

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

# On the N/O abundance ratio and the progenitor mass for the most luminous planetary nebulae of M 31

Toshiya Ueta (植田 稔也)<sup>1</sup> and Masaaki Otsuka (大塚 雅昭)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Denver, 2112 E Wesley Ave., Denver, CO 80208, USA  
e-mail: toshiya.ueta@du.edu

<sup>2</sup> Okayama Observatory, Kyoto University, Honjo, Kamogata, Asakuchi, Okayama, 719-0232, Japan  
e-mail: otsuka@kusastro.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Received August 12, 2022; Accepted October 9, 2022

## ABSTRACT

**Context.** Plasma diagnostics are the bases of investigation into the physical and chemical properties of line-emitting gaseous systems. **Aims.** To perform plasma diagnostics properly, it is essential to correct the input spectrum for extinction properly. This is simply because determining the degree of extinction is dependent on the physical properties of the line-emitting gas. Hence, both extinction correction and plasma diagnostics have to be performed simultaneously and self-consistently.

**Methods.** By comparing the results of analyses performed for a sample of nine bright planetary nebulae in M 31 with and without the fully iterative self-consistent simultaneous extinction correction and plasma diagnostics, we demonstrate how a seemingly benign initial assumptions for the physical conditions of the line-emitting gas in extinction correction would compromise the results of the entire analyses in terms of the extinction, electron density/temperature, and ionic/elemental abundances.

**Results.** While the electron density/temperature are relatively immune to the imposed inconsistent assumptions, the compromised extinction would cause systematic offsets in the extinction-corrected line strengths/spectrum, which consequently would impose adverse effects on the resulting ionic and elemental abundances, and other inferences made from the incorrect results.

**Conclusions.** We find that this M 31 PN sample simply represents those around the high-mass end of the mass range for low-mass planetary nebula progenitor stars as expected from the existing theoretical models. It appears that the suspicion raised in the previous study – these PNe being anomalously nitrogen overabundant for the expected progenitor mass range – is simply caused by the apparent underestimate in extinction that originates from the imposed inconsistent assumptions in extinction correction. In a larger context, the results of plasma diagnostics in the literature without seeking simultaneous self-consistency with extinction correction have to be handled cautiously. Ideally, such previous results should be re-evaluated by seeking simultaneous self-consistency.

**Key words.** Methods: data analysis – Techniques: spectroscopic – planetary nebulae: individual: M1687, M2068, M2538, M50, M1596, M2471, M2860, M1074, M1675 – circumstellar matter – ISM: abundances – dust, extinction

## 1. Introduction

In a recent article “On the most luminous planetary nebulae of M 31,” Galera-Rosillo et al. (2022, hereafter GR22) have presented the results of plasma diagnostics of planetary nebulae (PNe) in the Andromeda Galaxy (M 31). The analyses were based on optical spectra of nine bright PNe (the brightest four, plus five others as control cases) taken with the OSIRIS instrument at the 10.4 m Gran Telescopio Canarias (GTC) supplemented by archival spectra. Their study was aimed at investigating the physico-chemical properties of these PNe and the progenitor mass of the central stars expected to be at the tip of the PN luminosity function (PNLF; Jacoby 1980).

The nine bright PNe in M 31 in question have been found to have achieved the maximum temperature as suggested by the post-AGB evolutionary tracks for stars with initial mass of  $\sim 1.5 M_{\odot}$ , providing spectroscopic constraints for the stellar progenitors that define the PNLF cutoff for M 31 and for other similar star-forming galaxies. However, these PNe have also been found with the N/O abundance ratio that is 1.5 to 3 times larger than predicted for such stars (of  $\sim 1.5 M_{\odot}$  initial mass), indicating possible limitations for the existing theoretical models.

Meanwhile, our recent examination on a specific PN case has indicated that, unless both extinction correction and plasma diagnostics are performed simultaneously and self-consistently, the results of the subsequent abundance analyses can be off by tens of percents (Ueta & Otsuka 2021). For emission-line objects, the degree of extinction,  $c(H\beta)$ ,<sup>1</sup> is typically estimated by comparing the observed (attenuated) diagnostic line flux ratio (usually of a Balmer H line pair, most often the  $H\alpha$ -to- $H\beta$  line flux ratio) with its theoretical (unattenuated) counterpart.

This is a classic chicken-and-egg problem, because the theoretical H line ratio – the basis for extinction correction – is actually dependent on the electron density ( $n_e$ ) and temperature ( $T_e$ ) of the line emitting gas, which are the very quantities to be determined via plasma diagnostics that must be performed *after extinction is properly corrected*. Therefore, to achieve the maximum self-consistency, the theoretical H line ratio used in extinction correction must be updated simultaneously and iteratively with  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  obtained in plasma diagnostics until they converge to the optimum values. However, such an approach has

<sup>1</sup> The base-10 power-law index  $c(\lambda)$  as in  $I(\lambda) = I_0(\lambda) \times 10^{-c(\lambda)} = I_0(\lambda) \times 10^{-c(H\beta)(1+f(\lambda))}$  referenced at  $H\beta$ . Here,  $I(\lambda)$  and  $I_0(\lambda)$  are the observed (attenuated) and intrinsic (unattenuated) specific flux at  $\lambda$  and  $f(\lambda)$  refers to the adopted extinction law.

been seldom practiced in the literature for some unknown reasons, most likely to alleviate the volume of non-linear numerical calculations when computational resources were still scarce (Ueta 2022). At any rate, it is simply incorrect to perform extinction correction just once with some assumed  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  before performing plasma diagnostics.

In the recent M31 work by GR22, the  $H\alpha$ -to- $H\beta$  line ratio was fixed to 2.86 (equivalent to assuming  $T_e = 10^4$  K and  $n_e = 10^3$  cm $^{-3}$ ) in deriving the extinction,  $c(H\beta)$ , irrespective of what the subsequent plasma diagnostics suggested for  $n_e$  and  $T_e$ . Here, we opt to demonstrate how this widely adopted initial assumption – the fixed  $H\alpha$ -to- $H\beta$  line ratio – would influence the results of extinction correction and plasma diagnostics as well as any subsequent inferences based on the results of these analyses.

## 2. Analyses

We adopt the measured (uncorrected) line fluxes of these nine PNe in M31 as presented by GR22 (from their Table A.1). Regrettably, these fluxes are given in only three significant figures and without measurement uncertainties. As for uncertainties, GR22 stated that “total errors were determined from the quadratic propagation of the measured statistical errors of the spectra, which in general decrease from blue toward red, plus an estimated additional 3 % of the measured flux in order to account for systematic errors, which include continuum determination, flux calibration and, although less important, wavelength calibration uncertainties.” Thus, without exact uncertainties to quote, we choose to assume 5 % uncertainty across the spectrum.

For the rest of the analyses, we follow the same procedure as outlined by GR22 as long as they are described. The apparent deviation is adopting the self-consistent  $H\alpha$ -to- $H\beta$  line ratio in extinction correction according to the updated  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  from plasma diagnostics in order to guarantee simultaneous self-consistency between extinction correction and plasma diagnostics. Both extinction correction and plasma diagnostics are performed with PYNEB (Luridiana et al. 2015) using the same atomic parameter set (PYNEB\_18\_01, as summarized in Tables 4 and 6 by GR22). Uncertainties are assessed statistically by computing 1500 Monte Carlo simulations while allowing input line fluxes with Gaussian uncertainties.

Also, we assume a two-component nebula with high- and low-excitation regions characterized by the cut-off ionization potential (IP) of 17 eV. Transitions above this IP cut-off are considered of high-excitation and computed  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  derived from the [O III]  $\lambda 4363/\lambda 4959$  and [Ar IV]  $\lambda 4711/\lambda 4740$  diagnostic line ratios, while those below (of low-excitation) are calculated with the [N II]  $\lambda 5755/\lambda 6548$  and [S II]  $\lambda 6716/\lambda 6731$  diagnostic line ratios. A minor exception adopted by GR22 was that they used  $T_e$ ([O III]) even for low-excitation regions when  $T_e$ ([N II]) resulted with uncertainties greater than  $\sim 2,000$  K (for M2068 and M1675). As shown below, we do not make any such exceptions because uncertainties are below 1,200 K in our analyses.

## 3. Extinction Correction

To verify that the results of our analyses can be compared squarely with those by GR22, we first emulate only a single run of extinction correction and plasma diagnostics as was performed by GR22. This means that  $T_e$  and  $n_e$  are fixed in extinction correction at  $10^4$  K and  $10^3$  cm $^{-3}$ , respectively (equivalent to adopting the fixed theoretical  $H\alpha$ -to- $H\beta$  line ratio of 2.86) under the same extinction law (Cardelli et al. 1989) and the total-to-selective extinction ratio,  $R_V$ , of 3.1. Then,  $T_e$  and  $n_e$  are iterated

**Table 1.** The extinction  $c(H\beta)$  toward nine bright PNe in M31. Listed are values as computed by GR22, GR22-emulated by us (Emulated), and fully iterated by us (Full). Also listed are the GDRE values.

