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Abstract

The yields of the ion-induced sputtering from monoatomic solids at normal incidence for various ion-target combinations are presented graphically as a function of the incident ion energy. In order to fill the lack of the experimental data, the sputtering yields are also calculated by the Monte Carlo simulation code ACAT for some ion-target combinations. Each graph shows available experimental data points and the ACAT data, together with the sputtering yields calculated by the present empirical formula, whose parameters are determined by the best-fit to available data.
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1. Introduction

Sputtering of surfaces is an important parameter in the understanding of fusion energy device operation. Sputtering ejects high atomic number materials into the plasma causing significant contamination, increases in the effective charge of the plasma and results in inefficient heating of the fuel. From the view point of the plasma-wall-interaction, sputtering is an undesired effect which contaminates the plasma and erodes the surrounding walls. On the other hand, sputtering is also widely used for many applications. Sputtering allows us a controlled removal of surface layers on a nearly atomic scale and the submicron spatial resolution if a well-focused ion beam is used. One of the largest applications of sputtering is the deposition of thin films on a large variety of substrates. Therefore, it is important to present the empirical, analytical formula which can easily provide the sputtering yield for any ion-target combination.

In 1984 the working group at Institute of Plasma Physics, Nagoya University, published the compiled sputtering yield data available to the early 1983 and proposed the empirical formula which could predict the energy dependence of sputtering yields for any ion-target combination [1]. Since then, a large number of new data have been published. Therefore, it seems to be time to collect new experimental sputtering data published during 1983 - 1994 and to revise the previous empirical formula.

Recently, Eckstein et al.[2] have reported their survey of the experimental sputtering yield data measured at Max-Plank Institut für Plasmaphysik (Garching) where the data for normal incidence as a function of ion energy were fitted by a formula derived by Bohdansky [3]. Recently, Thomas et al.[4] also presented an evaluated data base for light ion sputtering, based on the Bohdansky's formula [3]. Basically, these two groups used the following Bohdansky's formula:

\[ Y(E) = Q \cdot s_n(\epsilon) \left( 1 - \frac{F_{th}}{E} \right)^{2\beta} \left[ 1 - \frac{F_{th}}{E} \right]^2 \]

(1)

where \( E \) is the projectile energy, \( s_n(\epsilon) \) is the reduced nuclear stopping cross section, and \( \epsilon \) is the reduced energy.
\[ \varepsilon = E \frac{M_2}{M_1 + M_2} \frac{a_L}{Z_1 Z_2 e^2} \]  

(2)

\( Z_1 \) and \( Z_2 \) are the atomic numbers, and \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) the masses of the projectile and the target atom, respectively. \( \varepsilon \) is the electron charge. The Lindhard screening length \( a_L \) is given as [5]

\[ a_L = 0.4685 \left( Z_1^{2/3} + Z_2^{2/3} \right)^{-1/2} \ \text{Å} \]  

(3)

The values \( Q \) and \( E_{\text{th}} \) are used as parameters to fit to the data available.

For the reduced nuclear stopping power in eq. (1) the original Bohdansky formula used the following analytical expression based on the Thomas-Fermi potential [1]:

\[ s_n^{TF}(\varepsilon) = \frac{3.441 \sqrt{\varepsilon \ln (\varepsilon + 2.718)}}{1 + 6.355 \varepsilon + \varepsilon (6.882 + 1.708)} \]  

(4)

In a recently revised Bohdansky's formula, Eckstein et al. used the following reduced nuclear stopping power based on the Kr-C potential [2]:

\[ s_n^{Kr-C}(\varepsilon) = \frac{0.5 \ln (1 + 1.2228 \varepsilon)}{\varepsilon + 0.1728 \varepsilon + 0.008 \varepsilon^{0.1504}} \]  

(5)

And the best-fit values of \( Q \) and \( E_{\text{th}} \) are listed for each ion-target combination in their data book [2].

From the theoretical point of view, the high-energy light-ion sputtering yield is not directly proportional to the reduced nuclear stopping cross section \( s_n(\varepsilon) \) corresponding to the incident projectile energy, because it is affected strongly by the electronic energy loss. In this sense, it is difficult for the Bohdansky's formula to predict the sputtering yield by high-energy light-ions. The Bohdansky's \( Q \) factor includes the effect of the electronic stopping, but the contribution of the electronic stopping to sputtering depends on the incident energy. From the viewpoint of plasma-wall-interaction, of which the main interest is the low-energy sputtering yield, it seems that the Bohdansky's formula can predict the sputtering yield reasonably well.

The purpose of this report is to propose a new empirical formula which presents the relation
between the ion-induced sputtering yield and the energy of the incident ions for various ion-target combinations, based on sputtering yield data published before 1994. In this report, some calculated data by the ACAT code are added to the present data base. The compiled experimental data of sputtering yields at normal incidence are shown in graphs, which include the energy-yield curve calculated by our proposed empirical formula.

2. Theoretical background for the empirical formula

The sputtering mechanism can be classified into two categories [6]. When a relatively heavy ion is bombarded on the solid surface, the incoming ion deposits its energy near the surface and the collision cascade is developed. As a result, target atoms are ejected from the surface (mechanism A). On the contrary, in the case of a light ion such as H⁺ and D⁺, the incoming light ion does not produce the collision cascade near the surface. Instead, when the reflected ion escapes from the surface layer, it hits the surface atoms. As a result, the recoil atoms is sputtered if their kinetic energies overcome the surface barrier (mechanism B). When the mass of the incident ion becomes lighter, the sputtering mechanism shifts the mechanism A to the mechanism B gradually. For intermediate ions such as an Ar ion, both mechanism A-sputtering and mechanism B-sputtering contribute to the total sputtering yield.

In 1969 Sigmund derived the formula of the sputtering yield [7]

\[ Y(E) = AF_d(E) \]

(6)
solving the linearized Boltzmann equation based on the assumption that the collision cascade is well developed in the infinite medium, where \( \Lambda \) is given as

\[ \Lambda = \frac{3}{4\pi^2} \frac{l}{NC_0U_s} = \frac{0.0420}{NU_s} \]

(7)
and $F_D(E)$ is the deposited energy at the surface which is given as

$$F_D(E) = \alpha(M_2/M_1) N S_d(E)$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

$N$ and $U_s$ are the number density and the surface binding energy, respectively. $S_n(E)$ is the nuclear stopping cross section. As the surface binding energy we use the heat of sublimation in this report. $C_0$ is the coefficient of nuclear stopping cross section when the power approximation of $m = 0$ is used for the interatomic potential.

When the energy of the incident ion becomes smaller, the angular distribution of the recoil spectrum in the collision cascade becomes anisotropic, and so the sputtering has its threshold. Then, the original Sigmund formula should be modified as [8]

$$Y(E) = 0.042 \frac{F_D(E)}{NU_s} \left[ 1 - \sqrt{\frac{E_{th}}{E}} \right] = 0.042 \frac{\alpha(M_2/M_1) S_n(E)}{U_s} \left[ 1 - \sqrt{\frac{E_{th}}{E}} \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

for the low-energy heavy-ion sputtering, where $E_{th}$ is the sputtering threshold energy.

As another extreme, let us consider the high-energy light-ion sputtering, where the sputtering yield is proportional to particle reflection coefficient. A single collision approximation says that the particle reflection coefficient $R_N(E)$ is proportional to the ratio of nuclear stopping cross section $S_n(E)$ to electronic stopping cross section $S_e(E)$ [9], i.e.,

$$R_N(E) \propto \frac{M_2 S_n(E)}{M_1 S_e(E)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

Since the high-energy light-ion sputtering is due to the deposited energy $F_D(E^*)$ at the surface by the reflected particle, its yield can be represented by [10]

$$Y(E) = 0.042 \frac{F_D(E^*) R_N(E)}{NU_s} \left[ 1 - \sqrt{\frac{E_{th}^L}{E}} \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

where $E^*$ is the average energy of reflected ions escaping from the surface layer, $E_{th}^L$ is the
threshold energy of the light-ion sputtering, and the power $s$ of eq. (11) is equal to 2.8 if the power
approximation of $m = 1$ is used.

Generally speaking, the real sputtering mechanisms are composed of both mechanisms A and
B. Therefore, the sputtering formula can be expressed by the interpolation between eq. (9) and eq.
(11), i.e.,

$$
Y(E) = 0.042 \frac{\alpha(M_2/M_1)}{U_s} \frac{S_n(E)s_n(e)}{s_n(e) + \Gamma s_e(e)} \left[ 1 - \sqrt{\frac{E_{th}}{E}} \right]^s
$$

$$
= 0.042 \frac{\alpha(M_2/M_1)}{U_s} \frac{S_n(E)}{1 + \Gamma s_e(e)/s_n(e)} \left[ 1 - \sqrt{\frac{E_{th}}{E}} \right]^s
$$

(12)

where $s_n(e)$ and $s_e(e)$ are the reduced nuclear stopping power and the reduced electronic stopping
power, respectively. The parameter $\Gamma$ means the contribution of the mechanism B-sputtering to the
total sputtering yield. For the low-energy heavy-ion sputtering where $s_e(e)$ is very small, eq.(12)
becomes equal to eq. (9), meanwhile for high-energy light-ion sputtering where $s_n(e)$ is negligibly
small, eq.(12) is reduced to eq. (11).

3. A new empirical formula

The important requests for empirical formulas are the following: The empirical formula should
predict the energy dependence of the sputtering yield as precisely as possible, using as parameters as
few as possible. For example, if we employ the ZBL formula for $s_e(e)$ in eq.(12), we can estimate
more precisely the electronic stopping power for any ion-target combination, but at the same time we
have to prepare a lot of parameters for this purpose.

