# Dielectric response of laser-excited silicon

S.A. Sato,<sup>1</sup> K. Yabana,<sup>2,1</sup> Y. Shinohara,<sup>1</sup> T. Otobe,<sup>3</sup> and G.F. Bertsch<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Graduate School of Pure and Applied Sciences, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba 305-8571, Japan <sup>2</sup>Center for Computational Sciences, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba 305-8577, Japan

<sup>3</sup>Advanced Photon Research Center,

JAEA, Kizugawa, Kyoto 619-0615, Japan

<sup>4</sup>Department of Physics and Institute for Nuclear Theory, University of Washington, Seattle 98195, U.S.A.

## Abstract

We calculate the dielectric response of crystalline silicon following irradiation by a high-intensity laser pulse, modeling the dynamics by time-dependent density functional theory (TDDFT). The pump-probe measurements are numerically simulated by solving the time-dependent Kohn-Sham equation with the pump and probe fields included as external fields. As expected, the excited silicon shows features of a particle-hole plasma in its response. We compare the calculated response with a thermal model and with a simple Drude model. The thermal model requires only a static DFT calculation to prepare electronically excited matter and agrees rather well with the TDDFT for the same particle-hole density. The Drude model with two fitted parameters (electron effective mass and collision time) also shows fair agreement at the lower excitation energies; the fitted effective masses are consistent with carrier-band dispersions. The extracted Drude lifetimes range from 6 fs at weak pumping fields to much lower values at high fields. However, we find that the Drude model does not give a good fit to the imaginary dielectric function at the highest fields. Comparing the thermal model with the Drude, we find that the extracted lifetimes are in the same range, 1-13 fs depending on the temperature. These short Drude lifetimes show that strong damping is possible in the TDDFT, despite the absence of electron scattering. One significant difference between the TDDFT response and the other models is that the response to the probe pulse depends on the polarization of the pump pulse. We also find that the imaginary part of the dielectric function can be negative, particularly for the parallel polarization of pump and probe fields.

### I. INTRODUCTION

The interaction of high-intensity and ultra-short electromagnetic fields with condensed matter is an important subject from both fundamental and technological points of view [1–4]. To investigate dynamics of electrons and phonons in real time, the pump-probe experimental technique has been extensively employed. One example of its use is creating coherent phonons and measuring their properties [5]. The vibration is detected by measuring the change of reflectance of the probe pulse. However, this requires a good understanding of the dielectric properties of the surface excited by the pump pulse. Another example is the energy deposited by strong laser pulses close to the damage threshold. They produce high-density electron-hole pairs at the surface of dielectrics, causing strong reflection for the probe pulse [6]. It is even now possible to measure the population of high-density electronhole pairs in the time resolution less than a femtosecond [7–9]. However, the existing theory describing these effects is largely phenomenological. The dielectric properties of laser-excited material are often modeled with the Drude model [10–13], assuming that excited electrons behave like free carriers.

We have been developing a first-principles theoretical approach to describe electron dynamics in crystalline solids induced by the intense and ultrashort laser pulses. We rely upon the time-dependent density functional theory (TDDFT) [14], solving the time-dependent Kohn-Sham (TDKS) equation in real time and real space [15]. We have applied our approach to the optical breakdown [16, 17], coherent phonon generation [18, 19], high harmonic generation [20], and coupled dynamics of electrons and electromagnetic fields in a multiscale description [21].

In the present paper, we apply the TDDFT to dielectric properties of a medium excited by short, intense laser pulses. The method is to solve the TDKS equation in the medium in the presence of an external electromagnetic field having both pump and probe pulses. Thus, we simulate the pump-probe experiments numerically. The theory describes the electron dynamics fully quantum mechanically but assuming that the electrons only interact via a time-dependent mean field. Thus, the theory is only expected to be justified before the times when electron-electron collisions have substantially affected the electronic structure. A separate issue is the creation of phonons. For the excitation energies we consider here, the electron-electron collision time sets a more stringent limit than the phonon interactions. To interpret the results, we compare with several more simplified models. One model that is often used is based on a Drude response of the excited quasiparticles, which embedded in a dielectric medium [12, 13]. This requires a number of parameters to be fitted. Another model ignores the dynamics that created the excited electronic states, replacing it by a thermal ensemble of electrons [22]. One can carry out the TDDFT calculation of the linear response of the thermal system and compare it directly with the response to the pumpexcited system. We will find that many features of response can be understood even at a quantitative level with the simpler treatments. However, there are also features that only appear in the full pump-probe simulation.

The construction of the paper is as follows. In Sec. II, we describe a method and results of numerical pump-probe simulation to extract dielectric properties of excited silicon. In Sec. III, we present results of a thermal model and compare them with the numerical pump-probe results. Our findings are summarized in Sec. IV.