PN	GR22	Emulated	Full	GDRE
M1687	0.20±0.06	0.20±0.03	0.24±0.02	0.26±0.06
M2068	0.13±0.06	0.15±0.02	0.37±0.02	0.25±0.07
M2538	0.00±0.00	0.06±0.01	0.35±0.10	0.04±0.01
M50	0.19±0.06	0.20±0.03	0.28±0.02	0.11±0.01
M1596	0.17±0.06	0.18±0.02	0.20±0.02	0.10±0.03
M2471	0.04±0.06	0.09±0.01	0.34±0.04	0.07±0.01
M2860	0.10±0.06	0.12±0.01	0.54±0.08	0.08±0.01
M1074	0.11±0.06	0.12±0.01	0.21±0.02	0.31±0.06
M1675	0.23±0.06	0.23±0.03	0.54±0.05	0.26±0.06

only in plasma diagnostics. In other words, plasma diagnostic would find optimum  $T_e$  and  $n_e$  via iteration, but only after diagnostic lines are extinction-corrected with  $c(H\beta)$  based on the pre-fixed  $T_e = 10^4$  K and  $n_e = 10^3$  cm $^{-3}$  (hence, the optimum  $T_e$  and  $n_e$  are most likely inconsistent with the presumed  $T_e$  and  $n_e$ ). With this emulated procedure established, the only difference is the adopted input flux uncertainties. As shown in Table 1, our  $c(H\beta)$  values (“Emulated”) in this verification are generally consistent with those obtained by GR22 (within  $94.0 \pm 6.5$  %). Thus, we consider that our calculations do reproduce the results obtained by GR22 reasonably well, and hence, all comparisons that follow are indeed valid.

In Table 1, we also quote the  $c(H\beta)$  values according to the NASA/IPAC Infrared Science Archive Galactic Dust Reddening and Extinction (GDRE) service (based on the SDSS spectra; Schlafly & Finkbeiner 2011).<sup>2</sup> The GDRE values are the mean  $c(H\beta)$  value within a sampling circle of 5 arcmin radius toward each of the nine M31 PNe, accounting for extinction from all but the circumstellar component for each PN, i.e., the interstellar component in both the Milky Way and M31 and the intragalactic component between the Milky Way and M31. Thus, the GDRE value may overestimate the M31 interstellar component because it accounts for extinction along the line of sight *even beyond* the target PN. At any rate, our fully iterated  $c(H\beta)$  values (“Full”) turn out generally greater than the GDRE values, corroborating the presence of non-zero circumstellar extinction component that varies a lot from object to object (from 0.46 to 0.1, corresponding to 65 to 20 % attenuation). This means that individual circumstellar  $c(H\beta)$  value cannot just be neglected or generically assumed: it must be computed for each object self-consistently. At a minimum, extinction correction with fixed  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  appears already dubious.

On the whole, direct comparisons between the GR22 values and our fully iterative results show that  $c(H\beta)$  by GR22 was more than 50 % underestimated ( $52.5 \pm 31.2$  %) with individual variations from 12.6 to 88.3 %. Because  $c(\lambda)$  is the base-10 power-law index varying non-linearly across the spectrum, the impact of offsets in  $c(\lambda)$  is hard to gauge unless actually calculated. The extinction-corrected line fluxes based on the fully iterative  $c(H\beta)$  are listed in Tables A.1 and A.2, along with the original-to-revised ratio for comparison. We see that the GR22 fluxes were underestimated (not sufficiently extinction-corrected) by up to 20 % at the shortest [O III]  $\lambda 3727$  line and overestimated (excessively extinction-corrected) by up to 59 % at the longest [Ar III]  $\lambda 7751$  line.

<sup>2</sup> <https://irsa.ipac.caltech.edu/applications/DUST/>

#### 4. Plasma Diagnostics: Physical Conditions

The resulting optimized  $n_e$  and  $T_e$ , after full iteration of extinction correction and plasma diagnostics, are summarized in Table A.3. Convergence is achieved in less than or equal to 4 iterations in all cases. The ratio column shows comparisons between the GR22 values to ours. No PN shows more than two- $\sigma$  deviations after one full iteration in both  $T_e([\text{O III}])$  and  $T_e([\text{N II}])$ . This stability of  $T_e$  seems to stem from the fact that the  $T_e$ -diagnostic is not only insensitive to  $n_e$  (which is why it works as the  $T_e$  diagnostic), but also varies only slightly in  $T_e$  in the  $n_e$ - $T_e$  diagnostic plane for the given diagnostic line ratio.

The  $n_e([\text{S II}])$  values agree remarkably well ( $100 \pm 3\%$  agreement), neglecting two very deviant cases (substantially overestimated by 177 and 235% for M2068 and M1675, respectively). For these two deviant PNe, GR22 found very large uncertainties (not explicitly defined). So do we with about 50% uncertainties. Meanwhile, the  $n_e([\text{Ar IV}])$  values were overestimated by GR22 ( $141.2 \pm 24.8\%$ ). This seems to have been caused by the  $c(\text{H}\beta)$  underestimates in mitigating He I  $\lambda 4713$  line contamination in the  $[\text{Ar IV}] \lambda 4711$  line flux, as will be described below.

Given the overall rough consistency among the  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  values obtained with and without fully iterative calculations, especially the rather invariant  $T_e$  results, one may be tempted to forgo seeking convergence in extinction correction. In determining  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  in plasma diagnostics, one tends to think of it as “fitting” for which the optimum values are found from a free excursion in the  $n_e$ - $T_e$  space. In reality, however, the applicable range of  $n_e$  is also rather restricted, because the  $n_e$ -diagnostic curve varies from one limiting ratio to another within a narrow range of  $n_e$  given the choice of the  $n_e$ -diagnostic line.

In the  $n_e$ - $T_e$  space, *given the measured line ratios of the adopted diagnostic lines*, where the solution exists (i.e. where diagnostic curves intersect) is already set. Hence, what “fitting” does in the  $n_e$ - $T_e$  space is to find the optimally closest ( $n_e$ ,  $T_e$ ) point to the intersection of the diagnostic curves within measurement uncertainties. In this sense, it is expected that plasma diagnostics with the measured line ratios would yield more or less the same  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  values, irrespective of the rigorousness in the preceding extinction correction. A true exploration of the  $n_e$ - $T_e$  space can only be done by allowing the measured diagnostic line ratios vary according to  $c(\text{H}\beta)$ . This relative insensitivity of  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  against plasma diagnostics probably fostered a sense of “lessez-faire” in the community to the extent that the theoretical  $\text{H}\alpha$ -to- $\text{H}\beta$  line ratio of 2.86 is referred to as “canonical” when there is no canonicity whatsoever to this value. As we will see below, omitting iteration in extinction correction is not at all a viable option, because the resulting  $c(\text{H}\beta)$  offset would seriously impact the rest of the plasma diagnostics.

#### 5. Plasma Diagnostics: Ionic Abundances

As for calculating ionic abundances with PyNEB, we again follow GR22 as much as possible even though sometimes the procedure was not explicitly described. The derived ionic abundances for all the input collisionally excited lines and He recombination lines are summarized in Tables A.4 and A.5, even though GR22 presented only a subset of lines in their Table A.2.

Theoretically speaking, ionic abundances derived from the same ionic transitions should turn out identical given the adopted  $n_e$  and  $T_e$ . In the literature, this is not necessarily accomplished. Discrepancies among derived ionic abundances for a particular ionic species are often attributed to local temperature (and density) fluctuations in the line-emitting gas. This attribution is ac-

tually very odd, especially when the fixed “canonical”  $\text{H}\alpha$ -to- $\text{H}\beta$  line ratio of 2.86 is adopted (i.e., the uniform  $n_e$  at  $10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  and  $T_e$  at  $10^4 \text{ K}$  are imposed). If we are to believe varying  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  in the target nebula along the line of sight, assuming the “canonical” uniformity in  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  in extinction correction is equivalent to *injecting inconsistency* into the analyses in the first place. This is even worse in analysing 2-D plasma diagnostics with line emission maps, in which spatial variation is surely expected by default. At any rate, when ionic abundances derived from multiple lines of an ionic specie vary, some sort of averaging needs to be done to define a representative value. GR22 took the straight average, while we take the uncertainty-weighted mean.

Our derived ionic abundances show good self-consistency nearly across the board: the derived abundances for most of the ionic species all agree within uncertainties. In all major transitions to be used in calculating the total elemental abundances ( $\text{He}^+$ ,  $\text{He}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{O}^+$ , and  $\text{O}^{2+}$ ) with the help of the ionization correction factors (ICFs; Delgado-Inglauda et al. 2014), the derived ionic abundances are consistent with each other except for  $\text{O}^+$  from M1675, for which the  $[\text{O II}] \lambda 7320$  line was not measured among the trio of  $[\text{O II}]$  lines at 3727, 7320, and 7330 Å. Among this  $\text{O}^+$  trio, the  $[\text{O II}] \lambda 3727$  line<sup>3</sup> is located at the blue-end of the detector bandwidth, while the  $[\text{O II}] \lambda 7330$  is at the red-end. Not knowing which is more accurate between the two, we simply take the uncertainty-weighted mean as others.

