Intrinsic linewidth calculation in an argon X-ray laser based on the model of geometrically dependent gain coefficient
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By introducing differential amplified spontaneous emission intensity, numerical calculations for both homogeneously and Doppler broadened lines, and using the reported experimental measurements of the amplified spontaneous emission intensity and linewidth, we managed to explain the linewidth behavior, and calculate the intrinsic linewidth due to Voigt-profile width in an argon X-ray laser operating at 440 × 10⁻³ torr argon pressure and current of 21 kA. For the calculation, the intensity rate equation, along with the model of geometrically dependent gain coefficient were applied. The calculated value of the intrinsic linewidth was found to be 55.67 mÅ, which is very close to the Doppler broadened line of 53.52 mÅ. That is, the collision broadening has a very small contribution to the light-matter interaction in argon X-ray lasers. Details of the procedure used for the calculation will be presented in this paper.
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1. Introduction

After the first successful demonstration of electron-collision excitation of soft X-ray using Se-target in 1985 [1], significant amplification has been observed in 3p-3s transition in Ne-like ions [1–7] and 4d-4p transitions in Ni-like ions [8, 9]. The subject for solid targets was also extensively investigated theoretically and reviewed [10–13]. In this direction, the characterization of a laser system under the study was also considered as an important issue. In gas phase, an Ar X-ray laser operating at 46.9 nm wavelength [14] has particularly attracted the worldwide attention, as it has the potential to be commercially available to be used as a practical tool in any laser laboratory. For understanding the behavior of X-ray lasers, in general, many theoretical models and mathematical approaches have also been proposed to predict and explain the lasers output behaviors, their coherencies and gain coefficients. From the experimental point of view, two types of measurements, namely, the amplified spontaneous emission (ASE)
output intensity $I_{\text{ASE}}$ extracted from a laser system and the linewidth $\Delta \lambda_{\text{ASE}}$ vs. excitation length $z$, are commonly considered. For data analysis for the first type of measurements, usually Linford equation, proposed in 1974 [15], is used to extract unsaturated gain coefficients. The proposed equation, in spite of many attempts that have been made for its improvement [12, 16], encounters disadvantages to be used for deducing small signal gains. For example, it does not explain all the experimental data points of the ASE intensity vs. $z$, in particular when the measured $I_{\text{ASE}}$ approaches the saturation limit. The $I_{\text{ASE}}$ formula predicts that at $z = 0$, it is always equal to zero, whereas it has been established experimentally that the ASE starts at a threshold length $z_{\text{th}}$ which is not zero, even for optically pumped small-sized samples [17, 18]. Selection of different portions of the $I_{\text{ASE}}$ vs. $z$ profile gives different values of the small signal gain [17]. In fact, by neglecting some random parts of the profile for data analysis, some valuable information that can be obtained from an experiment is left to be useless.

Based on our measurements, further analytical and numerical calculations for gas lasers [19], we managed to introduce the model of geometrically dependent gain coefficient (GDGC) for explaining gain coefficients in gas lasers such as N$_2$, and excimer lasers. In these studies it was confirmed that gain coefficients are dominantly determined by the geometry of the laser systems. Subsequently, the model was successfully applied for the ASE gain and linewidth behaviors in KrF lasers [20, 21]. The only requirement for applying the model is the availability of the $I_{\text{ASE}}$ and $\Delta \lambda_{\text{ASE}}$ vs. medium amplification length $l_{\text{amp}}$ which can be obtained through measurements. In this paper, we are presenting the results of applying the GDGC model to explain linewidth behavior in an Ar X-ray laser. Both homogeneously and Doppler broadened line shapes are used for the calculation and finally the intrinsic linewidth which is initiated at the threshold length $z_{\text{th}}$ is calculated. For the approach, the numerical calculation is applied, where the analytical calculation is also used for supporting the physical meaning behind the results obtained by the numerical calculations.

