11/25/86

(To be submitted to IAEA, who will
coordinate a supplement to Nuclear Fusion.)

CONF-8609257--1

ELECTRON-IMPACT IONIZATION DATA FOR THE Fe ISONUCLEAR SEQUENCE†

M. S. Pindzola,* D. C. Griffin,** C. Bottcher,
S. M. Younger*** and H. T. Hunter
Physics Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831

CONF-8609257--1

ABSTRACT

DE87 004420

Atomic data for the electron-impact ionization of ions in the Fe isonuclear sequence is reviewed. The best available data are identified. Comments are made on current research activities leading to future data for Fe ions.

I. INTRODUCTION

The experimental and theoretical study of electron-impact ionization processes in atomic systems has important applications in controlled thermonuclear fusion research.^{1,2} Following the discovery that highly charged impurity ions of Mo and W used in tokamak walls and limiters were responsible for rapid line radiation cooling of the plasma, research interest has shifted to lower Z structural materials which generally contain Fe, Ni, and Cr.³ Accurate electron-ionization atomic data for the atomic ions of the Fe isonuclear sequence has led and will lead to a better understanding of high temperature plasma cooling, transport, and confinement in not only tokamaks but other experimental fusion devices.

In the last decade experiment and theory have shown⁴ that indirect resonance processes may make substantial contributions to the electron-impact ionization of transition metal ions especially in low stages of ionization. Contributions to the electron-impact single ionization cross section can be made by the following processes,

The submitted manuscript has been authored by a contractor of the U.S. Government under contract DE-AC05-84OR21400. Accordingly, the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of this contribution, or allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes.

MASTER

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

$$e^{-} + A^{q+} \rightarrow A^{(q+1)+} + e^{-} + e^{-} , \quad (1)$$

$$e^{-} + A^{q+} \rightarrow [A^{q+}]^{*} + e^{-} \\ \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \\ \quad \quad \quad A^{(q+1)+} + e^{-} , \quad (2)$$

and

$$e^{-} + A^{q+} \rightarrow [A^{(q-1)+}]^{*} \\ \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \\ \quad \quad \quad [A^{q+}]^{*} + e^{-} \\ \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \\ \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad A^{(q+1)+} + e^{-} , \quad (3)$$

where A represents an arbitrary ion with charge q. The first process is called direct ionization, the second excitation-autoionization and the third resonant-recombination double autoionization. Although a complete quantum mechanical description of electron ionization would include the wave-particle interference between these processes, for the purpose of obtaining a total cross section or rate they can generally be assumed to be independent of one another. Contributions to the electron-impact double ionization cross section can be made by the following processes,

$$e^{-} + A^{q+} \rightarrow A^{(q+2)+} + e^{-} + e^{-} + e^{-} , \quad (4)$$

and

$$e^{-} + A^{q+} \rightarrow [A^{(q+1)+}]^{*} + e^{-} + e^{-} \\ \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \\ \quad \quad \quad A^{(q+2)+} + e^{-} . \quad (5)$$

The first process is called direct double ionization and the second ionization-autoionization. The further processes of excitation-double autoionization and resonant-recombination triple autoionization can also in principle contribute to the double ionization cross section.

The sequential ionization processes summarized in Eqs. (2), (3), and (5) depend critically on the branching ratio found at each step. For example the doubly excited ion $[Aq^+]^*$ found in Eq. (2) may radiatively decay to a true bound state of Aq^+ and thus not contribute to single ionization. For low stages of ionization one may generally assume that radiative branching is negligible. For high stages of ionization radiative branching may effectively eliminate many sequential ionization processes. For the double autoionization processes of Eq. (3) one must consider the branching ratio between autoionizing transitions found at the first step. For example the doubly excited ion $[A(q-1)^+]^*$ found in Eq. (3) may decay by autoionizing to a true bound state of Aq^+ and thus not contribute to single ionization. In some cases this is precisely what happens, thus eliminating the resonant-recombination process as an ionization mechanism.

The sequential ionization processes also depend critically on the interaction time. For example the direct process of Eq. (1) occurs on a time scale of 10^{-17} sec, which is approximately the electron-ion collision transit time. The sequential ionization processes all depend on the lifetimes of resonant autoionizing states. Generally these lifetimes range from 10^{-10} sec to 10^{-14} sec. However, sometimes metastable autoionizing states are formed with lifetimes of 10^{-6} sec or longer. Crossed-beams experiments may have scattering chamber to detector ion beam transit times which are faster than 10^{-6} sec, thus eliminating a certain metastable sequential ionization process as an ionization mechanism.

Recently experimental crossed-beams measurements have been made of electron-impact ionization cross sections of ions in the Fe isonuclear sequence.⁵⁻⁸ Due to the formation characteristics of the ion sources, ion beam currents generally become smaller for the higher ionization stages of a given element. More specifically the ORNL ECR ion source and crossed-beams apparatus has been used to make measurements up to Fe^{15+} . Thus comparison between experiment and theory is currently taking place in the low to intermediate ionization stages of Fe.

II. AVERAGE-CONFIGURATION STATISTICAL MODEL

The direct ionization and excitation-autoionization processes of Eqs. (1) and (2) may be calculated using the average-configuration distorted-wave method. The most general direct ionization transition between configurations is of the form

$$(n_1 \ell_1)^{q_1+1} k_i \ell_i \rightarrow (n_1 \ell_1)^{q_1} k_e \ell_e k_f \ell_f, \quad (6)$$

where n is the principal number, ℓ is the angular-momentum quantum number, q is the occupation number, and k is the linear momentum wave-number. The average-configuration direct ionization cross section (in atomic units) is given by^{9,10}

$$\sigma_{\text{ion}} = \int_0^{E/2} \frac{32(q_1+1)}{k_i^3 k_e k_f} \sum_{\ell_i, \ell_e, \ell_f} (2\ell_i+1)(2\ell_e+1)(2\ell_f+1) M(ef; li) d(k_e^2/2), \quad (7)$$

where $E = (k_e^2 + k_f^2)/2$. The factor M in Eq. (7) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
M(ef;li) = & \sum_{\lambda} \begin{pmatrix} l_1 & \lambda & l_e \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^2 \begin{pmatrix} l_i & \lambda & l_f \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^2 \frac{[R^{\lambda}(ef;li)]^2}{(2\lambda+1)} \\
& + \sum_{\lambda'} \begin{pmatrix} l_1 & \lambda' & l_f \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^2 \begin{pmatrix} l_i & \lambda' & l_e \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^2 \frac{[R^{\lambda'}(fe;li)]^2}{(2\lambda'+1)} \\
& - \text{abs} \left[\sum_{\lambda} \sum_{\lambda'} \begin{Bmatrix} l_1 & l_e & \lambda \\ l_i & l_f & \lambda' \end{Bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} l_1 & \lambda & l_e \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} l_i & \lambda & l_f \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} l_1 & \lambda' & l_f \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} l_i & \lambda' & l_e \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times R^{\lambda}(ef;li) R^{\lambda'}(fe;li) \right] , \quad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

where $R^{\lambda}(ef;li)$ is the usual Slater radial integral and angular coefficients are summarized in terms of standard 3-j and 6-j symbols.

Although there is no rigorous justification for the choice of phase between the direct and exchange scattering amplitudes, the maximum interference approximation¹¹ is used.

The most general excitation transition between configurations is of the form

$$(n_1 l_1)^{q_1+1} (n_2 l_2)^{q_2-1} k_i l_i \rightarrow (n_1 l_1)^{q_1} (n_2 l_2)^{q_2} k_f l_f . \quad (9)$$

The average-configuration excitation cross section is given by

$$\sigma_{\text{exc}} = \frac{8\pi}{k_i^3 k_f} (q_1+1) (4l_2+3-q_2) \sum_{l_i, l_f} (2l_i+1)(2l_f+1) M(2f;li) . \quad (10)$$

The factor M in Eq. (10) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 M(2f;1i) = & \sum_{\lambda} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda & \lambda_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^2 \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_i & \lambda & \lambda_f \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^2 \frac{[R^{\lambda}(2f;1i)]^2}{(2\lambda+1)} \\
 & + \sum_{\lambda'} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda' & \lambda_f \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^2 \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_i & \lambda' & \lambda_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^2 \frac{[R^{\lambda'}(f2;1i)]^2}{(2\lambda'+1)} \\
 & - \sum_{\lambda} \sum_{\lambda'} (-1)^{\lambda+\lambda'} \begin{Bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \lambda \\ \lambda_i & \lambda_f & \lambda' \end{Bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda & \lambda_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_i & \lambda & \lambda_f \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda' & \lambda_f \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_i & \lambda' & \lambda_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
 & \times R^{\lambda}(2f;1i) R^{\lambda'}(f2;1i) \quad . \quad (11)
 \end{aligned}$$

The continuum normalization in both Eqs. (7) and (10) is chosen as one times a sine function. The bound state orbitals needed to evaluate the Slater radial integrals can be generated using a Hartree-Fock wavefunction code such as the one developed by Cowan.¹² The continuum state orbitals are obtained by solving the radial Schrodinger equation in the distorted-wave approximation. For rapid evaluation of many continuum orbitals a local distorting potential constructed in a semiclassical exchange approximation¹³ has proved useful.

