# Atomic oxygen ion-neutral collision frequency models at ionospheric temperatures

Akimasa Ieda<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Nagoya University

November 21, 2022

#### Abstract

The Earth's F region ionosphere is dominated by the collision between atomic oxygen and its first positive ion. An accurate corresponding collision frequency model is necessary to understand the ionosphere. However, the widely used classic Banks theoretical model typically provides a collision frequency that is 30% lower than the expectation from ionospheric observations. Accordingly, the classic collision frequency is often adjusted by multiplying it by a constant known as the Burnside factor. This correction-factor model adopted the classic model as its basis due to a misunderstanding that the classic model was based on a laboratory experiment; that is, the correction factor was originally meant to compensate for laboratory contamination. In this study, we construct a collision frequency model based on the laboratory experiment. We find that the resultant laboratory based model is consistent with ionospheric observations. In this construction, we have determined that the impact of laboratory contamination is small (7%) and is mostly canceled by a misinterpretation regarding the conventional definitions of energy. Thus, the 30% difference is mainly caused by a theoretical error in the classic model itself. This error is energy-dependent and corrected by the later wide-energy theoretical model.

# 1 Atomic Oxygen Ion–Neutral Collision Frequency Models at Ionospheric

# 2 Temperatures

# 3 **A. Ieda**<sup>1</sup>

<sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup>Institute for Space-Earth Environmental Research, Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan

5 Corresponding author: Akimasa Ieda (<u>ieda@isee.nagoya-u.ac.jp</u>)

## 6 Key Points:

7

8

- The classic Banks theoretical model underestimates O<sup>+</sup>-O collision frequency by 30% at 1000 K.
- The correction-factor model is based on the classic model due to a misunderstanding that
   the classic model is based on laboratory results.
- The classic model is corrected by the later wide-energy model, and thus, should be
   replaced by this model.

## 13 Abstract

- 14 The Earth's F region ionosphere is dominated by the collision between atomic oxygen and its
- 15 first positive ion. An accurate corresponding collision frequency model is necessary to
- 16 understand the ionosphere. However, the widely used classic Banks theoretical model typically
- 17 provides a collision frequency that is 30% lower than the expectation from ionospheric
- 18 observations. Accordingly, the classic collision frequency is often adjusted by multiplying it by a
- 19 constant known as the Burnside factor. This correction-factor model adopted the classic model as
- 20 its basis due to a misunderstanding that the classic model was based on a laboratory experiment;
- that is, the correction factor was originally meant to compensate for laboratory contamination. In
- this study, we construct a collision frequency model based on the laboratory experiment. We find
- that the resultant laboratory-based model is consistent with ionospheric observations. In this
- construction, we have determined that the impact of laboratory contamination is small (7%) and is mostly canceled by a misinterpretation regarding the conventional definitions of energy. Thus,
- the 30% difference is mainly caused by a theoretical error in the classic model itself. This error is
- energy-dependent and corrected by the later wide-energy theoretical model. Thus, the classic
- model cannot be corrected by a constant and should be replaced by the later model.

# 29 Plain Language Summary

- 30 The Earth's ionosphere is a region at altitudes between 60 and 800 km. The ionosphere includes
- both neutral atmosphere and plasmas and is thus the interface between the Earth and space. The
- 32 plasma density reaches its maximum at an altitude of 300 km, where the dominant species are
- atomic oxygen and its first positive ion. Thus, collisions between this particle pair dominate the
- 34 structure of the ionosphere. However, the collision frequency of the widely used classic model 35 has been reported to be lower (by about 30%) than ionospheric observations for unknown
- has been reported to be lower (by about 30%) than ionospheric observations for unknown
   reasons. In the present study, we point out that the major reason for this underestimation is that
- the classic model has adopted a less accurate cross-section model. We thus conclude that the
- 38 classic model should be replaced by the later wide-energy model.

#### **1** Introduction 39

The O<sup>+</sup>-O collision governs the F region of the Earth's ionosphere. Its frequency  $v(O^+-O)$  is 40

- necessary to calculate the drag force, the electric conductivity, and the ambipolar diffusion. 41
- Thus, an accurate  $v(O^+-O)$  model is critical for quantitatively understanding the ionosphere. 42
- 43

Currently, there are three types of models for  $v(O^+-O)$  in the ionosphere, as summarized in 44

Figure 1 and Table 1. They are (1) the classic high-energy theory type (e.g., Banks, 1966; 45

Schunk & Nagy, 2009), (2) the later wide-energy theory type (e.g., Stallcop et al., 1991, 46

- hereinafter S1991), and (3) the correction-factor type (e.g., Salah, 1993). There has been no 47
- laboratory experiment of the  $O^+$ -O collision at ionospheric thermal energies (~0.1 eV), but at 48
- superthermal energies (Stebbings et al., 1964, hereinafter S1964). Laboratory experiments have 49
- been used to justify theoretical  $v(O^+-O)$  models, but have not been directly used to construct a 50  $v(O^+-O)$  model.
- 51
- 52

Collision frequency can be directly calculated from the collision cross section. The classic high-53

energy theory type model is based on the theoretical calculation of cross sections at energies 54

above 1 eV. The resultant cross section is then extrapolated down to ionospheric energies. This 55

classic model was constructed by Knof et al. (1964) (hereinafter K1964) and has been adapted to 56

formulate widely known sets of models (e.g., Banks, 1966; Schunk & Nagy, 2009), which 57

include models of collision frequencies of other particle pairs. This classic model has been 58

widely used in ionospheric studies (Brekke & Hall, 1988; Fang et al., 2013; Ieda et al., 2014; 59

- Lomidze et al., 2015; Takeda, 2016; Adachi et al., 2017; Kiene et al., 2019), in particular, to 60
- calculate electric conductivity. 61
- 62

In contrast, the later wide-energy theory type model directly calculates the cross section at the 63 ionospheric energy range. This later model was constructed by S1991 and was refined by Pesnell 64 et al. (1993) and Hickman et al. (1997a). The present study does not focus on the differences 65 between these later models, which are numerically small at ionospheric temperatures (6% at 66 1000 K). The later model has been compared with ionospheric observations (e.g., Nicolls et al., 67 2006; Anderson et al., 2013; Joshi et al., 2018) but has not been adopted for applications such as 68 constructing conductivity models or running ionospheric simulations. 69

70

The classic collision frequency has been reported to be underestimated when compared to 71 collision frequencies inferred from ionospheric observations (e.g., Burnside et al., 1987). The 72 ratio of the inferred collision frequencies to the classic  $v(O^+-O)$  model is called the Burnside 73 74 factor. Salah (1993) multiplied the classic model by the Burnside factor to construct the correction-factor type model. This type of model has been widely used for ionospheric studies 75 (e.g., McDonald et al., 2013; Fang et al., 2013; McGranaghan et al., 2015; Zossi et al., 2019), in 76 particular, to run ionospheric simulations. 77

78

The Banks (1966) model has often been used as the basis model of the correction-factor model 79

- 80 (e.g., Oliver & Glotfelty, 1996; Nicolls et al., 2006). In this study, we follow this tradition for
- calculations of the Burnside factor ( $F_{B66}$ ) and the percentages. For clarification, other classic 81
- 82 models have been used as the basis model in some previous studies. Their temperature-
- dependence is slightly different from the Banks (1966) model. Accordingly,  $F_{B66}$  of the Salah 83
- 84 (1993) model is not constant in Figure 1b although it is recognized by them to be nearly constant

between 700 and 1500 K. In such cases, we refer to  $F_{B66}$  at 1000 K. The Salah (1993) model corresponds to  $F_{B66} \sim 1.752$  at 1000 K.

87



**Figure 1**. (a) Coefficients of O<sup>+</sup>-O momentum-transfer collision frequency as a function of the

ion-neutral reduced temperature  $(T_i+T_n)/2$ . A representative model of each of the three types of

models is shown: (1) classic high-energy theory type (Banks, 1966), (2) later wide-energy theory

type (Stallcop et al., 1991), and (3) correction-factor type (Salah, 1993). (b) The ratio of (a) to

- the Banks model, known as the Burnside factor, for each of the representative models. (c)
- 94 Burnside factors of three additional models. See Table 1 for additional explanations.
- 95

88

96	Table 1. Mod	dels of $O^+$ - $O$	Collision	Frequency

J 1 7	
Model type, (Core work), Method	Ratio to Banks (1966) at 1000 K
(1) Classic high-energy theory type	1: Banks (1966)
(Knof et al., 1964 ("K1964"): 1-10,000 eV)	1.046: Banks and Kockarts (1973)
Theoretical calculation at superthermal energies and	1.049: Schunk and Nagy (2009)
extrapolation down to ionospheric thermal energies.	1.047: Ieda (2020)
(2) Later wide-energy theory type	1.28: Stallcop et al. (1991)
(Stallcop et al., 1991 ("S1991"): 0.027-52 eV)	1.31: Pesnell et al. (1993)
Theoretical calculation directly including ionospheric	1.25: Hickman et al. (1997a)
thermal energies.	
(3) Correction-factor type	1.75: Salah (1993)
(Salah (1993) and the classic model)	1.26: Nicolls et al. (2006)
A constant is multiplied to the classic model to be	1.57: McGranaghan et al. (2015)
consistent with various ionospheric observations.	1.27: Joshi et al. (2018)
(4) Laboratory-extrapolation type	1.15: "converted"
(Stebbings et al., 1964 ("S1964"): 40-10,000 eV)	1.22: "unconverted"
Ion beam experiments at superthermal energies and	1.23: "ground-state"
extrapolation down to ionospheric thermal energies.	-

97 Note. Some models are shown in Figure 1. Models are expressed as a function of temperature in

their final forms. The laboratory-extrapolation type models are created in the present study in

99 section 4.2. The "ground-state" model is appropriate for ionospheric study. The definition of

100 energy differs between laboratory experiments and theoretical studies (see Appendix A).

