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Abstract

Cathodic vacuum arc plasmas are known to contain multiply charged ions. 20 years after “Pressure Ionization: its role in metal vapour vacuum arc plasmas and ion sources” appeared in vol. 1 of Plasma Sources Science and Technology, it is a great opportunity to re-visit the issue of pressure ionization, a non-ideal plasma effect, and put it in perspective to the many other factors that influence observable charge state distributions, such as the role of the cathode material, the path in the density-temperature phase diagram, the “noise” in vacuum arc plasma as described by a fractal model approach, the effects of external magnetic fields and charge exchange collisions with neutrals. A much more complex image of the vacuum arc plasma emerges putting decades of experimentation and modeling in perspective.

(Some figures in this article are in colour only in the electronic version)
1. Introduction

Cathodic vacuum arc plasmas are among the most mysterious, difficult to understand, and uncontrolled plasma generators. Cathodic vacuum arc discharges are characterized by the formation of very small, non-stationary cathode spots – locations of extreme current and power densities – while the voltage between anode and cathode is relatively low (~ 20 V) and fluctuating. The plasma made at the spots stems from the cathode material, i.e. the cathode is the feedstock and process gas is not needed, hence the name cathodic vacuum arc. For many practical applications, especially when depositing thin films and coatings, reactive gas is added. For example, to make a TiN coating one would use a titanium cathode and operate the discharge in a nitrogen-containing gas. In this case, the name cathodic arc is preferred, emphasizing the point that the cathode is the source of the metal plasma. In that sense, cathodic vacuum arcs a subcategory of cathodic arcs.

The most physical definition of an arc can be related to the discharge’s mechanism of electron emission [1]. Arks involve collective electron emission processes, such as thermionic emission [2], field emission [3], the non-linear combination of thermionic and field emission (thermofield emission) [4], and explosive electron emission [5], all of which are discussed in [6]. Collective mechanisms can be contrasted with individual mechanisms such as secondary electron emission upon ion impact on a cathode surface, which is typical for glow and magnetron discharges.

Among arcs, we distinguish thermionic arcs, based on thermionic electron emission from a hot cathode, and cathodic arcs, which are at least partially based on explosive emission. In this contribution, a review of our understanding of plasma formation of cathodic vacuum arcs is presented, taking the 20th anniversary of the paper “Pressure ionization: its role in metal vapour vacuum arc plasmas and ion sources” [7] in volume 1 of Plasma Sources Science and Technology as the occasion. Even as this work has review character, no claim of being comprehensive is made. Rather, the report is largely based on research at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory with focus on clarifying the mechanisms that establish the observable ion charge state distributions, which are known to involve multiple charge states and depend of the cathode material.

2. Path of cathode material in the phase diagram.

One of the main points of the original paper [7] was an exploration how the solid cathodic material ends up as a fully ionized, expanding plasma far from the cathode body. The related heavy particle - temperature phase diagram is reproduced here as Fig. 1. The starting point of the journey is always the solid as indicated by the dot near the top left. We consider a microscopically small volume element of material at the cathode surface that exhibits stronger field emission than other locations. This can be caused by some form of surface irregularity or by the plasma itself. For example, the surface location may have a special feature there like a grain boundary, an edge, a protrusion, a scratch, or it is chemically modified due the formation of an oxide, hydroxide, nitride, etc., or a dust particle is present. Additionally, the plasma may be non-uniform and therefore especially dense at some location due to a previously occurring plasma formation event, or temporally enhanced due to a plasma fluctuation or instability. Locally dense plasma will provide intense heating of the surface due to positive ions being accelerated in the sheath toward the surface. The electric surface field can be enhanced simply because the sheath next to dense plasma is thinner than the sheath of less dense plasma. In all of those cases, the surface is locally non-uniformly heated by ion bombardment (bringing kinetic and potential energy to the surface), and Ohmic heating by the electron emission current. This can lead to a positive feedback: the more electrons are emitted the greater is the heating, which in turn can lead to a nonlinear amplification of the emission. Field emission turns into thermofield emission and then into explosive emission, where the material of the cathode volume under consideration explodes. The whole process can occur on a
timescale of nanoseconds. This thermal runaway description is at the heart of the explosive emission models. The phase diagram (Fig. 1) considers the paths of the material, which can be quite different depending on when atoms are released within in the explosive process.
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**Figure 1.** Paths of the cathode material in the heavy density-temperature phase diagram. Initially, the material is solid at room temperature (starting point in the upper left region of the diagram). The actual path strongly depends on the time relative to the “life stage” of the emitting site. In the initial explosive phase, the material may be heated beyond the critical point and transiently forms a dense, nonideal plasma. Later, more conventional melting and evaporation is dominant (after [7]).

Early in the fast runaway process, the density is not much changed due to inertia, and therefore the path appears horizontal, and the material may be heated beyond the solid-liquid phase transition circumnavigating the critical point “C”. By definition, beyond “C” one cannot distinguish between liquid metal and dense, non-ideal plasma. As the atomic lattice bonds are destroyed by the strong thermal motion of the ions (i.e. the previous lattice atoms of the solid), a very high pressure can be assigned to this state of matter, and the pressure gradient due to the vacuum ambient causes a very rapid expansion. This is evident in the phase diagram by the sharp turn of the path from horizontal to vertical, going from heating to expansion and cooling.

