NTIC FILE COPY

Naval Research Laboratory

Washington, DC 20375-5000



NRL Memorandum Report 6294

Electron Collision Shift of the Lyman-Alpha Line In H and He⁺

M. BLAHA

Laboratory for Plasma Research University of Maryland College Park, MD 20742

J. DAVIS

Plasma Radiation Branch Plasma Physics Division

September 9, 1988



Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0204 0188					
a PEPORT STO PTY CASS + 42105	10 R-518 (1 2+ VAR+ 105								
UNCLASSIFIED									
Zal SECURITY CLASSE CATONICAL THORETY		3 DISTRIBUTION AVALABLITY OF PEPPER							
26 DECLASSE CATION DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE		Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.							
T PERCORM NO LORGAN ZAT ON PERCENT NUMBER'S		5 MON TORING ORGANIZATION PERCETT, MERCES							
NRL Memorandum Report 6294									
A NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION	66 OFFICE SYMBOL	TA NAME OF M	01-1021-09	GA1. 241 (*					
Naval Research Laboratory	(ir applicable) Code 4720								
ADDRESS (City State and ZIP Code)		76 ADDPESS City State and ZIP Code)							
dashington, DC 20375-5000									
MANTE OF FURDING SPUNSOR NO	85 OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9 PROCIREMENT ASTRONENT DENTECATION NUMBER				V855			
Office of Naval Research									
ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		10 SOURCE OF	FUNDING NUM	BERS					
Arlington, VA 22217		ELEMENT NO	PPO,EC*	NO RE	.011-	ACCESSION NO			
		61153N		09-41		DN080-03			
Interim FROM		1988 Septe	mber 9			55			
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION This work was supported by t	he Office of Na	val Research							
COSA** CODES	18 SUBJECT TERMS	Continue on rever	se if necessary	and identify	by block	number)			
FED GROUP SUB-GROUP									
ABSTRACT Continue on reverse if necessar	y and identify by block i	number)							
The sensitivity of spectral line	shift is investigated	in the impact a	pproximatio	n for a va	riety o	f assump-			
tions using the distorted-wave with	exchange approach.	The formalism	is applied t	to the Lyn	nan-alp	ha line of			
hydrogen and ionized helium to de	termine the influenc	e of various as	sumptions o	n the line	shift a	as well as			
identifying the differences between	a neutral and ionize	d radiator. Th	e results are	e compare	d and	contrasted			
with a humber of other calculations	and experimental inc		LONX.						
	CT ARSTRACT SECURITY CLASSEC AT ON								
E DISTRIE TON, ALALAR TV OF ARSTRAC	•	. An "AC N	1.20.011.000	•	UNCLASSIFIED				
n optimus of Alas AB strong Abstrac Mister Association Notice - Elisane As		UNCLASSIFI	<u>ED</u>						
Contrel for ALA DAT TRIOCARSTRAC [Minute Assession in Minute - El Savelas Finans Depending - Novio A Dr. Jack Davis	labi. []D.α ⊡ta≷	UNCLASSIFI (202) 767-	ED (Include: Area C •3278	ode) Co	de 47	/20			

S/S 0102-LE 014-6603

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	CALCULATION OF THE LYMAN-ALPHA LINE SHIFT USING THE SCATTERING MATRIX FORMALISM	2
III.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	18
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	20
	REFERENCES	20
	DISTRIBUTION LIST	43

 co^{p^*} Accession For NTIS GRA&I M DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification_ By_____ Distribution/ Availability Codes Avati and/or Dist Special

ELECTRON COLLISION SHIFT OF THE LYMAN-ALPHA LINE IN H AND HE⁺

I. Introduction

The interaction of plasma microfields with radiating atoms and ions causes a line broadening that governs both the the half-width and shift of the spectral line, i.e., the intensity distribution in frequency is altered to reflect the prese.ce of the plasma. The line shifts are of particular interest both for their intrinsic value in terms of providing insight into the fundamental nature of the underlying physical processes affecting the emission of radiation as well as its diagnostic value in the study of high density plasmas. In addition, exact wavelengths of spectral lines of highly charged ions are required in the determination of line opacities and level positions for x-ray laser transitions.

Since the first investigation by Berg, et al. on the effects of plasma interactions on the frequency shift of spectral lines it still remains an interesting and challenging problem. This is due primarily to its N-body nature for which only approx.mate solutions can be found. however, in low density plasmas the mutual interactions of perturbing particles may be neglected converting an intractable problem into a manageable one, making it possible to evaluate line profiles in the impact approximation via the Baranger formalism. 2 This theory is based on the knowledge of the scattering matrix for collisions of electrons and the radiator in the upper as well as in the lower state of the line. In the application of Baranger's theory, the initial perturber-radiator correlations are generally neglected, and the theory leads to negative (i.e. red) frequency shifts of Lyman-alpha lines of hydrogen-like ions 3,4 , contrary to experimental results $^{5-8}$ which yield blue shifts. It has been suggested 9 that another effect which is associated with initial perturber-radiator correlations, namely plasma polarization, may cause blue shifts of hydrogen-like lines. Plasma polarization effects on He⁺ lines have been calculated by several authors 5-8,10 with the assumption of charge neutrality outside the orbit of the bound electron with the result of blue line-shifts. However, a procedure similar to the quantum-mechanical approach of Volonte¹⁰, but with inclusion of electric charges in the outer region, leads again to red shifts of Lyman lines.¹¹

In the present investigation, we concentrate our efforts on a few special problems in the theory of the fine-shift, mainly the sensitivity of calculated shifts to various effects taken into account in the evaluation of

Manuscript approved July 12, 1988.

scattering matrices. For this reason we have chosen the Lyman-alpha lines of hydrogen and of ionized helium as two typical examples where the effects can be demonstrated and differences between a neutral and an ionized emitter may Our approach is fully quantum-mechanical, and the scattering be seen. matrices are obtained in a distorted-wave approximation with exchange. This approximation, although rather simple, is convenient for our purposes because it is very well suited for the calculation of various effects - addition or deletion of different terms in the scattering matrix can be performed easily. We calculated only the electron collision contributions to the shift. Effects of plasma ions will be neglected. Our basic assumption is that perturber-perturber interactions are weak and can be ignored, and therefore the applicability of the results is limited to low-density plasmas, where the Debye shielding length is much larger than the dimensions of the radiator, i.e. for N $< 10^{18}$ cm⁻³. However, the effect of shielding has to be taken into account even at the low density limit for perturbing collisions involving the $\Delta n=0$ transitions and it will be separately discussed in par. 11.4.

The quantum-mechanical results are then compared to line-shifts derived from considerations based on the electrostatic interaction of the bound electron with the plasma. It will be shown that at the limit of weak interaction, both results are identical, but that neither in hydrogen nor in He^+ has this limit been reached.

II. Calculation of the Lyman-alpha line shift using the scattering matrix formalism.

The shift of the Lyman-alpha line of hydrogen and ionized helium produced by electron collisions will be calculated with the assumption that the impact approximation is valid, which means that results will be applicable to lowdensity plasmas only. We will also assume that: 1) the perturber-perturber interactions are small and can be neglected, 2) the wave functions of the bound electron are not changed by plasma interactions, and 3) we will ignore the effect of positive ions. No uniform positive background will be included in the calculations, and the fine structure splitting of atomic levels will be neglected. All calculated shifts will be normalized to the electron density N_c=1 cm⁻³. Unless indicated otherwise, all quantities throughout the paper will be given in atomic units ($e=h/2\pi=m=1$).