In order to propose as simple an empirical formula as possible, we use the power
approximation for $s_n(e)$ [5] and the Lindhard electronic stopping power for $s_e(e)$ [12], i.e.,
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{s_n(e)}{s_e(e)} &= \frac{2\lambda_m}{3-2m} e^{0.5-m}, \\
\frac{s_n(e)}{s_e(e)} &= k_e e^{0.5}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\lambda_m\) is the calculable constant if \(m\) is given, and \(k_e\) is the Lindhard electronic stopping coefficient. In the previous empirical formula published in 1985 we used \(m = 0.5\) for \(s_n(e)\). In the new empirical formula we use \(m = 0.3\) for \(s_n(e)\).

Since \(\alpha(M_2/M_1)\) of eq. (12) has the \(Z_2\)-dependence[1], we factorize it as \(\alpha(M_2/M_1) = Q(Z_2)\alpha^*(M_2/M_1)\). Then, finally the new empirical formula is given in the form

\[
Y(E) = 0.042 \frac{Q(Z_2)\alpha^*(M_2/M_1)}{U_s} \frac{S_n(e)}{1 + k_e e^{0.3}} \left[ 1 - \sqrt{\frac{E_{th}}{E}} \right]^2,
\]

where the \(\Gamma\) factor has the following expression:

\[
\Gamma = \frac{W(Z_2)}{1 + (M_1/7)^3}
\]

The factor \(\Gamma\) corresponds to 0.35\(U_s\) in the previous empirical formula and the best-fit values of \(W(Z_2)\) and \(Q(Z_2)\) are listed in Table 1. The power \(s\) of the previous empirical formula was fixed to be 2.8 for all target materials. On the contrary, the \(s\) of the new empirical formula is slightly dependent on the target material, as is shown in Table 1. The best-fit values of \(\alpha^*\) are described as a function of mass ratio \(M_2/M_1\) in the following manner:

\[
\alpha^* = 0.249(M_2/M_1)^{0.56} + 0.0035(M_2/M_1)^{1.5} \quad M_1 \geq M_2
\]
\[
= 0.088(M_2/M_1)^{-0.15} + 0.165(M_2/M_1) \quad M_1 \leq M_2
\]

Concerning the sputtering threshold in eq.(15), we use the following best-fit functional relation

\[
\frac{E_{th}}{U_s} = \frac{6.7}{\gamma} \quad M_1 \geq M_2
\]
\[
= \frac{1 + 5.7(M_1/M_2)}{\gamma} \quad M_1 \leq M_2
\]
which is derived based on Yamamura and Bohdansky's theory [13], where γ is the energy transfer factor at an elastic collision and is given as

$$\gamma = \frac{4M_1M_2}{(M_1+M_2)^2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

The Lindhard electronic stopping coefficient $k_e$ is given as

$$k_e = 0.079 \frac{(M_1 + M_2)^{3/2}}{M_1^{3/2}M_2^{1/2}} \frac{Z_1^{23}Z_2^{12}}{(Z_1^{23} + Z_2^{23})^{3/4}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

The nuclear stopping cross section $S_n(E)$ in the present formula is calculated by

$$S_n(E) = 84.78 \frac{Z_1Z_2}{(Z_1^{23} + Z_2^{23})^{1/2}M_1 + M_2} \frac{M_1}{s_n^{TF}(\epsilon)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

where we use an analytic expression of $s_n^{TF}(\epsilon)$ which is given in eq. (4). The explicit expression of the reduced energy $\epsilon$ is

$$\epsilon = \frac{0.03255}{Z_1Z_2(Z_1^{23} + Z_2^{23})^{1/2}M_1 + M_2} \frac{M_2}{E(eV)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

The procedures of obtaining the best-fit values of parameters from available experimental data are the same as in the previous compilation work done in 1984. The physical meaning of the $Z_2$ dependence of $Q(Z_2)$ is that though Sigmund used the nuclear stopping power of $m = 0$ for all target materials in the calculation of $A$ in eq. (7), the stopping power of sputtering particles depends on the $Z$ number of the target material and the energy of the escaping particles which are of the order of the surface binding energy. The best-fit values of $\alpha^*$ are shown in Fig. 1 as a function of mass ratio $M_2/M_1$, where the solid line represents eq. (17). The best-fit values of relative threshold energies $E_{th}/U_s$ are shown in Fig. 2 as a function of mass ratio $M_2/M_1$, where the solid line represents eq. (18). The $Z_2$ dependence of $W(Z_2)$ may reflect that of electronic stopping power. The most important
advantage of our new empirical formula over Bobdansky's empirical formula is that eq. (15) can be applied to all the possible ion-target combinations over any incident ion energy.

4. Simulations

For several ion-target combinations, especially for light-ion sputtering, sputtering yield data have been calculated with the ACAT program [14], in order to fill the lack of the experimental data. The ACAT program is based on the binary collision approximation, the target is assumed to be amorphous, and the surface is randomly rough in a depth of half a monolayer.

As an interatomic potential we used the Kr-C potential [15] with the Firsov screening length $a_F$ for heavy ion ($Z_1 > 3$) sputtering, where $a_F$ is given as

$$ a_F = 0.4685 \left( \frac{Z_1^{1/2}}{Z_2^{1/2}} + \frac{Z_2^{1/2}}{Z_1^{1/2}} \right)^{2/3} \text{Å}. $$

For light-ion sputtering such as H+, D+ and He+ ions some efforts were undertaken to get good agreement with experimental data by adjusting the Firsov screening length, i.e., $a_F(1+q)$, because in principle the Thomas-Fermi statistical model cannot be applied to light ions. The adjusting values $q$ are listed in Table 2 for possible target materials. For heavier projectiles ($Z_1 > 2$) we used the original Firsov screening length for all ion-target combinations.

The electronic energy loss is simulated with the path-length-dependent non-local model, where we used the ZBL electronic stopping formula[11] for all the ion-target combinations. For light-ion sputtering, the electronic energy loss due to the violent collision is estimated by the Oen-Robinson (OS) model [16]. The bulk binding energy is set to be zero for all ion-target combinations.
It is well known that the calculated sputtering yields are dependent on which electronic stopping loss model is used, the non-local or the local model. For several targets such as C, Cu, Ag Tb, Tm and Au which have the star marks in Table 2, we have obtained better energy dependence of sputtering yields if we employ the OS local model for possible projectile-target combinations. For heavier projectile \((Z_i > 2)\) the electronic energy losses at low collision energies are estimated by the OS local model.

5. Presentation of data and discussions

Each graph shows experimental data, the ACAT data and the yield-energy curve calculated by the present empirical formula, eq.(15), for each ion-target combination. For plots of experimental data and ACAT data, different symbols are used for different references. The calculated yield-energy curves are shown with solid lines. The ion-target combinations shown in graphs are listed in Table 3, where the number in each column represents the number of references of experimental works. If one estimate the preliminary sputtering yield for unlisted target materials by the present formula, one should use \(Q = 1.0, \ W = 0.35U_s, \ s = 2.5\), where \(U_s\) is the heat of sublimation.

Agreement between the solid-curve and data points is much more improved as compared with the previous work [1], especially for light-ion sputtering. The sputtering data near the threshold energy region for some ion-target combinations cannot be described by the present empirical formula, and the deviation of measured data from the solid curve can not be systematically explained. This may be due to the fact that the sputtering yield is strongly dependent on the surface conditions and the vacuum conditions.
6. Explanation of graphs

The graphs are ordered first by increasing projectile atomic number, and then by increasing target atomic number.

**Ordinate**  Sputtering yield (atoms/incident ion) at normal incidence.

**Abscissa**  Kinetic ion energy of incidence in eV.

**Heading**  Ion-target combination

He $\rightarrow$ Cu means He ion on Cu target.

Sb$_3$ $\rightarrow$ Pt (molecule) means a trimer of Sb on Pt target, but the yield is reduced to that per a monoatomic ion.

**Symbols**  Experimental data and ACAT simulation data.

The first author and the year published for each reference are listed and the ACAT data are denoted by YAMAMURA (ACAT).

**Solid line**  Energy dependence of the sputtering yield calculated by the newly proposed empirical formula.

7. A sample calculation of the sputtering yield

If one estimate preliminary sputtering yield for the unlisted target materials by the present formula, one should use $Q = 1.0$, $W = 0.35U_s$, $s = 2.5$, where $U_s$ is the heat of sublimation. As an example we calculate the sputtering yield of He on Au at an incident energy of 1 keV according to the present new formula (15). First calculate $\epsilon$ using eq. (22).

$$
\epsilon = \frac{0.03255}{2 \times 79 \times (2^{2.3} + 79^{2.3})^{0.5}} \times \frac{195.1}{4.002 + 195.1} \times 1000 = \frac{0.03255 \times 195.1}{706.5 \times 199.1} \times 1000 = 0.0451
$$

Then we can obtain
Using eq. (4), i.e.,

\[
s_n^T(E) = \frac{3.441 \times 0.0451 \ln 2.763}{1 + 0.635 \times 0.0451 + 0.0451 (6.882 \times 0.0451 - 1.708)} = \frac{0.7427}{2.350 - 0.01112} = 0.318
\]

Calculate \( k_{el}(E) \) using eq. (20).

\[
k_{el}(E) = 0.079 \times \frac{(4.002 + 195.1)^{3/2}}{4.002^{3/2} \times 195.1^{1/2}} \times \frac{2^{2/3} \times 79^{1/2}}{(2^{2/3} + 79^{2/3})^{3/4}} = \frac{221.9 \times 14.11}{111.8 \times 9.455} = 2.96
\]

Then calculate the nuclear stopping cross section \( S_n(E) \) from eq. (21):

\[
S_n(E) = 84.78 \times 2 \times 79 \times \frac{4.002}{(2^{2/3} + 79^{2/3})^{3/4}} \times 0.318 = \frac{84.78 \times 201.1}{4.471 \times 199.1} = 19.15
\]