As the explosive process evolves, the area of intense electron emission increases due to heat conduction. This leads to a decrease of the power density assuming that the current per emission site is limited and not increasing proportionally with the area (an assumption based on observations that higher discharge currents lead to a greater number of simultaneously operating emission sites [8, 9]). An increased emission area leads to a modified path characterized by a smaller rate of heating. The cathode material goes now through the more familiar phase transitions solid $\rightarrow$ liquid $\rightarrow$ gas $\rightarrow$ plasma, as indicated by the second, lower-density path. Those path representations are just two: the actual path changes as the spot development progresses. For example, late in a spot’s “lifetime,” only a hot crater is left on the surface, and this area does not produce plasma anymore but, depending on the cathode material and its vapor pressure, the crater may emit neutral metal vapor. This would be yet another path which is not shown in Fig. 1.
Once the arc discharge is completed the cathode is covered with numerous craters: remnant evidence for the sequence of microexplosions and the locally extreme power density that existed at some stage in the emission site’s evolution. As one can see from Fig. 2, similar craters of very different size exists, already suggesting that crater formation cannot be explained by a sequence of equal, short-lived elementary events, rather, a model spanning orders of magnitude is needed. The fractal model of section 4 can exactly do that.

![Figure 2](image)

**Figure 2.** A variety of craters formed by a pulsed vacuum arc discharge on molybdenum in ultra-high vacuum (UHV). The molybdenum cathode was pre-cleaned by heating in UHV prior to operating the arc; a magnetic field caused the spot motion to be steered (as opposed to being random). Photo courtesy of B. Jüttner, Berlin.


The theme of the original paper [7] was to consider what, if any, effect the strong interaction of particles has as the plasma goes through its dense phase near or beyond the critical point. The strong interaction or coupling between particles shifts the atomic energy level and thereby reduces the energy needed to ionize atoms and to produce multiply charged ions,

\[ E_{Q}^{\text{eff}} = E_{Q} - \Delta E_{Q} \]  

(1)

where \( E_{Q} \) is the energy needed to ionize (an isolated) ion of charge state \( Q \) (with \( Q = 0 \) being a neutral atom, \( Q = 1 \) the singly charged ion, etc.), and \( \Delta E_{Q} \) is the corresponding reduction due to many-particle interaction. The exact formulation was given in [7] and there is no need to reproduce the relatively elaborate scheme of equations here. It should be mentioned, though, that in the limit of a weakly nonideal plasma, the rather simple Debye-Hückel approximation
can be applied, where the Debye length (screening length) is given by

$$\lambda_D = \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0 kT}{e^2 \left(n_e + \langle Q^2 \rangle n_i \right)}\right)^{1/2}$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ indicates averaging over the charge states; $e$ is the elementary charge, $\varepsilon_0$ is the permittivity of free space, $k$ is the Boltzmann constant, $T$ is the temperature, and $n_e$ and $n_i$ are the electron and ion density, respectively.

As the dense plasma expands from the emission site its local density and temperature decrease. As a result, the frequency of collisions between particles drops. Now it is useful to compare the rate of change for ion charge states due to the expansion versus that due to ionization and recombination [10]. In order to do that one can take a concept from chemical engineering and consider ionization and recombination like chemical reactions and introduce the Damköhler number $\mathcal{Da}$ as a ratio of rates or as a ratio of characteristic times, as follows:

$$\mathcal{Da} = \frac{\text{reaction rate}}{\text{expansion rate}} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{Da} = \frac{\text{characteristic expansion time}}{\text{characteristic reaction time}}.$$  

If $\mathcal{Da} \ll 1$ the ionization and recombination processes can be neglected and the charge states are said to be frozen, i.e. the ion charge distribution function is not changing during the expansion (Fig. 3). In the opposite case, $\mathcal{Da} \gg 1$, the charge state distribution is in equilibrium for the local temperature and particle densities, and one can use the well-known Saha equations to express the ratios of charge states:

$$S_Q = \frac{n_e n_{Q+1}}{n_Q} = \Lambda_{g}^{-2} \frac{2 \sum_{Q+1} (T)}{\sum_{Q} (T)} \exp \left( -\frac{E_Q - \Delta E_Q}{kT} \right)$$

where

$$\Sigma_{Q} (T) = \sum_{s=1}^{s=\text{max}} g_{Q,s} \exp \left( -\frac{E_{Q,s}}{kT} \right)$$

are the partition functions which depend on the energy levels $E_{Q,s}$ of the ion and the level’s statistical weights $g_{Q,s}$. In this way, the atomic structure of the ions constituting the plasma is taken into account. In equation (5), $\Lambda_{g}$ is called the thermal de Broglie length, defined as

$$\Lambda_{g} = \hbar \left( 2 \pi m_e kT \right)^{1/2},$$

where $\hbar$ is the Planck constant. The system is closed by the condition of quasi-neutrality, where the density of electrons (negative charge) is equal to density of all positive charges:
The characteristic expansion time can be defined as the time needed for the density of heavy particles (atons and ions) to drop to half of its initial value (note: the sum of all atoms and ions is here used, since it is not affected by ionization and recombination reactions). Hence the expansion time can be written as \[ \tau_{\text{exp}}(r) = \frac{\sqrt{2} - 1}{v_{pl}} \sqrt{\gamma/n_{pl}(r)} \] (9)

where \( v_{pl} \) is the plasma’s expansion velocity (typically \( 10^4 \) m/s [11]), and

\[ n_{pl} \approx \gamma \frac{I_{an}}{r^2} \] (10)

is the local plasma density at the distance \( r \) from the emission site [12], and \( \gamma \) is a constant (about \( 2 \times 10^{13} \) A\(^{-1}\)m\(^{-1}\)). This relation is valid for low-current arcs where we can assume that the arc current is concentrated in a one emission site (generally less than 100 A). In order to derive the characteristic times for ionization and recombination we need to solve the balance equations (cf. chapter 4 of [6]):

\[ \frac{\partial n_Q}{\partial t} = n_{Q+1} n_e^2 \alpha_{Q+1,Q} - n_Q n_e \beta_{Q,Q+1} \] for \( Q = 0 \) (11)

\[ \frac{\partial n_Q}{\partial t} = n_{Q-1} n_e \beta_{Q-1,Q} + n_{Q+1} n_e^2 \alpha_{Q+1,Q} - n_Q n_e \beta_{Q,Q+1} - n_{Q+1} n_e^2 \alpha_{Q,Q-1} \] for \( Q \geq 1 \) (12)

where \( \beta \) and \( \alpha \) are the ionization and recombination coefficients [13], respectively,

\[ \beta_{Q,Q+1}(E_Q,T) \sim \frac{\Sigma_{Q+1}}{g_Q} \exp\left( -\frac{E_Q - \Delta E_Q}{kT} \right) (kT)^3, \] (13)

\[ \alpha_{Q,Q-1} \sim (kT)^{-3/2}. \] (14)

