University of Nebraska - Lincoln
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

M. Eugene Rudd Publications | Research Papers in Physics and Astronomy

1-1-1966

Observation of Doppler-Shifted Peaks in the Energy Spectrum of Autoionizatioin Electrons from Ar+ -Ar Collisions

M. Eugene Rudd
University of Nebraska - Lincoln, erudd@unl.edu

T. Jorgensen, Jr.
University of Nebraska - Lincoln

D. J. Volz
University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/physicsrudd

Part of the Physics Commons

Rudd, M. Eugene; Jorgensen, Jr., T.; and Volz, D. J., "Observation of Doppler-Shifted Peaks in the Energy Spectrum of Autoionizatioin Electrons from Ar+ -Ar Collisions" (1966). *M. Eugene Rudd Publications.* Paper 64.
http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/physicsrudd/64

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Research Papers in Physics and Astronomy at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in M. Eugene Rudd Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Observation of Doppler-Shifted Peaks in the Energy Spectrum of Autoionizatioin Electrons from Ar+ -Ar Collisions

M. E. Rudd, T. Jorgensen, Jr., and D. J. Volz
Department of Physics, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska

Received 25 April 1966

It is well known that when heavy ions traverse gas, electron pickup into excited states occurs. If the fast excited atom subsequently decays by radiating a photon, the energy of the photon will be Doppler shifted due to the motion of the source. This effect may be used to distinguish the radiation from stationary and moving atoms. For example, this method was used by Meinel to deduce the motion of solar protons streaming downward through the earth's atmosphere.

If instead the moving atom decays by autoionization, the ejected electron should also show a shift in energy analogous to the Doppler shift. We have now observed this effect in the autoionization electron spectrum from Ar^+-Ar collisions at 50 to 150 keV. Viewing the electrons ejected in a nearly backward direction (160°) relative to the beam of ions, we have found a number of characteristic peaks which shift with beam energy and a number of others which do not. Furthermore, there is a detailed correspondence between the shifted and unshifted sets. The latter sets come from the (nearly) stationary target atoms, while the shifted electrons are from the fast beam particles.

Published in *Physical Review Letters* **16**, 929 - 930 (1966)
©1966 The American Physical Society. Used by permission.
URL: http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.16.929
DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.16.929

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS

VOLUME 16 | 23 MAY 1966 | NUMBER 21

OBSERVATION OF DOPPLER-SHIFTED PEAKS IN THE ENERGY SPECTRUM OF AUTOIONIZATION ELECTRONS FROM Ar^+-Ar COLLISIONS*

M. E. Rudd, T. Jorgensen, Jr., and D. J. Volz
Department of Physics, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska
(Received 25 April 1966)

It is well known that when heavy ions traverse a gas, electron pickup into excited states occurs. If the fast excited atom subsequently decays by radiating a photon, the energy of the photon will be Doppler shifted due to the motion of the source. This effect may be used to distinguish the radiation from stationary and moving atoms. For example, this method was used by Meinel[1] to deduce the motion of solar protons streaming downward through the earth's atmosphere.

If instead the moving atom decays by autoionization, the ejected electron should also show a shift in energy analogous to the Doppler shift. We have now observed this effect in the autoionization electron spectrum from Ar^+-Ar collisions at 50 to 150 keV. Viewing the electrons ejected in a nearly backward direction (160°) relative to the beam of ions, we have found a number of characteristic peaks which shift with beam energy and a number of others which do not. Furthermore, there is a detailed correspondence between the shifted and unshifted sets. The latter sets come from the (nearly) stationary target atoms, while the shifted electrons are from the fast beam particles.

During the collision a temporary Ar_2^+ molecular ion is formed[2] and electrons are transferred back and forth between the nuclei.[3] By the time the two nuclei separate they have lost all "memory" of which was the projectile and which the target. Thus we have a completely symmetric situation and would expect to find the same spectrum from both participants in the collision.

Making the assumption that the beam particles are not appreciably deflected or slowed down in the collision, it is a very simple matter to calculate the expected shift in energy from a velocity vector triangle. If E' is the shifted energy, E the unshifted energy, and E_2 the beam energy, the relation is

$$E = E' - 2(E'E_2 m/M)^{1/2}\cos\theta + E_2 m/M,$$

where m and M are the masses of the electron and the emitting atom and ion, respectively, and θ is the angle of observation. In this work $M = 40\times 1836m$ and $\cos\theta = -0.940$. Using this equation we have calculated the expected shift in energy to compare with the measurements.

The actual deflection of the beam particles depends on the beam energy and on r_0, the distance of closest approach of the interacting particles. The deflection can, for this energy range, be calculated with good accuracy by classical methods using an exponentially screened Coulomb potential. This has been worked out by Everhart, Stone, and Carbone.[4] For 100 keV the deflection is less than 4° for a collision with $r_0 = 0.25$ Å. Therefore the correction due to the deflection is small and has been ignored here.

The apparatus is the same as that used previously[5] except for some modifications in the plotting system.[6] The energy scale was initial-

ly calibrated with an electron gun but because of space charge present when gas is admitted the scale is uniformly shifted by a few tenths of an electron volt. Therefore we have calibrated our scale by comparison with the 27.55-eV line measured by Simpson, Chamberlain, and Mielczarek.[7] Subtracting the ionization potential from this value yields 11.79 eV for the energy of the peak we have designated "*E*" in this work. If this identification is correct our energy scale should have an uncertainty of less than about 0.1 eV.

Figure 1 shows the energies of the unshifted peaks, most of which are averages taken from 20 to 25 runs. Also shown are the energies of the shifted peaks for three different beam energies as calculated from the equation above. These may be compared with the measured values plotted on the same diagram. All but one of the measured lines are within 0.1 eV of the calculated energies. At the lower electron energies, the large cross section for the background continuum tended to obscure the peaks. Sometimes overlapping of shifted and unshifted sets made identification and measurement difficult. For example, at 150 keV the shifted *H* line falls on the unshifted *A* line and at 50 keV the shifted *I* line is at the same energy as *C*. At 50 and 100 keV there is an additional shifted line between *D* and *E* which shows up only weakly in the unshifted spectrum.

Most of the transitions represented by the peaks have not yet been identified. It is reasonably clear that the line *E* is due to the transition $(3s3p^6 3d)\,^1D \rightarrow (3s^2 3p^5)\,^2P + 1e$. The line *C* is of the proper energy to originate at the $(3s3p^6 4s)\,^1S$ level identified by Simpson, Chamberlain, and Mielczarek.[7] The *F* line also agrees in energy with a level reported by them.



FIG. 1. Energy spectrum of electrons from argon gas bombarded by argon ions. Unshifted lines are ones which appear at the same energy regardless of beam energy. Doppler-shifted lines appear at different places for different beam energies. The calculated positions of the shifted lines are from the equation in the text. Dashed lines represent weak or uncertain lines.

*Work supported by the National Science Foundation.

[1]A. B. Meinel, Phys. Rev. 80, 1096 (1950).

[2]U. Fano and W. Lichten, Phys. Rev. Letters 14, 627 (1965).

[3]F. P. Ziemba, G. J. Lockwood, G. H. Morgan, and E. Everhart, Phys. Rev. 118, 1552 (1960).

[4]E. Everhart, G. Stone, and R. J. Carbone, Phys. Rev. 99, 1287 (1955).

[5]M. E. Rudd, Phys. Rev. Letters 13, 503 (1964); 15, 580 (1965).

[6]M. E. Rudd, to be published.

[7]J. A. Simpson, G. E. Chamberlain, and S. R. Mielczarek, Phys. Rev. 139, A1039 (1965).