101

- $F_{B66}$  has been deduced using observed ionospheric parameters and momentum or energy
- equations. Estimated  $F_{B66}$  ranges from 0.7 to 1.9 (e.g., Dyson et al., 1997; Wu et al., 2012;
- 104 Vickers et al., 2013) to date. This large variation is presumably due to neglect of vertical neutral
- wind or to various other assumptions in the equations (e.g., Nicolls et al., 2006; Dang et al.,
   2015).
- 107
- In particular, the neutral atomic oxygen density is not measured simultaneously with other ionospheric parameters but is assumed empirically. Note that a collision frequency model in the
- present study refers to a model of the collision frequency coefficient. This coefficient model is
- 111 multiplied by the neutral density to obtain the collision frequency. Thus, the Burnside correction
- 112 may not be relevant to the collision frequency coefficient model itself but to the assumed atomic
- 113 oxygen density instead (e.g., Joshi et al., 2018).
- 114
- 115 Nevertheless, appropriate statistical ionospheric observations have the potential capability to
- calibrate theoretical collision frequency (coefficient) models because the deviations of the
- simultaneous neutral atomic oxygen density from empirical models are expected to be averaged
- out. Later statistical observations tend to report  $F_{B66} \sim 1.3$  (e.g., Nicolls et al., 2006; Joshi et al.,
- 119 2018). Although this number has not yet been fully accepted, it is close to the later wide-energy
- theoretical model, labeled "Stallcop1991" in Figure 1c.
- 121

122 Thus, the later model could replace the classic model based on current ionospheric observation.

- However, the classic models are still widely used and have also been adopted as the basis of the
- 124 correction-factor models. It is unclear why the later wide-energy model is not adopted for
- 125 ionospheric applications.
- 126

We had hesitated to employ the later model because the following points had been unclear, so it appeared that the later model may include pitfalls. (1) In particular, both classic and later models are claimed to be consistent (within 6%) with the S1964 laboratory experiment; however, these consistencies appear to contradict the significant (30%) difference between the classic and later models. (2) It is also not clear whether the curved trajectory effect (Stubbe, 1968; Salah, 1993;

- 132 Pesnell et al., 1994) is the primary cause of the difference between the classic and the later
- models. (3) Furthermore, the reference laboratory experiment (S1964) is contaminated by
- excited-state  $O^+$  ions. Although the impact of this contamination on S1964 had been unclear,
- 135 Salah (1993) supposed that this contamination caused the lesser cross section in the classic
- model. (4) Finally, the theoretical association between the classic and the later models is unclear 127 has a set 127 has
- because S1991 did not refer to K1964. A new model is not necessarily better than an old model.
- 139 The purpose of the present study is to confirm that the classic high-energy type  $O^+$ -O collision
- 140 frequency model should be replaced by the later wide-energy type model. We review the
- 141 construction and verification of the classic model in section 3. We then revise interpretations of
- the laboratory experiment that is used to justify theoretical models in section 4. We discuss
- theoretical differences between the classic and later models in section 5. Implications of the
- 144 correction-factor model are discussed in section 6. In section 7, we discuss why the later model is
- 145 not used.

#### 146 **2 Definitions and Basics**

147 2.1 Definitions of Physical Parameters

148 The physical parameters used in this study are defined in Table 2. We use subscript D for the

diffusion or momentum-transfer cross sections and subscript E for the charge-exchange cross

- 150 sections.
- 151 **Table 2**. Definitions of Physical Parameters in the Present Study

Physical Parameters	Definition
е	Fundamental charge, $1.602176634 \times 10^{-19}$ C
kB	Boltzmann constant, $1.380649 \times 10^{-23} \text{ J/K}$
<i>g</i> (m/s)	Relative speed of an ion with respect to a neutral particle
$m_{\rm i}, m_{\rm n}  ({ m kg})$	Mass (ion, neutral particle)
$\mu_{\rm in}({ m kg})$	Reduced mass $m_i m_n / (m_i + m_n)$
$\varepsilon_{i} (eV)$	Ion kinetic energy $m_i v_i^2/2e$ , where $v_i$ is the ion speed in the laboratory frame
$\varepsilon_{\rm r}  ({\rm eV})$	Reduced energy $\mu_{in}g^2/2e$ (also known as the kinetic energy of relative motion, see Table A1)
<i>T</i> <sub>i</sub> , <i>T</i> <sub>n</sub> (K)	Temperature (ion, neutral gas)
<i>T</i> <sub>r</sub> (K)	Reduced temperature $(m_nT_i+m_iT_n)/(m_i+m_n)$
$q_{\rm D}(\varepsilon_{\rm r}), q_{\rm E}(\varepsilon_{\rm r}) ({\rm m}^2)$	Energy-dependent cross section (diffusion, charge-exchange)
$\bar{Q}_{\mathrm{D}}(T_{\mathrm{r}}),\bar{Q}_{\mathrm{E}}(T_{\mathrm{r}})(\mathrm{m}^2)$	Average cross section (diffusion, charge-exchange)
v (1/s)	Momentum-transfer collision frequency
$n_{\rm n}  (1/{\rm m}^3)$	Number density of neutral gas

152 *Note.* "Collision frequency" in the present study refers to the momentum-transfer collision

153 frequency for momentum transfer from neutral particles.

## 154 2.2 Charge-exchange Collision and Polarization Collision

155 There are two types of collisions between an ion and its parent neutral particle, such as between

an  $O^+$  and an O; these are non-resonant electric-polarization collision and resonant charge-

exchange collision (e.g., Banks & Kockarts, 1973). The polarization collision is caused by the

long-range attractive force that is due to the polarization of the neutral particle by the

approaching ion. The charge-exchange collision is caused by the transfer of an electron from a

neutral particle to an ion. The polarization collision dominates at low temperatures (i.e., low

particle speeds and thus, low kinetic energy), and the resonant collision is dominant at hightemperatures.

162

For the O<sup>+</sup>-O collision, the transition temperature of the two collision domains has been thought to be approximately 230 K (Banks & Kockarts, 1973; Schunk & Nagy, 2009; Ieda, 2020), 166 corresponding to 109 km altitude (COESA, 1976). Below this altitude (i.e., in the polarization

domain), the  $O^+$ -O collision is usually not as important for ionospheric physics as the collision of

other particle pairs such as  $NO^+$ -N<sub>2</sub>. Accordingly, only the charge-exchange collision frequency

is traditionally considered for the  $O^+$ -O collision.

# 170 2.3 Basics of Construction of Collision Frequency Model

A collision frequency model refers to a model of the collision frequency coefficient, which is the collision frequency divided by the number density of neutral gas. The collision frequency (coefficient) model for the ionosphere is traditionally expressed as a function of the reduced temperature. At a given temperature, particles with various kinetic energies contribute to the collision frequency. Accordingly, the energy-dependent diffusion cross section  $q_D(\varepsilon_r)$  is the main body of a model. Once  $q_D(\varepsilon_r)$  is obtained from theoretical or laboratory results, the collision frequency coefficient is calculated as follows.

178

179  $q_{\rm D}(\varepsilon_{\rm r})$  is integrated over energy for each temperature to obtain the average cross section  $\bar{Q}_{\rm D}(T_{\rm r})$  as

180

$$\overline{Q}_{\rm D}\left(T_{\rm r}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty q_{\rm D} e^{-x} x^2 dx \tag{1}$$

181 where *x* is defined by  $\varepsilon_r = xk_BT_r/e$ . See Table 2 for the definitions of the physical parameters.

This equation is equivalent to equation (3) of Dalgarno et al. (1958) and equation (7) of Hickman et al. (1997a). Numerical integration is necessary for general cases.

184

185  $\bar{Q}_{\rm D}(T_{\rm r})$  is associated with the momentum-transfer collision frequency coefficient as

186

$$v_{\rm LAB} / n_{\rm n} = \frac{m_{\rm n}}{m_{\rm i} + m_{\rm n}} \frac{4}{3} \sqrt{\frac{8k_{\rm B}}{\pi\mu_{\rm in}}} \sqrt{T_{\rm r}} \bar{Q}_{\rm D}$$
 (2)

in the laboratory frame. This equation is equivalent to equation (8) of Hickman et al. (1997a).

## 188 2.4 Approximation on Charge-exchange Collision

189 The classic model neglects the long-range force in the resonant charge-exchange collision. Then, 190 the resonant charge-exchange cross section  $q_{\rm E}(\varepsilon_{\rm r})$  can be given in the form of

191  $q_{\rm E}\left(\varepsilon_{\rm r}\right) = \left(A_0 - B_0 \log_{10} \varepsilon_{\rm r}\right)^2 \tag{3}$ 

where  $A_0$  and  $B_0$  are constants that depend on the particle species. These constants are obtained

from theoretical calculations or laboratory experiments. This approximate form was theoretically
 established by Dalgarno (1958b).

195

197

196 When  $q_{\rm E}(\varepsilon_{\rm r})$  is given by equation (3), the integration (equation (1)) can be approximated using

$$\bar{Q}_{\rm E}(T_{\rm r}) = \left[ \left( A_0 + R_{\rm T} B_0 \right) - B_0 \log_{10} T_{\rm r} \right]^2 \tag{4}$$

where  $R_T \sim 3.668$  and other constants are defined in equation (3) (Mason & Vanderslice, 1959; Banks, 1966; Pesnell et al., 1994; Ieda, 2020). The neglect of the long-range force also implies an approximation:

201
$$\begin{cases} q_{\rm D}(\varepsilon_{\rm r}) = 2 \times q_{\rm E}(\varepsilon_{\rm r}) \\ \bar{Q}_{\rm D}(T_{\rm r}) = 2 \times \bar{Q}_{\rm E}(T_{\rm r}) \end{cases}$$
(5)

- 202 The corresponding collision frequency can be obtained using equation (2).
- 203

Note that this method is not used for the later wide-energy model because it includes the long-

range force. Hence, equation (3) does not strictly hold. Instead, numerical integration is used in equation (1).

## 207 **3 Original Construction and Justification of the Classic Model**

#### 208 3.1 Original Construction of Classic Model

209 The classic  $v(O^+-O)$  model was originally constructed by K1964. There are many classic  $v(O^+-O)$ 

models (e.g., K1964, Banks, 1966; Banks & Kockarts, 1973; Schunk & Walker, 1973; Schunk & Nagy, 2009; Ieda, 2020). They are based on  $q_E(\varepsilon_r)$  of K1964 and are essentially the same,

although they may appear different because of different output styles, small errors, and

numerical rounding. The classic model was recalculated from the K1964 cross section by Ieda

(2020). This result is supposed to be accurate and is shown in Figure 1c by the line labeled

<sup>214</sup> (2020). This result is supposed to be accurate and is shown in Figure 1e by the line labeled <sup>215</sup> "Ieda2020." The Banks (1966) model is an underestimation of this accurate model by 4% (Table

- 1), presumably due to error (Ieda, 2020).
- 217

218 Before the classic model, Dalgarno (1958a) introduced the O<sup>+</sup>-O charge-exchange collision

concept for the diffusion of the F2 layer. However, Dalgarno (1964) noticed that the collision

frequency of Dalgarno (1958a) was approximately three times that of the S1964 laboratory

experiment. Accordingly, Dalgarno (1964) divided the Dalgarno (1958a) model by a factor of

three to be close to the S1964 laboratory experiment. In other words, the Dalgarno (1964) model

is conceptually similar to the correction-factor type model, where the Dalgarno (1958a) model is

the basis.