Within the validity of the impact approximation, the electron collision profile of a spectral line is determined by electron scattering on the upper and the lower level of the line. Let us denote by $\overline{\ell}$ and ℓ the orbital quantum number of the bound and the colliding electron, respectively, and by a subscript p or s all quantities associated with the scattering on the upper or lower level. The scattering on the upper level $n_p \overline{\ell}_p$ is characterized by elements of the scattering matrix $S(\alpha_p, \alpha_p)$, where the scattering channels α_p , α_p are defined by

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{p}} \equiv n_{\mathbf{p}} \overline{\ell}_{\mathbf{p}} k_{\mathbf{p}} \ell_{\mathbf{p}} L_{\mathbf{p}} S_{\mathbf{p}} ,$$

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{p}} \equiv n_{\mathbf{p}} \overline{\ell}_{\mathbf{p}} k_{\mathbf{p}} \ell_{\mathbf{p}} L_{\mathbf{p}} S_{\mathbf{p}} .$$

 $k_p(k_p)$ = momentum of the colliding electron before (after) the collision, L_pS_p = total orbital and spin angular momentum. Similarly, for the scattering on the lower level $n_s \overline{\ell}_s$ we have

$$\alpha_{\rm S} = n_{\rm S} \overline{\ell}_{\rm S} k_{\rm S} \ell_{\rm S} L_{\rm S} S_{\rm S} ,$$

$$\alpha_{\rm S}' = n_{\rm S}' \overline{\ell}_{\rm S}' k_{\rm S}' \ell_{\rm S}' L_{\rm S} S_{\rm S} .$$

For the Lyman-alpha line,

$$n_{p}\overline{\ell}_{p} \equiv 2p, \ L_{p} = \ell_{p}, \ \ell_{p}\pm 1, \ S_{p} = 0, \ 1,$$
$$n_{s}\overline{\ell}_{s} \equiv 1s, \ L_{s} = \ell_{s}, \ S_{s} = 0, \ 1.$$

According to Baranger², the angular frequency shift $\Delta \omega$ of the radiative transition $n_p p \rightarrow n_s$ is proportional to the electron density N_e and it can be expressed in terms of diagonal elements of the scattering matrix $S(\alpha_p, \alpha_p)$ and $S(\alpha_s, \alpha_s)$ by

$$\Delta \omega = \frac{1}{12} \pi N_{e} \int k^{-1} f(k) \sum_{\ell, L_{p}, S^{T}} (2L_{p} + 1)$$

$$\times (2S^{T} + 1) \operatorname{Im} \left[1 - S\left(\alpha_{p}, \alpha_{p}\right) S^{*}\left(\alpha_{s}, \alpha_{s}\right) \right] dk$$
(1)

with $k=k_p=k_s$, $S^T=S_p=S_s$, $\ell=\ell_p=\ell_s$. f(k) is the momentum distribution function of plasma electrons which is represented by a Maxwellian distribution in the present calculation.

For each value of ℓ and S^T (and consequently for each matrix element $S(\alpha_s, \alpha_s)$), the sum over L_p has three terms with different elements $S(\alpha_p, \alpha_p)$. A schematic example of diagonal matrix elements $S(\alpha_p, \alpha_p)$ for total angular momenta $L_p=1,2,3$ and one particular value of S^T is shown on Fig. 1. Elements with $\ell=2$, corresponding to different terms in the sum over L_p , are indicated by X.

It is convenient to rewrite (1) in terms of transmission matrices \underline{T} . From the relation $\underline{T} = 1 - \underline{S}$ it follows

$$1 - S(\alpha_p, \alpha_p)S^*(\alpha_s, \alpha_s) = T(\alpha_p, \alpha_p) + T^*(\alpha_s, \alpha_s) - T(\alpha_p, \alpha_p)T^*(\alpha_s, \alpha_s)$$
(2)

and the total line-shift is thus decomposed into two parts: contributions from direct terms $T(\alpha_p, \alpha_p) + T^*(\alpha_s, \alpha_s)$ and from the interference term $-T(\alpha_p, \alpha_p) T^*(\alpha_s, \alpha_s)$.

II.1 Evaluation of the T matrix for ionized helium and hydrogen.

In the evaluation of diagonal elements of the transmission matrix \underline{T} it is generally necessary to take into account coupling of several scattering channels. However, in the case of the Lyman-alpha line, the energy difference between the n=1 and n=2 levels in hydrogen and He⁺ is much larger than the average kinetic energy of plasma electrons at the temperatures considered in our calculation, so that only a very small fraction of electrons scattered from the 1s level are affected by coupling to other channels. Therefore, we simplify our procedure by omitting all other levels in the evaluation of the matrix elements $T(\alpha_s, \alpha_s)$. On the other hand, we

have included levels 1s, 2s, 2p, 3s, 3p, 3d in the \underline{T} matrix for the evaluation of $T(\alpha_p, \alpha_p)$, but we have ignored all elements which do not involve the 2p level and consequently have only a small indirect effect on $T(\alpha_p, \alpha_p)$. The structure of a \underline{T} matrix used for the evaluation of diagonal elements corresponding to one particular value of L_p and S^T is shown on Fig. 2. Matrix elements taken into account in our calculation are marked by X.

All matrix elements $S(\alpha, \alpha')$ have been calculated in the distorted wave approximation with exchange (DWX). In the following we give a brief outline of the procedure.

First, we calculate the ρ matrix¹² with elements defined by

$$\begin{split} p(\alpha, \alpha') &= -2 \left[\left(1 - \delta_{\alpha \alpha'} \right) f_{0} \left(\overline{\ell} \ \ell \ \overline{\ell}' \ \ell' \ L^{T} \right) R_{0}^{d} \left(\overline{\ell} \ \ell \ \overline{\ell}' \ \ell' \right) \\ &+ \sum_{\lambda=1}^{\infty} f_{\lambda} \left(\overline{\ell} \ \ell \ \overline{\ell}' \ \ell' \ L^{T} \right) R_{\lambda}^{d} \left(\overline{\ell} \ \ell \ \overline{\ell}' \ \ell' \right) \\ &+ (-1)^{S^{T}} \sum_{\lambda=0}^{\infty} g_{\lambda} \left(\overline{\ell} \ \ell \ \overline{\ell}' \ \ell' \ L^{T} \right) R_{\lambda}^{e} \left(\overline{\ell} \ \ell \ \overline{\ell}' \ \ell' \right) \end{split}$$
(3)

 $\overline{\ell}$ and $\overline{\ell}'$ are the orbital angular momenta of the bound electron before and after the collision, ℓ and ℓ' correspond to the colliding electron, L^{T} and S^{T} are the total orbital and spin angular momenta of the system with $L^{T} = L_{p}$ or L_{s} , $f_{\lambda}(\overline{\ell} \ \ell \ \overline{\ell}' \ \ell' \ L^{T})$ and $g_{\lambda}(\overline{\ell} \ \ell \ \overline{\ell}' \ \ell' \ L^{T})$ are coefficients given by Percival and Seaton.

The direct and the exchange radial integrals R_{λ}^{d} and R_{λ}^{e} are defined by

$$R_{\lambda}^{d} = \int P\left(n\overline{\ell}; r_{1}\right) F_{k\ell}\left(r_{2}\right) - \frac{r_{\zeta}^{\lambda}}{r_{\gamma}^{\lambda+1}} \left(P n'\overline{\ell}'; r_{1}\right) F_{k'\ell'}\left(r_{2}\right) dr_{1}dr_{2}, \qquad (4)$$

$$R_{\lambda}^{e} = \int P(n\overline{\ell}; r_{1}) F_{k\ell}(r_{2}) - \frac{r_{\zeta}^{\lambda}}{r_{\lambda}^{\lambda+1}} \quad (P n'\overline{\ell}'; r_{2}) F_{k'\ell'}(r_{1}) dr_{1} dr_{2} \quad .$$
 (5)

 r_{\leq} is the lesser and $r_{>}$ the greater of r_{1} and r_{2} , $P(n\overline{\ell}; r)$ and $P(n'\overline{\ell}'; r)$ are the radial wave functions of the bound electron before and after the collision normalized to unity, and $F_{k\ell}$ is the radial function of the colliding electron before the collision satisfying the equation

$$\left[\frac{d^{2}}{dr^{2}} - \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{r^{2}} + \frac{2(Z+1)}{r} - 2V(n\overline{\ell}; r) + k^{2}\right] F_{k\ell}(r)$$
$$= C P(n\overline{\ell}; r) + C' P(n'\overline{\ell}'; r), \qquad (6)$$

$$V(n\overline{\ell}; r) = \int \frac{1}{r_{>}} P^2(n\overline{\ell}; r_1) dr_1$$
, $r_{>}$ being the greater of r and r_1 . (7)

 $V(n\overline{\ell}; r)$ represents the monopole part of the electrostatic interaction energy of the bound and the free electron. Z is the asymptotic charge for the colliding electron and Lagrange multipliers C, C' are non-zero only if $\ell = \overline{\ell}$ or $\ell = \overline{\ell'}$, respectively. They are determined so that the functions $P(n\ell; r)$ and $P(n'\overline{\ell'}; r)$ are orthogonal to $F_{k\ell}$ (r), i.e.

$$\int P(n\overline{\ell}; r) F_{k\ell}(r) dr = \int P(n'\overline{\ell}'; r) F_{k\ell}(r) dr = 0.$$
 (8)

The asymptotic form of $F_{k\ell}$ is

$$F_{k\ell}(r) \sim k^{-1/2} \sin\left[kr - \frac{1}{2}\ell\pi + \frac{Z}{k}\ell n\left(2kr\right) + \arg\Gamma\left(\ell + 1 - \frac{iZ}{k}\right) + \tau_{\alpha}\right]. \quad (9)$$

The phase shift τ_{α} depends on k, $\ell,~$ and on the level $n\overline{\ell},$ but it is independent of $L^T,~s^T.$

Radial functions $F_{k^\prime\ell^\prime}$ of the scattered electron are calculated in a similar way.

