Versatile code DLAYZ for investigating population kinetics and radiative properties of plasmas in non-local thermodynamic equilibrium
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\textbf{A B S T R A C T}

A versatile code DLAYZ based on collisional-radiative model is developed for investigating the population kinetics and radiative properties of plasmas in non-local thermodynamic equilibrium. DLAYZ is implemented on the detailed level accounting (DLA) approach and can be extended to detailed configuration accounting (DCA) and hybrid DLA/DCA approaches. The code can treat both steady state and time-dependent problems. The implementation of the main modules of DLAYZ is discussed in detail including atomic data, rates, population distributions and radiative properties modules. The complete set of basic atomic data is obtained using relativistic quantum mechanics. For dense plasmas, the basic atomic data with plasma screening effects can be obtained. The populations are obtained by solving the coupled rate equations, which are used to calculate the radiative properties. A parallelized version is implemented in the code to treat the large-scale rate equations. Two illustrative examples of a steady state case for carbon plasmas and a time-dependent case for the relaxation of a K-shell excited argon are employed to show the main features of the present code.
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1. Introduction

Population kinetics and radiative properties of plasmas are and will remain a subject of interest since they have important applications in research fields such as inertial confinement fusion (ICF) and stellar physics \cite{1–3}. In indirect driven ICF experiments, for example, the inside wall of a hohlraum, usually made of gold, is irradiated by high power lasers and the gold plasma produced emits strong X-ray radiation to drive the target implosion. In order to understand the physics of, e.g., energy deposition and temperature relaxation and to optimize the design of the hohlraum and target, knowledge of the population kinetics and radiative properties of gold plasmas is essential.

For plasmas in local thermodynamic equilibrium (LTE), populations can be obtained by solving Saha–Boltzmann equation and then the radiative properties of plasmas can be calculated \cite{4–7}. However, in many circumstances plasmas are in non-LTE (NLTE) and much effort has been devoted to population distributions and radiative properties of NLTE plasmas recently (see the articles of NLTE code comparison workshops reported in Ref. \cite{8}). Theoretically, collisional-radiative (CR) models were widely used to obtain the population distributions in NLTE plasmas by solving the coupled rate equations for the atomic states. These CR models were developed based on various approaches such as detailed-configuration-accounting (DCA) \cite{9–11}, average atom (AA) \cite{12–16} and the super-configuration approach (SCA) \cite{17–19}. In order to obtain the population distributions and radiative properties of NLTE plasmas rapidly, calculational methods were also developed by using atomic data obtained analytically in CR models \cite{20–23}. Large discrepancies are found between different theoretical models due primarily to the different accuracy of atomic data \cite{8}. Normally, the detailed-level-accounting (DLA) approach is considered one of the most accurate methods which explicitly includes the information of fine structure levels \cite{24–28}. The DLA method, however, is usually used for low-Z plasmas \cite{29} and a large computational effort is needed for high-Z plasmas \cite{30}. To balance the computational accuracy and cost for complex systems, hybrid models combining detailed and statistical methods have been developed \cite{31}. Due to the complexity of the problem, large discrepancies were found between results obtained by different codes \cite{8}. To
elucidate the origin of these discrepancies, accurate theoretical models are needed.

We present a detailed description of our NLTE model named DLAYZ for the investigation of population kinetics and radiative properties of plasmas. The code was first developed based on a DLA approach, which contains a complete set of atomic data between fine structure levels by using a fully relativistic quantum mechanical method. More recently DLAYZ was extended to DCA and hybrid DLA/DCA approaches. A parallelized version has been developed to solve the rate equations with level numbers larger than 10^6. DLAYZ can treat the steady state and time-dependent NLTE problems. These features make it a versatile NLTE code for investigating the population kinetics and radiative properties from low-Z to high-Z plasmas. This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the present model is described, where the modules of DLAYZ are introduced. In Section 3, two examples are illustrated containing a steady state case and a time-dependent case. A conclusion is given in Section 4.

2. Model description

The objective of DLAYZ code is to compute atomic level populations and radiative properties of NLTE plasmas over a broad range of plasma conditions, by using the DLA formalism. Additionally, it can easily be extended to DCA and hybrid DLA/DCA approximation. In the following, we give a complete description on the different aspects of the DLA formalism, which is accurate to fine-structure levels of plasma ions. For a CR model, the essential components include a description of the atomic levels and the processes that couple these levels. Detailed information of the population of any ion in a given level can be obtained by solving the coupled rate equations, which is constructed with a choice of levels and the microscopic atomic processes that couple the levels. Once the plasma ionization balance is determined, the radiative properties such as opacity and emissivity can be derived.

In the CR model, the population n_i of fine-structure level i is obtained by solving the rate equation

\[
\frac{dn_i}{dt} = \sum_{j \neq i} n_j R_{ij} - n_i \sum_{j \neq i} R_{ji},
\]

where \(N_i\) is the total number of levels included in the rate equation, \(R_{ij}\) and \(R_{ji}\) are the total populating and depopulating rates for the level i due to different atomic processes, including photo-excitation and ionization, electron impact excitation and ionization, Auger decay and their reverse processes. To solve this equation, we need the rates as the input, which are determined by the basic atomic data including various cross sections for the interaction of photons and electrons with the ions.

2.1. Atomic data module

The computation of various atomic radiative and collisional processes involves the bound and continuum states of different successive ionization stages in the plasmas. For the bound states, a fully relativistic approach based on the Dirac equation is used while for the continuum processes the distorted wave approximation is employed [28,32].