An analysis of these expressions shows that (i) the expansion time slowly increases (proportional to \( n_{pl}^{-1/2} \) according to (9)) while the reaction times respond much faster as the density decreases. That means, as the plasma expands, it transitions from a state with many collisions and “reactions” near the emission site (equilibrium) to a state of much less collisions at greater distance from the emission site (non-equilibrium). The model approximation of charge state freezing makes use of this feature in that the ratios of charge states are calculated by the relatively simple system of Saha equations at the transition from equilibrium to non-equilibrium. Assuming sudden freezing, one can associate the charge state distribution measured far from the emission site (i.e. far from the cathode spot) with plasma conditions at the freezing zone. For point-like expansion in the absence of an external magnetic field this is roughly about 100 µm from the spot center. This has been done for all metals of the periodic table of elements [14]. In doing so, one can use measured charge state distributions [15] to determine the electron temperature at the freezing zone, which is typically 3-4 eV. The measured charge state distributions
could be approximately reproduced, however, for most elements, the measured distributions were broader than the calculated. Clearly, the model assumption of instantaneous freezing is rather crude. It is equivalent to assuming that the Damköhler number suddenly switches from \( Da \gg 1 \) to \( Da \ll 1 \) at a certain distance from the cathode spot center. Refinements are needed.

![Diagram of plasma expansion from a cathode spot](image)

**Figure 3.** Schematic representation of plasma expansion from a cathode spot; the transition zone from ionization equilibrium to non-equilibrium is relatively well defined in the model of instantaneous freezing of the charge state distribution.

In a first refinement step, one could have a closer look at the freezing conditions for reactions between different charge states. So far it was assumed that all charge state ratios freeze at the same time (distance from spot). However, the ionization-recombination reactions are charge state dependent: ions of higher charge state leave the equilibrium system first [16]. This is not the only reason for the discrepancies between experimental observation and Saha-based calculations. The transition is certainly more gradual. In some cases the freezing model is not adequate, especially when the assumption of expansion from a point-like emission center is not applicable. External magnetic fields greatly modify plasma expansion and plasma flow, which has numerous implications. We will return to this point in section 8.

### 4. Fractal cathode spots

The different paths of the cathode material in the phase diagram are indicative for a more general pattern or property exhibited by the cathode processes, namely that the cathode spot is a fractal [17]. Fractals are mathematical or physical objects that are self-similar, which means they are invariant to *multiplicative* changes of scale [18]. A self-similar object appears (approximately) unchanged after increasing or decreasing the scale of measurement and observation. Self-similarity may be discrete or continuous, deterministic or probabilistic. To see the relation to cathodic arc phenomena, a few comments are made on fractals and self-similarity.

Power laws are an abundant source of self-similarity [19] because of their invariance to multiplication. Consider the homogenous power law

\[
f(x) = cx^n
\]

(15)
where \( c \) and \( \alpha \) are constants. It is self-similar because rescaling—multiplication with a constant—preserves that \( f(x) \) is proportional to \( x^\alpha \), albeit with a different constant of proportionality. Therefore, a fruitful approach to identifying and modeling fractals is to look for power laws describing the object or physical phenomena. Power laws can be found in relation to cathode spot phenomena, most notable are power laws that describe the spectral power density of fluctuations (“noise”) of (i) the arc burning voltage [20, 21], (ii) the ion current density at a substrate or probe, (iii) the light arriving at a suitable (fast) detector [22-24], (iv) the electromagnetic waves in the RF spectral region (we are all familiar with a crackling noise in radios when switching occurs – these are examples the cathode emission phenomena [25]). Other arc properties also show power laws, like the size distribution of macroparticles emitted from the cathode spot [17]. Last but not least, the patterns seen in light emission and left on cathode surface are “tree-branched” – a typical self-similar pattern [24, 26]. Clearly, there is a relation to the apparent motion of cathode spots, which in the absence of a magnetic field can be modeled by random walk [27-29]. The fractal properties can be recorded using the streak camera technique (Fig. 4).

**Figure 4.** Two examples of false-color streak camera images showing spectrally integrated light intensity from emission sites on a titanium cathode in vacuum. The lower image features more than 10× greater time resolution compared to the upper yet the features look similar, which is evidence for self-similarity, a key fractal feature. More details on the technique can be found in [9, 30].
Random walk is a discrete fractal exhibiting stochastic self-similarity on large scales, but self-similarity is cut off as scales approach the elementary step width $s$ [17]. The well-known Brownian motion is the scaling limit of random walk. That means that if random walk occurs with very small steps, random walk becomes an approximation to Brownian motion, a fractal with the fractal (Hausdorff) dimension 2 [19]. In the presence of a magnetic field, the symmetry related to the spot ignition probability is broken and one observes an apparent spot motion into a preferred (steered) direction [6, 30, 31]. The fractal dimensional is then reduced, for example to 1.65 in the experiments of Kajita et al. [32].

The discussion is relevant to the starting point where the path of cathode material in the phase diagram was considered. Once we have realized that the cathode spot phenomena are fractal in nature, it becomes clear that questions like

- What is the current density of cathode spots?
- What is the burning voltage of cathodic arc?
- What is the lifetime of a cathode spot?
- What is the path of the cathode material in the phase diagram?
- What is the charge state distribution of the expanding plasma?

do not have a deterministic answers! Rather, a fractal approach is appropriate, where the actual time and space-resolved values show self-similarity depending on the resolution limits of the measuring instrumentation down to physical cutoffs.