### II. NUMERICAL PUMP-PROBE EXPERIMENTS

In this section we carry out what we call numerical pump-probe experiments to study the dielectric properties of the highly excited material. We examine the electronic response in a unit cell of a crystalline solid irradiated by the pump and probe laser pulses. Since the wavelength of the laser pulses is much longer than a typical length scale of electron dynamics, we treat the laser electric field as a spatially uniform field. The current induced by the probe pulse will be used to investigate the dielectric properties of excited matter.

#### A. Calculation of electron dynamics

Our calculation method has been described in detail elsewhere [18, 21, 23–25], so we only provide here the details germane to our study here. The electrons dynamics is calculated using the TDKS equation,

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\psi_i(\vec{r},t) = h_{KS}(t)\psi_i(\vec{r},t), \qquad (1)$$

where  $h_{KS}(t)$  is a time-dependent Kohn-Sham Hamiltonian. It differs from the ordinary TDKS Hamiltonian by inclusion of the vector potential  $\vec{A}$  in the kinetic term,  $p^2/2m \rightarrow$   $(\vec{p} + e\vec{A}/c)^2/2m$ . There is also a coupling to  $\vec{A}$  in the pseudopotential for the ions; see Ref. [23, 24] for details. The electron-electron interaction in the TDKS Hamiltonian is modeled in a simple a adiabatic local density approximation [26]. We calculate dynamics of valence electrons only, treating the electron-ion interaction by the norm-conserving pseudopotential [27, 28].

The current flowing within the unit cell is given by

$$\vec{J}(t) = \sum_{i} \frac{1}{\Omega} \Re \left[ \int_{\Omega} d\vec{r} \psi_i^*(\vec{r}, t) \vec{j}(t) \psi_i(\vec{r}, t) \right],$$
(2)

where  $\Omega$  is the volume of the unit cell and the current operator  $\vec{j}(t)$  is defined by

$$\vec{j}(t) = -\frac{e}{m} \frac{1}{i\hbar} \left[ \vec{r}, h_{KS}(t) \right].$$
(3)

The relation of the vector potential A(t) in the unit cell to the external electromagnetic field exciting the system depends on a number of factors including possible macroscopic polarization fields. In the present analysis, we assume a transverse geometry as discussed in Ref. [21]. The sample is treated as infinite in the direction of the polarization vector so there appears no polarization field inside the solid. Of course the field is also affected by the absorption and the reflection from the surface region, but we don't attempt here to express the results in terms of the incident laser intensity. We take the following form for the vector potential of the pump pulse in the medium  $A_P(t)$ ,

$$A_P(t) = \begin{cases} -c \frac{E_0}{\omega_P} \cos\left(\omega_P t\right) \sin^2(t/\tau_L) & (0 < t < \tau_L) \\ 0 & (otherwise), \end{cases}$$
(4)

where  $\omega_P$  and  $\tau_L$  is the average frequency and the time length of the laser pulse, respectively.  $E_0$  is the maximum electric field strength in the medium. This is related to the maximum intensity of the pulse I by  $I_v = cE_0^2/8\pi$  in the vacuum and  $I_m = \epsilon^{1/2}cE_0^2/8\pi$  in the medium. Since the dielectric function  $\epsilon$  is not well-defined in the presence of a strong electric field, we shall report our results using the field intensity corresponding to the vacuum relationship.

Our computer code to solve the TDKS equation uses a three-dimensional grid representation to represent orbital wave functions. The unit cell for the silicon crystal treated has a length a = 10.26 a.u. contains eight Si atoms. The cubic unit cell is discretized into  $16^3$ grid points. The four valence electrons of Si atoms beyond the closed (1s2s1p) shells are treated dynamically. The k-space is also discretized into  $24^3$  grid points. The time evolution is computed using a fourth-order Taylor expansion of the operator  $\exp(-ih_{KS}(t)\Delta t/\hbar)$  [15]. We use a time step of  $\Delta t = 0.08$  a.u. The number of time step is typically 24,000.

In Fig 1, we show an example of the calculated electron dynamics induced by the intense pump pulse. Here the frequency of the pump pulse is set to  $\hbar\omega_P = 1.55$  eV and the duration of the pump pulse is  $\tau_L = 18$  fs. These values will be used in all calculations of this paper. For this figure, the electric field strength corresponds to an intensity of  $I = 3.2 \times 10^{12}$ W/cm<sup>2</sup>.

Panel a) of the figure shows the time profile of the electric field,  $E_P(t) = -\frac{\partial}{c\partial t}A_P(t)$ . Panel b) shows the induced current, calculated using the time-dependent orbitals in Eq. (2). The average frequency  $\hbar \omega = 1.55$  eV is smaller than the direct band gap energy (2.4 eV in the present calculation), so the initial current response is nondissipative. This is seen by the phase difference between the current and the electric field, which is shifted by  $\pi/2$  at the beginning of the field pulse (t < 5 fs). As the intensity of the pulse increases, the system absorbs energy by the excitation of electron-hole pairs. As a result, the phase difference decreases. Note that the current shows a weak oscillation at high frequency after the pulse has passed. Making a Fourier analysis, we find that it is dominated by frequencies around 3.9 eV/ $\hbar$ . However, we have no physical explanation of the oscillation.