The bound states of the atomic system are calculated in the configuration interaction approximation. The radial orbitals for the construction of basis states are derived from a modified self-consistent Dirac–Fock–Slater iteration on a fictitious mean configuration with fractional occupation numbers, representing the average electron cloud of the configurations included in the calculation. Explicitly, the atomic structure is determined by diagonalizing the relativistic Hamiltonian [32]:

\[
H = \sum_{i=1}^{N} H_D(i) + \sum_{i<j} \frac{1}{r_{ij}}
\]

where \(H_D(i)\) is the single-electron Dirac Hamiltonian and \(N\) is the number of bound electrons. The basis states \(\phi_s\), which are referred to as configuration state functions (CSF), are antisymmetric sums of the products of \(N\) one-electron Dirac spinors \(\phi_{num}\)

\[
\phi_{num} = \frac{1}{(i\hbar)^{\ell/2}} \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{J}_\ell} \sum_{\mathbf{M}_\ell} \sum_{\mathbf{K}} C_{\ell \mathbf{J}_\ell \mathbf{M}_\ell}^{\mathbf{K}} \chi_{\ell \mathbf{J}_\ell \mathbf{M}_\ell}(\theta, \phi, \sigma) \right),
\]

where \(P_{n\ell}(r)\) and \(Q_{n\ell}(r)\) are radial functions for the large and small components of the orbital, \(\chi_{\ell \mathbf{J}_\ell \mathbf{M}_\ell}(\theta, \phi, \sigma)\) is a two-component spherical spinor, \(n, \ell,\) and \(\ell\) are the principal, relativistic angular, and magnetic quantum number, respectively. The relativistic angular momentum number \(\ell\) is linked with non-relativistic (\(\ell\)) and total (\(\ell\)) angular quantum number by \(\ell = |\ell| - |\ell| + 1\). The large and small components, \(P_{n\ell}(r)\) and \(Q_{n\ell}(r)\), satisfy the coupled Dirac equation for a local central field in the standard Dirac–Fock–Slater method. The local central potential includes the contributions from the nuclear charge and the electron-electron interaction. The standard \(\ell\) coupling scheme is used in coupling the angular momenta of successive shells. Various orbitals are assumed to be orthonormal:

\[
\int_0^\infty (P_{n\ell}P_{n\ell'} + Q_{n\ell}Q_{n\ell'}) \, dr = \delta_{\ell\ell'},
\]

An atomic state function is approximated by a linear combination of CSFs with the same symmetry

\[
\Psi(J\pi) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_c} a_j \phi_j(J\pi),
\]

where \(n_c\) is the number of CSFs and \(a_j\) denotes the representation of the atomic state in this basis.

After obtaining the wavefunctions, we can calculate the required atomic data to construct the rate equations. For a radiative transition from level i to j, the rate is given by

\[
A_{ij} = 2 \left( \frac{\alpha \Delta E_{ij}^{2L+1}}{g_i(2L+1)} \right) \left( \langle \psi_j | \mathcal{O}_{ij}^\ell | \psi_i \rangle \right)^2.
\]

where \(\Psi_i\) and \(\Psi_j\) are atomic wave function of level i and j, respectively, \(g_i\) is the statistical weight of level i, \(L\) denotes multipole designation which includes electric dipole, quadrupole, magnetic dipole and quadruple in our code, \(\Delta E\) is the transition energy between level i and j, and \(\mathcal{O}_{ij}^\ell\) is the tensorial operator. The oscillator strength is connected with radiative rate in the following way:

\[
\bar{f}_{ij} = \frac{A_{ij}}{2\alpha^2(\Delta E)^2}.
\]

The photoionization cross section from level i to j can be written as

\[
\sigma_{ij}^{\pi} = 2\pi\alpha \frac{df}{d\omega}.
\]

where \(df/d\omega\) is the differential oscillator strength and it can be obtained in a similar manner to the bound–bound transitions by
replacing one bound orbital in the final state with the free orbital of the ionized electron:

\[
\frac{df}{dE} = \frac{\Delta E (\Delta E)^{2L-2}}{g_i (2L+1)} \sum_{j \ell} \left| \langle \psi_j, \kappa ; f \ell | O^k \parallel \psi_i \rangle \right|^2 ,
\]

(9)

where \( \kappa \) is the relativistic quantum number of the free electron, \( J_f \) is the total angular momentum of the free electron coupled with the ionized upper bound state \( \psi_j \), \( g_i \) is the statistical weight of the initial state. \( \Delta E \) is the energy difference between the initial and final states, and \( O^k \) is the multipole operator inducing the transition.

For electron impact excitation from level \( i \) to \( j \), the cross section can be expressed in terms of the collision strength \( \Omega_j^{\text{EI}} \) as

\[
\sigma_{ij}^{\text{EI}} = \frac{\pi}{k_0 g_i} \Omega_j^{\text{EI}} ,
\]

(10)

where \( k_0 \) is the kinetic momentum of the incident electron and \( g_i \) is the statistical weight of the initial state. The collision strength can be expressed as

\[
\Omega_j^{\text{EI}} = 2 \sum_{\kappa_i \kappa_f} \sum_{J_f} \frac{1}{2J_f + 1} \left| \langle \psi_j \kappa_i ; J_f M_T | \sum_{\ell \ell' m} \frac{1}{\ell \ell'} | \psi_i \kappa_f \rangle \right|^2 ,
\]

(11)

where \( \kappa_i \) and \( \kappa_f \) are the relativistic angular quantum numbers of the incident and scattered electrons, respectively, and \( J_f \) is the total angular momentum of the target state coupled with the free electron and \( M_T \) is the projection of \( J_f \).

