ) formalism. The Molecular Orbital Close-Coupling (MOCC) method is also used for the cross section calculation of the  $\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}$  collision system. Final-state-resolved cross sections for the principal ( $n$ ), orbital angular momentum ( $\ell$ ), and where appropriate, total spin angular momentum ( $S$ ) quantum numbers are explicitly computed except for the incident bare ions  $\text{Ne}^{10+}$  and  $\text{Mg}^{12+}$ . In the latter two cases,  $n\ell$ -resolution is obtained from analytical  $\ell$ -distribution functions applied to  $n$ -resolved MCLZ cross sections. In all cases, the cross sections are computed over the collision energy range 1 meV/u to 50 keV/u with LZ parameters estimated from atomic energies obtained from experiment, theory, or, in the case of high-lying Rydberg levels, estimated with a quantum defect approach. Errors in the energy differences in the adiabatic potentials at the avoided-crossing distances give the largest contribution to the uncertainties in the cross sections, which is expect to increase with decreasing cross section magnitude. The energy differences are deduced here with the Olson-Salop-Taulbjerg radial coupling model. Proper selection of an  $\ell$ -distribution function for bare ion collisions

introduces another level of uncertainty in the results. Comparison is made to existing experimental or theoretical results when available, but such data are absent for most considered collision systems. The  $n\ell S$ -resolved SEC cross sections are used in an optically thin cascade simulation to predict X-ray spectra and line ratios which will aid in modeling the X-ray emission in environments where charge exchange is an important mechanism. Details on a MCLZ computational package, *Stüeckelberg*, are also provided.

INDEX WORDS: Atomic Data, Atomic Processes, Charge Exchange, Single Electron Capture, Molecular Collisions, Atomic Collisions, Ionic Collisions, Cross Sections, Landau-Zener, Molecular Orbital Close Coupling, Numerical Simulation

SINGLE ELECTRON CAPTURE FROM ATOMIC AND MOLECULAR COLLISIONS USING  
ADVANCED THEORETICAL METHODS

by

DAVID LYONS

BS, Electrical Engineering, Southern Illinois University

MS, Electrical Engineering, Southern Illinois University

MBA, University of Georgia

MS, Physics, University of Georgia

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty  
of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment  
of the

Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2019

© 2019

David Lyons

All Rights Reserved

SINGLE ELECTRON CAPTURE FROM ATOMIC AND MOLECULAR COLLISIONS USING  
ADVANCED THEORETICAL METHODS

by

DAVID LYONS

Approved:

Major Professor: Philip Stancil

Committee: Henning Meyer  
Loris Magnani

Electronic Version Approved:

Suzanne Barbour  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
May 2019

## DEDICATION

To the memory of Jeff Burns and his family.

To the memory of Dr. Howard Lee.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

When I became a graduate student, a graduate teaching assistant, and then a graduate reserach assistant in the Department of Physics and Astronomy at the University of Georgia, I was a full-time working professional. I had a schedule which allowed me to pursue a PhD in physics. I also had a wife and children, a house, cars, and the usual financial and time demands associated with such a life. It would not have been possible to participate in this program with a typical 9 hours per day, 5 days per week schedule. I am grateful to those managers I had who were suppotive of me by allowing me remain on the schedule which made it possible for me to pursue my academic goals.

This work was partially supported by NASA grants NNX09AC46G and NNX13AF31G.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	v
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	viii
LIST OF FIGURES . . . . .	ix
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
2 THEORY . . . . .	4
2.1 CHARGE EXCHANGE . . . . .	4
3 $\text{Ne}^{(8-10)+}$ AND $\text{Mg}^{(8-12)+}$ WITH H AND HE USING MCLZ . . . . .	6
3.1 METHODS . . . . .	6
3.2 SINGLE ELECTRON CAPTURE CROSS SECTIONS . . . . .	8
3.3 $\text{Ne}^{10+}$ . . . . .	9
3.4 $\text{Ne}^{9+}$ . . . . .	16
3.5 $\text{Ne}^{8+}$ . . . . .	20
3.6 $\text{Mg}^{12+}$ . . . . .	22
3.7 $\text{Mg}^{11+}$ . . . . .	26
3.8 $\text{Mg}^{10+}$ . . . . .	30
3.9 $\text{Mg}^{9+}$ . . . . .	32
3.10 $\text{Mg}^{8+}$ . . . . .	35
3.11 SUMMARY . . . . .	38
4 $\text{Fe}^{(8-9)+}$ WITH H, $\text{H}_2$ , HE, $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , CO, $\text{CO}_2$ , AND $\text{N}_2$ USING MCLZ . . . . .	40



4.1	METHODS . . . . .	40
4.2	$\text{Fe}^{9+}$ . . . . .	52
4.3	$\text{Fe}^{8+}$ . . . . .	58
5	$\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}$ USING MOCC . . . . .	66
5.1	METHOD . . . . .	66
5.2	RESULTS . . . . .	66
6	CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	67
6.1	MCLZ: $\text{Ne}^{(8-10)+}$ AND $\text{Mg}^{(8-12)+}$ . . . . .	67
6.2	MCLZ: $\text{Fe}^{(8-9)+}$ . . . . .	67
6.3	MOCC: $\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}$ . . . . .	67
APPENDIX		
A	STÜECKELBERG . . . . .	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .		69

# LIST OF TABLES

3.1	$\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$ MCLZ and CTMC $n$ -resolved cross section differences at 4550 eV/u. . . . .	16
3.2	$\text{Ne}^{(8-10)+}$ Dominant Channels. . . . .	39
3.3	$\text{Mg}^{(8-12)+}$ Dominant Channels. . . . .	39
4.1	Fe VIII ( $\text{Fe}^{7+}$ ) NIST Atomic Energies. . . . .	41
4.1	Fe VIII ( $\text{Fe}^{7+}$ ) NIST Atomic Energies. . . . .	42
4.2	Fe VIII ( $\text{Fe}^{7+}$ ) NIST Term Energies: Singly-Excited Doublets. . . . .	43
4.3	Fe VIII ( $\text{Fe}^{7+}$ ) Term Energies: Estimated and NIST. . . . .	45
4.3	Fe VIII ( $\text{Fe}^{7+}$ ) Term Energies: Estimated and NIST. . . . .	46
4.4	Fe IX ( $\text{Fe}^{8+}$ ) NIST Atomic Energies. . . . .	47
4.4	Fe IX ( $\text{Fe}^{8+}$ ) NIST Atomic Energies. . . . .	48
4.5	Fe IX ( $\text{Fe}^{8+}$ ) Singlet Term Energies: Estimated and NIST. . . . .	49
4.5	Fe IX ( $\text{Fe}^{8+}$ ) Singlet Term Energies: Estimated and NIST. . . . .	50
4.6	Fe IX ( $\text{Fe}^{8+}$ ) Triplet Term Energies: Estimated and NIST. . . . .	51
4.6	Fe IX ( $\text{Fe}^{8+}$ ) Triplet Term Energies: Estimated and NIST. . . . .	52
4.7	Degeneracy Factors. . . . .	53
4.8	$\text{Fe}^{(8-9)+}$ Dominant Channels. . . . .	64
4.8	$\text{Fe}^{(8-9)+}$ Dominant Channels. . . . .	65

## LIST OF FIGURES

2.1	Polarization ( $V_p$ ) and Coulomb ( $V_c$ ) potentials. . . . .	5
3.1	$\text{Ne}^{q+}$ and $\text{Mg}^{q+}$ total cross sections. . . . .	8
3.2	$\text{Ne}^{10+} + X \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + X^+$ total cross sections. . . . .	9
3.3	$\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved (low-energy) cross section comparisons. . .	10
3.4	$\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved (statistical) cross section comparisons. . .	11
3.5	$\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}^+$ total cross section comparison. . . . .	12
3.6	$\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross section comparison. . . . .	13
3.7	$\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	14
3.8	$\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	15
3.9	$\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	15
3.10	$\text{Ne}^{9+} + X \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{8+} + X^+$ total cross sections. . . . .	17
3.11	$\text{Ne}^{9+} + X \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{8+} + X^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	18
3.12	$\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$ $n$ - and $n\ell$ -resolved cross section comparisons. . . . .	19
3.13	$\text{Ne}^{8+} + X \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{7+} + X^+$ total cross sections. . . . .	20
3.14	$\text{Ne}^{8+} + X \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{7+} + X^+$ $n$ - and $n\ell$ -resolved cross section comparisons. . . . .	21
3.15	$\text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{7+} + \text{H}^+$ $n$ - and $n\ell$ -resolved cross section comparisons. . . . .	22
3.16	$\text{Mg}^{12+} + X \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + X^+$ total cross sections. . . . .	23
3.17	$\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	24
3.18	$\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	24
3.19	$\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	25
3.20	$\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	25
3.21	$\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	26
3.22	$\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	26

3.23	$\text{Mg}^{11+} + X \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + X^+$ total cross sections. . . . .	27
3.24	$\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{H}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	28
3.25	$\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{H}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	28
3.26	$\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{H}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	29
3.27	$\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{He}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	29
3.28	$\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{He}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	30
3.29	$\text{Mg}^{10+} + X \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{9+} + X^+$ total cross sections. . . . .	30
3.30	$\text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{H}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	31
3.31	$\text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{H}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	31
3.32	$\text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	32
3.33	$\text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	32
3.34	$\text{Mg}^{9+} + X \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + X^+$ total cross sections. . . . .	33
3.35	$\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	33
3.36	$\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	34
3.37	$\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	34
3.38	$\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{He}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	35
3.39	$\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{He}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	35
3.40	$\text{Mg}^{8+} + X \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{7+} + X^+$ total cross sections. . . . .	36
3.41	$\text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{7+} + \text{H}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	36
3.42	$\text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{7+} + \text{H}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	37
3.43	$\text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{7+} + \text{He}^+$ $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	37
3.44	$\text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{7+} + \text{He}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	38
4.1	$\mu$ vs. $n$ — $\text{Fe}^{7+}$ NIST excitation energies. . . . .	43
4.2	$\mu$ vs. $n$ — $\text{Fe}^{7+}$ estimated and NIST excitation energies. . . . .	44
4.3	$\text{Fe}^{9+} + X \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + X^+$ total cross sections. . . . .	53
4.4	$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	54
4.5	$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	54

4.6	$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	55
4.7	$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{He}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	55
4.8	$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2\text{O}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	56
4.9	$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{CO} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	57
4.10	$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{CO}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO}_2^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	57
4.11	$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{N}_2^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	58
4.12	$\text{Fe}^{8+} + X \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + X^+$ total cross sections. . . . .	59
4.13	$\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{H}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	59
4.14	$\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{H}_2^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections.. . . .	60
4.15	$\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{He}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	60
4.16	$\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{H}_2\text{O}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	61
4.17	$\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{CO}^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	62
4.18	$\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{CO}_2^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	63
4.19	$\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{N}_2^+$ $n$ -resolved cross sections. . . . .	63

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

With continual improvements in X-ray detector technology from charge-coupled devices (CCDs) to the reflection grating spectrometer (RGS) available on the current fleet of X-ray satellites (*Chandra*, *XMM-Newton*, *Suzaku*), the resolution of X-ray spectra have dramatically improved allowing for detailed studies of line formation mechanisms. While X-ray lines from highly ionized plasmas are primarily produced by electron impact excitation (EIE) in collisionally ionized equilibrium (CIE) or via electron radiative recombination (RR) in photoionized environments, a third mechanism, charge-exchange (CX) induced X-ray emission, has been found to be important in situations where hot plasmas meet cold gas.