While mathematical fractals show self-similarity at all scales, physical fractals have cutoffs. Considering spatial cutoffs, for example, one can readily see that that they are determined by the system size (large scale limit) and by the atomic and quantum nature (small scale limit).

The history of the cathodic arc research is rich in the search for cutoffs in the fractal model, even as this is not recognized or explicitly expressed in this way. For example, the search for spot lifetime was often seen as a search for the shortest possible process that leads to the formation of a cathode spot (as e.g. evident by a crater left on the surface) [9, 33]. Another example is the search for the “true” power density which is generally a search to determine the “true” area of the emitting site since current and voltages are relatively easily measured [34, 35]. Since the area changes as the spot evolves, this search was characterized by increasingly sophisticated diagnostic techniques with ever higher spatial and temporal resolution [23, 33, 36-38]. The power density is of great interest since any modeling of the spot phenomena needs to deal with the energetics of the processes, and theoreticians are looking to experimentalists for guidance what the “true” values are so theories could be tested on them [39].

A relevant concept in this context is the search for an elementary amount of the energy needed to form an explosive event. The explosive emission mechanisms has parallels to the theory of wire explosions [40], where the current density, $j$, and explosion delay time, $t_d$, satisfy

$$
\int_0^{t_d} j^2 \, dt = \overline{h},
$$

(16)

where $\overline{h}$ is called the specific action whose value depends on the cathode material but is approximately independent of current density, wire cross section, or other discharge quantities. According to the ecton model [41-44], thermal runaway occurs on microprotrusions until they explode with a delay time associated with the material-specific action. The ecton is the “quantum” of an electron emission event or microexplosion. The explosions create microscopic defects including new microprotrusions, thereby
facilitating sequences of many microexplosions which manifest themselves as the apparent cathode spot motion.

Although the light emitted by the plasma of an emission center exhibits typical fractal features in time and space, it can never be used to investigate possible substructures because the light from any physically relevant substructures, if they exist, are smeared-out due to the finite lifetime of excited states $t_{exc}$ and the high velocity of the excited ions. For example, if the excited ion moves with the typical velocity of $10^4$ m/s, and the lifetime of the excitation is $10^{-9}$ s, the spatial resolution is fundamentally limited to $v_{pl} t_{exc} \sim 10^{-5}$ m [23, 45]. Streak camera images show indeed no sharp features smaller than 10 $\mu$m on their spatial axes. Therefore, other techniques need to be employed that do not rely on light emission. Laser light absorption [46-48] and interferographic techniques [49, 50] indicated the existence of a cathode spot sub- or cell structure, which was long suspected [51] and discussed in the literature [23, 44, 52, 53]. The individual microexplosion or “ecton” can be understood as the small-scale physical cutoff of a fractal vacuum arc model [17]. Yet, even the most advanced techniques have not yet yielded a clear cutoff: ever improved diagnostic techniques have revealed finer structured features and processes.

5. Conventional and unipolar arcs

The concept of initiation of emission sites, fractal model description, and many other features are applicable to “conventional” and “unipolar” vacuum arcs. Generally we deal with conventional arcs, where anode and cathode are connected to an arc power supply that provides the necessary voltage and current to sustain the arc discharge. The dense plasma is responsible for the fact that most of the burning voltage (as measured between anode and cathode) drops in a very thin sheath adjacent to the cathode surface. Since the plasma density is very non-uniform it is clear that the sheath thickness is also very non-uniform. In fact, it was argued that for the brief movement of a phase transition around the critical point “C” (Fig. 1), the sheath does not exist at the location of the microexplosion [6]. This aside, and neglecting a number of other issues, the local sheath thickness can be roughly estimated by the Child law [6, 54]

$$S_{Child} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \lambda_D \left( \frac{2eV_c}{kT_e} \right)^{3/4},$$

(17)

where $V_c$ is the voltage drop of the cathode fall, and $\lambda_D$ is the Debye length (3). As the plasma density is high, for example close to a just-exploded emission site, the sheath is very thin and therefore the surface electric field

$$E_{surface} = \beta_{enhance} E_0$$

(18)

can be extremely high even as the voltage drop is only about 20 V; $E_0$ is the surface field if the cathode was perfectly flat and chemically clean and uniform, and $\beta_{enhance}$ is the field enhancement factor which is introduced ad-hoc to describe the local enhancement due to geometrical and chemical peculiarities of the real surface such as asperities, grain boundaries, dust particles, or oxide layers. Field enhancement factors in the range 2-10 are quite common. However, higher values in the range 10-100 [55] and up to $10^7$ [56] have been reported. In extreme cases of nanowires, $\beta_{enhance}$ can exceed $10^4$ [57]. A high electric
surface field, of order $10^8$-$10^9$ V/m, will necessarily lead to thermal runaway of electron emission and plasma formation, as mentioned before. This perpetuates the ignition of emission sites [6, 58].

The situation can be surprisingly similar for emission sites on an electrical isolated (floating) but conducting wall or shield, leading to “unipolar” arcs [59]. A floating object assumes a negative floating potential relative to the plasma potential in order to balance the electrical current of the more mobile negative plasma electrons against the less mobile positive ions [59, 60]

$$V_f \approx \frac{kT_e}{2e} \ln \left( \frac{m_i}{2\pi m_e} \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

Provided that the sheath is very thin and the floating potential is of order the arc burning voltage or greater, an electron emission site may ignite very much the same way it does for “conventional” vacuum arcs [61]. The emission site provides dense plasma of low impedance, which can short-out the sheath voltage and the “unipolar” arc will stop. However, the discharge may persist if the bulk plasma is heated by external means, like in a Tokamak. The floating wall can be simultaneously an electron emitter at the emission site (cathode function) and a receiver of hot plasma electrons (anode function) [62]. Unipolar arcs can erode the floating wall and produce a flux of highly undesirable dense plasma of the wall material, contaminating the fusion plasma. Therefore, unipolar arcs are subject of renewed interest [63-65].