225

K1964 improved the electric potential curve of the O<sup>+</sup>-O system by including available

spectroscopic data (see section 5). They insisted that their resultant  $q_{\rm E}(\varepsilon_{\rm r})$  is much closer to the

228 S1964 laboratory ion beam measurement (5.5% difference) than the Dalgarno (1958a) model is.

K1964 extrapolated the  $q_{\rm E}(\varepsilon_{\rm r})$  that they calculated above 1 eV down to ionospheric energies. This

- extrapolation is implicitly included in equation (3).
- 231

Banks (1966) adopted the K1964 cross-section model from existing models because K1964

insisted that their model was justified by the S1964 laboratory result. Banks (1966) stated,

234 "according to Knof et al., the average deviation between the predicted and measured values is

only 5.5 per cent. Therefore, the charge exchange cross section of Knof et al. will be used here."

(p. 1115). That is, Banks (1966) does not appear to have confirmed this justification. The

Dalgarno (1964) model is consistent with the S1964 results by definition. However, Banks

(1966) did not adopt the Dalgarno (1964) model, presumably because it includes a correction

- 239 factor.
- 240 3.2 Original Justification of Classic Model

K1964 compared their O<sup>+</sup>-O  $q_{\rm E}(\varepsilon_{\rm r})$  calculated at 1–10,000 eV with the S1964 laboratory

measurements at 40–10,000 eV in their Table 5. This comparison is shown in columns (2) and
(3) of Table 3. Figure 2a shows these values and Figure 2b shows their ratio.

244

- K1964 justified their results by insisting that there was consistency with laboratory
- measurements, stating, "The average absolute deviation between the calculated and experimental
- values over the experimental energy range is only 5.5%." (p. 3553). Although we cannot
- determine how to reproduce this 5.5%, the deviation between the K1964 results in column (2) of
- Table 3 and the S1964 results in column (3) do appear small at superthermal energies; that is, 2%
- 250 (21.5 to 22.0) at 100 eV.
- 251

252 However, the slope is different at ~100 eV, as shown in Figure 2b. As a consequence, the

deviation is much larger at ionospheric energies, that is, 18% (36.8 to 43.3) at 0.1 eV. Thus, the

K1964 results are not strongly supported by the laboratory measurements in the practical

- ionospheric context. Note that S1964 estimated  $\pm 25\%$  uncertainty in the absolute magnitudes of the cross sections in their experiment. Accordingly, discussions of laboratory results are not
- the cross sections in their experiment. Accordingly, discussions of laboratory results are not definite within this order but focus on the most probable values for relative justification.
- 258

In summary, the classic  $v(O^+-O)$  model was constructed theoretically by K1964. The K1964

260 model was adopted by the famous Banks (1966) model because K1964 insisted that their

theoretical model was close to S1964 laboratory results. The S1964 laboratory measurement is

not directly used to construct the classic  $v(O^+-O)$  model; S1964 was used only for justification at

superthermal energies.

Energy	Cross section $(10^{-20} \text{ m}^2)$				
(eV)	(2) Knof et	Stebbings et al. (1964)			
	al. (1964)	(3) Unconverted (Energy in experiment)	(4) Converted (Energy in theory)	(5) Ground-state (Adjusted for contamination)	
0.1	(36.8)	[43.3]	[40.8]	[43.9]	
1	31.2	[35.4]	[33.2]	[35.6]	
10	26.2	(28.3)	[26.3]	[28.3]	
100	21.5	22.0	[20.3]	[21.8]	
1,000	17.3	16.5	[15.0]	[16.1]	
10,000	13.6	11.8	[10.5]	[11.3]	

264 **Table 3**. O<sup>+</sup>-O Energy-dependent Collision Cross Section

Note. The O<sup>+</sup>-O charge-exchange cross sections as a function of reduced energy, also shown in Figure 2. The values shown in square brackets are calculated in this study. The other values are listed in Table 5 of Knof et al. (1964) ("K1964"), where the parentheses indicate extrapolated values. K1964 compared their theoretical result in column (2) with the Stebbings et al. (1964)

laboratory result in column (3). For clarification, we calculate the values 43.3 and 35.4 in column
(3) using equation (37) in K1964, which is the same as equation (7) of S1964. This equation is

consistent with the other values in column (3).



272

**Figure 2**. O<sup>+</sup>-O charge-exchange cross section as a function of reduced energy, also shown in 273 Table 3. The dashed lines indicate extrapolated energy ranges. (a) The Knof et al. (1964)

274 ("K1964") theoretical result and the Stebbings et al. (1964) ("S1964") laboratory result. (b) The 275

ratio of (a) to the K1964 values. (c) Similar to (b), but the S1964 results are shown in three 276

formats: (3) "unconverted": as-is in K1964; that is, the energy of S1964 should be converted 277

278 when referred in theoretical studies but is left unconverted in error; (4) "converted": energy of

S1964 is converted correctly in the present study; (5) "ground-state": "converted" S1964 model 279

is further adjusted to the ground-state  $O^+$  case in the present study, assuming that measured  $O^+$  is 280

contaminated with the excited-state  $O^+$  by 23%. Note that (5) is the best interpretation of the 281

laboratory results for ionospheric study and is higher than the K1964 result by 19% at 0.1 eV. 282

#### **4 Revised Interpretation of Laboratory Results** 283

In this section, we correct and refine the original interpretation of the laboratory results made by 284

K1964. As a result, we confirm that the classic model is not consistent with laboratory 285 measurements, in contrast to the original interpretation by K1964. 286

#### 4.1 Conventional Energy and Laboratory Contamination 287

Both classic and later theoretical models of O<sup>+</sup>-O  $q_D(\varepsilon_r)$  justify themselves by consistency with 288 the ion-beam laboratory experiment of S1964. However, there are two problems in the 289

interpretation of the laboratory experiment. They are (A) definition of energy and (B) 290

contamination of excited-state O<sup>+</sup>, as detailed respectively in Appendices A and B. The two 291 problems are briefly explained in the following. 292

293

(A) Definition of energy: The conventional definition of kinetic energy is two times different 294 across theoretical studies and laboratory experiments. For example, 1 eV in theoretical studies 295

296 corresponds to 2 eV in laboratory experiments. Thus, when the cross section is obtained by

experiments, the corresponding energy should be divided by two by theoretical studies. 297

- However, K1964 shows the S1964 results without this conversion (column (3) of Table 3). In 298
- contrast, we converted these "unconverted" values in column (3) to the "converted" values in 299
- column (4) in Table 3. As a result, the "unconverted" values overestimate the "converted" values 300

by approximately 9% at 100 eV (Figure 2c). 301

302

(B) Contamination of excited-state O<sup>+</sup>: The S1964 laboratory measurements are contaminated by 303 the excited-state O<sup>+</sup> ion, although the ground-state O<sup>+</sup> is relevant to the ionosphere. The impact 304

- of this contamination has been unknown and is not included in the classic model. We estimate
- that the original S1964 model has underestimated the cross section in the ionospheric context by
- 6.9%. Accordingly, we adjusted the "converted" values by multiplying it by  $1/0.931 \sim 1.074$  to
- obtain the "ground-state" values in column (5). As a result, "ground-state" results are close to the "unconverted" results within approximately 1% between 0.1 and 100 eV, as shown in Figure 2c.
- 310
- This indicates that the (A) conversions and (B) adjustments coincidentally cancel each other.
- Accordingly, the closeness in values and the differences in slopes at high energies between the
- K1964 and the S1964 results are not significantly altered by this revision. Note that the
- 314 contamination effect is now included as a result of our revision.

#### 315 4.2 Construction of a Laboratory-based Collision Frequency Model

- In this section, we construct collision frequency models based on laboratory experiments.
- "Unconverted," "converted," and "ground-state" versions of S1964  $q_{\rm E}(\varepsilon_{\rm r})$  discussed in section
- 4.1 are given by equations (A1), (A2), and (B3), respectively. Because these  $q_{\rm E}(\varepsilon_{\rm r})$  values are
- already expressed in the form of equation (3),  $\bar{Q}_D(T)$  can be obtained using equations (4) and (5).
- Accordingly, the collision frequency can be obtained using equation (2). For example, the
- 321 resultant "ground-state" S1964 model is

322 
$$\bar{Q}_{\rm E}(T_{\rm r}) = 1.0741 \times (8.0712 - 0.63 \log_{10} T_{\rm r})^2 \times 10^{-20}$$
 (6)

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\rm E}(I_{\rm r}) = 1.0741 \times (0.0712 - 0.0510 {\rm g}_{10} I_{\rm r}) \times 10 \tag{0}$$

$$v_{\text{LAB}} / n_{\text{n}} = 34.297 \sqrt{T_{\text{r}}} 2\bar{Q}_{\text{E}} = 0.4800 \sqrt{T_{\text{r}}} \left(1 - 0.07806 \times \log_{10} T_{\text{r}}\right)^2 \times 10^{-16}$$
(7)

- 324
- Figure 3 shows the Burnside factor of these models. The "ground-state" model is our best
- interpretation of the S1964 laboratory measurement for ionospheric study. The value at 1000 K
   exceeds the value obtained from the Banks (1966) model by 23%.
- 328



**Figure 3**. Collision frequency coefficient models calculated based on a laboratory experiment by Stebbings et al. (1964) shown as the ratio to the Banks (1966) model. Three versions of the models are shown. See detailed explanation in Figure 2 caption. The version labeled (5) "ground-state" is the best interpretation of the laboratory results for ionospheric study and is higher than the Banks (1966) result by 23% at 1000 K. The Stubbe (1968) and the Stallcop et al. (1991) models are also shown.

#### 329 4.3 Curved Particle Trajectory Effect

- 330 The laboratory-based models do not include the curved trajectory effect by definition. In this
- section, we discuss that the curved trajectory effect was overestimated (28% at 1000 K) by
- 332 Stubbe (1968).

#### 333

- The long-range attractive polarization force makes particle trajectories curved, and thus increases
- the effective charge-exchange cross section. Accordingly, the actual  $O^+$ -O charge-exchange cross
- section is increasingly higher than equation (3) as the temperature decreases. This effect is not
- included in the classic model because Banks (1966) recognized that this effect was small; i.e., at
- most 11% at the transition temperature (235 K), implying that this effect is negligible at 1000 K.
- 339
- In contrast, Stubbe (1968) insisted that the curved trajectory effect should be included; they
- estimated that the effect increased the collision frequency by 28% at 1000 K from the Banks
- (1966) model. This Stubbe (1968) result was mentioned by Salah (1993) and Pesnell et al. (1994)
   and is likely to be recognized as responsible for the 30% difference between the classic and later
- 344

models.

- 345
- However, Stubbe (1968) incorrectly assumed that Banks (1966) adopted the S1964 cross section.
- 347 In reality, Banks adopted the K1964 cross section instead, as explained in section 3. This
- misunderstanding is also pointed out by Carlson and Harper (1977). Accordingly, the
- contribution of the curved trajectory effect is not 28% (from "Banks1966" to "Stubbe1968" in
- Figure 3), but only 5.8% (from "Unconverted S1964" to "Stubbe1968" in Figure 3) at 1000 K.
- For some clarification, Stubbe (1968) did not convert energy. We calculate that the ratio of the Stubbe (1968) model to the Banks (1966) model is 29%, not 28%.
- 353

Nevertheless, the slope of the Stubbe (1968) model appears close to the later theoretical model

- 355 (S1991) at approximately 1000 K in Figure 3. This closeness suggests that the Stubbe (1968)
- 356 calculation of the curved trajectory effect itself is correct and that this effect is consistent with
- the long-range force that is included in the later model.