Pick up the values of \( Q, U_s, W \) and \( s \) from Table 2, and we have \( Q = 1.08, U_s = 3.81, W = 1.64 \), and \( s = 2.8 \). Then, we have \( \Gamma = 1.38 \) from eq. (16). Next, calculate \( \alpha^* \) using eq. (17), where \( M_2/M_1 = 48.75 \):

\[
\alpha^* = 0.249 \times (48.75)^{0.56} + 0.0035 \times (48.75)^{1.5} = 2.190 + 1.184 = 3.37
\]

The threshold energy of this combination is calculated by eq. (18). Since the energy transfer factor \( \gamma \) is calculated using eq. (19), i.e., \( \gamma = 4 \times 4.003 \times 197(4.003 + 197)^2 = 0.07878 \),

we have

\[
E_{th} = \frac{1 + 5.7 \times 48.75 \times 3.81}{0.07878} = 54.0
\]

Now the sputtering yield of 1 keV He → Au is

\[
Y = 0.042 \times \frac{1.08 \times 3.374 \times 19.15}{3.81 \times (1 + 1.38 \times 2.96 \times 0.0451^{0.3}) \left[ 1 - \frac{54.0}{1000} \right]^{1.8} \times 0.4769} = 2.932 \times 0.4769 = 0.140
\]

which is found to be in good agreement with the yield shown in Fig. 307.
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Table 1 The surface binding energies $U_s$ and best-fit values of $Q(Z_2)$, $W(Z_2)$ and $s(Z_2)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>target</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>$U_s$ (eV)</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zr</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rh</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sn</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tb</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tm</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hf</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Os</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2  Values of the adjusting parameter \( q \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>target</th>
<th>(Z)</th>
<th>(H)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
<th>(He)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zr</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rh</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sn</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tb*</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tm*</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hf</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Os</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au*</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*fn. The OR local model of the electronic energy loss is used for the target material with the star mark.*
Table 3. Ion-target combinations of which was drawn by graphs

| Ion | Target | H | D | He | Li | C | N | O | F | Ne | Si | P | S | Cl | Ar | K | Ca | Kr | Cu | Cd | Sb | Te | Xe | Cs | Hg | Tl | Pb | Bi |
|-----|--------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Be  | 1      | 1 | 1 | 1  | 1  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 1  | 1 | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| B  | 2      | 2 | 2 | 2  | 2  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2  | 2  | 2 | 2  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 2  |
| C  | 3      | 3 | 3 | 3  | 3  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3  | 3  | 3 | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  |
| O  | 5      | 5 | 5 | 5  | 5  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  | 5  | 5 | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  | 5  |
| F  | 6      | 6 | 6 | 6  | 6  | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6  | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6  | 6  | 6 | 6  | 6  | 6  | 6  | 6  | 6  | 6  | 6  | 6  | 6  |
| Ne | 7      | 7 | 7 | 7  | 7  | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7  | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7  | 7  | 7 | 7  | 7  | 7  | 7  | 7  | 7  | 7  | 7  | 7  | 7  |
| Si | 8      | 8 | 8 | 8  | 8  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8  | 8  | 8 | 8  | 8  | 8  | 8  | 8  | 8  | 8  | 8  | 8  | 8  |
| P  | 9      | 9 | 9 | 9  | 9  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9  | 9  | 9 | 9  | 9  | 9  | 9  | 9  | 9  | 9  | 9  | 9  | 9  |
| S  | 10     |10 |10 |10  |10  |10 |10 |10 |10 |10 |10  |10 |10 |10 |10  |10  |10 |10  |10  |10  |10  |10  |10  |10  |10  |10  |10  |

The figures in the table indicate the number of references of experimental work. + self-sputtering.
Fig. 1 Plots of the best-fit values of $\alpha^*$ as a function of mass ratio $M_2/M_1$
Fig. 2 Plots of the best-fit values of the relative threshold energy $E_{th}/U_s$ as a function of mass ratio $M_2/M_1$
FIG. 3 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF BE WITH H\textsuperscript{+}.
\[ A = 8.94, \Omega = 1.66, U_s = 3.32 \text{eV}, g = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.700 \text{Us}. \]

FIG. 4 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF BE WITH D\textsuperscript{+}.
\[ A = 4.47, \Omega = 1.66, U_s = 3.32 \text{eV}, g = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.700 \text{Us}. \]

FIG. 5 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF BE WITH HE\textsuperscript{+}.
\[ A = 2.25, \Omega = 1.66, U_s = 3.32 \text{eV}, g = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.700 \text{Us}. \]

FIG. 6 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF BE WITH O\textsuperscript{+}.
\[ A = 0.56, \Omega = 1.66, U_s = 3.90 \text{eV}, g = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.700 \text{Us}. \] THE BEST-FIT SURFACE BINDING ENERGY IS USED.
**FIG. 7** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF BE WITH Ne⁺.
A = 0.45, d = 1.65, U₀ = 3.32 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.70 μs.

**FIG. 8** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF BE WITH Ar⁺.
A = 0.23, d = 1.65, U₀ = 3.32 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.70 μs.

**FIG. 9** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF BE WITH Kr⁺.
A = 0.11, d = 1.65, U₀ = 3.32 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.70 μs.

**FIG. 10** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF BE WITH Xe⁺.
A = 0.07, d = 1.65, U₀ = 3.32 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.70 μs.
FIG. 11 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF B WITH H⁺.
A= 10.72, D= 2.62, Us= 5.77 ev, s= 2.50.
W= 0.76 Us.

FIG. 12 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF B WITH D⁺.
A= 5.97, D= 2.62, Us= 5.77 ev, s= 2.50.
W= 0.76 Us.

FIG. 13 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF B WITH HE⁺.
A= 2.70, D= 2.62, Us= 5.77 ev, s= 2.50.
W= 0.76 Us.

FIG. 14 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF B WITH D⁺.
A= 1.00, D= 2.62, Us= 5.77 ev, s= 2.51.
W= 0.76 Us.
FIG. 15 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF C WITH H⁺.
Λ = 11.91, D = 1.70, Us = 7.37eV, s= 2.50.
W = 0.25us. EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF GRAPHITE ARE INCLUDED. THE CHEMICAL EROSION IS FOUND EVEN AT ROOM TEMPERATURE.

FIG. 16 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF C WITH D⁺.
Λ = 5.96, D = 1.70, Us = 7.37eV, s= 2.50.
W = 0.25us. EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF GRAPHITE ARE INCLUDED. THE CHEMICAL EROSION IS FOUND EVEN AT ROOM TEMPERATURE.

FIG. 17 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF C WITH HE⁺.
Λ = 3.00, D = 1.70, Us = 7.37eV, s= 2.50.
W = 0.25us. EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF GRAPHITE ARE INCLUDED.

FIG. 18 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF C WITH C⁺.
Λ = 1.00, D = 1.70, Us = 7.37eV, s= 2.50.
W = 0.25us. EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF GRAPHITE ARE INCLUDED.
FIG. 19 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF C WITH O⁺.
A = 0.75, D = 1.70. Us = 7.37 eV. S = 2.50.
W = 0.25 s. EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF GRAPHITE ARE INCLUDED. THE CHEMICAL EROSION IS FOUND EVEN AT ROOM TEMPERATURE.

FIG. 20 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF C WITH Ne⁺.
A = 0.60. D = 1.70. Us = 7.37 eV. S = 2.50.
W = 0.25 s. EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF GRAPHITE ARE INCLUDED.

FIG. 21 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF C WITH Ar⁺.
A = 0.30. D = 1.70. Us = 7.37 eV. S = 2.50.
W = 0.25 s. EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF GRAPHITE ARE INCLUDED.

FIG. 22 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF C WITH Kr⁺.
A = 0.14. D = 1.70. Us = 7.37 eV. S = 2.50.
W = 0.25 s. EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF GRAPHITE ARE INCLUDED.
FIG. 23 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF C WITH Cd⁺:
A = 0.11, 0 = 1.70, Us = 7.37 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.25Us. EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF GRAPHITE ARE INCLUDED.

FIG. 24 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF C WITH Xe⁺:
A = 0.09, 0 = 1.70, Us = 7.37 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.25Us. EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF GRAPHITE ARE INCLUDED.

FIG. 25 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF C WITH Hg⁺:
A = 0.06, 0 = 1.70, Us = 7.37 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.25Us. EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF GRAPHITE ARE INCLUDED.

FIG. 26 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Al WITH H⁺:
A = 26.77, 0 = 1.00, Us = 3.37 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.64Us. EXPERIMENTAL DATA MIGHT BE AFFECTED BY OXIDE FORMATION DURING SPUTTERING.
FIG. 27 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF AL WITH D⁺.
A= 13.40, D= 1.00, U= 3.39eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.64us. EXPERIMENTAL DATA MIGHT BE AFFECTED BY OXIDE FORMATION DURING SPUTTERING.

FIG. 28 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF AL WITH He⁺.
A= 67.40, D= 1.00, U= 3.39eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.64us. EXPERIMENTAL DATA MIGHT BE AFFECTED BY OXIDE FORMATION DURING SPUTTERING.

FIG. 29 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF AL WITH Ne⁺.
A= 13.40, D= 1.00, U= 3.39eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.64us. EXPERIMENTAL DATA MIGHT BE AFFECTED BY OXIDE FORMATION DURING SPUTTERING.

FIG. 30 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF AL WITH Al⁺.
A= 1.00, D= 1.00, U= 3.39eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.64us.
**Fig. 31.** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Al with Ar⁺.
A = 0.58, U₀ = 1.00, Us = 3.39 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.64 μs.

**Fig. 32.** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Al with Kr⁺.
A = 0.32, U₀ = 1.00, Us = 3.39 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.64 μs.