GR22 obtained  $\text{O}^+$  abundances that were very discrepant (see their Table A.2). The  $\text{O}^+ \lambda 3772$  abundance came out to be less than half of the  $\text{O}^+ \lambda 7320/7330$  abundances, except for the recurring anomalous case of M2068 (for which the former was 2.5 times greater). There is a simple explanation as to why the  $\text{O}^+ \lambda 3772$  abundance came out much smaller: the underestimated  $c(\text{H}\beta)$ . Here, it is reminded that what counts is a ratio of given line flux *relative* to  $\text{H}\beta$  flux. The  $[\text{O II}] \lambda 3772$  is on the short-ward of  $\text{H}\beta$ , and hence, the extinction-corrected flux is underestimated (i.e., not corrected enough by the underestimated  $c(\text{H}\beta)$ ). On the other hand, the  $[\text{O II}] \lambda 7320/7330$  are on the long-ward of  $\text{H}\beta$ , and hence, the extinction-corrected flux is overestimated (i.e., not reduced enough by the underestimated  $c(\text{H}\beta)$ ). As a result, the underestimated  $c(\text{H}\beta)$  leads to under/over-estimated abundances on the opposite sides of the reference  $\text{H}\beta$  wavelength (as seen in Tables A.4 and A.5). The  $\text{O}^+$  abundance adopted by GR22 appears to have been biased toward an overestimate, as the  $[\text{O II}] \lambda 7320/7330$  lines are much farther away from  $\text{H}\beta$  than the  $[\text{O II}] \lambda 3772$  line.

The  $\text{He}^+$  and  $\text{He}^{2+}$  abundances by GR22 suffered from the same issue, because the  $\text{He}^+$  abundance was adopted from the He I  $\lambda 5876$  (hence, tended to be overestimated) and the  $\text{He}^{2+}$  abundance from the He I  $\lambda 4686$  (hence, tended to be underestimated). This trending is also seen in Tables A.4 and A.5. These observations reveal that anomalies in abundance analyses would arise not from offsets in the  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  values, but rather from the possible under/over-estimate by the underestimated  $c(\text{H}\beta)$  on either side of the reference wavelength of  $\text{H}\beta$  at 4861 Å. GR22 also used the corrected  $\text{He}^+$  and  $\text{He}^{2+}$  fluxes to constrain  $T_{\text{eff}}$  in comparison with theoretical models. Hence, the impact of an  $c(\text{H}\beta)$  offset can be seen at many different places in the analyses.

As for the rest of the observed lines, we find derived abundances somewhat discrepant for  $\text{Ar}^{2+}$  (7136/7751 Å),  $\text{Cl}^{2+}$  (5518/5538 Å), and  $\text{S}^+$  (4069/4076 Å). The  $[\text{Ar III}] \lambda 7751$  line is located at the red-end of the bandwidth and appears relatively strongly affected by the atmospheric absorption (by the  $\text{O}_2$  band

<sup>3</sup> The  $[\text{O II}] \lambda 3727$  line is actually a blend of two lines at 3726 and 3729 Å. In our calculations, it is treated as a blend.

around 8000 Å, verified in the OSIRIS 2-D spectrum itself). The [Cl III] lines are intrinsically weak (about  $\sim 1$  when  $I(\text{H}\beta) = 100$ ). As for the [S II] lines, GR22 referred the [S II]  $\lambda 4076$  line as the [S II]  $\lambda 4071$  line, and hence, the line identification might have been compromised. As these ionic abundances are not directly involved in the subsequent elemental abundance calculations, we leave them as they are. However, these ionic abundances, if incorrect, will affect the corresponding elemental abundances in the end. At any event, there always seem some reasonable explanations as to why the derived abundances are discrepant.

However, there is more subtle but involved complications in the [Ar IV]  $\lambda 4711/\lambda 4740$  lines, which play an important role in the present analyses as the high-excitation  $n_e$ -diagnostic lines. The [Ar IV]  $\lambda 4711$  is contaminated by the neighboring He I  $\lambda 4713$  line, whose strength needs to be estimated by scaling the He I  $\lambda 5876$  measurement (the strongest, hence, the most reliable of all the detected He lines) at the corresponding  $n_e$  and  $T_e$ . Thus, the [Ar IV]  $\lambda 4711$  measurement is unavoidably underestimated when the He I  $\lambda 5876$  measurement is overestimated by the underestimated  $c(\text{H}\beta)$ . Hence, the [Ar IV]  $\lambda 4711$  line flux corrected for the He I  $\lambda 4713$  contamination by GR22 was most likely doubly affected by this mechanism. This indeed artificially reduced the [Ar IV]  $\lambda 4711/\lambda 4740$  ratio for GR22, forcing the resulting  $n_e$  become larger by  $141.2 \pm 24.8\%$ .

By the same token, the [O III]  $\lambda 4363/\lambda 4959$   $T_e$ -diagnostic ratio obtained by GR22 was at least mildly affected by the underestimated  $c(\text{H}\beta)$ : the ratio was artificially reduced, forcing the resulting  $T_e$  become smaller by  $96.5 \pm 2.0\%$  (Table A.3), which is still an underestimate. Conversely, other  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  diagnostics did not seem to suffer from the underestimated  $c(\text{H}\beta)$ , because in these cases with the [N II]  $\lambda 5755/\lambda 6548$  and [S II]  $\lambda 6716/\lambda 6731$  lines for the low-excitation region the lines are on the same side of  $\text{H}\beta$  and not far from each other. Thus, the effects of the underestimated  $c(\text{H}\beta)$  were marginalised.

## 6. Plasma Diagnostics: Elemental Abundances

As the final step of plasma diagnostics, the total elemental abundances are computed from the derived ionic abundances in terms of  $A(X) = 12 + \log(X/H)$  (Table A.6). First, we emulate GR22 by adopting the same ICFs (Delgado-Inglada et al. 2014) with the derived ionic abundances of  $\text{O}^+$  and  $\text{O}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{N}^+$ ,  $\text{Ne}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{S}^+$ ,  $\text{Ar}^{2+}$ , and  $\text{Cl}^{2+}$ . However, there are unused ionic species such as  $\text{S}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Ar}^{3+}$ , and  $\text{Ar}^{4+}$  in the analyses. In fact, it is rather strange that the  $\text{Ar}^{3+}$  abundance was not used by GR22, because [Ar IV] was adopted as the  $n_e$  diagnostic. Because the Ar abundance can work as an important metallicity indicator, there is no reason not to adopt all three measured Ar ionic species to reduce reliance/uncertainty of the ICF. Hence, we also compute the total elemental abundances by adopting all observed ionic abundances. In this case, the adopted ICFs are still based on those suggested by Delgado-Inglada et al. (2014) except for Ar, for which we assume  $\text{Ar} = \text{Ar}^{2+} + \text{Ar}^{3+} + \text{Ar}^{4+}$ .

In the ICF formulation, to yield the total elemental abundance, the sum of the observed ionic abundances for a specific element has to be scaled to account for the unobserved ionic species. These scaling factors are empirically defined as functions of He and O ionic abundances ( $\text{He}^+$ ,  $\text{He}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{O}^+$ , and  $\text{O}^{2+}$ ; Delgado-Inglada et al. 2014). This means that the reliability of the observed ionic abundances depends on the derived abundances of these He and O ionic species.

The O elemental abundance is based on the observed  $\text{O}^+$  and  $\text{O}^{2+}$  ionic abundances. Both of the  $\text{O}^+$  and  $\text{O}^{2+}$  abundances are based on three lines, [O II] lines at 3727, 7320, and 7330 Å and

**Table 2.** Comparison of the best-fit luminosity ( $L_*$  in  $\log(L_*/L_\odot)$ ), surface temperature ( $T_{\text{eff}}$  in  $\log(T_{\text{eff}})$ ), and initial mass ( $M_i$  in  $M_\odot$ ) of the central star for the M 31 PN sample, based on CLOUDY model fitting constrained by the extinction-corrected line fluxes by GR22 (the solar metallicity of  $Z = 0.02$  assumed for all) and us (an appropriate metallicity in the range of  $Z = 0.003 - 0.009$  informed from abundance analyses adopted for each PN; Otsuka & Ueta *in prep.*).

PN	GR22			Otsuka & Ueta		
	$L_*$	$T_{\text{eff}}$	$M_i$	$L_*$	$T_{\text{eff}}$	$M_i$
M1687	3.66	5.06	1.48	3.87	5.01	1.9
M2068	3.62	5.05	1.34	4.04	5.01	2.4
M2538	3.65	5.11	1.56	4.03	5.07	2.4
M50	3.59	5.13	1.42	3.88	5.08	2.0
M1596	3.49	5.22	1.76	3.75	5.11	1.6
M2471	3.50	5.20	1.70	3.82	5.10	1.7
M2860	3.51	5.08	1.20	3.97	5.03	2.2
M1074	3.50	5.03	1.12	3.76	5.00	1.4
M1675	3.60	5.10	1.39	4.05	5.05	2.6

[O III] lines at 4363, 4959, and 5007 Å, respectively. As these lines are distributed on both sides of  $\text{H}\beta$  at 4861 Å, the effects of the underestimated  $c(\text{H}\beta)$  was most likely marginal even in the results by GR22. Indeed, the median O abundance among the nine PN sample obtained by GR22 was  $8.63 \pm 0.09$ , while ours is  $8.59 \pm 0.08$ : fairly consistent with relatively small uncertainties. This does not necessarily mean that the O abundance is insensitive to the  $c(\text{H}\beta)$  discrepancy. The present PN sample is of high-excitation, and hence, their O abundance is relatively less dependent on the more uncertain low-excitation  $\text{O}^+$  abundance. If targets are of low-excitation, the relative importance of the more uncertain  $\text{O}^+$  abundance would be greater, and hence, the O abundance would have been compromised by the  $c(\text{H}\beta)$  discrepancy.