From ρ we obtain the matrix S using

$$S' = (1 + i\rho) (1 - i\rho)^{-1}$$
 (10)

The S matrix and the scattering matrix S are related by

$$S_{z} = e^{i\tau} S_{z}' e^{i\tau}, \qquad (11)$$

 $e^{i\tau}$ being diagonal matrices with elements $e^{i\tau}\alpha$. The diagonal elements of the transmission matrix are then given by

$$T(\alpha, \alpha) = 1 - S'(\alpha, \alpha) e^{2i\tau} \alpha . \qquad (12)$$

In the present version of the distorted-wave approximation, the channels included in the ρ matrix are uncoupled. However, transformation (10) introduces a certain amount of coupling into the scattering matrix S, and consequently the line-shift calculated from eq. (1) depends on the number of levels included in the ρ and S matrices.

In the summation over ℓ in eq. (1), we have included values up to $\ell=13$. Sufficient convergence was achieved for the case of He⁺, for hydrogen we have extrapolated partial contributions to the shift assuming their proportionality to ℓ^{-q} and determined q from values for $\ell=12$ and 13. The extrapolated contributions were always less than 5% of the total shift.

Values of $T(\alpha_p, \alpha_p)$ and $T(\alpha_s, \alpha_s)$ have been obtained for 10 different energies ${}^{1}/{}_{2} k^{2}$ of the colliding electron. The energy mesh was determined so that it would give the best possible accuracy of the integral over the velocity distribution, and at the same time it would take into account the discontinuity of $T(\alpha_p, \alpha_p)$ at the excitation threshold of the n=3 levels. No resonance effects below the n=3 threshold were taken into account in our procedure.

The shifts for the Lyman-alpha line have been calculated for electron temperatures corresponding to 2.0, 2.5, 3.0 and 4.0 eV for He^+ , and to 0.5, 1.0, 1.5 and 2.0 eV for hydrogen.

If the diagonal matrix elements of S are much larger than the off-diagonal elements, the scattering may be approximately treated as a one-channel problem. In this case

$$S(\alpha, \alpha) = e^{2i\eta}\alpha$$
 (13)

and the phase shift $\eta_{_{\boldsymbol{v}}}$ in our approximation is given by

$$\eta_{\alpha} = \tau_{\alpha} + 1/2 \arctan[2\rho(\alpha, \alpha)/\{1 - \rho^{2}(\alpha, \alpha)\}]$$
(14)

according to (10) and (11). Equation (13) indicates the importance of phase shifts η_{\sim} for the calculation of frequency shifts $\Delta\omega_{*}$

The accuracy of phase shifts η_{α} obtained from (14) may be illustrated by a comparison with values calculated by $0za^{14}$ using a pseudo-state close-coupling method for scattering on the 1s state of the He⁺ which is shown in Figs. 3-5. Oza's method is substantially more accurate than our simple DWX approximation, but the differences of the two results represent not only the differences of the two methods, but also the fact that his phase shifts are affected by coupling to other channels so that (13) is generally not valid. This explains why the smallest relative differences occur for $\ell=0$ (S-wave) with the largest phase shift. Apparently, the major contribution to the phase shift comes from pure elastic scattering, therefore (13) is approximately satisfied even for 0za's values of the shift, and the discrepancy may be caused just by the difference of methods. As the elastic scattering decreases with increasing ℓ , coupling to other channels becomes more important and the comparison of the two quantities eventually becomes meaningless.

II.2 Results.

One of the goals of this investigation was to establish the importance of different contributions to the total line-shift. Therefore we have performed a series of calculations in which certain terms were omitted in the expression for $\Delta\omega$. A list of all calculations is shown on Table 1, and results of the distorted-

wave approximation are presented on Figs. 6 and 7 for He^+ and on Figs. 10-12 for hydrogen. In both cases we have found red line shifts.

Curve A on Figs. 6-13 represents the most complete DWX calculation with all levels 1s-3d included in the S matrix as described in par. II.1.

For He⁺ (Fig. 6), the omission of levels 3s, 3p, 3d leads to curve D, which indicates that the higher levels have only a very small effect on the frequency shift of Lyman-alpha line. If only 1s and 2p levels are included, the results is given by B, and if, in addition, all exchange terms are omitted and only elastic terms retained, the shift is represented by C. A glance at Fig. 6 and comparison of A and C shows that the pure elastic scattering is by far the most important contribution to the frequency shift. In this particular case $\Delta \omega$ depends only on phase shifts τ_{α} , because $\varrho = 0$, S' = 1 and consequently

$$\Delta \omega = -\pi N_{e} \int k^{-1} f(k) \xi (2\ell + 1) \sin 2 \left(\tau_{p\ell} - \tau_{s\ell} \right) dk , \qquad (15)$$

where $\tau_{p\ell}$ and $\tau_{s\ell}$ are phase shifts associated with the scattering on the 2p and 1s levels, respectively. Furthermore,

$$\sin^2\left(\tau_{p\ell} - \tau_{s\ell}\right) = \sin^2\tau_{p\ell} - \sin^2\tau_{s\ell} + 4\sin^2\tau_{p\ell}\sin^2\tau_{s\ell}\sin\left(\tau_{p\ell} - \tau_{s\ell}\right) . \tag{16}$$

The first two terms on the right-hand side of (16) correspond to the direct terms, and the third term to the interference term according to (2).

The importance of the interference term for He^+ is shown on Fig. 6 by curves J and K. J was obtained in the same way as A, but the interference term was not included. K similarly corresponds to C. It can be seen that the inclusion of upper levels and of exchange contributions significantly changes the magnitude of the interference term even if the total frequency shift is affected minimally.

Fig. 7 demonstrates the effect of exchange. Curves L, M, N, O were obtained by ignoring all exchange terms in the ρ matrix. In addition, functions $F_{k\ell}$ with (=0,1 were not orthogonalized to bound wave functions. Curve L was obtained with all levels included. A comparison with A shows that the omission of exchange decreases

the total shift. Curve N represents pure elastic scattering, and it would be identical to C in Fig. 6 except for one thing: functions $F_{k\ell}$ used to calculate C were orthogonalized to bound wave functions, while those for N were not. The resulting difference is negligible. Curve M corresponds to L but without the interference term, and O similarly corresponds to N.

In Fig. 8, our result for ionized helium (A) is compared to the semi-classical calculation of Griem 3 and to the R-matrix method of Yamamoto and Narumi.⁴

The semi-classical result is about 35% lower than the DWX method at kT = 2.5 eV, but the agreement improves with higher temperature. However, there are basic differences between the semi-classical procedure and our method. The semi-classical result is derived solely from the second-order terms in the <u>S</u> matrix elements, and in the expansion for the interaction potential only dipole and quadrupole terms have been taken into account. In the DWX method the main contribution to the shift comes from the monopole part of the potential and higher order contributions to the <u>S</u> matrix are due to the unitarizing relation (10). The <u>g</u> matrix has only first-order terms. Therefore a partial agreement between the two methods appears to be purely fortuitous. A more detailed comparison of both methods will be given in par. II.4.

The R-matrix calculation yields results which are almost three times smaller than the DWX approximation. Yamamoto and Narumi included in their calculation the same number of levels as we did (1s-3d), but there are several other differences which may cause the discrepancy. For example, they use the same basis set of functions for the scattering on both the upper and the lower state. According to Yamamoto¹⁵, the potential for the scattering on He⁺ was taken equal to (in our notation)

$$r^{-1}[1 + exp(-2^{1/3}r)]$$
 (17)

as compared to our potential $2r^{-1} - V(r)$ with V(r) given by (7). In order to evaluate the effect of such a potential, we have repeated the calculations (including all levels up to 3d) using potential (17) to generate $F_{k\ell}$. Thus the differences of phase shifts $\tau_{p\ell} - \tau_{s\ell}$ disappear, but the diagonal elements $\rho(\alpha, \alpha)$ were supplemented by direct monopole terms which are missing in the DWX approximation according to (3) and which represent different elastic scattering on the upper and lower level. The result is shown as curve S on fig. 9 and it proves that the form of the potential itself cannot explain the differences between our result and that of the R-matrix method. We suspect that the evaluation of elastic contributions in the R-matrix calculation is responsible for the discrepancy. We have performed two additional calculations to substantiate this suspicion: Curve T was obtained in the same way as S (i.e. using potential (17)), but without monopole terms in the g matrix, and U corresponds to our original calculations (curve A), but with all phase shifts $\tau_{p\ell}$ set equal to $\tau_{s\ell}$ (the result is then independent on the actual value of τ_{α}). In both cases the effects of pure elastic scattering were removed from the calculation, and the agreement with Yamamoto and Narumi is much better, but still not satisfactory over the whole temperature range. A possible inadequacy of diagonal R-matrix elements in ref. 4 has already been pointed out by Griem.³

Observational evidence $^{5-8}$ concerning the Lyman-alpha shift in ionized helium is to a certain degree contradictory due to experimental difficulties. In contrast to our calculation which yields negative shifts, experimentally found shifts are positive (i.e. blue) and of much larger magnitude. At the present time it is not even clear if this discrepancy is caused by experimental inaccuracy or if it represents incompleteness of the theory.