# 3584.4 Summary of the Revised Interpretation

The result from the "ground-state" laboratory-based model ( $F_{B66} \sim 1.23$  at 1000 K) is close to that from the S1991 model ( $F_{B66} = 1.28$  at 1000 K), particularly when the curved trajectory effect (~6% at 1000 K) is added. Hence, the classic model ( $F_{B66} \sim 1$ ) should be replaced by the later model, based on laboratory results.

363

The 28% difference in v(O<sup>+</sup>-O) at 1000 K between the Banks (1966) and S1991 models includes 364 the core difference of 19%, the non-essential error of 4% in the Banks (1966) model. The 365 remaining 5% is presumed to be due to the curved trajectory effect ( $\sim$ 6%). The core difference 366 corresponds to the difference of approximately 19% between the classic and the "ground-state" 367 laboratory results at approximately 0.1 eV, as shown in Figure 2c. The core difference implies 368 that the slope or energy dependence of the cross section is less accurate in the classic theory. 369 Note that values are calculated or measured only at high energies in the classic high-energy 370 model and in the laboratory experiment; values at low energies are obtained by extrapolation as a 371 consequence of slope. 372

# 373 **5 Theoretical Differences**

- In this section, we discuss the theoretical differences between the classic high-energy model and
- the later wide-energy model. There are several updates from K1964 (the classic model) to S1991
- 376 (the later model), but it is often difficult to identify the impact of each update. We broadly

discuss selected updates in this section. The key difference is in the potential curve as explainedbelow.

379 5.1 Potential Curve

Collision frequency or cross-section models depend largely on the electric potential of the ionneutral particle pair system. This potential is a function of the internuclear separation distance and is called the interaction potential curve. The classic models are based on the potential curve constructed by K1964 for the O<sup>+</sup>-O system, whereas the later models are based on the potential curve constructed by S1991.

385

Dalgarno (1958a) speculated the potential curve referring to the ionization potential of atomic
oxygen. K1964 enhanced Dalgarno (1958a) by including spectroscopic data of dissociation
energy for some electronic states to improve the potential curve. K1964 is recognized as a
milestone (Capitelli et al., 1996). However, K1964 is not cited by S1991, presumably because it
was recognized as too outdated.

391

The energy dependence of the charge-exchange cross section depends on the functional form of the potential curve. Stallcop (1971) pointed out that the functional form used for the potential curve in K1964 should be modified depending on spin multiplicity, as Capitelli et al. (1977) explain that Stallcop (1971) improved the K1964 approach, "by constraining the doublet molecular wavefunctions to transform properly also under inversion through the middle-point of the internuclear distance." (p. 269). That is, the energy-dependence of K1964 at high energy was in error and was corrected by Stallcop (1971).

399

Capitelli et al. (1977) suggested that the N<sup>+</sup>-N cross section of K1964 is underestimated by 30% without this correction. This is presumably associated with the fact that the energy-dependence of the N<sup>+</sup>-N cross section is less significant in K1964 than in Capitelli et al. (1977), as seen in Figure 3 of Capitelli et al. (1977). Thus, the O<sup>+</sup>-O cross section would also be significantly affected.

405

Stallcop and Partridge (1985) do not refer to K1964, but updated Stallcop (1971) by including
the outer boundary area of the charge-exchange. This update appears to increase the N<sup>+</sup>-N cross
section by 5% in Figure 3 of Stallcop and Partridge (1985). Thus, it is likely that the O<sup>+</sup>-O cross
section was also affected by this order. S1991 also included several revisions to the potential
curve without any explanation of the impacts, as outlined in Partridge and Stallcop (1986).

411 5.2 Mechanics and Long-range Force

Differences between the mechanical methods for K1964 and S1991 are not likely to have a
significant impact at high energies, as explained in the following paragraphs. Approximations in
quantum mechanics may be introduced for atomic and molecular collisions because the de
Broglie wavelength is relatively short. Both K1964 and S1991 invoke semiclassical
approximations.

417

K1964 used the impact parameter method. This relatively simple method is valid only at high
 energies because it assumes straight particle trajectories. That is, the long-range polarization

force and the resultant curved particle trajectory effect are not included. In addition, this method

- does not determine the rapid quantum oscillations of the electron transfer probability against the
- impact parameter that characterize close collisions. Instead it invokes the random phase
- 423 approximation, which means that the probability of electron transfer from a neutral particle to an
- ion in a close collision is taken to be 1/2.
- 425

S1991 used quantum mechanics with the semi-classical Wentzel–Kramers–Brillouin (WKB) approximation; that is, only the first-order perturbation of the Planck constant is considered for the nuclear wave function in the  $O^+$ -O quasi-molecule. This method can include the long-range force, which, however, is negligible above 1 eV. It can also include some discrete structures such as orbiting and glory resonances. However, such structures are mostly averaged out when the cross section is integrated over energy (Heiche & Mason, 1970).

431 432

For clarification, Hickman et al. (1997a) used full quantum mechanics, although we classify it

- the same type as S1991 because the potential curve is mostly based on S1991. Quantum spin-
- orbit interaction effects are important below approximately 300 K, but average out at higher
- temperatures, where the particle kinetic energy is much larger than the spin-orbit splitting.
- 437 Accordingly, the differences in method between Hickman et al. (1997a), K1964, and S1991 do
- not cause significant differences in cross sections at high energies (i.e., above 1 eV).
- 439 5.3 Summary of Theoretical Difference
- 440 We have discussed theoretical differences between K1964 and S1991 that potentially cause the
- difference in the cross section. Several improvements were introduced to K1964. Although we
- 442 are unable to precisely estimate the impact of each factor, the major cause appears to be in the
- 443 potential curve and not mechanics, presumably associated with the correction by Stallcop (1971).
- This error associated with spin multiplicity appears to cause an error in the energy-dependence
- (slope) of the cross section of K1964 as seen in Figure 3 of Capitelli et al. (1977).
- 446

Because many corrections were applied to the K1964 model, it is theoretically outdated. Thus,
we hesitate to use the classic model that is based on K1964. The later model (e.g., S1991) is the

- 449 corrected descendent of the classic model; they share the core idea, which is electronic structure
- 450 calculations combined with available spectroscopic data to construct their potential curves. Thus,
- from the theoretical point of view, the classic model should be replaced by the later model. In
- 452 addition, the later model includes the long-range force because the mechanics were also
- improved for describing lower energy.

# 454 **6 Implications of Correction-factor Type Model**

- 455 The correction-factor type  $v(O^+-O)$  model is a correction of the classic model with a constant 456 factor (see section 1). In this section, we discuss the implications of this model.
- 457 6.1 Original Proposal by Salah
- 458 Salah (1993) proposed the correction-factor type model, motivated by ionospheric observations
- 459 at that time ( $F_{B66} \sim 1.75$ ). Salah (1993) claimed that "It is clear that the early values derived by
- Dalgarno (1964), Banks (1966) and Schunk and Walker (1973) are too low, since they are
- primarily based on laboratory measurements that require confirmation due to the effects of beam
- 462 contamination. Theoretical formulations such as Stubbe (1968), Stallcop et al. (1991), and
- Pesnell et al. (1993) favor a 30% increase over the early models." (p. 1545). Salah (1993) also

- stated that "Unpublished theoretical calculations [A. Dalgarno, private communication, 1992]
- result in a collision cross-sections that are a factor of 1.5 larger than the results by Stallcop et al."
  (p. 1544).
- 467
- Thus, Salah (1993) believed that the classic model is based on laboratory results and is
- underestimated due to laboratory contamination. They presumably thought that laboratory
- 470 contamination can be corrected by a constant. Accordingly, they selected the classic model as the
- basis to be corrected by a constant. Salah did not select the later theoretical model (e.g., S1991),
- presumably in anticipation that this model will be taken over by a future correct theoretical
- 473 model (i.e., the private communication), which would be more consistent with ionospheric474 observations at that time.
- 475
- 476 For clarification, we state for simplicity that Salah (1993) adopted the classic model as the basis
- model. Strictly speaking, their basis model is neither the same as the Dalgarno (1964) nor the
- classic models but is a simplified version of these models. Salah (1993) recognized that these
- 479 models (the Dalgarno, classic, and their models) were primarily based on laboratory
- 480 measurements and were essentially the same in their context.

#### 481 6.2 Misunderstanding in Original Proposal

- 482 However, it is a misunderstanding that the classic model is based on laboratory measurement. In
- reality, the classic model is based on the K1964 theoretical result (see section 3). This
- 484 misunderstanding could have been noticed if the classic model and the laboratory result were
- numerically compared (Figure 3). In other words, the laboratory result was not shown in Salah
- (1993), presumably because they misunderstood that the classic model was based on the
- 487 laboratory result.
- 488
- 489 Due to this misunderstanding, the correction-factor model adopted the classic model as its basis,
- 490 intending a calibration of laboratory contamination. In contrast, the classic model is based on
- theory, and thus the laboratory contamination is irrelevant. Hence, the physical reasoning behind
- 492 the correction-factor model does not make sense.
- 493

Salah (1993) also recognized that the result of the S1991 model was 30% higher than the
laboratory expectation. This second misunderstanding presumably occurred due to their first
misunderstanding. In reality, the S1991 model is close to laboratory expectation (within ~5% at
1000 K, Figure 3). Furthermore, there is no follow-up theoretical study to verify the private
communication (see section 6.1).

- 498 communication (see section 0.1).
- 4996.3 Current and Future Implications

The classic model is not based on a laboratory experiment. Thus, the original correction-factor type concept should be rejected. Although a constant correction factor to collision frequency may still be useful, a constant cannot correct the classic model, because the error of the classic model is temperature-dependent. Thus, the basis model should be the later wide-energy model. This model is already consistent with the contamination-adjusted laboratory model. Accordingly, the correction by a constant is neither for the contamination nor the later wide-energy collision fragmency (coefficient) model itself, but for the neutral atomic or used and

506 frequency (coefficient) model itself, but for the neutral atomic oxygen density.