On the other hand, the N elemental abundance is based solely on the observed  $\text{N}^+$  ionic abundance. All three [N II] lines at 5755, 6548, and 6583 Å are located on the red-side of  $\text{H}\beta$ . Hence, their line fluxes and ionic abundances were most likely overestimated by GR22 because of the underestimated  $c(\text{H}\beta)$ . The median N elemental abundance obtained was  $8.27 \pm 0.38$  by GR22, while ours is  $7.99 \pm 0.35$ : this is a factor of 1.9 difference. While the two are statistically indifferent given the relatively large deviation, the difference in the elemental abundance amounts to nearly 90%. When both of the N and O elemental abundances are combined to assess the N/O abundance ratio, the values come out to be  $0.40 \pm 0.30$  (by GR22) and  $0.28 \pm 0.16$  (by us). Again, these are statistically indifferent, but the absolute difference is an overestimate at nearly 30%.

It was further argued by GR22 that the derived N/O ratio for the M 31 PN sample was 1.5–3 times greater than expected for PNe of the  $\sim 1.5 M_\odot$  initial mass based on comparisons with theoretical models (Karakas & Lugaro 2016; Miller Bertolami 2016; Ventura et al. 2018), even referring to possible limitations of the existing models. However, we can simply interpret this as another consequence of the underestimated  $c(\text{H}\beta)$ , which artificially *reddened* the whole spectra of target PNe.

Table 2 lists the best-fit luminosity ( $L_*$ ), surface temperature ( $T_{\text{eff}}$ ), and initial mass ( $M_i$ ) of the central star, obtained via CLOUDY model fitting by GR22 (with the  $c(\text{H}\beta)$  underestimate, and the fixed solar metallicity of  $Z = 0.02$  assumed for all PNe) and by us (without the  $c(\text{H}\beta)$  underestimate, and an appropriate metallicity in the range of  $Z = 0.003 - 0.009$  informed from abundance analyses adopted for each PN; Otsuka & Ueta, *in*

*prep.*). As has been discussed above, the apparent  $c(H\beta)$  underestimate imposed false reddening in the previous analyses. Hence, the revised models naturally suggest greater  $L_*$  (by a factor of two on average). Correspondingly, the expected initial progenitor mass for the nine-PN sample comes out to be greater.

Especially, the brightest four PNe in M 31 (M1687, M2068, M2538, and M50) are now appropriately found to be the most massive among the low-mass progenitors ( $1.9 - 2.4 M_\odot$  with the average of  $2.2 M_\odot$ , as opposed to  $1.3 - 1.6 M_\odot$  with the average of  $1.5 M_\odot$ ). For such relatively higher-mass progenitors, we would indeed expect comparatively enhanced N/O abundance ratios. However, they are by no means N over-abundant as in Type I PN (Peimbert & Torres-Peimbert 1983). Therefore, the present results from fully iterative self-consistent extinction correction and plasma diagnostics are in reasonable agreement with what is predicted by the existing theoretical models. There is no need for a greater amount of N from low-mass progenitors.

## 7. Concluding Remarks

Plasma diagnostics determine the physico-chemical conditions of line-emitting objects in terms of  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  as well as ionic and elemental abundances. Because  $c(H\beta)$  is directly influenced by  $n_e$  and  $T_e$ ,  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  must be determined self-consistently via an iterative search for convergence through both extinction correction and plasma diagnostics. In the present exercise, we have demonstrated, for a sample of nine bright PNe in M 31, how inconsistently assumed  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  in extinction correction can affect the results of the subsequent plasma diagnostics.

If  $c(H\beta)$  is not iteratively updated, and given the measured line fluxes, the resulting  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  values are more or less fixed as soon as the  $n_e$ - and  $T_e$ -diagnostic lines are selected. If  $c(H\beta)$  is not determined properly, observed line fluxes above and below the reference  $H\beta$  wavelength can be over/under-corrected depending on their wavelengths. Consequently, diagnostic line ratios can be erroneously amplified/reduced especially when the lines involved are taken from both sides of  $H\beta$ . This practically means that the derived ionic and elemental abundances can be unreliable, even though the resulting  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  values may still appear reasonable. Moreover, the results of model calculations would be equally compromised, especially when such wrongly extinction-corrected lines are used as constraints.

For the present case of the nine bright PN sample in M 31, we have been able to attribute the differences between the previous and present results to  $c(H\beta)$  that was underestimated more than 50 % in the previous analyses. It was because the  $H\alpha$ -to- $H\beta$  line ratio was assumed to be fixed at 2.86 (equivalent to assuming  $n_e = 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  and  $T_e = 10^4 \text{ K}$ ) in extinction correction even when the final  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  were different. We have also shown that the underestimated  $c(H\beta)$  inflicted inconsistencies in the derived ionic and elemental abundances as well as the subsequent photoionization model calculations. In the end, we have established that this bright M 31 PN sample represents the high-mass end of the low-mass PN progenitor stars of less than solar metallicities. Hence, no anomalous N overabundance has been found to suspect any irregularities in the existing evolutionary models as was hinted at with the previous analyses.

More specifically, the N/O abundance ratio can be significantly affected in plasma diagnostics based on optical spectra, if  $c(H\beta)$  is not determined properly. For the present case, the previously suspected N overabundance was simply caused by the underestimated  $c(H\beta)$ . The empirical N abundance is based almost exclusively on the  $[N II]$  lines around  $6000 \text{ \AA}$  (5755 and

6548/83  $\text{\AA}$ ), on the much redder side of the reference wavelength at  $H\beta$ . Therefore, the  $[N II]$  line strengths, and hence, the N abundance can be artificially inflated when  $c(H\beta)$  is underestimated. In the mean time, the O abundance, based on multiple lines of multiple ionic species scattered across the optical spectrum on either side of  $H\beta$ , is relatively insensitive to the apparent  $c(H\beta)$  underestimate. For example, the N/O ratio is often used as an indicator of the initial stellar mass based on predictions made by theoretical models (e.g. Karakas & Lugaro 2016; Miller Bertolami 2016; Ventura et al. 2018). Hence, the erroneously estimated N/O ratio can lead to a variety of wrong conclusions beyond the physico-chemical conditions of the target PNe. This issue is of course not isolated in PNe and can happen in any line-emitting objects. Therefore, caution must be exercised when quoting abundances from the literature.

To summarize, the general lessons learned are;

- The quality of the input spectra is of course important. Especially, line fluxes should be free from any anomalies such as the atmospheric dispersion, sky emission/absorption, etc.
- Extinction correction and plasma diagnostics should be performed simultaneously and self-consistently through full iteration, with a careful choice of diagnostic lines.
- It is best to incorporate as many lines as possible in the analyses, especially from either side of the reference wavelength of extinction correction (typically at  $H\beta$ ).
- The adverse effects of not performing extinction correction and plasma diagnostics self-consistently do not necessarily incur in the resulting  $n_e$  and  $T_e$ , but would be more likely in the resulting ionic and elemental abundances via diagnostic line ratios compromised by the wrongly derived  $c(H\beta)$ .
- The incorrectly determined  $c(H\beta)$  would systematically redden or blue the input spectrum and affect the outcomes of any subsequent analyses.
- Abundances in the literature need to be treated with care, unless plasma diagnostics were performed self-consistently in conjunction with extinction correction. It may be worthwhile to re-evaluate abundances via self-consistent extinction correction and plasma diagnostics, especially when anomalies are reported in the previous results.

*Acknowledgements.* This research made use of the NASA/IPAC Infrared Science Archive Galactic Dust Reddening and Extinction (GDRE) service and PyNeb, a toolset dedicated to the analysis of emission lines (Luridiana et al. 2015). T.U. was supported partially by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) through its invitation fellowship program (FY2020; L20505). M.O. was supported by JSPS Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research(C) (JP19K03914 and 22K03675). Authors thank the anonymous referee, whose inputs helped to clarify some critical points in the manuscript.

## References

- Cardelli, J. A., Clayton, G. C., & Mathis, J. S. 1989, *ApJ*, 345, 245 (12 pp.)  
 Ciardullo, R. 2013, in *Proceedings of IAU Symp. 289: Advancing the Physics of Cosmic Distances*, ed. R. de Grijs (Cambridge: CUP), p.247 (8 pp.)  
 Delgado-Inglada, G., Morisset, C., & Stasińska, G. 2014, *MNRAS*, 440, 536 (19 pp.)  
 Galera-Rosillo, R., Mampaso, A., Corradi, R. L. M., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 657, A71 (20 pp.)  
 Izotov, Y. I., Stasińska, G., Meynet, G., et al. 2006, *A&A*, 448, 955 (16 pp.)  
 Jacoby, G. H. 1980, *ApJS*, 42, 1 (18 pp.)  
 Karakas, A. I., & Lugaro, M. 2016, *ApJ*, 825, 26 (22 pp.)  
 Luridiana, V., Morisset, C., & Shaw, R. A. 2015, *A&A*, 573, A42 (14 pp.)  
 Miller Bertolami, M. M. 2016, *A&A*, 588, A25 (21 pp.)  
 Peimbert, M., & Torres-Peimbert, S. 1983, in *Proceedings of IAU Symp. 103: Planetary Nebulae*, ed. D. R. Flower (Dordrecht: Reidel), p.233 (10 pp.)  
 Schlafly, E. F., & Finkbeiner, D. P. 2011, *ApJ*, 737, 103 (13 pp.)  
 Ueta, T. 2022, *Galaxies*, 10, 30 (8 pp.)  
 Ueta, T., & Otsuka, M. 2021, *PASP*, 133, 093002 (27 pp.)  
 Ventura, P., Karakas, A., Dell’Agli, F., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 475, 2282 (27 pp.)

