



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Applied Radiation and Isotopes

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/apradiso](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/apradiso)

## Distorted wave calculations for electron loss process induced by bare ion impact on biological targets

J.M. Monti<sup>a</sup>, C.A. Tachino<sup>a,\*</sup>, J. Hanssen<sup>b</sup>, O.A. Fojón<sup>a</sup>, M.E. Galassi<sup>a</sup>, C. Champion<sup>c</sup>, R.D. Rivarola<sup>a</sup><sup>a</sup> Instituto de Física Rosario, CONICET and Universidad Nacional de Rosario, Avenida Pellegrini 250, 2000 Rosario, Argentina<sup>b</sup> Laboratoire de Physique Moléculaire et des Collisions, ICPMB (FR CNRS 2843), Université de Lorraine, 1 bd Arago, 57078 Metz Cedex 3, France<sup>c</sup> Université Bordeaux 1, CNRS/IN2P3, Centre d'Etudes Nucléaires de Bordeaux Gradignan, CENBG, 33175 Gradignan, France

## HIGHLIGHTS

- ▶ Distorted wave models are used to investigate ion-molecule collisions.
- ▶ Differential and total cross-sections for capture and ionization are evaluated.
- ▶ The influence of dynamic screening is determined.
- ▶ Capture reaction dominates the mean energy deposited by the projectile on the target.

## ARTICLE INFO

Available online 16 January 2013

## Keywords:

Distorted wave  
Ionization  
Capture  
Biomolecules

## ABSTRACT

Distorted wave models are employed to investigate the electron loss process induced by bare ions on biological targets. The two main reactions which contribute to this process, namely, the single electron ionization as well as the single electron capture are here studied. In order to further assess the validity of the theoretical descriptions used, the influence of particular mechanisms are studied, like dynamic screening for the case of electron ionization and energy deposition on the target by the impacting projectile for the electron capture one. Results are compared with existing experimental data.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Research on electronic reactions involved in collisions between ions and molecules are of prime interest in different areas, like radiobiology and medical physics for possible applications in radiotherapy with protons (protontherapy) and heavy ions (hadrontherapy).

Two main processes contribute to the single electron loss from atomic/molecular targets, namely, the electron capture and the electron ionization which dominates at low and high impact velocities, respectively. In recent works, both reactions were theoretically studied for biological targets by using different perturbative approximations (Champion et al., 2010, 2012; Galassi et al., 2012). In particular, water molecules as well as adenine, cytosine, guanine, thymine, uracil and sugar-phosphate backbone molecules were considered. The continuum distorted wave-eikonal initial state

(CDW-EIS) approach (Crothers and McCann, 1983; Fainstein et al., 1988) was used for describing the single electron ionization at intermediate and high impact energies. Previous calculations using this model were employed with success to characterize this reaction for collisions involving numerous atoms and molecules as collision aggregates (Fainstein et al., 1991; Stolterfoht et al., 1997; Galassi et al., 2000). More recently, electron loss from molecular targets due to electron capture by the projectile was also investigated using the CDW-EIS and the continuum distorted wave (CDW) approximations (Galassi et al., 2010; Champion et al., 2012 and references therein). In general, an adequate description of the existing experimental data was obtained, even considering that they are very scarce for biological targets, in particular for DNA nucleobases and uracil. In this context, new theoretical predictions appear of prime importance in many fields like (micro)dosimetry.

In order to further investigate the adequacy of the mentioned distorted wave models, the present work is focused on the analysis of different physical effects which will help at the same time for a better understanding of the reactions analyzed. In particular, isolated water and adenine molecules are here considered, the last one being seen as a test case to predict some general behaviors common to all DNA molecular compounds.

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +54 0341 4495467.

E-mail addresses: [monti@ifir-conicet.gov.ar](mailto:monti@ifir-conicet.gov.ar) (J.M. Monti), [tachino@ifir-conicet.gov.ar](mailto:tachino@ifir-conicet.gov.ar) (C.A. Tachino), [jocelyn@univ-metz.fr](mailto:jocelyn@univ-metz.fr) (J. Hanssen), [fojon@fceia.unr.edu.ar](mailto:fojon@fceia.unr.edu.ar) (O.A. Fojón), [galassi@fceia.unr.edu.ar](mailto:galassi@fceia.unr.edu.ar) (M.E. Galassi), [champion@cenbg.in2p3.fr](mailto:champion@cenbg.in2p3.fr) (C. Champion), [rivarola@fceia.unr.edu.ar](mailto:rivarola@fceia.unr.edu.ar) (R.D. Rivarola).

