STANDARD VALUE FOR THE RADIATION LENGTH IN AIR

John Linsley
Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131
USA

ABSTRACT

Following the Paris ICRC I did some additional research on the radiation length in air, which was reported in Proceedings of the Paris Workshop on Cascade Simulations. However no standard value was recommended because a few calculations remained undone. These have now been finished. They give new values for to in atomic oxygen and nitrogen which are entirely free of dependence on the Thomas-Fermi approximate model. With the usual small corrections for atmospheric A and CO₂, these give to air = 37.15 g cm⁻², in close agreement with a value recommended by Dovzhenko and Pomanskii, but in contrast to to air = 36.66 g cm⁻² obtained by Tsai using the Thomas-Fermi approximation.

1. Introduction. This concludes an inquiry concerning the radiation length in air, motivated by the importance of that unit in applying cascade theory to the interpretation of cosmic ray air shower data. The preceding installments provide background and more complete references (Linsley 1981a, 1981b).

where N is Avagadro's number, $\sigma_{\rm o} = 4\alpha r_{\rm o}^{2}$ (α the fine-structure constant, $r_{\rm o}$ the classical radius of the electron), A is the atomic weight and Z is the atomic number of the target atom, f corrects for use of the Born approximation, $L_{\rm rad}$ is the usual radiation logarithm given by

$$L_{rad} = \int_0^1 (1-F)^2 \frac{dq}{q} + 1$$
, (2)

where q is the momentum transfer in units of m_e^c and F(q,Z) is the atomic form factor, and L_{rad}^{\dagger} , a quantity analogous to L_{rad}^{\dagger} , takes into account collisions in which the scattering system is left in an excited state.

$$L_{rad'} = \int_0^1 s \, \frac{dq}{q} + 1 , \qquad (3)$$

where S(q,Z) is the so-called incoherent scattering function. There is general acceptance of the Bethe-Maximon formula for f:

$$f(z) = z \sum_{1}^{\infty} n(n^2+z) \sim 1.202z-1.0369z^2+1.008z^3/(1+z)$$
, (4)

where $z = (Z/137)^2$. For N and O, f = 0.0031 and 0.0041, respectively.

3. Evaluation of Structure Dependent Terms. The effect of atomic structure on t is expressed mainly through L and L it was shown by Bethe (1934) that the Z-dependence of L is given essentially by

$$L_{\rm rad} = \ln(aZ^{-1/3})$$
 , (5)

where a is called the elastic screening coefficient. Using the Thomas-Fermi model he obtained the widely quoted value 183 for $a_{TF}^{}$. Recognizing the hazard in relying on a statistical model for an atom as light as N, Wheeler and Lamb (1939) recalculated L_{rad} for that element (and for hydrogen) using self-consistent wave functions of the Hartree-Fock type, obtaining a result equivalent to L_{rad} CF = 4.56.

The need for taking into account inelastic scattering was noted first by Landau and Rumer (1938). Their estimate $L_{\rm rad}$, $^{\circ}$ $^{\circ}$ $^{\circ}$ $^{\circ}$ $^{\circ}$ underestimates $L_{\rm rad}$, by about 20% in case of elements as light as N and O, leading to errors in t of about 3%. A correct quantum mechanical formula equivalent to Eq. 3 was given by Wheeler and Lamb (1939). They used it to calculate $L_{\rm rad}$ for N (and for hydrogen) using both the Thomas-Fermi model and self-consistent wave functions. Their result in the latter case was equivalent to $L_{\rm rad}$, CF = 5.47.

More recently, values of F and S based on accurate self-consistent wave functions have been tabulated for all the elements over a complete range of q-values (Hubbell et al. 1975). Using these data and Eq's (2) and (3) I have calculated L rad SCF and L rad' SCF for O as well as N, obtaining 4.490, 5.253 for O, and 4.554, 5.347 for N (in good agreement with the results of Wheeler and Lamb), respectively.

4. The Radiation Length in Air. The radiation length in a complex substance is given by the following expression (Rossi 1952):

$$(t_0)^{-1} = \sum_{i} p_i / (t_0)_i$$
, (6)

where \mathbf{p}_{i} is the fraction by weight of the i-th atomic species. The data

^{*} The alternative value 191, frequently quoted although it is erroneous, apparently entered the literature through being recommended by Oppenheimer to Serber (1938, 1981). (In Serber's 1938 paper it is attributed to Bartlett, who visited Oppenheimer's group at Caltech about the time the paper was being written.) The value of a has been recalculated recently, but it is questionable whether the new result, a TF 184.15 (Tsai 1974), is any more accurate than Bethe's, since the new calculation used an approximate parametrization of the Thomas-Fermi potential.

adopted here for calculating t_0 air are given in Table 1. The present result is t_0 air = 37.15 g cm⁻².

