Berlin Sfb288 Preprint
quant-ph/9609011
2-nd revised version

On the Influence of Pulse Shapes on Ionization Probability

C. Figueira de Morisson Faria,† A. Fring*
and R. Schrader* *

* *Institut für Theoretische Physik*
Freie Universität Berlin, Arnimallee 14, D-14195 Berlin, Germany
† *Max-Born-Institut, Rudower Chaussee 6, D-12474 Berlin, Germany*

Abstract

We investigate analytical expressions for the upper and lower bounds for the ionization probability through ultra-intense shortly pulsed laser radiation. We take several different pulse shapes into account, including in particular those with a smooth adiabatic turn-on and turn-off. For all situations for which our bounds are applicable we do not find any evidence for bound-state stabilization.

PACS numbers: 32.80.Rm, 32.80.Fb, 33.80.Rv, 42.50.Hz, 03.65.Db

August 1996

*e-mail addresses: Faria@mbi.fta-berlin.de,
Fring@physik.fu-berlin.de,
Schrader@physik.fu-berlin.de

1 Introduction

The computation of ionization rates or probabilities of atoms through low intensity ($I << 3.5 \times 10^{16} W/cm^2$) laser radiation can be carried out successfully using perturbation theory around the solution of the Schrödinger equation without the presence of the laser fields [1]. With the advance of laser technology, nowadays intensities of up to ($10^{19} W/cm^2$) are possible and pulses may be reduced to a duration of ($\tau \sim 10^{-15} s$), * the region of validity of the above method is left. The new regime is usually tackled by perturbative methods around the Gordon-Volkov solution [3] of the Schrödinger equation [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10], fully numerical solutions of the Schrödinger equation [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16], Floquet solution [17, 18, 19], high frequency approximations [20] or analogies to classical dynamical systems [21]. All these methods have its drawbacks. The most surprising outcome of the analysis of the high-intensity region for short pulses (the pulse length is smaller than 1 ps) is the finding by the majority of the atomic-physics community (see [22, 23, 24, 25] and references therein) of so-called atomic stabilization. This means that the probability of ionization by a pulse of laser radiation, which for low intensities increases with increasing intensities reaches some sort of maximum at high intensities and commences to decrease until ionization is almost totally suppressed. This picture is very counterintuitive and doubts on the existence of this phenomenon have been raised by several authors [9, 26, 27, 7, 10], who do not find evidence for it in their computations. So far no support is given to either side by experimentalists.† For reviews on the subject we refer to [22, 23, 24, 25].

Since all of the above methods involve a high degree of numerical analysis,

*For a review and the experimental realization of such pulses see for instance [2].

†Experimental evidence for some sort of stabilization is given in [28], but these experiments deal with intensities of $10^{13} W/cm^2$, which is not the "ultra-intense" regime for which the theoretical predictions are made.

which are difficult to be verified by third parties, it is extremely desirable to reach some form of analytical understanding. In [29, 30, 31, 32] we derived analytical expressions for upper and lower bounds for the ionization probability, meaning that the ionization probability is certainly lower or higher, respectively, than these values. The lower bound in particular may be employed to investigate the possibility of stabilization for an atomic bound state. In [32] we analyzed the hydrogen atom and found that for increasing intensities the lower bound also increases and hence that the existence of atomic stabilization can be excluded in the sense that the ionization probability tends to one. The shortcoming of our previous analysis [32] is, that definite conclusions concerning the above question may only be reached for extremely short pulses ($\tau < 1$ a.u.), which are experimentally unrealistic. In the present article we analyze these bounds in further detail and demonstrate that atomic stabilization can also be excluded for longer pulses.

Some authors [8, 14] put forward the claim that in order to "observe" atomic stabilization one requires pulses which are switched on, sometimes also off, smoothly. This seems very surprising since stabilization is supposed to be a phenomenon specific to high intensities and with these type of pulses emphasis is just put on the importance of the low intensity regime. It further appears that among the authors who put forward these claims, it is not commonly agreed upon, whether one should associate these pulse shapes to the laser field or to the associated vector potential. We did not find a proper and convincing physical explanation why such pulses should produce so surprising effects in the literature. Geltman [10] and also Chen and Bernstein [26] do not find evidence for stabilization for these type of pulses with smooth and turn on (and off) of the laser field.

In order to address also the validity of these claims in our framework we extend in the present paper our previous analysis to various type of pulses commonly employed in the literature in this context and investigate also the effects different frequencies might have. Once more we conclude that our arguments do not support atomic stabilization.

Our manuscript is organized as follows: In section 2. we briefly recall the principle of our argumentation and our previous expressions for the upper and lower bounds for the ionization probability and discuss them in more detail for the hydrogen atom. We then turn to an analysis for specific pulses. In section 3. we state our conclusions. In the appendix we present the explicit computation for the Hilbert space norm of the difference of the potential in the Kramers-Henneberger frame and the one in the laboratory frame for any bound state.

2 The upper and lower bounds

For the convenience of the reader we commence by summarizing briefly the main principle of our argument. Instead of calculating exact ionization probabilities we compute upper and lower bounds for them, meaning that the exact values are always greater or smaller, respectively. We then vary these bounds with respect to the intensity of the laser field and study their behaviour. If the lower bound tends to one with increasing intensity, we can infer that stabilization is definitely excluded. On the other hand, if the upper bound tends to zero for increasing intensities, we would conclude that stabilization is present. In case the lower bound increases, but remains below one, we only take this as an indication for a general type of behaviour and interpret it as not providing any evidence for stabilization, but we can not definitely exclude its existence. In case the lower bound becomes negative or the upper bound greater than one, our expressions obviously do not allow any conclusion.