6. Cohesive Energy Rule

Early in the research of vacuum arcs it became clear that similar cathode materials behave similarly. For example, refractory metals tended to make plasmas with the highest charge states, whereas large craters and large macroparticles were observed when using cathode material of low melting or boiling point. Brown and co-workers established the empirical relation [15, 66]

$$\bar{Q} = 0.6 + 3.8 \times 10^{-4} T_{boil} \text{ [K]}$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

between the mean ion charge state number, $\bar{Q}$ (measured about 150 µs after arc start), and the boiling temperature (in Kelvin) of the cathode material. Later we will refer to this as “Brown’s Rule.” While such empirical relation is helpful, the underlying physics remained obscure. In the last 20 years, much research focused on how the ion charge state distributions develop and what the reason for the strong material dependence is.

One step toward physical modeling of the processes is to formulate empirical rules based on energy considerations as opposed to rather arbitrary physical parameters such as boiling temperature or thermal conductivity. After all, we have energy conservation, but no conservation laws for temperature or thermal conductivity. In our strongly time dependent system we should include the energy input per time, or power, which essentially means to consider the time-dependent, self-establishing arc burning voltage. Accordingly, the **Cohesive Energy Rule** for vacuum arcs can be considered as an empirical relationship between the cohesive energy of the cathode material and the arc burning voltage because the local power density, $p$, is directly related to the arc burning voltage, via the local current density, $j$, by

$$p = jV.$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

The Cohesive Energy Rule states that the burning voltage depends approximately linearly on the cohesive energy. The cohesive energy is defined as energy needed to separate an atom from its
neighbors in a solid and to move it to infinite distance; for values see Table I in [11], for example. Based on experiments at Berkeley’s vacuum arc ion source, the Cohesive Energy Rule was quantified as

\[ V = V_0 + A E_{CEV}, \]  

(22)

with \( V_0 \approx 14.3 \text{ V} \) and \( A = 1.69 \text{ V/(eV/atom)} \) [20, 67] (Fig. 5).

**Figure 5.** Cohesive energy and vacuum arc burning voltage for most conducting elements of the Periodic Table (adapted from [67]).

In order to accomplish the phase transition from the solid to the plasma, energy must be invested, and the cohesive energy represents, roughly speaking, the energy needed to reach the expanded vapor phase. A fraction of the invested power is used to facilitate phase transitions. Another fraction is used to produce the various ion charge states and to accelerate the plasma away from the cathode. Materials with high cohesive energy tend to produce plasmas with higher electron temperature and related higher charge state. These less-than-rigorous arguments are supported by surprisingly good correlations as indicated in Figs. 5 and 6.

**Figure 6.** The mean charge state and the most likely kinetic energy of ions show a correlation to the cohesive energy and a periodicity according to the Periodic Table of Elements (adapted from [11]).
Another reason to justify the Cohesive Energy Rule is that many physical properties of the cathode material show periodicity as expressed in the periodic table of the elements. Therefore, the periodicity of the cohesive energy is a proxy for the periodicity of other quantities such as melting and boiling temperatures or ionization energies [67]. In this sense, Brown’s Rule for the mean ion charge state number, equation (20), is directly related to the Cohesive Energy Rule.

### 7. Use of high purity metal, oxidized, semiconducting, or alloy cathodes

It has been long recognized that the surface conditions of the cathode are very important yet difficult to control or reproduce. For example, Cobine in 1938 stresses the role of oxides and metal impurities for the reignition of arc spots [68]. “Type 1” and “type 2” cathode spots were introduced by Djakov and Holmes [69] and later associated with surface conditions by Jüttner and coworkers [70, 71]. At about the same time, Proskurovsky found that “the formation of new emission centers below the plasma of the cathode spot by a mechanism involving explosion of microscopic fine tips can occur at distances similar to $10^{-4}$ cm from the primary emission center, while a mechanism involving the breakdown of nonmetallic inclusions and films on the cathode can explain the formation of new emission centers at distances out to $10^{-2}$ cm” [72]. The role of surface conditions is emphasized in most reviews on cathode spots [6, 29, 43, 53, 73]. Consistently, the plasma generated by spots on oxidized or non-conditioned cathode surfaces contains large amounts of non-metal ion species. Using pulsed arcs of various repetition rates, it has been demonstrated that the fraction of gas ions in the plasma is clearly related to the time it takes to form an adsorbate layer from residual gas [74].

Semi-metals and semiconductors represent their own class of cathode materials. In contrast to metals, high current causes a very significant voltage drop inside in the cathode (compared to the voltage drop between anode and cathode). This is associated with significant Ohmic heating, which in cases of semiconductors actually enhances conductivity and thereby reduces the need for new spot formation. The velocity of the apparent spot motion is therefore smaller than with metals. Spots on those cathodes may be assigned their own spot type (type 3) [6].

Another interesting situation arises when the cathode is made of more than one metal. In light of the Cohesive Energy Rule (cf. section 6) it turns out that the charge states of the constituent with low cohesive energy are enhanced, compared to the pure metal situation, and the ion charge states of the material of higher cohesive energy are relatively reduced [75-78]. One may also look at this in terms of the electron temperature that can be associated with ionization: it is about the average value of the temperatures one would expect in the pure metal cases [14]. Of special interest to ion sources, the effect can be utilized to enhance the ion charge states by alloying the desired material with another material of higher cohesive energy.

### 8. Effects of the magnetic field on plasma expansion and ion charge states

External magnetic fields are applied in many practical applications of cathodic vacuum arcs (or cathodic arcs in general). This is to control process parameters like plasma density, to steer the apparent spot motion, to guide plasma in a macroparticle filter and to control plasma impact on a substrate, and, last but not least, to enhance the ion charge states.

