Joint electron-energy spectra for the dissociative ionization of a model \(^{2+}\) in few-cycle, infrared laser pulses are calculated via the numerical \textit{ab initio} solution of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation. A strong, pulse-dependent modulation of the ionization probability for certain values of the protons' kinetic energy (but almost independent of the electron's energy) is observed. With the help of models with frozen ions, this feature—which mistakenly might be attributed to vibrational excitations—is traced back to the transient population of electronically excited states, followed by ionization. This assertion is further corroborated employing a two-level model incorporating strong-field ionization from the excited state.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. [II] we start with the full quantum \(^{2+}\) model and introduce the effect we discuss in the remainder of this work: the "vertical fringes" (VF) in JES, indicating strong variations of the DI yield as function of the KER but almost independent of the electron energy. The subsequent sections serve to prove that the VF effect is not due to vibrational excitations (Sec. [III]), not due to the one-dimensionality of our model (Sec. [IV]), and not due to the two-center nature of diatomic molecular potentials (Sec. [V]). In Sec. [VI], a two-level model, combined with the strong-field approximation, is introduced that is capable of qualitatively reproducing the VF effect. We conclude in Sec. [VII] and give all the numerical details in the Appendix, in particular on the t-SURFF approach for calculating the JES in the various geometries.

Experimental photoelectron spectra for \(^{2+}\) and JES for \(H_2\) have been reported in Refs. [8, 9], simulated ones in Refs. [3–6]. In the multiphoton regime, energy sharing according to \(E_0 + n\hbar\omega = E_e + E_p\) is observed. Here, \(E_0\) is the initial energy, \(n\hbar\omega\) the absorbed photon energy, and \(E_e, E_p\) the energy of the emitted electron and the nuclear kinetic energy release (KER), respectively. As \(E_e + E_p = \text{const.}\), this correlated energy sharing leads to diagonal, straight-line features in the \(E_e, E_p\)-plane of the JES. At longer wavelengths the JES are less simple, especially at low electron energy where Coulomb effects are very important, as is well known from atomic strong-field ionization [10]. The diagonal, correlated features tend to fade while pronounced oscillations in the ionization probability as function of the electron energy emerge. However, also oscillations of the probability for dissociative ionization (DI) as function of the KER are observed, which have been shown to depend on the initial vibrational state [3]. One might be tempted to always attribute such variations in the DI probability to vibrational excitations. In fact, an interesting application of DI is Coulomb explosion imaging [11] where one strives for reconstructing the initial configuration of the nuclei from the KER spectrum after rapid ionization by a strong laser field. In this way, e.g., interference structures in the KER spectra due to a two-surface population dynamics in \(^{2+}\) were observed experimentally [12, 13]. We will discuss in this paper another mechanism that introduces a modulation in the KER. It is based on the oscillatory behavior of the ionization probability as function of the internuclear distance and the few-cycle laser pulse duration.

The hydrogen molecular ion \(^{2+}\) is one of the few systems for which the interaction with intense, short laser pulses can be simulated truly \textit{ab initio}, i.e., based on the solution of the time-dependent Schrödinger (TDSE) equation [11, 2] without further approximations such as, e.g., Born-Oppenheimer or Ehrenfest dynamics. Only rotations are usually neglected, which is justified for short laser pulses. Despite the simplicity of \(^{2+}\), its joint electron spectra (JES) for electrons and nuclei are intriguingly complex [3–6]. In fact, on top of the already complex features in photoelectron spectra from atoms [7] there is a nuclear degree of freedom added in \(^{2+}\) (or its isotopic sisters). Hence, for any feature observed in a strong-field JES at least one question arises: are there vibronic excitations involved?

The hydrogen molecular ion \(^{2+}\) is one of the few systems for which the interaction with intense, short laser pulses can be simulated truly \textit{ab initio}, i.e., based on the solution of the time-dependent Schrödinger (TDSE) equation [11, 2] without further approximations such as, e.g., Born-Oppenheimer or Ehrenfest dynamics. Only rotations are usually neglected, which is justified for short laser pulses. Despite the simplicity of \(^{2+}\), its joint electron spectra (JES) for electrons and nuclei are intriguingly complex [3–6]. In fact, on top of the already complex features in photoelectron spectra from atoms [7] there is a nuclear degree of freedom added in \(^{2+}\) (or its isotopic sisters). Hence, for any feature observed in a strong-field JES at least one question arises: are there vibronic excitations involved?

\begin{equation}
H = -\frac{1}{2\mu}\partial_x^2 - \frac{1}{M}\partial_R^2 - i\beta A(t)\partial_x + V_{\text{pe}} + \frac{1}{|R|},
\end{equation}

Both the electronic degrees and the nuclear degrees of freedom, i.e., electronic coordinate \(x \in (-\infty, \infty)\) and internuclear distance \(R \in (0, \infty)\), are restricted to the laser polarization axis, \(M = 1836\) is the proton mass, \(\mu = 2M/(2M + 1)\), and \(\beta = (M + 1)/M\). As we are dealing with a homonuclear diatomic molecule the laser field only couples to the electronic degree of freedom [14]. The velocity-gauge coupling to the laser field of vector potential \(A(t)\) (in dipole approximation) was chosen, with the purely time-dependent \(A^2\)-term transformed away.