The cross section of electron impact ionization can be obtained from that for electron impact excitation by replacing one bound orbital in the final state with the free orbital of the ejected electron and summing over its angular momentum. It can be written as

\[
\sigma_{ij}^{\text{EI}}(\varepsilon, \epsilon) = \frac{1}{k_0 g_i} \Omega_j^{\text{EI}} ,
\]

(12)

where \( \varepsilon_0 \) and \( k_0 \) are the energy and kinetic momentum of the incident electron and \( \epsilon \) is the energy of the ejected electron. The collision strength of electron impact ionization can be expressed as

\[
\Omega_j^{\text{EI}} = 2 \sum_{\kappa_i \kappa_e} \sum_{J_f M_T} \frac{1}{2J_f + 1} \left| \langle \psi_j \kappa_i \kappa_e ; J_f M_T | \sum_{\ell \ell' m} \frac{1}{\ell \ell'} | \psi_i \kappa_f \rangle \right|^2 ,
\]

(13)

where \( \kappa_e \) is the relativistic angular quantum number of the ejected electron.

The autoionization rate from level \( i \) to \( j \) is expressed as

\[
A_{ij}^k = 2 \sum_{\kappa} \left| \langle \psi_j, \kappa ; f \ell M_T | \sum_{\ell \ell' m} \frac{1}{\ell \ell'} | \psi_i \rangle \right|^2 ,
\]

(14)

where \( \kappa \) is the relativistic angular quantum number of the ionized electron.

For some cases, two-electron processes such as direct double Auger and double photoionization are nontrivial and should be included in the rate equations. The atomic data of direct two-electron processes can be obtained by our recently developed code [33]. In this work, we do not give detailed description on the direct two-electron and multi-electron processes, yet their inclusion in the rate equations is straightforward.

### 2.2. Plasma screening effects module

The ions are embedded in the environment of plasmas, and therefore the atomic structure will be effected. If the plasma density is not very high, then we can deal with it in an approximate way. Three models are usually utilized to deal with the ionization potential depression (IPD) caused by the plasma screening effects, Debye–Hückel model, ion-sphere model and Stewart–Pyatt model [34,35].

In Debye–Hückel model, the largest radius of an electron which can still be bound is determined by the Debye radius. The IPD \( \Delta \phi_i \) of the ion \( i \) can be expressed as

\[
\Delta \phi_i = z_i e^2 \sqrt{\frac{4 \pi e^2 n_e}{k T_e}} ,
\]

(15)

where \( z_i \) is the charge of the ion \( i (z_i = 1 \) for neutral), \( n_e \) and \( T_e \) are the electron density and temperature, respectively.

For ion-sphere model, the electrons are assumed bound until they are close to a neighboring ion. Therefore the largest allowed radius is the average inter-ion distance. The IPD \( \Delta \phi_i \) of ion \( i \) can be written as

\[
\Delta \phi_i = \frac{3 z_i e^2}{2 R} ,
\]

(16)

where \( R = ((3/4 \pi z^2)^{1/3}) (z^* \) is the average ionization) is the ion-sphere radius.

For Stewart–Pyatt model, the IPD is expressed as

\[
\Delta \phi_i = \left( \frac{3(z^* + 1)}{2} \right)^{2/3} \frac{e^2}{k T_e} ,
\]

(17)

where \( D = \sqrt{k T_e/4 \pi e^2} \) is the Debye length. Once the IPD of all ion stages in the plasma are obtained, the outermost bound orbital \( nl \) is determined for each ion stage. The configurations with the valence orbital above the outermost bound orbital \( nl \) are considered as ionized and the levels belonging to those configurations should be removed from the rate equation. For dense plasmas, i.e., near or above solid density, the plasma screening effects can affect the basic atomic data [36–38]. Li et al. [37] proposed a method of using a self-consistent potential to account for the plasma screening effects on the atomic data. Considering an ion with nuclear charge \( Z \), bound electrons \( N_b \) and radius \( R \) embedded in a hot dense plasma with temperature \( T_e \) and free electron density \( n_e \), we find that in an ion sphere the average potential produced by the free electrons for the \( i \)th bound electron is expressed as

\[
V(r_i) = 4 \pi \int_0^{r_i} \left[ \frac{1}{r_1} \right] \rho_i(r_1) dr_1 ,
\]

(18)

where \( \rho_i(r) \) is the free electron density distribution in the ionosphere. \( \rho_i(r) \) is assumed to follow the Fermi-Dirac distribution of the local free electron gas in the plane wave momentum \( k \) space and can be defined as

\[
\rho_i(r) = \frac{1}{2 \pi^2 \int_{k_{0i}(r)}^\infty \frac{k^2 dk}{e^{\sqrt{k^2 c^2 - e^2} - 1/2} + k^2} ,
\]