The importance of CX as a mechanism for producing X-ray emission was recognized from studies of the Jovian aurora as early as the 1980s (e.g., Cravens et al. 1995, and references therein), but it was the detection of cometary X-ray emission (Lisse et al. 1996), and later its possible contribution to the soft X-ray background (Cox 1998; Cravens 2000) which brought CX induced emission to the attention of the high-energy astrophysics community. More recently, CX has been invoked for a host of environments, from supernova remnants (Katsuda et al. 2011; Cumbee et al. 2014, 2016) to extragalactic cooling flows (Fabian et al. 2011), in attempts to explain “anomalous” X-ray emission features which are unlikely to be attributable to EIE or RR. Unfortunately, the current CX cross sectional data are of insufficient reliability or availability to allow for quantitative spectroscopic models. To partially address this situation, cross sections, as a function of kinetic energy, for a series of single electron capture (SEC) collision systems are calculated here using the multi-channel Landau-Zener (MCLZ) (Janev et al. 1983; Butler and Dalgarno 1980) and Molecular Orbital

Close-Coupling (MOCC) methods. Theoretical summaries of these methods are presented in Chapter 2.

Chapter 3 discusses the study of  $\text{Ne}^{(8-10)+}$  and  $\text{Mg}^{(8-12)+}$  colliding with neutral H and He resulting in single electron capture. The resulting cross sections are calculated over a range of energies from  $10^{-1}$ – $10^5$  eV/u. The MCLZ method is used since it is reasonably accurate for kinetic energies  $\lesssim 10$  keV/u, and computation effort is minimal which allows several collision systems to be studied, benchmarking their results to other data when available. In many of these cases, explicit experimental or theoretical CX data are lacking. Collisional ionization, not included in the MCLZ model, begins to become important, and eventually dominates, at higher energies.

Chapter 4 discusses  $\text{Fe}^{(8-9)+}$  in collisions with H,  $\text{H}_2$ , He,  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , CO,  $\text{CO}_2$ , and  $\text{N}_2$ . For the same reasons with with Ne and Mg, the MCLZ is used to calculate the cross sections of collisions over a range of energies from  $10^{-1}$ – $10^5$  eV/u. For  $\text{Fe}^{9+}$ , multiple calculations are performed on each collision system as dictated by Wigner-Witmer rules (Wigner and Witmer 1928) describing the symmetries of the scattering channels. Cross section calculations are performed for singly-excited  $n\ell$ -resolved quantum states. Cross sections are also calculated for core-excited states when those energies are available. Excitation energies are estimated only for singly-excited states when they are not initially available.

SEC cross sections for these collision systems— $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$ ,  $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$ ,  $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO}$ ,  $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{CO}$ ,  $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO}_2$ , and  $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{CO}_2$ —are found in only two publications Simcic et al. (2010a) & Simcic et al. (2010b), which provide cross sections from experimental and  $n$ -electron classical trajectory Monte Carlo ( $n\text{CTMC}$ ) methods at 7q keV. This study produces results which can serve as a basis of comparison for any future studies of these systems. The cross sections produced here can be used for further prediction of X-ray spectra where these systems may be found, such as in the solar wind, comets, and supernova remnants (Cumbee et al. 2016; Lyons et al. 2017).

In Chapter 5,  $\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}$  is studied using MOCC. Cross sections comparison are made with existing data and discussed.

Conclusions are given in Chapter 6. An Appendix discusses the implementation of the MCLZ method in a new computational package, *Stüeckelberg*. Atomic units are used unless otherwise indicated.



## CHAPTER 2

### THEORY

#### 2.1 CHARGE EXCHANGE

The interaction of two particles where single electron capture charge exchange occurs can be described by

$$X^{q+} + Y(1s) \rightarrow X(n, \ell)^{(q-1)+} + Y^+ + \Delta E, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $X$  is a positively charged ion,  $Y$  is a neutral atom or molecule,  $q$  is the ionic charge,  $n$  is the principal quantum number,  $\ell$  is the angular momentum quantum number, and  $E$  is energy.

In the Landau-Zener model, the difference between ionization potential of the two particles can be written as

$$\Delta E = I(X^{(q-1)+}) - I(Y) \quad (2.2)$$

The polarization potential of the dominant long-range interaction between  $X$  and  $Y$  is

$$V_p = \frac{\alpha q^2}{2R^4} \quad (2.3)$$

where  $R$  is the separation, or internuclear distance, in atomic units, and  $\alpha$  is the polarizability of the neutral target  $Y$ . According to Schwerdtfeger and Nagle (2018), if  $Y=\text{H}$  (hydrogen), then  $\alpha=4.5$ . And if  $Y=\text{He}$  (helium), then  $\alpha=1.383191$ .

$$V_c = \frac{q-1}{R} \quad (2.4)$$

Plots of equations 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 are shown in Figure 2.1.




Figure 2.1: Polarization ( $V_p$ ) and Coulomb ( $V_c$ ) potentials.

(a) diabatic crossing; (b) adiabatic avoided crossing at  $R_x$ .

## CHAPTER 3

### NE<sup>(8-10)+</sup> AND MG<sup>(8-12)+</sup> WITH H AND HE USING MCLZ<sup>1</sup>

#### 3.1 METHODS

Many physical phenomena can be modeled by a two-level system (TLS) consisting of two interacting states (Nakamura 2002). The strength of the interaction can be varied typically by some external parameter such that the internal state energies of the quantum TLS exhibit an avoided-level crossing. Some physical property of the two states is typically exchanged when passing from one side of the avoided crossing to the other. In such a case, the system undergoes a nonadiabatic transition between the two energy states. Nonadiabatic interactions were first discussed by Landau (1932), Zener (1932), and Stüeckelberg (1932). In the current study, the control parameter is the distance  $R$  between an incident ion and a target neutral which interact during a charge exchange collision process (Equation 2.1), where an electron is transferred from the neutral target to an highly-ionized ion. Application of a TLS analysis to charge transfer systems is commonly referred to as the Landau-Zener (LZ) method. Here we apply a series of TLS crossings via the LZ approach of Butler and Dalgarno (1980) with the multichannel formalism of Janev et al. (1983).

For all collision systems, the first step in the MCLZ approach is to estimate the avoided crossing distances  $R_x$  between the incoming and outgoing channels. Beginning with atomic energies available from the NIST Atomic Spectral Database (Kramida et al. 2018), the crossings are estimated and then used to predict the adiabatic potential splitting at the crossing,  $\Delta U(R_x)$ , using the Olson and Salop (1977) radial coupling model for product

---

<sup>1</sup>Lyons, David A., Cumbee, Renata S., and Stancil, Phillip C., 2017. Charge Exchange of Highly Charged Ne and Mg Ions with H and He, *The Astrophysical Journal*, Vol. 232, No. 2, 23 October 2017.

hydrogen-like ions. In the case of multielectron ions, the Olson-Salop-Taulbjerg (Taulbjerg 1986) radial coupling approximation is adopted. The rotational coupling model of Janev et al. (1983) is included for hydrogen-like product ion systems, but only the radial coupling is considered for multielectron ions. In addition to  $R_x$  and  $\Delta U(R_x)$ , a third LZ parameter, the difference in slopes of the diabatic potentials at  $R_x$  is obtained analytically from empirical molecular potentials for the collision complexes following Butler and Dalgarno (1980).

In most cases, each individual  $n\ell$  or  $n\ell S$ -resolved SEC cross section is calculated directly with the MCLZ method. However, if the ion is initially bare, then the SEC cross sections for the angular momentum states in each  $n$ -shell are estimated using analytical  $\ell$ -distribution functions (see, for example, Krasnopolsky et al. 2004; Smith et al. 2014).  $\ell$ -distribution functions are necessary in such cases due to the  $\ell$ -level degeneracy in a given  $n$ -manifold. Unfortunately, this introduces considerable uncertainty in the  $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections as will be illustrated below.

Here, statistical distribution function is considered,

$$W_{nl}^{\text{st}} = \frac{2l+1}{n^2}, \quad (3.1)$$

and the low-energy distribution (Abramov et al. 1978; Krasnopolsky et al. 2004),

$$W_{nl}^{\text{le}} = (2l+1) \frac{[(n-1)!]^2}{(n+l)!(n-1-l)!}. \quad (3.2)$$

The statistical distribution function is believed to be valid for energies above  $\sim 5\text{--}10$  keV/u, while for lower energies, the low-energy distribution function is preferred (Krasnopolsky et al. 2004; Cumbee et al. 2016; Mullen et al. 2016).

For some ions, experimental or theoretical energy level data for high-lying Rydberg states are lacking. In such instances, the ion energies are estimated with a variant of the quantum defect method (Connerade 1998; Mullen et al. 2016) and polynomial extrapolations from available energy data (Kramida et al. 2018). While advanced atomic structure calculations

can be performed, the goal is to utilize available recommended data with quick extrapolations.