The non-relativistic quantum mechanical description of a system with potential V in the presence of linearly polarized laser radiation is given by the Schrödinger equation involving the Stark Hamiltonian

$$i\frac{\partial\psi(\vec{x},t)}{\partial t} = \left(-\frac{\Delta}{2} + V + z\cdot E(t)\right)\psi(\vec{x},t) = H(t)\psi(\vec{x},t). \tag{2.1}$$

For high, but not relativistic, intensities the laser field may be approximated classically. We furthermore assume the dipole approximation. In the following we will always use atomic units $\hbar = e = m_e = c \cdot \alpha = 1$. For a general time dependent Hamiltonian $H(t)$ the ionization probability of a normalized bound state ψ is defined [6, 29] as

$$P(\psi) \;=\; \|(\mathbf{1} - \mathcal{P}_+)S\psi\|^2 \;=\; 1 - \|\mathcal{P}_+ S\psi\|^2 \quad . \tag{2.2}$$

The gauge invariance of this expression was discussed in [32]. Here $\|\psi\|$ denotes as usual the Hilbert space norm, i.e. $\|\psi\|^2 = \langle\psi,\psi\rangle = \int |\psi(\vec{x})|^2 d^3x$. We always assume that $H_\pm = \lim\limits_{t\to\pm\infty} H(t)$ exists and ψ is then understood to be a bound state of H_-. $\mathcal{P}_+$ and $\mathcal{P}_-$ denote the projectors onto the space spanned by the bound states of H_+ and H_-, respectively and S is the unitary "scattering matrix"

$$S = \lim_{t_\pm\to\pm\infty} \exp(it_+H_+) \cdot U(t_+,t_-) \cdot \exp(-it_-H_-) \quad . \tag{2.3}$$

Here the unitary time evolution operator $U(t_+,t_-)$ for $H(t)$, brings a state from time t_- to t_+. Note that by definition $0 \leq P(\psi) \leq 1$. Employing methods of functional analysis we derived in [29, 30, 31, 32] several analytical expressions by which the possible values for the ionization probability may be restricted. We emphasize once more that these expressions are not to be confused with exact computations of ionization probabilities. We recall here the formula for the upper

$$P_u(\psi)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \int_0^\tau \|(V(\vec{x}-c(t)e_z) - V(\vec{x}))\psi\|dt + |c(\tau)|\;\|p_z\psi\| + |b(\tau)|\;\|z\psi\| \tag{2.4}$$

and the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} P_l(\psi) = 1 \quad - \quad & \left\{ \int_0^\tau \|(V(\vec{x}-c(t)e_z) - V(\vec{x}))\psi\|dt \right. \qquad\qquad (2.5) \\ & \left. + \frac{2}{2E+b(\tau)^2}\|(V(\vec{x}-c(\tau)e_z) - V(\vec{x}))\psi\| + \frac{2|b(\tau)|}{2E+b(\tau)^2}\|p_z\psi\| \right\}^2 \quad , \end{aligned}$$

which were deduced in [32]. e_z is the unit vector in the z-direction. Here we use the notation

$$b(t) := \int_0^t E(s)ds \qquad\qquad c(t) := \int_0^t b(s)ds \quad , \tag{2.6}$$

for the total classical momentum transfer and the total classical displacement, respectively. Note that for the vector potential in the z-direction we have $A(t) = -\frac{1}{c}b(t) + const$. It is important to recall that the expression for the lower bound is only valid if the classical energy transfer is larger than the ionization energy of the bound state, i.e. $\frac{1}{2}b^2(\tau) > -E$. Our bounds hold for all Kato small potentials.‡ In particular the Coulomb potential and its modifications, which are very often employed in numerical computations, such as smoothed or screened Coulomb potentials, are Kato small. However, the delta-potential, which is widely used in toy-model computations because of its nice property to possess only one bound state, is not a Kato potential.

In the following we will consider a realistic example and take the potential V to be the Coulomb potential and concentrate our discussion on the hydrogen atom. In this case it is well known that the binding energy for a state ψ_{nlm} is $E_n = -\frac{1}{2n^2}$, $\|p_z\psi_{n00}\|^2 = \frac{1}{3n^2}$ and $\|z\psi_{n00}\|^2 = \frac{1}{3}\langle\psi_{n00}|r^2|\psi_{n00}\rangle = \frac{n^2}{6}(5n^2+1)$ (see for instance [33]). We will employ these relations below. In [32] it was shown, that the Hilbert space norm of the difference of the potential in the Kramers-Henneberger frame [36, 37] and in the laboratory frame applied to the state ψ

$$N(\vec{y}, \psi) \;:=\; \|(V(\vec{x}-\vec{y}) - V(\vec{x}))\psi\| \tag{2.7}$$

is bounded by 2 when $\psi = \psi_{100}$ for arbitrary $\vec{y} = ce_z$. We shall now investigate in more detail how this function depends on c. In order to simplify notations we ignore in the following the explicit mentioning of e_z. In the appendix we present a detailed computation, where we obtain

$$N^2(c, \psi_{100}) \;=\; 2 + (1+|c|^{-1})e^{-|c|}Ei\left(|c|\right) + (1-|c|^{-1})e^{|c|}Ei\left(-|c|\right) + \frac{2}{|c|}\left(e^{-2|c|} - 1\right). \tag{2.8}$$

‡Potentials are called Kato small if for arbitrary there $0 < a < 1$ there is a constant $b < \infty$, such that $\|V\psi\| \leq a\| - \Delta\psi\| + b\|\psi\|$ holds for all ψ in the domain $\mathcal{D}(H_0)$ of $H_0 = -\Delta/2$, see for instance [34, 35].