**Fig. 33.** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Al with Xe⁺.
A = 0.21, U₀ = 1.00, Us = 3.39 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.64 μs.

**Fig. 34.** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Al with He⁺.
A = 0.13, U₀ = 1.00, Us = 3.39 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.64 μs.
FIG. 35 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF SI WITH H⁺.
A = 27.86, Q = 0.66, U₀ = 4.63 eV, 5 = 2.50.
W = 0.50Us.

FIG. 36 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF SI WITH D⁺.
A = 13.94, Q = 0.66, U₀ = 4.63 eV, 5 = 2.50.
W = 0.50Us.

FIG. 37 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF SI WITH HE⁺.
A = 7.01, Q = 0.66, U₀ = 4.63 eV, 5 = 2.50.
W = 0.50Us.

FIG. 38 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF SI WITH O⁺.
A = 1.75, Q = 0.66, U₀ = 11.57 eV, 5 = 2.50.
W = 0.50Us. THE BEST-FIT SURFACE BINDING ENERGY IS USED.
FIG. 39 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF SI WITH F⁺.
A = 1.45, D = 0.65, Uₜ = 3.24 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.50 eV. THE BEST-FIT SURFACE BINDING ENERGY IS USED.

FIG. 40 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF SI WITH NE⁺.
A = 1.35, D = 0.65, Uₜ = 4.63 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.50 eV.

FIG. 41 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF SI WITH AR⁺.
A = 0.70, D = 0.65, Uₜ = 4.63 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.50 eV.

FIG. 42 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF SI WITH KR⁺.
A = 0.34, D = 0.65, Uₜ = 4.63 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.50 eV.
**Fig. 43** Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Si with Xe⁺.
A = 0.21, D = 0.65, U = 4.63 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.50Us.

**Fig. 44** Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Si with Hg⁺.
A = 0.14, D = 0.66, U = 4.63 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.50Us.

**Fig. 45** Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Si with Pb⁺.
A = 0.14, D = 0.66, U = 4.63 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.50Us.

**Fig. 46** Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Ti with H⁺.
A = 47.52, D = 0.54, U = 4.65 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.53Us.
FIG. 47 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ti WITH D⁺.
A = 23.78, b = 0.54, Us = 4.85 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.59 s.

FIG. 48 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ti WITH He⁺.
A = 11.97, b = 0.54, Us = 4.85 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.59 s.

FIG. 49 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ti WITH Ne⁺.
A = 2.37, b = 0.54, Us = 4.85 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.59 s.

FIG. 50 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ti WITH Ar⁺.
A = 1.20, b = 0.54, Us = 4.85 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.59 s.
**Fig. 51** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ti with Kr⁺.
\[ A = 0.57, \, Q = 0.54, \, U_s = 4.85 \text{eV}, \, s = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.53 \text{Us}. \]

**Fig. 52** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ti with Cd⁺.
\[ A = 0.43, \, Q = 0.54, \, U_s = 4.85 \text{eV}, \, s = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.53 \text{Us}. \]

**Fig. 53** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ti with Xe⁺.
\[ A = 0.36, \, Q = 0.54, \, U_s = 4.85 \text{eV}, \, s = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.53 \text{Us}. \]

**Fig. 54** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ti with Hg⁺.
\[ A = 0.24, \, Q = 0.54, \, U_s = 4.85 \text{eV}, \, s = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.53 \text{Us}. \]
**Fig. 55** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of V with H⁺.

A: 50.54, O: 0.72, Us = 5.31 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.45 Us.

**Fig. 56** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of V with D⁺.

A: 25.29, O: 0.72, Us = 5.31 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.45 Us.

**Fig. 57** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of V with He⁺.

A: 12.73, O: 0.72, Us = 5.31 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.45 Us.

**Fig. 58** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of V with Ne⁺.

A: 25.33, O: 0.72, Us = 5.31 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.45 Us.
FIG. 59 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF V WITH Ar⁺. 
A = 1.28, D = 0.72, Uₜ = 5.31 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.45 s⁻¹.

FIG. 60 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF V WITH Kr⁺. 
A = 0.61, D = 0.72, Uₜ = 5.31 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.45 s⁻¹.

FIG. 61 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF V WITH Xe⁺. 
A = 0.39, D = 0.72, Uₜ = 5.31 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.45 s⁻¹.

FIG. 62 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF V WITH Hg⁺. 
A = 0.25, D = 0.72, Uₜ = 5.31 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.45 s⁻¹.
**FIG. 63** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cr WITH H⁺:
A = 51.59, ɤ = 0.93, Us = 4.10eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.35us.

**FIG. 64** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cr WITH D⁺:
A = 26.82, ɤ = 0.93, Us = 4.10eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.35us.

**FIG. 65** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cr WITH He⁺:
A = 12.96, ɤ = 0.93, Us = 4.10eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.35us.

**FIG. 66** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cr WITH Ne⁺:
A = 2.56, ɤ = 0.93, Us = 4.10eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.35us.
FIG. 67 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPATTERING YIELD OF CR WITH AR$^*$.
A = 1.30, b = 0.93, Us = 4.10 ev, s = 2.50.
W = 0.35Us.

FIG. 68 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPATTERING YIELD OF CR WITH CR$^*$.
A = 1.00, b = 0.93, Us = 4.10 ev, s = 2.50.
W = 0.35Us.

FIG. 69 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPATTERING YIELD OF CR WITH KR$^*$.
A = 0.62, b = 0.93, Us = 4.10 ev, s = 2.50.
W = 0.35Us.

FIG. 70 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPATTERING YIELD OF CR WITH XE$^*$.
A = 0.40, b = 0.93, Us = 4.10 ev, s = 2.50.
W = 0.35Us.
Fig. 71 Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Cr with H^+.
A = 0.25, q = 0.93, U = 4.10 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.35 Us.

Fig. 72 Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Mn with H^+.
A = 54.49, q = 0.95, U = 2.92 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.30 Us.

Fig. 73 Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Mn with D^+.
A = 27.27, q = 0.95, U = 2.92 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.30 Us.

Fig. 74 Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Mn with He^+.
A = 13.72, q = 0.95, U = 2.92 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.30 Us.
FIG. 75 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Mn WITH Ar*.
A = 1.38, D = 0.95, Us = 2.92eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.30us.

FIG. 76 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Mn WITH Kr*.
A = 0.66, D = 0.95, Us = 2.92eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.30us.

FIG. 77 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Mn WITH Xe*.
A = 0.42, D = 0.95, Us = 2.92eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.30us.

FIG. 78 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Fe WITH H*.
A = 55.41, D = 0.75, Us = 4.28eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.28us.
FIG. 79 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPITTING YIELD OF Fe WITH D$^*$. A = 27.75, 0 = 0.75, U$_s$ = 4.28 eV, s = 2.50. W = 0.28 U$_s$.

FIG. 80 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPITTING YIELD OF Fe WITH He$^*$. A = 13.95, 0 = 0.75, U$_s$ = 4.28 eV, s = 2.50. W = 0.28 U$_s$.

FIG. 81 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPITTING YIELD OF Fe WITH N$^*$. A = 3.99, 0 = 0.75, U$_s$ = 5.14 eV, s = 2.50. W = 0.28 U$_s$. THE BEST-FIT SURFACE BOUNDING ENERGY IS USED.

FIG. 82 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPITTING YIELD OF Fe WITH Ne$^*$. A = 2.77, 0 = 0.75, U$_s$ = 4.28 eV, s = 2.50. W = 0.28 U$_s$. 
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**Fig. 83** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Fe with Ar⁺.
\[ \lambda = 1.40, \theta = 0.75, U_s = 4.28 \text{ eV}, s = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.28 \mu \text{s}. \]

**Fig. 84** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Fe with Kr⁺.
\[ \lambda = 0.67, \theta = 0.75, U_s = 4.28 \text{ eV}, s = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.28 \mu \text{s}. \]

**Fig. 85** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Fe with Xe⁺.
\[ \lambda = 0.43, \theta = 0.75, U_s = 4.28 \text{ eV}, s = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.28 \mu \text{s}. \]

**Fig. 86** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Fe with Cs⁺.
\[ \lambda = 0.42, \theta = 0.75, U_s = 4.28 \text{ eV}, s = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.28 \mu \text{s}. \]
FIG. 87 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Fe WITH Hg⁺:
A = 0.28, Q = 0.75, U = 4.28 eV, S = 2.50;
W = 0.28 Us.

FIG. 88 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Fe WITH Pb⁺:
A = 0.27, Q = 0.75, U = 4.28 eV, S = 2.50;
W = 0.28 Us.

FIG. 89 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Co WITH H⁺:
A = 58.46, Q = 1.02, U = 4.39 eV, S = 2.50;
W = 0.35 Us.

FIG. 90 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Co WITH D⁺:
A = 29.26, Q = 1.02, U = 4.39 eV, S = 2.50;
W = 0.35 Us.
FIG. 91. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF CO WITH He⁺.
A = 14.72, D = 1.02, U = 4.39 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.35 

FIG. 92. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF CO WITH Ne⁺.
A = 2.92, D = 1.02, U = 4.39 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.35 

FIG. 93. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF CO WITH Ar⁺.
A = 1.48, D = 1.02, U = 4.39 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.35 

FIG. 94. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF CO WITH CO⁺.
A = 1.00, D = 1.02, U = 4.39 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.35
FIG. 99 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ni WITH H⁺:
A = 50.24, D = 0.94, Us = 4.44 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.30 μs.

FIG. 100 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ni WITH D⁺:
A = 28.15, D = 0.94, Us = 4.44 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.30 μs.

FIG. 101 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ni WITH He⁺:
A = 14.67, D = 0.94, Us = 4.44 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.30 μs.