### 3.2 SINGLE ELECTRON CAPTURE CROSS SECTIONS




Figure 3.1:  $\text{Ne}^{q+}$  and  $\text{Mg}^{q+}$  total cross sections.

For collisions with hydrogen (H) and helium (He) for  $q=8-12$  using the MCLZ method.

Total MCLZ charge exchange cross sections for all systems studied in this chapter are presented in Figure 3.1. The total cross sections for both H and He targets generally converge at high collision energies to within a factor of  $\sim 5$ , but diverge for  $E \lesssim 1 - 10$  eV/u. At low kinetic energies, all cross sections go to the Langevin limit, increasing as  $1/E^{1/2}$  with decreasing kinetic energy. Collisions with bare ions give the smallest cross sections since the interaction results in a smaller number of final channels, degenerate for a given  $n$ . Details on each collision system are given below with comparison to available theoretical or experimental results.

### 3.3 $\text{Ne}^{10+}$

Of all the ions considered here,  $\text{Ne}^{10+}$  has received the most attention, being the subject of numerous theoretical and experimental studies for the past 40 years. Unfortunately, this is not the case for most of the other ion-atom collision systems. Total MCLZ SEC cross sections for  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H}$  and  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{He}$  are presented in Figure 3.2.




Figure 3.2:  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + X \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + X^+$  total cross sections.

Additional details for  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + X$ , where  $X = \text{H}$ , are given in Section 3.3.1. And where  $X = \text{He}$ , Section 3.3.2.

#### 3.3.1 $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H}$

For  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H}$ , the  $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections are calculated using the low-energy (Figure 3.3) and statistical (Figure 3.4) distribution functions. These figures also show comparison to CTMC data from Schultz and Kristić (1996) for  $n=5$ ,  $n=6$ , and  $n=7$ .




Figure 3.3:  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved (low-energy) cross section comparisons.

MCLZ (lines); CTMC (Schultz and Kristić 1996) (lines with circles).

For  $n=5$  and  $n=6$ , the cross sections are within an order of magnitude of those of Schultz and Kristić (1996). In fact, in the lower range of the data,  $n=5$  is very similar to Schultz and Kristić (1996), and in the  $n\ell$ -resolved case, they can be seen to be in close agreement. However, Figure 3.3 (b) shows the correspondence between the  $\ell$  states of each method to be out of order. The MCLZ states, from highest to lowest are ordered:  $d$ ,  $p$ ,  $s$ ,  $f$ , and  $g$ , while for Schultz and Kristić (1996), they are arranged as:  $g$ ,  $f$ ,  $d$ ,  $p$ , and  $s$ , i.e., the latter follow a statistical distribution, though it is expected that for energies less than 1 keV/u, the  $\ell$  distribution should follow more closely the low-energy distribution form. A similar phenomenon appears in graphs (c) and (d).




Figure 3.4:  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved (statistical) cross section comparisons.

MCLZ (lines); CTMC (Schultz and Kristić 1996) (lines with circles).

As a consequence, the MCLZ  $n\ell$ -resolved statistical cross sections, as shown in Figure 3.4, are in better agreement with the CTMC results (Schultz and Kristić 1996), as might be expected. It should be noted that 10 keV/u corresponds to the region where the applicability of both methods, MCLZ and CTMC, begins to be questionable, i.e. MCLZ is expected to be reliable for lower kinetic energies and CTMC for higher energies, likewise, the statistical  $\ell$ -distribution is likely valid at 10 keV/u, while the low-energy distribution may be expected to be reasonable below 1 keV/u. How the transition should be made from statistical to low-energy, and at what kinetic energy, is unknown.






Figure 3.5:  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}^+$  total cross section comparison.

(a) CTMC (Olson and Salop 1977); (b) CTMC microcanonical (Errea et al. 2004); (c) OEDM (Errea et al. 2004); (d) CTMC (Perez et al. 2001); (e) CTMC hydrogenic (Errea et al. 2004); (f) experimental (Bendahman et al. 1985); (g) theory (Grozdanov 1980); (h) CTMC (Maynard et al. 1992); (i) experimental (Meyer et al. 1985); (j) CTMC (Schultz and Kristić 1996); and (k) current MCLZ.

In Figure 3.5, the total MCLZ cross section for  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H}$  is compared to other calculations and experimental data. It can be seen that the MCLZ results are very close to those obtained by other methods, particularly in the range 1–100 eV/u. Below 1 eV/u, the MCLZ cross section diverges from the other cross sections. And for higher energies, the MCLZ results overestimate the available data and continue to diverge with increasing energy. However,  $\gtrsim 300$  eV/u, as can be seen in Figure 3.2, the total MCLZ cross section begins to fall. These comparisons suggest that the MCLZ method is sufficiently accurate in the domain of 1–100 eV/u.




Figure 3.6:  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross section comparison.

(a) Bendahman et al. (1985); (b) AOCC (Cumbee et al. 2016); (c) CTMC (Perez et al. 2001); (d) CTMC (Olson and Salop 1977); (e) CTMC hydrogenic (Errea et al. 2004); (f) current MCLZ; (g) CTMC micro-canonical (Errea et al. 2004); (h) CTMC (Maynard et al. 1992); (i) OEDM (Errea et al. 2004); (j) CTMC (Schultz and Kristić 1996).

MCLZ  $n$ -resolved cross sections are compared to available data, as presented in Figure 3.6. For each cross section, there are AOCC data available for comparison (Cumbee et al. 2016), but in the cases of  $n=1$  and  $n=2$ , the AOCC cross sections are significantly smaller, being off the scale of the plots. For  $n=4$ , the MCLZ cross section comes within an order of magnitude of the AOCC calculation. While for  $n=5$  and  $n=6$ , the MCLZ and AOCC cross sections overlap at higher energies. Compared to other data,  $n=5$  gives the closest agreement, especially around 20-30 keV/u compared to the measurements of Bendahman et al. (1985) and the CTMC calculations of Perez et al. (2001). The results for  $n=6$  are somewhat smaller

than all previous results, while the  $n=7$  and 8 cross sections are underestimates, again due to the lack of short-range couplings in the MCLZ model. The underestimation of the MCLZ  $n=6$  cross section accounts for most of the discrepancy in the total cross section given in Figure 3.5.

### 3.3.2 $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{He}$




Figure 3.7:  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.

Low-energy distribution function.

MCLZ  $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections for  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{He}$  are presented in Figure 3.7 (low-energy distribution function) and Figure 3.8 (statistical distribution function).




Figure 3.8:  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.

Statistical distribution function.




Figure 3.9:  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

MCLZ comparison to the CTMC cross sections of Ali et al. (2010).

Figure 3.9 shows  $n$ -resolved cross sections. Comparison is made at 4550 eV/u, to the CTMC results of Ali et al. (2010) where general agreement is seen with the current MCLZ calculations, both indicating that the dominant capture channels are  $n=4$ , 5, and 6, but with

Table 3.1.  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$  MCLZ and CTMC  
 $n$ -resolved cross section differences at 4550 eV/u.

Channel	MCLZ	CTMC	Difference
Total	2.6981e+01	5.4636e+01	-2.7655e+01
$n=1$	1.9726e-03	1.8858e-04	1.7840e-03
$n=2$	1.8877e-02	6.5847e-01	-6.3959e-01
$n=3$	8.0112e-01	8.9748e+00	-8.1737e+00
$n=4$	1.2729e+01	4.2818e+01	3.0089e+01
$n=5$	1.3414e+01	2.0630e+00	1.1351e+01
$n=6$	4.7142e-03	1.0353e-01	-9.8816e-02

different ordering. This is not unexpected given that the MCLZ method is approaching its range of applicability at our high energy limit, while the CTMC results approach their low energy validity range (i.e., the uncertainty in both CTMC and MCLZ are expected to be relatively high at this collision energy). The differences between these two sets of data are listed in Table 3.1.

### 3.4 $\text{Ne}^{9+}$

Total MCLZ SEC cross sections for  $\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}$  and  $\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{He}$  are presented in Figure 3.10.




Figure 3.10:  $\text{Ne}^{9+} + X \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{8+} + X^+$  total cross sections.

Additional details for  $\text{Ne}^{9+} + X$ , where  $X=\text{H}$ , are given in Section 3.4.1. And where  $X=\text{He}$ , Section 3.4.2.




Figure 3.11:  $\text{Ne}^{9+} + X \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{8+} + X^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

(a):  $X=\text{H}$  (triplets); (b)  $X=\text{H}$  (singlets); (c)  $X=\text{H}$  (sum of singlets and triplets), and experimental data (Bendahman et al. 1985; Meyer et al. 1985); (d)  $X=\text{He}$ , and comparison to experimental result of Greenwood et al. (2001).

#### 3.4.1 $\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}$

For  $\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}$ , the singlet and triplet cross sections are calculated separately due to symmetry considerations. Figure 3.11 (a) shows the  $n$ -resolved triplet cross sections, where the dominant capture channel is  $n=5$  (for energies below  $\sim 854$  eV/u), and  $n=4$  for energies above that value. In (b), the  $n$ -resolved singlet cross sections are similar. Graph (c) shows the total  $n$ -resolved cross sections, which are the sums of each  $n$  state in the singlets and triplets, and they are compared to experimental total cross section data from Bendahman et al. (1985) and Meyer et al. (1985). The MCLZ cross section is in close agreement with results of both Bendahman et al. (1985) and Meyer et al. (1985). Dominant channels are listed in Table 3.2.




Figure 3.12:  $\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$   $n$ - and  $n\ell$ -resolved cross section comparisons.

MCLZ (lines); CTMC (Schultz and Kristić 1996) (lines with circles). Note that  $\ell$ -distribution functions are not needed for two or more electron ions for MCLZ calculations.

Figure 3.12 displays a comparison of MCLZ  $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections for  $\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}$  with CTMC data (Schultz and Kristić 1996). The data are in good agreement with each other at 10 keV/u for the  $n$ -resolved cross sections, but they diverge at higher energies as would be expected. Further, the CTMC calculations adopt an effective one-electron model and cannot distinguish final singlet or triplet ions. As a consequence, CTMC results generally follow a statistical  $\ell$ -distribution pattern. On the other hand, each  $n\ell S$ -cross section is explicitly calculated, without a distribution function, with the MCLZ method. Further, for He-like ions, the degeneracy in an  $n$ -manifold is lifted, but the energy of the states may be in a counter-intuitive order. As an example, the  $4^3L$  ordering is  $S$ ,  $P$ ,  $F$ , and  $D$ , which partially explains the same ordering in the MCLZ cross sections about  $\sim 2$  keV/u in Figure 3.12(b).