## Appendix A: Supplemental Materials

Table A.1. Extinction-Corrected Line Fluxes and Original-to-Revised Ratios for the Brightest Four PNe in M 31

Line	M1687	Ratio	M2068	Ratio	M2538	Ratio	M50	Ratio
[O II] 3727	21.0 ± 2.3	0.97	50.2 ± 9.4	0.83	66.2 ± 12.1	0.77	53.4 ± 7.2	0.94
H10 3798	...	...	...	...	4.4 ± 0.8	0.77	5.8 ± 0.8	0.94
H9 3835	...	...	6.1 ± 1.1	0.85	8.9 ± 1.6	0.78	5.8 ± 0.8	0.94
[Ne III] 3868	172.7 ± 18.6	0.97	162.0 ± 30.5	0.85	119.3 ± 21.8	0.79	126.3 ± 16.9	0.94
H8 3889 <sup>a</sup>	0.1 ± 1.6	...	2.6 ± 2.8	...	5.7 ± 2.8	...	2.4 ± 2.0	...
[Ne III] 3967 <sup>b</sup>	50.7 ± 6.7	0.97	49.8 ± 11.3	0.81	25.3 ± 6.4	0.66	33.9 ± 5.9	0.92
He I 4026	6.1 ± 0.7	0.97	2.8 ± 0.5	0.87	3.8 ± 0.7	0.81	2.5 ± 0.3	0.95
[S II] 4069	0.0 ± 0.0	...	4.3 ± 0.8	0.88	...	...	3.9 ± 0.5	0.96
[S II] 4076	0.0 ± 0.0	...	2.9 ± 0.5	0.88	...	...	1.1 ± 0.2	0.96
H6 4101 <sup>c</sup>	29.3 ± 3.1	0.98	30.2 ± 5.7	0.88	30.1 ± 5.5	0.83	27.1 ± 3.6	0.95
H5 4340 <sup>d</sup>	48.5 ± 5.2	0.99	50.0 ± 9.4	0.92	50.7 ± 9.3	0.88	46.2 ± 6.2	0.97
[O III] 4363	27.0 ± 2.9	0.99	15.3 ± 2.9	0.92	19.1 ± 3.5	0.88	17.7 ± 2.4	0.98
He I 4472	6.0 ± 0.6	0.99	6.0 ± 1.1	0.94	4.7 ± 0.9	0.91	5.1 ± 0.7	0.98
He II 4686	2.9 ± 0.3	1.00	3.9 ± 0.7	0.97	12.5 ± 2.3	0.96	14.6 ± 1.9	0.99
[Ar IV] 4711 <sup>e</sup>	1.9 ± 0.3	0.99	1.5 ± 0.4	0.91	2.7 ± 0.6	0.93	2.4 ± 0.4	0.98
[Ar IV] 4740	5.3 ± 0.6	1.00	4.1 ± 0.8	0.98	3.4 ± 0.6	0.97	4.4 ± 0.6	0.99
Hβ 4861 <sup>f</sup>	100.0 ± 10.5	1.00	100.0 ± 18.8	1.00	100.0 ± 18.1	1.00	100.0 ± 13.1	1.00
He I 4922	0.9 ± 0.1	1.01	1.4 ± 0.3	1.01	1.0 ± 0.2	1.02	0.7 ± 0.1	1.01
[O III] 4959	599.5 ± 76.7	1.00	506.0 ± 116.2	1.02	461.1 ± 101.9	1.03	543.0 ± 86.9	1.01
[O III] 5007	1774.9 ± 227.0	1.01	1492.0 ± 342.5	1.03	1360.8 ± 300.6	1.04	1606.6 ± 256.9	1.02
[N I] 5198	...	...	...	...	...	...	0.5 ± 0.1	1.01
He II 5411	...	...	...	...	1.4 ± 0.3	1.12	1.4 ± 0.2	1.03
[Cl III] 5518	...	...	...	...	...	...	0.4 ± 0.1	1.04
[Cl III] 5538	...	...	...	...	...	...	0.8 ± 0.1	1.03
[N II] 5755	2.0 ± 0.3	1.02	2.3 ± 0.5	1.11	1.0 ± 0.2	1.18	2.1 ± 0.3	1.04
He I 5876	16.9 ± 2.1	1.02	15.7 ± 3.6	1.12	13.0 ± 2.9	1.19	15.6 ± 2.5	1.04
[O I] 6300	7.5 ± 0.9	1.03	6.3 ± 1.4	1.16	5.0 ± 1.1	1.25	9.1 ± 1.4	1.06
[S III] 6312 <sup>g</sup>	2.1 ± 0.3	1.03	1.7 ± 0.4	1.17	1.7 ± 0.4	1.26	1.6 ± 0.3	1.07
[O I] 6363	2.7 ± 0.3	1.03	2.0 ± 0.5	1.16	2.0 ± 0.4	1.26	2.9 ± 0.5	1.06
[N II] 6548	10.7 ± 1.3	1.04	21.9 ± 5.0	1.18	12.5 ± 2.7	1.29	23.3 ± 3.7	1.07
Hα 6563 <sup>h</sup>	277.3 ± 34.6	1.03	241.7 ± 54.7	1.18	216.3 ± 47.2	1.29	268.1 ± 42.1	1.07
[N II] 6583	27.0 ± 3.4	1.03	63.5 ± 14.4	1.18	36.3 ± 7.9	1.29	67.2 ± 10.5	1.07
He I 6678 <sup>i</sup>	3.6 ± 0.5	1.03	3.7 ± 0.8	1.20	2.9 ± 0.6	1.31	3.4 ± 0.5	1.07
[S II] 6716	1.3 ± 0.2	1.03	1.6 ± 0.4	1.20	2.0 ± 0.4	1.31	2.4 ± 0.4	1.07
[S II] 6730	2.3 ± 0.3	1.03	3.2 ± 0.7	1.20	3.4 ± 0.7	1.31	4.5 ± 0.7	1.07
[Ar V] 7005	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
He I 7065	11.0 ± 1.4	1.04	8.0 ± 1.8	1.23	6.7 ± 1.5	1.36	8.7 ± 1.4	1.08
[Ar III] 7136	9.4 ± 1.2	1.05	13.1 ± 2.9	1.23	7.6 ± 1.6	1.36	13.8 ± 2.1	1.08
He I 7281	0.8 ± 0.1	1.05	0.5 ± 0.1	1.25	1.1 ± 0.2	1.40	0.7 ± 0.1	1.09
[O II] 7320	6.6 ± 0.8	1.04	3.5 ± 0.8	1.25	2.9 ± 0.6	1.40	5.8 ± 0.9	1.09
[O II] 7330	6.5 ± 0.8	1.04	3.4 ± 0.8	1.25	3.0 ± 0.6	1.40	5.2 ± 0.8	1.09
[Ar III] 7751	1.8 ± 0.2	1.05	1.9 ± 0.4	1.29	1.3 ± 0.3	1.47	2.5 ± 0.4	1.10

**Notes.** Contaminating He I and He II lines scaled from He I 5876 and He II 4686, respectively. <sup>(a)</sup> Blend with He I 3889. <sup>(b)</sup> Blend with H7 3970 and He I 3965. <sup>(c)</sup> Blend with He II 4100. <sup>(d)</sup> Blend with He II 4338. <sup>(e)</sup> Blend with He I 4713. <sup>(f)</sup> Blend with He II 4859. <sup>(g)</sup> Blend with He II 6310. <sup>(h)</sup> Blend with He II 6560. <sup>(i)</sup> Blend with He II 6683.