The shift to higher charge states by a magnetic field has been extensively documented in the literature [79-87]. The strength of the magnetic field is in most cases not sufficient to “magnetize” ions:
only the electrons are magnetized. By “magnetization” we mean that (i) the gyration radius of the charged particle of charge $Qe$ and mass $m$

$$r_r = \frac{v_r m}{QeB}$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

is small compared to a characteristic length of the system (such as the inner radius of a macroparticle filter, or the cathode-anode distance), and (ii) the charged particle can execute many gyrations around the magnetic field line before experiencing a collision. In (23), $v_r$ is the velocity component perpendicular to the magnetic field (induction) vector $B$. Magnetized particles tend to move along magnetic field lines (motion of the gyration center, i.e. the motion is averaged over the gyration), which is utilized in macroparticle filters among other apparatus. Cross-field motion is facilitated via collisions and collective modes (micro-instabilities).

Near the emission center we implied that many collisions occur, which can be associated to a kinetic pressure

$$p_{kin} = \gamma \frac{I_{arc}}{r^2} kT$$ \hspace{1cm} (24)

where we again used the relation (10). The local magnetic pressure can be determined from

$$p_{mag} = \frac{B^2}{2\mu_0}$$ \hspace{1cm} (25)

where $\mu_0$ is the permeability of vacuum. The second condition of magnetization implies $p_{mag} > p_{kin}$, which means than plasma electrons are only magnetized for distances

$$r > \frac{1}{B} \left( \frac{2\mu_0 \gamma I_{arc} kT}{v_r B} \right)^{1/2}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (26)

To illustrate this, let’s consider a typical temperature of 3 eV, an arc current of 100 A, and a magnetic induction of 100 mT. We obtain that the plasma electrons are magnetized and follow magnetic field lines if their distance from the emission center is greater than about 5 mm. The electron gyration radius is of order 10 µm. Since the plasma is not expanding freely, the rate of expansion is less, the characteristic time of expansion is much longer and the Damköhler number does not drop as rapidly. Freezing of charge state ratios is not occurring, or at least not at the rate of free expansion. Additionally, the most energetic electrons, capable of causing ionizing collisions, are effectively confined such that they have a much higher probability of actually causing an ionizing collision. These effects lead to enhanced ionization compared to the free expansion case. The reduced expansion and flow of plasma along magnetic field lines can be readily seen in macroparticle filters of open architecture [88, 89] (Fig. 7).
Yet another effect is that electrons are magnetically shielded from reaching the anode, unless the magnetic field lines directly intersect emission site and anode surface. An additional voltage drop between anode and cathode develops setting up an electric field that assists electron transport to the magnetically shielded anode. Even as the additional voltage is generally less than 40 V, the value should be seen in comparison to the arc burning voltage of magnetically unimpeded arcs, which are in the range from 15 to 29 V depending on the material [11], see equation (22). Since the power density (21) is proportional to the voltage, the enhancement of the arc voltage upon application of an external magnetic field provides the mechanism by which additional energy is provided for producing higher ion charge states. A significant enhancement of the arc burning voltage is consistent with a significant shift to higher ion charge states [11, 79-87].

9. Charge exchange collisions

Early papers of the 1960s and 70s reported about the existence of multiple charge states in vacuum arc plasmas, which are characteristic for the cathode material [90-93]. More detailed investigations revealed that pulsed arcs have higher charge states compared to dc arcs [94-96], or, as Galvin and co-workers put it, “There is an interesting early-time transient behavior when the arc is first initiated and the arc current is still rising, during which time the ion charge states produced are observed to be significantly higher than during the steady current region that follows” [97]. The characteristic time for this “early-time transient behavior” is of order of several 10 μs and its origin was subject to many investigations of cathodic arcs in vacuum [94-102] and with background gas [103, 104].

Two arguments have crystallized to be responsible for higher charge states seen early after discharge ignition: One is associated with the observation that, at the very beginning of a discharge, the voltage between anode and cathode is high and the discharge is still in its spark phase (see section 10). The other argument, and much more relevant for the time scale of change observed, is the evolution of a neutral gas or vapor background as the discharge operates. This requires more elaboration.

Already in 1975, Daalder studied several cathode materials and states that “ions and neutrals differ in origin of generation, the cathode spots being the centres of fully ionized metal vapour, while neutrals are formed in surrounding areas” [105]. The relevance of this finding for the evolution of ion
charges states was overlooked for over two decades. The charge exchange reaction between a metal ion of charge state \( Q \) and a neutral atom \( A \) conserves charge but leads to a reduction of the average ion charge state (since neutrals, \( Q = 0 \), are not included in the definition of the mean ion charge state) [99]:

\[
Me^{Q+} + A \rightarrow Me^{(Q-1)+} + A^+, \quad Q = 1, 2, 3, ...
\]  

The cross section for charge exchange collisions is large compared to the cross sections of most other types of collision, and therefore charge exchange collisions are very important, even at moderate densities of neutrals. The sources of neutrals are manifold and include evaporating macroparticles, vapor from still-hot, previously active emission sites, desorption of gas from surfaces exposed to plasma and its radiation, and atoms returning to the plasma due to less-than-complete condensation of the metal plasma upon arrival on a surface. The latter effect alone is important in the sense that even a fully ionized plasma flow is a source of neutrals!

Evidence for the last point can be found in “optical flares” as reported by Tarrant and coworkers [106] and more recently also studied in our laboratory [107]. Such “flares” manifest themselves as clear intensity enhancement of neutral emission lines close to the surface exposed to flowing cathodic vacuum arc plasma (Fig. 8).