### 3.4.2 $\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{He}$

Figure 3.11 (d) shows the single electron capture  $n$ -resolved cross sections for  $\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{He}$ , with comparison to the single measurement of Greenwood et al. (2001). The latter is also in excellent agreement with the MCLZ results.

### 3.5 $\text{Ne}^{8+}$

Total MCLZ SEC cross sections for  $\text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{H}$  and  $\text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{He}$  are presented in Figure 3.13.




Figure 3.13:  $\text{Ne}^{8+} + X \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{7+} + X^+$  total cross sections.

Additional details for  $\text{Ne}^{8+} + X$ , where  $X = \text{H}$ , are given in Section 3.5.1. And where  $X = \text{He}$ , Section 3.5.2.




Figure 3.14:  $\text{Ne}^{8+} + X \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{7+} + X^+$   $n$ - and  $n\ell$ -resolved cross section comparisons.

(a)  $X=\text{H}$  ( $n$ -resolved), and experimental data of Bendahman et al. (1985); (b)  $X=\text{H}$  ( $n\ell$ -resolved), and experimental data of Bendahman et al. (1985); (c)  $X=\text{He}$  ( $n$ -resolved); (d)  $X=\text{He}$  ( $n\ell$ -resolved).

### 3.5.1 $\text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{H}$

$\text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{H}$  cross sections,  $n$ - and  $n\ell$ -resolved, are presented in Figure 3.14(a) and (b). For comparison purposes, there is also an experimental data point from Bendahman et al. (1985), which agrees with the MCLZ total cross section at 4500 eV/u.

Figure 3.15 shows a comparison of MCLZ  $n$ - and  $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections with CTMC data (Schultz and Kristić 1996). At 10 keV/u,  $n=4$  and  $n=5$  closely agree with the CTMC results from Schultz and Kristić (1996). For the  $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections in (b), the agreement at 10 keV/u is very good since the effective one-electron CTMC model should be valid for the Li-like Ne product ions. However, as for  $\text{Ne}^{9+}$  collisions, the CTMC  $\ell$ -distributions are statistical, while MCLZ  $\ell$ -cross section orders are controlled mostly by the energy ordering of states.




Figure 3.15:  $\text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{7+} + \text{H}^+$   $n$ - and  $n\ell$ -resolved cross section comparisons.

MCLZ (lines); CTMC (Schultz and Kristić 1996) (lines with circles).

### 3.5.2 $\text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{He}$

$\text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{He}$  cross sections,  $n$ - and  $n\ell$ -resolved, are presented in Figure 3.14(c) and (d). Dominant channels are listed in Table 3.2. There are no other data available for the purpose of comparison.

### 3.6 $\text{Mg}^{12+}$

Total cross sections for  $\text{Mg}^{12+}$  with H and He are shown in Figure 3.16.




Figure 3.16:  $\text{Mg}^{12+} + X \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + X^+$  total cross sections.

The  $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections are calculated using the statistical (Equation 3.1) and low-energy (Equation 3.2) distribution functions. Plots for these results are shown in the appropriate sections below. Furthermore, previously published results for  $\text{Mg}^{12+}$  ionic collisions with H and He are not available. The results here can serve as a basis for future comparisons.

Additional details for  $\text{Mg}^{12+} + X$ , where  $X=\text{H}$ , are given in Section 3.6.1. And where  $X=\text{He}$ , Section 3.6.2.

### 3.6.1 $\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{H}$

Figure 3.17 shows the  $n$ -resolved cross sections for  $\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H}^+$ . The dominant channels, as shown in the figure, are listed in Table 3.3.




Figure 3.17:  $\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.




Figure 3.18:  $\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.

Low-energy distribution function.




Figure 3.19:  $\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.

Statistical distribution function.

### 3.6.2 $\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{He}$

Figure 3.20 shows the  $n$ -resolved cross sections for  $\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He}^+$ . The dominant channels, as shown in the figure, are listed in Table 3.3.




Figure 3.20:  $\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.




Figure 3.21:  $\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.

Low-energy distribution function.




Figure 3.22:  $\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.

Statistical distribution function.

### 3.7 $\text{Mg}^{11+}$

Total cross sections for  $\text{Mg}^{11+}$  with H and He are shown in Figure 3.23.




Figure 3.23:  $\text{Mg}^{11+} + X \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + X^+$  total cross sections.

Additional details for  $\text{Mg}^{11+} + X$ , where  $X=\text{H}$  are given in Section 3.7.1. And where  $X=\text{He}$ , Section 3.7.2.

### 3.7.1 $\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H}$

Cross sections for  $\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{H}^+$  in Figures 3.24, 3.25, and 3.26. Dominant channels are listed in Table 3.3.






Figure 3.24:  $\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{H}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.

Singlets.




Figure 3.25:  $\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{H}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.

Triplets.




Figure 3.26:  $\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{H}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

Sum of singlets and triplets.

### 3.7.2 $\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He}$

Results for  $\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{He}^+$  are shown in Figures 3.27 and 3.28. Dominant channels are listed in Table 3.3. Again, with this system, no previously publish results are available.




Figure 3.27:  $\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{He}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.




Figure 3.28:  $\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{He}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

### 3.8 $\text{Mg}^{10+}$

Total cross sections for  $\text{Mg}^{10+}$  with H and He are shown in Figure 3.29.




Figure 3.29:  $\text{Mg}^{10+} + X \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{9+} + X^+$  total cross sections.

Additional details for  $\text{Mg}^{10+}+X$ , where  $X=\text{H}$  are given in Section 3.8.1. And where  $X=\text{He}$ , Section 3.8.2.

### 3.8.1 $\text{Mg}^{10+}+\text{H}$




Figure 3.30:  $\text{Mg}^{10+}+\text{H}\rightarrow\text{Mg}^{9+}+\text{H}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.




Figure 3.31:  $\text{Mg}^{10+}+\text{H}\rightarrow\text{Mg}^{9+}+\text{H}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

### 3.8.2 $\text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{He}$




Figure 3.32:  $\text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.




Figure 3.33:  $\text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

### 3.9 $\text{Mg}^{9+}$

Total cross sections for  $\text{Mg}^{9+}$  with H and He are shown in Figure 3.34.




Figure 3.34:  $\text{Mg}^{9+} + X \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + X^+$  total cross sections.

Additional details for  $\text{Mg}^{9+} + X$ , where  $X=\text{H}$  are given in Section 3.9.1. And where  $X=\text{He}$ , Section 3.9.2.

### 3.9.1 $\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{H}$




Figure 3.35:  $\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.

Singlets.




Figure 3.36:  $\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.

Triplets.




Figure 3.37:  $\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

Sum of singlets and triplets.

### 3.9.2 $\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{He}$




Figure 3.38:  $\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{He}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.




Figure 3.39:  $\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{He}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

### 3.10 $\text{Mg}^{8+}$

Total cross sections for  $\text{Mg}^{8+}$  with H and He are shown in Figure 3.40.






Figure 3.40:  $\text{Mg}^{8+} + X \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{7+} + X^+$  total cross sections.

Additional details for  $\text{Mg}^{8+} + X$ , where  $X=\text{H}$  are given in Section 3.10.1. And where  $X=\text{He}$ , Section 3.10.2.

### 3.10.1 $\text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{H}$




Figure 3.41:  $\text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{7+} + \text{H}^+$   $n\ell$ -resolved cross sections.




Figure 3.42:  $\text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{7+} + \text{H}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

### 3.10.2 $\text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{He}$




Figure 3.43:  $\text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{7+} + \text{He}^+$   $nl$ -resolved cross sections.




Figure 3.44:  $\text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{7+} + \text{He}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

### 3.11 SUMMARY

Using the MCLZ method, SEC cross sections were calculated and plotted for  $\text{Ne}^{q+} + X$ , where  $q=8-10$ , and for  $\text{Mg}^{q+} + X$ , where  $q=8-12$ , and  $X=\text{H}$  and  $\text{He}$ . These results were compared to previous theoretical and experimental results where available. It was determined that the results in this study were consistent with the compared data, and thus, the MCLZ method is a reasonably accurate estimation of SEC cross sections.

Because of the lack of available data for comparison with the Mg systems, it can only be said that the results appear to be consistent. It is assumed the same accuracy is present in these systems.

Below are the dominant channels which were found in each system.

Table 3.2.  $\text{Ne}^{(8-10)+}$  Dominant Channels.

System	Channel	eV/u
$\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}^+$	$n=7$	$\lesssim 2.3\text{e1}$
	$n=6$	$2.3\text{e1}-2.1\text{e4}$
	$n=5$	$\gtrsim 2.1\text{e4}$
$\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$	$n=6$	$\lesssim 6.3\text{e-1}$
	$n=5$	$6.3\text{e-1}-5.1\text{e3}$
	$n=4$	$\gtrsim 5.1\text{e3}$
$\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$	$n=6$	$\lesssim 9.8\text{e2}$
	$n=5$	$\gtrsim 9.8\text{e2}$
$\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{He}^+$	$n=5$	$\lesssim 2.0\text{e2}$
	$n=4$	$\gtrsim 2.0\text{e2}$
$\text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{7+} + \text{H}^+$	$n=5$	$1.0\text{e-3}-1.0\text{e5}$
$\text{Ne}^{8+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Ne}^{7+} + \text{He}^+$	$n=4$	$1.0\text{e-3}-1.0\text{e5}$

Table 3.3.  $\text{Mg}^{(8-12)+}$  Dominant Channels.