The average-configuration distorted wave method can be extended with little more effort to take into account the energy level spread within each configuration. A simple procedure called the average-configuration statistical model (ACSM) is adopted. The average-configuration collision cross section for either the direct ionization or excitation-autoionization process is statistically partitioned over all levels of the final ionized or excited configuration. The total cross section is then summed taking explicit account of the energy position of each level calculated using an atomic-structure program provided

by Cowan.¹² If the atomic structure calculations show that certain excited levels are bound, their contribution to the ionization cross section is of course ignored. Branching ratios for autoionization versus radiation are also calculated for each excited level and then multiplied by the statistically partitioned excitation cross sections. A statistically weighted Boltzmann distribution over the levels of the initial configuration, based on an average ion temperature, may also be included in the average-configuration statistical model.

Average-configuration direct ionization cross sections have been calculated for the outer subshells of many of the ground and excited configurations in the Fe isonuclear sequence. For ease in accessing the results of the numerical calculations, the direct cross section for each subshell may be written in the following parameterized form¹⁴

$$\sigma(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{IE} \left[A \left(1 - \frac{I}{E} \right) + B \left(1 - \frac{I}{E} \right)^2 + C \ln \left(\frac{E}{I} \right) + \frac{DI}{E} \ln \left(\frac{E}{I} \right) \right], \quad (12)$$

where E is the incident electron energy in eV, I is the subshell ionization potential in eV and the cross section is in cm^2 . A , B , C , D parameters for the ground configuration of all Fe ions are collected together¹⁴⁻¹⁶ and presented in Table I. A , B , C , D parameters for various excited configurations are given in Table II. For those inner subshells not found in Tables I and II, the semiempirical formula due to Lotz¹⁷ can be used to estimate the cross section.

Average-configuration excitation cross sections have been calculated for transitions to many of the autoionizing configurations in the Fe isonuclear sequence. The strongest excitation cross sections for

transitions from the ground configuration are presented in Table III, while similar cross sections from the excited configuration are given in Table IV. Additional atomic structure information is presented in Tables III and IV, from which calculations for the total ionization cross section in the average-configuration statistical model can be made.

III. CROSS SECTIONS FOR Fe ATOMIC IONS

In Fig. 1 the crossed-beams measurements of Montague et al.⁵ for Fe^+ are compared with an ACSM calculation for the $3p^63d^64s$ ground configuration, which includes the $3p+3d$ excitation and direct ionization of the $4s$ and $3d$ subshells. Near threshold the direct cross sections alone are higher than experiment. Further theoretical investigation into the effects of configuration-interaction and direct-indirect interference are clearly needed.

In Fig. 2 the crossed-beams measurements of Mueller et al.⁶ for Fe^{2+} are compared with an ACSM calculation¹⁸ for the $3p^63d^6$ ground configuration, which includes the $3p+3d$ excitation and direct ionization of the $3d$ subshell. The total and direct cross sections bracket the experiment over a wide energy range. Very near threshold the experimental measurements clearly indicate the contribution of metastable states within the ground configuration. The unincluded $3p+4p$ excitation further increases the calculated indirect contribution to the total ionization cross section by 20%. Atomic structure calculations indicate that most of the levels, 173 out of 180, of the $3p^53d^6$ configuration formed by direct ionization of the $3p$ shell are autoionizing. Thus most of the $3p$ direct ionization contributes to the double ionization of Fe^{2+} .

In Fig. 3 an ACSM calculation¹⁸ for the $3p^63d^5$ ground configuration of Fe^{3+} , including the $3p \rightarrow 3d$ excitation-autoionization contribution and direct ionization of the $3d$ and $3p$ subshells, is presented. Atomic structure calculations indicate that only a few of the levels, 31 out of 214, of the $3p^53d^5$ configuration formed by direct ionization of the $3p$ shell are autoionizing. Thus most of the $3p$ direct ionization contributes to the single ionization of Fe^{3+} .

In Fig. 4 an ACSM calculation for the $3p^63d^4$ ground configuration of Fe^{4+} , including 9 different excitations and direct ionization of the $3d$, $3p$, and $3s$ subshells, is presented. The $3p \rightarrow 3d$ excitation creates the same final configuration as discussed in the previous paragraph for $3p$ ionization of Fe^{3+} . Since only 31 out of the 214 levels are autoionizing, the $3p \rightarrow 3d$ contributions become relatively small. The $3p \rightarrow 4p$ excitation is comparable in magnitude to the $3p \rightarrow 3d$ excitation since all 1038 levels of the $3p^53d^44p$ configuration are autoionizing. The $3s \rightarrow 3d$ and $3p \rightarrow 4d$ excitations are also quite important.

In Fig. 5 the crossed-beams measurements of Gregory et al.⁷ for Fe^{5+} are compared with an ACSM calculation¹⁹ for the $3p^63d^3$ ground configuration which includes 10 different excitations and direct ionization of the $3d$, $3p$, and $3s$ subshells. The $3p \rightarrow 4p$ excitation is the strongest, but important contributions are made by the $3s \rightarrow 3d$ and $3p \rightarrow 4d$ excitations. Beyond the 10 specific excitations included, an n^3 rule extrapolation was used to approximate the remaining non-negligible $3p \rightarrow nx$ excitation-autoionization contributions. The agreement between theory and experiment is reasonably good. The smooth appearance of the theoretical curve results from the statistical partition of the total excitation collision

cross section over more than 5000 levels. An ACSM calculation¹⁹ for Fe^{5+} was repeated for electron ionization of the $3p^63d^24s$ excited configuration, including 10 different excitations and direct ionization of the 4s, 3d, and 3p subshells. In Fig. 6 the theoretical curve for the excited configuration is larger than that for the ground configuration because of the additional presence of the strong $3p \rightarrow 3d$ excitation. From the poor agreement found between experiment and theory in Fig. 6, one concludes that most of the metastable states in the excited configuration have decayed during the ion beam time of flight from source to scattering chamber.

In Fig. 7 the crossed-beams measurements of Gregory et al.⁷ for Fe^{6+} are compared with an ACSM calculation¹⁹ for the $3p^63d^2$ ground configuration, which includes 9 different excitations and direct ionization of the 3d, 3p, and 3s subshells. The $3p \rightarrow 4p$ excitation is reduced in strength, due to the fact that only 24 of the 256 levels of the $3p^53d^24p$ configuration are autoionizing. The $3p \rightarrow 4f$ excitation is the strongest, but important contributions are made by the $3s \rightarrow 4s$ and $3p \rightarrow 5s$ excitations. Higher $3p \rightarrow n\ell$ excitations are estimated using the n^3 rule. An ACSM calculation¹⁹ for Fe^{6+} was repeated for electron ionization of the $3p^63d4s$ excited configuration including 9 different excitations and direct ionization of the 4s, 3d, 3p, and 3s subshells. In Fig. 8 the agreement between theory and experiment is poor, again indicating that a substantial number of metastable states in the excited configuration have decayed before the measurements are made.

In Fig. 9 an ACSM calculation for the $3p^63d$ ground configuration of Fe^{7+} , including 10 different excitations and direct ionization of the 3d, 3p, and 3s subshells, is presented. The $3p \rightarrow 5s$ and $3s \rightarrow 4s$ excitations

are the most important and higher $n\ell$ excitations are estimated using the n^3 rule.

In Fig. 10 an ACSM calculation for the $3s^23p^6$ ground configuration of Fe^{8+} , including the $2p \rightarrow 3d$ excitation and direct ionization of the 3p and 3s subshells, is presented. An ACSM calculation for the $3s^23p^53d$ excited configuration, including 10 different excitations and direct ionization of the 3d, 3p, and 3s subshells, is shown in Fig. 11. The $2p \rightarrow 3d$ excitation is the strongest, but important contributions are made by $3s \rightarrow 4\ell$ excitations.

In Fig. 12 the crossed-beams measurements of Gregory et al.⁷ for Fe^{9+} are compared with an ACSM calculation¹⁹ for the $3s^23p^5$ ground configuration, which includes the $2p \rightarrow 3d$ excitation and direct ionization of the 3p and 3s subshells. The theory falls below experiment and does not predict the proper threshold energy. An ACSM calculation¹⁹ for Fe^{9+} was repeated for electron ionization of the $3s^23p^43d$ excited configuration, including 5 different excitations and direct ionization of the 3d, 3p, and 3s subshells. The $2p \rightarrow 3d$ excitation is the strongest, but important contributions are made by $3s \rightarrow 4\ell$ excitations. In Fig. 13 the agreement between theory and experiment has improved. It seems that the experiment on Fe^{9+} is predominately measuring electron ionization from the metastable states of the excited configuration.

In Fig. 14 an ACSM calculation for the $3s^23p^4$ ground configuration of Fe^{10+} , including 5 different excitations and direct ionization of the 3p and 3s subshells, is presented. The $2p \rightarrow 3d$ excitation is the strongest, but important contributions are made by the $2p \rightarrow 3p$ and $2s \rightarrow 3d$ excitations. An ACSM calculation for the $3s^23p^33d$ excited configuration,

including 10 different excitations and direct ionization of the 3d, 3p, and 3s subshells, is shown in Fig. 15. The 2p+3d excitation is the strongest, but contributions are made by 3s+5 λ excitations.