(19)

where \( k_{0i}(r) = [2V(r_i)^2 + V(r)^2]^{1/2} \) and \( \mu \) is the chemical potential. The chemical potential is determined by the neutrality condition.
expressed as the corresponding inverse process, radiative recombination, can be obtained from the corresponding cross section. For photo-excitation, this reads

$$B_{ij} = \int_0^\infty \frac{8\pi n^2}{c^2} f_e \sigma_{PE}^{ij}(\nu) d\nu,$$

where $\nu$ is the photon frequency, $f_e$ is the photon distribution function of the radiation field, $c$ is the velocity of photons in vacuum, $\sigma_{PE}^{ij}(\nu)$ is the photo-excitation cross section at the photon frequency $\nu$. For a bound–bound transition, $\sigma_{PE}^{ij}(\nu)$ can be expressed in terms of oscillator strengths $f_{ij}$ as

$$\sigma_{PE}^{ij}(\nu) = \frac{\pi \hbar^2}{m_e^2 c^2} f_{ij} \Sigma(\nu),$$

where $\hbar$ is the Planck constant, $m_e$ is the electron mass, $\Sigma(\nu)$ is the line profile that is, in general, a Voigt profile with natural lifetime broadenings, Doppler and electron impact broadening widths taken into account [5]. For a wide-band radiation field such as blackbody radiation with a Planck distribution and very narrow line width, the integration of expression in $B_{ij}$ can be approximated by

$$B_{ij} = \frac{8\pi n^2}{c^2} f_e \int_0^\infty \frac{\pi \hbar^2}{m_e^2 c^2} f_{ij} \Sigma(\nu) d\nu.$$

For narrow-band radiation field such as X-ray free-electron lasers of the Linac Coherent Light Source (LCLS) [39], one has to integrate the contributions from the radiation field, as part of the line profile may be outside the photon distribution function. The radiative decay rate is the sum of the photo-deexcitation and spontaneous radiative decay rate

$$B_{ji} = g_j B_{ij} g_i + A_{ji}.$$  

For the photoionization process, the expression of the rate from level $i$ to $j$ is similar to that of photo-excitation

$$C_{ij} = \int_{\Delta E/h}^\infty \frac{8\pi n^2}{c^2} f_e \sigma_{PI}^{ij} d\nu,$$

where $\Delta E$ is the energy difference between levels $i$ and $j$. The rate of the corresponding inverse process, radiative recombination, can be expressed as

$$C_{ji} = n_e \int_0^\infty v f(v)(1 + f_e) \sigma_{ij}^{re} d\nu,$$

where $n_e$ is the electron density, $\sigma_{ij}^{re}$ is the cross section of radiative recombination, $v$ is the velocity of free electrons and $f(v)$ is the electron distribution function, which is generally assumed to be a Maxwellian distribution. According to the principle of detailed balance, one can obtain the relations between the cross section of photoionization and radiative recombination:

$$\sigma_{ij}^{PE} = \frac{g_i}{g_j} \left( \frac{\hbar \nu}{m_e c^2} \right)^2 \sigma_{ij}^{PI}.$$

The rate of electron impact excitation $D_{ij}$ from level $i$ to $j$ can be written as

$$D_{ij} = n_e \int_0^\infty v f(v) \sigma_{ij}^{EI} d\nu,$$

where $\Delta E$ is the energy difference between levels $i$ and $j$, $\sigma_{ij}^{EI}$ is the cross section of electron impact excitation. According to the principle of detailed balance, the de-excitation rate $D_{ji}$ can be obtained by

$$D_{ji} = \frac{g_j}{g_i} \sigma_{ij}^{EI} D_{ij},$$

where $T_e$ is the electron temperature.

The rate of electron impact ionization from level $i$ to $j$ can be expressed as

$$E_{ij} = n_e \int_0^\infty v f(v) \sigma_{ij}^{II} d\nu,$$

where $\Delta E$ is the energy difference between levels $i$ and $j$, and $\sigma_{ij}^{II}$ is the electron impact ionization cross section. According to the principle of detailed balance, the rate of three body recombination can be obtained by the following relation

$$E_{ij} = n_e \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\hbar^2}{2 \pi m_e k T_e} \right)^{3/2} e^{\Delta E/k T_e} E_{ij}.$$

The autoionization rate $A_{ij}$ from level $i$ to level $j$ has been obtained in the previous section

$$F_{ij} = A_{ij}.$$

According to the principle of detailed balance, the rate of dielectronic capture $F_{ji}$ can be obtained by

$$F_{ji} = n_e \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\hbar^2}{2 \pi m_e k T_e} \right)^{3/2} e^{-\Delta E/k T_e} A_{ij}.$$

where $\Delta E$ is the energy difference between levels $i$ and $j$. To construct a DCA method, the level-to-level rates obtained from above relativistic calculations are transformed to configuration-to-configuration rates by summing all final levels belonging to the final configuration and averaging over all initial levels belonging to the initial configuration. In this way, the accuracy of atomic data can be maintained as in the DLA formalism. If we want to keep detailed structure of the radiative properties, we construct a hybrid DLA/DCA method which employs a DLA formalism for the detailed structure and a DCA method for the smoothed background.
2.4. Collisional-radiative module

Combining all rates derived in the previous section, we set up a complete time-dependent rate equation (TDRE) which couples all levels (or configurations) in the plasmas

$$\frac{dn_i}{dt} = \sum_{j \neq i} n_j (B_{ji} + C_{ji} + D_{ji} + E_{ji} + F_{ji}) - n_i \sum_{j \neq i} (B_{ij} + C_{ij} + D_{ij} + E_{ij} + F_{ij}).$$

(34)

To solve this TDRE, additional constraint must be introduced to ensure population conservation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_i} n_i = N_{\text{ion}},$$

(35)

and charge neutrality in the plasma

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_i} z_i n_i = N_e,$$

(36)

where $z_i$ is the ionization degree associated with level $i$, $N_e$ is the population number of the electrons and $N_{\text{ion}}$ is the population number of atoms and ions. The most pronounced characteristic is that the rates involved in the rate equation can differ by orders of magnitude and therefore it is a stiff problem. Therefore, we use a fourth Runge–Kutta method to solve the TDRE.