2. Theoretical approach

We start with the intensity rate equation, and by considering the saturation effect we can write [22],

$$\frac{\partial I^v(z)}{\partial z} = \frac{g^v_0(z)I^v(z)}{1 + I^v(z)/I^v_s}^\mu + \frac{g^v_0(z)h_v}{\sigma_{\text{stim}}^v \tau_{\text{sp}}^v [1 + I^v(z)/I^v_s]^\mu} \gamma(z)$$

where $I^v$ is the ASE intensity, $g^v_0$ is the unsaturated small signal gain at frequency $v$, and $I^v_s$ is the saturation intensity; $\sigma_{\text{stim}}^v$ and $\tau_{\text{sp}}^v$ are stimulated emission cross-section and the spontaneous emission lifetime of the medium upper state level, respectively; $\gamma(z) = \Omega(z)/4\pi$ specifies the nature of the ASE propagation, where $\Omega(z)$ is the solid angle subtended from the exit face of the medium as seen from a plane located at the $z$-position. In a capillary discharge $\gamma(z) = (\pi d_{\text{amp}}^2/4)/(4\pi z^2)$ is applied for the numer-
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...atical calculation; \( d_{\text{amp}} \) is the discharge tube diameter. For the upper state population \( N_2 \), we let \( N_2 \equiv g_{0}^{v}/\sigma_{\text{stim}}^{v} \). Equation (1) for \( \mu = 0, 1/2 \) and 1 is solved numerically; \( \mu = 0 \) corresponds to the case when the effect of saturation is not considered [20]; \( \mu = 1/2 \) and 1 correspond to the homogeneously (H) and Doppler (D) broadened transitions, respectively. For the case when \( \mu = 1/2 \) is used for the numerical calculation, \( I_{\nu_{0}}^{v} \), which refers to the saturation intensity at the \( \nu_{0} \) frequency for the H-broadened line is used in the denominator of this equation [22]. The saturation length \( z_{\text{sat}} \) in this case is defined when \( I_{\nu_{0}}^{v} = I_{\nu_{0}}^{v} \), where for the saturated gain coefficient it gives \( g_{0}^{v} \). For the \( \mu = 1/2 \) solution when \( I_{\nu_{0}}^{v} = I_{\nu_{0}}^{v} \), the saturated small signal gain coefficient is \( g_{0}^{v} \).

To obtain the analytical solution for \( I^{v}(z) \), we let \( \mu = 0 \). In this case, the solution for \( \mu = 0 \) can be readily obtained [20],

\[
I^{v} = \frac{\gamma(z_{\text{th}})h_{v}}{\sigma_{\text{stim}}^{v} \tau_{sp}} \left\{ \exp \left[ \Delta G_{0}^{v}(z, z_{\text{th}}) \right] - 1 \right\}
\]

(2)

where to solve the equation, the term \( \gamma(z_{\text{th}}) \), which is a constant and very close to the value obtained by the numerical calculation, is used; \( \Delta G_{0}^{v}(z, z_{\text{th}}) = G_{0}^{v}(z) - G_{0}^{v}(z_{\text{th}}) \) is defined. Also, \( G_{0}^{v}(z) = \int g_{0}^{v}(z)dz \). In the GDG model, it is proved that small signal gain at the central frequency \( \nu_{0} \) is calculated to be [19]

\[
g_{0}^{\nu_{0}}(z) = m' + \frac{1 + \gamma_{L}^{\text{max}}}{z} + b \gamma_{L}^{\text{max}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n}{(n+1)!} (-bz)^{n}
\]

(3)

where \( m' \), \( \gamma_{L}^{\text{max}} \) and \( b \) are constants and they refer to gain parameters; \( \gamma_{L}^{\text{max}} \) is the maximum power losses. The saturation intensity at frequency \( \nu \) is given by [22, 23]

\[
I_{s}^{\nu} = \frac{h_{v}}{\sigma_{\text{stim}}^{v} \tau_{u}} = \frac{h_{v}}{\sigma_{\text{stim}}^{v} \tau_{sp} \phi}
\]