#### 7 Discussion 507

7.1 Primary Concerns in the Present Study 508

As introduced in section 1, we had hesitated to employ the later wide-energy model because we 509 were concerned that the following four points were unclear. We have clarified them in support of 510

- this model as follows. 511
- 512

513 (1) The classic and the later models are different by 30% at 1000 K even though both models had

been claimed to be consistent with laboratory experiments. We clarified this discrepancy in 514

sections 3 and 4. That is, the later model is consistent with the laboratory-based model, but the 515 classic model is consistent only at superthermal energies (~100 eV). 516

517

(2) The S1964 laboratory experiment was contaminated by excited-state O<sup>+</sup>. We estimated that 518

- 519 the impact of this contamination on the measured cross section was small (7.4%). Meanwhile,
- we noticed that conventional laboratory energy was misinterpreted in previous theoretical 520
- studies, causing a conversion error. We estimated that the contamination and this 521
- misinterpretation tend to cancel each other (see section 4.1). 522
- 523

(3) The curved particle trajectory effect had been estimated to be 28% at 1000 K (Stubbe, 1968). 524 We clarified that the curved trajectory effect contributes only 6% at 1000 K to the cross section 525 (see section 4.3).

526

527

(4) Theoretical association between the classic and the later models was not readily clear because 528 529 K1964 is not referenced by S1991. We now recognize that the S1991 model is the correction and update of K1964 (see section 5). 530

7.2 Why Is the Later Model Still Not Adopted? 531

As explained in section 1, it is known that the later wide-energy model is closer to current 532

statistical ionospheric observations ( $F_{B66} \sim 1.3$ ) than the classic high-energy model is. Thus, the 533 classic model should have been replaced by the later model from the ionospheric observation 534 point of view. In this section, we discuss why the later model has still not been adopted. 535

536

A possible reason may be tradition. The later model has not been adopted by previous studies, in 537 particular, by Salah (1993). The later model is not widely known because it is not mentioned in 538 key textbooks (i.e., Schunk & Nagy, 2009; Kelley, 2009; Brekke, 2013). 539

540

541 The core reason is presumably that the classic model (e.g., Banks, 1966; Schunk & Nagy, 2009) is misunderstood as based on laboratory experiments. Namely, it is often misunderstood (e.g., 542

Stubbe, 1968; Pesnell et al., 1993; Salah, 1993; Buonsanto et al., 1997; Lindsay et al., 2001) to 543

544 be the case that the classic model is based on the S1964 laboratory result. In reality, the classic

model is based on the K1964 theoretical model. This misunderstanding could have been noticed 545

if the classic model and the laboratory result had been numerically compared (Figure 3). In other 546

words, this misunderstanding is likely why there has been no explicit collision frequency model 547

548 that is based on laboratory measurement.

549

550 The cause of this misunderstanding may be a coincidence as follows. Dalgarno (1964) thought

- that the collision frequency of the Dalgarno (1958a) theoretical model was approximately three
- times higher than the S1964 laboratory experiment, and divided the Dalgarno (1958a) model by
- a factor of three (see section 3.1). The resultant Dalgarno (1964) model ( $F_{B66} = 1.01$  at 1000 K)
- is similar to the Banks (1966) model ( $F_{B66} = 1$ ).
- 555

This similarity (1%) may give the impression that the Banks (1966) model should also be

extremely close to laboratory results. Furthermore, the extreme closeness may appear to support

the recognition that the classic model is based on the laboratory result. Note, however, that
 Dalgarno (1964) presumably intended a rough calibration, using the factor of three. The resultant

Dalgarno (1964) model is not so close to the laboratory results (e.g., 14-22% at 1000 K in Table1).

562

In some other previous studies, the classic model was recognized as a theoretical model, but was often interpreted as being in "reasonable agreement" with laboratory results (e.g., Burnside et al.,

<sup>565</sup> 1987; Nicolls et al., 2006). This lack of clarity was partly inevitable because the impact of

- 566 laboratory contamination was unclear.
- 567

In summary, the Dalgarno (1964) model is extremely close to the Banks (1966) model by a rare

coincidence. This coincidence presumably endorsed the misunderstanding that the classic model
 is based on laboratory results. The classic model was adopted as the basis due to this

is based on laboratory results. The classic model was adopted as the basis due to this
 misunderstanding and is still used presumably by tradition. As a consequence, the superior merit

- 572 of the latter model has not been appreciated.
- 573 7.3 Slope of Lindsay Laboratory Results

574 Lindsay et al. (2001) performed the most recently reported laboratory measurement of the O<sup>+</sup>-O

collision cross section. They insist that their results are consistent with the Salah (1993) model

 $(F_{B66} \sim 1.75)$ . This conclusion prevents definitive consensus on the Burnside problem (e.g.,

577 Nicolls et al., 2006) and thus is likely another reason why the later model ( $F_{B66} \sim 1.3$ ) is not

adopted in ionospheric applications. We clarify this conclusion as follows.

579

580 S1964 measured the cross section at 40-10,000 eV, where O<sup>+</sup>-states are mixed. Lindsay et al.

(2001) measured the cross section at 500–5,000 eV, where  $O^+$  states are separated. They

identified that the S1964 result with mixed-state O<sup>+</sup> lies between their ground- and excited-state

- results (Figure 4), and in this regard insisted that their experiment is consistent with the S1964
- 584 results.

585 586 Confusingly, Lindsay et al. (2001) also concluded that their results are consistent with Salah 587 (1993). Lindsay et al. (2001) did not show a line that represents an extrapolation of their results 588 in the Figure 4 of their paper but pointed the cross section that is 1.7 times greater than that of 589 S1964. This factor of 1.7 implicitly invokes the Salah (1993) model. As a result, their conclusion 590 may tend to be interpreted that an extrapolation of the Lindsay et al. (2001) ground-state results 591 is consistent with Salah (1993).

- 592
- However, this interpretation is incorrect as shown in Figure 4. An extrapolation of the Lindsay et al. (2001) ground-state results corresponds to  $q_{\rm E} = 104 \times 10^{-20}$  m<sup>2</sup> and  $F_{\rm B66} = 2.8$  at 0.1 eV, which

- is much larger than the Salah (1993) model ( $F_{B66} \sim 1.75$ ). For clarification, Lindsay et al. (2001)
- 596 misunderstood that the classic model is based on laboratory results and thus overestimated the597 Salah (1993) model.





**Figure 4**. The O<sup>+</sup>-O charge-exchange cross section  $q_E$  against ion kinetic energy in the 599 laboratory frame  $\varepsilon_i$ . Laboratory measurements by Stebbings et al. (1964) (red) at 40–10,000 eV 600 and Lindsay et al. (2001) (black) are compared. The green diamond shows the Salah (1993) 601 model  $q_{\rm E} = 58.3 \times 10^{-20} \,\mathrm{m^2}$ , which is independent of energy. Circles indicate the Lindsay et al. 602 (2001) measurements at five ion energies (500, 850, 1500, 2800, and 5000 eV). Corresponding 603 least-square regression lines are calculated in the present study:  $\sqrt{q_E} = 8.838 - 1.364 \times \log_{10\varepsilon_i}$ 604 correlation coefficient cc=-0.997 for the ground-state;  $\sqrt{q_E} = 6.576 - 0.8852 \times \log_{10}\varepsilon_i$ , cc=-0.974 605 for the excited-state. 606

607

The unrealistically high cross section ( $F_{B66} = 2.8$  at 0.1 eV) stems from the steep slope. The slope or energy-dependence of the cross section is steeper in their ground-state results than in the S1964 results (Figure 4). However, Lindsay et al. (2001) did not discuss the difference in slope. Instead, Lindsay et al. (2001) prohibited extrapolation of their results down to ~ 0.1 eV, stating that "The present results for ground state ions cannot be used to estimate the thermal energy

cross section with any degree of accuracy because of their limited energy range and the

associated uncertainties." (p. 8202). Thus, neither an extrapolation nor the slope is relevant to their conclusion.

616

Instead, the reason of their conclusion is that "the charge transfer cross section for ground state ions is larger than that for excited ions and may thus be considered as lending support to a larger value for the thermal energy cross section than was inferred from the earlier laboratory work" (p.

8202). That is, they intended to state that a correct model should be higher than the S1964 result

- 621 because of the contamination.
- 622

However, the impact of contamination is only 6.9%, as we have estimated it in section 4.1. Thus,

the S1964 model is valid, especially after the small adjustment for this impact. For clarification,

the contamination is independent of ion energy. Lindsay and Stebbings (2005) do not mention an

energy-dependence when they discuss the contamination.

627

- In summary, Lindsay et al. (2001) concluded that their result of O<sup>+</sup>-O cross section is consistent
- with the Salah (1993) model. Note however that Lindsay et al. (2001) prohibited extrapolations
- of their results. Thus, they do not intend to exclusively support the Salah (1993) model in their
- logical flow. The adjusted S1964 model is consistent with the later model, which means that the
- result of Lindsay et al. (2001) is more consistent with the later model than with the Salah (1993)
- 633 model.

# 634 8 Conclusion

This study describes the O<sup>+</sup>-O collision frequency models. Currently, the classic theoretical
model (e.g., Banks, 1966; Schunk & Nagy, 2009) is widely used, often with a correction factor.
In contrast, the later theoretical model (e.g., Stallcop et al., 1991) is not used for ionospheric
applications. We conclude that the classic model should be replaced by the later model, primarily
because the later model is the correction of the classic model.

640

It has often been misunderstood that the classic model is based on laboratory results. Owing to

this misunderstanding, the correction-factor model (e.g., Salah, 1993) has adopted the classic

model as its basis, intending a calibration of laboratory contamination. In reality, the classic

model is based on Knof et al. (1964) theory. Thus, the original purpose of the correction-factor

model does not make sense. The energy-dependent error in the classic model cannot be correctedby a constant.

646 647

A correction factor to collision frequency may be useful if its basis is the later theoretical model.

However, such a constant rather implies a correction of assumed neutral atomic oxygen density.

650 Simultaneous observation of atomic oxygen is necessary for further evaluation of the collision

- 651 frequency coefficient model. The later model may not be final but is better than the classic model
- from all points of view (ionospheric observation, laboratory measurement, and theoretical study).

# 653 Appendix A: Conventional Kinetic Energy in Laboratory Experiment and Theory

654 Kinetic energy is not defined with an equation in previous studies. The conventional definition of

kinetic energy is different across laboratory experiments and theoretical studies. For the collision

of a parental particle pair such as  $O^+$ -O, the conventional energy in a laboratory ion beam

experiment is twice that in a theoretical study (Appendix A1). This relationship should have been

used in previous studies (Appendix A2). However, the energy used in the S1964 laboratory

experiment was not converted in K1964 and S1991 theoretical studies. As a result, the energy-

dependent cross section of the laboratory results is overestimated in these theoretical studies by 100 M (A = 100 M)))))

- approximately 9% at 100 eV (Appendix A3).
- A1 Summary of Conventional Kinetic Energy

663 The conventional definitions of kinetic energy are summarized in Table A1. For simplicity, the

parameters in the theoretical study are approximated for collisions between parental particle pairs

such as  $O^+$ -O. That is, the ion mass  $m_i$  and the neutral mass  $m_n$  are practically the same. Let us

consider the same collision with relative speed g from two different points of view (i.e.,

laboratory experiment and theoretical study).