System	Channel	eV/u
$\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H}^+$	$n=8$	$\lesssim 2.5\text{e1}$
	$n=7$	$2.5\text{e1}-7.4\text{e3}$
	$n=6$	$\gtrsim 7.4\text{e3}$
$\text{Mg}^{12+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He}^+$	$n=7$	$\lesssim 1.5\text{e-1}$
	$n=6$	$1.5\text{e-1}-5.6\text{e2}$
	$n=5$	$\gtrsim 5.6\text{e2}$
$\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{H}^+$	$n=7$	$\lesssim 7.9\text{e2}$
	$n=6$	$\gtrsim 7.9\text{e2}$
$\text{Mg}^{11+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{He}^+$	$n=6$	$\lesssim 8.7\text{e1}$
	$n=5$	$\gtrsim 8.7\text{e1}$
$\text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{H}^+$	$n=7$	$\lesssim 3.1\text{e0}$
	$n=6$	$3.1\text{e0}-3.3\text{e4}$
	$n=5$	$\gtrsim 3.3\text{e4}$
$\text{Mg}^{10+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{He}^+$	$n=5$	$\lesssim 9.6\text{e3}$
	$n=4$	$\gtrsim 9.6\text{e3}$
$\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$	$n=6$	$\lesssim 1.3\text{e3}$
	$n=5$	$1.3\text{e3}-8.4\text{e4}$
	$n=4$	$\gtrsim 8.4\text{e4}$
$\text{Mg}^{9+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{He}^+$	$n=5$	$\lesssim 1.4\text{e1}$
	$n=4$	$\gtrsim 1.4\text{e1}$
$\text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{7+} + \text{H}^+$	$n=5$	$\lesssim 6.5\text{e3}$
	$n=4$	$\gtrsim 6.5\text{e3}$
$\text{Mg}^{8+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Mg}^{7+} + \text{He}^+$	$n=4$	$\lesssim 7.1\text{e-1}$
	$n=3$	$\gtrsim 7.1\text{e-1}$

## CHAPTER 4

### Fe<sup>(8-9)+</sup> WITH H, H<sub>2</sub>, He, H<sub>2</sub>O, CO, CO<sub>2</sub>, AND N<sub>2</sub> USING MCLZ<sup>1</sup>

#### 4.1 METHODS

The calculation of cross sections for collisions of Fe<sup>(8-9)+</sup> with H, H<sub>2</sub>, He, H<sub>2</sub>O, CO, CO<sub>2</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>, resulting in single electron capture, using the Landau-Zener method (Butler and Dalgarno 1980; Janev et al. 1983) is the same as that discussed in Chapter 3 (Lyons et al. 2017). However, since atomic energies for the Rydberg levels (given by the electron configurations) of the resulting ion are required to begin the calculations, an additional step is necessary to obtain those energies when they are unavailable. For example, Table 4.1 shows the energy levels which are available at NIST (Kramida et al. 2018).

Of particular concern are the energies of each singly-excited doublet state, i.e., where only the valence electron is excited, as seen in Table 4.2. In these tables, the highly-excited term energies for  $3p^64s$ ,  $3p^65s$ ,  $3p^65p$ ,  $3p^65d$ ,  $3p^65g$ , etc., are not given. If these energies are unavailable from other sources, they can be calculated or estimated using a variety of methods. These missing energies are estimated using a form of the Quantum Defect relation (Connerade 1998; Lyons et al. 2017; Mullen et al. 2016):

$$E(n) = E_0 \left( 1 - \frac{1}{(n - \mu)^2} \right) \quad (4.1)$$

Solving for  $\mu$  in Equation 4.1 gives

$$\mu = n \pm \sqrt{\frac{1}{1 - \frac{E(n)}{E_0}}} \quad (4.2)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Lyons, David A., and Stancil, Phillip C., 2019. To be submitted to *The Astrophysical Journal*.

Table 4.1. Fe VIII ( $\text{Fe}^{7+}$ ) NIST Atomic Energies.

Configuration	Term	J	Level ( $\text{cm}^{-1}$ )	Term Energy
$3p^6 3d$	$^2\text{D}$	$3/2$	0	0
		$5/2$	1836	
$3p^5(^2\text{P}^\circ)3d^2(^1\text{G})$	$^2\text{F}^\circ$	$5/2$	431250	432037
		$7/2$	434555	
$3p^5(^2\text{P}^\circ)3d^2(^1\text{D})$	$^2\text{F}^\circ$	$7/2$	447658	451575
		$5/2$	459367	
$3p^5(^2\text{P}^\circ)3d^2(^1\text{S})$	$^2\text{P}^\circ$	$3/2$	508518	511518
		$1/2$	520822	
$3p^6 4p$	$^2\text{P}^\circ$	$1/2$	510277	512691
		$3/2$	515550	
$3p^5(^2\text{P}^\circ)3d^2(^3\text{F})$	$^2\text{F}^\circ$	$5/2$	535909	538988
		$7/2$	541755	
$3p^5(^2\text{P}^\circ)3d^2(^3\text{P})$	$^2\text{P}^\circ$	$1/2$	591964	592988
		$3/2$	595152	
$3p^5(^2\text{P}^\circ)3d^2(^3\text{F})$	$^2\text{D}^\circ$	$5/2$	596463	595656
		$3/2$	597065	
$3p^6 4f$	$2\text{F}^\circ$	$5/2$	763703	762656
		$7/2$	763799	
$3p^5 3d(^3\text{P}^\circ)4s$	$^2\text{P}^\circ$	$1/2$	837661	840005
		$3/2$	842829	
$3p^5 3d(^3\text{P}^\circ)4s$	$^4\text{F}^\circ$	$7/2$	847145	848229
		$5/2$	849899	
		$3/2$	852849	
$3p^5 3d(^3\text{F}^\circ)4s$	$^2\text{F}^\circ$	$7/2$	855100	856362
		$5/2$	860615	
$3p^5 3d(^3\text{D}^\circ)4s$	$^4\text{D}^\circ$	$7/2$	874711	875134

Table 4.1 (cont'd)

Configuration	Term	J	Level (cm <sup>-1</sup> )	Term Energy
$3p^5 3d(^1D^\circ)4s$	$^2D^\circ$	$5/2$	876765	878849
		$3/2$	877476	
		$1/2$	878264	
		$5/2$	879021	
$3p^5 3d(^1F^\circ)4s$	$^2F^\circ$	$3/2$	881345	884940
		$5/2$	884331	
$3p^5 3d(^3D^\circ)4s$	$^2D^\circ$	$7/2$	887325	889051
		$3/2$	889113	
		$5/2$	890845	
$3p^6 5f$	$^2F^\circ$	$5/2$	927059	925982
		$7/2$	927102	
$3p^6 6f$	$^2F^\circ$	$5/2$	1016560	1015464
		$7/2$	1016570	
$3p^6 7f$	$^2F^\circ$	$5/2$	1069873	1068861
		$7/2$	1070029	
Fe IX ( $3p^6(^1S_0)$ )	Limit	—	1218380.1	

Equation 4.2 shows that there can be two values for  $\mu$ , which are called  $\mu_+$  and  $\mu_-$ . Using the term energies in Table 4.2, the values of  $\mu_+$  and  $\mu_-$  are plotted and shown in Figure 4.1, where the linearity of the  $\mu_+$  and  $\mu_-$  values for  $\ell=3$  ( $f$  states) appear to converge at or near the origin. It is assumed that for all other values of  $\ell$ , the values of  $\mu_+$  and  $\mu_-$  are also linear and converge at the same point. Thus, the values of  $\mu_+$  and  $\mu_-$  are calculated for all  $n$  where  $\ell=1$ ,  $\ell=2$ , and  $\ell=3$ .

Table 4.2. Fe VIII ( $\text{Fe}^{7+}$ ) NIST Term Energies: Singly-Excited Doublets.

Configuration	Term	Term Energy
$3p^6 3d$	$^2D$	0
$3p^6 4p$	$^2P^\circ$	512691
$3p^6 4f$	$^2F^\circ$	762656
$3p^6 5f$	$^2F^\circ$	925982
$3p^6 6f$	$^2F^\circ$	1015464
$3p^6 7f$	$^2F^\circ$	1068861




Figure 4.1:  $\mu$  vs.  $n$  —  $\text{Fe}^{7+}$  NIST excitation energies.

Singly-excited doublet states.

The results of Quantum Defect estimations are shown in Figure 4.2. Since there are no data available for states where  $\ell=4$  and above, the values of  $\mu$  are estimated graphically and adjusted until the resulting term energies (obtained with Equation 4.1) fit as expected with the rest of the data. The resulting estimated term energies, along with those provided by



NIST, are shown in Table 4.3. These are the energies used to calculate the MCLZ SEC cross section of  $\text{Fe}^{8+} + X \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + X^+$ .




Figure 4.2:  $\mu$  vs.  $n$  —  $\text{Fe}^{7+}$  estimated and NIST excitation energies.

Singly-excited doublet states.

Table 4.3. Fe VIII ( $\text{Fe}^{7+}$ ) Term Energies: Estimated and NIST.

Valence Electron	Term	Term Energy
$3d$	$^2D$	0
$3d$	$^2F^\circ$	432037
$3d$	$^2F^\circ$	451575
$4s$	$^2S$	497445
$3d$	$^2P^\circ$	511518
$4p$	$^2P^\circ$	512691
$4d$	$^2D$	530760
$3d$	$^2F^\circ$	538988
$3d$	$^2P^\circ$	592988
$3d$	$^2D^\circ$	595656
$5s$	$^2S$	756060
$4f$	$^2F^\circ$	762656
$5p$	$^2P$	765836
$5d$	$^2D$	777424
$4s$	$^2P^\circ$	840005
$4s$	$^2F^\circ$	856362
$4s$	$^2D^\circ$	878849
$4s$	$^2F^\circ$	884940
$4s$	$^2D^\circ$	889051
$6s$	$^2S$	896896
$6p$	$^2P$	903695
$6d$	$^2D$	911752
$5f$	$^2F^\circ$	925982
$7s$	$^2S$	981963
$7p$	$^2P$	986962
$7d$	$^2D$	992888

Table 4.3 (cont'd)