For hydrogen (Figs. 10-12), the sensitivity of frequency shift to the inclusion of atomic levels in the S matrix is much larger than for He^+ .

The smallest shift is obtained with pure elastic scattering without exchange, i.e. with $\rho = 0$ (curve C, Fig. 10). The shift even reverses its sign and becomes blue at low temperature. The gap between A and C is much larger than for He⁺. The largest shift is the result of inclusion of the 1s2s2p levels (curve D). Addition of the 3s and 3p levels (curve E, Fig. 11) decreases the shift and so does the inclusion of 3d (curve A). If 4d is included instead of 3d, the shift again becomes larger (G), therefore it is not possible to estimate simply the effect of levels with n > 3 by extrapolation. They may be important and, in contrast to ionized helium, their effect may not be negligible. Calculations without the interference term are represented by J and K (Fig. 10). J corresponds to A and K to C.

A comparison of results without exchange is displayed on Fig. 12. As in He⁺, these results were obtained with no orthogonalization of $F_{k(}$ to bound wave functions. The omission of exchange and orthogonalization substantially increases the shift (L). Curve C (Fig. 10) and N (Fig. 12) representing results of pure elastic scattering differ only by orthogonalization of $F_{k(}$ with (=0 and 1 in curve C. For hydrogen this difference is substantial in contrast to He⁺ and it is caused

entirely by an opposite sign of the partial contribution with $L_p=1$ in the DWX calculation (curve C). The effect arising by the omission of the interference term is indicated by M and O which correspond to L and N, respectively.

The semi-classical calculation of Griem¹⁶ is compared to our DWX result (curve A) on Fig. 13. There is a discrepancy by a factor of five between the two calculations, and the disagreement appears to be due to the differences of both methods. A discussion of the discrepancy and a comparison with the experimental result will be given in par. II.4.

The contributions to the total frequency shift $\Delta \omega$ of the Lyman-alpha line of He⁺ and hydrogen from angular momenta L_p are shown on Figs. 14 and 15 for two values of temperature. In He⁺, the major contribution corresponds to L_p=1, for higher angular momenta the contributions decrease monotonously. In hydrogen, the L_p=1 partial contribution is positive, while all others are negative. The opposite sign for L_p=1 is caused predominantly by orthogonality of F_{kl} and P(nl), and it is also the main source of difference between line A and L in Fig. 12.

II.3. Shift of Lyman-alpha derived from electrostatic interaction.

Several authors have studied the Lyman-alpha shifts from the point of view of electrostatic interaction of the radiator and plasma.^{11,17-19} Status of the theory prior to 1978 has been reviewed by Volonte¹⁷. The basic assumption of this approach is that each atomic level is independently shifted by plasma interaction and that the frequency shift of the spectral line is equal to the difference of these level shifts. The level shifts are therefore derived without any regard to the radiative process from a static model of atom-plasma interaction.

It is easy to see the relationship between one particular form of "static lineshift" and formula (1). If all values τ_{α} are small compared to unity and only pure elastic scattering significantly contributes to the line-shift, $\Delta \omega$ is given by (15) and $\sin^2(\tau_{p\ell} - \tau_{s\ell})$ by (16) without the interference term. Assuming a spherical charge distribution of the atomic electron, we obtain from the perturbation expression for the phase shifts²⁰

$$\sin^2\left(\tau_{p\ell} - \tau_{s\ell}\right) \sim -4\int \left[V\left(n_p p; r\right) - V\left(n_s s; r\right)\right] \left[F_{k\ell} \left(r\right)\right]^2 dr .$$
 (18)

Potentials $V(n\overline{\ell}; r)$ are defined by (7) and $F_{k\ell}^c$ are solutions of (6) with C=C'=0 and with $2(Z + 1)r^{-1} - 2V(n\overline{\ell}; r)$ replaced by $2Zr^{-1}$ (i.e. $F_{k\ell}^c = k^{1/2}r$ x spherical Bessel function for a neutral radiator or a Coulomb function for an ion). A spherically symmetric density distribution n_e of mutually non-interacting free electrons moving in the field of a positive point charge Z with a momentum distribution f(k) can be written in the form

$$n_{e}(r) = N_{e} \int k^{-1} f(k) r^{-2} \sum_{\ell} \left(2\ell + 1 \right) \left[F_{k\ell}^{c}(r) \right]^{2} dk$$
(19)

with $\lim_{r \to \infty} n_e = N_e$. The energy $W(n\overline{\ell})$ of electrostatic interaction of a bound electron in the $n\overline{\ell}$ state with free electrons described by (19) is

$$W(n\overline{\ell}) = 4\pi \int r^2 n_e(r) V(n\overline{\ell}; r) dr$$
 (20)

The expression for $W(n\overline{\ell})$ diverges, but the difference $W(n\overline{\ell}) - W(n'\overline{\ell'})$ has a finite value.

Let us define a static frequency shift $\Delta \omega_{static}$ of the Lyman-alpha line as

$$\Delta \omega_{\text{static}} = W(2p) - W(1s) . \qquad (21)$$

Then, with respect to (18), the static shift (21) is identical to (15). It should be noted that for neutral radiators with Z=0, formula (19) represents a uniform density distribution.

It is convenient for the following discussion to denote by $\Delta\omega_{static I}$ the frequency shift (21) obtained from the uniform electron distribution, and by $\Delta\omega_{static II}$ the shift (21) if the functions $F_{k\ell}^c$ in (19) are Coulomb functions with $Z \neq 0$.

In the static shifts just described, the effect of the bound electron on the free electron density distribution has been ignored. This effect can be taken into account by replacing $F_{k\ell}^{c}$ in (20) by $F_{k\ell}$, which are solutions of (6) (with C=C'=O) and which are identical to the functions used in our distorted-wave approximation

without exchange. This procedure leads to another version of a static shift, and the result will be referred to as $\Delta \omega_{\text{static III}}$.

In a real physical situation, (18) is not always satisfied and the interference term is not negligible, so that the static shift may be substantially different from the shift calculated according to (1). Static shifts defined by (21) are compared with the DWX result (curve A) on Figs. 9 and 13 for He⁺ and hydrogen, respectively.

For ionized helium, $\Delta \omega_{static I}$ (curve R) is much smaller than $\Delta \omega_{static III}$ (Q) and $\Delta \omega_{static III}$ (P). The difference is obviously caused by a much weaker interaction of the bound electron with uniform electron background that with electrons attracted to the radiator by the ion field. A relatively good agreement of P and A is probably a pure coincidence. On the other hand, the agreement of $\Delta \omega_{static II}$ (curve Q) with the distorted-wave calculation without exchange and without inelastic terms (curve O) is rather poor in spite of the fact that both results were derived from the same expression (15). This indicates the inadequacy of (18) for the replacement of phase shifts by perturbation expression.

In hydrogen (Fig. 13), A is much smaller than $\Delta\omega_{static I}$ (R) and $\Delta\omega_{static III}$ (P). The phase shifts τ_{α} for hydrogen scattering are not small and therefore (18) cannot be valid.

II.4. Comparison of the semi-classical calculation and the DWX method.

On Figs. 8 and 13, the results of the semi-classical (SC) calculations^{3,16} (circles) for the Lyman-alpha shift are compared to the values obtained from the present DWX method (curve A). There is a large discrepancy between the two results for hydrogen, while for He⁺ the agreement is much better, although not satisfactory.

In the semi-classical calculation, the first-order contributions to the line shift vanish, and the shift is obtained from the second-order terms in the expansion for the S matrix elements. The second-order terms do not contain any monopole contributions. Moreover, the interference term in the expression (2) is ignored, and the line shift is equal to the difference of level shifts. The dipole contribution to the shift of an $n\bar{\ell}$ level from electrons with velocity v and impact parameter ρ_i is proportional to^{3,16}

$$(\rho_{i} v)^{-1} \sum_{n' \overline{\ell}'} \max(\overline{\ell'}, \overline{\ell}) |\langle n' \ell' | r | n \overline{\ell} \rangle|^{2} B, \qquad (22)$$

where $n'\overline{\ell}'$ are all possible final states produced by collisions of electrons with the radiator in the state $n\overline{\ell}$, and B is the shift function depending on ρ_i , v, and $E_{n\overline{\ell}} - E_{n'\overline{\ell}'}$. Quadrupole contributions, which are much less important, are proportional to a similar expression, and they involve matrix elements $\langle n'\overline{\ell}' | r^2 | n\overline{\ell} \rangle$.