FIG. 102 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ni WITH N⁺:
A = 4.19, D = 0.94, Us = 5.77 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.30 μs. THE BEST-FIT SURFACE BINDING ENERGY IS USED.
**FIG. 95** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF CO WITH Kr⁺.
A = 0.70, q = 1.02, Us = 4.39 ev, s = 2.50.
M = 0.35 u.

**FIG. 96** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF CO WITH Xe⁺.
A = 0.45, q = 1.02, Us = 4.39 ev, s = 2.50.
M = 0.35 u.

**FIG. 97** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF CO WITH Cs⁺.
A = 0.44, q = 1.02, Us = 4.39 ev, s = 2.50.
M = 0.35 u.

**FIG. 98** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF CO WITH Hg⁺.
A = 0.28, q = 1.02, Us = 4.39 ev, s = 2.50.
M = 0.35 u.
FIG. 103. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF NI WITH O*. A = 3.67, D = 0.94, U = 10.21 eV, s = 2.50. W = 0.30 eV. THE BEST-FIT SURFACE BINDING ENERGY IS USED.

FIG. 104. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF NI WITH Ne*. A = 2.91, D = 0.94, U = 4.44 eV, s = 2.50. W = 0.30 eV.

FIG. 105. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF NI WITH Ar*. A = 1.47, D = 0.94, U = 4.44 eV, s = 2.50. W = 0.30 eV.

FIG. 106. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF NI WITH Ni*. A = 1.00, D = 0.94, U = 4.44 eV, s = 2.50. W = 0.30 eV.
FIG. 107 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ni WITH Kr⁺.  
A = 0.70, D = 0.94, Us = 4.44 eV, s = 2.50,  
W = 0.300 Us.

FIG. 108 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ni WITH Xe⁺.  
A = 0.45, D = 0.94, Us = 4.44 eV, s = 2.50,  
W = 0.300 Us.

FIG. 109 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ni WITH Hg⁺.  
A = 0.29, D = 0.94, Us = 4.44 eV, s = 2.50,  
W = 0.300 Us.

FIG. 110 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH H⁺.  
A = 63.05, D = 1.00, Us = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50,  
W = 0.21 Us.
FIG. 111 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE
SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH D*.
A = 31.55, 0 = 1.00, Us = 3.49 ev, s = 2.50.
W = 0.21 Us.

FIG. 112 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE
SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH He*.
A = 15.06, 0 = 1.00, Us = 3.49 ev, s = 2.50.
W = 0.21 Us.

FIG. 113 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE
SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH N*.
A = 4.54, 0 = 1.00, Us = 3.49 ev, s = 2.50.
W = 0.21 Us. THE BEST-FIT SURFACE
BINDING ENERGY IS USED.

FIG. 114 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE
SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Ne*.
A = 3.15, 0 = 1.00, Us = 3.49 ev, s = 2.50.
W = 0.21 Us.
**FIG. 115** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPATTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Na⁺.
A = 2.76, e = 1.00, Us = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.21 Us.

**FIG. 116** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPATTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Si⁺.
A = 2.26, e = 1.00, Us = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.21 Us.

**FIG. 117** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPATTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH P⁺.
A = 2.05, e = 1.00, Us = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.21 Us.

**FIG. 118** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPATTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH S⁺.
A = 1.98, e = 1.00, Us = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.21 Us.
**FIG. 119. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Cl⁺.**
A = 1.75, B = 1.00, Us = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.21 Us.

**FIG. 120. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Ar⁺.**
A = 1.59, B = 1.00, Us = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.21 Us.

**FIG. 121. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH K⁺.**
A = 1.63, B = 1.00, Us = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.21 Us.

**FIG. 122. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Ni⁺.**
A = 1.09, B = 1.00, Us = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.21 Us.
FIG. 123 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Cu⁺.
\[ A = 1.00, Q = 1.00, U_s = 3.49 \text{eV}, s = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.21 U_s. \]

FIG. 124 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Zn⁺.
\[ A = 0.97, Q = 1.00, U_s = 3.49 \text{eV}, s = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.21 U_s. \]

FIG. 125 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Kr⁺.
\[ A = 0.76, Q = 1.00, U_s = 3.49 \text{eV}, s = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.21 U_s. \]

FIG. 126 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Cd⁺.
\[ A = 0.57, Q = 1.00, U_s = 3.49 \text{eV}, s = 2.50, \]
\[ W = 0.21 U_s. \]
FIG. 127 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPATTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Xe\(^+\).
A = 0.48, G = 1.00, Us = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.21 Us. THE NON-LINEAR EFFECT IS OBSERVED DUE TO MOLECULAR IONS.

FIG. 129 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPATTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Cs\(^+\).
A = 0.48, G = 1.00, Us = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.21 Us.

FIG. 130 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPATTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Hg\(^+\).
A = 0.32, G = 1.00, Us = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.21 Us.
FIG. 131 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Tl⁺.
A = 0.26, Q = 1.00, U₁ = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.21 μs.

FIG. 132 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Cu WITH Pb⁺.
A = 0.31, Q = 1.00, U₁ = 3.49 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.21 μs.

FIG. 133 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ge WITH H⁺.
A = 72.01, Q = 0.59, U₁ = 3.85 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.54 μs.

FIG. 134 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ge WITH D⁺.
A = 36.04, Q = 0.59, U₁ = 3.85 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.54 μs.
FIG. 135  ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF GE WITH HE⁺.
A = 18.13, D = 0.59, Us = 3.85 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.54 Us.

FIG. 136  ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF GE WITH NE⁺.
A = 3.60, D = 0.59, Us = 3.85 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.54 Us.

FIG. 137  ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF GE WITH AR⁺.
A = 1.82, D = 0.59, Us = 3.85 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.54 Us.

FIG. 138  ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF GE WITH O₂⁺.
A = 1.00, D = 0.59, Us = 3.85 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.54 Us.
FIG. 139. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ge WITH Kr⁺.
A= 0.87, Q= 0.59, Us= 3.85eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.54Us.

FIG. 140. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ge WITH Xe⁺.
A= 0.55, Q= 0.59, Us= 3.85eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.54Us.

FIG. 141. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ge WITH He⁺.
A= 0.36, Q= 0.59, Us= 3.85eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.54Us.

FIG. 142. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Zr WITH H⁺.
A= 90.50, Q= 0.54, Us= 6.25eV, s= 2.80.
W= 0.40Us.
FIG. 143 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Zr WITH D⁺:
A = 45.29, E = 0.54, U₀ = 6.25 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.40 Us.

FIG. 144 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Zr WITH He⁺:
A = 22.79, E = 0.54, U₀ = 6.25 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.40 Us.

FIG. 145 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Zr WITH Li⁺:
A = 13.14, E = 0.54, U₀ = 6.25 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.40 Us.

FIG. 146 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Zr WITH Ne⁺:
A = 4.52, E = 0.54, U₀ = 6.25 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.40 Us.
**Fig. 147** Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Zr with Ar⁺.
\[ \text{A} = 2.28, \text{r} = 0.54, \text{Us} = 6.25 \text{eV}, s = 2.80, \text{n} = 0.40Us. \]

**Fig. 148** Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Zr with Kr⁺.
\[ \text{A} = 1.05, \text{r} = 0.54, \text{Us} = 6.25 \text{eV}, s = 2.80, \text{n} = 0.40Us. \]

**Fig. 149** Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Zr with Cd⁺.
\[ \text{A} = 0.81, \text{r} = 0.54, \text{Us} = 6.25 \text{eV}, s = 2.80, \text{n} = 0.40Us. \]

**Fig. 150** Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Zr with Xe⁺.
\[ \text{A} = 0.69, \text{r} = 0.54, \text{Us} = 6.25 \text{eV}, s = 2.80, \text{n} = 0.40Us. \]
FIG. 151 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING FIELD OF ZR WITH H^+.
A = 0.45, B = 0.54, Us = 6.25eV, s = 2.80,
W = 0.40Us.

FIG. 152 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING FIELD OF Nb WITH H^+.
A = 92.17, B = 0.93, Us = 7.57eV, s = 2.80,
W = 0.35Us.

FIG. 153 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING FIELD OF Nb WITH D^+.
A = 46.13, B = 0.93, Us = 7.57eV, s = 2.80,
W = 0.35Us.

FIG. 154 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING FIELD OF Nb WITH He^+.
A = 23.21, B = 0.93, Us = 7.57eV, s = 2.80,
W = 0.35Us.
FIG. 155 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Nb WITH Li⁺.
\[ \lambda = 13, 39.0 = 0.93, U_s = 7.57 \text{ ev}, s = 2.80, \]
\[ W = 0.35 U_s. \]

FIG. 156 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Nb WITH Ne⁺.
\[ \lambda = 4.60, 0 = 0.93, U_s = 7.57 \text{ ev}, s = 2.80, \]
\[ W = 0.35 U_s. \]

FIG. 157 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Nb WITH Ar⁺.
\[ \lambda = 2.35, 0 = 0.93, U_s = 7.57 \text{ ev}, s = 2.80, \]
\[ W = 0.35 U_s. \]

FIG. 158 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Nb WITH Br⁺.
\[ \lambda = 1.16, 0 = 0.93, U_s = 7.57 \text{ ev}, s = 2.80, \]
\[ W = 0.35 U_s. \]
FIG. 159 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Nb WITH Kr⁺.
A = 1.11; D = 0.93; Us = 7.57 eV; s = 2.80.
W = 0.35Us.

FIG. 160 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Nb WITH Nb⁺.
A = 1.00; D = 0.93; Us = 7.57 eV; s = 2.80.
W = 0.35Us.

FIG. 161 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Nb WITH Xe⁺.
A = 0.71; D = 0.93; Us = 7.57 eV; s = 2.80.
W = 0.35Us.