Figure 1 (c) shows the excitation energy per Si atom. During the field pulse, a rapid increase of the electronic excitation energy is seen. After the pulse ends, the excitation energy is independent of time, showing that our computational algorithm conserves the energy of the system.

We next discuss the number density of excited electron-hole pairs and the electronic excitation energy when field pulses of different intensities irradiate on the silicon crystal. To calculate the number density of excited electron-hole pairs, we first define eigenstates of the Kohn-Sham Hamiltonian of the excited system. We consider a system at a time  $t_f$ sufficiently after the applied field pulse ends, and denote the Kohn-Sham Hamiltonian of Eq. (1) at the time  $t_f$  as  $h_{KS}(t_f)$ . We introduce the Kohn-Sham orbitals which satisfy the following eigenvalue equations.

$$\hat{h}_{KS}(t_f)\phi_i^{t_f} = \epsilon_i^{t_f}\phi_i^{t_f} \tag{5}$$

Note that the Kohn-Sham Hamiltonian  $\hat{h}_{KS}(t_f)$  is different from that of the initial state,



FIG. 1: (a) The time profile of the applied electric field. (b) The current induced by the applied electric field. (c) The excitation energy per Si atom.

due to the change in electron density in the excited system. Using eigenfunctions  $\phi_i^{t_f}$ , we may define the number density of electron-hole pairs by

$$n_{eh} = \sum_{i} \left\{ 1 - \sum_{j} \left| \langle \phi_j^{t_f} | \psi_i(t_f) \rangle \right|^2 \right\},\tag{6}$$

where the sum over i, j is taken over occupied orbitals, and  $|\psi_i(t_f)\rangle$  is the orbital of the TDKS equation at the time  $t_f$ . We use the final-state definition of the orbitals because it facilitates the comparison to a thermal model that will be discussed later.

In Fig. 2, we show the number density of electron-hole pairs (top panel) and the electronic excitation energy per atom (middle panel). The bottom panel shows the electronic excitation energy divided by the number of electron-hole pairs. As seen from the figure, both excitation energy and the number of excited electrons increase with increasing the applied field intensity. At low intensity region, they scale with the square of the field intensity. This is because two photons are required for electrons to be excited across the direct band gap. As



FIG. 2: Electronic properties of the crystalline silicon in the final state following the pulsed excitation. Shown are: electronic excitation energy per Si atom (top panel); the number density of electron-hole pairs (middle panel); the excitation energy per electron-hole pair (bottom panel). Quantities are shown as a function of the maximum pump intensity determined as  $I = cE_0^2/8\pi$ .

seen from the bottom panel, the electronic excitation energy per excited electron-hole pairs is given by 3.1 eV, which coincides with the two-photon energy of the applied field pulse. As the field intensity increases above  $10^{11}$  W/cm<sup>2</sup>, both the number density of electron-hole pairs and the electronic excitation energy deviated from the two-photon curve. As will be seen later, the dielectric property of excited matter also shows a large change from that in the ground state at field intensities above this value.

#### B. Dielectric function from numerical pump-probe calculation

To extract dielectric properties of excited matter, we compare two calculations, one solving the TDKS equation of Eq. (1) with the vector potential containing pump and probe pulses and the other containing the pump pulse only. We denote the electric field of the pump pulse as  $E_P(t)$  and that of the probe pulse as  $E_p(t)$ . We denote the current in the calculations containing the pump pulse only as  $J_P(t)$  and that in the calculations containing both pump and probe pulses as  $J_{Pp}(t)$ . We define the current induced by the probe pulse as the difference,

$$J_p(t) = J_{Pp}(t) - J_P(t).$$
 (7)

From the difference of the induced currents, we may extract the conductivity and the dielectric function of excited matter.

From the probe current  $J_p(t)$ , we may extract the electric conductivity  $\sigma(\omega)$  and the dielectric function  $\epsilon(\omega)$  of excited matter by the following equations:

$$\sigma(\omega) = \frac{\int dt J_p(t) e^{i\omega t}}{\int dt E_p(t) e^{i\omega t}}$$
(8)

$$\epsilon(\omega) = 1 + \frac{4\pi i \sigma(\omega)}{\omega},\tag{9}$$

In principle, the above-defined conductivity and dielectric function depend also on the time delay  $\tau_{Pp}$  between the pump and probe pulses. We will later show that the dependence on delay-time is rather small in the TDDFT calculations.

In practice we employ the vector potential of the form of Eq. (4) as the pump pulse. As for the probe pulse, we use the same functional form as Eq. (4) delayed by an amount  $\tau_{Pp}$ from the pump pulse,

$$A_p(t) = -c \frac{e_0}{\omega_p} \cos\left(\omega_p(t - \tau_{Pp})\right) \\ \times \sin^2((t - \tau_{Pp})/\tau_L)$$
(10)

for  $\tau_{Pp} < t < \tau_L + \tau_{Pp}$  and zero otherwise.