In Fig. 16 the crossed-beams measurements of Gregory et al.⁸ for Fe¹¹⁺ are compared with an ACSM calculation¹⁹ for the 3s²3p³ ground configuration, which includes 5 different excitations and direct ionization of the 3p and 3s subshells. The theory falls below experiment and does not predict the proper threshold energy. An ACSM calculation for Fe¹¹⁺ was repeated for electron ionization of the 3s²3p²3d excited configuration, including 10 different excitations and direct ionization of the 3d, 3p, and 3s subshells. The 2p+3d excitation is the strongest, but contributions are made by 3s+5 λ and 2p+3p excitations. In Fig. 17 the agreement between theory and experiment has markedly improved, but the contributions from the lower energy 3s+5 λ excitations seems to be theoretically overestimated. It is surprising that the experiment apparently shows a large fraction of initial ions in the 3s⁵3p²3d configuration when only a small fraction of the states of this configuration should be metastable.

In Fig. 18 an ACSM calculation for the 3s²3p² ground configuration of Fe¹²⁺, including 5 different excitations and direct ionization of the 3p and 3s subshells, is presented. The 2p+3d excitation is the strongest, but important contributions are made by 2p+3p and 2s+3d excitations.

In Fig. 19 the crossed-beams measurements of Gregory et al.⁸ for Fe¹³⁺ are compared with an ACSM calculation¹⁹ for the 3s²3p ground configuration, which includes 5 different excitations and direct ionization

of the 3p and 3s subshells. With the scatter of experimental points it is difficult to make a definitive judgment of the theory.

In Fig. 20 an ACSM calculation for the $2p^63s^2$ ground configuration of Fe^{14+} , including 8 different excitations and direct ionization of the 3s subshell, is presented. The $2p+3d$ excitation is the strongest, but important contributions are made by the $2p+3p$ and $2s+3d$ excitations. An ACSM calculation for the $2p^63s3p$ excited configuration, including 9 different excitations and direct ionization of the 3p, 3s, and 2p subshells, is shown in Fig. 21. The $2p+3p$ and $2p+3d$ are the strongest excitations. Radiative branching has a significant effect on the $2p+3d$ excitation in both cases. Therefore, there is more uncertainty in the theoretical calculations for this ion due to errors inherent in averaging over branching ratios with the ACSM.

In Fig. 22 the crossed-beams measurements of Gregory et al.⁸ for Fe^{15+} are compared with an average-configuration distorted-wave calculation²⁰ for the $2p^63s$ ground configuration. Although the $2p+3d$ excitation cross section is the largest, the branching ratio for autoionization is only 1/3. Both the $2p+3p$ and $2s+3d$ excitations, with branching ratios for autoionization close to unity, are also sizable. Contributions from resonant-recombination double autoionization, see Eq. (3), which are predicted to increase the ionization rate at certain temperatures by as much as 20%, appear to be missing in the experimental data.

For Fe^{16+} through Fe^{23+} the contributions of excitation-autoionization to the total ionization cross section should be fairly small. For electron ionization from the ground configuration, the direct cross section results of Table I should give a reasonable estimate of the total cross section.

Theoretical calculations have been made which investigate excitation-autoionization contributions to the single ionization of the Fe^{23+} atomic ion.²¹ Although the $1s \rightarrow 2s$ and $1s \rightarrow 2p$ excitation cross sections are about 20% of the direct cross section, the branching ratio for autoionization is quite small. The overall enhancement of the total ionization cross section due to excitation-autoionization is estimated to be only about 3%. We note that the role of metastable states in excited configurations is not yet fully understood for electron ionization of highly ionized iron.

IV. RATE COEFFICIENTS FOR Fe ATOMIC IONS

Rate coefficients for Fe^+ through Fe^{25+} were calculated using the theoretical and experimental cross section data discussed in the previous section. The theoretical results are presented in Tables V-X and Figs. 23-28, while the experimental results are presented in Table XI and Fig. 29. In addition to the tabulated values, a set of fitting parameters are included which allows the user to calculate the rate coefficient at any value of kT from ($E_{\min}$ to $E_{\max} = 20$ eV, where $E_{\min}$ is listed in the tables) for any of the ions included here. The coefficients A_0 through A_6 in Tables V-XI were fitted following the method reported by Cox and Hayes²² and may be utilized in a direct expansion through Chebychev polynomials of the first kind $[T_n(x)]$ ²³ to obtain rate coefficients through the formula

$$\alpha(kT) = A_0/2 + \sum_{n=1}^6 A_n T_n(x) \quad , \quad (13)$$

where the reduced energy x is given by

$$x = \frac{[2\ln(kT) - \ln(E_{\max}) - \ln(E_{\min})]}{\ln(E_{\max}) - \ln(E_{\min})}, \quad kT \text{ and } E_{\min} \text{ in (eV)}; \quad (14)$$

$$E_{\max} = 20,000 \text{ eV}.$$

Our recommendation for Fe isonuclear rate coefficients is to use the experimental results for Fe^+ , Fe^{2+} , Fe^{5+} , Fe^{6+} , Fe^{9+} , Fe^{11+} , Fe^{13+} , and Fe^{15+} ; the theoretical results for Fe^{3+} , Fe^{4+} , Fe^{7+} , Fe^{8+} , Fe^{10+} , Fe^{12+} , and Fe^{14+} ; and the direct ionization results from Table I for Fe^{16+} through Fe^{25+} . These recommended rates are incorporated in a subroutine called FERATE (Q, TEMP), which will return the rate coefficient in cm^3/sec for any ionic charge Q and temperature, TEMP, in electron volts. It will be available as a library function at the National Magnetic Fusion Energy Computer Center in Livermore, California. A listing of a program, written in Basic, that produces rates using the given Chebyshev coefficients is found in Table XII.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In summary we have learned a great deal by examining electron-impact ionization along the Fe isonuclear sequence. Although directly applicable to numerical studies of transport phenomena in plasmas, an isonuclear series presents additional theoretical complications due to the changing atomic structure. Cross sections and branching ratios are not amenable to scaling along an isonuclear sequence. Sequential ionization processes, such as excitation-autoionization, can be relatively large for several ionization stages, become almost negligible and then reappear at higher stages of ionization. Multiple ionization may also be important, especially when the ionization-autoionization process involves an almost filled subshell. Current comparisons of experimental crossed-

beams measurements and theory are complicated by the presence of a substantial, but unknown, fraction of metastable states in the ion beam. The future study of the electron-impact ionization of metastable states of excited configurations promises to provide further insight into our understanding of the ionization processes found in the high temperature plasmas of controlled fusion devices.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank all the members of the ORNL experimental group, in particular D. C. Gregory and R. A. Phaneuf, for many valuable discussions. We also would like to acknowledge R. D. Cowan for providing us with a copy of his atomic-structure programs and a number of helpful conversations.

REFERENCES

- [†]Research was supported by the Office of Fusion Energy, U.S. Department of Energy, under contract No. DE-AC05-84OR21400 with Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc., and under contract No. DE-FG05-86ER53217 with Auburn University.
- *Department of Physics, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama 36849.
- **Department of Physics, Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida 32789.
- ***Department of Defense Science, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550.
- 1. M.R.C. McDowell and A. M. Ferendeci, eds. of "Atomic and Molecular Processes in Controlled Thermonuclear Fusion," NATO ASI B53 (Plenum, New York, 1980).

2. C. J. Joachain and D. E. Post, eds. of "Atomic and Molecular Physics of Controlled Thermonuclear Fusion," NATO ASI B101 (Plenum, New York, 1983).
3. C. F. Barnett, Nucl. Instrum. Methods 214, 1 (1983).
4. D. H. Crandall in "Physics of Electron and Atomic Collisions; Invited Papers of the XII ICPEAC," ed. S. Datz (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982), p. 595.
5. R. G. Montague, M. J. Diserens, and M.F.A. Harrison, J. Phys. B 17, 2085 (1984). [Fe^+]
6. D. W. Mueller, T. J. Morgan, G. H. Dunn, D. C. Gregory, and D. H. Crandall, Phys. Rev. A 31, 2905 (1985). [Fe^{2+}]
7. D. C. Gregory, F. W. Meyer, A. Müller, and P. Defrance, Phys. Rev. A 34, 3657 (1986). [Fe^{5+} , Fe^{6+} , and Fe^{9+}]
8. D. C. Gregory, L.-J. Wang, K. Rinn, and F. W. Meyer, Phys. Rev. A 35, XXXX (1987). [Fe^{11+} , Fe^{13+} , Fe^{15+}]
9. S. M. Younger, Phys. Rev. A 22, 111 (1980).
10. H. Jakubowicz and D. L. Moores, J. Phys. B 14, 3733 (1981).
11. R. K. Peterkop, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 41, 1938 (1961) [Sov. Phys. JETP 14, 1377 (1962)].
12. R. D. Cowan, "The Theory of Atomic Structure and Spectra" (California Press, Berkeley, 1981).
13. M. E. Riley and D. G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. 63, 2182 (1975).
14. S. M. Younger in "Atomic Data for Fusion," eds. D. H. Crandall, C. F. Barnett, and W. L. Wiese, Vol. 7, 190 (1981).
15. S. M. Younger, Phys. Rev. A 24, 1272 (1981).
16. S. M. Younger, J. Quan. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transfer 27, 541 (1982).