(4)

where \( \phi = \tau_{u}/\tau_{sp} \) is the fluorescence quantum yield; \( \tau_{u} \) is the medium upper state lifetime. By the use of Eq. (4), \( I^{v}(z) \) in Eq. (2) simplifies to

\[
I^{v}(z) = \gamma(z_{\text{th}})I_{s}^{\nu} \phi \left\{ \exp \left[ \Delta G_{0}^{v}(z, z_{\text{th}}) \right] - 1 \right\}
\]

(5)

Equation (5) shows that \( I^{v}(z) \) is frequency dependent. We may also show this dependence explicitly. For the H- and D-broadened lines we have [23]:

\[
\sigma_{\text{stim}}^{v,H} = \sigma_{\text{stim}}^{v,H}/(1 + x^2)
\]

\[
g_{0}^{v,H}(z) = g_{0}^{v,H}(z)/(1 + x^2)
\]

\[
I_{s}^{v,H} = (1 + x^2)I_{s}^{v,H}
\]
also
\[
\sigma_{\text{stim}}^\nu, D = \sigma_{\text{stim}}^\nu, D \exp(-x^2 \ln 2)
\]
\[
g_0^\nu, D (z) = g_0^\nu, D (z) \exp(-x^2 \ln 2)
\]
\[
I_s^\nu, D = I_s^\nu, D \exp(x^2 \ln 2)
\]
then \(\Delta G_0^\nu (z, z_{th})\) in Equation (5) will be \(\Delta G_0^\nu, H (z, z_{th})/(1 + x^2)\) and \(\Delta G_0^\nu, D (z, z_{th}) \times \exp(-x^2 \ln 2)\), respectively, where superscripts H and D refer to H- and D-broadened lines. By substituting these last two expressions along with the \(I_s^\nu, H\) and \(I_s^\nu, D\) expressions shown in the above identities into Eq. (5), the ASE intensities with respect to \(x\) are obtained. The normalized frequency offset \(x\) for the H- and D-broadened lines is given by \(x = 2(\nu - \nu_0)/\Delta \nu_0^H\) and \(x = 2(\nu - \nu_0)/\Delta \nu_0^D\), respectively; \(\Delta \nu_0^H\) and \(\Delta \nu_0^D\) are their corresponding spontaneous emission linewidths \([22, 23]\). When the ASE starts at the threshold length \(z_{th}\) and propagates along the \(z\)-direction, it means that it is possible to measure the ASE intensity and linewidth with respect to excitation length \(z\) and this is always accomplished in any laser laboratory. By applying Eq. (3) into Eq. (1) and solving this equation numerically for \(\nu = \nu_0\), gain parameters \((m', \gamma_L^{\text{max}}\text{ and } b\)) for the central transition frequency \(\nu_0\) can be deduced for a given ASE intensity measurement. For the linewidth calculation, it is also required to solve Eq. (1) numerically. In this case for both H- and D-lines we let \(g_0^\nu, H (z) = g_0^\nu, H (z)/(1 + x^2)\) and \(g_0^\nu, D (z) = g_0^\nu, D (z) \exp(-x^2 \ln 2)\) in Eq. (1). Then, \(x\) is considered to be a parameter. By varying \(x\) we can also obtain the \(x\)-dependence of the ASE intensity at any given \(z_j\). The FWHMs deduced from the profiles (for both H- and D-broadenings) will give the calculated ASE linewidths at \(z_j\) for both line broadenings. Subsequently \(\Delta \lambda_{\text{ASE}, \nu}\), corresponding to Voigt integral for both lines, is obtained using the following expression \([24]\)
\[
\Delta \lambda_{\text{ASE}, \nu} = 0.5346 \Delta \lambda_{\text{ASE}, H} + \sqrt{0.2166(\Delta \lambda_{\text{ASE}, H})^2 + (\Delta \lambda_{\text{ASE}, D})^2}
\]
By extending the calculation for all \(z_j\), our requirement for deducing the \(\Delta \lambda_{\text{ASE}, \nu}\) vs. \(z\) profile is obtained.
If we consider the analytical calculation, Eq. (5) is used for \(\mu = 0\). For this approach, we have already obtained
\[
\Delta \nu_{\text{ASE}, H}/\Delta \nu_0^H = \sqrt{\ln 2/\Delta G_0^\nu, H (z, z_{th})}
\]
\[
\Delta \nu_{\text{ASE}, D}/\Delta \nu_0^D = 1/\sqrt{\Delta G_0^\nu, D (z, z_{th})}
\]
for the H- and D-lines, respectively \([18]\). These last two expressions for the linewidths indicate that at \(z_{th}\), we have nonfinite values for \(\Delta \lambda_{\text{ASE}, \nu}\), as \(\Delta G_0^\nu (z, z_{th}) \to 0\) for both broadenings. This definitely introduces an ambiguity also for the numerical calculations when Eq. (1) is used. For \(x^2 \gg 1\), or very small \(z\), however, we may consider cal-
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Calculating the \( I^v(z) \)-profile according to Eq. (5) and applying the \( x^2 \gg 1 \) limit. For the H- and D-broadened lines, respectively, we obtain