**Table A.2.** Extinction-Corrected Line Fluxes and Original-to-Revised Ratios for the Other Five PNe in M 31

Line	M1596	Ratio	M2471	Ratio	M2860	Ratio	M1074	Ratio	M1675	Ratio
[O II] 3727	65.0±5.3	0.98	78.7±13.7	0.80	28.7±7.5	0.73	20.8± 1.9	0.93	17.8±4.7	0.80
H10 3798	...	...	5.4 ±0.9	0.81	4.3 ±1.1	0.73	...	...	...	...
H9 3835	8.3±0.7	0.98	6.0 ±1.0	0.81	5.1 ±1.3	0.74	7.2 ± 0.7	0.93	5.3 ±1.4	0.81
[Ne III] 3868	127.5±10.4	0.98	141.9±24.6	0.82	115.6±30.2	0.74	118.8± 10.7	0.93	112.4±29.5	0.81
H8 3889 <sup>a</sup>	0.0±1.0	...	10.8±3.1	...	5.5 ±4.0	...	3.7 ± 1.5	...	3.1 ±3.7	4.01
[Ne III] 3967 <sup>b</sup>	38.7±4.0	0.97	44.4±9.3	0.77	45.7±14.3	0.67	35.6± 4.2	0.90	32.7±11.0	0.73
He I 4026	5.6±0.5	0.98	2.7 ±0.5	0.84	4.6 ±1.2	0.78	1.6 ± 0.2	0.94	...	...
[S II] 4069	3.9±0.3	0.98	3.6 ±0.6	0.85	3.5 ±0.9	0.78	2.1 ± 0.2	0.94	...	...
[S II] 4076	...	...	...	...	1.9 ±0.5	0.79	...	...	...	...
H6 4101 <sup>c</sup>	27.3±2.2	0.99	31.3±5.5	0.85	32.8±8.6	0.79	26.0± 2.3	0.94	27.1±7.2	0.85
H5 4340 <sup>d</sup>	47.0±3.8	0.99	50.8±8.9	0.90	51.7±13.7	0.85	46.2± 4.1	0.96	51.7±13.8	0.90
[O III] 4363	20.1±1.6	0.99	18.9±3.3	0.90	11.6±3.1	0.86	17.5± 1.6	0.96	13.9±3.7	0.90
He I 4472	4.3±0.4	0.99	4.1±0.7	0.92	6.1 ±1.6	0.89	5.4 ± 0.5	0.97	4.7 ±1.3	0.92
He II 4686	35.4±2.8	1.00	33.6±5.8	0.97	7.7 ±2.1	0.95	2.7 ± 0.2	0.99	12.8±3.4	0.97
[Ar IV] 4711 <sup>e</sup>	6.4±0.5	1.00	4.2±0.8	0.96	3.1 ±0.9	0.90	1.7 ± 0.2	0.96	3.3 ±1.0	0.94
[Ar IV] 4740	8.1±0.6	1.00	4.8±0.8	0.98	4.5 ±1.2	0.97	3.8 ± 0.3	0.99	4.5 ±1.2	0.98
H $\beta$ 4861 <sup>f</sup>	100.0±7.7	1.00	100.0±17.0	1.00	100.0±26.7	1.00	100.0± 8.7	1.00	100.0±26.7	1.00
He I 4922	...	...	0.7±0.2	1.03	1.3 ±0.4	1.02	...	...	2.4 ±0.8	1.02
[O III] 4959	575.3±54.3	1.02	499.8±103.7	1.03	477.6±156.1	1.03	476.0± 50.8	1.01	510.6±167.0	1.02
[O III] 5007	1717.7±161.9	1.01	1491.1±309.3	1.04	1411.8±461.7	1.04	1429.6±152.4	1.01	1535.9±502.5	1.03
[N I] 5198	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2.1 ±0.7	1.07
He II 5411	3.1±0.3	1.03	2.6±0.5	1.11	0.5 ±0.2	1.15	...	...	...	...
[Cl III] 5518	0.6±0.1	1.02	...	...	0.3 ±0.1	1.16	...	...	...	...
[Cl III] 5538	1.2±0.1	1.03	...	...	0.4 ±0.1	1.18	...	...	...	...
[N II] 5755	2.5±0.2	1.03	0.9 ±0.2	1.16	0.8 ±0.3	1.21	0.5 ± 0.1	1.05	2.3 ±0.8	1.15
He I 5876	14.1±1.3	1.03	10.9±2.2	1.17	13.5±4.4	1.23	16.1± 1.7	1.05	13.9±4.6	1.16
[O I] 6300	7.0±0.6	1.03	6.6 ±1.4	1.22	2.2 ±0.7	1.31	3.6 ± 0.4	1.07	7.7 ±2.5	1.20
[S III] 6312 <sup>g</sup>	4.0±0.4	1.03	1.3 ±0.3	1.24	1.3 ±0.4	1.32	2.1 ± 0.2	1.07	2.2 ±0.7	1.22
[O I] 6363	2.2±0.2	1.04	2.0 ±0.4	1.22	0.9 ±0.3	1.32	1.2 ± 0.1	1.07	2.4 ±0.8	1.22
[N II] 6548	36.4±3.3	1.04	14.7±3.0	1.24	9.0 ±3.0	1.35	5.9 ± 0.6	1.08	29.0±9.5	1.24
H $\alpha$ 6563 <sup>h</sup>	276.2±25.5	1.04	229.0±47.0	1.25	211.0±69.2	1.36	265.3± 27.6	1.08	230.3±75.6	1.24
[N II] 6583	105.8±9.7	1.04	42.4±8.6	1.25	24.8±8.1	1.36	17.1± 1.8	1.08	84.9±27.8	1.24
He I 6678 <sup>i</sup>	3.8±0.4	1.04	2.2 ±0.5	1.29	2.9 ±0.9	1.39	3.5 ± 0.4	1.08	4.2 ±1.4	1.26
[S II] 6716	6.2±0.6	1.04	2.6 ±0.5	1.27	1.5 ±0.5	1.38	1.2 ± 0.1	1.08	3.4 ±1.1	1.26
[S II] 6730	10.6±1.0	1.03	4.4 ±0.9	1.27	2.6 ±0.8	1.39	1.9 ± 0.2	1.08	7.1 ±2.3	1.26
[Ar V] 7005	1.0±0.1	1.04	0.4 ±0.1	1.30	...	...	...	...	...	...
He I 7065	6.7±0.6	1.04	5.2 ±1.1	1.30	5.1 ±1.7	1.45	8.5 ± 0.9	1.09	5.5 ±1.8	1.30
[Ar III] 7136	22.4±2.0	1.04	9.5 ±1.9	1.31	9.9 ±3.2	1.46	7.6 ± 0.8	1.10	11.3±3.7	1.31
He I 7281	...	...	0.5 ±0.1	1.32	0.3 ±0.1	1.51	...	...	...	...
[O II] 7320	4.4±0.4	1.04	3.4 ±0.7	1.34	1.5 ±0.5	1.50	3.7 ± 0.4	1.10	...	...
[O II] 7330	4.0±0.4	1.04	3.1 ±0.6	1.34	1.4 ±0.5	1.50	3.7 ± 0.4	1.10	2.6 ±0.8	1.33
[Ar III] 7751	4.2±0.4	1.05	2.0 ±0.4	1.39	1.8 ±0.6	1.59	1.4 ± 0.2	1.12	2.2 ±0.7	1.43

**Notes.** Contaminating He I and He II lines scaled from He I 5876 and He II 4686, respectively. <sup>(a)</sup> Blend with He I 3889. <sup>(b)</sup> Blend with H7 3970 and He I 3965. <sup>(c)</sup> Blend with He II 4100. <sup>(d)</sup> Blend with He II 4338. <sup>(e)</sup> Blend with He I 4713. <sup>(f)</sup> Blend with He II 4859. <sup>(g)</sup> Blend with He II 6310. <sup>(h)</sup> Blend with He II 6560. <sup>(i)</sup> Blend with He II 6683.

**Table A.3.** Derived  $n_e$  and  $T_e$  for both high- and low-excitation regions from fully iterative extinction correction/plasma diagnostics with original-to-revised ratios.

	M1687	Ratio	M2068	Ratio	M2538	Ratio
$T_e$ ([O III])	12940± 420	0.983	11250± 310	0.945	12870± 550	0.942
$n_e$ ([Ar IV])	22340±3510	1.386	18020±2530	1.970	4430±1230	1.563
$T_e$ ([N II])	25650±1690	0.842	13020±1110	0.795	12600± 580	0.947
$n_e$ ([S II])	4720±1320	0.977	11010±5120	1.771	3340± 880	1.002
	M50	Ratio	M1596	Ratio	M2471	Ratio
$T_e$ ([O III])	11670± 320	0.984	12030± 340	0.992	12380± 380	0.954
$n_e$ ([Ar IV])	9780±1690	1.364	5410±1100	1.116	3640± 930	1.312
$T_e$ ([N II])	13030± 670	0.979	11770± 450	0.994	11390± 420	0.959
$n_e$ ([S II])	5980±2120	1.081	3460±1030	1.019	3220± 870	1.000
	M2860	Ratio	M1074	Ratio	M1675	Ratio
$T_e$ ([O III])	10660± 310	0.939	12110± 340	0.976	11000± 270	0.959
$n_e$ ([Ar IV])	6000±1070	1.527	15590±2480	1.438	5170±1050	1.720
$T_e$ ([N II])	13780± 560	0.910	13120± 480	0.977	11380± 860	1.002
$n_e$ ([S II])	3440± 890	0.994	2750± 710	1.006	10330±4680	2.351