![Figure 8. Open-shutter photograph through the vacuum window showing the enhanced optical emission when a surface (left) is hit by cathodic vacuum arc plasma (steaming from the right); for details see [107].](image)

The “flares” are evidence of the less-than-unity sticking coefficient, \( S_c \), of vacuum arc ions [108]. Even as only a small percentage of ions do not stick, the flux of atoms (i.e., neutralized former ions) from the surface causes a very relevant density according to

\[
n_a = (1 - S_c) n_i v_i / v_a
\]

since the characteristic atom velocity \( v_a \) is much smaller than the characteristic ion velocity \( v_i \). Non-sticking necessarily produces neutrals, and charge exchange reactions (27) occur, predominantly reducing the fraction of higher charged ions and producing more singly charged ions, in agreement with measurements [100, 102].

Several other examples should be mentioned here that clearly support this interpretation. In the first, sophisticated optical and spectroscopic measurements were used on a liquid-metal cathode of a
gallium-indium alloy under ultrahigh-vacuum conditions. Broadened lines of gallium and indium single-, double- and higher charged ions dominated the spectrum at the beginning of the pulsed discharge, and atomic lines appeared with a delay of several hundreds of nanoseconds. The intensity of all lines then decayed but those of atoms at a much slower rate [109].

The next example concerns the peculiarly different evolution of charges states for the low-melting point materials bismuth and lead. Most of their physical properties are very similar, including melting point \( T_{\text{melt}} (Pb) = 600.6 \, \text{K}, \ T_{\text{melt}} (Bi) = 544.7 \, \text{K} \), boiling point \( T_{\text{boil}} (Pb) = 2013 \, \text{K} \) and \( T_{\text{boil}} (Bi) = 1833 \, \text{K} \), and cohesive energy \( E_{\text{CE}} (Pb) = 2.03 \, \text{eV} , \ E_{\text{CE}} (Bi) = 2.18 \, \text{eV} \). According to Brown’s Rule (20) one would expect that the mean ion charge state of bismuth is slightly lower than lead’s, whereas the Cohesive Energy Rule suggests the opposite. None of those rules refer to the evolution of the charge state distribution. Time resolved measurements (Fig. 9) showed that the mean charge state extrapolated to times shorter than 50 µs after arc ignition is slightly higher for Bi, in agreement with the Cohesive Energy Rule [101]. For later times, the mean charge states drop for both Pb and Bi, but much more significantly for Bi. Brown’s Rule [15, 66] was established based on experimental data taken about 150 µs after arc ignition, and indeed, at that time, bismuth has slightly lower mean charge state than lead (Fig. 9).

Figure 9. Evolution of the ion charge state distribution of cathodic vacuum arcs for (a) lead plasma and (b) bismuth plasma. Arc current of 300 A, ion extraction (analysis) about 10 cm from the cathode; from [101].
The reason for the much stronger decay of the mean ion charge state for bismuth can be found in charge exchange collision with metal neutrals. Bismuth has a much smaller thermal conductivity and much higher vapor pressure than lead, which leads to the evolution of a much higher background vapor [101].

If charge exchange collisions with neutrals are really the reasons for the reduction of charge states, more of such collisions should occur as the ions travel from the cathode spot region, and a corresponding charge state reduction should be seen. This was tested in a special setup of the time-of-flight instrument equipped with a movable cathode: the mean ion charge state indeed decreased as indicated in Fig. 10.

![Figure 10. Mean ion charge state number for molybdenum vacuum arc plasma as a function of time after arc ignition for different distances between cathode surface and the ion extraction grid, which is effectively the location of ion analysis; from [102].](image)

Charge exchange does not only occur with neutrals of the same element (i.e. the metal the cathode is made of) but with gas atoms, should they be present. Most vacuum systems are not ultra-high vacuum (UHV) systems and therefore water is adsorbed on walls and present as vapor when desorbed. Additionally, one may intentionally add gases, for example when the goal is to produce compound films using the cathodic arc process [6, 110-113]. Besides electron impact ionization, charge exchange collisions produce gas ions. Gas ions, as opposed to metal ions, can represent a very large fraction of the plasma or even become the dominant ion species [114-118].

Extrapolating time-dependent charges state distributions to $t \to 0$, i.e. a time when the spot plasma expands into space not yet filled with neutrals, the charge states are significantly higher than reported in survey tables [11, 14, 15, 66, 90, 91]. This suggests that the ion charges states produced during the explosive process in cathode spots are much higher than observed far from the spot. One may suspect that especially for dc arcs, when a background of neutrals is fully developed, the observed and used ion charge states are actually significantly lower than what is produced at the non-stationary cathode spots.
10. Vacuum arc and vacuum sparks

Short-pulse cathodic vacuum arcs are sometime loosely labeled as “vacuum sparks” which, strictly speaking, is not correct. Vacuum arcs are characterized by their typical low anode-cathode voltage, Eq. (22), which can be enhanced by magnetic fields, for example, as discussed in section 8. Yet, even enhanced arc voltages are generally less than 100 V. Vacuum sparks, in contrast, are characterized by a high voltage, which can be 10s of kV, for example. Such high voltage between electrodes cannot be sustained and therefore vacuum sparks are always transient phenomena.

Often, a short spark phase can be observed when a cathodic vacuum arc is initiated. For example, a kV-pulse generator with a few ns rise time was applied to a very short (100 µm) anode-cathode gap to produce an 800 ns pulsed arc; the voltage between anode and cathode remained high for about 20 ns, which is the time the plasma needed to bridge the electrode gap [46, 47].

Driven by low impedance pulse power generators, vacuum sparks show very high current (often 10s of kA) up to the point where pinching occurs caused by the high magnetic self-field. A phenomenon called *radiative collapse* leads to the formation of high density plasma hot spots that emit x-rays characteristic of highly charged ions, e.g. helium-like Fe XXIV [119], molybdenum Mo XL [120], or magnesium Mg X [121]. Such phenomena are very different from vacuum arcs.