668

- In this study, the laboratory experiment refers to the ion beam experiment by S1964. Ion beam
- experiments eject the O<sup>+</sup> ion at speed  $v_i = g$ , which will collide the target neutral atomic O that
- 671 presumably has initial speed  $v_n = 0$  in the laboratory frame. The relative speed  $g = v_i v_n$  is
- independent of the frame. As a result, conventional energy in the laboratory experiment is twice
- that in the theoretical study (Table A1). Corresponding examples of numerical values are listed
- 674 in Table A2.

	Laboratory ion beam	I heoretical study
	experiment	
Frame	Laboratory	Center-of-mass
Relative speed (m/s)	g	g
Ion speed $v_i$ (m/s)	g	$\sim g/2$
Neutral speed $v_n$ (m/s)	0	$\sim -g/2$
Reduced mass (kg)		$\mu_{\rm in} \equiv m_{\rm i} m_{\rm n} / (m_{\rm i} + m_{\rm n}) \sim m_{\rm i} / 2$
Conventional energy	$\varepsilon_{\rm i,LAB} \equiv m_{\rm i} v_{\rm i}^2 / 2e$	$\varepsilon_{\rm r} \equiv \mu_{\rm in} g^2 / 2e$
(eV)	$= m_{\rm i}g^2/2e \sim 2\varepsilon_{ m r}$	$\sim (m_{\rm i}/2)g^2/2e = m_{\rm i}g^2/4e \sim \varepsilon_{\rm i,LAB}/2$
T 6 1	Ion energy (present study)	Reduced energy (present study)
Term for energy used	Ion energy (Stebbings et al., 1964)	Energy (Knof et al., 1964)
in the present and	Projectile energy (Lindsay et al.,	Kinetic energy of relative motion (Banks,
previous studies	2001; Lindsay & Stebbings, 2005)	1966; Pesnell et al., 1994)
1	Collision energy (Lindsay &	Collision energy (Stallcop et al., 1991)
	Stebbings, 2005)	Kinetic energy (Hickman et al., 1997a)

675 **Table A1**. Conventional Definition of Kinetic Energy in Laboratory and Theory Laboratory ion beam Theoretical study

*Note.* The conventional definition of energy for the ion-neutral collision is different across

laboratory ion beam experiments and theoretical studies. These definitions were not shown with

equations in previous studies and are inferred by the present study. This table is valid only when

ion and neutral masses are practically the same, that is, for the collision of a parental particle pair

680 such as  $O^+$ -O.

681

682 **Table A2**. Correspondence of Conventional Energies for Parental Ion–Neutral Collision

(a) Reduced energy	(b) Ion energy	(c) Reduced	(d) Reduced energy
in theory	in laboratory	temperature	in theory
$\varepsilon_{\rm r}  ({\rm eV})$	Ei,LAB (eV)	$T_{kT}(\mathbf{K})$	$\varepsilon_{\rm r}$ (a.u.)
~ $\varepsilon_{i,LAB}$ (eV)/2	~ $2\varepsilon_r (eV)$	~ 11604.52 <i>ε</i> <sub>r</sub> (eV)	~ \varepsilon_r (eV)/27.21139
27.211	54.423	315775	1
2	4	23209	0.073499
1	2	11605	0.036749
1/2	1	5802.3	0.018375
0.17235	0.34469	2000	0.0063336
0.086173	0.17235	1000	0.0031668

*Note.* Example correspondence of conventional energies. See Table A1 for definition. A collision between a parental particle pair such as  $O^+$  and O is supposed; that is, the ion mass and the

between a parential particle pair such as O and O is supposed, that is, the foll mass and the

neutral particle mass are assumed to be the same. (a) Conventional energy in theoretical study.

(b) Corresponding conventional energy in laboratory ion beam experiment. (c) The reduced

temperature defined by  $T = e\varepsilon_r/k_B$ . Note that other definitions are possible. (d) Similar to (a), but

in the atomic unit in the Hartree definition.

A2 Indirect Evidence for the Existence of Different Conventional Definitions

In this section, we evaluate the conventional definitions of kinetic energy (Table A1) used in previous studies. Energy is generally not explicitly defined with an equation in previous studies, presumably because the definition of energy is evident within each scientific community. In other words, the same definition is likely used within each scientific community if there is no explicit explanation. The frame was also generally not explicitly defined in previous studies. In such studies, the frame is presumably the laboratory frame for laboratory experiments and the

- such studies, the frame is presumably the laboratorycenter-of-mass frame for theoretical studies.
- 697

We first confirm indirectly that "ion energy" in the S1964 laboratory experiment conventionally refers to  $\varepsilon_i = m_i v_i^2/2e$  that is defined in the laboratory frame. This interpretation is numerically consistent with the relationship for O<sup>+</sup> between ion energy of 1 eV and ion velocity of  $3.5 \times 10^3$ m/s shown in Table 4 and Figure 7 of Stebbings et al. (1966). Thus, our interpretation is presumably correct also in S1964.

703

In contrast, "energy" conventionally refers to  $\varepsilon_r = \mu_{in}g^2/2e$  in theoretical studies, although this

equation is not explicitly shown in previous theoretical studies (e.g., K1964; Banks, 1966;
Pesnell et al., 1993; Pesnell et al., 1994; Stallcop et al., 1991; Hickman et al., 1997a, 1997b). We
call this energy "reduced energy" associated with reduced mass to avoid confusion. Indirect
evidence for this convention is that Hasted (1964) states that "collision problems are frequently
discussed in terms of the equivalent one-body problem" (p. 49) in theoretical studies; the reduced
mass is used by Heiche and Mason (1970) to define their energy; and that the energy of relative

- motion of an ion and a gas in equation (4) of Dalgarno et al. (1958) is consistent with our
- reduced energy.
- 713

725

In summary, we have indirectly confirmed that the conventional energies are used in previous
 studies for O<sup>+</sup>-O collision. Thus, the energy used in laboratory experiments should be converted
 by previous theoretical studies (Table A1).

- A3 Conversion of Energy-dependent Cross Section from Laboratory Experiment to
   Theory
- According to the discussion in section A2, K1964 (a theoretical study) presumably used the reduced energy to show the results. This expectation is consistent with the usage of K1964
- results by Banks (1966). Thus, K1964 should have divided the S1964 energies by two before

showing the S1964 laboratory results of charge-exchange cross section  $q_{\rm E}(\tilde{\epsilon}_{\rm r})$  in their Table 5

(our Table 3). However, K1964 showed  $q_E$  in their equation (37) as is originally given in

724 equation (7) of S1964 as

$$q_{\rm E,S1964}^{\rm Unconverted} = \left(5.95 - 0.63 \log_{10} \varepsilon_{\rm i,LAB}\right)^2 \times 10^{-20}$$
(A1)

K1964 should have converted this equation using  $\varepsilon_{i,LAB} = 2\varepsilon_r$  to

727 
$$q_{\text{E},\text{S1964}}^{\text{Converted}} = (5.95 - 0.63 \log_{10} 2\varepsilon_{\text{r}})^2 \times 10^{-20} = (5.7604 - 0.63 \log_{10} \varepsilon_{\text{r}})^2 \times 10^{-20}$$
(A2)

For example, the cross section of equation (A1) is 21.996 at 100 eV and 20.253 at 200 eV, and

their ratio is 1.09. These values are valid when energy refers to the ion energy in the laboratory

experiment convention. However, K1964 presumably intended to show the S1964 results against

- the reduced energy. That is, the value of  $q_E$  at 200 eV in equation (A1) should have been used as
- the value at 100 eV in K1964. The lack of this conversion results in a 9% overestimation (i.e.,
- 733
   20.253 to 21.996) at 100 eV of reduced energy. That is, the value of 22.0 in Table 5 of K1964
- (column (3) of our Table 3) should have been 20.3, as shown in column (4) of our Table 3, for
- example. Similar calculations show overestimations of 10% at 1 keV and 6% at 0.1 eV.
- 736
- Similarly, S1991 should have divided the S1964 energies by two. For example, the value of the
- 738 cross section in S1964 originally at 40 eV (i.e., ion energy in the laboratory convention) should
- have been plotted at 20 eV (i.e., reduced energy) in Figure 5 of S1991. However, the 40 eV (lowest energy) data point of S1964 is shown enproximately at 40 eV (i.e.,  $40/27.21 - 10^{0.17}$  ev.)
- (lowest energy) data point of S1964 is shown approximately at 40 eV (i.e.,  $40/27.21 \sim 10^{0.17}$  a.u.) in Figure 5 of S1991. It should have been at 20 eV (i.e.,  $20/27.21 \sim 10^{-0.13}$  a.u.). Thus, S1991 did
- not convert the energy in error, as well.
- 743
- For clarification, the unit of energy is "atomic units" in Figure 5 of S1991 without further
- explanation. We notice that the unit of energy is "Eh" in Stallcop et al. (1998). Thus, we assume
- that the Hartree definition (not Rydberg definition) was used in S1991. Accordingly, 1 a.u.
- 747 corresponds to 27.21139 eV.
- 748

Another clarification is that Table 4 of Banks (1966) refers to the S1964 laboratory result as the

- coefficients of  $A_0 = 5.88$  and  $B_0 = 0.57$  (see our equation (3)). These coefficients are different
- from those in equations (A1) and (A2) and thus are probably typographical errors. However,
- these errors do not affect the conclusion of Banks (1966) because their model is not based on the
- 753 S1964 result.

# 754 Appendix B: Excited-State O<sup>+</sup> Contamination in Laboratory Experiments

The  $O^+$ -O collision in the ionosphere practically occurs between the ground-state  $O^+$  and ground-

state O. However, the S1964 laboratory experiment is contaminated with excited-state  $O^+$ .

Accordingly, we adjust the cross section of S1964 by multiplying it by a factor of 1.074 for

- ionospheric study in section 4.1. In this section, we describe our estimation of this factor.
- 759 B1 Impact of Contamination
- Lindsay et al. (2001) measured the ground-state cross section  $q_{\text{E,ground}}$  in a limited energy range

(500–5,000 eV) using a filtering technique. They also measured the mixed-state (ground- and

excited-state) cross section  $q_{\text{E,mixed}}$ . The excited-state cross section  $q_{\text{E,excited}}$  was not measured but calculated presumably using an association of sum:

764

$$q_{\rm E}^{\rm mixed} = f_{\rm e/m} q_{\rm E}^{\rm excited} + \left(1 - f_{\rm e/m}\right) q_{\rm E}^{\rm ground} \tag{B1}$$

where  $f_{e/m}$  is the fraction of number density (excited-state to mixed-state O<sup>+</sup>), which was measured but not reported. As a result, they estimated that  $q_{E,excited} \sim 0.7 \times q_{E,ground}$ .