For the interaction between electron and protons we choose

\begin{equation}
V_{\text{pe}} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{(x - R/2)^2 + \epsilon}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{(x + R/2)^2 + \epsilon}}
\end{equation}

with the smoothing parameter \(\epsilon = 1\). The JES for DI is calculated via the time-dependent surface flux method (t-SURFF)
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t-SURFF boundary for DI (with electrons escaping in positive x direction) is
given by \( x = X_{DI} \). The red area indicates the region in which a mask
function absorbs probability density.

\[ A(t) = A_0 \sin^2 \left( \frac{\omega t}{2n_c} \right) \sin(\omega t) \] (3)
for \( 0 < t < T_p = 2\pi n_c/\omega \), calculated by the absolute square of
\[ \langle \hat{X}^2 \rangle \]. \( T_p \) is the pulse duration and \( n_c \) the number of laser
cycles. The initial wave function for the TDSE simulations was always the ground state of the Hamiltonian \( \hat{H} \), which
has the energy \( E_0 = -0.78 \). The laser parameters are given in the figure caption.

The main features in the spectra in Fig. 2 are nearly vertical
and horizontal fringe patterns. Diagonal features indicating
energy sharing according to \( E_0 + n\hbar \omega = E_e + E_p \) are not
observed for the laser parameters and the direction of escaping
electrons chosen. The modulation of the yield for fixed
nuclear kinetic energy \( E_e \) as function of the electronic kinetic energy \( E_e \) is well known from laser atom interaction. It can be
attributed to the interference of several electron paths with dif-
ferent ionization times that lead to the same final electron momentum (see, e.g., [7,16,17]). Moreover, "direct electrons"
and rescattered electrons can be clearly distinguished. The
"simple man’s" cut-off \( 2U_p \) is indicated in both panels by a
horizontal line. The yield due to direct electrons stretches well
beyond \( 2U_p \) before it drops down to the level of rescattered
electrons (approximately four orders of magnitude smaller, visible for \( 0.26 < E_p < 0.47 \)).

The objective of this paper is to reveal the origin of the mod-
ulation of the yield as function of the nuclear kinetic energy \( E_e \). In other words, why is the DI yield strongly suppressed
for certain proton energies? And why is this suppression almost
independent of the electronic energy (i.e., why are the
corresponding fringe patterns almost vertical in Fig. 2) but
dependent on the pulse duration? Similar modulations have been
reported in Ref. [3] for simulations starting from a vibrationally excited \( \text{H}_2^+ \) molecule. The number of VF was found
to increase with increasing vibrational quantum number \( \nu \)
of the initial state. However, in our simulations we started from
\( \nu = 0 \) so that the vertical pattern in Fig. 2 does not just reflect the
probability density of the initial vibrational wave packet.

On one hand, experience shows that commonly all spectral features in strong field ionization can be explained in terms of
interfering quantum trajectories. On the other hand, the in-
terference of the usual long and short trajectories starting at
the two nuclear sites [13] (including potential rescattering and
the generation of a double-slit type interference pattern [19]),
should depend not only on the internuclear distance but also
on the electronic energy \( E_e \). Hence the strong suppression
The most important insight gained from these calculations is that the ionization yield as a function of the internuclear distance $R$ is an increasing function of $R$, and that this increase is most pronounced for values of $E_p$ that are independent of $E_e$. However, the ionization yield is less pronounced than in the energy resolved spectrum, which can be explained by the “left-right asymmetry” of the spectra for electrons escaping in polarization direction (top panel) and opposite to it (inset in top panel). Moreover, the modulations in the energy resolved spectrum are not strictly independent of the electronic energy $E_e$, i.e., not perfectly vertical but slightly tilted.

The fact that ionization probability and bound state occupations at the end of the pulse oscillate similarly as function of $I_p$ (or $1/R \simeq E_p$) suggests that the electronically excited state plays an important role in the DI process in few-cycle laser pulses. However, the minima in the ionization yield do not perfectly coincide with the minima in the excited-state population. For ionization probabilities smaller than $10^{-6}$ the occupations of the excited state rather oscillates with twice the frequency of $P_{ion}$ as function of $I_p$. Hence, the ionization step introduces an additional, nontrivial $I_p$-dependence. Note that the excited state energy $|E_1| \simeq 0.8$ varies little with $R$ so that in any case at least about 12 photons are required for ionization. Additionally, 2 up to 10 photons are needed to couple the initial electronic ground state of energy $E_0$ with the excited state of energy $E_1$. Below, in Sec. IV, we reproduce the VF qualitatively, using a two-level approximation in combination with the strong-field approximation (SFA).