**Table A.4.** Ionic Abundances and Original-to-Revised Ratios for the Brightest Four PNe in M 31

Line/Ion	M1678	Ratio	M2068	Ratio	M2538	Ratio	M50	Ratio
He I 4026	20.763±2.247(-2)		11.255±2.102(-2)		15.521±2.767(-2)		10.098±1.378(-2)	
He I 4472	8.840±0.978(-2)		11.040±2.065(-2)		8.908±1.617(-2)		9.438±1.258(-2)	
He 4922	4.428±0.650(-2)		9.240±2.113(-2)		7.155±1.589(-2)		4.986±0.860(-2)	
He I 5876	6.472±0.862(-2)		8.701±2.094(-2)		8.093±1.820(-2)		9.086±1.473(-2)	
He I 6678	4.779±0.660(-2)		7.319±1.766(-2)		6.457±1.423(-2)		7.084±1.193(-2)	
He I 7065	11.290±1.567(-2)		12.201±3.179(-2)		13.152±3.011(-2)		14.545±2.673(-2)	
He I 7281	4.671±0.663(-2)		3.841±0.982(-2)		9.850±2.139(-2)		6.262±1.130(-2)	
He <sup>+</sup> (adopted)	6.472±0.862(-2)	1.45	8.701±2.094(-2)	1.22	8.093±1.820(-2)	1.14	9.086±1.473(-2)	1.08
He II 4686	2.513±0.271(-3)		3.299±0.603(-3)		1.071±0.191(-2)		1.235±0.160(-2)	
He II 5411	...		...		1.525±0.331(-2)		1.478±0.235(-2)	
He <sup>2+</sup> (adopted)	2.513±0.271(-3)	0.99	3.299±0.603(-3)	0.97	1.071±0.191(-2)	0.95	1.235±0.160(-2)	0.98
[O I] 6300	1.001±0.177(-6)		4.826±1.636(-6)		4.247±1.121(-6)		7.030±1.587(-6)	
[O I] 6363	1.144±0.197(-6)		4.964±1.675(-6)		5.216±1.361(-6)		7.021±1.536(-6)	
O <sup>0</sup> (adopted)	1.064±0.265(-6)		4.893±2.342(-6)		4.639±1.763(-6)		7.025±2.208(-6)	
[O II] 3727	1.180±0.228(-5)		4.077±0.961(-5)		1.516±0.377(-5)		2.541±0.494(-5)	
[O II] 7320	1.497±0.288(-5)		1.644±0.435(-5)		1.025±0.317(-5)		2.614±0.564(-5)	
[O II] 7330	1.819±0.359(-5)		1.944±0.539(-5)		1.309±0.403(-5)		2.882±0.625(-5)	
O <sup>+</sup> (adopted)	1.405±0.514(-5)	1.50	2.017±1.185(-5)	2.43	1.250±0.637(-5)	1.82	2.653±0.976(-5)	0.74
[O III] 4363	2.830±0.552(-4)		3.582±0.881(-4)		2.168±0.618(-4)		3.457±0.721(-4)	
[O III] 4959	2.841±0.440(-4)		3.621±0.904(-4)		2.164±0.544(-4)		3.411±0.612(-4)	
[O III] 5007	2.818±0.439(-4)		3.554±0.852(-4)		2.123±0.533(-4)		3.377±0.600(-4)	
O <sup>2+</sup> (adopted)	2.830±0.832(-4)	1.08	3.584±1.523(-4)	1.26	2.150±0.981(-4)	1.25	3.410±1.120(-4)	1.09
[Ne III] 3868	7.234±1.091(-5)		1.100±0.235(-4)		5.093±1.191(-5)		7.525±1.266(-5)	
[Ne III] 3967	7.026±1.165(-5)		1.133±0.279(-4)		3.599±1.022(-5)		6.687±1.298(-5)	
Ne <sup>2+</sup> (adopted)	7.137±1.597(-5)	1.05	1.114±0.365(-4)	1.05	4.232±1.570(-5)	0.15	7.116±1.813(-5)	1.08
[Ar III] 7136	4.436±0.602(-7)		8.313±1.879(-7)		3.605±0.828(-7)		8.087±1.278(-7)	
[Ar III] 7751	3.627±0.505(-7)		4.842±1.105(-7)		2.637±0.603(-7)		6.036±0.967(-7)	
Ar <sup>2+</sup> (adopted)	3.962±0.786(-7)	1.21	8.313±1.879(-7)	1.38	2.973±1.024(-7)	1.88	6.783±1.603(-7)	1.35
[Ar IV] 4711	4.329±0.791(-7)		4.741±1.307(-7)		3.771±0.904(-7)		5.584±1.046(-7)	
[Ar IV] 4740	5.503±0.757(-7)		6.534±1.298(-7)		4.504±1.001(-7)		6.824±1.100(-7)	
Ar <sup>3+</sup> (adopted)	4.942±1.095(-7)	1.13	5.644±1.842(-7)	1.29	4.100±1.349(-7)	1.18	6.173±1.518(-7)	1.10
[N I] 5198	...		...		...		5.038±1.593(-7)	
N <sup>0</sup> (adopted)	...		...		...		5.038±1.593(-7)	
[N II] 5755	0.921±0.177(-6)		7.854±3.040(-6)		4.302±1.291(-6)		7.741±1.942(-6)	
[N II] 6548	1.089±0.169(-6)		7.851±2.317(-6)		4.440±1.024(-6)		7.905±1.503(-6)	
[N II] 6583	9.275±1.463(-7)		7.631±2.234(-6)		4.381±1.038(-6)		7.743±1.447(-6)	
N <sup>+</sup> (adopted)	9.752±2.853(-7)	3.42	7.763±4.427(-6)	2.55	4.385±1.948(-6)	1.48	7.803±2.850(-6)	1.12
[S II] 4069	...		2.395±0.827(-7)		...		1.631±0.346(-7)	
[S II] 4076	...		9.046±2.852(-7)		...		3.738±0.835(-7)	
[S II] 6716	2.689±0.596(-8)		1.608±0.690(-7)		1.137±0.309(-7)		1.684±0.472(-7)	
[S II] 6730	3.016±0.507(-8)		1.778±0.669(-7)		1.263±0.306(-7)		1.873±0.425(-7)	

**Table A.4.** continued.

Line/Ion	M1678	Ratio	M2068	Ratio	M2538	Ratio	M50	Ratio
S <sup>+</sup> (adopted)	2.879±0.783(-8)	3.72	1.695±0.961(-7)	4.86	1.201±0.435(-7)	1.70	1.788±0.635(-7)	1.40
[S III]6312	1.607±0.271(-6)		2.212±0.547(-6)		1.410±0.372(-6)		1.791±0.338(-6)	
S <sup>2+</sup> (adopted)	1.607±0.271(-6)	1.08	2.212±0.547(-6)	1.42	1.410±0.372(-6)	1.55	1.791±0.338(-6)	1.14
[Cl III]5518	...		...		...		2.890±0.612(-8)	
[Cl III]5538	...		...		...		5.903±1.065(-8)	
Cl <sup>2+</sup> (adopted)	...		...		...		5.903±1.065(-8)	1.10

**Notes.** The adopted notation of the abundance ( $X^{i+}/H^+$ ),  $\alpha \pm \beta(-\gamma)$ , means  $(a \pm b) \times 10^{-\gamma}$ .

**Table A.5.** Ionic Abundances and Original-to-Revised Ratios for the Other Five PNe in M 31

Line/Ion	M1596	Ratio	M2471	Ratio	M2860	Ratio	M1074	Ratio	M1675	Ratio
He I 4026	23.120±1.809(-2)		11.248±1.879(-2)		18.550±4.793(-2)		6.538±0.640(-2)		...	
He I 4472	8.334±0.666(-2)		8.003±1.358(-2)		11.377±3.056(-2)		10.259±0.917(-2)		8.809±2.349(-2)	
He 4922	...		5.163±1.124(-2)		9.027±2.900(-2)		...		16.353±5.232(-2)	
He I 5876	8.992±0.858(-2)		7.056±1.429(-2)		7.953±2.537(-2)		9.992±1.134(-2)		8.478±2.789(-2)	
He I 6678	8.691±0.829(-2)		4.976±1.059(-2)		6.145±1.971(-2)		7.610±0.811(-2)		9.243±3.021(-2)	
He I 7065	14.203±1.721(-2)		11.479±2.509(-2)		8.858±2.903(-2)		16.511±2.064(-2)		9.937±3.446(-2)	
He I 7281	...		5.235±1.116(-2)		2.179±0.755(-2)		...		...	
He <sup>+</sup> (adopted)	8.992±0.858(-2)	0.99	7.056±1.429(-2)	1.13	7.953±2.537(-2)	1.33	9.992±1.134(-2)	0.98	8.478±2.789(-2)	1.19
He II 4686	2.993±0.232(-2)		2.887±0.495(-2)		6.490±1.687(-3)		2.260±0.199(-3)		1.063±0.283(-2)	
He II 5411	3.323±0.309(-2)		2.843±0.581(-2)		5.745±1.910(-3)		...		...	
He <sup>2+</sup> (adopted)	2.993±0.232(-2)	1.00	2.887±0.495(-2)	0.95	6.490±1.687(-3)	0.94	2.260±0.199(-3)	0.99	1.063±0.283(-2)	0.97
[O I]6300	7.494±1.150(-6)		7.906±1.885(-6)		1.429±0.513(-6)		2.691±0.410(-6)		9.044±3.703(-6)	
[O I]6363	7.230±1.135(-6)		7.610±1.823(-6)		1.873±0.655(-6)		2.801±0.423(-6)		8.722±3.592(-6)	
O <sup>0</sup> (adopted)	7.360±1.615(-6)		7.753±2.622(-6)		1.598±0.832(-6)		2.745±0.589(-6)		8.878±5.159(-6)	
[O II]3727	2.064±0.325(-5)		1.922±0.415(-5)		1.512±0.446(-5)		1.154±0.200(-5)		0.778±0.225(-5)	
[O II]7320	2.025±0.361(-5)		1.529±0.397(-5)		1.254±0.473(-5)		1.217±0.208(-5)		...	
[O II]7330	2.320±0.413(-5)		1.777±0.466(-5)		1.492±0.551(-5)		1.547±0.268(-5)		2.366±0.868(-5)	
O <sup>+</sup> (adopted)	2.116±0.637(-5)	1.28	1.733±0.740(-5)	2.23	1.417±0.852(-5)	0.63	1.266±0.393(-5)	1.74	2.366±0.868(-5)	0.63
[O III]4363	3.326±0.576(-4)		2.672±0.632(-4)		3.954±1.247(-4)		2.716±0.469(-4)		3.928±1.205(-4)	
[O III]4959	3.298±0.410(-4)		2.629±0.597(-4)		4.004±1.357(-4)		2.708±0.356(-4)		3.805±1.263(-4)	
[O III]5007	3.296±0.405(-4)		2.618±0.588(-4)		3.948±1.342(-4)		2.722±0.357(-4)		3.878±1.260(-4)	
O <sup>2+</sup> (adopted)	3.303±0.815(-4)	1.05	2.638±1.049(-4)	1.20	3.968±2.280(-4)	1.29	2.715±0.688(-4)	1.10	3.872±2.153(-4)	1.17
[Ne III]3868	6.843±0.868(-5)		6.891±1.385(-5)		0.967±0.273(-4)		6.223±0.795(-5)		8.376±2.335(-5)	
[Ne III]3967	6.938±0.977(-5)		7.092±1.630(-5)		1.269±0.421(-4)		6.190±0.923(-5)		7.969±2.705(-5)	
Ne <sup>2+</sup> (adopted)	6.885±1.308(-5)	1.02	6.975±2.139(-5)	0.96	1.057±0.502(-4)	0.88	6.209±1.218(-5)	1.02	8.202±3.574(-5)	0.98
[Ar III]7136	1.231±0.132(-6)		4.932±1.010(-7)		7.022±2.328(-7)		4.079±0.475(-7)		7.454±2.496(-7)	
[Ar III]7751	0.954±0.102(-6)		4.241±0.890(-7)		5.269±1.717(-7)		3.221±0.381(-7)		6.064±1.920(-7)	
Ar <sup>2+</sup> (adopted)	1.057±0.167(-6)	1.24	4.543±1.346(-7)	1.58	5.887±2.892(-7)	2.04	3.557±0.610(-7)	1.34	6.581±3.149(-7)	1.64
[Ar IV]4711	1.139±0.141(-6)		6.364±1.318(-7)		0.819±0.259(-6)		3.970±0.627(-7)		7.553±2.353(-7)	
[Ar IV]4740	1.253±0.149(-6)		7.174±1.356(-7)		1.003±0.278(-6)		5.007±0.610(-7)		9.099±2.519(-7)	
Ar <sup>3+</sup> (adopted)	1.193±0.205(-6)	1.04	6.758±1.891(-7)	1.14	0.905±0.380(-6)	1.21	4.503±0.875(-7)	1.13	8.273±3.447(-7)	1.15
[Ar V]7005	1.258±0.152(-7)		4.875±1.115(-8)		...		...		...	
Ar <sup>4+</sup> (adopted)	1.258±0.152(-7)	1.07	4.875±1.115(-8)	1.47	...	...	...	...	...	...
[N I]5198	...		...		...		...		4.409±2.318(-6)	
N <sup>0</sup> (adopted)	...		...		...		...		4.409±2.318(-6)	
[N II]5755	1.499±0.287(-5)		6.370±1.671(-6)		2.439±0.917(-6)		1.878±0.368(-6)		1.420±0.651(-5)	
[N II]6548	1.502±0.190(-5)		6.565±1.404(-6)		2.665±0.890(-6)		1.908±0.245(-6)		1.397±0.515(-5)	
[N II]6583	1.489±0.185(-5)		6.447±1.379(-6)		2.454±0.822(-6)		1.881±0.242(-6)		1.381±0.522(-5)	
N <sup>+</sup> (adopted)	1.496±0.391(-5)	1.06	6.470±2.582(-6)	1.38	2.517±1.520(-6)	1.63	1.891±0.504(-6)	1.36	1.396±0.981(-5)	1.20
[S II]4069	1.676±0.220(-7)		1.660±0.327(-7)		11.030±3.083(-8)		6.943±0.854(-8)		...	