In Fig. 3, we show typical time profiles of the electric fields and the induced currents for a delay time of  $\tau_{Pp} = 19$  fs. The pump pulse is the same as in Fig. 1, with a maximum



FIG. 3: Left panels show the electric field of pump and probe pulses in (a), pump pulse in (b), and the probe pulse in (c). Right panels show the current induced by the pump plus probe pulse in (d), the current by the pump pulse only in (e), and the difference of the currents shown in (d) and (e) in (f).

intensity of  $3.2 \times 10^{11}$  W/cm<sup>2</sup>. The probe intensity is a factor of 200 smaller, which we deem to be sufficiently weak to extract the linear response. In the left panels of Fig. 3, we show electric fields of pump and probe pulses,  $E_P(t) + E_p(t)$ , in (a), pump pulse,  $E_P(t)$ , in (b), and probe pulse,  $E_p(t)$ , in (c), as functions of the time. The right panels show currents induced by the pump and probe pulses,  $J_{Pp}(t)$ , in (d), by the pump pulse only,  $J_P(t)$ , in (e), and the difference of the currents,  $J_p(t)$  of Eq. (7), in (f).

The next step is to calculate the dielectric function from the probe current using Eqs. (8) and (9). The pump-probe calculation using the probe pulse of Eq. (10) and the probe current of Eq. (7) gives us dielectric properties around the average frequency  $\hbar\omega_p$ . To investigate dielectric properties for a wide frequency region, we repeat the pump-probe calculations for different frequencies of the probe pulses.

In Fig. 4, we show typical calculations using a number of probe pulses of differing frequencies. Panels (a) and (b) show the absolute values of the Fourier transforms of  $E_p(t)$ and  $J_p(t)$ , respectively. Panel (c) shows the real part of the dielectric function which is calculated using Eqs. (8) and (9). The curve is composed of a number of curves with different colors for each probe frequency. One can see that the overlap is very good for the different average probe frequencies, validating our method to extract the dielectric function.

We next ask how sensitive is the extracted dielectric function to the time delay of the probe pulse? Since there are no dissipative processes in the TDDFT under ALDA, the properties of the system should not change after some initial period when the phases of the excited orbitals become incoherent. Figure 5 shows how the extracted dielectric function depends on delay time for one of the cases. We have selected delay times over a range that corresponds to a full cycle of the pump pulse, since that frequency could be imprinted on the phases of the particle at later times. The range of the delay times is 19.00 fs, 19.67 fs, 20.33fs, and 21.67fs. The latter three delay times correspond to a quarter, a half, and one period of the pump pulse  $2\pi/\omega_P$  added to the first time. One can see that real part is practically independent of the delay. The imaginary part, however, shows variation although qualitatively the functions are similar. We found the same behavior for other cases as well. Namely, the real part is only qualitatively similar for different delay times. In the sequel, we will analyze all the results using the dielectric function at  $\tau_{Pp} = 19$  fs, and one should remember that the imaginary part is less well defined than the real part.

We have carried out the pump-probe simulations for several intensities of the pump pulse. The results for the dielectric functions are shown in Fig 6. The real and the imaginary parts are presented in panels (a) and (b), respectively.

The distinguishing feature in the response is the negative divergence at small frequencies. This arises from the quasiparticles in the excited system, as we will see more quantitatively later. The imaginary part of the response is not quite as simple to analyze. The plasmon in a free electron gas at zero temperature is undamped and the imaginary part of the dielectric function vanishes at low frequency. Figure 6 shows, however, that  $\text{Im}[\epsilon(\omega)]$  becomes large at low frequency. The quasiparticle response is thus far from that of a free electron gas.

An interesting feature of the TDDFT response is that the dielectric tensor is not isotropic in the excited crystal, even though the crystal symmetry is cubic. This may be seen in Fig. 7, comparing the dielectric functions for the probe polarization either parallel or perpendicular to the pump polarization.

The real part of the dielectric function shows the low-frequency plasmon response more strongly for the parallel component. One may notice that  $\text{Im}[\epsilon(\omega)]$  is negative at some frequencies. This might indicate a population inversion that could sustain a growth of



FIG. 4: The top two panels show the Fourier transformations of the probe electric field  $E_p(\omega)$  and the probe current  $J_p(\omega)$ . The bottom panel shows the real part of the dielectric function extracted from  $E_p(\omega)$  and  $J_p(\omega)$  through Eqs. (8) and (9). The pump pulse has an intensity  $I = 3.2 \times 10^{12}$ W/cm<sup>2</sup> and an average frequency  $\omega_P = 1.55 \text{ eV}/\hbar$ . The polarization directions of the pump and probe pulses are taken to be parallel.

intensity at those frequencies. However, one should carry the full calculation of the pulse propagating in space as well as time to assert that the excited medium can amply the pulses.