\[
I^{v,H}_x(z) \equiv I^{v,H}_{x \to \infty}(z) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta G^{v,H}_0(z, z_{th})}{1 + x^2} I^{v,H}_{x \to \infty}(z)
\]

\[
I^{v,D}_x(z) \equiv I^{v,D}_{x \to \infty}(z) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta G^{v,D}_0(z, z_{th}) \exp(-x^2 \ln 2) I^{v,D}_{x \to \infty}(z)
\]

(7a) (7b)

where

\[
I^{v,H}_{x \to \infty}(z) = \gamma(z_{th}) I^{v_H}_s \phi \Delta G^{v_H}_0(z, z_{th})
\]

\[
I^{v,D}_{x \to \infty}(z) = \gamma(z_{th}) I^{v_D}_s \phi \Delta G^{v_D}_0(z, z_{th})
\]

are defined, and for a given \( z \) they are constants. It is understood from Eqs. (7a) and (7b) that by introducing the differential ASE intensities, defined by

\[
\Delta I^{v,H}(z) = I^{v,H}(z) - I^{v,H}_{x \to \infty}(z)
\]

\[
\Delta I^{v,D}(z) = I^{v,D}(z) - I^{v,D}_{x \to \infty}(z)
\]

we obtain pure Lorentzian and Gaussian frequency distributions for the H- and D-lines, respectively. This means that for \( x^2 \gg 1 \) the ASE linewidths are calculated to be, respectively, \( \Delta \nu^{\text{ASE},H} = \Delta \nu^{H}_0 \) and \( \Delta \nu^{\text{ASE},D} = \Delta \nu^{D}_0 \), \textit{i.e.}, by eliminating the ASE intensity background, given by \( I^{v}_x \to \infty(z) \) for both lines, the ambiguities for nonfinite values for \( \Delta \nu^{\text{ASE}} \) at \( z = z_{th} \) are removed and the H- and D-broadened spontaneous emission linewidths are obtained. This ambiguity exists for the linewidth calculations when \( I^v(z) \) is used, and naturally it is impossible to obtain the exact value for the intrinsic linewidth as long as \( \Delta I^v \) is not used. It is to be cited that the corresponding line-profiles for using \( I^v(z) \) and \( \Delta I^v(z) \) overlap at large \( z \), while when \( z \to z_{th} \) they tend to deviate from each other so that the latter one at \( z = z_{th} \) gives a finite value for \( \Delta \lambda^{\text{ASE}} \). For the numerical calculation, \( x = 4 \) is enough for calculating the intensity background \( I^{v}_x \to \infty(z) \).