11. Additional ionization of cathodic vacuum arc plasma

In an attempt to make higher charges states available for particle accelerators, ion implantation and surface modification, short pulse arcs with a brief initial spark phase can be utilized and further optimized by using pulsed high current, additional external magnetic fields, and good vacuum practices (less gas adsorbates). Early experiments were done in the 1950s [122]. In more recent studies, pulsed ion beams were produced from plasmas in the spark-arc transition region containing multiply charged ions up to 11+ [123, 124] (Fig. 11).

![Figure 11](image)

**Figure 11.** Typical time-of-flight spectrum of a pulsed vacuum discharge in the spark-arc transition region with a gold cathode; peak current was 1.5 kA, discharging a low-inductance 450 nF storage capacitor charged to 4 kV; from [124]. While the very first, small peak before the H⁺ is electromagnetic noise, the multiple charge states of gold are clearly discernible.
It appears very difficult to extract higher charge states for fundamental reasons related to recombination [124]. Systematic studies for many elements showed that the mean charge state number is typically shifted to higher values by only about 1-2 [125].

Further charge states enhancements for ion beam formation have been demonstrated for dedicated ion sources using magnetic compression and electron-beam ionization of the vacuum arc plasma in z-Mevva [126-128] and e-Mevva configurations [127, 129-131]). Alternatively, microwave-based electron cyclotron resonance (ECR) ionization can be used to shift the average charge state, e.g. from typically 2+ to up to 7+ for platinum [132-134].

A simple approach to temporally enhance ion charges states is to superimpose current pulses on the arc current by increasing the applied voltage [135]. Each current pulse is driven by a temporary spike in the arc burning voltage and power. While this technique leads to only relatively small changes of charges states (similar to the study [125]), it was effectively used by Yushkov and coworkers to determine ion drift velocities in vacuum arc plasmas [136]. However, in their original work [136], a systematic error due to ion optics effects distorted the results especially for light ions. The authors then developed an improved technique a couple of years later to obtain generally accepted values [11]. Interestingly, the ion velocity distribution function for each material exhibited only one peak, indicative that all ion charge states of a material move with approximately the same velocity or kinetic energy [137]. This is an indication for the hydrodynamic nature of ion acceleration, as opposed to an electrostatic acceleration that would lead to kinetic energies proportional to the charge states [11].

Practically all the vacuum arc or “Mevva” type ion sources are broad beam sources that do not have mass/charge selection. The time-of-flight and similar diagnostics generally indicate two groups of ions, namely the multiply charged metal ions and lower-mass lower-charge gas ions. The latter usually stem from adsorbates on surfaces of the discharge system. Occasionally very high metal charges states such as Au²⁶⁺ have been claimed to be extracted [128, 138, 139], however, it is much more likely that those ions are actually low ion charge states of desorbed gases. This statement is based on both theoretical considerations of ionization and recombination [124] as well as my own practical attempts using pulsed vacuum discharges up to 75 kA, which led to extracted charge states of “only” up to 7+ [140, 141].

12. Summary and Conclusions

The ion charge state distributions in vacuum arc plasmas are material dependent but not fixed as some older literature may suggest. Rather, the ratios of ion charge states undergo an evolution as the plasma is formed and expands from the cathode spot region, where it is then used for a variety of applications such as in ion accelerators, in vacuum arc switches, for surface modification and deposition of coatings. Decades of research can be summarized in the following main points:

1. Plasma generation occurs at cathode spots of extreme but variable power and current density best described by a fractal model. The ecton model of repetitive microexplosions is compatible with a fractal approach in that ectons (the smallest unit of microexplosions) represent the small-scale physical cutoff of self-similarity.

2. Non-ideal plasma effects such as pressure ionization play a role as the cathode material transitions from a solid to dense plasma, circumnavigating the critical point in the density-temperature phase diagram. The path of the material in the phase diagram is not fixed but rather subject to change depending on the development stage of the emission site. Such change is consistent with a fractal approach.
3. The cohesive energy rule provides good guidance on estimating charge state distributions. The most complete compilation of charge state distributions (as observed about 150-200 µs after arc ignition in 10-20 cm distance from the cathode) was published in [11]. It is reproduced with some minor additions in Appendix B of [6]. In the case of alloy cathodes, the plasma has one common effective electron temperature leading to a relative enhancement of the ionization of the material with low cohesive energy and a relative reduction of ionization of the material of high cohesive energy.

4. Charge exchange collisions of multiply charged ions with neutrals reduce the average ion charge states. As the neutral density itself is a function of the plasma development, such reductions are relatively slow (10s or 100s of microseconds after arc ignition) compared to the changes of the emission sites themselves (usually less than 1 µs). Extrapolation of charge state distributions to conditions without neutrals, or back close to the emission site, suggests that the ion charge states at the emission site are significantly higher than those actually utilized in applications.

5. Strategies for obtaining higher charge states for applications include reducing the neutral density, using magnetic fields, or apply additional ionization schemes such as electron-beam or electron cyclotron resonance ionization known from other types of ion sources.

6. Vacuum arcs should not be confused with vacuum sparks. Not the pulse duration but the voltage between anode and cathode should be used to distinguish them. Vacuum sparks are transient, high voltage, high current discharges that in extreme cases exhibit pinching, radiative collapse, and x-ray emission from highly ionized ions (e.g. helium-like Mo$^{40^+}$). Such ions are very short-lived and therefore cannot be extracted. Experiments using pulsed arcs (including a short spark phase) with magnetic field resulted in higher charge states up to about 10+. Some reports of much higher extracted ion charges (like 18+) appear to be based on a misinterpretation of lighter and lower charged gas ions.

The initial question, triggered by the original publication [7], was whether or not the lowering of the ionization energy in dense plasmas (pressure ionization) is responsible for the high fraction of multiply charged ions in vacuum arc plasmas. The conclusion of the original paper was: yes, at least to some degree. The years of research suggest that, while the effect is likely to be present, other effects appear to be much more important in the establishment of observable plasma parameters.
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