For plasmas in a steady state case, the rate equations are reduced to $dn_i/dt = 0$. A Gaussian elimination method is used to solve the set of linear equations. For the problems of large-scale rate equations, a parallel procedure is developed by calling the ScaLA-PACK library [40], which is a library with subroutines for solving the most common problems in numerical linear algebra.

2.5. Radiative properties module

After solving the rate equation, one obtains the level populations that can be used to calculate the radiative properties of plasmas from the same set of atomic data. The emissivity $j(\nu)$ at photon energy $\nu$ contains contributions from bound–bound, free–bound and free–free processes

$$j(\nu) = j_{bb}(\nu) + j_{fb}(\nu) + j_{ff}(\nu).$$

(37)

The bound–bound contribution can be expressed as

$$j_{bb}(\nu) = \sum_{j} n_j h \nu A_{ji} S(\nu),$$

(38)

where $n_j$ is the population of the upper level of the transition $j \rightarrow i$, $A_{ji}$ and $S(\nu)$ are the radiative transition probability and line profile of the transition $j \rightarrow i$, respectively.

The free–bound contribution can be written as

$$j_{fb}(\nu) = \sum_{j} n_e n_i h \nu \frac{\Delta E}{kT_e} \sqrt{\frac{16}{(2\pi m_e kT_e)^3}} \sigma_{ji} \nu e^{-\nu h/kT_e},$$

(39)

where $n_e$ and $T_e$ are the electron density and electron temperature, respectively, $\Delta E$ is the energy difference between levels $i$ and $j$, and $\sigma_{ji}$ is the cross section of radiative recombination.

The free–free contribution is

$$j_{ff}(\nu) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3\pi}} \alpha \sigma T_c n_e m_e c^2 \eta_G e^{-\nu h/kT_e} \sum_{i=0}^{Z} N_i z_i^2,$$

(40)

where $\alpha$ is the fine structure constant, $\sigma_T$ is the Thomson scattering cross section, $\eta_G$ is the Gaunt factor, $Z$ is the nuclear charge, $N_i$ is the population number of ion $i$ and $z_i$ is the effective nuclear charge of ion $i$.

A similar formula is employed for the radiative opacity and the details can be found elsewhere [41,42]. No additional description will be given here.

3. Results and discussions

As the theoretical methods of DCA and hybrid DLA/DCA models are similar to that of DLA and we therefore restrict the illustrative examples to two cases obtained using the DLA formalism. One is a steady state case for carbon plasmas and the other is a time-dependent case for the relaxation process that occurs for K-shell excited argon. For these two cases, the rates connecting ionization stages from H-like to Mg-like ions are used to set up the rate equations. In our calculations, the levels belonging to configurations from H-like to Mg-like ions are listed in Table 1 for the DLA calculation. The configurations include the ground, singly and doubly excited states with the maximum principal quantum number $n$ up to 8 or 9. The guide line of such a choice of configurations is to ensure the convergence of results.

3.1. Steady state case: carbon

Carbon is one of the most important elements under investigation, since it is widely used in ICF [43] and international thermonuclear experimental reactor [44]. It has been selected as a test case by the NLTE workshops due to the relatively simple atomic structure [8]. To begin with, the convergence of the present calculation should be checked. Fig. 1 shows the steady state case by the NLTE workshops due to the relatively simple atomic structure [8]. The convergence of the present calculation should be checked. Fig. 1 shows the steady state case for carbon plasmas and the other is a time-dependent case for the relaxation process that occurs for K-shell excited argon. For these two cases, the rates connecting ionization stages from H-like to Mg-like ions are used to set up the rate equations. In our calculations, the levels belonging to configurations from H-like to Mg-like ions are listed in Table 1 for the DLA calculation. The configurations include the ground, singly and doubly excited states with the maximum principal quantum number $n$ up to 8 or 9. The guide line of such a choice of configurations is to ensure the convergence of results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configurations from H-like to Mg-like ions included for DLA calculation. $(n)^m$ means arbitrary distribution of $m$ electrons in the shell with the principal quantum number $n$. $i = 0, 1, 2, ..., n - 1$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-like</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maximum principal quantum number is truncated due to the effects of IPD and therefore it becomes sufficient to set $n_{\text{max}}$ to 9. We also checked the convergence behavior of CSDs at smaller densities and found that the $n_{\text{max}} = 9$ is adequate for carbon plasmas at densities above $10^{15}$ cm$^{-3}$. With the increasing temperature larger values of $n_{\text{max}}$ will be required.

After checking the convergence of the results, the population distributions of carbon plasmas over a wide range of electron density are calculated. In Fig. 2 we show in a solid line the average ionization of carbon plasmas for an electron temperature of $T_e = 10$ eV as a function of the electron density. For comparison, we also show the results obtained by Florida et al. using ABAKO code [21] and by Colgan et al. using the ATOMIC code [24] that are presented by dotted and dashed lines, respectively. The three results were obtained without radiation field, i.e., $T_r = 0$, meaning a complete NLTE condition. It can be seen that reasonably good agreement is found between the three theoretical results over the entire range of electron densities from $10^{12}$ to $10^{21}$ cm$^{-3}$, although evident discrepancies can be found at lower and higher electron density. At the electron density range of $10^{16}$–$10^{19}$ cm$^{-3}$, the average ionization is 4 indicating that the most abundant ion stage is the He-like C$^{4+}$, which is due to the high ionization potential of C$^{4+}$. At these plasma conditions, the population distribution and average ionization are insensitive to the different models and therefore the models using detailed calculation and analytical formula gave basically the same results. At density below $10^{10}$ cm$^{-3}$ and above $10^{19}$ cm$^{-3}$, our predicted average ionization is larger than those of ABAKO. We suggest that such discrepancies should be due to the different models and different atomic data used. Yet all theoretical results predicted the same trend with the increase of electron density, the average ionization first increases with the increase of electron density and then decreases. Such a trend is consistent with the observation of the NLTE workshops [8].