Atomic units will be used in the following except where otherwise stated.

## 2. Theory

Let us consider the single electron capture and the single electron ionization processes induced by bare ion impact on an atomic or molecular target. For these processes, it has been shown that multi-electron collision systems may be reduced to the study of a three body reaction composed by the projectile, the active electron and the residual target (Rivarola and Salin, 1984; Fainstein et al., 1988; Corchs et al., 1993; Galassi et al., 2004). In such a representation it is assumed that the passive electrons (the not promoted ones) remain in their orbitals during the collision. This is valid at high enough impact velocities for which the collision time is smaller than the one corresponding to the relaxation of the passive electrons. For molecular targets it will correspond additionally to collision times smaller than the vibrational and rotational ones.

The reaction is described from a reference frame fixed on the target nucleus and the straight line version of the impact parameter approximation is employed. We focus here our analysis on the use of two distorted wave models, the continuum distorted wave (CDW) and the continuum distorted wave-eikonal initial state (CDW-EIS). The internuclear interaction is not included in the following description because integration over all projectile angular distributions is considered.

In the  $\alpha$ -entry channel, the initial one-active electron distorted wavefunction is chosen as

$$\chi_{\alpha}^{+} = \varphi_{\alpha}(\vec{x}) \exp(-i\varepsilon_{\alpha}t) \mathcal{L}_{\alpha}(\vec{s}) \quad (1)$$

where the super-index (+) indicates that it preserves correct outgoing boundary conditions, being the distortion factor

$$\mathcal{L}_{\alpha}(\vec{s}) = \exp[-iv \ln(vs + \vec{v} \cdot \vec{s})] \quad (2)$$

in the CDW-EIS model, whereas

$$\mathcal{L}_{\alpha}(\vec{s}) = N(v) {}_1F_1(iv; 1; ivs + i\vec{v} \cdot \vec{s}) \quad (3)$$

in the CDW one. In Eq. (1),  $\varphi_{\alpha}(\vec{x})$  represents the non-perturbed initial electron bound orbital and  $\varepsilon_{\alpha}$  the corresponding orbital energy,  $\vec{x}$  and  $\vec{s}$  are the electron position vectors as measured from the target and projectile nuclei, respectively,  $Z_p$  is the projectile nuclear charge,  $\vec{v}$  is the impact velocity, and  $v = Z_p/v$ . The distorted functions included in the entrance channel depending of the  $\vec{s}$  coordinate, take into account the fact that the electron bound to the target is simultaneously travelling in a continuum state of the projectile field, being this one considered in an eikonal approximation in CDW-EIS. This approximation in CDW-EIS is proposed in order to avoid the non-normalization of the initial distorted wavefunction, which provokes in the CDW model the overestimation of the total cross-sections at intermediate collision velocities. The function  $N(a) = \exp(\pi a/2) \Gamma(1 - ia)$  gives the normalization of the corresponding continuum factor.

For both CDW-EIS and CDW models, the same final distorted wavefunctions are chosen for electron capture and electron ionization in the  $\beta$ -exit channel. Thus, for electron capture this wavefunction is chosen as

$$\chi_{\beta}^{-} = \varphi_{\beta}(\vec{s}) \exp(-i\varepsilon_{\beta}t + i\vec{v} \cdot \vec{x} - iv^2t/2) \times N^*(\zeta) {}_1F_1(-i\zeta; 1; -ivx - i\vec{v} \cdot \vec{x}) \quad (4)$$

where  $\varphi_{\beta}(\vec{s})$  represents the final non-perturbed bound projectile state and  $\varepsilon_{\beta}$  its corresponding orbital energy. Also, in Eq. (4),  ${}_1F_1(-i\zeta; 1; -ivx - i\vec{v} \cdot \vec{x})$  is a Coulomb continuum factor associated with the electron-residual target interaction where

$\zeta = Z_T^*/v$ , with  $Z_T^*$  an effective target nuclear charge defined by  $Z_T^* = (-2n^2\varepsilon_{\alpha})^{1/2}$  (Belkić, 1978), where the value of the principal quantum number  $n$  is set to be equal to the principal quantum number of each atomic orbital used to describe the molecular orbitals (see hereafter). In such a way the interaction between the active electron and the residual target is described by an effective Coulomb potential  $V_T \cong -Z_T^*/x$ . The final distorted wavefunction presents also a two-center character associated with the fact that the electron evolves in the combined field of the projectile and residual target. Now, the super-index (−) indicates that correct ingoing conditions are satisfied.