Here $Ei(x)$ denotes the exponential integral function, given by the principal value of the integral

$$Ei(x) = -\int_{-x}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-t}}{t}\, dt \qquad \text{for} \quad x > 0 \ . \tag{2.9}$$

Considering now the asymptotic of N, we obtain as expected $\lim\limits_{c\to 0} N = 0$ and $\lim\limits_{c\to\infty} N = \sqrt{2}$. Noting further that N is a monotonically increasing function of c, (one may easily compute its derivatives w.r.t. c, but we refer here only to the plot of this function in figure 1), it follows that our previous [32] estimate may in fact be improved to $N(c, \psi_{100}) \leq \sqrt{2}$. The important thing to notice is, that since $N(c, \psi_{100})$ is an overall increasing function of c, it therefore also increases as a function of the field strength. The last term in the bracket of the lower bound $P_l(\psi)$ is a decreasing function of the field strength, while the second term does not have an obvious behaviour. Hence if the first term dominates the whole expression in the bracket, thus leading to a decrease of $P_l(\psi)$, one has in principle the possibility of stabilization. We now investigate several pulse shapes for the possibility of such a behaviour and analyze the expressions

$$P_l(\psi_{100}) = 1 - \left\{ \int_0^{\tau} N(c(t), \psi_{100}) dt + \frac{2N(c(\tau), \psi_{100})}{b(\tau)^2 - 1} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{|b(\tau)|}{b(\tau)^2 - 1} \right\}^2 \tag{2.10}$$

$$P_u(\psi_{100}) = \left\{ \int_0^{\tau} N(c(t), \psi_{100}) dt + \frac{|c(\tau)|}{\sqrt{3}} + |b(\tau)| \right\}^2 \ . \tag{2.11}$$

Here we have simply inserted the explicit values for E_1, $\|z\psi_{100}\|$ and $\|p_z\psi_{100}\|$ into (2.4) and (2.5), and understand $N(c, \psi_{100})$ to be given by the analytical expression (2.8). The formulae presented in the appendix allow in principle also the computation of $N(c, \psi_{nlm})$ for different values of n, l and m. However, for $l \neq 0$ the sum over the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients becomes more complicated and due to the presence of the Laguerre polynomial of degree n in the radial wave-function R_{nl} this becomes a rather complex analytical computation. We will therefore be content with a weaker analytical estimate here. In fact, we have

$$N^2(c(t), \psi_{n00}) \ \leq \ 2\langle \psi_{n00}, V(\vec{x})^2 \psi_{n00} \rangle \ = \ \frac{4}{n^3} \ . \tag{2.12}$$

In the appendix of [32] this statement was proven for $n = 1$. The general proof for arbitrary n may be carried out exactly along the same line. Therefore, we obtain the following new upper and lower bounds

$$P_{lw}(\psi_{n00}) = 1 - \left\{ \frac{2}{n^{3/2}}\tau + \frac{4}{b(\tau)^2 - 1/n^2}\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{n\sqrt{3}}\frac{2|b(\tau)|}{b(\tau)^2 - 1/n^2} \right\}^2 \tag{2.13}$$

$$P_{uw}(\psi_{n00}) = \left\{ \frac{2}{n^{3/2}}\tau + \frac{|c(\tau)|}{n\sqrt{3}} + n\sqrt{\frac{5n^2+1}{6}}|b(\tau)| \right\}^2, \tag{2.14}$$

which are weaker than (2.11) and (2.10), in the the sense that

$$P_{lw}(\psi_{n00}) \leq P_l(\psi_{n00}) \leq P(\psi_{n00}) \leq P_u(\psi_{n00}) \leq P_{uw}(\psi_{n00}) \quad . \tag{2.15}$$

In order for (2.13) to be valid we now have to have $b(\tau)^2 > \frac{1}{n^2}$. We will now turn to a detailed analysis of these bounds by looking at different pulses. Our main purpose in the present manuscript for considering states of the type ψ_{nlm} with $n \neq 0$ is to extend our discussion to pulses with longer duration, see also section 2.3. The reason that longer pulse durations are accesible for states with higher n is the n-dependence in estimate (2.15) and its effect in (2.14) and (2.13).

2.1 Static Field

This is the simplest case, but still instructive to investigate since it already contains the general feature which we will observe for more complicated pulses. It is furthermore important to study, because it may be viewed as the background which is present in most experimental setups, before more complicated pulses can be generated. For a static field of intensity $I = E_0^2$ we trivially have

$$E(t) = E_0 \qquad b(t) = E_0 t \qquad c(t) = \frac{E_0 t^2}{2} \tag{2.16}$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \tau$. Inserting these functions into (2.10) we may easily compute the upper and lower bound. Here the one dimensional integrals over time, appearing in (2.11) and (2.10) were carried out numerically. The result is presented in figure 2, which shows that a bound for higher intensities always corresponds to a higher ionization probability. The overall qualitative behaviour clearly indicates that for increasing field strength the ionization probability also increases and tends to one. In particular lines for different intensities never cross each other. Surely the shown pulse lengths are too short to be realistic and we will indicate below how to obtain situations in which conclusive statements may be drawn concerning longer pulse durations. In the following we will always encounter the same qualitative behaviour.

2.2 Linearly polarized monochromatic light (LPML)

Now we have

$$E(t) = E_0 \sin(\omega t) \qquad b(t) = \frac{2E_0}{\omega}\sin^2\left(\frac{\omega t}{2}\right) \qquad c(t) = \frac{E_0}{\omega^2}\left(\omega t - \sin(\omega t)\right) \tag{2.17}$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \tau$. The result of the computation which employs these functions in order to compute (2.10) and (2.11) is illustrated in figure 3. Once again our bounds indicate that for increasing field strength the ionization probability also increases. Keeping the field strength fixed at $E_0 = 2$ a.u., a comparison between the case for $\omega = 0.4$ and $\omega = 4$ shows (figure 4), as expected, the lower bounds for the ionization probability to be decreasing functions of the frequency. The peak on the left, which seems to contradict this statement for that region, is only due to the fact that the expression for the lower bound is not valid for $\omega = 0.4$ in that regime. Clearly, this is not meant by stabilization, since for this to happen we require fixed frequencies and we have to analyze the behaviour for varying field strength. The claim [14, 20] is that in general very high frequencies are required for this phenomenon to emerge. Our analysis does not support stabilization for any frequency. As mentioned above, the shortcoming of the analysis of the bounds $P_u(\psi_{100})$ and $P_l(\psi_{100})$ is that we only see an effect for times smaller than one atomic unit. figure 4 and figure 5 also show that by considering $P(\psi_{n00})$ for higher values of n our expressions allow also conclusions for longer pulse durations. For the reasons mentioned above, in this analysis we employed the slightly weaker bounds (2.14) and (2.13).