FIG. 162 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Nb WITH Cs⁺.
A = 0.70; D = 0.93; Us = 7.57 eV; s = 2.80.
W = 0.35Us.
**Fig. 163** Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Nb with H⁺.

\[ Y \propto \frac{1}{E} \]

\[ A = 0.46, B = 0.93, U_s = 7.57 \text{eV}, s = 2.80, \]

\[ W = 0.35 \text{Us}. \]

**Fig. 164** Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Mo with H⁺.

\[ Y \propto \frac{1}{E} \]

\[ A = 0.95, B = 0.85, U_s = 6.82 \text{eV}, s = 2.80, \]

\[ W = 0.45 \text{Us}. \]

**Fig. 165** Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Mo with D⁺.

\[ Y \propto \frac{1}{E} \]

\[ A = 0.47, B = 0.85, U_s = 6.82 \text{eV}, s = 2.80, \]

\[ W = 0.45 \text{Us}. \]

**Fig. 166** Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Mo with He⁺.

\[ Y \propto \frac{1}{E} \]

\[ A = 0.31, B = 0.85, U_s = 6.82 \text{eV}, s = 2.80, \]

\[ W = 0.45 \text{Us}. \]
FIG. 167 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Mo WITH He*. 
A = 23.97, s = 0.85, Us = 6.82 eV, s = 2.80, 
W = 0.45 Us.

FIG. 168 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Mo WITH N*. 
A = 6.85, s = 0.85, Us = 13.64 eV, s = 2.80, 
W = 0.45 Us. THE BEST-FIT SURFACE BINDING ENERGY IS USED.

FIG. 169 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Mo WITH O*. 
A = 6.00, s = 0.95, Us = 8.16 eV, s = 2.80, 
W = 0.45 Us. THE BEST-FIT SURFACE BINDING ENERGY IS USED.

FIG. 170 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Mo WITH Ne*. 
A = 4.75, s = 0.95, Us = 5.82 eV, s = 2.80, 
W = 0.45 Us.
FIG. 171 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Mo WITH Ar*.
A= 2.40, D= 0.85, U= 6.82eV, s= 2.80.
W= 0.45Us.

FIG. 172 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Mo WITH Kr*.
A= 1.14, D= 0.85, U= 6.82eV, s= 2.80.
W= 0.45Us.

FIG. 173 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Mo WITH Mo*.
A= 1.00, D= 0.85, U= 6.82eV, s= 2.80.
W= 0.45Us.

FIG. 174 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Mo WITH Cd*.
A= 0.85, D= 0.85, U= 6.82eV, s= 2.80.
W= 0.45Us.
Fig. 175. Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Mo with Xe*. 
A = 0.73, 0 - 0.85, Us = 6.82 eV, s = 2.80, 
W = 0.45 Us.

Fig. 176. Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Mo with Cs*. 
A = 0.72, 0 - 0.85, Us = 6.82 eV, s = 2.80, 
W = 0.45 Us.

Fig. 177. Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Mo with He*. 
A = 0, 0 - 0.85, Us = 6.82 eV, s = 2.80, 
W = 0.45 Us.

Fig. 178. Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Mo with Pb*. 
A = 0, 0 - 0.85, Us = 6.82 eV, s = 2.80, 
W = 0.45 Us.
FIG. 179. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ru WITH $H^+$. 
$A = 100$, $O = 1.31$, $U = 6.74$, $s = 2.50$, $W = 0.35$.

FIG. 180. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ru WITH $D^+$. 
$A = 50$, $O = 1.31$, $U = 6.74$, $s = 2.50$, $W = 0.35$.

FIG. 181. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ru WITH $He^+$. 
$A = 25$, $O = 1.31$, $U = 6.74$, $s = 2.50$, $W = 0.35$.

FIG. 182. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ru WITH $Ne^+$. 
$A = 5$, $O = 1.31$, $U = 6.74$, $s = 2.50$, $W = 0.35$. 
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FIG. 183 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ru WITH Ar⁺. 
A = 2.53, Q = 1.31, Us = 6.74 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.35 Us.

FIG. 184 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ru WITH Kr⁺. 
A = 1.21, Q = 1.31, Us = 6.74 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.35 Us.

FIG. 185 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ru WITH Xe⁺. 
A = 0.77, Q = 1.31, Us = 6.74 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.35 Us.

FIG. 186 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Rh WITH H⁺. 
A = 102.09, Q = 1.14, Us = 5.75 eV, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.45 Us.
Fig. 187. Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Rh with D⁺.
A = 51.09, Q = 1.14, U₀ = 5.75 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.45 Us.

Fig. 188. Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Rh with He⁺.
A = 25.71, Q = 1.14, U₀ = 5.75 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.45 Us.

Fig. 189. Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Rh with Ne⁺.
A = 51.09, Q = 1.14, U₀ = 5.75 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.45 Us.

Fig. 190. Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Rh with Ar⁺.
A = 51.09, Q = 1.14, U₀ = 5.75 eV, s = 2.50,
W = 0.45 Us.
FIG. 191. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF RH WITH Krypton.*
A = 1.23, Q = 1.14, U* = 5.75 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.45 μs.

FIG. 192. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF RH WITH Xenon.*
A = 0.78, Q = 1.14, U* = 5.75 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.45 μs.

FIG. 193. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF RH WITH Helium.*
A = 0.51, Q = 1.14, U* = 5.75 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.45 μs.

FIG. 194. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pd WITH Helium.*
A = 105.56, Q = 0.85, U* = 3.99 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.35 μs.
FIG. 195: ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pd WITH O⁺.
A = 52.83, \(\theta = 0.85\), \(U_s = 3.99\) eV, \(s = 2.50\),
\(W = 0.35\) Us.

FIG. 196: ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pd WITH He⁺.
A = 26.58, \(\theta = 0.85\), \(U_s = 3.99\) eV, \(s = 2.50\),
\(W = 0.35\) Us.

FIG. 197: ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pd WITH Ne⁺.
A = 5.27, \(\theta = 0.85\), \(U_s = 3.99\) eV, \(s = 2.50\),
\(W = 0.35\) Us.

FIG. 198: ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pd WITH Ar⁺.
A = 2.66, \(\theta = 0.85\), \(U_s = 3.99\) eV, \(s = 2.50\),
\(W = 0.35\) Us.
FIG. 199 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPREADING YIELD OF Pd WITH Kr⁺.
\[ A = 1.27, \text{E} = 0.85, \text{U} = 3.89 \text{eV, } \Delta = 2.50, \]
\[ \eta = 0.35 \text{Us}. \]

FIG. 200 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPREADING YIELD OF Pd WITH Xe⁺.
\[ A = 0.81, \text{E} = 0.85, \text{U} = 3.89 \text{eV, } \Delta = 2.50, \]
\[ \eta = 0.35 \text{Us}. \]

FIG. 201 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPREADING YIELD OF Pd WITH Hg⁺.
\[ A = 0.53, \text{E} = 0.85, \text{U} = 3.89 \text{eV, } \Delta = 2.50, \]
\[ \eta = 0.35 \text{Us}. \]

FIG. 202 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPREADING YIELD OF Ag WITH H⁺.
\[ A = 1.06, \text{E} = 0.86, \text{U} = 2.95 \text{eV, } \Delta = 2.80, \]
\[ \eta = 0.35 \text{Us}. \]
FIG. 203 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF AG WITH D⁺.
A = 53.53, Q = 1.08, Us = 2.95eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.35Us.

FIG. 204 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF AG WITH He⁺.
A = 26.95, Q = 1.08, Us = 2.95eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.35Us.

FIG. 205 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF AG WITH N⁺.
A = 7.69, Q = 1.08, Us = 3.83eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.35Us. THE BEST-FIT SURFACE BINDING ENERGY IS USED.

FIG. 206 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF AG WITH Ne⁺.
A = 5.34, Q = 1.08, Us = 2.95eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.35Us.
FIG. 207 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ag WITH P⁺.
A = 3.45, O₁ = 1.08, Uₛ = 2.95 eV, s = 2.80,
W = 0.35 µs.

FIG. 208 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ag WITH Cl⁺.
A = 3.04, O₁ = 1.08, Uₛ = 2.95 eV, s = 2.80,
W = 0.35 µs.

FIG. 209 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ag WITH Ar⁺.
A = 2.70, O₁ = 1.08, Uₛ = 2.95 eV, s = 2.80,
W = 0.35 µs.

FIG. 210 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ag WITH As⁺.
A = 1.44, O₁ = 1.08, Uₛ = 2.95 eV, s = 2.80,
W = 0.35 µs.
FIG. 211: ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ag WITH Se⁺.
A = 1.37, Δ = 1.08, Us = 2.95 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.35 Us.

FIG. 212: ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ag WITH Kr⁺.
A = 1.29, Δ = 1.08, Us = 2.95 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.35 Us.

FIG. 213: ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ag WITH Ag⁺.
A = 1.09, Δ = 1.08, Us = 2.95 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.35 Us.

FIG. 214: ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ag WITH Sb⁺.
A = 0.89, Δ = 1.08, Us = 2.95 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.35 Us.
FIG. 215. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPURTERING YIELD OF Ag WITH Sb₂⁺. 
A = 0.89, α = 1.06, U₀ = 2.95eV, s = 2.80, 
W = 0.35μs. THE NON-LINEAR EFFECT IS OBSERVED DUE TO MOLECULAR IONS.

FIG. 216. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPURTERING YIELD OF Ag WITH Sb₃⁺. 
A = 0.89, α = 1.06, U₀ = 2.95eV, s = 2.80, 
W = 0.35μs. THE NON-LINEAR EFFECT IS OBSERVED DUE TO MOLECULAR IONS.

FIG. 217. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPURTERING YIELD OF Ag WITH Te⁺. 
A = 0.84, α = 1.06, U₀ = 2.95eV, s = 2.80, 
W = 0.35μs.