### C. Comparison with free-carrier models

Dielectric properties of solids excited by intense and ultrashort laser pulses are often modeled employing a simplified dielectric function, adding a Drude-like component to the



FIG. 5: Extracted dielectric functions as a function of the delay time  $\tau_{Pp}$ . The pump pulse has an intensity  $I = 3.2 \times 10^{12} \text{ W/cm}^2$  and an average frequency  $\omega_P = 1.55 \text{ eV}/\hbar$ . The probe frequency is  $\omega_p = 1.55 \text{ eV}/\hbar$  and its delay times for the four graphed lines are  $\tau_{Pp} = 19, 0, 19.67, 20.33$  and 21.67 fs. The polarization directions of the pump and probe pulses are taken to be parallel.

dielectric function in the ground state [12, 13]. In this subsection, we will examine how well the dielectric function of excited matter in the TDDFT calculation may be described by a simplified dielectric model.

First we consider an embedded Drude model, the dielectric function given as a sum of the ground state response and the Drude response of free carriers

$$\epsilon_{ED}(\omega) = \epsilon_0(\omega) - 4\pi i \frac{e^2 n_{eh}}{m^* \omega(\omega + i/\tau)}.$$
(11)

Here  $\epsilon_0(\omega)$  is the dielectric function in the ground state,  $n_{eh}$  is the electron-hole density,  $m^*$ is the reduced mass of electron-holes, and  $\tau$  is the Drude damping time. For the dielectric function in the ground state,  $\epsilon_0(\omega)$ , we will use the values obtain from the TDDFT calculation. The number density of electron-hole pairs,  $n_{eh}$ , is extracted from the calculation using Eq. (6). We treat  $m^*$  and  $\tau$  as parameters, fitting to the calculated  $\epsilon(\omega)$ .

Sokolowski-Tinten and von der Lind proposed a more complicated model for the dielectric function excited by strong laser fields [6], which we shall call the SL model. They consider three physical effects for the dielectric response of laser-excited semiconductor: (i) state and band filling, (ii) renormalization of the band structure, and (iii) the free-carrier response.



FIG. 6: Real (a) and imaginary (b) parts of the dielectric functions of Si excited by field pulses of three intensities. The dielectric functions are deduced using pump-probe calculations. The polarization direction of the probe pulse is taken to be parallel to that of pump pulse. The dielectric function of silicon in the ground state is also shown.

The SL dielectric function is parameterized as

$$\epsilon_{SL}(\omega) = 1 + \left[\epsilon_0(\omega + \Delta E_{gap}) - 1\right] \frac{n_0 - n_{eh}}{n_0} -4\pi i \frac{e^2 n_{eh}}{m^* \omega(\omega + i/\tau)},$$
(12)

where  $\Delta E_{gap}$  is the change of the band gap by the laser irradiation and  $n_0$  is the density of electrons which contribute to the dielectric response. For  $\Delta E_{gap}$ , we use a change of single particle energies,  $\epsilon_i^{t_f}$  of Eq. (5), after the laser pulse ended. We treat the active number of valence electrons,  $n_0$ , as a fitting parameter.



FIG. 7: Comparison of dielectric functions of excited silicon probed with either parallel or perpendicular direction to the pump fields.



FIG. 8: Dielectric function of silicon excited by two field pulses,  $3.2 \times 10^{11} \text{W/cm}^2$  (left panels) and  $3.2 \times 10^{12} \text{W/cm}^2$  (right panels), are fitted by the embedded Drude model and by the SL model.

Figure 8 shows the fits obtained in the embedded Drude model and the SL model for two intensities of the pump field. The polarization directions of the pump and probe pulses are taken to be parallel. At the lower intensity, the dielectric functions are well fitted by both models. At the higher intensity, the real part is well described by both models at lower frequencies, but the SL model fits better above the direct band gap. However, neither model does well for the imaginary part in the high intensity case. In the fitting procedure, we found the effective mass is sensitive to the real part of the dielectric function and can be determined without ambiguity. The effective mass for the pump pulse of  $3.2 \times 10^{11}$  W/cm<sup>2</sup> is given by  $m^* = 0.18$ , while the effective mass for the pump pulse of  $3.2 \times 10^{12}$  W/cm<sup>2</sup> is given by  $m^* = 0.32$ . The collision time for the weaker pump pulse case of  $3.2 \times 10^{11}$  W/cm<sup>2</sup> is determined to be about 6 fs. However, the Drude damping time  $\tau$  cannot be determined well for high intensity case, because the frequency dependence of the imaginary-part dielectric function is very different from the Drude behavior.

The effective mass and its change with excitation energy may be understood from the band structure. A weak pump pulse excites electrons at specific k-points by two-photon absorption, while a strong pump pulse excites electrons at various k-points by tunnel and multi-photon excitations. The effective mass of electrons depends very much on the their positions in the bands; only the lowest bands have the very small effective masses.