**Table A.5.** continued.

Line/Ion	M1596	Ratio	M2471	Ratio	M2860	Ratio	M1074	Ratio	M1675	Ratio
[S II]4076	...		...		66.702±19.455(-8)		...		...	
[S II]6716	4.107±0.809(-7)		1.804±0.455(-7)		7.198±2.648(-8)		5.674±0.998(-8)		4.394±2.122(-7)	
[S II]6730	4.605±0.629(-7)		2.012±0.454(-7)		8.048±2.793(-8)		6.386±0.842(-8)		4.947±2.177(-7)	
S <sup>+</sup> (adopted)	4.418±1.025(-7)	1.20	1.908±0.643(-7)	1.58	7.600±3.849(-8)	1.92	6.090±1.306(-8)	1.52	4.664±3.040(-7)	1.19
[S III]6312	4.161±0.575(-6)		1.223±0.291(-6)		2.161±0.764(-6)		2.047±0.298(-6)		3.263±1.118(-6)	
S <sup>2+</sup> (adopted)	4.161±0.575(-6)	1.08	1.223±0.291(-6)	1.47	2.161±0.764(-6)	1.72	2.047±0.298(-6)	1.16	3.263±1.118(-6)	1.42
[Cl III]5518	4.619±0.633(-8)		...		2.763±1.015(-8)		...		...	
[Cl III]5538	9.073±1.108(-8)		...		4.145±1.461(-8)		...		...	
Cl <sup>2+</sup> (adopted)	9.073±1.108(-8)	0.90	...		3.213±1.780(-8)	1.91	...		...	

**Notes.** The adopted notation of the abundance ( $X^{i+}/H^+$ ),  $\alpha \pm \beta(-\gamma)$ , means  $(a \pm b) \times 10^{-\gamma}$ .

**Table A.6.** Total elemental Abundances and Original-to-Revised Ratios, with the Solar Abundances for Comparison.

ICFs follow those by Delgado-Inglada et al. (2014)										
Elem.	M1687	Ratio	M2068	Ratio	M2538	Ratio	M50	Ratio	$Z_{\odot}$	
He	10.83±0.06	1.43	10.95±0.10	1.22	10.96±0.09	1.13	11.01±0.06	1.06	10.92±0.02	
N	7.32±0.24	2.52	8.17±0.39	1.38	7.94±0.34	0.99	8.07±0.26	1.59	7.85±0.12	
O	8.48±0.12	1.10	8.58±0.17	1.33	8.40±0.18	1.26	8.60±0.13	1.05	8.73±0.07	
Ne	7.87±0.07	1.04	8.06±0.09	1.08	7.74±0.10	0.95	7.91±0.07	1.00	8.15±0.10	
S	6.05±0.22	2.88	6.68±0.40	1.29	6.56±0.32	1.14	6.64±0.25	1.06	7.15±0.03	
Cl	...	...	...	...	...	...	5.05±0.09	1.19	5.23±0.06	
Ar	5.59±0.08	1.91	5.91±0.10	2.09	5.48±0.15	2.93	5.85±0.10	2.20	6.50±0.10	
Elem.	M1596	Ratio	M2471	Ratio	M2860	Ratio	M1074	Ratio	M1675	Ratio
He	11.08±0.03	0.98	11.00±0.07	1.08	10.94±0.13	1.30	11.01±0.05	0.97	10.98±0.12	1.18
N	8.47±0.20	0.87	8.11±0.30	0.76	7.88±0.44	3.29	7.63±0.21	0.88	8.42±0.42	2.16
O	8.62±0.10	1.07	8.54±0.16	1.23	8.63±0.24	1.25	8.46±0.11	1.12	8.64±0.23	1.14
Ne	7.91±0.06	1.03	7.93±0.09	0.95	8.01±0.12	0.94	7.82±0.06	1.03	7.96±0.12	0.94
S	7.10±0.18	0.73	6.69±0.27	0.77	6.49±0.49	3.11	6.42±0.19	1.62	7.07±0.47	0.96
Cl	5.30±0.06	0.87	...	...	4.85±0.25	2.22	...	...	...	...
Ar	6.08±0.07	1.95	5.73±0.13	2.22	5.77±0.21	3.53	5.54±0.07	2.10	5.83±0.21	2.77
Using all available $X^{+}$ abundances with appropriate ICFs										
Elem.	M1687	Ratio	M2068	Ratio	M2538	Ratio	M50	Ratio	$Z_{\odot}$	
He	10.83±0.05	1.41	10.96±0.09	1.20	10.96±0.08	1.12	11.01±0.06	1.07	10.92±0.02	
N	7.36±0.22	2.32	8.16±0.39	1.42	7.83±0.35	1.27	8.00±0.25	1.84	7.85±0.12	
O	8.49±0.12	1.08	8.60±0.17	1.30	8.38±0.18	1.32	8.59±0.14	1.07	8.73±0.07	
Ne	7.87±0.06	1.04	8.06±0.09	1.07	7.74±0.10	0.95	7.91±0.07	1.01	8.15±0.10	
S	6.50±0.09	1.03	6.64±0.13	1.42	6.46±0.15	1.45	6.55±0.10	1.29	7.15±0.03	
Cl	...	...	...	...	...	...	5.05±0.09	1.20	5.23±0.06	
Ar	5.96±0.07	0.81	6.16±0.09	1.19	5.86±0.11	1.23	6.12±0.07	1.18	6.50±0.10	
Elem.	M1596	Ratio	M2471	Ratio	M2860	Ratio	M1074	Ratio	M1675	Ratio
He	11.08±0.03	0.98	11.00±0.07	1.08	10.94±0.13	1.29	11.01±0.05	0.97	10.98±0.13	1.19
N	8.40±0.19	1.02	7.99±0.30	1.01	7.74±0.50	4.56	7.71±0.19	0.74	8.33±0.45	2.65
O	8.63±0.10	1.05	8.53±0.17	1.25	8.65±0.23	1.21	8.47±0.10	1.11	8.65±0.22	1.12
Ne	7.91±0.06	1.02	7.93±0.09	0.96	8.01±0.12	0.93	7.82±0.06	1.02	7.95±0.11	0.95
S	6.99±0.07	0.96	6.48±0.12	1.24	6.65±0.21	2.12	6.61±0.08	1.04	6.85±0.16	1.57
Cl	5.31±0.07	0.86	...	...	4.83±0.27	2.33	...	...	...	...
Ar	6.38±0.05	0.99	6.07±0.08	1.02	6.20±0.16	1.33	5.92±0.06	0.87	6.18±0.14	1.22