FIG. 218. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPURTERING YIELD OF Ag WITH Xe⁺. 
A = 0.82, α = 1.06, U₀ = 2.95eV, s = 2.80, 
W = 0.35μs.
**Fig. 219** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ag with Hg⁺.

\[
A = 0.54, D = 1.08, \theta_s = 2.95 \text{ eV}, s = 2.80, \nu = 0.35 \text{ us}.
\]

**Fig. 220** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ag with Bi⁺.

\[
A = 0.52, D = 1.08, \theta_s = 2.95 \text{ eV}, s = 2.80, \nu = 0.35 \text{ us}.
\]

**Fig. 221** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ag with Bi⁺.

\[
A = 0.52, D = 1.08, \theta_s = 2.95 \text{ eV}, s = 2.80, \nu = 0.35 \text{ us}. \text{ The non-linear effect is observed due to molecular ions.}
\]

**Fig. 222** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Sn with H⁺.

\[
A = 117.66, D = 0.47, \theta_s = 3.14 \text{ eV}, s = 2.50, \nu = 0.28 \text{ us}.
\]
Fig. 223 Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Sn with D⁺.
A= 56.89, Q= 0.47, Us= 3.14eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.28us.

Fig. 224 Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Sn with He⁺.
A= 29.63, Q= 0.47, Us= 3.14eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.28us.

Fig. 225 Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Sn with Ne⁺.
A= 56.89, Q= 0.47, Us= 3.14eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.28us.

Fig. 226 Energy Dependence of the Sputtering Yield of Sn with Ar⁺.
A= 29.63, Q= 0.47, Us= 3.14eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.28us.
FIG. 227  ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Sn WITH Kr⁺.
A = 1.42, D = 0.47, Us = 3.14eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.28Us.

FIG. 228  ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Sn WITH Sn⁺.
A = 1.00, D = 0.47, Us = 3.14eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.28Us.

FIG. 229  ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Sn WITH Xe⁺.
A = 0.90, D = 0.47, Us = 3.14eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.28Us.

FIG. 230  ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Tb WITH H⁺.
A = 157.64, D = 0.90, Us = 4.05eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.35Us.
FIG. 231 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Tb WITH D⁺.
A = 78.90, D = 0.90, U = 4.05eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.35Us.

FIG. 232 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Tb WITH He⁺.
A = 39.70, D = 0.90, U = 4.05eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.35Us.

FIG. 233 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Tb WITH Ar⁺.
A = 3.98, D = 0.90, U = 4.05eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.35Us.

FIG. 234 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Tb WITH H⁺.
A = 167.56, D = 0.65, U = 2.42eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.35Us.
FIG. 235 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF TM WITH D⁺.
A = 83.86, O = 0.65, U₀ = 2.42 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.35μs.

FIG. 236 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF TM WITH HE⁺.
A = 42.19, O = 0.65, U₀ = 2.42 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.35μs.

FIG. 237 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF TM WITH AR⁺.
A = 4.23, O = 0.65, U₀ = 2.42 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.35μs.

FIG. 238 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF HF WITH H⁺.
A = 176.98, O = 0.65, U₀ = 6.44 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.35μs.
**Fig. 239** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Hf with D⁺
A = 88.55, 0 = 0.55, Us = 6.44 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.35 Us.

**Fig. 240** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Hf with He⁺
A = 44.57, 0 = 0.65, Us = 6.44 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.35 Us.

**Fig. 241** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Hf with Ne⁺
A = 6.84, 0 = 0.65, Us = 6.44 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.35 Us.

**Fig. 242** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Hf with Ar⁺
A = 4.47, 0 = 0.65, Us = 6.44 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.35 Us.
FIG. 243 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF HF WITH Kr⁺.
A = 2.13, Q = 0.65, Uₛ = 6.44 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.35 Us.

FIG. 244 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF HF WITH Xe⁺.
A = 1.36, Q = 0.65, Uₛ = 6.44 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.35 Us.

FIG. 245 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF HF WITH Hg⁺.
A = 0.89, Q = 0.65, Uₛ = 6.44 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.35 Us.

FIG. 246 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ta WITH H⁺.
A = 179.46, Q = 0.56, Uₛ = 6.10 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.35 Us.
Fig. 247. Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ta with D⁺.
A = 88.82, 0 = 0.56, Uₜ = 8.10 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.35 Us.

Fig. 248. Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ta with He⁺.
A = 45.19, 0 = 0.56, Uₜ = 8.10 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.35 Us.

Fig. 249. Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ta with Ne⁺.
A = 8.96, 0 = 0.56, Uₜ = 8.10 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.35 Us.

Fig. 250. Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ta with Ar⁺.
A = 4.53, 0 = 0.56, Uₜ = 8.10 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.35 Us.
FIG. 251 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ta WITH Kr*.
A= 2.16, D= 0.56, Us= 8.10eV, s= 2.80, W= 0.35Us.

FIG. 252 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ta WITH Cd*.
A= 1.61, D= 0.56, Us= 8.10eV, s= 2.80, W= 0.35Us.

FIG. 253 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ta WITH Xe*.
A= 1.38, D= 0.56, Us= 8.10eV, s= 2.80, W= 0.35Us.

FIG. 254 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Ta WITH Hg*.
A= 0.90, D= 0.56, Us= 8.10eV, s= 2.80, W= 0.35Us.
FIG. 255 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH H⁺.

A = 102.34, α = 0.72, U = 8.90eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.24μs.

FIG. 256 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH O⁺.

A = 91.26, α = 0.72, U = 8.90eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.24μs.

FIG. 257 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH HE⁺.

A = 45.92, α = 0.72, U = 8.90eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.24μs.

FIG. 258 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH C⁺.

A = 15.30, α = 0.72, U = 8.90eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.24μs.
FIG. 259 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH N⁺. 
A = 13.12, D = 0.72, U = 13.95 eV, S = 2.80. 
W = 0.24 Us. THE BEST-FIT SURFACE BOUNDING ENERGY IS USED.

FIG. 260 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH O⁺. 
A = 11.49, D = 0.72, U = 15.13 eV, S = 2.80. 
W = 0.24 Us. THE BEST-FIT SURFACE BOUNDING ENERGY IS USED.

FIG. 261 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH Ne⁺. 
A = 9.11, D = 0.72, U = 8.90 eV, S = 2.80. 
W = 0.24 Us.

FIG. 262 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH A⁺. 
A = 4.60, D = 0.72, U = 8.90 eV, S = 2.80. 
W = 0.24 Us.
FIG. 263 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH K⁺.
A = 4.70, Q = 0.72, Us = 39.16 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.24 Us. THE BEST-FIT SURFACE BINDING ENERGY IS USED.

FIG. 264 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH K⁺.
A = 2.19, Q = 0.72, Us = 8.90 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.24 Us.

FIG. 265 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH Cd⁺.
A = 1.64, Q = 0.72, Us = 8.90 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.24 Us.

FIG. 266 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH Xe⁺.
A = 1.40, Q = 0.72, Us = 8.90 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.24 Us.
FIG. 267 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH Cs⁺.
A= 1.36, D= 0.72, Us= 8.90eV, s= 2.80.
W= 0.24Us.

FIG. 268 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH W⁺.
A= 1.00, D= 0.72, Us= 8.90eV, s= 2.80.
W= 0.24Us.

FIG. 269 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH Hg⁺.
A= 0.92, D= 0.72, Us= 8.90eV, s= 2.80.
W= 0.24Us.

FIG. 270 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF W WITH Pb⁺.
A= 0.89, D= 0.72, Us= 8.90eV, s= 2.80.
W= 0.24Us.
Fig. 271 Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Re with Ne⁺.
A = 9.23, Q = 1.03, U = 8.03 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.35 μs.

Fig. 272 Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Re with Ar⁺.
A = 4.66, Q = 1.03, U = 8.03 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.35 μs.

Fig. 273 Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Re with Kr⁺.
A = 2.22, Q = 1.03, U = 8.03 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.35 μs.

Fig. 274 Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Re with Xe⁺.
A = 1.42, Q = 1.03, U = 9.03 eV, s = 2.50, W = 0.35 μs.
FIG. 275 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF RE WITH H^+.
A  =  0.93, \( U_0 = 1.03 \), \( U_s = 8.03 \text{ ev} \), \( s = 2.50 \),
\( W = 0.35 \text{ Us} \).

FIG. 276 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF OS WITH H^+.
A  =  188.69, \( U_0 = 1.11 \), \( U_s = 8.17 \text{ ev} \), \( s = 2.50 \),
\( W = 0.35 \text{ Us} \).

FIG. 277 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF OS WITH D^+.
A  =  94.44, \( U_0 = 1.11 \), \( U_s = 8.17 \text{ ev} \), \( s = 2.50 \),
\( W = 0.35 \text{ Us} \).

FIG. 278 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF OS WITH He^+.
A  =  47.51, \( U_0 = 1.11 \), \( U_s = 8.17 \text{ ev} \), \( s = 2.50 \),
\( W = 0.35 \text{ Us} \).
FIG. 279. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Os WITH Ne⁺.
A= 9.43, Q= 1.11, Us= 8.17 eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.35 Us.

FIG. 280. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Os WITH Ar⁺.
A= 4.76, Q= 1.11, Us= 8.17 eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.35 Us.

FIG. 281. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Os WITH Kr⁺.
A= 2.27, Q= 1.11, Us= 8.17 eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.35 Us.

FIG. 282. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Os WITH Xe⁺.
A= 1.45, Q= 1.11, Us= 8.17 eV, s= 2.50.
W= 0.35 Us.
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FIG. 283 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF IR WITH H⁺.

E = 190.67, Q = 0.96, Us = 6.94 eV, s = 2.50.

W = 0.35 μs.

FIG. 284 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF IR WITH D⁺.

E = 95.43, Q = 0.96, Us = 6.94 eV, s = 2.50.

W = 0.35 μs.

FIG. 285 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF IR WITH HE⁺.

E = 48.01, Q = 0.96, Us = 6.94 eV, s = 2.50.

