

4. PRODUCTION AND PROPERTIES OF RADIATIONS

from one another by $\sim E_{\text{tot}}/mc^2$ in the neighbourhood of the *K*-absorption edge of niobium in the compound lithium niobate.

Further theoretical objections have been made by Creagh (1984) and Smith (1987), who has shown that the Stibius-Jensen correction is not valid, and that, when higher-order multipolar expansions and retardation are considered, the total self-energy correction becomes E_{tot}/mc^2 rather than $\frac{5}{3}E_{\text{tot}}/mc^2$. Fig. 4.2.6.1 shows the variation of the self-energy correction with atomic number for the modified form factor (Creagh, 1984; Smith, 1987; Cromer & Liberman, 1970).

For the imaginary part of the dispersion correction $f''(\omega, 0)$, which depends on the calculation of the photoelectric scattering cross section, better agreement is found between theoretical results and experimental data. Details of this comparison have been given elsewhere (Section 4.2.4). Suffice it to say that Creagh & Hubbell (1990), in reporting the results of the IUCr X-ray Attenuation Project, could find no rational basis for preferring the Scofield (1973) Hartree-Fock calculations to the Cromer & Liberman (1970, 1981) and Storm & Israel (1970) Dirac-Hartree-Fock-Slater calculations.

Computer programs based on the Cromer & Liberman program (Cromer & Liberman, 1983) are in use at all the major synchrotron-radiation laboratories. Many other laboratories have also acquired copies of their program. This program must be modified to remove the incorrect Stibius-Jensen correction term, and, as will be seen later, the energy term should be modified to be E_{tot}/mc^2 .

4.2.6.2.3.2. The scattering matrix formalism

Kissel, Pratt & Roy (1980) have developed a computer program based on the second-order *S*-matrix formalism suggested by Brown, Peierls & Woodward (1955). Their aim was to provide a prescription for the accurate ($\sim 1\%$) prediction of the total-atom Rayleigh scattering amplitudes.

Their model treats the elastic scattering as the sum of bound electron, nuclear, and Delbrück scattering cross sections, and treats the Rayleigh scattering by considering second-order, single-electron transitions from electrons bound in a relativistic, self-consistent, central potential. This potential was a Dirac-Hartree-Fock-Slater potential, and exchange was included by use of the Kohn & Sham (1965) exchange model. They omitted radiative corrections.

In principle, the observables in an elastic scattering process are momentum ($\hbar\mathbf{k}$) and polarization $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$. The complex polarization vectors $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ satisfy the conditions

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^* \cdot \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = 1'; \quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \cdot \mathbf{k} = 0. \quad (4.2.6.29)$$

In quantum mechanics, elastic scattering is described in terms of a differential scattering amplitude, M , which is related to the elastic cross section by equation (4.2.6.16).

If polarization is not an observable, then the expression for the differential scattering cross section takes the form of equation (4.2.6.17). If polarization is taken into account, as may be the case when a polarizer is used on a beam scattered from a sample irradiated by the linearly polarized beam from a synchrotron-radiation source, the full equation, and not equation (4.2.6.17), must be used to compute the differential scattering cross section.

The principle of causality implies that the forward-scattering amplitude $M(\omega, 0)$ should be analytic in the upper half of the ω plane, and that the dispersion relation

$$\text{Re } M(\omega, 0) = \frac{2\omega^2}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{\text{Im } M(\omega', 0)}{\omega'(\omega'^2 - \omega^2)} d\omega' \quad (4.2.6.30)$$

 Table 4.2.6.1. Values of E_{tot}/mc^2 listed as a function of atomic number *Z*

<i>Z</i>	Symbol	E_{tot}/mc^2	<i>Z</i>	Symbol	E_{tot}/mc^2
3	Li	-0.0004	49	In	-0.318
4	Be	-0.0006	50	Sn	-0.330
5	B	-0.0012	51	Sb	-0.348
6	C	-0.0018	52	Te	-0.363
7	N	-0.0030	53	I	-0.384
8	O	-0.0042	54	Xe	-0.396
9	F	-0.0054			
10	Ne	-0.0066	55	Cs	-0.414
			56	Ba	-0.438
11	Na	-0.0084			
12	Mg	-0.0110	57	La	-0.456
13	Al	-0.0125	58	Ce	-0.474
14	Si	-0.0158	59	Pr	-0.492
15	P	-0.0180	60	Nd	-0.516
16	S	-0.0210	61	Pm	-0.534
17	Cl	-0.0250	62	Sm	-0.558
18	Ar	-0.0285	63	Eu	-0.582
			64	Gd	-0.610
19	K	-0.0320	65	Tb	-0.624
20	Ca	-0.0362	66	Dy	-0.648
			67	Ho	-0.672
21	Sc	-0.0410	68	Er	-0.696
22	Ti	-0.0460	69	Tm	-0.723
23	V	-0.0510	70	Yb	-0.750
24	Cr	-0.0560	71	Lu	-0.780
25	Mn	-0.0616			
26	Fe	-0.0680	72	Hf	-0.804
27	Co	-0.0740	73	Ta	-0.834
28	Ni	-0.0815	74	W	-0.864
29	Cu	-0.0878	75	Re	-0.900
30	Zn	-0.0960	76	Os	-0.919
			77	Ir	-0.948
31	Ga	-0.104	78	Pt	-0.984
32	Ge	-0.114	79	Au	-1.014
33	As	-0.120	80	Hg	-1.046
34	Se	-0.132			
35	Br	-0.141	81	Tl	-1.080
36	Kr	-0.150	82	Pb	-1.116
			83	Bi	-1.149
37	Rb	-0.159	84	Po	-1.189
38	Sr	-0.171	85	At	-1.224
			86	Rn	-1.260
39	Y	-0.180			
40	Zr	-0.192	87	Fr	-1.296
41	Nb	-0.204	88	Ra	-1.332
42	Mo	-0.216			
43	Tc	-0.228	89	Ac	-1.374
44	Ru	-0.246	90	Th	-1.416
45	Rh	-0.258	91	Pa	-1.458
46	Pd	-0.270	92	U	-1.470
47	Ag	-0.285	93	Np	-1.536
48	Cd	-0.300	94	Pu	-1.584
			95	Am	-1.626
			96	Cm	-1.669
			97	Bk	-1.716
			98	Cf	-1.764

should hold, with the consequence that

$$\text{Re } M(\infty, 0) = -\frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{\text{Im } M(\omega', 0)}{\omega'} d\omega'. \quad (4.2.6.31)$$