2.3 LPML with a trapezoidal enveloping function

We now turn to the simplest case of a pulse which is adiabatically switched on and off. These type of pulses are of special interest since many authors claim [14, 8] that stabilization only occurs in these cases. We consider a pulse of duration τ_0 which has linear turn-on and turn-off ramps of length T. Then

$$E(t) = E_0 \sin(\omega t) \begin{cases} \frac{t}{T} & \text{for} \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \\ 1 & \text{for} \quad T < t < (\tau_0 - T) \\ \frac{(\tau_0 - t)}{T} & \text{for} \quad (\tau_0 - T) \leq t \leq \tau_0 \end{cases} \tag{2.18}$$

$$b(\tau_0) = \frac{E_0}{\omega^2 T} \{\sin(\omega T) - \sin(\omega \tau_0) + \sin(\omega(\tau_0 - T))\} \tag{2.19}$$

$$c(\tau_0) = \frac{E_0}{\omega^3 T} \Big(2 - 2\cos(\omega T) + 2\cos(\omega \tau_0) - 2\cos(\omega(\tau_0 - T)) \\ -\omega T \sin(\omega T) + \omega \tau_0 \sin(\omega T) + \omega T \sin(\omega(\tau_0 - T)) \Big) \ . \tag{2.20}$$

The expressions for $b(t)$ and $c(t)$ are rather messy and will not be reported here since we only analyze the weaker bounds. Notice that now, in contrast to the previous cases, both $b(\tau_0)$ and $c(\tau_0)$ may become zero for certain pulse durations and ramps. We shall comment on this situation in section 3. We choose the ramps to be of the form $T = \left(m + \frac{1}{4}\right) \frac{2\pi}{\omega}$ (m being an integer) for the lower and $T = \left(m + \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{2\pi}{\omega}$ for the upper bound. Our lower bound does not permit the analysis of half cycles since then $b(\tau_0) = 0$. The results are shown in figure 6 and 7, which both do not show any evidence for stabilization. They further indicate that a decrease in the slopes of the ramps with fixed pulse duration, leads to a smaller ionization probability. Once more (we do not present a figure for this, since one may also see this from the analytical expressions), an increase in the frequency leads to a decrease in the lower bound of the ionization probability for fixed field strength.

2.4 LPML with a sine-squared enveloping function

Here we consider

$$
\begin{aligned}
E(t) &= E_0 \ \sin^2(\Omega t)\sin(\omega t) && (2.21)\\
b(t) &= \frac{E_0}{16\,\omega\,\Omega^2 - 4\,\omega^3}\Big(8\,\Omega^2 + 2\,\omega^2\,\cos(\omega\,t) - 8\,\Omega^2\,\cos(\omega\,t)\\
&\quad -\omega^2\,\cos((\omega-2\,\Omega)\ t) - 2\,\omega\,\Omega\,\cos((\omega-2\,\Omega)\ t)\\
&\quad -\omega^2\,\cos((\omega+2\,\Omega)\ t) + 2\,\omega\,\Omega\,\cos((\omega+2\,\Omega)\ t)\Big) && (2.22)\\
c(t) &= \frac{E_0}{4\,\omega^2\,(\omega-2\,\Omega)^2\,(\omega+2\,\Omega)^2}\Big(-8\,\omega^3\,\Omega^2\,t + 32\,\omega\,\Omega^4\,t - 2\,\omega^4\,\sin(\omega\,t)\\
&\quad +16\,\omega^2\,\Omega^2\,\sin(\omega\,t) - 32\,\Omega^4\,\sin(\omega\,t) - \omega^4\,\sin((2\,\Omega-\omega)\ t)\\
&\quad -4\,\omega^3\,\Omega\,\sin((2\,\Omega-\omega)\ t) - 4\,\omega^2\,\Omega^2\,\sin((2\,\Omega-\omega)\ t)\\
&\quad +\omega^4\,\sin((\omega+2\,\Omega)\ t) - 4\,\omega^3\,\Omega\,\sin((\omega+2\,\Omega)\ t)\\
&\quad +4\,\omega^2\,\Omega^2\,\sin((\omega+2\,\Omega)\ t)\Big) && (2.23)
\end{aligned}
$$

for $0 \leq t \leq \tau$. At first sight it appears that both $b(t)$ and $c(t)$ are singular at $\omega = \pm 2\Omega$, which of course is not the case since both functions are bounded as one may easily derive. With the help of the Schwarz inequality it follows that always $|b(t)| \leq t^{\frac{1}{2}}\|E\|$ and $|c(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2}t^{\frac{3}{2}}\|E\|$. We first investigate the situation in which this pulse is switched on smoothly but turned off abruptly. Figure 8 shows that the bounds become nontrivial for times larger than one atomic unit in the same fashion as in the previous cases by considering $P_l(\psi_{n00})$ for higher values of n. Figure 9 shows that also in this case the ionization probability tends to one and no sign for stabilization is found. Figure 10 shows the lower bound in which the pulse length is taken to be a half cycle of the enveloping function. Once more it indicates increasing ionization probability with increasing field strength and also for increasing values for n. Following now Geltman [10] and Su et al. [14] we employ the sine-square only for the turn-on and off and include a plateau region into the pulse shape. Then

$$E(t) = E_0 \sin(\omega t) \begin{cases} \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi t}{2T}\right) & \text{for} \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \\ 1 & \text{for} \quad T < t < (\tau_0 - T) \\ \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi(\tau_0 - t)}{2T}\right) & \text{for} \quad (\tau_0 - T) \leq t \leq \tau_0 \end{cases} \tag{2.24}$$

$$b(\tau_0) = \frac{E_0\, \pi^2\, (1 + \cos(\omega\, T) - \cos(\omega\, (T - \tau_0)) - \cos(\omega\, \tau_0))}{2\, \omega\, \pi^2 - 2\, \omega^3\, T^2} \tag{2.25}$$

$$\begin{aligned} c(\tau_0) = \; & \frac{E_0\, \pi^2 2\, \omega^2}{(\pi^2 - \omega^2\, T^2)^2} \Big(\omega\, \pi^2\, \tau_0 - \omega^3\, T^2\, \tau_0 - \omega\, \pi^2\, T\, \cos(\omega\, T) + \omega^3\, T^3\, \cos(\omega\, T) \\ & +\; \omega\, \pi^2\, \tau_0\, \cos(\omega\, T) - \omega^3\, T^2\, \tau_0\, \cos(\omega\, T) - \omega\, \pi^2\, T\, \cos(\omega\, (T - \tau_0)) \\ & +\; \omega^3\, T^3\, \cos(\omega\, (T - \tau_0)) + \pi^2\, \sin(\omega\, T) - 3\, \omega^2\, T^2\, \sin(\omega\, T) \\ & +\; \pi^2\, \sin(\omega\, (T - \tau_0)) - 3\, \omega^2\, T^2\, \sin(\omega\, (T - \tau_0)) - \pi^2\, \sin(\omega\, \tau_0) \\ & +\; 3\, \omega^2\, T^2\, \sin(\omega\, \tau_0)\Big)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