Valence Electron	Term	Term Energy
<i>6f</i>	$^2F^\circ$	1015464
<i>8s</i>	$^2S$	1037244
<i>8p</i>	$^2P$	1041074
<i>8d</i>	$^2D$	1045614
<i>5g</i>	$^2G$	1051250
<i>7f</i>	$^2F^\circ$	1068861
<i>9s</i>	$^2S$	1075180
<i>9p</i>	$^2P$	1078209
<i>9d</i>	$^2D$	1081798
<i>6g</i>	$^2G$	1102163
<i>8f</i>	$^2F^\circ$	1103894
<i>9f</i>	$^2F^\circ$	1127872
<i>7g</i>	$^2G$	1132915
<i>8g</i>	$^2G$	1152899
<i>6h</i>	$^2H$	1155447
<i>9g</i>	$^2G$	1166613
<i>7h</i>	$^2H$	1172100
<i>8h</i>	$^2H$	1182921
<i>9h</i>	$^2H$	1190348
<i>7i</i>	$^2I$	1192789
<i>8i</i>	$^2I$	1198773
<i>9i</i>	$^2I$	1202880
<i>8k</i>	$^2K$	1206196
<i>9k</i>	$^2K$	1208748
<i>9l</i>	$^2L$	1213309

$\text{Fe}^{8+}$  has even fewer energies available which can be used to predict the missing values. Furthermore, this ion has a number of ambiguous states (i.e., it is unclear whether these ambiguous states are singlets or triplets). However, the same assumptions are used for  $\text{Fe}^{8+}$  as those used for  $\text{Fe}^{7+}$ : the  $\mu$  values are linear in  $n$  for a given  $\ell$ , and they pass through the origin for  $n=0$ . For  $\text{Fe}^{8+}$ , singlets and triplets are calculated separately. For the ambiguous states, assumptions are made whether these are included in the calculations for singlets or triplets. These assumptions are based on the electron configuration and term. For this ion, Wigner-Witmer rules are applied, and the resulting molecular channels are further divided into  $\Sigma$  and  $\Pi$  states. As with singlets and triplets, these are calculated separately. For these

Table 4.4. Fe IX ( $\text{Fe}^{8+}$ ) NIST Atomic Energies.

Configuration	Term	J	Level	Term Energy
$3s^23p^6$	$^1\text{S}$	0	0	0
$3s^23p^53d$	$^3\text{P}^\circ$	0	405772	411007
		1	408315.1	
		2	413669.2	
$3s^23p^53d$	$^3\text{F}^\circ$	4	425809.8	428883.7
		3	429310.9	
		2	433818.8	
$3s^23p^53d$	$^3\text{D}^\circ$	3	455612.2	458948
		1	460616	
		2	462616.6	
$3s^23p^53d$	$^1\text{D}^\circ$	2	456752.7	456752.7
$3s^23p^53d$	$^1\text{F}^\circ$	3	465828.4	465828.4
$3s^23p^53d$	$^1\text{P}^\circ$	1	584546	584546
$3s3p^63d$	$^3\text{D}$	1	726734	728036
		2	727560	
		3	728935	
$3s3p^63d$	$^1\text{D}$	2	749871	749871
$3s^23p^5(^2\text{P}_{3/2}^\circ)4s$	$(3/2, 1/2)^\circ$	1	950500	950500
$3s^23p^5(^2\text{P}_{1/2}^\circ)4s$	$(1/2, 1/2)^\circ$	1	965570	965570
$3s^23p^54d$	$^3\text{P}^\circ$	1	1198220	1198220
$3s^23p^54d$	$^1\text{P}^\circ$	1	1213150	1213150
$3s^23p^5(^2\text{P}_{3/2}^\circ)4f$	$^2[3/2]$	1	1300920	1302120
		2	1302840	
$3s^23p^5(^2\text{P}_{3/2}^\circ)4f$	$^2[9/2]$	5	1304600	1305374

states, there are also degeneracy factors which are needed in the cross section calculations, as shown in Table 4.7.

Table 4.4 (cont'd)

Configuration	Term	J	Level	Term Energy
		4	1306320	
$3s^23p^5(^2P_{3/2}^\circ)4f$	$2[5/2]$	3	1305760	1305760
$3s^23p^5(^2P_{3/2}^\circ)4f$	$2[7/2]$	3	1310160	1311054
		4	1311750	
$3s^23p^5(^2P_{1/2}^\circ)4f$	$2[5/2]$	3	1323660	1323660
$3s^23p^5(^2P_{1/2}^\circ)4f$	$2[7/2]$	3	1324720	1324765
		4	1324800	
$3s^23p^5(^2P_{3/2}^\circ)5s$	$(3/2, 1/2)^\circ$	1	1358140	1358140
$3s3p^64p$	$1P^\circ$	1	1371910	1371910
$3s^23p^5(^2P_{1/2}^\circ)5s$	$(1/2, 1/2)^\circ$	1	1372670	1372670
Fe X ( $3p^52P_{3/2}^\circ$ )	Limit	—	1884000.3	

The available energies are sourced from the NIST database, and are shown in Table 4.4. Based on those term energies of the singly-excited states, the  $\mu$  values are adjusted such that the resulting energy falls into an expected range, based on the other energies given. For example, a singly-excited state should have a lower energy than a similar state where the core is excited. An example would be as follows: the singly-excited state  $3s^23p^54p(^1P^\circ)$  should have a lower energy than that for the core-excited state  $3s3p^64p(^1P^\circ)$ . The value of  $\mu$  is adjusted in increments of 0.1 until the term energy falls into the appropriate range. In some cases, increments of  $\mu$  are adjusted by 0.01 or even 0.001 until the energy for that state falls into a reasonable range. After  $\mu$  is estimated for  $3s^23p^54p(^1P^\circ)$ , then  $\mu$  is found for  $3s^23p^55p(^1P^\circ)$ ,  $3s^23p^56p(^1P^\circ)$ , and so on, using the linear assumption. Next, it is assumed that  $3s^23p^54s(^1S^\circ)$  will have a lower energy than  $3s^23p^54p(^1P^\circ)$ . So a similar adjustment of  $\mu$  is made until the energy is satisfactorily estimated. Then the rest of the  $\mu$  values for 5s, 6s, etc. can be calculated. The process continues for the next  $\ell$  quantum number,  $d$ , then  $f$ , and so on. MCLZ SEC cross sections are calculated using the resulting estimated and given energies shown in Table 4.5 (singlets) and Table 4.6 (triplets).

Table 4.5. Fe IX ( $\text{Fe}^{8+}$ ) Singlet Term Energies: Estimated and NIST.

Valence Electron	Term	Term Energy ( $\text{cm}^{-1}$ )
$3p$	$^1\text{S}$	0.00000000e+00
$3d$	$^1\text{D}^\circ$	4.56752700e+05
$3d$	$^1\text{F}^\circ$	4.65828400e+05
$3d$	$^1\text{P}^\circ$	5.84546000e+05
$3d$	$^1\text{D}$	7.49871000e+05
$4s$	$(^1/2, ^1/2)^\circ$	9.65570000e+05
$4d$	$^1\text{P}^\circ$	1.21315000e+06
$4f$	$^2[5/2]$	1.32366000e+06
$4f$	$^2[7/2]$	1.32476500e+06
$5p$	$^1\text{P}$	1.36958893e+06
$5d$	$^1\text{D}$	1.37019116e+06
$4p$	$^1\text{P}^\circ$	1.37191000e+06
$5s$	$(^1/2, ^1/2)^\circ$	1.37267000e+06
$5f$	$^1\text{F}$	1.51143825e+06
$6s$	$^1\text{S}$	1.52630306e+06
$6p$	$^1\text{P}$	1.52677018e+06
$6d$	$^1\text{D}$	1.52718840e+06
$5g$	$^1\text{G}$	1.55691692e+06
$7s$	$^1\text{S}$	1.62120233e+06
$7p$	$^1\text{P}$	1.62154552e+06
$7d$	$^1\text{D}$	1.62185278e+06
$6f$	$^1\text{F}$	1.62527665e+06
$6g$	$^1\text{G}$	1.65685906e+06
$8s$	$^1\text{S}$	1.68279560e+06
$8p$	$^1\text{P}$	1.68305836e+06
$8d$	$^1\text{D}$	1.68329361e+06

Table 4.5 (cont'd)

Valence Electron	Term	Term Energy (cm <sup>-1</sup> )
<i>6h</i>	<sup>1</sup> H	1.68795448e+06
<i>7f</i>	<sup>1</sup> F	1.69391762e+06
<i>7g</i>	<sup>1</sup> G	1.71712102e+06
<i>9s</i>	<sup>1</sup> S	1.72502375e+06
<i>9p</i>	<sup>1</sup> P	1.72523136e+06
<i>9d</i>	<sup>1</sup> D	1.72541723e+06
<i>8f</i>	<sup>1</sup> F	1.73846825e+06
<i>7h</i>	<sup>1</sup> H	1.73996664e+06
<i>7i</i>	<sup>1</sup> I	1.74638158e+06
<i>8g</i>	<sup>1</sup> G	1.75623335e+06
<i>9f</i>	<sup>1</sup> F	1.76901201e+06
<i>8h</i>	<sup>1</sup> H	1.77372453e+06
<i>8i</i>	<sup>1</sup> I	1.77863597e+06
<i>9g</i>	<sup>1</sup> G	1.78304864e+06
<i>8k</i>	<sup>1</sup> K	1.79096325e+06
<i>9h</i>	<sup>1</sup> H	1.79686883e+06
<i>9i</i>	<sup>1</sup> I	1.80074947e+06
<i>9k</i>	<sup>1</sup> K	1.81048954e+06
<i>9l</i>	<sup>1</sup> L	1.82171930e+06

Table 4.6. Fe IX ( $\text{Fe}^{8+}$ ) Triplet Term Energies: Estimated and NIST.