767

This result is supposed to be independent of the details of each experiment. Thus, substitutinginto equation B1 yields:

- 770  $q_{\rm E}^{\rm mixed} / q_{\rm E}^{\rm ground} = 1 0.3 f_{\rm e/m}$  (B2)
- The fraction  $f_{e/m}$  depends on the details of each experiment and is not measured by S1964. We

assume  $f_{e/m}=0.23$ , as it will be discussed in section B2. Then, we find that the S1964 O<sup>+</sup>-O cross

section is underestimated by 6.9% for ionospheric purposes. Accordingly, we multiply equation A2 by a factor of  $1/0.931 \sim 1.074$  to deduce the ground-state O<sup>+</sup> cross section (see section 4.1). That is,

776 
$$q_{\rm E,S1964}^{\rm ground}\left(\varepsilon_{\rm r}\right) = 1.0741 \times q_{\rm E,S1964}^{\rm mixed}\left(\varepsilon_{\rm r}\right) = 1.0741 \times \left(5.7604 - 0.63\log_{10}\varepsilon_{\rm r}\right)^{2} \times 10^{-20}$$
(B3)

#### B2 Number Density Fraction of Contamination

In section B1 we assumed that the fraction of excited-state  $O^+ f_{e/m}$  was 23% in the S1964

experiment. In this section, we detail the basis of this assumption. We first conclude that no

measured fraction in existing studies is appropriate for direct application to the S1964

experiment. We then indirectly calibrate the S1964 results.

782

In laboratory ion beam experiments, the projectile  $O^+$  is prepared by electron impact to  $O_2$ . Such electron impact creates both ground- and excited-state  $O^+$  (Stebbings et al., 1966). The fraction depends on the energy of the ionizing electron. Table B1 summarizes reported fractions against electron energies.

787

S1964 created a projectile  $O^+$  using the impact of 200-eV electrons colliding with  $O_2$ . They were unable to measure the fraction of  $O^+$  states but they made "a crude estimate" that  $O^+$  created by 200-eV electrons in their experiment includes 30% of the excited state. This estimate is based on private communication with J. W. McGowan, who observed the dependence of cross section on the ionizing electron energy.

793

		Fraction o	of excite	d-state O <sup>+</sup>	
Energy of ionizing electron	Not	40	50	100	200
	stated	(eV)	(eV)	(eV)	(eV)
Stebbings et al. (1964)					(30%)
Stebbings et al. (1966) Table 3			34%	44%	
Stebbings and Rutherford		23%			
(1968) Figure 2					
Turner et al. (1968)	1/3 #1	23%#2	27%	30%	34%#2
Rutherford and Vroom (1974)					
Lindsay et al. (2001)					
Lindsay and Stebbings (2005)	(25%)				

#### 794 **Table B1**. Fraction of Excited-state O<sup>+</sup> Contamination in Laboratory Experiment

*Note.* Number density fraction of the excited-state  $O^+$  against total (excited and ground states).

The fraction is sorted by the energies of electrons that were used to create  $O^+$ . Parentheses

indicate that the value is not measured but discussed. Dashes indicate that fractions were notmentioned.

<sup>#1</sup> The researchers conclude that the excited-state fraction is one third but did not state the

corresponding energy range.  $^{#2}$  This value is not explicitly mentioned but can be seen in Figure 10.

802

Stebbings et al. (1966) provisionally measured the fraction of  $O^+$  in the excited state using its dependence on the energy of the ionizing electron. The fraction was 34% for 50-eV electrons and 44% for 100-eV electrons. However, the fraction was not mentioned for 200-eV electrons used
in S1964.

807

Turner et al. (1968) measured that the fraction of excited-state O<sup>+</sup> cross section was 27% for 50-

eV electrons and 30% for 100-eV electrons. Turner et al. (1968) concluded that approximately

- 810 one-third of the  $O^+$  formed from  $O_2$  by the electron impacts will be in excited states although
- they did not state the electron energy range for this conclusion. Although they did not mention it,
- the fraction for 200-eV electrons (i.e., the energy used in S1964) is approximately 34% in Figure 10.
- 814
- However, this measurement with 200-eV electrons is likely unreliable as follows. Stebbings and
  Rutherford (1968) state that "Most of the measurements were carried out using 40-eV electrons"
- (p. 1037) and that "This energy was sufficiently low to ensure negligible production of  $O_2^{++}$ ,
- which, if present, could not have been separated from  $O^+$  in the analyzer." (p. 1037). We
- interpret this to mean that Stebbings and Rutherford (1968) were unable to clarify the fraction of
- $O^+$  in the excited state for 200 eV electrons that were used by S1964. The possible contamination
- of  $O_2^{++}$  is presumably the reason why there are no studies that discuss the 200-eV electrons used
- in S1964. Accordingly, we cannot directly calibrate the S1964 results.
- 823

In contrast, Stebbings and Rutherford (1968) concluded that the fraction of excited O<sup>+</sup> is 23% at

- 40 eV. This result appears established because Lindsay and Stebbings (2005) argue that their
- indirect estimation of 25% is entirely consistent with Stebbings and Rutherford (1968).
- Accordingly, it is possible to indirectly calibrate the S1964 results as follows.
- 828
- Rutherford and Vroom (1974) measured the O<sup>+</sup>-O cross section at 60–500 eV and concluded that their values are in good agreement with those of S1964 at 40–10,000 eV. Rutherford and Vroom (1974) presumably used 40-eV electrons to create O<sup>+</sup> as they did to create N<sup>+</sup>. Thus, we can
- calculate the factor to calibrate the Rutherford and Vroom (1974) results and can apply the same
- factor to the S1964 results.
- 834
- For clarification, the consistency between Stebbings et al. (1964) and Rutherford and Vroom
- (1974) is not readily clear because the adopted electron energies are different. One possibility is
- that the difference of fraction was small enough to affirm the consistency. Another possibility is
- that other detailed differences between the experiments tend to cancel the differences between
- fractions. For example, the experiment of Stebbings et al. (1964) is presumably also
- contaminated with excited-state neutral O atom, but that of Rutherford and Vroom (1974) is not
- (Lindsay & Stebbings, 2005). In other words, our calibration using the fraction of 23% does not
- necessarily imply that the fraction was exactly 23% in S1964 but may include other small
  effects.
- 843 844
- 845 In summary, the fraction of excited-state O<sup>+</sup> is unknown for the S1964 cross section with 200-eV
- 846 electrons. Thus, the S1964 cross section cannot be directly calibrated. However, the cross
- sections are numerically consistent between S1964 and Rutherford and Vroom (1974)
- 848 (presumably with 40-eV electrons). Then, the S1964 model can be indirectly calibrated with a
- fraction of 23% at 40 eV (i.e., originally not for this model).

#### 850 Acknowledgments

- A.I. would like to thank A. P. Hickman for their helpful discussions. Physical constants used in
- the present study are based on the 2018 CODATA (committee on data for science and
- technology) recommended values at https://physics.nist.gov/constants and the ninth edition of the
- SI (international system of units) brochure (2019) at https://www.bipm.org/. This work was
- supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant 16K05568.

#### 856 **References**

- Adachi, K., Nozawa, S., Ogawa, Y., Brekke, A., Hall, C., & Fujii, R. (2017). Evaluation of a method to derive
   ionospheric conductivities using two auroral emissions (428 and 630 nm) measured with a photometer at
   Tromso (69.6 degrees N). *Earth Planets and Space*, 69, 90. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1186/s40623-017-0677-4">https://doi.org/10.1186/s40623-017-0677-4</a>
- Anderson, C., Kosch, M. J., Nicolls, M. J., & Conde, M. (2013). Ion-neutral coupling in Earth's thermosphere,
   estimated from concurrent radar and optical observations above Alaska. *Journal of Atmospheric and Solar- Terrestrial Physics*, 105, 313-324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jastp.2013.04.005
- Banks, P. (1966). Collision frequencies and energy transfer Ions. *Planetary and Space Science*, *14*(11), 1105-1122.
   https://doi.org/10.1016/0032-0633(66)90025-0
- Banks, P. M., & Kockarts, G. (1973). *Aeronomy, Part A*. New York: Academic Press.
- Brekke, A. (2013). *Physics of the upper polar atmosphere* (2nd ed.). Heidelberg: Springer.
- Brekke, A., & Hall, C. (1988). Auroral ionospheric quiet summer time conductances. Annales Geophysicae *Atmospheres Hydrospheres and Space Sciences*, 6(4), 361-375.
- Buonsanto, M. J., Sipler, D. P., Davenport, G. B., & Holt, J. M. (1997). Estimation of the O<sup>+</sup>–O collision frequency
   from coincident radar and Fabry-Perot observations at Millstone Hill. *Journal of Geophysical Research- Space Physics, 102*(A8), 17267-17274. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1029/97ja01300">https://doi.org/10.1029/97ja01300</a>
- Burnside, R. G., Tepley, C. A., & Wickwar, V. B. (1987). The O<sup>+</sup>–O collision cross-section: Can it be inferred from aeronomical measurements. *Annales Geophysicae*, 5A(6), 343-349.
- Capitelli, M., Celiberto, R., Gorse, C., & Giordano, D. (1996). Transport properties of high temperature air
   components: A review. *Plasma Chemistry and Plasma Processing*, 16(1), S267-S302.
- Capitelli, M., Lamanna, U. T., Guidotti, C., & Arrighini, G. P. (1977). The gerade-ungerade splitting of N<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup>
   potentials: Effects on resonant charge transfer cross sections of nitrogen atoms. *Chemical Physics*, 19(2),
   269-278. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0301-0104(77)85138-0</u>
- Carlson, H. C., & Harper, R. M. (1977). An experimental estimate of O<sup>+</sup>–O resonant charge transfer cross section,
   collision frequency, and energy-transfer rate. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Space Physics*, 82(7), 1144 1148. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/JA082i007p01144</u>
- 882 COESA. (1976). U.S. standard atmosphere, 1976. Washington, D.C: U.S. government printing office.
- Dalgarno, A. (1958a). Ambipolar diffusion in the F2-layer. *Journal of Atmospheric and Terrestrial Physics*, *12*(2-3),
   219-220. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9169(58)90096-5</u>
- Dalgarno, A. (1958b). The mobilities of ions in their parent gases. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 250(982), 426-439.
   <u>https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.1958.0003</u>
- Dalgarno, A. (1964). Ambipolar diffusion in the F-region. *Journal of Atmospheric and Terrestrial Physics*, 26(9),
   939-939. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9169(64)90236-3</u>
- Balgarno, A., McDowell, M. R. C., & Williams, A. (1958). The mobilities of ions in unlike gases. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 250(982), 411-425. <u>https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.1958.0002</u>
- Dang, T., Lei, J., Dou, X., & Wan, W. (2015). Feasibility study on the derivation of the O<sup>+</sup>–O collision frequency from ionospheric field-aligned observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Space Physics*, *120*(7), 6029-6035. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/2015ja020987</u>
- Byson, P. L., Davies, T. P., Parkinson, M. L., Reeves, A. J., Richards, P. G., & Fairchild, C. E. (1997).
   Thermospheric neutral winds at southern mid-latitudes: A comparison of optical and ionosonde h(m)F(2)
   methods. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Space Physics, 102*(A12), 27189-27196.
   https://doi.org/10.1029/97ja02138
- Fang, T. W., Anderson, D., Fuller-Rowell, T., Akmaev, R., Codrescu, M., Millward, G., et al. (2013). Comparative studies of theoretical models in the equatorial ionosphere. In J. Huba, R. Schunk, & G. Khazanov (Eds.),