Without radiation field, the steady state of NLTE plasmas is maintained by electron impact excitation and ionization which can be used as a check of the present calculation. To further check our model, we specify the average ionization stage for the same plasma condition but include a Planckian radiation field with the same temperature as the electron temperature, and the results are shown by the dot-dashed line in Fig. 2. This means that the radiation field and the electron are in thermodynamic equilibrium and therefore the NLTE models should give the same results as the Saha ionization equilibrium equation for the population distribution. We calculated the population distribution using the Saha equation and compared with that of NLTE computation, which verified this conclusion. Therefore, the DLA model is reliable. Below $10^{10}$ cm$^{-3}$, the result including a radiation field with the same temperature of the electron predicted a constant average ionization, which means that the coronal equilibrium condition is fulfilled for carbon plasmas below electron density of $10^{17}$ cm$^{-3}$. With increasing electron density the ionization and recombination are gradually dominated by the collisional processes due to the electrons. The radiation field of $10$ eV can hardly affect the ionization balance and therefore the results of $T_r = T_e$ are the same as those of $T_r = 0$ at high densities.

At lower electron density, the population distribution deviates from LTE values, which can easily be seen in Fig. 3. As an example, Fig. 3 shows the ratio of NLTE ($T_r = 0$) to LTE ($T_r = T_e$) populations of energy levels belonging to configurations $1s1n_l (n = 2-9)$ of C$^{4+}$ at $T_e = 10$ eV. The electron density varies from $10^{12}$ to $10^{21}$ cm$^{-3}$ and the horizontal axis represents level energies relative to the ground state of C$^{4+}$. From the inspection of Fig. 3, it is obvious that the population increasingly drops below the Boltzmann distribution (LTE) as the electron density is lowered. This deviation shows reproducible characteristic with the principal quantum number $n$. That is, for the same $n$, the levels with larger orbital angular momentum $l$ deviate more strongly than those of lower $l$. With the increase of the electron density the population distribution becomes closer to the Boltzmann distribution. At the electron density above $10^{14}$ cm$^{-3}$, the ratio is nearly 1 and it shows that the population distribution is close to that of LTE. This means that the radiation field no longer has effects on the population distribution at higher electron density.

Autoionization (AI) and its inverse process dielectronic capture (DC) play an important role on the ionization balance and much
research has been performed on the effects of AI/DC on population distributions [45,46]. Some NLTE codes calculate the AI rates with analytical formula and the accuracy of atomic data can be evaluated by using more accurate formalism [33,47]. The effects of AI/DC on the population distribution can be seen in Fig. 4, which shows the CSD of carbon plasmas at an electron temperature of 50 eV and a variety of electron densities. The solid line with squares represents the result obtained by including AI/DC processes and the dashed line with circles by excluding AI/DC processes in our code. From inspection of Fig. 4, one finds that the average ionization without AI/DC processes is always lower than that of with AI/DC processes. The effects of AI/DC processes on the average ionization are not the same over the entire electron density range with the largest effects occurring at an electron density near $10^{21}$ cm$^{-3}$. With a further increase of electron density from $10^{21}$ to $10^{22}$ cm$^{-3}$, the results obtained by including and excluding AI/DC processes are closer and closer, converging to roughly the same value. Such a conclusion is consistent with the common knowledge that for high density plasmas the three-body recombination dominates the DC process so that inclusion of AI/DC processes gives roughly the same result as that of without AI/DC.

For plasmas at high densities, the atomic structure and cross sections can be affected by the plasma environment [37,38]. One such effect is the IPD, a consequence of which is that the number of bound levels is no longer infinite. In principle, the IPD should be calculated by solving the Dirac equation of atomic structure with the plasma screening potential. For illustrative purposes we use the analytical Stewart–Pyatt model to implement the IPD [34]. Table 2 shows the IPD of carbon ions at an electron density of $10^{21}$ cm$^{-3}$ and temperature of 50 eV. For each ion stage, the outermost valence orbital nl which is still bound is also listed. In practical calculations, the configurations with the valence shell higher than nl are considered ionized and the levels belonging to those configurations should be removed from the rate equations. From Table 2, one can see that plasma screening effects play a role on ionization potential.

For example, the ionization potential of C$^{4+}$ is lowered by 4.33 eV and the outermost bound orbital is 8k, which means orbitals above 8k are already free. For neutral C, the outermost bound orbital is 5p indicating that the plasma screening effects play a more important role on lower ionization stages. The total number of levels in the rate equation is greatly reduced due to IPD and the population distributions are consequently affected. The IPD effects on population distributions can be seen in Fig. 5, where the CSD of a carbon plasma at 50 eV and $10^{21}$ cm$^{-3}$ is shown. The solid line with squares represents the result when including IPD effects and the dashed line with circles when excluding IPD effects. With the IPD effects being taken into account, the fraction of H-like C$^{5+}$ is increased while that of Li-like C$^{6+}$ is decreased, resulting in a higher average ionization.