Valence Electron	Term	Term Energy
$3d$	$^3\text{P}^\circ$	4.11007000e+05
$3d$	$^3\text{F}^\circ$	4.28883700e+05
$3d$	$^3\text{D}^\circ$	4.58948000e+05
$3d$	$^3\text{D}$	7.28036000e+05
$4s$	$(^3/2, ^1/2)^\circ$	9.50500000e+05
$4d$	$^3\text{P}^\circ$	1.19822000e+06
$4p$	$^3\text{P}$	1.29046568e+06
$4f$	$^2[3/2]$	1.30212000e+06
$4f$	$^2[9/2]$	1.30537400e+06
$4f$	$^2[5/2]$	1.30576000e+06
$4f$	$^2[7/2]$	1.31105400e+06
$5p$	$^3\text{P}$	1.35624063e+06
$5s$	$(^3/2, ^1/2)^\circ$	1.35814000e+06
$5d$	$^3\text{D}$	1.35814943e+06
$5f$	$^3\text{F}$	1.50413814e+06
$6s$	$^3\text{S}$	1.51701127e+06
$6p$	$^3\text{P}$	1.51750053e+06
$6d$	$^3\text{D}$	1.51882609e+06
$5g$	$^3\text{G}$	1.55070963e+06
$7s$	$^3\text{S}$	1.61437571e+06
$7p$	$^3\text{P}$	1.61473516e+06
$7d$	$^3\text{D}$	1.61570904e+06
$6f$	$^3\text{F}$	1.62020713e+06
$6g$	$^3\text{G}$	1.65254845e+06
$8s$	$^3\text{S}$	1.67756897e+06
$8p$	$^3\text{P}$	1.67784418e+06



Table 4.6 (cont'd)

Valence Electron	Term	Term Energy
<i>8d</i>	<sup>3</sup> D	1.67858980e+06
<i>6h</i>	<sup>3</sup> H	1.68446797e+06
<i>7f</i>	<sup>3</sup> F	1.69019308e+06
<i>7g</i>	<sup>3</sup> G	1.71395404e+06
<i>9s</i>	<sup>3</sup> S	1.72089407e+06
<i>9p</i>	<sup>3</sup> P	1.72111151e+06
<i>9d</i>	<sup>3</sup> D	1.72170065e+06
<i>8f</i>	<sup>3</sup> F	1.73561664e+06
<i>7h</i>	<sup>3</sup> H	1.73740512e+06
<i>7i</i>	<sup>3</sup> I	1.74386209e+06
<i>8g</i>	<sup>3</sup> G	1.75380863e+06
<i>9f</i>	<sup>3</sup> F	1.76675889e+06
<i>8h</i>	<sup>3</sup> H	1.77176336e+06
<i>8i</i>	<sup>3</sup> I	1.77670698e+06
<i>9g</i>	<sup>3</sup> G	1.78113281e+06
<i>8k</i>	<sup>3</sup> K	1.78937009e+06
<i>9h</i>	<sup>3</sup> H	1.79531926e+06
<i>9i</i>	<sup>3</sup> I	1.79922533e+06
<i>9k</i>	<sup>3</sup> K	1.80923075e+06
<i>9l</i>	<sup>3</sup> L	1.82078846e+06

## 4.2 Fe<sup>9+</sup>

For systems where the neutral atom is not hydrogen-like, it is necessary to perform separate calculations for  $\Sigma$  and  $\Pi$  states using degeneracy factors shown in Table 4.7, according to Wigner-Witmer rules. These  $\Sigma$  and  $\Pi$  calculations are combined into single cross-section results for each system, shown in Figures 4.3–4.11.

Table 4.7. Degeneracy Factors.

State	Factor
$^1\Sigma$	0.08333
$^1\Pi$	0.1667
$^3\Sigma$	0.2500
$^3\Pi$	0.5000




Figure 4.3:  $\text{Fe}^{9+} + X \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + X^+$  total cross sections.

#### 4.2.1 $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H}$

For this system, singlet and triplet cross sections are calculated separately. Furthermore, separate calculations are performed for  $\Sigma$  and  $\Pi$  states for the singlets and triplets. Thus, there are 4 separate calculations performed for  $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$ , identified by  $^1\Sigma$ ,  $^1\Pi$ ,  $^3\Sigma$  and  $^3\Pi$ , shown in Figure 4.4. These four results are summed into a final result, shown in Figure 4.5.




Figure 4.4:  $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

$1\Pi, 1\Sigma, 3\Pi, 3\Sigma$ .




Figure 4.5:  $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

$1\Pi + 1\Sigma + 3\Pi + 3\Sigma$ .

#### 4.2.2 $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H}_2$




Figure 4.6:  $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

#### 4.2.3 $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{He}$




Figure 4.7:  $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{He}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

#### 4.2.4 $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$

Figure 4.8 shows close agreement of MCLZ and  $n$ CTMC and experimental results from Simcic et al. (2010a).




Figure 4.8:  $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2\text{O}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

MCLZ comparison to  $n$ CTMC and experimental results of Simcic et al. (2010a).

#### 4.2.5 $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{CO}$

Figure 4.9 shows close agreement of MCLZ and  $n$ CTMC and experimental results from Simcic et al. (2010b).




Figure 4.9:  $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{CO} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

MCLZ comparison to  $n$ CTMC and experimental results of Simcic et al. (2010b).

#### 4.2.6 $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{CO}_2$

Figure 4.10 shows close agreement of MCLZ and  $n$ CTMC and experimental results from Simcic et al. (2010b).




Figure 4.10:  $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{CO}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO}_2^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

MCLZ comparison to  $n$ CTMC and experimental results of Simcic et al. (2010b).

#### 4.2.7 $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{N}_2$




Figure 4.11:  $\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{N}_2^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

#### 4.3 $\text{Fe}^{8+}$

The energies (Table 4.3) are calculated from the estimated values of  $\mu$ , and cross sections are obtained from these energies using the MCLZ method. Plots of these cross sections are shown in Figures 4.12–4.19. Comparisons are made with data available from Simcic et al. (2010a,b), and the results are in agreement. For those systems where no cross sectional data are available, the method used is shown to be sufficiently accurate for Ne and Mg ionic systems (Lyons et al. 2017) in the energy ranges which are presented here.




Figure 4.12:  $\text{Fe}^{8+} + X \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + X^+$  total cross sections.

#### 4.3.1 $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}$




Figure 4.13:  $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{H}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.



### 4.3.2 $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2$




Figure 4.14:  $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{H}_2^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections..

### 4.3.3 $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{He}$




Figure 4.15:  $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{He}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

#### 4.3.4 $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$

Figure 4.16 shows close agreement of MCLZ and  $n$ CTMC and experimental results from Simcic et al. (2010a).




Figure 4.16:  $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{H}_2\text{O}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

MCLZ comparison to  $n$ CTMC and experimental results of Simcic et al. (2010a) .

#### 4.3.5 $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO}$

Figure 4.17 shows close agreement of MCLZ and  $n$ CTMC and experimental results from Simcic et al. (2010b).




Figure 4.17:  $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{CO}^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

MCLZ comparison to  $n$ CTMC and experimental results of Simcic et al. (2010b) .

#### 4.3.6 $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO}_2$

Figure 4.18 shows close agreement of MCLZ and  $n$ CTMC and experimental results from Simcic et al. (2010b).




Figure 4.18:  $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{CO}_2^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

MCLZ comparison to  $n$ CTMC and experimental results of Simcic et al. (2010b) .

#### 4.3.7 $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{N}_2$




Figure 4.19:  $\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{N}_2^+$   $n$ -resolved cross sections.

Table 4.8.  $\text{Fe}^{(8-9)+}$  Dominant Channels.

System	Channel	eV/u
$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$	$n=6$	$\lesssim 5.9\text{e0}$
	$n=7$	$5.9\text{e0} - 1.5\text{e3}$
	$n=6$	$\gtrsim 1.5\text{e3}$
$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2^+$	$n=7$	$\lesssim 5.0\text{e-3}$
	$n=6$	$5.0\text{e-3} - 1.1\text{e-1}$
	$n=7$	$1.1\text{e-1} - 4.7\text{e2}$
	$n=6$	$\gtrsim 4.7\text{e2}$
$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}^+$	$n=6$	$\lesssim 1.7\text{e2}$
	$n=5$	$1.7\text{e2} - 5.0\text{e4}$
	$n=4$	$\gtrsim 5.0\text{e4}$
$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2\text{O}^+$	$n=8$	$\lesssim 5.6\text{e0}$
	$n=6$	$5.6\text{e0} - 2.5\text{e1}$
	$n=7$	$2.5\text{e1} - 1.1\text{e4}$
	$n=6$	$\gtrsim 1.1\text{e4}$
$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{CO} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO}^+$	$n=6$	$\lesssim 2.1\text{e0}$
	$n=7$	$2.1\text{e0} - 1.4\text{e3}$
	$n=6$	$\gtrsim 1.4\text{e3}$
$\text{Fe}^{9+} + \text{CO}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{CO}_2^+$	$n=8$	$\lesssim 9.0\text{e-3}$
	$n=6$	$9.0\text{e-3} - 2.3\text{e0}$
	$n=7$	$2.3\text{e0} - 1.2\text{e3}$
	$n=6$	$\gtrsim 1.2\text{e3}$
$\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{H}^+$	$n=7$	$\lesssim 4.5\text{e2}$
	$n=6$	$4.5\text{e2} - 2.1\text{e4}$
	$n=4$	$\gtrsim 2.1\text{e4}$
$\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{H}_2^+$	$n=7$	$\lesssim 3.7\text{e0}$
	$n=6$	$3.7\text{e0} - 3.6\text{e1}$

Table 4.8 (cont'd)

System	Channel	eV/u
$\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{H}^+$	$n=5$	$3.6\text{e1}-3.1\text{e3}$
	$n=4$	$\gtrsim 3.1\text{e3}$
	$n=4$	$\lesssim 1.0\text{e2}$
	$n=5$	$1.0\text{e2}-7.4\text{e4}$
$\text{Fe}^{8+} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{7+} + \text{H}_2\text{O}^+$	$n=3$	$\gtrsim 7.4\text{e4}$
	$n=6$	$\lesssim 3.8\text{e-1}$
	$n=7$	$3.8\text{e-1}-1.3\text{e3}$
	$n=6$	$1.3\text{e3}-2.7\text{e4}$
	$n=4$	$\gtrsim 2.7\text{e4}$

Results are included from Simcic et al. (2010a) and Simcic et al. (2010b) where available, which confirm the accuracy of the MCLZ method used here.

## CHAPTER 5

### NE<sup>9+</sup>+H USING MOCC<sup>1</sup>

#### 5.1 METHOD

#### 5.2 RESULTS

---

<sup>1</sup>Lyons, David A., and Stancil, Phillip C., 2019. To be submitted to *The Astrophysical Journal*.