To describe the electron ionization process, the final distorted wavefunction is taken as

$$\chi_{\beta}^{-} = (2\pi)^{-3/2} \exp(-i\varepsilon_{\beta}t + i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x} - ik^2t/2) \times N^*(\xi) {}_1F_1(-i\xi; 1; -ikx - i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x}) \times N^*(\zeta) {}_1F_1(-i\zeta; 1; -ips - i\vec{p} \cdot \vec{s}) \quad (5)$$

where  $\vec{k}$  and  $\vec{p} = \vec{k} - \vec{v}$  are the linear momenta of the electron with respect to the target and projectile nucleus respectively,  $\xi = Z_T^*/k$  and  $\zeta = Z_p/p$ . The first part of Eq. (5), depending on the coordinate  $\vec{x}$ , is a wavefunction describing the electron in a continuum state of the residual target whereas the continuum factor depending on the coordinate  $\vec{s}$  corresponds to the electron-projectile interaction. Thus, the final distorted wavefunction describes the electron travelling in a continuum state of both the projectile and residual target fields, and their actions on the emitted electron are considered on equal footing. Once more, but now for ionization, the super-index (−) indicates that correct ingoing conditions are satisfied.

The post- and prior-versions of the transition amplitude for both reactions above mentioned can be written as

$$A_{\alpha,\beta}^{+} = -i \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt \left\langle \chi_{\beta}^{-} \left| \left( H_{el} - i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right)^{\dagger} \right| \chi_{\alpha}^{+} \right\rangle \quad (6)$$

and

$$A_{\alpha,\beta}^{-} = -i \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt \left\langle \chi_{\beta}^{-} \left| \left( H_{el} - i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \right| \chi_{\alpha}^{+} \right\rangle \quad (7)$$

respectively, with  $H_{el}$  the electronic Hamiltonian.

Cross-sections for single ionization of water and single electron capture from adenine by impact of bare ions, are reported in the following section. In order to represent the corresponding initial orbitals a complete neglect of differential overlap (CNDO) approximation is employed. The molecular orbitals are assumed to be described by linear combinations of their atomic compound orbitals (LCAOs). The corresponding binding energies are obtained within a Hartree-Fock formalism. For more details, we refer the reader to our previous works (Olivera et al., 1996; Galassi et al., 2012).

Employing the CNDO approximation, doubly differential cross-sections (DDCSs) for ionization as a function of the energy  $E_k$  and solid angle  $\Omega_k$  subtended by the ejected electron and total cross-sections (TCSs) for electron capture are expressed as

$$\frac{d^2\sigma}{dE_k d\Omega_k} = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{d^2\sigma_j}{dE_k d\Omega_k} = \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} \xi_{ij} \frac{d^2\sigma_{at,i}}{dE_k d\Omega_k} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\sigma = \sum_{j=1}^N \sigma_j = \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} \xi_{ij} \sigma_{at,i} \quad (9)$$

respectively. In Eqs. (8) and (9),  $N$  is the number of molecular orbitals,  $N_j$  is the total number of atomic components of the  $j$ -

molecular orbital and  $d^2\sigma_{at,i}/dE_k d\Omega_k$  and  $\sigma_{at,i}$  refers to the atomic orbital doubly differential and total cross sections involved in its LCAO description, respectively. Besides,  $\xi_{i,j}$  refers to the corresponding atomic effective occupation electron numbers.

Finally, the mean energy  $\langle\Delta E\rangle$  deposited by the projectile on the target through the process of charge exchange is calculated by using the equation


$$\langle\Delta E\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon_j \frac{\sigma_j}{\sigma} \quad (10)$$

where  $\varepsilon_j$  is the binding energy of the  $j$ th-electronic orbital and  $\sigma_j/\sigma$  represents the probability of capturing an electron from this orbital.