17. W. Lotz, Z. Phys. 206, 205 (1967).
18. M. S. Pindzola, D. C. Griffin, C. Bottcher, D. C. Gregory, A. M. Howald, R. A. Phaneuf, D. H. Crandall, G. H. Dunn, D. W. Mueller, and T. J. Morgan, ORNL/TM-9436 (1985). [Fe^{2+} , Fe^{3+} , Fe^{4+}]
19. M. S. Pindzola, D. C. Griffin, and C. Bottcher, Phys. Rev. A 34, 3668 (1986). [Fe^{5+} , Fe^{6+} , Fe^{9+} , Fe^{11+} , Fe^{13+}]
20. K. J. LaGattuta and Y. Hahn, Phys. Rev. A 24, 2273 (1981). [Fe^{15+}]
21. K. Butler and D. L. Moores, J. Phys. B 18, 1247 (1985). [Fe^{23+}]
22. M. G. Cox and J. G. Hayes, "Curve Fitting: A Guide and Suite of Algorithms for the Non-Specialist User," U.K. National Physical Laboratory Report NAC26, December 1973.
23. See, for example, Jon Mathews and Robert L. Walker, Mathematical Methods of Physics (Benjamin, New York, 1970), pp. 351-353.

Table I. Direct ionization cross section parameters for ground configurations in units of $10^{-14} \text{ (eV}\cdot\text{cm)}^2$

Ion	Configuration	Subshell	I(eV)	A	B	C	D
Fe^+	$3p^6 3d^6 4s$	4s	14.82	6.58	1.29	0.160	-3.21
		3d	24.83	66.2	-54.6	18.6	-71.1
		3p	83.37	115.0	-72.4	9.57	-107.0
Fe^{2+}	$3s^2 3p^6 3d^6$	3d	34.75	97.5	-67.6	21.0	-103.0
		3p	93.28	87.7	-49.6	11.4	-84.8
		3s	131.9	25.9	-11.7	2.32	-23.9
Fe^{3+}	$3s^2 3p^6 3d^5$	3d	53.74	77.4	-43.9	19.6	-81.9
		3p	111.9	79.1	-30.0	8.38	-74.6
		3s	151.0	16.7	-3.44	2.32	-15.1
Fe^{4+}	$3s^2 3p^6 3d^4$	3d	75.15	48.1	-20.4	16.2	-48.4
		3p	132.7	66.8	-18.9	9.29	-60.5
		3s	172.4	13.4	-0.410	2.33	-10.9
Fe^{5+}	$3s^2 3p^6 3d^3$	3d	98.69	36.9	-11.8	10.3	-31.5
		3p	155.5	67.0	-18.6	9.43	-56.5
		3s	195.8	12.7	-0.0863	2.42	-8.97
Fe^{6+}	$3s^2 3p^6 3d^2$	3d	124.2	14.6	-4.36	5.98	-10.5
		3p	180.0	67.9	-20.6	9.82	-53.7
		3s	220.9	15.6	-2.29	2.30	-10.6
Fe^{7+}	$3s^2 3p^6 3d$	3d	151.7	14.3	-4.44	2.45	-9.53
		3p	206.1	70.3	-23.4	9.89	-53.5
		3s	247.7	18.0	-4.29	2.27	-12.0
$\text{Fe}^{8+}(\text{Ar})$	$3s^2 3p^6$	3p	233.6	71.0	-23.9	9.47	-51.9
		3s	275.9	19.1	-5.55	2.32	-12.7
$\text{Fe}^{9+}(\text{Cl})$	$3s^2 3p^5$	3p	262.1	57.0	-18.6	7.64	-39.7
		3s	119.5	20.8	-7.40	2.28	-14.1
$\text{Fe}^{10+}(\text{S})$	$3s^2 3p^4$	3p	290.3	44.7	-14.4	5.88	-30.1
		3s	325.2	22.3	-8.65	2.22	-15.2
$\text{Fe}^{11+}(\text{P})$	$3s^2 3p^3$	3p	330.8	32.7	-9.73	4.40	-20.9
		3s	368.4	24.7	-10.2	2.27	-17.0
$\text{Fe}^{12+}(\text{Si})$	$3s^2 3p^2$	3p	361.0	20.5	-5.65	2.82	-12.3
		3s	403.0	26.2	-11.3	2.25	-18.2
$\text{Fe}^{13+}(\text{Al})$	$3s^2 3p$	3p	392.2	9.77	-2.58	1.35	-5.57
		3s	426.0	27.5	-12.0	1.91	-19.3

Table I (Continued)

Ion	Configuration	Subshell	I(eV)	A	B	C	D
Fe ¹⁴⁺ (Mg)	3s ²	3s	457.0	38.8	-16.7	1.87	-28.8
Fe ¹⁵⁺ (Na)	2s ² 2p ⁶ 3s	3s	488.9	8.95	-2.62	0.963	-5.34
		2p	1219.0	78.9	-27.2	10.5	-53.0
		2s	1351.0	22.5	-7.80	2.96	-16.5
Fe ¹⁶⁺ (Ne)	2s ² 2p ⁶	2p	1266.0	50.4	-16.1	4.03	-30.5
		2s	1394.0	11.8	-3.27	1.64	-7.58
Fe ¹⁷⁺ (F)	2s ² 2p ⁵	2p	1366.0	42.0	-13.4	3.36	-25.4
		2s	1482.0	11.8	-3.27	1.64	-7.58
Fe ¹⁸⁺ (O)	2s ² 2p ⁴	2p	1463.0	33.6	-10.7	2.69	-20.3
		2s	1566.0	11.8	-3.27	1.64	-7.58
Fe ¹⁹⁺ (N)	2s ² 2p ³	2p	1583.0	25.2	-8.04	2.02	-15.2
		2s	1679.0	11.8	-3.27	1.64	-7.58
Fe ²⁰⁺ (C)	2s ² 2p ²	2p	1678.0	16.8	-5.36	1.34	-10.2
		2s	1755.0	11.8	-3.27	1.64	-7.58
Fe ²¹⁺ (B)	2s ² 2p	2p	1789.0	8.40	-2.68	0.672	-5.08
		2s	1852.0	11.8	-3.27	1.64	-7.58
Fe ²²⁺ (Be)	2s ²	2s	1950.0	11.8	-3.27	1.64	-7.58
Fe ²³⁺ (Li)	1s ² 2s	2s	2046.0	5.90	-1.64	0.820	-3.79
		1s	8694.0	15.0	-5.21	2.39	-12.3
Fe ²⁴⁺ (He)	1s ²	1s	8829.0	15.0	-5.21	2.39	-12.3
Fe ²⁵⁺ (H)	1s	1s	9277.0	7.50	-2.61	1.20	-6.15

Table II. Direct ionization cross section parameters for
excited configurations in units of $10^{-14} \text{ (eV}\cdot\text{cm)}^2$

Ion	Configu- ration	Subshell	I(eV)	A	B	C	D
Fe^{5+}	$3s^2 3p^6 3d^2 4s$	4s	66.20	9.35	-3.34	0.432	-5.61
		3d	107.65	18.70	-6.22	8.55	-16.09
Fe^{6+}	$3s^2 3p^6 3d 4s$	4s	81.78	7.40	-2.04	0.496	-3.82
		3d	134.27	10.33	-3.14	3.64	-7.39
$\text{Fe}^{8+} \text{ (Ar)}$	$3s^2 3p^5 3d$	3d	178.79	12.11	-3.58	2.55	-7.19
		3p	234.49	53.73	-17.18	9.21	-39.11
		3s	276.07	17.81	-4.79	2.50	-12.00
$\text{Fe}^{9+} \text{ (Cl)}$	$3s^2 3p^4 3d$	3d	207.86	12.70	-3.74	2.10	-7.09
		3p	263.66	44.05	-14.58	7.19	-31.17
		3s	303.11	18.06	-5.26	2.44	-11.85
$\text{Fe}^{10+} \text{ (S)}$	$3s^2 3p^3 3d$	3d	238.07	13.08	-3.83	1.74	-7.00
		3p	293.79	32.80	-10.77	5.21	-22.41
		3s	330.98	16.76	-4.70	2.38	-10.31
$\text{Fe}^{11+} \text{ (P)}$	$3s^2 3p^2 3d$	3d	269.40	13.25	-3.84	1.45	-6.84
		3p	324.87	21.10	-6.65	3.34	-13.75
		3s	359.66	14.98	-3.81	2.31	-8.35
$\text{Fe}^{14+} \text{ (Mg)}$	$2p^6 3s 3p$	3p	421.63	8.70	-2.15	1.43	-4.51
		3s	457.88	8.77	-2.95	1.10	-5.20
		2p	1173.67	73.90	-24.51	12.12	-50.15