### III. THERMAL MODEL

The numerical pump-probe experiments reported in the previous section are applicable to the excited matter immediately after the pump irradiation, perhaps for a time period of a few tens of femtoseconds. In this section, we will investigate dielectric properties of thermally excited matter, which should be more appropriate at later times. We assume that the electronic states are described by a thermal ensemble, but the ions have not yet had time to respond.

#### A. Dielectric function at finite temperature

We describe the thermally excited matter by static density functional theory at finite electron temperature. In the calculations, the electrons population is described by the Fermi-Dirac distribution of a given temperature, while atomic positions are frozen at the ground-state positions. The electron density at temperature T,  $\rho^T(\vec{r})$ , is given by

$$\rho^{T}(\vec{r}) = \sum_{i} n_{i}^{T} |\phi_{i}(\vec{r})|^{2}, \qquad (13)$$

where  $n_i^T$  is the temperature-dependent occupation number of Fermi-Dirac distribution,

$$n_i^T = \frac{1}{1 + e^{(\epsilon_i - \mu)/k_B T}},\tag{14}$$



FIG. 9: Basic electron properties of the thermal model of crystalline silicon. The top panel shows the excitation energy per Si atom. The middle panel shows the number of excited electron per Si atom. The bottom panel shows the excitation energy per excited electron.

Here  $\epsilon_i$  is the single particle energy,  $\mu$  is the chemical potential, and  $k_B T$  is the temperature in energy units. We note that all the quantities related to the orbitals,  $\phi_i$ ,  $\epsilon_i$ , and  $\mu$  depend on the temperature T due to the self-consistency requirement.

In Fig. 9, we show calculated results at several electron temperatures. The top panel (a) shows the excitation energy per atom, the middle panel (b) shows the number of excited electrons, and the bottom panel (c) shows the excitation energy per excited electron. As seen from the figure, both excitation energy and the number of excited electrons monotonically increase as the electron temperature increases. At very low temperature, we find the excitation energy per excited electrons is rather small, 1.2 eV for  $k_BT = 0.2$  eV. This value should approach to the energy of the indirect gap, 0.52 eV in our calculation, in the low temperature limit.

We investigate dielectric properties of crystalline silicon at finite temperature by the real-



FIG. 10: The dielectric functions of the finite temperature model at several temperatures. Top panel shows the real part of the dielectric function, and the bottom panel shows the imaginary part.

time method, applying a distorting vector potential of step function in time [23]. In Fig. 10, we show dielectric functions of silicon at several electron temperatures. As seen from the real-part of the dielectric function, all responses at finite temperatures show a Drude-like like behavior at low frequencies. This behavior is more or less similar to those in our numerical pump-probe calculations shown in Fig. 6. The low energy component of the imaginary part shows absorptive contributions at low frequencies, increasing monotonically as the temperature increases.

A good way to display a plasmon contribution to the response is to plot the imaginary part of the inverse dielectric function,  $\text{Im}\epsilon^{-1}$ . This is shown in Fig. 11 for several temperatures up to  $k_BT = 1.2$  eV. At the lowest temperature one sees a very sharp plasmon peak, located at an energy of ~ 0.4 eV. The plasmon excitation energy increases with temperature, due to the increased density of electron-hole pairs. We note that the width of the plasmon also



FIG. 11: The imaginary part of the inverse dielectric function for various electronic temperatures.

increases with temperature, up to about  $k_BT \approx 0.6$  eV. Beyond that, the width does not change very much, up to the maximum temperature considered.

The thermal dielectric function presented here can be well fitted by the SL model. For the basic parameters of the SL model, we employ the calculated dielectric function at zero temperature for  $\epsilon_0$ , the calculated electron-hole pair density for  $n_{eh}$ , and the calculated shift of the gap energy for  $\Delta E_{gap}$ . Other three parameters,  $m^*$ ,  $\tau$ , and  $n_0$  are treated as fitting parameters. The fit is carried out by minimizing the mean square error as given by

$$I_{error} = \int_{\omega_i}^{\omega_f} d\omega \left| \epsilon_T^{-1}(\omega) - \epsilon_{SL}^{-1}(\omega) \right|^2, \qquad (15)$$

in the interval  $\hbar \omega_i = 0.35$  eV and  $\hbar \omega_f = 5.0$  eV. The  $\epsilon_T(\omega)$  is the dielectric function in the thermal model. The quality of the fit is shown in Fig. 12 for a temperature of  $k_B T = 1.2$  eV in the thermal model. The fit is very good except for the Im $\epsilon$  at the lowest frequencies. In particular, the plasmon feature in the inverse dielectric function is very well reproduced.

In Fig. 13, we show the fitted effective mass  $m^*$  and the collision time  $\tau$  as functions of the temperature in the thermal model. The top panel shows that the effective mass  $m^*$  gets heavier as the temperature increases. This feature was also found for the dielectric function extracted from the numerical pump-probe experiments, see Fig. 8. As we discussed in Sec. II, the change of effective mass may be understood by the change of the distribution of the electron-hole quasiparticles in k-space.