After the population distributions are obtained, the radiative properties can be calculated. Fig. 6 shows the emission spectra of carbon plasmas at an electron temperature of 50 eV and electron density of (a) $10^{20}$ and (b) $10^{21}$ cm$^{-3}$. The emission lines of Hez, Heβ, Lyα and Lyβ are marked and the 1s ionization thresholds of C$^{3+}$, C$^{4+}$ and C$^{5+}$ are represented by arrows in panel (b). The structures in the emissivity below photon energy of 150 eV is contributed by the valence electron emission and those above photon energy of 200 eV are contributed by the inner-shell emission. Due to IPD, some levels with higher principal quantum number are merged in the continuum and therefore some emission lines in Fig. 6(b) have disappeared. The distinct character in the photon energy region of 350–400 eV of Fig. 6 is caused by the

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ions</th>
<th>IPD (eV)</th>
<th>nl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>5p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$^+$</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>6h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$^{2+}$</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>7p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$^{3+}$</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>7p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$^{4+}$</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>8k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$^{5+}$</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>9f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
different population distribution at the respective plasma condition. At higher electron density, the CSD favors lower ionization stages and more population is distributed into the excited states. As a result, the free-bound emission at 10^{21} \text{ cm}^{-3} is more intense than that at 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-3}.

3.2. Time-dependent case: argon

In many cases, the steady state assumption does not hold and therefore one has to apply the TDRE approach to investigate the evolution of populations [48]. One such example is the interaction of X-ray free electron lasers such as LCLS [39,49] with atoms, molecules and clusters, where TDRE is widely employed to investigate the evolution dynamics of populations [28,50–52]. Here we consider the relaxation process of Ne-like argon after selective K-shell photoexcitation that can be achieved using X-ray free electron lasers such as LCLS and which is a test case in NLTE workshop [53]. It is assumed that at time \( t = 0 \) all population is in the \( 1s^22s^22p^6^3 \) state.

Fig. 5. CSD of a carbon plasma at an electron temperature of 50 eV and electron density of \( 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-3} \). The dashed line with circles represents the results obtained by excluding the IPD effects.

Fig. 6. The emissivity of carbon plasmas at \( T_e = 50 \text{ eV} \) and electron density of (a) \( 10^{20} \) and (b) \( 10^{21} \text{ cm}^{-3} \). The locations of 1s ionization thresholds of \( \text{C}^{2+}, \text{C}^{3+} \) and \( \text{C}^{4+} \) are denoted by arrows.

Fig. 7. Evolution of average ionization of argon plasma at an electron temperature of 50 eV and densities of \( 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3} \) (dashed), \( 10^{18} \text{ cm}^{-3} \) (dot-dashed) and \( 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-3} \) (solid). The arrows represent the time at which the plasma reaches steady state.

Fig. 8. Evolution of fractions of \( \text{Ar}^{7+} - \text{Ar}^{10+} \) at the temperature of 50 eV and density of \( 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-3} \). The fractions of \( \text{Ar}^{10+} \) and \( \text{Ar}^{9+} \) are multiplied by a factor of 10 for illustrative purposes.
configuration of $\text{Ar}^{8+}$. The electron temperature is chosen to be 50 eV and the initial populations are distributed amongst the four fine-structure levels of $1s^22s^22p^63p$ according to their respective statistical weights. No radiation field is included in the calculation.