Table IV. Strongest excitation cross sections for excited configurations in units of 10^{-18} cm^2

Ion	Transition	Initial Configuration	Number of Bound Levels	Energy Spread (eV)	Final Configuration	Number of Bound Levels	Number of Autoionizing Levels	Energy Spread (eV)	Average Excitation Energy (eV)	Threshold Cross Section (10^{-18} cm^2)	Twice Threshold Cross Section (10^{-18} cm^2)
Fe^{5+}	3p→3d	$3p^6 3d^2 4s$	16	9.91	$3p^5 3d^3 4s$	161	52	36.64	57.48	73.75	49.51
Fe^{6+}	3p→4p	$3p^6 3d 4s$	4	0.80	$3p^5 3d 4s 4p$	0	130	33.81	114.86	4.40	2.39
Fe^{8+}	2p→3d	$3s^2 3p^5 3d$	12	26.12	$2p^5 3s^2 3p^5 3d^2$	0	256	53.72	740.17	0.161	0.100
Fe^{9+}	2p→3d	$3s^2 3p^4 3d$	28	28.46	$2p^5 3s^2 3p^4 3d^2$	0	604	72.88	747.94	0.167	0.106
Fe^{10+}	2p→3d	$3s^2 3p^3 3d$	38	33.08	$2p^5 3s^2 3p^3 3d^2$	0	808	77.03	756.09	0.173	0.111
Fe^{11+}	2p→3d	$3s^2 3p^2 3d$	28	24.90	$2p^5 3s^2 3p^2 3d^2$	0	604	68.73	764.63	0.179	0.116
Fe^{14+}	2p→3d	$2p^6 3s 3p$	4	17.51	$2p^5 3s 3p 3d$	0	130	53.75	791.02	0.218	0.144

Table III. Strongest excitation cross sections for ground configurations in units of 10^{-18} cm^2

Ion	Transition	Initial Configuration	Number of Bound Levels	Energy Spread (eV)	Final Configuration	Number of Bound Levels	Number of Autoionizing Levels	Energy Spread (eV)	Average Excitation Energy (eV)	Threshold Cross Section (10^{-18} cm^2)	Twice Threshold Cross Section (10^{-18} cm^2)
Fe ⁺	3p→3d	3p ⁶ 3d ⁶ 4s	63	15.10	3p ⁵ 3d ⁷ 4s	0	213	29.14	57.84	35.12	18.04
Fe ²⁺	3p→3d	3p ⁶ 3d ⁶	34	14.89	3p ⁵ 3d ⁷	0	110	29.02	57.28	28.80	19.96
Fe ³⁺	3p→3d	3p ⁶ 3d ⁵	37	15.98	3p ⁵ 3d ⁶	7	173	34.50	57.52	32.22	27.64
Fe ⁴⁺	3p→3d	3p ⁶ 3d ⁴	34	17.76	3p ⁵ 3d ⁵	183	31	43.78	57.53	44.65	35.76
Fe ⁵⁺	3p→4p	3p ⁶ 3d ³	19	10.48	3p ⁵ 3d ³ 4p	194	419	37.31	98.52	4.85	2.79
Fe ⁶⁺	3p→4f	3p ⁶ 3d	9	9.72	3p ⁵ 3d ² 4f	0	472	31.66	136.56	1.104	0.647
Fe ⁷⁺	3p→5p	3p ⁶ 3d	2	0.22	3p ⁵ 3d ⁵ p	1	64	26.58	156.88	0.828	0.427
Fe ⁸⁺	2p→3d	3s ² 3p ⁶	1	0.00	2p ⁵ 3s ² 3p ⁶ 3d	0	12	19.92	739.01	0.180	0.113
Fe ⁹⁺	2p→3d	3s ² 3p ⁵	2	1.89	2p ⁵ 3s ² 3p ⁵ 3d	0	65	44.28	746.89	0.187	0.119
Fe ¹⁰⁺	2p→3d	3s ² 3p ⁴	5	11.48	2p ⁵ 3s ² 3p ⁴ 3d	0	158	51.13	755.16	0.194	0.124
Fe ¹¹⁺	2p→3d	3s ² 3p ³	5	11.32	2p ⁵ 3s ² 3p ³ 3d	0	203	54.12	763.80	0.201	0.130
Fe ¹²⁺	2p→3d	3s ² 3p ²	5	12.80	2p ⁵ 3s ² 3p ² 3d	0	158	49.61	772.81	0.207	0.135
Fe ¹³⁺	2p→3d	3s ² 3p	2	2.28	2p ⁵ 3s ² 3p ³ d	0	65	41.46	782.20	0.213	0.140
Fe ¹⁴⁺	2p→3d	2p ⁶ 3s ²	1	0.00	2p ⁵ 3s ² 3d	0	12	24.29	791.95	0.218	0.144

Table V. Theoretical Electron-Impact Ionization Rate Coefficients for
 $e^- + \text{Fe}^{q+} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{(q+1)+} + 2e^-$

Maxwellian Rate Coefficients (cm^3/s)

e^- Temp. (eV)	Fe^+	Fe^{2+}	Fe^{3+}	Fe^{4+}	Fe^{5+}	Fe^{5++}
1.0E+00	3.66E-17	7.64E-25	7.04E-33	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	5.82E-38
2.0E+00	7.95E-13	7.74E-17	1.10E-20	1.31E-25	2.55E-30	3.07E-23
4.0E+00	1.69E-10	1.13E-12	1.69E-14	4.57E-17	1.69E-19	7.45E-16
7.0E+00	2.02E-09	8.76E-11	8.52E-12	2.24E-13	7.93E-15	1.10E-12
1.0E+01	5.79E-09	5.53E-10	1.07E-10	6.99E-12	6.08E-13	2.04E-11
2.0E+01	2.20E-08	5.44E-09	2.16E-09	4.15E-10	1.03E-10	6.37E-10
4.0E+01	4.63E-08	1.88E-08	1.03E-08	3.39E-09	1.40E-09	3.72E-09
7.0E+01	6.51E-08	3.31E-08	2.07E-08	8.55E-09	4.35E-09	8.04E-09
1.0E+02	7.44E-08	4.18E-08	2.76E-08	1.25E-08	6.88E-09	1.09E-08
2.0E+02	8.45E-08	5.42E-08	3.82E-08	1.94E-08	1.15E-08	1.55E-08
4.0E+02	8.51E-08	5.87E-08	4.30E-08	2.31E-08	1.36E-08	1.75E-08
7.0E+02	8.07E-08	5.65E-08	4.22E-08	2.30E-08	1.35E-08	1.69E-08
1.0E+03	7.64E-08	5.32E-08	3.99E-08	2.18E-08	1.28E-08	1.56E-08
2.0E+03	6.56E-08	4.47E-08	3.38E-08	1.83E-08	1.08E-08	1.26E-08
4.0E+03	5.35E-08	3.57E-08	2.70E-08	1.45E-08	8.62E-09	9.79E-09
7.0E+03	4.31E-08	2.84E-08	2.20E-08	1.18E-08	6.97E-09	7.84E-09
1.0E+04	3.57E-08	2.34E-08	1.90E-08	1.02E-08	5.91E-09	6.73E-09
2.0E+04	2.10E-08	1.38E-08	1.31E-08	6.99E-09	3.74E-09	4.60E-09

Chebyshev Fitting Parameters for Rate Coefficients

	$E_{\min}$ (eV)	$E_{\max}$ (eV)	A0	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6
Fe^+	2.0	2.0E+04	7.27659E-08	2.08323E-08	-3.33583E-08	-1.06976E-08	1.14687E-08	3.03861E-10	-4.05392E-09
Fe^{2+}	4.0	2.0E+04	4.77199E-08	1.33778E-08	-2.23308E-08	-7.17694E-09	7.48972E-09	7.09691E-10	-2.10716E-09
Fe^{3+}	7.0	2.0E+04	3.77529E-08	1.00948E-08	-1.65784E-08	-3.02579E-09	6.10890E-09	-5.60197E-10	-1.88958E-09
Fe^{4+}	7.0	2.0E+04	1.91763E-08	5.81190E-09	-8.34540E-09	-2.60598E-09	3.11531E-09	3.01497E-10	-8.50416E-10
Fe^{5+}	10.	2.0E+04	1.16528E-08	3.14983E-09	-5.23982E-09	-1.12359E-09	2.07228E-09	-1.68938E-10	-8.00979E-10
Fe^{5++}	7.0	2.0E+04	1.43319E-08	3.61811E-09	-6.71730E-09	-1.13006E-09	2.69277E-09	-1.99644E-10	-8.51922E-10

Table VI. Theoretical Electron-Impact Ionization Rate Coefficients for
 $e^- + \text{Fe}^{q+} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{(q+1)+} + 2e^-$