### 3. Results and discussions

We show in Fig. 1 the DDCS for single ionization of an isolated water molecule by impact of a 6 MeV/amu- $C^{6+}$  beam as a function of the angle subtended by the ejected electron at fixed emission energies. CDW-EIS calculations are obtained into its prior- and post-versions. The former ones appear in better agreement with the existing experimental data. The same behavior have been also found for DDCS (not shown in the present work) for 500 keV- $H^+$  impacting on the above mentioned target. As it has been observed for atomic targets, the discrepancy between the prior- and post-versions comes from the fact that the first one includes in its description the influence of the passive electrons on the dynamical evolution of the ejected one (the so called dynamical screening) (Monti et al., 2010), whereas in the post-version it is only partially taken into account through the use of an effective charge. Thus, the difference between both versions can be attributed to the contribution to DDCS of dynamical screening.

In Fig. 2, TCS for electron capture from adenine by proton impact are shown as a function of the collision energy. We observe that the difference between CDW and CDW-EIS is important at enough low collision energies ( $E < 1$  MeV). Conversely, at higher energies ( $E > 1$  MeV) the two theories produce results which converge one to each other. These behaviors confirm the previously ones observed for uracil (Champion et al., 2012). For the reaction here analyzed, to our knowledge, it exists only one measured point (Tabet et al., 2010) and so that it



**Fig. 1.** Double differential cross-sections (DDCSs) for different electron emission energies, as a function of the electron emission angle, for single electron ionization of water molecules by  $C^{6+}$  (6 MeV/u) impact. CNDO post-version results (solid line), CNDO prior-version results (dashed line), experiments (solid circles) are taken from Dal Capello et al. (2009).



**Fig. 2.** Total cross-sections for single electron capture by  $H^+$  from an adenine target: CDW results (solid line) with its core orbitals contribution (dashed line), CDW-EIS results (dotted line), CTMC-COB results (solid squares). Experimental data (solid circles) are taken from Tabet et al. (2010).


is almost impossible to establish any conclusion from a comparison between theoretical and experimental results until new measurements are done.

Previously published classical cross-sections (obtained within the classical trajectory Monte Carlo-classical over barrier criterion, CTMC-COB) (Lekadir et al., 2009) lie between the CDW and the CDW EIS ones for energies lower than 300 keV. For larger impact energies classical calculations tend to underestimate the quantum mechanical ones. This comportment must be attributed to the fact that the present CTMC-COB calculations do not take into account contributions from the inner molecular orbitals—hereafter denoted “core contribution”. This core involves the 10 inner orbitals (which are represented by C(1s) and N(1s) type atomic components) which dominate the electron capture process in particular for  $E > 500$  keV.

In Fig. 3, the mean energy deposited on a adenine target by a proton beam is presented as a function of the impact energy. The figure shows two limiting cases: the limit of low collision energies ( $E < 300$  keV) and the limit of high collision energies ( $E > 3$  MeV). The behavior at high energies can be explained by the fact that the TCS corresponding to the “core” orbitals are dominant for impact energies larger than 3 MeV (see Fig. 2). Besides, we have recently observed that the energy deposits were essentially governed by the electron capture process provided that the incident proton energy was greater than about 100 keV. For lower impact energies, the ionization and the electron capture contributions are of the same order of magnitude with in particular a mean energy deposit ranging from 10 eV to 20 eV. These observations will be reported along a forthcoming work.

### 4. Conclusions

The reactions of single electron capture and single electron ionization are studied for the impact of bare ions on adenine and water targets, respectively. Continuum distorted wave models have been employed.



**Fig. 3.** Mean deposited energy by electron capture as a function of the impact energy for the H<sup>+</sup>-adenine collision calculated within the CDW approximation. The solid line represents the calculations for all 35 molecular orbitals while the dashed line represents the contribution of only the 10 core ones.

It is shown that the inclusion of dynamical screening contributions in the CDW-EIS model improves the description of experimental double differential spectra of electron emission.

It is also determined that electron capture from adenine by protons, produced at high enough impact energies, becomes preferably for those electrons which are tightly bound to the molecular target. This effect is observed on total cross-sections. As a consequence, the mean energy deposited by the projectile beam on the target, at high collision velocities, is also dominated by these inner orbitals.

### Acknowledgments

This work has been developed as part of the activities planned in the Programme de Coopération ECOS-Sud A09E04 as well as in the project PICS 5921 (THEOS) of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique and the project PICT 2145 of the Agencia Nacional de Promoción Científica y Tecnológica.