(Also in these cases the apparent poles in $b(\tau_0)$ and $c(\tau_0)$ for $\omega = \pm\frac{\pi}{T}$ are accompanied by zeros.) The results of this computations are shown in figure 6 and 7, once more with no evidence for bound-state stabilization. A comparison with the linear switch on and off shows that the ionization probability for sine-squared turn-on and offs is lower. The effect is larger for longer ramps.

3 Conclusions

We have investigated the ionization probability for the hydrogen atom when exposed to ultra-intense shortly pulsed laser radiation of various types of pulse shapes. In comparison with [32], we extended our analysis to the situation which is applicable to any bound-state ψ_{nlm} and in particular for the ψ_{100}-state we carried out the computation until the end for the stronger upper (2.4) and lower (2.5) bounds. We overcome the shortcoming of [32] which did not allow definite statements for pulses of durations longer than one atomic unit by investigating the bounds for higher values of n. A direct comparison between existing numerical computations for small n, in particular n=1, and reasonably long pulse durations is at present not feasible. As our computations show (see also [38]) there is of course a quantitative different behaviour for different values of n. However, qualitatively we obtain the same behaviour (refer figure 10) and therefore we do not think this to be of any physical significance. It would be very interesting to carry our analysis further and also investigate the effect resulting from varying l and m. In principle our equations already allow such an analysis, but due to the sum in (A.6) the explicit expressions will be rather messy and we will therefore omit them here.

We regard the lack of support for the existence of bound-state stabilization in a realistic three dimensional atom resulting from these type of arguments, even for high values of n, as more convincing than for instance the support for stabilization based on one-dimensional toy models.

For the situation when the total classical momentum transfer $b(\tau)$ and the total classical displacement $c(\tau)$ are non-vanishing we confirm once more the results of [32] and do not find any evidence for bound-state stabilization for ultrashort pulses. This holds for various types of pulses, whether they are switched on (and off), smoothly or not. We therefore agree with Geltman in the conclusion that smooth pulses in general will only prolong the onset of ionization but will not provide a mechanism for stabilization.

There is however a particular way of switching on and off, such that $b(\tau) = 0$, but $c(\tau) \neq 0$. These type of pulses are used for instance in [8, 14]. Unfortunately our bounds do not permit to make any definite statement about this case, since the lower bound is not applicable (in the sense that then the necessay condition $\frac{1}{2}b^2(\tau) > -E$ for th validity of the lower bound is not fulfilled) and the upper bound gives for typical values of the frequency and field strength ionization probabilities larger than one. So in principle for these type of pulses the possibility of bound-state stabilization remains. It would be very interesting to find alternative expressions for the upper and lower bound which allow conclusions on this case.

For the case $b(\tau) = c(\tau) = 0$ the upper bound P_u remains an increasing function of the field strength due to the properties of the Hilbert space norm of the difference of the potential in the Kramers-Henneberger frame and in the laboratory frame applied to the state ψ_{100}. The weaker upper bound takes on the value $P_{uw}(\psi_{n00}) = \frac{4\tau^2}{n^3}$, which at first sight seems counterintuitive, since it implies that the upper bound decreases with increasing n, i.e. for states close to the ionization threshold, and fixed τ. Classically this may, however, be understood easily. For closed Kepler orbits, i.e. ellipses, with energies sufficiently close to zero (depending on τ), for any pulse with small $b(\tau)$ and $c(\tau)$, these quantities will be very close to the actual changes, caused by the pulse, of the momentum and the coordinate, respectively. So in this case ionization, i.e. the transition to a hyperbolic or parabolic orbit will therefore be very unlikely. This kind of behaviour was also observed in [38] for a Gaußian pulse, for which $b(\tau) = 0$ and $c(\tau) \neq 0$.

Acknowledgment: We would like to thank J.H. Eberly, S. Geltman and V. Kostrykin for very useful discussions and correspondences. One of the authors (CFMF) is supported by the DAAD.

Appendix

In this appendix we will provide the explicit calculation of the term

$$N^2(\vec{y},\psi) \;=\; \langle\psi, V(\vec{x})^2\psi\rangle + \langle\psi, V(\vec{x}-\vec{y})^2\psi\rangle - 2\langle\psi, V(\vec{x}-\vec{y})V(\vec{x})\psi\rangle \qquad \text{(A.1)}$$

For $\psi = \psi_{nlm}$ the first term is well known to equal $\frac{1}{n^3(l+1/2)}$ [33]. We did not find a computation for the matrix element involving the Coulomb potential in the Kramers-Henneberger frame in the literature and will therefore present it here. Starting with the familiar expansion of the shifted Coulomb potential in terms of spherical harmonics

$$\frac{1}{|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{r_<^l}{r_>^{l+1}}\right)\sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{2l+1}}Y_{l\,0}(\vartheta,\phi) \qquad \text{(A.2)}$$

where $r_< = Min(|\vec{x}|, |\vec{y}|)$ and $r_> = Max(|\vec{x}|, |\vec{y}|)$, we obtain

$$\langle\Psi_{nlm}|\;|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|^{-1}\;|\vec{x}|^{-1}|\Psi_{nlm}\rangle \;=\; \sum_{l'=0}^{\infty}\int d\Omega Y^*_{l\,m} Y_{l'\,0} Y_{l\,m}\sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{2l'+1}} \left(\int_0^{|\vec{y}|} dr\left(\frac{r}{|\vec{y}|}\right)^{l'+1} R^2_{nl} + \int_{|\vec{y}|}^{\infty} dr\left(\frac{|\vec{y}|}{r}\right)^{l'} R^2_{nl}\right)$$