Fig. 7 shows the evolution of the average ionization of the argon plasma at electron densities of $10^{14}$, $10^{15}$ and $10^{16}$ cm$^{-3}$, respectively, and the arrows represent the time points when the plasma reaches steady state at the respective density. At all electron densities, the average ionization increases rapidly at an earlier time of $10^{-16}$–$10^{-14}$ s and then keeps approximately constant for a time interval and then decreases rapidly. The evolution dynamics of the average ionization is irrelevant to the electron density from $t = 0$ to $t = 10^{-12}$ s. At this time duration, the evolution dynamics is predominantly due to the Al processes. As Al rates do not vary with time and hence the evolution is the same for all electron densities.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1s^22s^22p^63p$</td>
<td>$(1s_1/23p_{1/2})_h$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(1s_1/23p_{3/2})_h$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(1s_1/23p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(1s_1/23p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1s^22s^22p^63p$</td>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(2p_{3/2}3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1s^22s^22p^63p$</td>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(2p_{3/2}3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{1/2})_h$</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(2p_{3/2}3p_{3/2})_h$</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{3/2})_h$</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1s^22s^22p^6$</td>
<td>$(2p_{1/2})_{1/2}$</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the increasing time different evolution trends are found at different electron densities. The evolution of the average ionization remains constant for longer time as the electron density lowered. The particular time points with a constant average ionization are $\sim 10^{-4}$, $\sim 10^{-8}$ and $\sim 10^{-10}$ s, for electron densities of $10^{14}$, $10^{15}$ and $10^{16}$ cm$^{-3}$, respectively. After this time the average ionization decreases rapidly and finally reaches steady state. One can find that it takes a much longer time to reach a steady state for the plasma at $10^{16}$ cm$^{-3}$ than at $10^{15}$ cm$^{-3}$. Such a trend is understandable, as with the increase of the electron density the electrons interact much more frequently with the ions and therefore the system can more rapidly arrive at a steady state. In the following, we take the plasma at $10^{16}$ cm$^{-3}$ as an example to investigate the evolution dynamics of the different ion stages and populations of the detailed levels.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial level</th>
<th>Final level</th>
<th>Rate (s$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(1s_1/23p_{1/2})_h$</td>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>1.86(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>$(3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>5.31(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{3/2}3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>$(3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>6.26(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>$(3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>1.48(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{3/2}3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>$(3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>5.14(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(1s_1/23p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>5.25(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>$(3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>1.45(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{3/2}3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>$(3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>9.34(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(1s_1/23p_{3/2})_h$</td>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>5.35(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>$(3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>1.12(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{3/2}3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>$(3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>7.94(13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the increase of the time different evolution trends are found at different electron densities. The evolution of the average ionization remains constant for longer time as the electron density lowered. The particular time points with a constant average ionization are $\sim 10^{-4}$, $\sim 10^{-8}$ and $\sim 10^{-10}$ s, for electron densities of $10^{14}$, $10^{15}$ and $10^{16}$ cm$^{-3}$, respectively. After this time the average ionization decreases rapidly and finally reaches steady state. One can find that it takes a much longer time to reach a steady state for the plasma at $10^{16}$ cm$^{-3}$ than at $10^{15}$ cm$^{-3}$. Such a trend is understandable, as with the increase of the electron density the electrons interact much more frequently with the ions and therefore the system can more rapidly arrive at a steady state. In the following, we take the plasma at $10^{16}$ cm$^{-3}$ as an example to investigate the evolution dynamics of the different ion stages and populations of the detailed levels.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial level</th>
<th>Final level</th>
<th>Rate (s$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>$(3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>1.69(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{3/2}3p_{1/2})_l$</td>
<td>$(3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>1.96(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>$(3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>1.66(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{3/2}3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>$(3p_{3/2})_l$</td>
<td>1.70(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{1/2})_h$</td>
<td>$(3p_{1/2})_h$</td>
<td>1.83(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{3/2}3p_{1/2})_h$</td>
<td>$(3p_{1/2})_h$</td>
<td>1.22(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{3/2})_h$</td>
<td>$(3p_{3/2})_h$</td>
<td>2.01(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{3/2}3p_{3/2})_h$</td>
<td>$(3p_{3/2})_h$</td>
<td>1.71(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{1/2})_h$</td>
<td>$(3p_{1/2})_h$</td>
<td>1.75(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{3/2}3p_{1/2})_h$</td>
<td>$(3p_{1/2})_h$</td>
<td>1.85(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(2p_{1/2}3p_{3/2})_h$</td>
<td>$(3p_{3/2})_h$</td>
<td>1.93(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 8 shows the evolution of Ar⁷⁺-Ar¹⁰⁺ at the density of 10²⁰ cm⁻³, where the fractions of Ar⁷⁺ and Ar¹⁰⁺ are multiplied by a factor of 10 for illustrative purposes. From an inspection of Fig. 8, one can find that Ar⁸⁺ and Ar⁹⁺ are the most abundant ionization stages in the plasma accounting for ~95%, and that Ar⁷⁺ and Ar⁹⁺ account for ~5%. The evolution of different ionization stages shows different features. In the time interval of 10⁻¹⁶-10⁻¹⁴ s, the fraction of Ar⁸⁺ decreases rapidly and the fraction of Ar⁹⁺ increases rapidly. In this time interval, the fractions of Ar⁷⁺ and Ar¹⁰⁺ are very small. This is the reason that the average ionization increases rapidly in this time interval, as discussed above with respect to Fig. 7. In the time interval from 10⁻¹⁴ to 10⁻¹⁰ s, the fractions of both Ar⁸⁺ and Ar⁹⁺ change little and consequently the average ionization changes little. During the interval from 10⁻¹⁰ to 10⁻⁸ s, the fraction of Ar¹⁰⁺ increases slowly to ~0.03 leading to a small increase of average ionization as shown in Fig. 8. In the interval from 10⁻¹⁰ to 10⁻⁸ s, the fraction of Ar¹⁰⁺ increases and that of Ar⁹⁺ decreases and consequently the average ionization decreases rapidly. From 10⁻⁸ s, Ar⁷⁺-Ar¹⁰⁺ reach a steady state and as a result the average ionization reaches a constant value.

Table 6 shows the initial and final levels and rate constants for the processes of electron impact de-excitation and radiative decay of Ar⁷⁺-⁹⁺. The results obtained by using DCA formalism can be found elsewhere [11]. The hybrid method for investigating the radiative opacity of LTE plasmas can be utilized to construct NLTE models [54]. The effects of direct double Auger and photoionization were discussed in the X-ray interaction with neon atoms in Ref. [28].

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, a NLTE code DLAYZ is presented for investigating the population kinetics and radiative properties of plasmas. The code is implemented with a DLA approach and can treat the steady state and time-dependent problems. The DLA formalism is extended to DCA and hybrid DLA/DCA approaches with the same atomic data by a configuration averaging method, which is very useful especially for high-Z plasmas. The complete set of atomic data between fine-structure levels including single photon and single electron processes are obtained by calculations using full relativistic quantum mechanics. The direct double electron processes such as double Auger and double photoionization can be included in the code. The plasma screening effects on the atomic structure and atomic processes can be taken into account. In the present illustrative examples, the plasma screening effects are described in terms of a lowering of the ionization potential by using analytical formula of Stewart-Pyatt model. For mid-Z or high-Z plasmas, the determination of the population distributions usually involves large-scale rate equations and therefore a parallelized method is developed for DLAYZ code. Two examples were given to show the main features.
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