**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Ultrafast Probing of Collective Electron Dynamics Driven by Dielectronic Repulsion

Lysaght, M. A., Burke, P. G., & van Der Hart, H. W. (2009). Ultrafast Probing of Collective Electron Dynamics Driven by Dielectronic Repulsion. *Physical Review Letters*, 102(19), [193001].
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.193001>

Published in:
Physical Review Letters

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights
© 2009 The American Physical Society

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

of the $2s2p^2\ ^2S^e$ and $^2D^e$ excited states. The energy separation between these two states, caused by the Coulomb repulsion between the two equivalent $2p$ electrons, results in a temporal interference between the two states with a frequency determined by the energy separation. In a naive single-configuration picture, the responsible dielectronic repulsion integral is the $F^2(2p, 2p)$ integral [12]. Hence, this repulsion governs the dynamical behavior of the EWP which continues to evolve after the end of the pump pulse. Subsequent irradiation of the C^+ ion with the time-delayed ultrashort pulse will ionize the C^+ ion. We study the ionization probability as a function of time delay between the two pulses to obtain information on the time-dependent interference between the 2S and 2D states and the associated electron dynamics.

The investigation is carried out using the recently developed three-dimensional time-dependent R -matrix theory [11]. This nonperturbative theory enables the interaction of ultrashort light fields with multielectron atoms and atomic ions to be determined from first principles, and was employed successfully to investigate ultrafast laser-driven excitation dynamics in Ne.

In the time-dependent R -matrix method, the solution of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation (TDSE) (in atomic units) at time $t = t_{q+1}$ is expressed in terms of the solution at $t = t_q$ as follows:

$$[H(t_{q+(1/2)}) - E]\Psi(\mathbf{X}_{N+1}, t_{q+1}) = \Theta(\mathbf{X}_{N+1}, t_q), \quad (1)$$

where

$$\Theta(\mathbf{X}_{N+1}, t_q) = -[H(t_{q+(1/2)}) + E]\Psi(\mathbf{X}_{N+1}, t_q). \quad (2)$$

In Eqs. (1) and (2) $\mathbf{X}_{N+1} \equiv \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{N+1}$ where $\mathbf{x}_i \equiv \mathbf{r}_i\sigma_i$ are the space and spin coordinates of the i th electron, and $H(t_{q+(1/2)})$ is the time-dependent Hamiltonian at the midpoint which is described in the length gauge throughout. In this formalism $E \equiv 2i\Delta t^{-1}$.

The solution of Eq. (1) is accomplished by partitioning configuration space into an internal and external region as in the standard R -matrix method [13] with the boundary at radius $r = a$. In the internal region electron exchange and electron-electron correlation effects between the ejected electron and the remaining N electrons are important, while in the external region such effects are negligible. Hence, the ejected electron moves in the local long-range potential of the residual N -electron atom or ion together with the laser field.

In the inner region $r \leq a$, an R -matrix basis expansion of the wave function describing the $(N + 1)$ -electron complex is adopted. The solution of a system of linear equations described in Ref. [11] at each time step enables the R matrix to be calculated on the boundary $r = a$ of this region and also enables the calculation of an inhomogeneous T vector which is due to the right-hand side of Eq. (1). In the outer region $a \leq r \leq a_p$, a set of coupled differential equations describing the motion of the scattered electron in the presence of the light field is solved at each time

step by subdividing this region into n_s subregions and propagating the R matrix and T vector across them from $r = a$ to $r = a_p$. The R matrix and T vector at $r = a_p$ can then be used to propagate the wave function backwards across the n_s subregions. This propagated wave function then provides the starting point for the calculation at the next time step. A second R -matrix-based time-dependent approach has also been developed [14], but the dynamics within this approach is restricted to the R -matrix inner region only.