3. Results

For our study we use the results of measurements presented in [25]. The excitation range in this report is \( l_{\text{amp}} = 18 \) to 36 cm and Ar gas pressure is \( 4.4 \times 10^{-3} \) torr. The peak amplitude of the current pulse is 21 kA. The contributions of the Lorentzian and Doppler line shapes are \( \Delta \lambda^H_0 = 3.96 \) mÅ and \( \Delta \lambda^D_0 = 53.52 \) mÅ, where they correspond to \( 5.4 \times 10^{10} \) and \( 7.3 \times 10^{11} \) Hz, respectively; and

\[
\sigma_{\text{stim}}^{v,H} = g^{v,H}_0 \phi \Delta \lambda^H_0 / (8 \pi n^2 \tau_{\text{sp}})
\]
where \( g^{\nu_0, H} = \frac{2}{(\pi \Delta \nu_0^H)} \), and

\[
\sigma_{\text{stim}}^{\nu_0, D} = g^{\nu_0, D}(\frac{\lambda_0^D}{8\pi n^2 \tau_{sp}})
\]

where \( g^{\nu_0, D} = 2\sqrt{\ln 2/\pi /\Delta \nu_0^D} \) [12], and \( n \) is the medium index of refraction (\( n = 1 \)). By calculating \( \sigma_{\text{stim}}^{\nu_0, H} \tau_{sp} = 1.03 \times 10^{-23} \text{ cm}^2\text{s} \) and \( \sigma_{\text{stim}}^{\nu_0, D} \tau_{sp} = 1.12 \times 10^{-24} \text{ cm}^2\text{s} \), and by the use of \( \phi = 0.05 \), the saturation intensities are \( I_{s}^{\nu_0, H} = 0.82 \times 10^7 \text{ W/cm}^2 \) and \( I_{s}^{\nu_0, D} = 7.53 \times 10^7 \text{ W/cm}^2 \). It is seen that \( I_{s}^{\nu_0, D} = 9.2 I_{s}^{H} \).

In [25] the measured ASE intensity is given in an arbitrary unit. In this calculation, however, based on the values of the saturation intensities \( I_{s}^{\nu_0, H} \) and \( I_{s}^{\nu_0, D} \), the intensity units are modified and are given in \( \text{W/cm}^2 \). Thus, for the \( I^\nu(z) \) calculation, when \( \mu = 1 \) and \( \mu = 1/2 \) are used, two sets of gain parameters, corresponding to the H- and D-broadened lines, are obtained. In Figure 1a the calculated \( I^{\nu_0} \) vs. \( l_{\text{amp}} \) for the H-broadened

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig1.png}
\caption{Calculated results for the Ar X-ray laser output intensity vs. capillary discharge excitation length \( l_{\text{amp}} \) for the H-broadened line (a) and D-broadened line (b). The \( C_{1, \text{H}} \) and \( C^{(0)}_{1, \text{H}} \)-profiles refer to saturated and unsaturated calculations and the \( C_{1, \text{D}} \)-profile shows the fitting to Linford equation. Inset is the unsaturated \( g_{0}^{\nu_0} \) and saturated \( g_{0}^{\nu_0} \) gain profiles. Linford equation for both (a) and (b) figures gives \( g_{0}^{\nu_0} = 0.62 \text{ cm}^{-1} \). Experimental measurements adopted from [25].}
\end{figure}
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Line is given. The $C_{1,H}$-profile refers to the solution of Eq. (1) when $\mu = 1$ is used, while the $C_{1,H}^{(0)}$-profile in this calculation refers to the case when $\mu = 0$ is applied, but gain parameters are used for the $\mu = 1$ solution. Thus, the $C_{1,H}$ and $C_{1,H}^{(0)}$-profiles refer to the saturated and unsaturated intensity solutions, respectively. The $C_L$-profile shows the results of the fitting to the experimental intensity measurements when the Linford equation is used, where it gives $g_{0}^{\nu_0} = 0.62 \text{ cm}^{-1}$. Significant differences between the $C_{1,H}$ and $C_{1,L}$-profiles can be seen in this figure. In the inset of the figure, the unsaturated and saturated gain profiles are also given. For the excitation length of $l_{\text{amp}} = 36 \text{ cm}$, these profiles give $g_{0}^{\nu_0,H} = 0.38 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ and $g_{0}^{\nu_0,H} = 0.10 \text{ cm}^{-1}$. The threshold length is $z_{\text{th}} = 4.7 \text{ cm}$, and the saturation length is calculated to be $z_{\text{sat}} = 29.0 \text{ cm}$ (slightly higher than $z_{\text{sat}} \sim 24 \text{ cm}$, reported in [25]). Figure 1b shows the analysis made for the D-broadened line, where in this case $g_{0}^{\nu_0,D} = 0.57 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ and $g_{0}^{\nu_0,D} = 0.11 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ for $l_{\text{amp}} = 36 \text{ cm}$ are obtained. For the D-broadened line, $z_{\text{sat}} = 21.5 \text{ cm}$ is calculated, and is slightly different from that obtained in Fig. 1a for the H-broadened line. It is to be cited that while the $C_{1,H}$ and $C_{1,D}$-profiles explain the $I_{\text{ASE}}$ measurements, the $C_{1,H}^{(0)}$ and $C_{1,D}^{(0)}$-profiles, corresponding to the unsaturated solutions, do not explain the ASE behavior and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of broadening</th>
<th>$m' [\text{cm}^{-1}]$</th>
<th>$g_{0}^{\nu_0,\text{max}} [\text{cm}^{-1}]$</th>
<th>$g_{0}^{\nu_0} [\text{cm}^{-1}]$</th>
<th>$g_{0}^{\nu_0} [\text{cm}^{-1}]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.28 ± 0.04</td>
<td>5.50 ± 0.60</td>
<td>0.38 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.50 ± 0.04</td>
<td>3.30 ± 0.50</td>
<td>0.57 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 2](image.png)