Maxwellian Rate Coefficients (cm^3/s)

e^- Temp. (eV)	Fe^{6+}	Fe^{6++}	Fe^{7+}	Fe^{8+}	Fe^{8++}	Fe^{9+}	Fe^{9++}
2.0E+00	3.40E-37	2.49E-28	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
4.0E+00	5.41E-23	8.26E-19	8.49E-26	4.31E-36	2.79E-29	1.73E-39	2.97E-32
7.0E+00	7.12E-17	1.39E-14	1.84E-18	1.11E-24	7.13E-21	1.13E-26	1.00E-22
1.0E+01	2.05E-14	7.71E-13	1.55E-15	4.13E-20	1.79E-17	1.53E-21	7.15E-19
2.0E+01	1.52E-11	9.33E-11	3.80E-12	9.61E-15	1.94E-13	1.59E-15	2.68E-14
4.0E+01	4.12E-10	1.09E-09	1.81E-10	5.22E-12	2.43E-11	1.81E-12	6.67E-12
7.0E+01	1.71E-09	3.14E-09	9.43E-10	8.39E-11	2.15E-10	3.99E-11	8.43E-11
1.0E+02	3.03E-09	4.81E-09	1.83E-09	2.63E-10	5.38E-10	1.42E-10	2.47E-10
2.0E+02	5.77E-09	7.69E-09	3.97E-09	1.04E-09	1.64E-09	6.55E-10	9.31E-10
4.0E+02	7.32E-09	8.97E-09	5.54E-09	2.05E-09	2.86E-09	1.42E-09	1.84E-09
7.0E+02	7.43E-09	8.79E-09	5.94E-09	2.59E-09	3.43E-09	1.89E-09	2.36E-09
1.0E+03	7.11E-09	8.31E-09	5.82E-09	2.71E-09	3.53E-09	2.03E-09	2.50E-09
2.0E+03	6.07E-09	6.99E-09	5.12E-09	2.58E-09	3.30E-09	2.00E-09	2.42E-09
4.0E+03	4.89E-09	5.59E-09	4.18E-09	2.19E-09	2.77E-09	1.72E-09	2.07E-09
7.0E+03	3.96E-09	4.52E-09	3.41E-09	1.82E-09	2.31E-09	1.44E-09	1.74E-09
1.0E+04	3.36E-09	3.83E-09	2.90E-09	1.55E-09	2.02E-09	1.23E-09	1.53E-09
2.0E+04	2.13E-09	2.42E-09	1.84E-09	9.92E-10	1.52E-09	7.89E-10	1.15E-09

Chebyshev Fitting Parameters for Rate Coefficients

	$E_{\min}$ (eV)	$E_{\max}$ (eV)	A0	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6
Fe^{6+}	10.	2.0E+04	6.23012E-03	1.88804E-09	-2.69814E-05	-8.71715E-10	1.10071E-09	4.38379E-11	-4.57442E-10
Fe^{6++}	7.0	2.0E+04	7.19552E-09	2.19248E-09	-3.22308E-09	-1.13769E-09	1.15579E-09	1.62338E-10	-3.13322E-10
Fe^{7+}	10.	2.0E+04	4.88744E-09	1.68240E-09	-1.98115E-09	-9.51190E-10	7.13278E-10	1.91203E-10	-2.53426E-10
Fe^{8+}	20.	2.0E+04	2.33147E-09	8.72445E-10	-8.58820E-10	-4.95472E-10	2.70416E-10	1.21725E-10	-7.86229E-11
Fe^{8++}	20.	2.0E+04	3.19738E-09	1.14842E-09	-1.12673E-09	-4.70382E-10	4.33547E-10	8.18497E-11	-1.45423E-10
Fe^{9+}	20.	2.0E+04	1.74279E-09	6.98979E-10	-6.12254E-10	-4.34593E-10	1.62445E-10	1.34210E-10	-2.29881E-11
Fe^{9++}	20.	2.0E+04	2.23914E-09	8.87449E-10	-7.32732E-10	-4.30681E-10	2.55037E-10	1.21649E-10	-6.34315E-11

Table VII. Theoretical Electron-Impact Ionization Rate Coefficients for
 $e^- + Fe^{q+} \rightarrow Fe^{(q+1)+} + 2e^-$

Maxwellian Rate Coefficients (cm^3/s)

e^- Temp. (eV)	Fe^{10+}	Fe^{10+*}	Fe^{11+}	Fe^{11+*}	Fe^{12+}	Fe^{13+}
4.0E+00	0.00E+00	1.61E-36	0.00E+00	1.56E-39	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
7.0E+00	9.29E-29	4.46E-25	4.14E-31	9.10E-27	1.74E-33	3.20E-35
1.0E+01	4.80E-23	1.81E-20	9.02E-25	1.18E-21	1.80E-26	8.38E-28
2.0E+01	2.41E-16	4.68E-15	2.51E-17	1.09E-15	3.02E-18	4.60E-19
4.0E+01	6.08E-13	2.68E-12	1.56E-13	1.10E-12	4.53E-14	1.35E-14
7.0E+01	1.89E-11	4.55E-11	7.28E-12	2.35E-11	3.07E-12	1.26E-12
1.0E+02	7.71E-11	1.48E-10	3.55E-11	8.43E-11	1.76E-11	8.49E-12
2.0E+02	4.30E-10	6.37E-10	2.50E-10	4.13E-10	1.56E-10	9.55E-11
4.0E+02	1.06E-09	1.38E-09	6.94E-10	9.73E-10	5.00E-10	3.42E-10
7.0E+02	1.50E-09	1.86E-09	1.02E-09	1.36E-09	7.91E-10	5.58E-10
1.0E+03	1.67E-09	2.02E-09	1.14E-09	1.51E-09	9.12E-10	6.48E-10
2.0E+03	1.70E-09	2.02E-09	1.17E-09	1.53E-09	9.71E-10	6.91E-10
4.0E+03	1.50E-09	1.76E-09	1.03E-09	1.34E-09	8.71E-10	6.19E-10
7.0E+03	1.27E-09	1.49E-09	8.68E-10	1.14E-09	7.44E-10	5.25E-10
1.0E+04	1.12E-09	1.31E-09	7.46E-10	1.01E-09	6.59E-10	4.52E-10
2.0E+04	8.49E-10	9.91E-10	4.79E-10	7.60E-10	5.00E-10	2.91E-10

Chebyshev Fitting Parameters for Rate Coefficients

	E_{min} (eV)	E_{max} (eV)	A0	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6
Fe^{10+}	20.	2.0E+04	1.47535E-09	6.58900E-10	-4.55215E-10	-4.10075E-10	1.15383E-10	1.92298E-10	4.32819E-11
Fe^{10+*}	20.	2.0E+04	1.81678E-09	7.68129E-10	-5.60225E-10	-4.06996E-10	1.69956E-10	1.39853E-10	-1.71292E-11
Fe^{11+}	40.	2.0E+04	1.08227E-09	3.95811E-10	-3.03976E-10	-1.85964E-10	1.17196E-10	3.01153E-11	-3.42384E-11
Fe^{11+*}	20.	2.0E+04	1.34703E-09	5.92096E-10	-4.03648E-10	-3.36145E-10	1.07700E-10	1.30687E-10	9.07224E-12
Fe^{12+}	40.	2.0E+04	9.01326E-10	3.68932E-10	-2.75547E-10	-1.66776E-10	9.02926E-11	4.95957E-11	-1.36118E-11
Fe^{13+}	40.	2.0E+04	6.11522E-10	2.44334E-10	-2.08886E-10	-1.38204E-10	5.59602E-11	4.0546E-11	-6.14503E-12

Table VIII. Theoretical Electron-Impact Ionization Rate Coefficients for
 $e^- + Fe^{q+} \rightarrow Fe^{(q+1)+} + 2e^-$

Maxwellian Rate Coefficients (cm^3/s)

e^- Temp. (eV)	Fe^{14+}	Fe^{14+*}	Fe^{15+}	Fe^{15+} (RRDA)
7.0E+00	7.25E-39	2.76E-37	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
1.0E+01	2.48E-30	3.08E-29	8.73E-33	2.80E-32
2.0E+01	2.37E-20	8.10E-20	9.92E-22	1.61E-21
4.0E+01	2.56E-15	4.63E-15	3.49E-16	4.34E-16
7.0E+01	4.27E-13	5.70E-13	1.07E-13	1.37E-13
1.0E+02	3.83E-12	4.41E-12	1.32E-12	1.73E-12
2.0E+02	6.36E-11	6.25E-11	3.04E-11	3.75E-11
4.0E+02	2.79E-10	2.67E-10	1.51E-10	1.70E-10
7.0E+02	5.00E-10	4.88E-10	2.87E-10	3.08E-10
1.0E+03	6.05E-10	5.98E-10	3.58E-10	3.77E-10
2.0E+03	6.81E-10	6.89E-10	4.21E-10	4.33E-10
4.0E+03	6.28E-10	6.43E-10	3.97E-10	4.05E-10
7.0E+03	5.42E-10	5.59E-10	3.47E-10	3.52E-10
1.0E+04	4.82E-10	4.98E-10	3.10E-10	3.14E-10
2.0E+04	3.68E-10	3.81E-10	2.37E-10	2.40E-10