902	Modeling the Ionosphere-Thermosphere System, Geophysical Monograph Series (Vol. 201, pp. 133-144).
903	Washington, DC: American Geophysical Union, https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118704417.ch12
904	Hasted, J. B. (1964). <i>Physics of atomic collisions</i> . London: Butterworths.
905	Heiche, G., & Mason, E. A. (1970). Jon mobilities with charge exchange. <i>Journal of Chemical Physics</i> , 53(12).
906	4687-4696 https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1673997
907	Hickman, A. P., Medikeri-Naphade, M., Chapin, C. D., & Huestis, D. L. (1997a). Fine structure effects in the O <sup>+</sup> –O
908	collision frequency. Geophysical Research Letters 24(2) 119-122. https://doi.org/10.1029/96g103797
909	Hickman A P Medikeri-Nanhade M Chapin C D & Huestis D L (1997b) Calculation of fine-structure
910	effects in O <sup>+</sup> -O collisions <i>Physical Review A</i> 56(6) 4633-4643
911	https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA 56.4633
912	Ieda A (2020) Ion-neutral collision frequencies for calculating ionospheric conductivity. <i>Journal of Geophysical</i>
913	Research-Space Physics, 125, e2019IA027128, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019IA027128
914	Ieda A Ovama S Vanhamäki H Fujiji R Nakamizo A Amm O et al (2014) Approximate forms of
915	davtime ionospheric conductance. <i>Journal of Geophysical Research-Space Physics</i> 119(12) 10397-10415
916	https://doi.org/10.1002/2014ja020665
917	Joshi P P Waldron L S & Brum C G M (2018) Jonospheric O <sup>+</sup> momentum balance through charge exchange
918	with thermospheric o atoms. <i>Journal of Geophysical Research-Space Physics</i> 123(11) 9743-9761
919	https://doi.org/10.1029/2018ia025821
920	Kelley, M. C. (2009). Earth's Ionosphere: Plasma Physics and Electrodynamics (2nd ed. Vol. 96). London:
921	Elsevier.
922	Kiene, A., Bristow, W. A., Conde, M. G., & Hampton, D. L. (2019). High-resolution local measurements of F
923	region ion temperatures and Joule heating rates using SuperDARN and groung-based optics. Journal of
924	Geophysical Research-Space Physics, 124(1), 557-572. https://doi.org/10.1029/2018ja025997
925	Knof, H., Vanderslice, J. T., & Mason, E. A. (1964). Interaction energies, charge exchange cross sections, and
926	diffusion cross sections for N <sup>+</sup> –N and O <sup>+</sup> –O collisions. Journal of Chemical Physics, 40(12), 3548-3553.
927	https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1725050
928	Lindsay, B. G., Sieglaff, D. R., Smith, K. A., & Stebbings, R. F. (2001). Charge transfer of keV O <sup>+</sup> ions with atomic
929	oxygen. Journal of Geophysical Research-Space Physics, 106(A5), 8197-8203.
930	https://doi.org/10.1029/2000ja000437
931	Lindsay, B. G., & Stebbings, R. F. (2005). Charge transfer cross sections for energetic neutral atom data analysis.
932	Journal of Geophysical Research-Space Physics, 110(A12), A12213. https://doi.org/10.1029/2005ja011298
933	Lomidze, L., Scherliess, L., & Schunk, R. W. (2015). Magnetic meridional winds in the thermosphere obtained from
934	Global Assimilation of Ionospheric Measurements (GAIM) model. Journal of Geophysical Research-Space
935	Physics, 120(9), 8025-8044. https://doi.org/10.1002/2015ja021098
936	Mason, E. A., & Vanderslice, J. T. (1959). Mobility of hydrogen ions (H <sup>+</sup> ,H <sub>2</sub> <sup>+</sup> ,H <sub>3</sub> <sup>+</sup> ) in hydrogen. <i>Physical Review</i> ,
937	114(2), 497-502. <u>https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.114.497</u>
938	McDonald, S. E., Lean, J. L., Huba, J. D., Joyce, G., Emmert, J. T., & Drob, D. P. (2013). Long-term simulations of
939	the ionosphere using SAMI3. In J. Huba, R. Schunk, & G. Khazanov (Eds.), Modeling the Ionosphere-
940	Thermosphere System, Geophysical Monograph Series (Vol. 201, pp. 119-131). Washingon, DC: American
941	Geophysical Union. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118704417.ch11</u>
942	McGranaghan, R., Knipp, D. J., Solomon, S. C., & Fang, X. H. (2015). A fast, parameterized model of upper
943	atmospheric ionization rates, chemistry, and conductivity. Journal of Geophysical Research-Space Physics,
944	120(6), 4936-4949. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/2015ja021146</u>
945	Nicolls, M. J., Aponte, N., Gonzalez, S. A., Sulzer, M. P., & Oliver, W. L. (2006). Daytime F region ion energy
946	balance at Arecibo for moderate to high solar flux conditions. <i>Journal of Geophysical Research-Space</i>
947	<i>Physics</i> , <i>111</i> (A10), A10307. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2006ja011664</u>
948	Oliver, W. L., & Glotfelty, K. (1996). O <sup>+</sup> -O collision cross section and long-term F region O density variations
949	deduced from the ionospheric energy budget. Journal of Geophysical Research-Space Physics, 101(A10),
950	21/69-21/84. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/96ja01585</u>
951	Partriage, H., & Stallcop, J. K. (1986). N – N and U – U interaction energies, dipole transition moments, and
952 052	transport cross sections. In J. N. Moss & C. D. Scott (Eds.), AIAA Progress in Astronautics and
933 054	Aeronautics: Inermophysical Aspects of Ke-entry Flows (Vol. 103, pp. 243-260). New York: AIAA.
934 055	resheni, w. D., Onnuvar, K., & Hoegy, w. K. (1995). Iviomentum-transfer confision frequency of U'–U.
900	Geophysical Research Letters, 20(15), 1545-1540. https://doi.org/10.1029/93g101597

- Pesnell, W. D., Omidvar, K., Hoegy, W. R., & Wharton, L. E. (1994). O<sup>+</sup>-O collision frequency in high-speed flows.
   *Journal of Geophysical Research-Space Physics*, 99(A11), 21375-21382.
   https://doi.org/10.1029/94ja01650
- Rutherford, J. A., & Vroom, D. A. (1974). The reaction of atomic oxygen with several atmospheric ions. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, *61*(7), 2514-2519. <u>https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1682371</u>
- Salah, J. E. (1993). Interim standard for the ion-neutral atomic oxygen collision frequency. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 20(15), 1543-1546. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/93gl01699</u>
- Schunk, R. W., & Nagy, A. F. (2009). *Ionospheres : physics, plasma physics, and chemistry* (2nd ed.). New York:
   Cambridge University Press.
- Schunk, R. W., & Walker, J. C. G. (1973). Theoretical ion densities in lower ionosphere. *Planetary and Space* Science, 21(11), 1875-1896. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0032-0633(73)90118-9</u>
- Stallcop, J. R. (1971). N<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup> potential-energy curves. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 54(6), 2602-2605.
   <u>https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1675218</u>
- Stallcop, J. R., Levin, E., & Partridge, H. (1998). Transport properties of hydrogen. *Journal of Thermophysics and Heat Transfer, 12*(4), 514-519. <u>https://doi.org/10.2514/2.6370</u>
- Stallcop, J. R., & Partridge, H. (1985). N<sup>+</sup>-N long-range interaction energies and resonance charge exchange.
   *Physical Review A*, 32(1), 639-642. <u>https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.32.639</u>
- Stallcop, J. R., Partridge, H., & Levin, E. (1991). Resonance charge transfer, transport cross sections, and collision integrals for N<sup>+</sup>(<sup>3</sup>P)–N(<sup>4</sup>S<sup>0</sup>) and O<sup>+</sup>(<sup>4</sup>S<sup>0</sup>)–O(<sup>3</sup>P) interactions. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 95(9), 6429-6439. <u>https://doi.org/10.1063/1.461563</u>
- Stebbings, R. F., Ehrhardt, H., & Smith, A. C. H. (1964). Charge transfer between oxygen atoms and O<sup>+</sup> and H<sup>+</sup>
   ions. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 69(11), 2349-2355. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/JZ069i011p02349</u>
- Stebbings, R. F., & Rutherford, J. A. (1968). Low-energy collisions between O<sup>+</sup>(<sup>4</sup>S) and H(1s). *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 73(3), 1035-1038. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/JA073i003p01035</u>
- Stebbings, R. F., Turner, B. R., & Rutherford, J. A. (1966). Low-energy collisions between some atmospheric ions
   and neutral particles. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 71(3), 771-784.
   https://doi.org/10.1029/JZ071i003p00771
- Stubbe, P. (1968). Frictional forces and collision frequencies between moving ion and neutral gases. *Journal of Atmospheric and Terrestrial Physics*, 30(12), 1965-1985. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9169(68)90004-4</u>
- Takeda, M. (2016). Long-term variation of Ampere force by geomagnetic Sq currents and thermospheric pressure difference. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Space Physics*, *121*(11), 11407-11412.
   https://doi.org/10.1002/2016ja022845
- Turner, B. R., Rutherfo.Ja, & Compton, D. M. J. (1968). Abundance of excited ions in O<sup>+</sup> and O<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup> ion beams.
   *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 48(4), 1602-1608. <u>https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1668882</u>
- Vickers, H., Kosch, M. J., Sutton, E., Ogawa, Y., & La Hoz, C. (2013). Thermospheric atomic oxygen density
   estimates using the EISCAT Svalbard Radar. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Space Physics*, *118*(3),
   1319-1330. https://doi.org/10.1002/jgra.50169
- Wu, Q., Wang, W., Roble, R. G., Haggstrom, I., & Stromme, A. (2012). First daytime thermospheric wind
   observation from a balloon-borne Fabry-Perot interferometer over Kiruna (68N). *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39, L14104. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2012gl052533</u>
- Zossi, B. S., Fagre, M., & Elias, A. G. (2019). Pedersen ionic contribution in different time scales. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Space Physics*, 124(8), 6961-6970. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2019ja026884</u>

998