Fig. 2. The calculated ASE linewidth $\Delta \lambda_{\text{ASE}}/\lambda$ with respect to excitation length $l_{\text{amp}}$ for the H- and D-broadened line shapes. The Voigt profile ($B^V$-profile) is calculated to be very close to the inhomogeneously broadened line ($B^D$-profile). The dashed profiles ($B^H_{\text{sat}}$ and $B^D_{\text{sat}}$) show the re-broadening and have no contribution to the broadening mechanisms.
they give profiles close to those predicted by the Linford equation. We also notice from these figures that the Linford equation always gives zero values for the ASE intensities when $z = 0$. In the Table a summary of the calculated results is given. The most elegant observation in this study for applying the GDGC model is the linewidth calculation shown in Figs. 2 and 3. For the calculations, the gain parameters are as those obtained from Fig. 1. It is seen in Fig. 2 that the H-broadened line (when $\mu = 1$) has a small contribution to the broadening mechanism (the $B^H$-profile), while the $B^D$-profile corresponding to the $\mu = 1/2$ solution, can explain the measurements. Consequently, the contribution of the Voigt-profile (the $B^V$-profile) corresponding to the H- and D-broadenings can be also visualized in this figure. In fact the $B^D$- and $B^V$-profiles in this study are very close to each other and they both, with a small difference can explain the measurements. The $B^H$- and $B^D$-profiles corresponding to the $C^{(0)}_{1,H}$ and $C^{(0)}_{1,D}$-calculated profiles (unsaturated), are shown in Fig. 1. The GDGC model also predicts the re-broadening linewidth, as shown by the $B^{sat}$-profiles in Fig. 2. These linewidths behavior are obtained by using gain parameters from Fig. 1 using $\mu = 1$ and $\mu = 1/2$ solutions, with the gain parameters obtained from the Table ($C_{1,H}$ and $C_{1,D}$-profiles). For $z < 15$ cm the re-broadening effects for two lines disappear. According to the experimental linewidth measurements, however, these re-broadening effects have not been observed and therefore should not be further considered. One particular aspect of the linewidth calculation is the linewidth behavior near $z_{th}$. According to our previously introduced method to obtain a finite value for the linewidth at $z_{th}$, the FWHM of the $\Delta I^V(z)$-profile, instead of the $I^V(z)$-profile, has to be evaluated. The calculated results corresponding to this computation is given in Fig. 3. The $C_1$-profile (solid line) in this