Chebyshev Fitting Parameters for Rate Coefficients

	E_{min} (eV)	E_{max} (eV)	A0	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6
Fe^{14+}	70.	2.0E+04	6.76462E-10	2.60490E-10	-2.03542E-10	-8.33662E-11	7.32119E-11	6.56074E-12	-2.37890E-11
Fe^{14+*}	70.	2.0E+04	6.84244E-10	2.69321E-10	-1.99665E-10	-8.97420E-11	6.88852E-11	1.06475E-11	-2.05456E-11
Fe^{15+}	70.	2.0E+04	4.15723E-10	1.69623E-10	-1.17910E-10	-5.95740E-11	4.09458E-11	8.43660E-12	-1.23039E-11
Fe^{15+} (RRDA)	70.	2.0E+04	4.31049E-10	1.70508E-10	-1.25769E-10	-5.62354E-11	4.41498E-11	5.62029E-12	-1.38756E-11

Table IX. Theoretical Electron-Impact Ionization Rate Coefficients for
 $e^- + Fe^{q+} \rightarrow Fe^{(q+1)+} + 2e^-$

Maxwellian Rate Coefficients (cm^3/s)

e^- Temp. (eV)	Fe^{16+}	Fe^{17+}	Fe^{18+}	Fe^{19+}	Fe^{20+}
7.0E+01	4.70E-19	8.67E-20	1.57E-20	2.34E-21	3.76E-22
1.0E+02	1.78E-16	5.00E-17	1.39E-17	3.22E-18	8.12E-19
2.0E+02	1.88E-13	8.65E-14	3.96E-14	1.58E-14	6.67E-15
4.0E+02	6.38E-12	3.78E-12	2.22E-12	1.18E-12	6.47E-13
7.0E+02	2.95E-11	1.96E-11	1.29E-11	7.77E-12	4.76E-12
1.0E+03	5.45E-11	3.79E-11	2.61E-11	1.66E-11	1.07E-11
2.0E+03	1.10E-10	8.08E-11	5.88E-11	4.02E-11	2.73E-11
3.0E+03	1.36E-10	1.02E-10	7.57E-11	5.30E-11	3.68E-11
4.0E+03	1.48E-10	1.13E-10	8.48E-11	6.03E-11	4.23E-11
5.0E+03	1.55E-10	1.19E-10	9.00E-11	6.46E-11	4.58E-11
6.0E+03	1.58E-10	1.22E-10	9.28E-11	6.70E-11	4.78E-11
7.0E+03	1.59E-10	1.23E-10	9.40E-11	6.82E-11	4.87E-11
8.0E+03	1.59E-10	1.23E-10	9.47E-11	6.90E-11	4.94E-11
9.0E+03	1.58E-10	1.23E-10	9.47E-11	6.91E-11	4.96E-11
1.0E+04	1.57E-10	1.23E-10	9.44E-11	6.91E-11	4.97E-11
1.2E+04	1.54E-10	1.20E-10	9.30E-11	6.81E-11	4.91E-11
1.5E+04	1.49E-10	1.17E-10	9.04E-11	6.64E-11	4.80E-11
2.0E+04	1.40E-10	1.10E-10	8.56E-11	6.35E-11	4.62E-11

Chebyshev Fitting Parameters for Rate Coefficients

	E_{min} (eV)	E_{max} (eV)	A0	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6
Fe^{16+}	200.	2.E+04.	1.71279E-10	8.82601E-11	-1.81630E-11	-2.16876E-11	4.10843E-12	3.13239E-12	-1.69224E-12
Fe^{17+}	200.	2.E+04.	1.30837E-10	6.95299E-11	-1.16036E-11	-1.73318E-11	2.41865E-12	2.79580E-12	-1.15335E-12
Fe^{18+}	200.	2.E+04.	9.88938E-11	5.39741E-11	-7.14323E-12	-1.35460E-11	1.28830E-12	2.37495E-12	-7.49385E-13
Fe^{19+}	200.	2.E+04.	7.08654E-11	3.98340E-11	-3.73340E-12	-9.98940E-12	4.32819E-13	1.90022E-12	-3.71562E-13
Fe^{20+}	200.	2.E+04.	5.02092E-11	2.88631E-11	-1.84257E-12	-7.18531E-12	1.99540E-14	1.43894E-12	-1.58607E-13

Table X. Theoretical Electron-Impact Ionization Rate Coefficients for
 $e^- + \text{Fe}^{q+} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{(q+1)+} + 2e^-$

Maxwellian Rate Coefficients (cm^3/s)

e^- Temp. (eV)	Fe^{21+}	Fe^{22+}	Fe^{23+}	Fe^{24+}	Fe^{25+}
7.0E+01	5.27E-23	2.68E-24	2.84E-25	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
1.0E+02	1.76E-19	1.93E-20	3.20E-21	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
2.0E+02	2.45E-15	6.29E-16	1.75E-16	9.08E-32	4.58E-33
4.0E+02	3.13E-13	1.20E-13	4.29E-14	3.39E-22	5.23E-23
7.0E+02	2.61E-12	1.18E-12	4.71E-13	4.73E-18	1.17E-18
1.0E+03	6.18E-12	2.98E-12	1.25E-12	2.26E-16	6.70E-17
2.0E+03	1.69E-11	8.82E-12	3.93E-12	2.23E-14	8.24E-15
3.0E+03	2.33E-11	1.25E-11	5.79E-12	1.04E-13	4.12E-14
4.0E+03	2.71E-11	1.49E-11	7.06E-12	2.42E-13	9.97E-14
5.0E+03	2.97E-11	1.65E-11	7.99E-12	3.96E-13	1.67E-13
6.0E+03	3.12E-11	1.74E-11	8.62E-12	5.51E-13	2.36E-13
7.0E+03	3.19E-11	1.79E-11	9.01E-12	6.97E-13	3.02E-13
8.0E+03	3.25E-11	1.84E-11	9.38E-12	8.33E-13	3.64E-13
9.0E+03	3.27E-11	1.85E-11	9.60E-12	9.58E-13	4.21E-13
1.0E+04	3.29E-11	1.87E-11	9.80E-12	1.07E-12	4.74E-13
1.2E+04	3.25E-11	1.85E-11	9.93E-12	1.27E-12	5.64E-13
1.5E+04	3.18E-11	1.82E-11	1.00E-11	1.49E-12	6.70E-13
2.0E+04	3.10E-11	1.80E-11	1.02E-11	1.72E-12	7.81E-13

Chebyshev Fitting Parameters for Rate Coefficients

	$E_{\min}$ (eV)	$E_{\max}$ (eV)	A0	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6
Fe^{21+}	200.	2.E+04	3.26206E-11	1.92107E-11	-5.96805E-13	-4.70444E-12	-2.02019E-13	9.84203E-13	-1.85937E-14
Fe^{22+}	200.	2.E+04	1.82182E-11	1.10297E-11	7.41865E-14	-2.62089E-12	-2.53155E-13	5.72536E-13	5.18376E-14
Fe^{23+}	200.	2.E+04	9.39620E-12	5.98496E-12	5.65971E-13	-1.12187E-12	-2.08927E-13	2.25523E-13	3.36430E-14
Fe^{24+}	1000	2.E+04	1.26599E-12	8.98312E-13	2.73254E-13	-4.12907E-14	-4.57171E-14	3.28509E-15	0.00000E+00
Fe^{25+}	1000	2.E+04	5.64060E-13	4.04743E-13	1.29701E-13	-1.50931E-14	-2.12768E-14	7.36451E-16	0.00000E+00

Table XI. Experimental Electron-Impact Ionization Rate Coefficients for
 $e^- + \text{Fe}^{q+} \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{(q+1)+} + 2e^-$

Maxwellian Rate Coefficients (cm^3/s)

e^- Temp. (eV)	Fe^+	Fe^{2+}	Fe^{5+}	Fe^{6+}	Fe^{9+}	Fe^{11+}	Fe^{13+}	Fe^{15+}
1.0E+00	2.64E-15	3.71E-20	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
2.0E+00	7.77E-12	1.63E-14	4.99E-30	2.76E-36	0.09E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
4.0E+00	5.29E-10	1.27E-11	2.10E-19	1.37E-22	3.71E-33	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
7.0E+00	3.53E-09	2.70E-10	8.12E-15	1.10E-16	4.49E-23	1.36E-30	9.27E-36	0.00E+00
1.0E+01	7.83E-09	1.02E-09	5.76E-13	2.63E-14	4.78E-19	2.62E-24	6.02E-28	4.11E-36
2.0E+01	2.14E-08	5.84E-09	8.94E-11	1.64E-11	2.51E-14	5.52E-17	7.91E-19	3.03E-23
4.0E+01	3.83E-08	1.66E-08	1.21E-09	4.33E-10	6.95E-12	2.63E-13	2.57E-14	8.58E-17
7.0E+01	5.14E-08	2.86E-08	3.88E-09	1.84E-09	9.02E-11	1.07E-11	2.09E-12	6.87E-14
1.0E+02	5.85E-08	3.68E-08	6.33E-09	3.34E-09	2.66E-10	4.93E-11	1.28E-11	1.14E-12
2.0E+02	6.81E-08	5.13E-08	1.15E-08	6.91E-09	1.02E-09	3.26E-10	1.31E-10	3.21E-11
4.0E+02	7.00E-08	6.14E-08	1.55E-08	1.00E-08	2.05E-09	8.78E-10	4.64E-10	1.63E-10
7.0E+02	6.60E-08	6.48E-08	1.69E-08	1.13E-08	2.66E-09	1.30E-09	7.95E-10	3.22E-10
1.0E+03	6.16E-08	6.42E-08	1.68E-08	1.15E-08	2.84E-09	1.47E-09	9.72E-10	4.25E-10
2.0E+03	5.12E-08	5.81E-08	1.53E-08	1.06E-08	2.78E-09	1.60E-09	1.17E-09	5.90E-10
4.0E+03	4.08E-08	4.85E-08	1.28E-08	8.91E-09	2.40E-09	1.52E-09	1.17E-09	6.78E-10
7.0E+03	3.32E-08	4.02E-08	1.06E-08	7.41E-09	2.01E-09	1.37E-09	1.07E-09	6.84E-10
1.0E+04	2.89E-08	3.52E-08	9.29E-09	6.50E-09	1.77E-09	1.25E-09	9.78E-10	6.60E-10
2.0E+04	2.16E-08	2.64E-08	6.95E-09	4.88E-09	1.32E-09	9.94E-10	7.79E-10	5.73E-10