W = 0.35 μs.

FIG. 286 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF IR WITH NE⁺.

E = 9.52, Q = 0.96, Us = 6.94 eV, s = 2.50.

W = 0.35 μs.
**Fig. 287** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ir with Ar$^+$. $A = 4.91, Q = 0.98, U_s = 6.94\text{eV}, \delta = 2.50, \omega = 0.35\mu s$.

**Fig. 288** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ir with Kr$^+$. $A = 2.29, Q = 0.96, U_s = 6.94\text{eV}, \delta = 2.50, \omega = 0.35\mu s$.

**Fig. 289** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ir with Xe$^+$. $A = 1.46, Q = 0.96, U_s = 6.94\text{eV}, \delta = 2.50, \omega = 0.35\mu s$.

**Fig. 280** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Ir with H$^+$. $A = 0.96, Q = 0.96, U_s = 6.94\text{eV}, \delta = 2.50, \omega = 0.35\mu s$. 
FIG. 291 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pt WITH H⁺.
A = 193.45, Q = 1.03, Us = 5.84 ev, s = 2.50.
W = 0.55Us.

FIG. 292 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pt WITH D⁺.
A = 96.82, Q = 1.03, Us = 5.84 ev, s = 2.50.
W = 0.55Us.

FIG. 293 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pt WITH He⁺.
A = 48.71, Q = 1.03, Us = 5.84 ev, s = 2.50.
W = 0.55Us.

FIG. 294 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pt WITH Ne⁺.
A = 96.86, Q = 1.03, Us = 5.84 ev, s = 2.50.
W = 0.55Us.
FIG. 295 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pt WITH Ar⁺. 
A = 4.86, Q = 1.03, Uₚ = 5.84 eV, S = 2.50. 
W = 0.55 Us.

FIG. 296 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pt WITH Kr⁺. 
A = 2.33, Q = 1.03, Uₚ = 5.84 eV, S = 2.50. 
W = 0.55 Us.

FIG. 297 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pt WITH Sb⁺. 
A = 1.60, Q = 1.03, Uₚ = 5.84 eV, S = 2.50. 
W = 0.55 Us.

FIG. 298 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pt WITH Sb⁺. 
A = 1.60, Q = 1.03, Uₚ = 5.84 eV, S = 2.50. 
W = 0.55 Us. THE NON-LINEAR EFFECT IS OBSERVED DUE TO MOLECULAR IONS.
FIG. 299. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pt WITH Sb₂⁺.
A = 1.60. D = 1.03. Us = 5.84 eV. s = 2.50.
W = 0.55 μs. The non-linear effect is observed due to molecular ions.

FIG. 300. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pt WITH Xe⁺.
A = 1.49. D = 1.03. Us = 5.84 eV. s = 2.50.
W = 0.55 μs.

FIG. 301. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pt WITH Hg⁺.
A = 0.97. D = 1.03. Us = 5.84 eV. s = 2.50.
W = 0.55 μs.

FIG. 302. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pt WITH Bi⁺.
A = 0.93. D = 1.03. Us = 5.84 eV. s = 2.50.
W = 0.55 μs.
FIG. 303 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Pt WITH Bi₂⁺.
A = 0.93, D = 1.03, Us = 5.84 eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.55 μs. THE NON-LINEAR EFFECT IS OBSERVED DUE TO MOLECULAR IONS.

FIG. 304 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH H⁺.
A = 195.34, D = 1.08, Us = 3.61 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.43 μs.

FIG. 305 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH O⁺.
A = 97.77, D = 1.08, Us = 3.81 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.43 μs.

FIG. 306 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH ³He⁺.
A = 95.29, D = 1.08, Us = 3.61 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.43 μs.
FIG. 307 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH He$^*$.  
$A =$ 49.15, $d =$ 1.08, $U_s =$ 3.81 eV, $s =$ 2.80,  
$W =$ 0.43 uS.

FIG. 308 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH N$^*$.  
$A =$ 14.05, $d =$ 1.08, $U_s =$ 3.81 eV, $s =$ 2.80,  
$W =$ 0.43 uS. THE BEST-FIT SURFACE BINDING ENERGY IS USED.

FIG. 309 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH Ne$^*$.  
$A =$ 9.76, $d =$ 1.08, $U_s =$ 9.31 eV, $s =$ 2.80,  
$W =$ 0.43 uS.

FIG. 310 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH Ar$^*$.  
$A =$ 4.93, $d =$ 1.08, $U_s =$ 3.81 eV, $s =$ 2.80,  
$W =$ 0.43 uS.
FIG. 311 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH Ar²⁺.
A = 1.0 s⁻¹, D = 1.0 s⁻¹, E = 3.5 eV, F = 2.5 eV, 
W = 0.43 Us.

A GILVA-FLORES, J. (1987)

FIG. 312 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH Se²⁺.
A = 2.4 s⁻¹, D = 1.0 s⁻¹, E = 3.5 eV, F = 2.5 eV, 
W = 0.43 Us.

A ANDERSEN, B. K. (1978)
★ YAMAMOTO, T. (JACO)

FIG. 313 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH Kr²⁺.
A = 2.35 s⁻¹, D = 1.0 s⁻¹, E = 3.5 eV, F = 2.5 eV, 
W = 0.43 Us.

A ALMIR, O. (1961)
B RUSENKO, D. (1962)
C ANDERSEN, B. K. (1978)
★ YAMAMOTO, T. (JACO)

FIG. 314 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH Sb²⁺.
A = 1.62 s⁻¹, D = 1.0 s⁻¹, E = 3.5 eV, F = 2.5 eV, 
W = 0.43 Us.

★ YAMAMOTO, T. (JACO)
**Fig. 315** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Au with Sb⁺.
A = 1.62, D = 1.0, Uₜ = 3.81 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.43 ms. The non-linear effect is observed due to molecular ions.

**Fig. 316** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Au with Sb⁺.
A = 1.62, D = 1.0, Uₜ = 3.81 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.43 ms. The non-linear effect is observed due to molecular ions.

**Fig. 317** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Au with Xe⁺.
A = 1.50, D = 1.0, Uₜ = 3.81 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.43 ms.

**Fig. 318** Energy dependence of the sputtering yield of Au with Xe⁺.
A = 1.50, D = 1.0, Uₜ = 3.81 eV, s = 2.80.
W = 0.43 ms. The non-linear effect is observed due to molecular ions.
FIG. 3.19 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH Au⁺. 
A = 1.0G, D = 1.0G, Us = 3.81eV, σ = 2.80. 
W = 0.43Us.

FIG. 320 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH Hg⁺. 
A = 0.98, D = 1.08, Us = 3.81eV, σ = 2.80. 
W = 0.43Us.

FIG. 3.21 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH Bi⁺. 
A = 0.94, D = 1.08, Us = 3.81eV, σ = 2.80. 
W = 0.43Us.

FIG. 3.22 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF Au WITH Bi₂⁺. 
A = 0.94, D = 1.08, Us = 3.81eV, σ = 2.80. 
W = 0.43Us. THE NON-LINEAR EFFECT IS OBSERVED DUE TO MOLECULAR IONS.
FIG. 323  ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF TH WITH H*.  
A = 230, 16, O = 0.63, U = 6.20 ev, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.45Us.

FIG. 324  ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF TH WITH D*.  
A = 115, 19, O = 0.63, U = 6.20 ev, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.45Us.

FIG. 325  ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF TH WITH HE*.  
A = 57, 96, O = 0.63, U = 6.20 ev, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.45Us.

FIG. 326  ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF TH WITH NE*.  
A = 11, 50, O = 0.63, U = 6.20 ev, s = 2.50, 
W = 0.45Us.
**FIG. 327.** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF TH WITH AR⁺.
A = 5.91, Q = 0.63, U₄ = 6.20 eV, s = 2.50. W = 0.45 μs.

**FIG. 328.** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF TH WITH KR⁺.
A = 2.77, Q = 0.63, U₄ = 6.20 eV, s = 2.50. W = 0.45 μs.

**FIG. 329.** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF TH WITH XE⁺.
A = 1.77, Q = 0.63, U₄ = 6.20 eV, s = 2.50. W = 0.45 μs.

**FIG. 330.** ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF TH WITH He⁺.
A = 1.15, Q = 0.63, U₄ = 6.20 eV, s = 2.50. W = 0.45 μs.
FIG. 331 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF U WITH H⁺.
\[ A = 236.11, q = 0.66, U_s = 5.55 \text{eV}, \, \lambda = 2.50, \]
\[ \beta = 0.50 \mu \text{s}. \]

FIG. 332 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF U WITH D⁺.
\[ A = 118.17, q = 0.66, U_s = 5.55 \text{eV}, \, \lambda = 2.50, \]
\[ \beta = 0.50 \mu \text{s}. \]

FIG. 333 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF U WITH He⁺.
\[ A = 59.46, q = 0.66, U_s = 5.55 \text{eV}, \, \lambda = 2.50, \]
\[ \beta = 0.50 \mu \text{s}. \]

FIG. 334 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF U WITH Ne⁺.
\[ A = 11.79, q = 0.66, U_s = 5.55 \text{eV}, \, \lambda = 2.50, \]
\[ \beta = 0.50 \mu \text{s}. \]
FIG. 335 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF U WITH AR⁺.
A = 5.86, U = 0.86, Uₜ = 5.55eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.50Us.

FIG. 336 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF U WITH KR⁺.
A = 1.84, U = 0.86, Uₜ = 5.55eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.50Us.

FIG. 337 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF U WITH XE⁺.
A = 1.81, U = 0.86, Uₜ = 5.55eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.50Us.

FIG. 338 ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF THE SPUTTERING YIELD OF U WITH H⁺.
A = 1.19, U = 0.86, Uₜ = 5.55eV, s = 2.50.
W = 0.50Us.
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