In the present DWX approximation, the matrix elements $\rho(\alpha, \alpha)$ and $S(\alpha, \alpha)$ are calculated from the first-order perturbation theory and contain no contributions of type (22). In order to obtain second-order contributions, one has either to solve coupled equations for the scattering problem or to employ the second-order perturbation theory. In the following we use a simplified form of the latter procedure.

Expression (3) for the elements of the $\underline{\rho}$ matrix may be obtained from the Kohn's variational principle

$$\rho(\alpha, \alpha') = -2 \sum_{\text{spins}} \int \Psi_{\alpha}^{\star}, \quad (H - E) \Psi_{\alpha} d\vec{r}_{1} d\vec{r}_{2} \quad , \quad (23)$$

where Ψ_{α} and $\Psi_{\alpha'}$ are trial wave functions of the total system (including spin) corresponding to the channel α and α' , respectively. Ψ_{α} has the form (for simplicity we use here unsymmetrized functions)

$$\Psi_{\alpha} = Q_{\alpha} r_2^{-1} F_{k_{\alpha} \ell_{\alpha}} (r_2)$$
(24)

with

$$Q_{\alpha} = \sum_{\substack{\overline{m} \ \overline{m} \\ m \ \overline{m} \\ m \ \overline{m} \\ s}} C_{\overline{m} \ \overline{m} \ \overline{m} \\ M \\ L}^{\overline{\ell} \alpha \ \ell \alpha \ L} \frac{T}{r} C_{\overline{m} \ \overline{m} \\ s}^{1/2 \ 1/2 \ S} \frac{S^{T}}{m} \overline{\Phi} \left(\overline{\ell}_{\alpha} \ \overline{m} \ \overline{m}_{s} \right) r_{1}^{-1} P \left(n_{\alpha} \ \overline{\ell}_{\alpha}; r_{1} \right) \Phi \left(\ell_{\alpha} \ m_{\alpha} \ m_{s} \right), \quad (25)$$

where all symbols with bars refer to the bound electron, $\overline{\Phi}r_1^{-1}P$ is the wave function of the bound electron including spin, and Φ is the angular and spin part of the function for the colliding electron. Improved values of diagonal elements $p(\alpha, \alpha)$ may be obtained if the trial function Ψ_{α} in (23) is replaced by a corrected function $\Psi_{\alpha}^{\text{corr}}$ which also contains terms representing scattering, so that

$$\Psi_{\alpha}^{\text{corr}} = Q_{\alpha} r_2^{-1} F_{k_{\alpha} \ell_{\alpha}} \left(r_2 \right) + \sum_{\alpha' \neq \alpha} Q_{\alpha'} r_2^{-1} G_{k_{\alpha'} \ell_{\alpha'}} \left(r_2 \right) .$$
 (26)

The asymptotic form of G should be

$${}^{G_{k_{\alpha'}\ell_{\alpha'}}}\left(r\right) \sim \rho\left(\alpha, \alpha'\right) k_{\alpha'}^{-1/2} \cos\left[k_{\alpha'}r - \frac{1}{2}\ell_{\alpha'}\pi + 2k_{\alpha'}^{-1}\ell n\left(2k_{\alpha'}r\right) \right.$$

$$+ \arg \Gamma \left(\ell_{\alpha'} + 1 - i2k_{\alpha'}^{-1}\right) + \tau_{\alpha'}\right] .$$

In our simplified procedure we replace ${}^{G}k_{\alpha'}\ell_{\alpha'}$ by $\rho(\alpha, \alpha'){}^{F}k_{\alpha'}\ell_{\alpha'}$, which has the same amplitude at infinity, but has an incorrect phase. Therefore the values of matrix elements (23) will be subject to errors which may be difficult to estimate. However, with this replacement, (23) assumes a very simple form, and the resulting expression for the second-order contributions to the level shift contains terms of the type (22) and is therefore directly comparable to the SC formula. Assuming that elements $\rho(\alpha, \alpha')$ are small and retaining only terms up to the second order in $\rho(\alpha, \alpha')$, we obtain from (23) for the corrected diagonal matrix element

$$\rho^{\text{corr}}(\alpha, \alpha) = \rho(\alpha, \alpha) + 2 \sum_{\alpha' \neq \alpha} \rho^2(\alpha, \alpha') . \qquad (27)$$

The same result is obtained if one uses antisymmetric function Ψ_{α} and (27) is therefore generally valid.

On Figs. 16 and 18 we compare our previous result (curve A) with line shift obtained from matrix elements $\rho^{\rm corr}(\alpha, \alpha)$ according to (27).

For He⁺ (Fig. 16), the result of inclusion of all second-order terms for angular momenta up to L^{T} =13 is represented by curve B_{1} . However, the sum over all L^{T} is divergent due to the contributions from the 2p-2s transition with ΔE =0. If the second-order terms due to this transition are excluded, the shift is given by curve A_{1} . The effect of the 2p-2s transition cannot be properly treated without consideration of plasma effects on electron collisions, because contributions from distant collisions corresponding to large angular momenta L^{T} are substantially reduced due to plasma screening effects. In a recent paper, Griem²¹ has obtained values of contributions to the Lyman-alpha shift from Δn =0 transitions for He⁺ and H for the electron density N_{e} =10¹⁷ cm⁻³ following the method of Boercker and Iglesias.²² If we add these contributions to the values given by curve A_{1} (scaled to N_{e} =1 for the sake of comparison), we obtain the final result for the Lyman-alpha shift represented by curve C_{1} .

The inclusion of second-order terms into our DWX method makes the disagreement between the Griem's original SC calculation 3 (Figs. 8 and 17) and our present results even greater. In the semi-classical calculation, the main contributions to the shift originate from the 2p-3s and 2p-3d transitions, but the total effect of the second-order inelastic term in the DWX approximation (difference of curves A and A_1 on Fig. 16) is much smaller than the total SC shift (Fig. 17). In order to find out if the discrepancy is just a result of differences inherent to both methods, we have performed a quantum-mechanical calculation which follows closely many features of a SC procedure: we have used a unitarized Coulomb-Bethe approximation with inclusion of second-order terms according to (27), but we have taken into account only contributions from the 2p-3s and 2p-3d transitions. The result is represented by curve D_1 on Fig. 17. If our results are extrapolated to kT=5 eV, the agreement with the SC calculation is good. The disagreement at low temperature may be caused by the fact that in the SC procedure the integration over the velocity distribution includes also non-vanishing contributions from energies below the inelastic threshold. To estimate the affect of such contributions, we repeated the previous calculation and set the values of all matrix elements below the n=3 threshold equal to their corresponding threshold values, thus obtaining an upper limit for the shift. The result is shown as curve E_1 on Fig. 17, and it demonstrates the drastic effect of contributions from energies below the threshold. From the results for He⁺ shown on Figs. 16 and 17 we conclude that the difference of line shifts obtained from the DWX method and from the SC calculation is caused by several effects: elastic monopole contributions which represent a dominant part of the DWX shift are not taken into account in the SC procedure. On the other hand, the inelastic second-order dipole terms are much larger in the SC method than in the DWX approximation (agreement with the Coulomb-Bethe approximation is much better), and contributions from energies below the inelastic threshold further increase the line shift in the SC calculation, while these contributions are ignored in the DWX calculation. Several other details of the semi-classical calculation may also contribute to the discrepancy. E.g., the method of unitarization (eq. 9 of ref. 3) makes some allowance for higher-order perturbation theory terms. In the DW method, the unitarization is achieved by a different procedure (eq. 10).

Turning to hydrogen (Fig. 18), we find that the effect of second-order terms in the DWX approximation is greater than in He^+ (curves B_1 and A_1). Supplementing results shown as A_1 by contributions due to $\Delta n=0$ transitions given by Griem²¹ and scaled to $N_e=1$, we obtain curve C_1 which is in a good agreement with the experimental value of Gruetzmacher and Wende²³, from which the ion quadrupole contribution according to Griem¹⁶ has been subtracted. (The result of ref. 23 should be taken with caution, however, because of uncertainties caused by the Jsplitting and by the fact that the measured width is greater than the shift.) As in He⁺, second-order inelastic contributions in the DWX approximation (difference of curves A and A, on Fig. 18) are smaller than the total shift from the SC calculation (Fig. 13). On Fig. 19 we again compare results of a unitarized Bethe approximation (with the inclusion of second-order terms and contributions limited to 2p-3s and 2p-3d transitions) and semi-classical shifts from $\Delta n=1$ transitions¹⁶ (circles). In the SC calculation, the contributions to the shift from energies below the n=3 threshold do not vanish. These contributions represent the effects of resonances in the elastic scattering which are ignored in the DWX and Bethe approximations. If the contributions from energies below the inelastic threshold are excluded in the SC calculation, one obtains results shown as triangles in Fig. 19. However, this result still corresponds to a finite value of excitation cross section at threshold, and consequently it has to be larger than the result of the Bethe approximation. Figs. 18 and 19 for hydrogen therefore lead to a conclusion similar to that reached for He⁺, and large values of SC shifts in comparison to the DWX results are caused mainly by larger second-order terms and by non-vanishing contributions from energies below and in the vicinity of the n=3 threshold.