Chebyshev Fitting Parameters for Rate Coefficients

	$E_{\min}$ (eV)	$E_{\max}$ (eV)	A0	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6
Fe^+	2.0	2.0E+04	6.00791E-08	1.67339E-08	-2.63725E-08	-6.44384E-09	9.46914E-09	4.74165E-10	-2.36412E-09
Fe^{2+}	4.0	2.0E+04	5.77388E-08	2.10394E-08	-2.05923E-08	-1.01454E-08	5.75459E-09	2.37691E-09	-7.38041E-10
Fe^{5+}	10.	2.0E+04	1.52457E-08	5.37054E-09	-5.54878E-09	-2.25777E-09	2.00940E-09	3.58806E-10	-6.11348E-10
Fe^{6+}	20.	2.0E+04	1.09898E-08	3.39386E-09	-4.04332E-09	-9.47759E-10	1.32074E-09	-1.76953E-11	-3.27522E-10
Fe^{9+}	40.	2.0E+04	2.82099E-09	9.08732E-10	-9.80096E-10	-2.44726E-10	3.26964E-10	-8.31039E-12	-9.47159E-11
Fe^{11+}	40.	2.0E+04	1.63120E-09	6.97234E-10	-4.14229E-10	-2.40006E-10	1.34267E-10	4.06652E-11	-3.74791E-11
Fe^{13+}	40.	2.0E+04	1.15389E-09	5.54161E-10	-2.48820E-10	-2.37374E-10	5.89966E-11	7.62673E-11	5.95736E-12
Fe^{15+}	70.	2.0E+04	7.20566E-10	3.76154E-10	-8.55112E-11	-1.03310E-10	1.85122E-11	1.35716E-11	-6.79957E-12

Table XII. Computer program Chebfe

```

10  REM  PROGRAM CHEBFE
20  REM CHBFIT PROGRAM IS A BASIC PROGRAM DERIVED FROM A PROGRAM IN
30  REM "ELEMENTARY NUMERICAL ANALYSIS: AN ALGORITHMIC APPROACH", S.D. CONTE
40  REM AND C. DE BOOR, MCGRAW-HILL, INC., P 254, 1972.
50  DIM D(?)
60  NTERMS=7
70  INPUT"ENTER Emin (eV) ",EMIN:INPUT"ENTER Emax (eV) ",EMAX
80  EMINL=LOG(EMIN)
90  EMAXL=LOG(EMAX)
100  PRINT USING "ENTER # COEFFICIENTS A0 THRU A6";NTERMS
110  FOR J=1 TO NTERMS
120  INPUT D(J):NEXT J
130  PRINT USING "INPUT ENERGY (eV) BETWEEN ###.# AND #.#**** FOR THE RATE CO
EF. CALCULATION";EMIN;EMAX
140  REM GET ENERGY FOR CALCULATION AND USE THREE TERM RECURRENCE RELATION
150  INPUT X
160  K=NTERMS
170  CHEB=D(K)
180  IF X<0 THEN END
190  X=LOG(X)
200  K=K-1
210  IF K=0 THEN END
220  XNORM=(X-EMINL-(EMAXL-X))/(EMAXL-EMINL)
230  TWOX=2*XNORM
240  PREV2=0
250  PREV=CHEB
260  IF K=1 GOTO 310
270  CHEB=D(K)+TWOX*PREV-PREV2
280  PREV2=PREV
290  K=K-1
300  GOTO 250
310  CHEB=.5*D(1)+XNORM*PREV-PREV2
320  PRINT USING "###.#**** = RATE COEFFICIENT (CM3/S)";CHEB
330  GOTO 130
340  END

```

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^+ . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3p^63d^64s$ ground configuration in the average statistical model; dashed curve: direct cross section only; solid circles: experimental measurements (ref. 5).

Fig. 2. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{2+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3p^63d^6$ ground configuration in the average statistical model (ref. 18); dashed curve: direct cross section only; solid circles: experimental measurements (ref. 6).

Fig. 3. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{3+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3p^63d^5$ ground configuration in the average statistical model (ref. 18); dashed curve: direct cross section only.

Fig. 4. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{4+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3p^63d^4$ ground configuration in the average statistical model; dashed curve: direct cross section only.

Fig. 5. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{5+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3p^63d^3$ ground configuration in the average statistical model (ref. 19); dashed curve: direct cross section only; solid circles: experimental measurements (ref. 7).

Fig. 6. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{5+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3p^63d^24s$ excited configuration in the average statistical model (ref. 19); dashed curve: direct cross section only; solid circles: experimental measurements (ref. 7).

Fig. 7. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{6+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3p^63d^2$ ground configuration in the average statistical model (ref. 19); dashed curve: direct cross section only; solid circles: experimental measurements (ref. 7).

Fig. 8. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{6+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3p^63d4s$ excited configuration in the average statistical model (ref. 19); dashed curve: direct cross section only; solid circles: experimental measurements (ref. 7).

Fig. 9. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{7+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3p^63d$ ground configuration in the average statistical model; dashed curve: direct cross section only.

Fig. 10. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{8+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3s^23p^6$ ground configuration in the average statistical model; dashed curve: direct cross section only.

Fig. 11. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{8+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3s^23p^53d$ excited configuration in the average statistical model; dashed curve: direct cross section only.

Fig. 12. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{9+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3s^23p^5$ ground configuration in the average statistical model (ref. 19); dashed curve: direct cross section only; solid circles: experimental measurements (ref. 7).

Fig. 13. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{9+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3s^23p^43d$ excited configuration in the average statistical model (ref. 19); dashed curve: direct cross section only; solid circles: experimental measurements (ref. 7).

Fig. 14. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{10+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3s^23p^4$ ground configuration in the average statistical model; dashed curve: direct cross section only.

Fig. 15. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{10+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3s^23p^33d$ excited configuration in the average statistical model; dashed curve: direct cross section only.

Fig. 16. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{11+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3s^23p^3$ ground configuration in the average statistical model (ref. 19); dashed curve: direct cross section only; solid circles: experimental measurements (ref. 8).

Fig. 17. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{11+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3s^23p^23d$ excited configuration in the average statistical model; dashed curve: direct cross section only; solid circles: experimental measurements (ref. 8).

Fig. 18. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{12+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3s^23p^2$ ground configuration in the average statistical model; dashed curve: direct cross section only.

Fig. 19. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{13+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $3s^23p$ ground configuration in the average statistical model (ref. 19); dashed curve: direct cross section only; solid circles: experimental measurements (ref. 8).

Fig. 20. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{14+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $2p^63s^2$ ground configuration in the average statistical model; dashed curve: direct cross section only.

Fig. 21. Electron-impact ionization of Fe^{14+} . Solid curve: total cross section from the $2p^63s3p$ excited configuration in the average statistical model; dashed curve: direct cross section only.

Fig. 22. Electron impact ionization of Fe^{15+} . Lower solid curve: total cross section from the $2p^63s$ ground configuration (ref. 20); hatched region includes resonant-recombination double autoionization contribution; dashed curve: direct cross section only; solid circles: experimental measurements (ref. 8).

Fig. 23. Theoretical rate coefficients for Fe ions.

Fig. 24. Theoretical rate coefficients for Fe ions.

Fig. 25. Theoretical rate coefficients for Fe ions.

Fig. 26. Theoretical rate coefficients for Fe ions.

Fig. 27. Theoretical rate coefficients for Fe ions.

Fig. 28. Theoretical rate coefficients for Fe ions.

Fig. 29. Experimental rate coefficients for Fe ions.

Fig. 2

Fig.3

Fig. 4

Fig.5

Fig.6

Fig. 7

Fig. 8

Fig. 9

Fig. 10

Fig.11

Fig.12

Fig.13

Fig. 14

Fig.15

Fig.16

Fig. 17

Fig. 18

Fig. 19

Fig. 20

Fig. 21

Fig. 23

Fig. 24

Fig. 25

Fig. 26

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Fig. 29