The bottom panel of Fig. 13 shows that the damping time  $\tau$  becomes very small as the electron temperature increases. The value of  $\tau$  reaches a saturated value of 1.2 fs at  $k_BT \approx 0.8$  eV. At first sight this is puzzling, because there are no collision effects in either the



FIG. 12: Comparison of the thermal model and a fit with the SL model. The electronic temperature in the thermal model is  $k_BT = 1.2$  eV.

TDKS equation or in the thermal model. In spite of this fact, we obtain a plasmon feature with large damping, corresponding to collision times as short as 1.2 fs in the thermal model. We believe that the damping arises from the elastic scattering of high-energy quasiparticles from ionic core potentials, but we have no quantitative understanding of its magnitude or dependence on the quasiparticle distribution. We note that TDDFT treatment of linear response describes the dielectric function of metals fairly well, including the width of plasmon seen in the inverse dielectric function [23].

#### B. Comparison with numerical pump-probe experiments

The difference between the numerical pump-probe calculations presented in Sec. II and the thermal model comes entirely from the different electron-hole distributions in the excited system to be probed. In this subsection, we compare their predicted dielectric functions.

We first need to assume a correspondence between the excited systems that we wish to compare. Two possibilities come to mind, namely consider systems of equal excitation energy or of equal densities of particle-hole excitations. In general, the laser-excited system will have a higher excitation energy for the same number of particle-hole pairs. Since the plasmon characteristics are closely tied to the number of quasiparticles, we shall use that measure to make the comparison. One comparison will be with  $n_{ph} = 0.015$  /Atom; this is obtained by a pump pulse of  $3.2 \times 10^{11}$  W/cm<sup>2</sup> or by a thermal system with electron temperature  $k_BT = 0.3$  eV. Another comparison will be with  $n_{ph} = 0.3$  /Atom, requiring



FIG. 13: Parameters of the SL model determined by the fitting procedure to the thermal model. Top panel shows the effective mass  $m^*$  and the bottom panel shows the Drude damping time  $\tau$ .

a pump pulse of  $3.2 \times 10^{12}$  W/cm<sup>2</sup> or a temperature of  $k_B T = 1.3$  eV. The two dielectric functions are shown in Fig. 14.

As seen from the figure, the dielectric function of silicon excited by the low-intensity pump-pulse  $(I = 3.2 \times 10^{11} \text{ W/cm}^2)$  is close to the thermal model. At the stronger pump intensity of  $I = 3.2 \times 10^{12} \text{ W/cm}^2$ , the real part of the dielectric function in the thermal model lies between the perpendicular and parallel dielectric functions of the numerically pumped system. In fact, the finite temperature function is close to the parallel case at the higher frequencies. On the other hand, the imaginary part of the dielectric function agrees with the perpendicular case at high frequencies, but is much larger than either polarizations at low frequency. We thus conclude that, making correspondence between the numerical pumpprobe calculations and the thermal electron model using the number density of electronhole pairs, the dielectric functions show a reasonable correspondence, especially when the excitations are not very violent. The difference between two calculations comes from the different k-space distributions of electron-hole pairs. It seems that the difference is more evident for the imaginary part.



FIG. 14: Comparisons of the dielectric function of the numerical pump-probe calculation and the thermal model. Left-hand panels:  $n_{eh} = 0.015$  /Atom; right-hand panels:  $n_{eh} = 0.3$  /Atom.

### IV. SUMMARY

To investigate a change of dielectric properties of bulk silicon immediately after ultrashort laser pulses, we made numerical pump-probe experiments solving the time-dependent Kohn-Sham equation in real time including electric fields of both pump and probe pulses. The simulation makes it possible to investigate dielectric properties of excited matter before any dissipation or dephasing effects start to become significant.

For a comparison, we have also constructed a thermal model by solving the static Kohn-Sham equation with finite-temperature Fermi function occupation factors. Its dielectric response was then computed by applying the linear response theory using the usual realtime method. We found that the thermal model works very well at lower excitation energies, but becomes unreliable at the higher excitation energy where one finds differences in the parallel and perpendicular dielectric functions.

An even more simple model can be constructed using ingredients of the Drude model of free-electron dynamics. In general, the real part of the dielectric function was found to be well described by a Drude-like contribution of the excited quasiparticles embedded in the dielectric medium corresponding to the ground state. As for the imaginary part, the dielectric function in the thermal model is reasonably described by the embedded Drude model. The dielectric function in the numerical pump-probe experiments shows rather different behavior, even negative values for the imaginary part. The difference comes from the nonequilibrium distributions of electrons and holes in k-space in the numerical pumpprobe experiments.

