

Comment on the paper “**Photoionization of endohedral atoms using R-matrix methods: application to Xe@C₆₀**” by T. W. Gorczyca, M. F. Hasoglu and S. T. Manson, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 033204 (2012) [1].


M. Ya. Amusia^{1,21} and L. V. Chernysheva²

¹Racah institute of Physics, the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 91904, Israel

²Ioffe Physical-Technical institutes, RAS, St. Petersburg, 194021, Russia

Abstract: We demonstrate serious misrepresentation of existing experimental data and important omissions in the List of references in the paper [1]. We demonstrate that what is called in [1] total photoionization cross-section is in fact a partial photoionization cross-section. We demonstrate that long before [1] and presented there experimental data for photoionization of $Xe@C_{60}^+$ were obtained, a theoretical prediction for $Xe@C_{60}$ have been published that was in a reasonable agreement with experiment. These data are even not mentioned in [1].

Incidentally, we run across the paper [1] that is dedicated to describing R-matrix approach to endohedrals photoionization, using as a concrete object of application the endohedral $Xe@C_{60}$. The authors of [1] started from considering the total photoionization of



Xe atom above its $4d^{10}$ – subshell photoionization threshold (the Fig.2 in [1]). They claim that a big discrepancy exists between experimental data from [2] (their [44]) and the RPAE calculations from [3] (their [45]). In fact, paper [1] compares RPAE results for total cross-section with partial photoionization contribution from channels $4d - \epsilon f, p$, measured in [2]. These results, as was demonstrated in [3], should be different. The difference determines the so-called intra-atomic inelastic photoelectron scattering. The account of this effect led to demonstrated in Fig. 1 complete agreement

¹ E-mail: amusia@vms.huji.ac.il

between calculations [3] (solid line) and experimental data [2] (dots).

As to the total cross sections, for them very good agreement with experiment exists since long ago [4]. Our Fig. 1 is similar to Fig. 2 from [1], differing from it by an additional, solid curve from [3] (in red) that is, however, very important. This curve compared to experimental data shows that the partial photoionization cross-section of Xe atom above its $4d^{10}$ – subshell was well explained in [3] more than two decades before [1] was published. To overlook this curve the authors of [1] were unable since this is the main, however omitted by them, result of cited in [1] paper [3]. Note that in [3] the reasons were clarified, why RPAE is close to the total photo-absorption cross-section and differ from contribution of only $4d - \epsilon f, p$ channels. Namely, this is because RPAE cross-sections automatically includes two-step processes like primary $4d$ -photoionization as a first step with subsequent inelastic scattering of the photoelectrons $\epsilon f, p$ upon the residual ion with $5p$ and $5s$ subshells ionization as the second step.

Now let us discuss the photoionization of $Xe @ C_{60}$. The first prediction of Xe 4d Giant




Fig. 2. Photoionization cross-section of $Xe @ C_{60}$ and free Xe in the region of Xe $4d^{10}$ Giant resonance. The red curve from [5, 6] that is omitted in Fig. 3 of [1].

resonance destruction under the action of the fullerenes shell have been made in the frame of RPAE, i.e. for the total photoionization, in papers [5, 6] and confirmed at least qualitatively in [7]. There, according to the point of view of the authors of [7], the total photoionization cross-section of $Xe @ C_{60}^+$ was presented. Although only one channel was in fact measured, to estimate the total cross-section the data obtained were normalized multiplying it by a factor 6.5 in order to be on the average as close as possible to the

value of the experimental cross-section at the Xe 4d Giant resonance.

The experiment, according to what is written in [7], was specially designed to check the validity of the predictions made in [5]. In the Letter [7] the experimental data were presented together with the results of calculations from [5, 6] along with some other calculations performed after 2005. All they were definitely further away from experiment than the results obtained in [5, 6]. The data extracted from Letter [7] are presented in [1], in their Fig.3, being however stripped of all previous calculation data, including that of [5, 6]. We are positive that it was impossible to overlook our curve from [5] while constructing Fig. 3 in [1]. Thus, we do believe that this omission in Fig. 3 of [1] was intentional. Note that the calculation result from [1] still deviates definitely not less from experiment [7] than our prediction in [5, 6]. This is illustrated in Fig.2 of this Comment. Such an omission considerably distorts the real situation by unjust enhancing the R-matrix approach achievements.

We are aware that the experiment was performed on $Xe @ C_{60}^+$ instead of $Xe @ C_{60}$. This makes, of course, the comparison theory – experiment more difficult. However the same problem is valid for [1] and for [5, 6], with the essential difference that [5, 6] was a prediction, while [1] followed the existing data. Even the fullerenes square well potential used

in [1] was different by radiuses and depth from that generally accepted. In fact, in [1] those values of these parameters [8] were employed that permitted to reproduce data from [7].

One can say that [1] is dedicated to developing of the R-matrix approach, so it can limit itself to presenting R-matrix ability to describe existing experimental data. From our point of view, this is incorrect. A subsequent paper has to present also previous explanation of the data that are used even as a test field to demonstrate a given method's abilities. The intentional omission of the previously obtained result is a serious fault an violation of scientific ethics. Therefore, we do believe that our critical comments to the paper [1] deserved to be presented to the attention of the same readership as that of [1].

References:

- [1]. T. W. Gorczyca, M. F. Hasoglu and S. T. Manson, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 033204 (2012).
- [2]. B. Kammerling, H. Kossman, and V. Schmidt, J. Phys. B **22**, 841 (1989).
- [3]. M. Ya. Amusia, G. F. Gribakin, V. K. Ivanov, and L. V. Chernysheva, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **23**, 385-391 (1990).
- [4]. M. Ya. Amusia and N. A. Cherepkov, Case Studies in Atomic Physics, **5**, 47, 441 (1975).
- [5]. M. Ya. Amusia, A. S. Baltenkov, L. V. Chernysheva, Z. Felfli, A. Z. Msezane, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **38**, L169-73 (2005).
- [6]. M. Ya. Amusia, A. S. Baltenkov, L. V. Chernysheva, Z. Felfli, A. Z. Msezane, JETP **102**, 4, 556-561 (2006).
- [7]. A. L. D. Kilcoyne, A. Aguilar, A. Müller, S. Schippers, C. Cisneros, G. Alna'Washi, N. B. Aryal, K. K. Baral, D. A. Esteves, C. M. Thomas, and R. A. Phaneuf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 213001(4) (2010).
- [8]. V. K. Dolmatov, J. L. King, and J. C. Oglesby, J. Phys. B **45**, 105102 (2012).