which by the well known formula from angular momentum theory

$$\int d\Omega Y^*_{l\,m} Y_{l_1\,m_1} Y_{l_2\,m_2} \;=\; \sqrt{\frac{(2l_1+1)(2l_2+1)}{4\pi(2l+1)}}\langle l_1 l_2; 00|l0\rangle\langle l_1 l_2; m_1 m_2|lm\rangle \tag{A.3}$$

leads to

$$\sum_{l'=0}^{\infty}\langle ll'; 00|l0\rangle\langle ll'; m0|lm\rangle \;\left(\int_0^{|\vec{y}|} dr\left(\frac{r}{|\vec{y}|}\right)^{l'+1} R^2_{nl} + \int_{|\vec{y}|}^{\infty} dr\left(\frac{|\vec{y}|}{r}\right)^{l'} R^2_{nl}\right) . \tag{A.4}$$

Here $\langle l_1 l_2; m_1 m_2|lm\rangle$ denote the Wigner or Clebsch-Gordan coefficients in the usual conventions (see e.g. [39]).

We shall now consider the term

$$\langle\Psi_{nlm}|\;|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|^{-2}\;|\Psi_{nlm}\rangle \tag{A.5}$$

Employing (A.2) and the formula

$$Y_{l_1 m_1} Y_{l_2 m_2} = \sqrt{\frac{(2l_1+1)(2l_2+1)}{4\pi}}\sum_{l'm'}\frac{1}{(2l'+1)} Y_{l'm'}\langle l_1 l_2; m_1 m_2|l'm'\rangle\langle l_1 l_2; 00|l'0\rangle$$

yields

$$\frac{1}{|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|^2} = \sum_{k,l'}\sum_{\tilde{l}=|k-l'|}^{|k+l'|}\frac{r_<^{k+l'}}{r_>^{k+l'+2}}\sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{2\tilde{l}+1}}\;\langle kl'; 00|\tilde{l}0\rangle^2\; Y_{\tilde{l}0}\;\; . \tag{A.6}$$

Once again applying (A.3) shows that (A.5) equals

$$\sum_{\tilde{l},\bar{l},l'}\langle\tilde{l}l'; 00|\tilde{l}0\rangle^2\langle\bar{l}l; 0m|lm\rangle\langle\bar{l}l; 00|l0\rangle \;\left(\int_0^{|\vec{y}|} dr\left(\frac{r}{|\vec{y}|}\right)^{l'+\tilde{l}+2} R^2_{nl} + \int_{|\vec{y}|}^{\infty} dr\left(\frac{|\vec{y}|}{r}\right)^{l'+\tilde{l}} R^2_{nl}\right) . \tag{A.7}$$

For s-states, i.e. $(l=0)$, we may carry out the sums over the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients easily. In (A.4) the only contribution comes from $l'=0$ and we trivially obtain

$$\langle\Psi_{n00}|\,|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|^{-1}\,|\vec{x}|^{-1}|\Psi_{n00}\rangle \;=\; \int_0^{|\vec{y}|} dr \frac{r}{|\vec{y}|} R_{n0}^2 + \int_{|\vec{y}|}^{\infty} dr R_{n0}^2\,. \tag{A.8}$$

In (A.7) the sum over $\bar{l}$ contributes only for $\bar{l}=0$ and together with $\langle\tilde{l}l';00|00\rangle^2 = \frac{\delta_{\tilde{l}l'}}{2\tilde{l}+1}$ it leads to

$$\langle\Psi_{n00}|\,|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|^{-2}\,|\Psi_{n00}\rangle \;=\; \sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2l+1}\left(\int_0^{|\vec{y}|} dr\left(\frac{r}{|\vec{y}|}\right)^{2l+2} R_{nl}^2 + \int_{|\vec{y}|}^{\infty} dr\left(\frac{|\vec{y}|}{r}\right)^{2l} R_{nl}^2\right)\,. \tag{A.9}$$

We turn to the case $n=1$ (with $\Psi_{100}=\frac{2}{\sqrt{4\pi}}e^{-|\vec{x}|}$) for which (A.4) becomes

$$\langle\Psi_{100}|\,|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|^{-1}\,|\vec{x}|^{-1}|\Psi_{100}\rangle \;=\; \frac{1-e^{-2|\vec{y}|}}{|\vec{y}|}\quad. \tag{A.10}$$

As consistency check one may consider the asymptotic behaviours $|\vec{y}|\to\infty$ and $|\vec{y}|\to 0$, which give, as expected, 0 and 2 respectively. Using the series expansion for the logarithm, (A.9) for $n=1$ becomes

$$\langle\Psi_{100}|\,|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|^{-2}\,|\Psi_{100}\rangle \;=\; \frac{2}{|\vec{y}|}\left(\int_0^{|\vec{y}|} dr\ln\left(\frac{|\vec{y}|+r}{|\vec{y}|-r}\right) re^{-2r} + \int_{|\vec{y}|}^{\infty} dr\ln\left(\frac{r+|\vec{y}|}{r-|\vec{y}|}\right) re^{-2r}\right)\,. \tag{A.11}$$

Using then the integrals

$$\int dr\ln(1\pm r)re^{-2cr} \;=\; \frac{1}{4c^2}\Big((1\mp 2c)e^{\pm 2cr}Ei\left(\mp 2c(1\pm r)\right) \\ -e^{-2cr}\left(1+(1+2cr)\ln(1\pm r)\right)\Big) \tag{A.12}$$

$$\int dr\ln(1\pm r^{-1})re^{-2cr} \;=\; \frac{1}{4c^2}\Big((1\mp 2c)e^{\pm 2cr}Ei\left(2c(\mp 1-r)\right) \\ -Ei\left(-2cr\right)-(1+2cr)e^{-2cr}\ln(1\pm r^{-1})\Big) \tag{A.13}$$

we obtain

$$\langle\Psi_{100}|\,|\vec{x}-\vec{y}/2|^{-2}\,|\Psi_{100}\rangle \;= (1-|\vec{y}|^{-1})e^{-|\vec{y}|}Ei(|\vec{y}|)+(1-|\vec{y}|^{-1})e^{|\vec{y}|}Ei(-|\vec{y}|) \tag{A.14}$$

As a consistency check we may again consider the asymptotic behaviour, that is $|\vec{y}|\to 0$ and $|\vec{y}|\to\infty$, which gives correctly 2 and 0, respectively. Assembling now (A.1), (A.10) and (A.14) gives as claimed (2.8). In the same fashion one may also compute $N(\vec{y},\psi_{nlm})$ for arbitrary n,l and m.