The structure of C^+ is described in the R -matrix internal region using the R -matrix basis developed for electron impact studies of C^{2+} [15], although we extend the inner region to a radius of 20 a.u., while the set of continuum orbitals contains 60 continuum functions for each available angular momentum of the continuum electron. The present calculations have been performed including the $1s^22s^2\ ^1S^e$ ground state, and the $1s^22s2p\ ^3P^o$ and $^1P^o$ excited states of C^{2+} as target states. The description of C^+ includes all $1s^22s^2\ell$ and $1s^22s2p\ell'$ channels up to $L_{\max} = 5$. In the external region we propagate the R matrix and T vector outwards to a radial distance of typically 1500 a.u. in order to prevent any reflections of the wave function from the external region boundary. Each external region sector is typically 3 a.u. wide and contains 35 B splines per channel with order $k = 9$.

The laser pulses used in the present investigation are as follows: The pump laser pulse has a central photon energy $\omega_1 = 10.88$ eV in order to be near resonant with the $2s2p^2\ ^2S^e$ and $^2D^e$ states. It is defined by a three-cycle $\sin^2$ ramp on of the electric field followed by a three-cycle $\sin^2$ ramp off giving a pulse duration of 2 fs. The XUV ultrashort light pulse has a central photon energy $\omega_2 = 17$ eV and is also described by a three-cycle $\sin^2$ ramp on followed by a three-cycle $\sin^2$ ramp off of the electric field giving a pulse duration of 1.5 fs. Both pulses have a maximum intensity of 5×10^{12} W/cm².

Figure 2 shows the population in the $2s2p^2\ ^2S$ and 2D bound states as a function of time, where $t = 0$ is the start time of the pump pulse. It can be seen that the populations of $2s2p^2\ ^2S$ and 2D steadily increase during the pump pulse and evolve to a steady state after the end of the pump pulse. After letting the pumped C^+ freely evolve for ~ 1 fs, we start to probe the bound state population from ~ 3.8 fs onwards by irradiating C^+ at different delay times with an ultrashort XUV pulse that has a high enough photon energy (17 eV) to transfer the population in the excited states to the continuum. After the time-delayed ultrashort pulse, we allow the system to relax freely for ~ 30 fs to enable the emitted electron to reach a distance of 200 a.u. This relaxation time also accounts for some decay of autoionizing states, but these could have lifetimes that are too long to fully take autoionization into account in a time-dependent calculation.

Figure 2 also shows the ionization probability due to the pulse sequence as a function of the time at which the probe

FIG. 2 (color online). Ionization probability (black joined dots) as a function of time, where time is measured at the moment at which the peak of the ultrashort probe pulse occurs with respect to the start time of the pump pulse. The $2s2p^2^2S$ population is shown as a dark gray (blue) solid line, and the $2s2p^2^2D$ population is shown as a light gray (red) dashed line. The bound state populations are shown here without the presence of the ultrashort pulse to show how the system freely evolves in time. The populations are scaled by a factor of 2×10^{-2} .

pulse reaches its peak intensity with respect to the start time of the pump pulse. The ionization probability is calculated by integrating the wave function in a spatial region given by $200 \text{ a.u.} < r < 1500 \text{ a.u.}$. We find that the ionization probability oscillates with a period, $T_{\text{osc}} = 1.5 \text{ fs}$. These ultrafast oscillations can be accounted for by the fact that the probe pulse is probing an EWP in a superposition of the $2s2p^2^2S$ and $2D$ excited states. These states are separated by an energy of $\Delta E \sim 2.4 \text{ eV}$ due to the electron-electron interaction between the two $2p$ electrons, and it is this interaction that leads to the interference between the two excited states. The oscillations with a period of $\sim 0.4 \text{ fs}$ are due to interferences between the two excited states and the ground state and are not of interest in this study.

Although the interference can be explained by the energy separation between the two states, this separation does not explain the ultrafast atomic dynamics in detail. The EWP generated here is primarily confined to the $2s2p^2$ configurations. Its dynamics is thus governed by angular dynamics, for which the main driver is the difference in electron-electron repulsion between the $2p$ electrons for $2s2p^2^2S$ and $2D$. The LS coupled basis in which the atomic structure is described is, however, not the ideal basis to gain insight into this angular dynamics. To elucidate the dynamics, we thus transform from the LS coupled basis to the uncoupled basis $|2p_{m_1}2p_{m_2}\rangle$, in which the role of magnetic substates becomes more transparent. Since we consider light polarized in the z direction, the total magnetic number M is conserved, $M = 0$. The $2s$ electron can be considered as a spectator electron, so that the LS