### References

- Belkić, D., 1978. A quantum theory of ionisation in fast collisions between ions and atomic systems. *J. Phys. B At. Mol. Phys.* 11, 3529–3552.
- Champion, C., Lekadir, H., Galassi, M.E., Fojón, O., Rivarola, R.D., Hanssen, J., 2010. Theoretical predictions for ionization cross sections of DNA nucleobases impacted by light ions. *Phys. Med. Biol.* 55, 6053–6067.
- Champion, C., Weck, P.F., Lekadir, H., Galassi, M.E., Fojón, O.A., Abufager, P., Rivarola, R.D., Hanssen, J., 2012. Proton-induced single electron capture on DNA/RNA bases. *Phys. Med. Biol.* 57, 3039–3049.
- Corchs, S.E., Rivarola, R.D., McGuire, J.H., Wang, Y.M., 1993. Distorted-wave models for single-electron capture from molecular targets by the impact of bare ions. *Phys. Rev. A* 47, 201–207.
- Crothers, D.S.F., McCann, J.F., 1983. Ionization of atoms by ion impact. *J. Phys. B At. Mol. Phys.* 16, 3229–3242.
- Dal Capello, C., Champion, C., Boudrioua, O., Lekadir, H., Sato, Y., Ohsawa, D., 2009. Theoretical and experimental investigations of electron emission in C<sup>6+</sup> + H<sub>2</sub>O collisions. *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. B* 267, 781–790.
- Fainstein, P.D., Ponce, V.H., Rivarola, R.D., 1988. A theoretical model for ionization in ion-atom collisions. Applications for the impact of multicharged projectiles on helium. *J. Phys. B At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* 21, 287–299.
- Fainstein, P.D., Ponce, V.H., Rivarola, R.D., 1991. Two-centre effects in ionization by ion impact. *J. Phys. B At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* 24, 3091–3119.
- Galassi, M.E., Rivarola, R.D., Beuve, M., Olivera, G.H., Fainstein, P.D., 2000. Theoretical calculation of single ionization in collisions between protons and low-Z molecules at intermediate and high energies. *Phys. Rev. A* 62, 022701.
- Galassi, M.E., Rivarola, R.D., Fainstein, P.D., 2004. Multicenter character in single-electron emission from H<sub>2</sub> molecules by ion impact. *Phys. Rev. A* 70, 032721.
- Galassi, M.E., Abufager, P.N., Fainstein, P.D., Rivarola, R.D., 2010. Single-electron capture in collisions of proton beams with molecules of biological interest. *Phys. Rev. A* 81, 062713.
- Galassi, M.E., Champion, C., Weck, P.F., Rivarola, R.D., Fojón, O.A., Hanssen, J., 2012. Quantum-mechanical predictions of DNA and RNA ionization by energetic proton beams. *Phys. Med. Biol.* 57, 2081–2099.
- Lekadir, H., Abbas, I., Champion, C., Fojón, O.A., Rivarola, R.D., Hanssen, J., 2009. Single electron LOS cross sections of DNA/RNA bases impacted by energetic multi-charged ions: a classical trajectory Monte Carlo approach. *Phys. Rev. A* 79, 062710.
- Monti, J.M., Fojón, O.A., Hanssen, J., Rivarola, R.D., 2010. Influence of the dynamic screening on single-electron ionization of multi-electron atoms. *J. Phys. B At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* 43, 205203.
- Olivera, G.H., Fainstein, P.D., Rivarola, R.D., 1996. Contribution from the inner shell of water vapour to dose profiles under proton and alpha particle irradiation. *Phys. Med. Biol.* 41, 1633–1647.
- Rivarola, R.D., Salin, A., 1984. K-shell one-electron capture in asymmetric collisions at intermediate and high energies. *J. Phys. B At. Mol. Phys.* 17, 659–669.
- Stolterfoht, N., DuBois, R.D., Rivarola, R.D., 1997. *Electron Emission in Heavy Ion-Atom Collisions*. Springer, New York, NY, USA.
- Tabet, J., Eden, S., Feil, S., Abdoul-Carime, H., Farizon, B., Farizon, M., Ouaskit, S., Märk, T.D., 2010. Absolute total and partial cross sections for ionization of nucleobases by proton impact in the Bragg peak velocity range. *Phys. Rev. A* 82, 022703.