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSIONS

#### 6.1 MCLZ: $\text{Ne}^{(8-10)+}$ AND $\text{Mg}^{(8-12)+}$

Using the multichannel Landau–Zener method, state-resolved CX cross sections were computed for highly charged Ne and Mg ions colliding with H and He. It was found that the MCLZ method can provide reasonable SEC cross sections for energies below 10 keV/u for the dominant capture channels. Comparison to previous work was primarily limited to  $\text{Ne}^{10+} + \text{H}$  and a handful of results for  $\text{Ne}^{9+}$  and  $\text{Ne}^{8+}$ . Some of the other less dominant channels do not agree as closely with other theoretical and experimental data as do the dominant channels, while prior results for the Mg ions considered here are completely lacking.

#### 6.2 MCLZ: $\text{Fe}^{(8-9)+}$

Cross sections were calculated for ionic systems  $\text{Fe}^{(8-9)+}$  colliding with neutral atoms and molecules H,  $\text{H}_2$ , He,  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , CO,  $\text{CO}_2$ , and  $\text{N}_2$ , for single electron capture. Excitation energies were estimated where they were not provided by NIST or other sources. These estimations were based on a version of the Quantum Defect method and Hund’s rules. The estimations of excitation energies should be accurate to two significant digits.

It results presented here were supported by the results of Simcic et al. (2010a) and Simcic et al. (2010b).

#### 6.3 MOCC: $\text{Ne}^{9+} + \text{H}$



## APPENDIX A

### *Stüeckelberg*

The cross sections computed here were generated with the MCLZ package *Stüeckelberg* written by the author using the C language and designed to be highly automated, efficient, and modular. The user is required to only provide asymptotic atomic ion energies to *Stüeckelberg*, but a careful application of Wigner-Witmer rules to select final states consistent with allowed transitions is the user's responsibility. The code can be downloaded from <https://www.physast.uga.edu/ambds/> along with documentation and a start-up guide.

Within the CXDatabase directory one will find the input files for *Stüeckelberg* and various output files including lists of avoided-crossings as well as  $n$ -,  $n\ell$ -, and  $n\ell S$ -resolved cross sections. For bare ions,  $n\ell$  cross sections are given using the low-energy and statistical distribution functions, but other  $\ell$ -distribution functions can be applied by the user to the  $n$ -resolved cross section files. Cross sections for additional collision pairs and/or obtained by other theoretical methods are expected to be routinely added. The cross sections will also be available on the UGA Charge Transfer Database (<https://www.physast.uga.edu/ugacxdb/>).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramov, V. A., Baryshnikov, F. F., and Lisitsa, V. S. (1978). *Charge transfer between hydrogen atoms and the nuclei of multicharged ions with allowance for the degeneracy of the final states. Sov. Phys. JETP*, 47:469–477.
- Ali, R., Neill, P. A., Beiersdorfer, P., Harris, C. L., Schultz, D. R., and Stancil, P. C. (2010). *Critical test of simulations of charge-exchange-induced x-ray emission in the solar system. ApJ*, 716:L95–L98.
- Bendahman, M., Bliman, S., Dousson, S., Hitz, D., Gayet, R., Hanssen, J., Harel, C., and Salin, A. (1985). *Electron capture from atomic hydrogen by multiply charged ions in low energy collisions. J. De Physique*, 46:561–572.
- Butler, S. E. and Dalgarno, A. (1980). *Charge transfer of multiply charged ions with hydrogen and helium: Landau-Zener calculations. ApJ*, 241:838–843.
- Connerade, J. P. (1998). *Highly Excited Ions*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, D. P. (1998). *Modeling the Local Bubble*. In Breitschwerdt, D., Freyberg, M. J., and Trümper, J., editors, *The Local Bubble and Beyond: Lyman-Spitzer-Colloquium (Lecture Notes in Physics)*, pages 121–131. Berlin:Springer, 1998 edition.
- Cravens, T. E. (2000). *Heliospheric x-ray emission associated with charge transfer of the solar wind with interstellar neutrals. ApJ*, 532(2):L153–L156.
- Cravens, T. E., Howell, E., Waite, Jr., J. H., and Gladstone, G. R. (1995). *Auroral oxygen precipitation at Jupiter. Journal of Geophysical Research*, 100:17153–17162.

- Cumbee, R. S., Henley, D. B., Stancil, P. C., Shelton, R. L., Nolte, J. L., Wu, Y., and Schultz, D. R. (2014). *Can charge exchange explain anomalous soft x-ray emission in the Cygnus Loop?* *ApJ*, 787(2):L31.
- Cumbee, R. S., Liu, L., Lyons, D., Schultz, D. R., Stancil, P. C., Wang, J. G., and Ali, R. (2016). *Ne X X-ray Emission due to Charge Exchange in M82. Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 458(4):3554–3560.
- Errea, L. F., Illescas, C., Méndez, L., Pons, B., Riera, A., and Suárez, J. (2004). *Accuracy of the classical trajectory Monte Carlo method for electron capture in  $Li^{3+}$  and  $Ne^{10+}+H(1s)$  collisions.* *Phys. Rev. A*, 70:052713.
- Fabian, A. C., Sanders, J. S., Williams, R. J. R., Lazarian, A., Ferland, G. J., and Johnstone, R. M. (2011). *The energy source of the filaments around the giant galaxy NGC 1275. Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 417:172–177.
- Greenwood, J. B., Williams, I. D., Smith, S. J., and Chutjian, A. (2001). *Experimental investigation of the processes determining x-ray emission intensities from charge-exchange collisions.* *Phys. Rev. A*, 63:062707.
- Grozdanov, T. P. (1980). *Classical model for electron capture in collisions of highly charged, fully stripped ions with hydrogen atoms.* *Journal of Physics B: Atomic Molecular Physics*, 13:3835–3847.
- Janev, R. K., Belić, D. S., and Bransden, B. H. (1983). *Total and partial cross sections for electron capture in collisions of hydrogen atoms with fully stripped ions.* *Phys. Rev. A*, 28:3:1293–1302.
- Katsuda, S., Tsunemi, H., Mori, K., Uchida, H., Kosugi, H., Kimura, M., Nakajima, H., Takakura, S., Petre, R., Hewitt, J. W., and Yamaguchi, H. (2011). *Possible charge-exchange x-ray emission in the Cygnus Loop detected with Suzaku. The Astrophysical Journal*, 730(1):24.

- Kramida, A., Ralchenko, Y., Reader, J., and NIST ASD Team (2018). NIST Atomic Spectra Database (ver. 5.6.1), [Online]. Available: <https://physics.nist.gov/asd> [2015, April 16]. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD.
- Krasnopolsky, V. A., Greenwood, J. B., and Stancil, P. C. (2004). *X-Ray and extreme ultraviolet emissions from comets. Space Sci. Rev.*, 113:271–374.
- Landau, L. D. (1932). *A theory of energy transfer II. Phys. Zts. Sowjetunion*, 2:46.
- Lisse, C. M., Dennerl, K., Englhauser, J., Harden, M., Marshall, F. E., Mumma, M. J., Petre, R., Pye, J. P., Ricketts, M. J., Schmitt, J., Trümper, J., and West, R. G. (1996). *Discovery of x-ray and extreme ultraviolet emission from comet C/Hyakutake 1996 B2. Science*, 274(5285):205–209.
- Lyons, D., Cumbee, R. S., and Stancil, P. C. (2017). *Charge Exchange between Ne and Mg Ions and H and He. ApJS*, 232(2):27–43.
- Maynard, G., Janev, R. K., and Katsonis, K. (1992). *Electron capture and ionization in collisions of multicharged neon ions with atomic hydrogen. Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics*, 25(2):437–444.
- Meyer, F. W., Howald, A. M., Havener, C. C., and Phaneuf, R. A. (1985). *Low-energy total-electron-capture cross sections for fully stripped and H-like projectiles incident on H and H<sub>2</sub>. Phys. Rev. A*, 32:3310–3318.
- Mullen, P. D., Cumbee, R. S., Lyons, D., and Stancil, P. C. (2016). *Charge exchange-induced x-ray emission of Fe xxv and Fe xxvi via a streamlined model. ApJS*, 224(2):31.
- Nakamura, H. (2002). *Nonadiabatic Transition*. World Scientific Publishing Co Pte Ltd.
- Olson, R. E. and Salop, A. (1977). *Charge-transfer and impact-ionization cross sections for fully and partially stripped positive ions colliding with atomic hydrogen. Phys. Rev. A*, 16:531–541.

- Perez, J. A., Olson, R. E., and Beiersdorfer, P. (2001). *Charge transfer and x-ray emission reactions involving highly charged ions and neutral hydrogen. Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics*, 34(15):3063–3072.
- Schultz, D. R. and Kristić, P. S. (1996). *Atomic and Plasma-Material Interaction Data for Fusion. Supplement to the Journal Nuclear Fusion*, 16:173.
- Schwerdtfeger, P. and Nagle, J. K. (2018). *2018 Table of static dipole polarizabilities of the neutral elements in the periodic table. Molecular Physics*, 0(0):1–26.
- Simcic, J., Schultz, D. R., Mawhorter, R. J., Greenwood, J. B., Winstead, C., McKoy, B. V., and Chutjian, S. J. S. A. (2010a). *Measurement and Calculation of Absolute Single and Multiple Charge Exchange Cross Sections for  $Fe^{q+}$  Ions Impacting  $H_2O$ . ApJ*, 722:425–439.
- Simcic, J., Schultz, D. R., Mawhorter, R. J., Čadež, I., Greenwood, J. B., Chutjian, A., Smith, S. J., and Lisse, C. M. (2010b). *Measurement of absolute single and multiple charge exchange cross sections for  $Fe^{q+}$  ions impacting CO and  $CO_2$ . Phys. Rev. A*, 81:062715.
- Smith, R. K., Foster, A. R., Edgar, R. J., and Brickhouse, N. S. (2014). *Resolving the origin of the diffuse soft x-ray background. ApJ*, 787(1):77.
- Stüeckelberg, E. C. G. (1932). *Theory of Inelastic Collisions between Atoms. Helvetica Physica Acta*, 5:369–423.
- Taulbjerg, K. (1986). *Reaction windows for electron capture by highly charged ions. Journal of Physics B: Atomic and Molecular Physics*, 19(10):L367–L372.
- Wigner, E. and Witmer, E. E. (1928). *Über die Struktur der zweiatomigen Molekelspektren nach der Quantenmechanik. Zeitschrift für Physik*, 51:859.

Zener, C. (1932). *Non-adiabatic crossing of energy levels. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical and Physical Character*, 137:696–702.