coupled $2p^2^1S$ and $1D$ configurations can be decomposed as follows:

$$|2p_0, 2p_0\rangle = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}|2p^2^1S\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|2p^2^1D\rangle, \quad (3a)$$

$$|2p_1, 2p_{-1}\rangle_S = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|2p^2^1S\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}|2p^2^1D\rangle, \quad (3b)$$

where the subscript S indicates singlet spin coupling between the $m = 1$ and $m = -1$ electrons. This decomposition immediately suggests that angular dynamics in the $2s2p^2$ configuration involves collective dynamics of the two electrons: if the m value of one electron changes, the other electron must also experience a change.

We can now transform the description of the atomic structure from the LS coupling scheme to an uncoupled basis. This transformation only applies to the contribution of the $2s2p^2$ configuration to the state labeled $2s2p^2$. Other configurations also play a role, but they are far less important. Figure 3 again shows the ionization probability as a function of time delay, but this time the probability is compared to the population of the uncoupled basis functions. The first feature to note in Fig. 3 is that the population of $|2p_0, 2p_0\rangle$ shows small rapid oscillations for $t < 1.6 \text{ fs}$, whereas the population of $|2p_1, 2p_{-1}\rangle_S$ does not. This is as expected. The $\text{C}^+ 1s^2 2s^2 2p \ M = 0$ ground state is dominated by electrons with $m = 0$. With the polarization of the laser pulse in the z direction, leading to $\Delta m = 0$, one should expect the interaction with $|2p_0, 2p_0\rangle$ to be stronger than with $|2p_1, 2p_{-1}\rangle_S$. The most striking feature in Fig. 3, however, is the periodic oscillation in the population of $|2p_0, 2p_0\rangle$ and $|2p_1, 2p_{-1}\rangle_S$. These oscillations closely match the observed oscillation in the ionization probability, with the oscillations of $|2p_0, 2p_0\rangle$ in phase. Hence the uncoupled basis provides a clearer interpretation of the ultrafast dynamics of C^+ explored here.

FIG. 3 (color online). Ionization probability (black joined dots) as a function of time, as shown in Fig. 2. Both the $|2p_0, 2p_0\rangle$ population (blue solid line) and the summed $|2p_1, 2p_{-1}\rangle_S$ population (red dashed line) are shown. The bound state populations are scaled as in Fig. 2.

The transformation into the uncoupled basis allows an assessment of the reasons why the ionization probability oscillates with time delay between the pump and the probe pulse. After the C^+ system has been excited by the pump pulse, the excited multielectron wave packet is in a breathing motion between two different angular distributions. When the population of $|2p_0, 2p_0\rangle$ has reached its maximum, the EWP is aligned along the direction of laser polarization, and so the probe pulse interacts strongly with the EWP, corresponding to a maximum in the ionization probability. Alternatively, when the population of $|2p_1, 2p_{-1}\rangle_S$ has reached a maximum, the EWP is aligned perpendicular to the direction of laser polarization, and so the probe pulse interacts less strongly with the EWP, resulting in ionization being suppressed. This scheme thus allows the observation of collective breathing motions in superpositions of low-lying atomic states, while the frequency of these motions is a measure of the magnitude of dielectronic repulsion.

This collective dynamics within the $2p^2$ states is of wider relevance to intense-laser physics. The dominant ionization mechanism for infrared laser fields is the sequential emission of $m = 0$ electrons. In this picture, emission of two electrons from Ne would lead to a Ne^{2+} ion with two $m = 0$ vacancies in the $2p$ shell. This hole then evolves like the $2p^2$ states of C^+ in this study. Hence, in Ne^{2+} , the $m = 0$ vacancies would be filled by an $m = 1$ and an $m = -1$ electron, and vice versa, which will effectively enhance ionization of the Ne^{2+} ion. If ionization is slow compared to the period of this transfer (1.1 fs for Ne^{2+}), the appropriate ionization rate to use for ionization of Ne^+ to Ne^{5+} is the ionization rate assuming the presence of a single $m = 0$ electron in the $2p$ shell. The dominance of the emission of electrons with $m = 0$ has already been demonstrated [16,17], but the results presented here may indicate the mechanism by which the $m = 0$ levels are filled and depleted. However, it must be noted that not all spin symmetries of the Ne ions are accessible by sequential emission of $m = 0$ electrons [18].