III. Summary of conclusions.

Frequency shifts of the Lyman-alpha line for ionized helium and hydrogen calculated in the DWX approximation are negative. The main contributions to the line shift are due to elastic scattering on the 2p level, but the shift is substantially affected by the inclusion of inelastic terms in the scattering matrix, and the effect is larger in H than in He⁺. In hydrogen, contributions from levels higher than 3d (not included in the present calculation) may not be negligible. Second-order terms in the scattering matrix, representing coupling of different channels, are very important.

The interference term increases the absolute value of the line shift, and the effect is larger for H than for He^+ .

Major contributions to the shift come from the lowest angular momenta of the colliding electrons.

The static shift of the line, defined as a difference of electrostatic interactions of the bound electron with plasma electrons moving in the potential of a point charge Z, is larger than the shift from the DWX method, but the agreement for He^+ is much better than for hydrogen.

The present DWX results for the shift of ionized helium are almost three times larger than results of the R-matrix method by Yamamoto and Narumi⁴. A possible explanation is the difference of elastic terms in both methods.

The difference of the DWX results and the semi-classical calculations of Griem^{3,16} is attributable to several effects: elastic monopole contributions that represent a major part of the DWX shift are not included in the SC calculations; inelastic second-order terms are much larger in the SC method than in the DWX approximation; and inelastic contributions from energies below the n=3 threshold representing resonance effects in elastic scattering, were not taken into account in the DWX method.

Experimentally found positive shifts of the Lyman-alpha line of He^{+5-8} are in sharp contrast to our calculation which yields negative shifts of much smaller magnitude. Observed electron collision shift of the Lyman-alpha line of hydrogen is in agreement with the DWX result, if second-order terms are included and contributions due to the 2p-2s transition according to Griem²¹ are taken into account.

With respect to previous discussions, the most reliable result of the present investigation (combined with partial result of Griem²¹ for contributions due to the 2p-2s transition) is represented by curves C_1 on Figs. 16 and 18. It applies, however, only to electron density $N_e = 10^{17}$ cm⁻³ for which the results of ref. 21 have been obtained. Further improvement in future calculations should be

accomplished by properly taking into account second-order terms in the scattering matrix either by using close-coupling results or by rigorously applying the secondorder perturbation theory, and by taking into account the effect of resonances below inelastic thresholds.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Office of Naval Research.

The authors are indebted to Prof. Hans R. Griem for valuable discussions and comments.

References

- 1. H.F. Berg, A.W. Ali, R. Lincke, and H.R. Griem, Phys. Rev. 125, 199 (1962).
- 2. M. Baranger, Phys. Rev. 111, 481 (1958).
- 3. H.R. Griem, Phys. Rev. A 27, 2566 (1983).
- 4. K. Yamamoto and H. Narumi, Progr. Theor. Physics 64, 436 (1980).
- 5. J.R. Greig, H.R. Griem, L.A. Jones, and T. Oda, Phys. Rev. Lett. 24, 3 (1970).
- 6. A.H. Gabriel and S. Volonté, J. Phys. B:Atom. Molec. Phys. 6, 2684 (1973).
- 7. T. Goto and D.D. Burgess, J. Phys. B:Atom. Molec. Phys. 7, 857 (1974).
- 8. M. Neiger and H.R. Griem, Phys. Rev. A 14, 291 (1976).
- 9. 0. Theimer and P.C. Kepple, Phys. Rev. A 1, 957 (1970).
- 10. S. Volonté, J. Phys. B:Atom. Molec. Phys. 8, 1170 (1975).
- 11. R. Cauble, J. Quant. Spectrosc. Rad. Transfer 28, 41 (1982).
- 12. H.E. Saraph, M.J. Seaton, and J. Shemming, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London A <u>264</u>, 77 (1969).
- 13. I.C. Percival and M.J. Seaton, Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. 53, 654 (1957).
- 14. D.H. Oza, Phys. Rev. A 33, 824 (1986).
- 15. K. Yamamoto, J. Phys. Soc. Japan, 49, 730 (1980).
- 16. H.R. Griem, Phys. Rev. A 28, 1596 (1983).
- 17. S. Volonté, J. Phys. D:Appl. Phys. 11, 1615 (1978).
- 18. J.C. Adcock and H.R. Griem, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50, 1369 (1983).
- 19. J. Davis and M. Blaha, J. Quant. Spectrosc. Rad. Transfer 27, 307 (1982).
- 20. N.F. Mott and H.S.W. Massey, The Theory of Atomic Collisions, Oxford Univ. Press (1965).
- 21. H.R. Griem, to be published in Phys. Rev. (1988).

D.B. Boercker and C.A. Iglesias, Phys. Rev. A <u>30</u>, 2771 (1984).
 K. Gruetzmacher and B. Wende, Spectral Line Shapes <u>4</u>, 58 (1987).

Table 1

Results for the Lyman-alpha shifts shown on Figs. 6-13. (DWX = distorted-wave approximation with exchange DW = distorted - wave approximation without exchange)Curve Levels included in the Remark scattering matrix 1s2s2p3s3p3d DWX Α DWX В 1s2p С DW, only elastic terms included, 1s2p $F_{k\ell}$ orthogonalized to $P(n\overline{\ell})$ with $\ell = \overline{\ell}$ DWX D 1s2s2p 1s2s2p3s3p DWX Е 1s2s2p3s3p4d DWX G 1s2s2p3s3p3d DWX, same as A without interference term J K 1s2p DW, same as C without interference term DW 1s2s2p3s3p3d L DW, same as L without interference term Μ 1s2s2p3s3p3d DW, only elastic terms included, Ν 1s2p $F_{k\ell}$ not orthogonalized to $P(n\overline{\ell})$ DW, same as N without interference term 0 1s2p DWX, F_k generated using Yamamoto and Narumi's^{4,15} potential S 1s2s2p3s3p3d DWX, same as S, without direct monopole terms Т 1s2s2p3s3p3d DWX, same as A, with all $\tau_{p\ell} = \tau_{s\ell}$ U 1s2s2p3s3p3d static shift $\Delta \omega$ static III Ρ (from distorted waves $F_{k,c}$) static shift $\Delta \omega$ static II Q (from Coulomb functions $F_{k\ell}^{c}$ static shift $\Delta \omega_{static I}$ R (from uniform electron background)





Fig. 3. S-phase shift (radians) for scattering on the 1s state of He⁺. Solid curve: pseudo-state close-coupling calculation by 0za¹⁴; dashed curve: present result from the DWX approximation, eq. (14).

Fig. 4. P-phase shift (radians) for scattering on the 1s state of He⁺. Solid curve: Oza¹⁴; dashed curve: eq. (14).

Fig. 5. D-phase shift (radians) for scattering on the 1s state of He⁺. Solid curve: Oza¹⁴; dashed curve: eq. (14).

Fig. 6. Lyman-alpha shift of He⁺. Symbols are explained in Table 1.

Fig. 7. Lyman-alpha shift of He⁺. Symbols are explained in Table 1.

Fig. 8. Lyman-alpha shift of He⁺. Symbols are explained in Table 1. Cirles: semi-classical calculation of Griem³; dashed line: R-matrix method of Yamamoto and Narumi⁴.

Fig. 9. Lyman-alpha shift of He⁺. Symbols are explained in Table 1.

Fig. 10. Lyman-alpha shift of hydrogen. Symbols are explained in Table 1.

.

.

Fig. 12. Lyman-alpha shift of hydrogen. Symbols are explained in Table 1.

Fig. 13. Lyman-alpha shift of hydrogen. Symbols are explained in Table 1. Circles: semi-classical calculation of Griem¹⁶.

Fig. 14. Partial contributions to the Lyman-alpha shift of He⁺ from total angular momenta L_p . Contributions correspond to line A (Fig. 6). Solid line: kT=2 eV; dashed line: kT=4 eV.

Fig. 15. Partial contributions to the Lyman-alpha shift of hydrogen from total angular momenta L_p. Contributions correspond to line A (Fig. 10). Solid line: kT=0.5 eV; dashed line: kT=2 eV

Fig. 16. Lyman-alpha shift of He⁺.