Table 1.	Calculation	of	Radiation	Length	in	Air

i	р _і	z _i	A	f	(L _{rad})	(L _{rad} ,)	note
1	0.05	6	12.0111	0.0019	4.618	5.403	(a)
2	75.52	7	14.0067	0.0031	4.554	5.347	(b)
3	23.14	8	15.9994	0.0041	4.490	5.253	(b)
4	1.29	18	39.9480	0.0204	4.252	5.081	(a)

note (a):
$$L_{rad} = L_{rad}|_{TF} = ln(183z^{-1/3})$$
, $L_{rad} = L_{rad}|_{TF} = ln(1194z^{-2/3})$ (Tsai 1974)

5. Comparison with Previous Results. Values of to for C, N, O and A, as well as air, are compared in Table 2 with values recommended in widely quoted reviews: 1) by Dovzhenko and Pomanskii (1964), and 2) by Tsai (1974). (Tsai's article is the authority for values given in the Particle Properties Data Booklet.) The results by Tsai are based entirely on the Thomas-Fermi model. Dovzhenko and Pomanskii used their own SCF calculations of L rad they used interpolated values based on Wheeler and Lamb's results for N.

Table 2. Radiation Length in C, N, O, A and air (units g cm -2)

material	Dovzhenko & Pomanskii	Tsai	present work
С	43.3	42.70	43.33
N	38.6	37.99	38.53
0	34.6	34.24	34.83
A	19.7	19.55	19.57
air	37.1	36.66	37.15

^{6.} Remaining Questions. Out of 7 questions listed previously (Linsley 1981b) there are 2 which have not been given definitive answers:

How great is the molecular binding effect in N and O₂?

2) What is the relation between t_{O} defined by Eq. 1 and the electromagnetic cascade unit X defined by $X_{O} = X_{max}/ln(E/E_{C})$, where E is the critical energy and X_{max} is the average depth of maximum development of simple cascades with energy E?

Regarding (1): Using the conventional definition of $L_{\rm rad}$ (Eq. 2), the value I reported previously for molecular nitrogen (Linsley 1981a) becomes 4.50, 1.2% less than the best SCF value for atomic nitrogen. On the other hand, Bernstein and Panofsky (1956) showed that in the complete screening limit the effect of molecular binding in hydrogen is to increase $\sigma_{\rm pair}$ by 2.8%.

Regarding (2): The point of the distinction is that the quantity appearing in the elongation-energy relation should logically be X_O rather than t_O . Clearly, X_O/t_O is independent of the stopping medium to a high degree of accuracy. Landau and Rumer (1938), for approximation A, and Snyder (1949), for approximation B of electromagnetic cascade theory, give $X_O/t_O = 1.01$. From tables given by Messel and Crawford (1970) I find $X_O/t_O = 1.04\pm.02$. Can additional results of this kind be derived from existing work?

7. References.

Bernstein, D. and Panofsky, W. K. H. 1956, Phys. Rev. 102, 522.

Bethe, H. A. 1934, Proc. Cambr. Phil. Soc. 30, 524.

Dovzhenko, O. I. and Pomanskii, A. A. 1964, Sov. Phys. JETP 18, 187.

Hubbell, J. H., Veigele, W. J., Briggs, E. A., Brown, R. T., Cromer, D. T., and Howerton, R. J. 1975, J. Phys. Chem. Reference Data 4, 471.

Landau, L. and Rumer, G. 1938, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A166, 213.

Linsley, J. 1981a, Proc. 17th ICRC (Paris) 11, 246.

1981b, Proc. Paris Workshop on Cascade Simulations, eds. J. Linsley and A. M. Hillas (Texas Center for the Advancement of Science and Technology, Albuquerque) p. 23.

Messel, M. and Crawford, D. F. 1970, Electron-Photon Shower Distribution Function Tables (Oxford, Pergamon Press).

Rossi, B. 1952 in *High Energy Particles* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall).

Serber, R. 1938, Phys. Rev. 54, 317.

1981, private communication.

Tsai, Y-S. 1974, Rev. Mod. Phys. 46, 815.

Wheeler, J. A. and Lamb, W. E. 1939, Phys. Rev. <u>55</u>, 858, erratum <u>101</u>, 1836 (1956).