References

[1] P. Lambropoulos, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **29** (1972) 453.

[2] W. Rudolph and B. Wilhelmi, *Light Pulse Compression* (Harwood Acad. Publ., London, 1989)

[3] W. Gordon *Zeit. für Physik* **40** (1926) 117; D.M. Volkov, *Zeit. für Physik* **94** (1935) 250.

[4] L.V. Keldysh, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **20** (1965) 1307; A.M. Perelomov, V.S. Popov and M.V. Terentev; *Sov. Phys. JETP* **23** (1966) 924; *Sov. Phys. JETP* **24** (1967) 207; F.H.M. Faisal, *Jour. of Phys.* **B6** (1973) L89.

[5] S. Geltman and M.R. Teague, *Jour. of Phys.* **B7** (1974) L22.

[6] H.R. Reiss, *Phys. Rev.* **A22** (1980) 1786.

[7] S. Geltman, *Phys. Rev.* **A45** (1992) 5293.

[8] R. Grobe and M.V. Fedorov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68** (1992) 2592; R. Grobe and M.V. Fedorov, *Jour. of Phys.* **B26** (1993) 1181.

[9] S. Geltman, *Jour. of Phys.* **B27** (1994) 257.

[10] S. Geltman, *Jour. of Phys.* **B27** (1994) 1497.

[11] L.A. Collins and A.L. Merts, *Phys. Rev.* **A37** (1988) 2415.

[12] J.N. Bardsley, A. Szöke and M.J. Comella, *Jour. of Phys.* **B21** (1988) 3899.

[13] K.J. LaGattuta, *Phys. Rev.* **A40** (1989) 683.

[14] J. Javanainen, J.H. Eberly and Q. Su, *Phys. Rev.* **A38** (1988) 3430;*Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** (1990) 862; Q. Su and J.H. Eberly, *Jour. of Opt. Soc. Am.* **7** (1990) 564 Q. Su and J.H. Eberly *J. Opt. Soc. Am.* **B7** (1990) 564; C.K. Law, Q. Su and J.H. Eberly, *Phys. Rev.* **44** (1991) 7844; Q. Su and J.H. Eberly, *Phys. Rev.* **A43** (1991) 2474; Q. Su *Laser Phys.* **2** (1993) 241; Q. Su, B.P. Irving, C.W. Johnson and J.H. Eberly, *Jour. of Phys.* **B29** (1996) 5755.

[15] V.C. Reed and K. Burnett, *Phys. Rev.* **A42** (1990) 3152; *Phys. Rev.* **A43** (1991) 6217

[16] O. Latinne, C.J. Joachain and M. Dörr, *Europhys. Lett.* **26** (1994) 333; M. Dörr, O. Latinne and C.J. Joachain, *Phys. Rev.* **52** (1995) 4289

[17] J.H. Shirley, *Phys. Rev.* **B138** (1965) 979.

[18] R.M. Potvliege and R. Shakeshaft, *Phys. Rev.* **A38** (1988) 1098; *Phys. Rev.* **A38** (1988) 4597; *Phys. Rev.* **A38** (1988) 6190; *Phys. Rev.* **A40** (1990) 4061; M. Dörr, R.M. Potvliege, D. Proulx and R. Shakeshaft, *Phys. Rev.* **A43** (1991) 3729; M. Dörr, P.G. Burke, C.J. Joachain, C.J. Noble, J. Purvis and M. Terao-Dunseath, *Jour. of Phys.* **B25** (1993) L275.

[19] L. Dimou and F.H.M. Faisal, *Acta Physica Polonica* **A86** (1993) 201; L. Dimou and F.H.M. Faisal, *Phys. Rev.* **A46** (1994) 4564; F.H.M. Faisal, L. Dimou, H.-J. Stiemke and M. Nurhuda, *Journ. of Nonlinear Optical Physics and Materials* **4** (1995) 701.

[20] M. Gavrila and J.Z. Kaminski *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52** (1984) 613; M.J. Offerhaus, J.Z. Kaminski and M. Gavrila, *Phys. Lett.* **112A** (1985) 151; M. Gavrila, M.J. Offerhaus and J.Z. Kaminski, *Phys. Lett.* **118A** (1986) 331; M. Pont, M.J. Offerhaus and M. Gavrila, *Z. Phys.* **D9** (1988) 297; J. van de Ree, J.Z. Kaminski and M. Gavrila, *Phys. Rev.* **A37** (1988) 4536; M. Pont, N.R. Walet, M. Gavrila and C.W. McCurdy; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61** (1988) 939; M. Pont and M. Gavrila, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** (1990) 2362.

[21] J.G. Leopold and I.C. Parcival, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **41** (1978) 944; J. Grochmalicki, M. Lewenstein and K. Rzażewski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66** (1991) 1038; R. Grobe and C.K. Law, *Phys. Rev.* **A44** (1991) 4114; F. Benvenuto, G. Casati and D.L. Stepelyanski, *Phys. Rev.* **A45** (1992) R7670; S. Menis, R. Taieb, V. Veniard and A. Maquet, *Jour. of Phys.* **B25** (1992) L263.

[22] K. Burnett, V.C. Reed and P.L. Knight, *Jour. of Phys.* **26** (1993) 561.

[23] J.H. Eberly and K.C. Kulander, *Science* **262** (1993) 1229.