![Fig. 3. The calculated linewidth $\Delta \lambda_{ASE}/\lambda$ vs. $l_{amp}$ for using $\Delta I^V(l_{amp})$ for the FWHM calculations ($C_1$-profile). For $z \to z_{th}$ the $C_1$-profile gives the intrinsic linewidth of 55.67 mA. The $C_2$-profile is the calculated linewidth as presented in [25], to be compared with the calculation made in this work. Experimental measurements were adopted from [25].](image-url)
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The figure corresponds to the $\Delta \lambda_{\text{ASE}, \text{V}}/\lambda$, where $\Delta \lambda_{0}^{\text{H}} = 3.96$ mÅ and $\Delta \lambda_{0}^{\text{D}} = 53.52$ mÅ are used for the calculation. In this figure, our linewidth calculation is also compared with that presented in [25], shown by the $C_{2}$-profile (dashed line). In the related calculations reported in [25] where the ion–ion collisions introduced in [26] and the molecular dynamics computation [27] were used, a slightly higher re-broadening is predicted, showing a small deviation from the measurements, and definitely their method does not predict the value of the intrinsic linewidth that occurs at $z_{\text{th}}$. Thus, with the introduced method of calculation for the linewidth, it can be concluded that:

1. The D-broadened line has the major responsibility for the broadening mechanism in a low pressure Ar X-ray laser.
2. The re-broadening mechanism (shown by dashed lines in Fig. 2) does not contribute to the light-matter interaction in the Ne-like Ar X-ray laser.
3. The theoretical approach explains measurements correctly with the intrinsic linewidth of $\Delta \lambda_{0}^{\text{V}} = 55.67$ mÅ which is very close to the Doppler linewidth of $\Delta \lambda_{0}^{\text{D}} = 53.52$ mÅ.
4. The calculations, based on the GDGC model, show a gradual decrease in the linewidth when $l_{\text{amp}}$ increases.

4. Conclusion and discussion

Using the model of geometrically dependent gain coefficient (GDGC), and experimental results of the ASE intensity and linewidth vs. capillary discharge length of an Ar X-ray laser, a calculation was carried out for both H- and D-broadening lines to obtain the intrinsic linewidth. It was found that the linewidth with respect to $l_{\text{amp}}$ is dominantly determined by Doppler broadening mechanism, and collision broadening has a small contribution to the broadening mechanism. In the numerical calculation, in contrast to using the ASE intensity alone, i.e., $I_{\text{ASE}}(z)$, it was realized that $z$-dependent values of the ASE intensity background must be subtracted from the $I_{\text{ASE}}(z)$-profile to obtain $\Delta I_{\text{ASE}}(z)$. With this approach we reached a finite value for the linewidth at the threshold length $z_{\text{th}}$. The numerical calculation is also supported by the analytical approach, where it resulted in $\Delta \lambda_{\text{ASE}, \text{V}}^{0} = 55.67$ mÅ. As $z_{\text{th}} = 4.7$ cm is large enough, so, letting the $z_{\text{th}} \rightarrow 0$ condition, which is a common method for small-sized samples [10], cannot be used. It deserves mentioning that the predictions that can be made using the GDGC model should not be compared with the reported results of the calculations using different mathematical approaches. The GDGC model not only simplifies the method of the calculation, but also, it relies on an excellent agreement with the experimental measurements. For example, the presence of the threshold length $z_{\text{th}}$ where it is the ASE start point, although it has been introduced in the earliest reported theoretical investigations presented in [28], it has not been further considered in the related ASE solutions reported in the literature. Thus, by neglecting this parameter, a great amount of information is lost naturally. Also, for using the GDGC model, it is necessary to solve the intensity rate equation for both lines separately and then the corresponding Voigt-profile should be calculated. By observing and comparing the results of calculations with...
the measurements, one can finalize the conclusion. In fact, the GDGC model, as shown in [29], is based on introducing the geometrical loss, where it leads to correct prediction for the light matter interaction.
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