A - DWX calculation (see Table 1);

- A₁ same as A with inclusion of second-order terms according to (27) except for contributions corresponding to the 2p-2s transition;
- B_1 same as A with inclusion of all second-order terms (contributions corresponding to 2p-2s transition included only up to $L^T=13$);
- $C_1 A_1$ plus contributions from 2p-2s transition taken from Griem²¹.

D₁ - unitarized Coulomb-Bethe approximation with second-order terms according to (27). Only contributions corresponding to 2p-3s and 2p-3d transitions included;

 E_1 - same as D_1 , but elements of the ρ matrix below the n=3 threshold set equal to the value of corresponding elements at the threshold; circles: semi-classical approximation of Griem³.

D₁ - unitarized Bethe approximation with second-order terms according to (27). Only contributions corresponding to 2p-3s and 2p-3d transitions included;

circles: SC approximation of Griem¹⁶ (An=1 contributions only);

triangles: same as circles without contributions from energies below n=3 threshold.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Larry Altgilbers 3805 Jamestown Huntsville, AL 35810

Argonne National Lab 9700 S. Cass Avenue Argonne, IL 60439 Attn: Y. K. Kim K. T. Lu, K105

Lloyd Armstrong Department of Physics Johns Hopkins University Baltimore, MD 21318

P. Bakshi Dept. of Physics and Center for Energy Research Boston College Chestnut Hill, MA 02167

C. F. Barnett Oak Ridge Natl. Lab P.O. Box X Bldg. 6003 Oak Ridge, TN 37830

Rogers Bengston Dept. of Physics U. of Texas Austin, TX 78712

Klaus H. Berkner Lawrence Berkeley Lab Univ. of California Berkeley, CA 94530

Nat Bhaskar Columbia University Columbia Radiation Lab New York, NY 10027

Prof. L.C. Biedenharn Duke University Dept. of Physics Durham, NC 27706

Howard C. Bryant Phsyics and Astronomy Univ. of New Mexico Albuquerque, NM 87131 J. T. Chan Physics Department Univ. of Arkansas Fayetteville, AK 72701 Edward S. Chang Dept. of Physics Univ. of Massachusetts Amherst, MA 01003 Shih-I Chu Dept. of Chemistry Univ. of Kansas Lawrence, KS 66045 David A. Clark Univ. of New Mexico P.O. Box 608 Albuquerque, NM 87544 E. D. Commins Dept. of Physics Univ. of California Berkeley, CA 94720 William E. Cooke Dept. of Physics Univ. of S. California University Park Los Angeles, CA 90007 Stuart Crampton Williams College Williamstown, MA 01267 William A. Davis Fusion Energy Division Oak Ridge National Lab Box Y, Bldg. 9201-2 Oak Ridge, TN 37830 Hans G. Dehmelt Department of Washington Univ. of Washington Seattle, WA 98195 Alan Desilva University of Maryland Physics Dept. College Park, MD 20742

Richard D. Deslattes National Science Foundation Washington, DC 20234

Norval Fortson University of Washington Seattle, WA 98105

Frank Franz Dept. of Physics Indiana University Bloomington, IN 47405

Richard Freeman Bell Laboratories 4D-321 Crawfords Corner Road Homdel, NJ 07733

Robert S. Freund Bell Laboratories 600 Mountain Avenue Murray Hill, NJ 07974

G. Gerdin 214 Nucl. Eng. Lab. 1035 Goodwin Urbana, IL 61801

K. I. Golden Dept. of Electrical Engineering University of Vermont Burlington, VT 05401

Harvey Gould Bldg. 70, Room 257 Lawrence Berkeley Lab Berkeley, CA 94720

Hans Griem University of Maryland Lab. for Plasma & Fusion Studies College Park, MD 20742

R. Gupta University of Arkansas Dept. of Physics Fayetteville, AK 72701 Harvard University 60 Garden Street Cambridge, MA 02138 W. H. Parkinson Center for Astrophysics Alex Dalgarno Lyman Laboratory Francis M. Pipkin Roger A. Hegstrom Dept. of Chemistry Wake Forest University Winston-Salem, NC 27109 Robert M. Hill SRI International 333 Ravenswood Avenue Menlo Park, CA 94025 Harry Jacobson Dir. of Special Programs University of Tenn. Knoxville, TN 37916 Duane H. Jaecks Physics Dept. University of Nebraska Lincoln, NE 68588 Thomas H. Jeys **Rice University** Space Phys. and Astronomy 6100 South Main Houston, TX 77005 JILA/NBS Campus Box 440 Univ. of Colorado 1510 Eisenhower Drive Boulder, CO 80309 J. Cooper (1 each) Sidney Geltman Stephen J. Smith Charles E. Johnson Physics Dept. N. Carolina State Univ. Raleigh, NC 27607

W. R. Johnson Physics Dept. Univ. of Notre Dame Notre Dame, IN 46556 B. R. Junker ONR Code 323 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217 G. Kalman Dept. of Physics and Center for Energy Research Boston College Chestnut Hill, MA 02167 Kansas State University Physics Dept. Manhattan, KA 66506 Chander P. Bhalla C. D. Lin University of Virginia Physics Dept. McCormick Road Charlottesville, VA 22901 Hugh R. Kelly Tom Gallagher KMS Fusion, Inc. P.O. Box 1567 3621 S. State Road Ann Arbor, MI 48106 George Charatis Jon T. Larsen Paul Rockett D. Tanner Joseph J. Kubis P.O. Box 1082 Ann Arbor, MI 48106 Lawrence Livermore National Lab. P.O. Box 808 Livermore, CA 94550 Attn: David Boercker, MS 387 Hugh E. DeWitt Richard Fortner, L-401 Forrest J. Rogers Balazs F. Rozsnyai, L-71 James H. Scofield Bruce W. Shore

Los Alamos National Lab. P.O. Box 1663 Los Alamos, NM 87545 Attn: Fred Begay (1 each) John H. Brownell, MS 220 Lee A. Collins C. W. Cranfill, MS 538 R. Godwin, MS 420 Alan Hauer, MS 554 Walter F. Huebner, MS 212 Joseph B. Mann A. L. Merts T. F. Stratton Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, MA 02139 Shaoul Ezekiel Rm. 26-255 Michael Feld Rm. 6-009 Daniel Kleppner Rm. 26-231 Harold J. Metcalf Physics Dept State University of NY Stony Brook, NY 11794 Fred W. Meyer Oak Ridge National Lab P.O. Box X Bldg. 6003 Oak Ridge, TN 37830 Masataka Mizushima Physics Dept. Univ. of Colorado Boulder, CO 80309 National Bureau of Standards Washington, DC 20234 Attn: Larry Roszman (1 each) Joseph Reader Raju U. Datla, Bldg. 221 Wofgang Wiese Bldg. 221, Rm. A267 Univ. of Illinois Dept. of Physics Urbana, IL 61801 Attn: M. H. Nayfeth Chicago Campus C. Rhodes

Randolph S. Peterson Box U-46 Dept. of Physics Univ. of Conn. Storrs, CT 06286

Robert Peterson Nuclear Engineering Dept. University of Wisconsin 1500 Johnson Drive Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Physics International Inc. 2700 Merced Street San Leandro, CA 94577 Richard L. Schneider M. Krishnan

H. Pilloff ONR Code 323 800 N. Quincy St. Arlington, VA 22217

Michael S. Pindzola Oak Ridge National Lab Phys. Div., Bldg. 6003 Oak Ridge, TN 37830

Princeton University Plasma Physics Laboratory Forrestal Campus Princeton, NJ 08540 Manfred L. Bitter Kenneth W. Hill

A. K. Rajagopal Dept. of Physics and Astronomy Louisianna State Univ. Baton Rouge, LA 70803

M. Eugene Rudd University of Nebraska Behlen Lab of Physics Lincolr, NB 68588

D. H. Sampson Dept. of Astronomy 525 Davey Laboratory Pennsylvania State Univ. University Park, PA 16802 Eugene J. McGuire Org. 4211 Sandia Laboratories P.O. Box 5800 Albuquerque, NM 87185 Wolfgang Sandner SRI International 332 Ravenswood Avenue Menlo Park, CA 94025 Ivan A. Sellin Oak Ridge National Lab P.O. Box X Oak Ridge, TN 37830 Robin Shakeshaft Dept. of Physics Texas A & M Univ. College Station, TX 77843 R. Shepherd Dept. of Nuclear Eng. 114 N.A.M.E. Ann Arbor, MI 48106 Haward A. Shugart Dept. of Physics Univ. of CA Berkeley, CA 94720 Rolf Sinclair Physics Division Natl. Sci. Foundation Washington, DC 20550 Ken Smith Rice Univ. Space Phys. and Astronomy 6100 South Main Houston, TX 77005 Winthrop W. Smith Dept. of Physics Univ. of Conn. Storrs, CT 06268 Larry Spruch New York University Physics Dept. 4 Washington Place New York, NY 10003

Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305 ATTN: Nils Carlson (1 each) S. E. Harris Edward L. Ginzton Lab W. E. Meyerhof Arthur L. Schawlow

Ronald F. Stebbings Dept. of Space and Astron. Rice Univ. Houston, TX 77001

Rudolph M. Sternheimer Dept. of Physics Brookhaven National Lab. Upton, NY 11973

Strategic Defense Initiative Org. Pentagon Washington, DC 20301-7100 Attn: Dwight Duston/IST Len Caveny/IST

C. F. Hooper, Jr. University of Florida Dept. of Physics Gainesville, FL 32611

University of Michigan Physics Dept. 500 E. University Ann Arbor, MI 48109 Attn: W. L. Williams Jens C. Zorn T. Kammish Dept. of Nucl. Eng.