[24] N.B. Delone and V.P. Krainov, *Multiphoton Processes in Atoms* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1994) Chapter 10.

[25] S. Geltman, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **237** (1995) 286.

[26] Q. Chen and I.B. Bernstein, *Phys. Rev.* **A47** (1993) 4099.

[27] V.P. Krainov and M.A. Preobrazenski, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **76** (1993) 559.

[28] M.P. de Boer, J.H. Hoogenraad, R.B. Vrijen, L.D. Noordam and H.G. Muller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* (1993) **71** 3263; M.P. de Boer, J.H. Hoogenraad, R.B. Vrijen and L.D. Noordam, *Phys. Rev.* **A50** (1994) 4133.

[29] V. Enss, V. Kostrykin and R. Schrader, *Phys. Rev.* **A50** (1995) 1578.

[30] V. Kostrykin and R. Schrader, *Jour. of Phys.* **B28** (1995) L87.

[31] V. Kostrykin and R. Schrader, *Ionization of Atoms and Molecules by short strong laser pulses*, Sfb 288, preprint 185, Berlin (1995), submitted to *Jour. of Phys.* **A**.

[32] A. Fring, V. Kostrykin and R. Schrader, *Jour. of Phys.* **B29** (1996) 5651.

[33] H.A. Bethe and E.E. Salpeter, *Quantum Mechanics of One and Two-Electron Atoms* (Springer, Berlin, 1957), L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifschitz, *Quantum Mechanics* (Pergamon Press, New York, 1977).

[34] H.L Cycon, R.G. Froese, W. Kirsch, W. and B. Simon, *Schrödinger Operators* (Springer, Berlin, 1987).

[35] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics* (Academic Press, New York, Vol. 2, 1972).

[36] H.A. Kramers, *Collected Scientific Papers*, (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1956).

[37] W.C. Henneberger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **21** (1968) 838.

[38] M. Pont and R. Shakeshaft, *Phys. Rev.* **A44** (1991) R4110.

[39] Y. Inui, Y. Tanabe and Y. Onodera, *Group Theory and its Application in Physics* (Springer, Berlin, 1996).

Figure 1: The Hilbert space norm of the difference of the potential in the Kramers-Henneberger frame and in the laboratory frame applied to the state ψ_{100} versus the classical displacement c.

Figure 2: Upper (three curves on the left) and lower bound (P_l and P_u) for the ionization probability of the ψ_{100}-state through a static laser field E_0. The dotted line corresponds to $E_0 = 5$ a.u., the dashed line to $E_0 = 10$ a.u. and the solid line to $E_0 = 20$ a.u. The time is in a.u.

Figure 3: Upper (three curves on the left) and lower bound (P_l and P_u) for the ionization probability of the ψ_{100}-state through a linearly polarized monochromatic laser field $E(t) = E_0 \sin(\omega t)$; $\omega = 1.5$ a.u. The dotted line corresponds to $E_0 = 5$ a.u., the dashed line to $E_0 = 10$ a.u. and the solid line to $E_0 = 20$ a.u. The time is in a.u.

Figure 4: Lower bound (P_{lw}) for the ionization probability of the $\psi_{10\,00}$-state through a linearly polarized monochromatic laser field $E(t) = E_0 \sin(\omega t)$, $E_0 = 2$ a.u. The dotted line corresponds to $\omega = 0.4$ a.u. and the solid line to $\omega = 4$ a.u. The time is in a.u.

Figure 5: Lower bound for the ionization (P_{lw}) probability of the $\psi_{20\,00}$-state through a linearly polarized monochromatic laser field $E(t) = E_0 \sin(\omega t)$, $\omega = 1.5$ a.u., $E_0 = 20$ a.u. The time is in a.u.

Figure 6: Lower bound (P_{lw}) for the ionization probability of the $\psi_{34\,00}$-state through a linearly polarized monochromatic laser field with a trapezoidal and a sine-squared turn-on and turn-off enveloping function, upper and lower curve of the same line type, respectively. (solid line: $\frac{5}{4} - 12 - \frac{5}{4}$ pulse, dashed line: $\frac{9}{4} - 10 - \frac{9}{4}$ pulse and dotted line: $\frac{17}{4} - 6 - \frac{17}{4}$ pulse), $\omega = 1.5$ a.u.

Figure 7: Upper bound (P_{lw}) for the ionization probability of the $\psi_{34\,00}$-state through a linearly polarized monochromatic laser field with a trapezoidal and a sine-squared turn-on and turn-off enveloping function, upper and lower curve of the same line type, respectively. (solid line: $\frac{1}{2}-6-\frac{1}{2}$ pulse, dashed line: $\frac{3}{2}-4-\frac{3}{2}$ pulse and dotted line: $\frac{5}{2}-2-\frac{5}{2}$ pulse), $\omega = 1.5$ a.u.

Figure 8: Lower bound (P_{lw}) for the ionization probability of the $\psi_{30\,00}$-state through a linearly polarized monochromatic laser field with a sine-squared enveloping function $E(t) = E_0 \sin(\omega t) \sin(\Omega t)^2$, $\omega = 0.2$ a.u., $\Omega = 0.01$ a.u., $E_0 = 20$ a.u. The time is in a.u.

Figure 9: Lower bound (P_{lw}) for the ionization probability of the $\psi_{30\,00}$-state through a linearly polarized monochromatic laser field with a sine-squared enveloping function $E(t) = E_0 \sin(\omega t) \sin(\Omega t)^2$, $\omega = 0.2$ a.u., $\Omega = 0.01$ a.u. The dotted line corresponds to $E_0 = 5$ a.u., the dashed line to $E_0 = 10$ a.u. and the solid line to $E_0 = 20$ a.u. The time is in a.u.

Figure 10: Lower bound (P_{lw}) for the ionization probability of the ψ_{n00}-state through a linearly polarized monochromatic laser field with a sine-squared enveloping function $E(t) = E_0 \sin(\omega t) \sin(\Omega t)^2$, $\omega = 0.8$ a.u., $\Omega = \omega/13.5$ a.u. The dotted line corresponds to $n = 40$, the dashed line to $n = 35$ and the solid line to $n = 30$.