In the embedded Drude model, there are three parameters determining the quasiparticle plasmon contribution, namely the density of quasiparticles, their effective mass  $m^*$ , and the collision time  $\tau$ . The density of quasiparticles is known from the TDDFT or thermal calculation, but the other quantities are fit. From the real part of the dielectric function, we find increase of the effective mass as the pump field intensity increases as expected from the band structure. We find the calculated dielectric functions show substantial imaginary part. In the thermal electron model, the collision time of as short as 1.2 fs gives reasonable fit. This short value for the collision time is unexpected, since there are no explicit collision terms in the time-dependent Kohn-Sham equation that we solve. We believe the short collision time comes from the elastic scattering of electrons from atoms rather than from electron-electron or electron-phonon interactions, but we lack a simple model to exhibit this aspect of the response.

#### Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research No. 23340113, No. 23104503, No. 21340073, and No. 21740303. The numerical calculations were performed on the supercomputer at the Institute of Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo, and T2K-Tsukuba at the Center for Computational Sciences, University of Tsukuba. G.F.B. acknowledges support by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. PHY-0835543 and by the US Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG02-00ER41132.

- [1] See, e.g. the Conference proceedings of http://lap2012.sciencesconf.org.
- [2] M.D. Perry, B.C. Stuart, P.S. Banks, M.D. Feit, V. Yanovsky, A.M. Rubenchik, J. Appl. Phys. 85, 6803 (1999).
- [3] T. Brabec, F. Krausz, Rev. Mod. Phys. **72**, 545 (2000).
- [4] A. Couairon and A. Mysyrowicz, Phys. Rep. 441, 47 (2007).
- [5] R. Merlin, Solid State Commun. 102, 207 (1997).

- [6] K. Sokolowski-Tinten and D. von der Linde, Phys. Rev. B 61, 2643 (2000).
- [7] M. Schultze, E.M. Bothschafter, A. Sommer, S. Holzner, W. Schweinberger, M. Fiess, M. Hofstetter, R. Kienberger, V. Apalkov, V.S. Yakovlev, M.I. Stockman, and F. Krausz, Nature 493, 75 (2013).
- [8] A. Schiffrin, T. Paasch-Colberg, N. Karpowicz, V. Apalkov, D. Gerster, S. Mühlbrandt, M. Korbman, J. Reichert, M. Schultze, S. Holzner, J. Barth, R. Kienberger, R. Ernstorfer, V. Yakovlev, M. I. Stockman, and F. Krausz, Nature 493, 70 (2013).
- [9] A.V. Mitrofanov, A.J. Verhoef, E.E. Serebryannikov, J. Lumeau, L. Glebov, A.M. Zheltikov, A. Baltuska, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 147401 (2011).
- [10] A. Kaiser, B. Rethfeld, M. Vicanek, and G. Simon, Phys. Rev. B61, 11437 (2000).
- [11] B. Rethfeld, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 187401 (2004).
- [12] N. Medvedev and B. Rethfeld, J. Appl. Phys. 108, 103112 (2010)
- [13] B. Rethfeld, O. Brenk, N. Medvedev, H. Krutsch, D.H.H. Hoffmann, Appl. Phys. A101 19, (2010).
- [14] E. Runge and E. K. U. Gross, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 997 (1984).
- [15] K. Yabana and G.F. Bertsch, Phys. Rev. B54, 4484 (1996).
- [16] T. Otobe, M. Yamagiwa, J.-I. Iwata, K. Yabana, T. Nakatsukasa, and G.F. Bertsch, Phys. Rev. B77, 165104 (2008).
- [17] T. Otobe, K. Yabana, and J.-I. Iwata, J. Phys. Cond. Matter 21, 064224 (2009).
- [18] Y. Shinohara, K. Yabana, Y. Kawashita, J.-I. Iwata, T. Otobe, G.F. Bertsch, Phys. Rev. B82 155110 (2010).
- [19] Y. Shinohara, S.A. Sato, K. Yabana, T. Otobe, J.-I. Iwata, G.F. Bertsch, J. Chem. Phys. 137, 22A527 (2012).
- [20] T. Otobe, J. Appl. Phys. **111**, 093112 (2012).
- [21] K. Yabana, T. Sugiyama, Y. Shinohara, T. Otobe, G.F. Bertsch, Phys. Rev. B 85 045134 (2012).
- [22] V. Recoules, J. Clérouin, G. Zérah, P.M. Anglade, S. Mazevet, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 055503 (2006).
- [23] G.F. Bertsch, J.-I. Iwata, A. Rubio, and K. Yabana, Phys. Rev. B 62 7998 (2000).
- [24] K. Yabana, T. Nakatsukasa, J.-I. Iwata, and G.F. Bertsch, phys. stat. sol. (b)243, 1121 (2006).
- [25] G.F. Bertsch and K. Yabana, Introduction to Computational Methods in Many Body Physics,

Chap. 3, eds. M. Bonitz and D. Semkat, Rinton Press 2006.

- [26] J.P. Perdew and A. Zunger, Phys. Rev. B23, 5048 (1981).
- [27] N. Troullier and J.L. Martins, Phys. Rev. B43, 1993 (1991).
- [28] L. Kleinman and D. M. Bylander, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 1425 (1982).