University of Rochester Lab. for Laser Energetics 250 E. River Road Rochester, NY 14623 Reuben Epstein Stanley Skupsky

University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA 15260 Attn: J. E. Bayfield 100 Allen Hall Physics Dept. Richard H. Pratt L. Vahala Dept. of Elec. Eng. Old Dominion University Norfolk, VA Carol Venanzi Ritgers University P.O. Box 939 Piscataway, NJ 08854 Leposava Vuskovic Jet Propulsion Lab 4800 Oak Grove Drive Pasadena, CA 91103 Fred L. Walls Natl. Bur. of Standards 325 Broadway Boulder, CO 80303 Shinichi Watanabe Dept. of Physics University of Chicago 1100 East 58th St. Chicago, IL 60637 William Westerveld Dept. of Physics N. Carolina State Univ. Raleigh, NC 27650 Villiam Wing Phys. and Optical Sciences University of Arizona Tucson, AZ 85721 Peter Winkler Physics Dept. University of Nevada Reno, Nevada 89557 David M. Woodall Dept. of Nuclear Engineering University of New Mexico Albuquerque, NM 87131 Robert Yaris Chemistry Department Washington University St. Louis, MO 63130

"

Pierre Agostini C.E.A. CEN SACLAY B.P. 2 Gif-sur-Yvette FRANCE

Ignacio Alvarez Instituto de Fisica U.N.A.M. Apdo. Pstal 20-364 MEXICO

Dr. Alain Angelie Commissarait a l'Energie Atomique Villeneuve St. Georges FRANCE

Alain Aspect Universite Paris Sud B.P. 43 91406 Orsay Cedex FRANCE

P.E.G. Baird Clarendon Laboratory University of Oxford Parks Road Oxford, ENGLAND

Gunter G. Baum Univ. Bielefeld Fakultat fur Physik 48 Bielefeld WEST GERMANY

Uwe Becker Tech. Univ. Berlin Rondellstr. 5, D-1000 Berlin 37 WEST GERMANY

Bibliotéque 21, Av. des Bains CH-1007 Lausanne SWITZERLAND

Emile Biemont Inst. D'Astrophysique Universite de Liege B-4200 Cointe-Ougree BELGIUM C. Bouchist Ecole Normale Sup. 24 Rue Lhomond 24 75231 Paris Cedex 05 FRANCE Fritz Buchinger Mainz University CERN CERN Div. EP Geneve, SWITZERLAND D. D. Burgess The Blackett Laboratory Imperial College of Sci. and Tech. London SV7 2BZ ENGLAND Carmen Dra. Cisneros Instituto de Fisica U.N.A.M. Apdo. Postal 20-364 MEXICO Charles W. Clark SRC Daresbury Lab. Daresbury, Warrington ENGLAND WA4 4AD N. Czsjkowski University of Windcor Windsor, Ontario CANADA N9B 3P4 C. Deutsch Laboratoire de Physique des Plasmas Universite Paris XI 91405 Orsay FRANCE Andre Dietrich Tech. Univ. Berlin D 1 Berlin 37 Rondellstrasse 5 WEST GERMANY Gordon Drake Dept. of Physics Univ. of Windsor Windsor, Ontario CANADA N9B 3P4

Francoise Fabre C.E.A. CEN SACLAY B.P.2 Gif-sur-Yvette

FRANCE Edmond Genenx Universitat Bern Sidlerstrasse 3012 Berne SWITZERLAND

Elisabeth Giacobino Universite Paris VI 4 Place Jussieu 75230 Paris Cedex 05 FRANCE

Samuel A. Goldman University of Windsor Windsor, Ontario CANADA N9B 3P4

Dr. Francois Grimaldi Centre d'Etudes de Limeil Villeneuve, St. Georges FRANCE

G. Friedrich Hanne Physikal Institut Corrensstrasse 4400 Muenster WEST GERMANY

R. A. Holt Dept. of Physics Univ. of West. Ontario London, Ontario CANADA N6A 3K7

J. W. Humberston Univ. College London Gower Street London WC1E 6BT ENGLAND

F. E. Irons Hughes Technology Pty. Ltd. P.O. Box 1155 Canberra A.C.T. 2601 AUSTRALIA

P. Jaegle Laboratoire de Spectroscopie Atomique et Ionique University Paris-Sud Orsay, FRANCE Dr. Takao Kato Institute of Plasma Physics Nagoya University, JAPAN H. Klein Clarendon Laboratory Parks Road Oxford ENGLAND Hans Kleinpoppen Inst. of Atomic Phys. University of Stirling Stirling, FK94LA ENGLAND Aaron D. Krumbein Soreq Nuclear Research Center Yavne, ISRAEL 70600 Hans-Joach I. Kunze Inst. Experimentalphysik v Ruhr Universitat Postfach 2148 4630 Bochum WEST GERMANY Dr. Michele Lamoureux Laboratoire de Spectroscopie Atomique et Ionique Universite Paris-Sud Orsay, FRANCE W. N. Lennard Atom. Ener. of Canada Ltd. C.R.N.L. Chaulk River, Ontario CANADA KOJ 1JO Librarian Max-Planck-Institut fur Plasmaphysik 8046 Garching bei Munchen WEST GERMANY

. • •

Library Institut fur Plasmaforschung Universitat Stuttgart Pfaffenwaldring 31 700 Stuttgart 80 WEST GERMANY

H.O. Lutz Univ. bielefeld Fakultat fur Physik D-4800 Bielefeld 1 WEST GERMANY

Dr. M. Stuart McRobert Blackett Laboratory Imperial College ENGLAND

Reinhard Morgenstern University Utrecht Princetonplein 5 NL 3508 TA Utrecht NETHERLANDS

Hajime Narumi Dept. of Physics Hiroshima University Hiroshima 730 JAPAN

A. Ng Dept. of Physics U.B.C. Vancouver B.C., CANADA V6T 1W5

Derek Paul Physics Dept. University of Toronto Toronto M5S 1A7 CANADA

Dr. F. Perrot Centre d'Etudes de Limeil Villeneuve St. Georges FRANCE

F. H. Read Physics Dept. Univ. of Manchester Manchester M13 9P1 ENGLAND Arne Rosen Dept. of Physics Chalmers Univ. of Tech S-41296 Goteborg SWEDEN S. David Rosner Dept. of Physics Univ. of Western Ontario London, Ontario N6A 3K7 CANADA David Salzmann Soreq Nuclear Research Center Yavne 70600 ISRAEL Joshua D. Silver Univ. of Oxford Parks Road Oxford OX1 3PU ENGLAND A.C.H. Smith Dept of Phys. and Astro. Univ. College London London EC1E 6BT ENGLAND N. Stolterfoht Hahn-Mfitner-Institut D-1 Berlin 39 100 Glienickerstr. WEST GERMANY J.D. Talman Dept. of Chemistry Univ. of West Ontario London, Ontario N6A 3K7 CANADA Hiroshi Tanaka Sophia University Faculty of Sci. and Tech. Chiyoda-Ku, Koiocho 7 Tokyo, JAPAN 102

F. Trager Physikalisches Institut Der Univ. Heidelberg D-690 Heidelberg 1 WEST GERMANY

Ervin Weinberger University of Torcnto 255 Huron St. Toronto, Ontario CANADA M5S 1A7

Tatsuhiko Yamanaka Osaka University Osaka, JAPAN

Dieter Zimmermann Inst. fur Strahlungs-Un Kerenphysik Technische Univ. of Berlin D-1002 Berlin WEST GERMANY

Zev Zinzmon The Weizmann Insitute of Science Rohovot, ISRAEL

Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D. C. 20375-5000 Code 4700 26 copies Code 4720 50 copies P. Burkhalter, Code 4681 Ed McClean, Code 4732 Dave Nagel, Code 4700

DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY ANNAPOLIS, MD 21402 2 copies

CODE 1220 1 copy

CODE 2628 22 copies

Records 1 copy

Cindy Sims (Code 2634) 1 copy