These observations also have implications for high-harmonic generation (HHG) from open-shell ions such as Ne^+ and Ar^+ [19]. High-harmonic generation is typically described by a three-step model, in which the laser field first ionizes the atom and accelerates the liberated electron away from and back into the core, generating high-harmonic photons when the returning electron recombines with the parent ion. Typically, high harmonics are generated from neutral noble-gas atoms, but they could in principle also be generated from open-shell systems. Suppose that we have Ne^+ in $M = 0$. In the first step an $m = 0$ electron is liberated, leaving the Ne^{2+} core in a superposition of $2s^2 2p^4 {}^1D$ and 1S . This superposition will initially be in a $|2p_0, 2p_0\rangle$ hole, due to the absence of two $m = 0$ electrons (and hence 3P is spin forbidden). Because of the energy gap between 1D and 1S , this superposition will now transform into a $|2p_1, 2p_{-1}\rangle_S$ hole and back. If the motion of the liberated electron is independent from the core, it

will continue to have $m = 0$. If this electron returns when the core is in a $|2p_0, 2p_0\rangle$ hole, recombination is possible, but when the core is in a $|2p_1, 2p_{-1}\rangle_S$ hole, recombination is impossible as there is no $m = 0$ vacancy. Hence the present results suggest that angular core dynamics may have an influence on high-harmonic generation yields in open-shell systems.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that ultrafast pump-probe techniques can be exploited to observe rapid oscillations in the ionization probability of C^+ due to collective electron dynamics. The uncoupled-electron basis provides a clearer interpretation of the ionization probability than the traditional LS -coupling scheme. The rapid oscillations in the ionization probability are ascribed to a breathing motion between two different angular distributions, explaining the modulation of the ionization yield as a function of time delay between the pump and probe pulse. The frequency of this oscillation is, in a naive picture, directly related to a particular electron-electron repulsion integral, $F^2(2p, 2p)$. This breathing motion between angular distributions could be a general feature of the multi-electron response to strong laser fields, and could have a significant effect on multiple ionization and on the generation of high-harmonic radiation from open-shell systems. Direct experimental verification of the current theoretical results will, however, require high-density pure ion sources which is still a challenging problem.

M. A. L. acknowledges support through the UK EPSRC.

-
- [1] M. Hentschel *et al.*, Nature (London) **414**, 509 (2001).
 - [2] M. Uiberacker *et al.*, Nature (London) **446**, 627 (2007).
 - [3] P. Johnsson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 233001 (2007).
 - [4] S. X. Hu and L. A. Collins, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 073004 (2006).
 - [5] J. S. Parker *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 133001 (2006).
 - [6] S. X. Hu, J. Colgan, and L. A. Collins, J. Phys. B **38**, L35 (2005).
 - [7] R. Shakeshaft, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 063405 (2007).
 - [8] I. A. Ivanov and A. S. Kheifets, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 033411 (2007).
 - [9] I. F. Barna, J. Wang, and J. Burgdörfer, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 023402 (2006).
 - [10] E. Fomouuo *et al.*, New J. Phys. **10**, 025017 (2008).
 - [11] M. A. Lysaght, P. G. Burke, and H. W. van der Hart, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 253001 (2008).
 - [12] C. F. Fischer, T. Brage, and P. Jönsson, *Computational Atomic Structure: An MCHF Approach* (IOP, Bristol, 1997), Chap. 2.2.2.
 - [13] P. G. Burke and K. A. Berrington, *Atomic and Molecular Processes: An R-Matrix Approach* (IOP, Bristol, 1993).
 - [14] X. Guan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 053402 (2008).
 - [15] K. A. Berrington *et al.*, J. Phys. B **22**, 665 (1989).
 - [16] E. Gubbini *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 053602 (2005).
 - [17] R. Taïeb, V. Vénier, and M. Maquet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 053002 (2001).
 - [18] H. W. van der Hart, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 053406 (2006).
 - [19] E. A. Gibson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 033001 (2004).