The middle panel of Fig. 3 shows the total ionization probability

$$P_{ion} = 1 - \int_{-X_1}^{X_1} d|\Psi(x,T)|^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

and the occupations of the ground and first excited states after the interaction with the laser pulse. The modulations in the total ionization probability are less pronounced than in the energy resolved spectrum, which can be explained by the “left-right asymmetry” of the spectra for electrons escaping in polarization direction (top panel) and opposite to it (inset in top panel). Moreover, the modulations in the energy resolved spectrum are not strictly independent of the electronic energy $E_e$, i.e., not perfectly vertical but slightly tilted.

The fact that ionization probability and bound state occupations at the end of the pulse oscillate similarly as function of $I_p$ (or $1/R \simeq E_p$) suggests that the electronically excited state plays an important role in the DI process in few-cycle laser pulses. However, the minima in the ionization yield do not perfectly coincide with the minima in the excited-state population. For ionization probabilities smaller than $10^{-6}$ the occupations of the excited state rather oscillates with twice the frequency of $P_{ion}$ as function of $I_p$. Hence, the ionization step introduces an additional, nontrivial $I_p$-dependence. Note that the excited state energy $|E_1| \simeq 0.8$ varies little with $R$ so that in any case at least about 12 photons are required for ionization. Additionally, 2 up to 10 photons are needed to couple the initial electronic ground state of energy $E_0$ with the excited state of energy $E_1$. Below, in Sec. IV, we reproduce the VF qualitatively, using a two-level approximation in combination with the strong-field approximation (SFA).

### III. FIXED INTERNUCLEAR DISTANCE

To rule out vibrations as the origin of the VF in Fig. 2 results for $H_2^+$ with fixed internuclear distances are discussed now.

In order to calculate electronic spectra for the $H_2^+$ model with fixed internuclear distance $R$ the electronic TDSE $i \partial_t \Psi(x,t) = H(t)\Psi(x,t)$ for the Hamiltonian

$$H(t) = -\frac{1}{2} \partial_x^2 - iA(t)\partial_x + V(x)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

and binding potential

$$V(x) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{(x-R/2)^2 + \epsilon}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{(x+R/2)^2 + \epsilon}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

was solved for many $R$ in the range where $1/R \simeq E_p$ covers the relevant KER $E_p$ in Fig. 2

In the top panel of Fig. 3 all these electronic spectra are collected for comparison with Fig. 2 upper panel. The overall trend is an increasing ionization yield with increasing $R$ because of the decreasing ionization potential $I_p = |E_0|$ (see bottom panel). The most important insight gained from these fixed-$R$ simulations is that pronounced suppressions of the ionization yield are observed for certain internuclear distances $R \simeq 1/E_p$ as well. This proves that vibrational excitation cannot be the origin of the VF visible in both Fig. 3 and Fig. 2.

The bottom panel of Fig. 3 shows the energies of the two lowest bound electronic states in the $H_2^+$ potential (5) vs the ionization potential $I_p = |E_0|$. For large internuclear distances $R$ the two levels are almost degenerate with the ground state energy rising asymptotically towards the ground state energy value for the potential $V(x) = -1/\sqrt{x^2 + \epsilon}$. Because of this asymptotic degeneracy and the related diverging transition dipole moment $d_{01}$ these two states were dubbed “charge resonance states”. However, we should stress that the VF in the DI yield as discussed in this work occur at smaller distances than “charge resonance enhanced ionization” (CREI) [20].

The middle panel of Fig. 3 shows the total ionization probability

$$P_{ion} = 1 - \int_{-X_1}^{X_1} d|\Psi(x,T)|^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

and the occupations of the ground and first excited states after the interaction with the laser pulse. The modulations in the total ionization probability is less pronounced than in the energy resolved spectrum, which can be explained by the “left-right asymmetry” of the spectra for electrons escaping in polarization direction (top panel) and opposite to it (inset in top panel). Moreover, the modulations in the energy resolved spectrum are not strictly independent of the electronic energy $E_e$, i.e., not perfectly vertical but slightly tilted.

The fact that ionization probability and bound state occupations at the end of the pulse oscillate similarly as function of $I_p$ (or $1/R \simeq E_p$) suggests that the electronically excited state plays an important role in the DI process in few-cycle laser pulses. However, the minima in the ionization yield do not perfectly coincide with the minima in the excited-state population. For ionization probabilities smaller than $10^{-6}$ the occupations of the excited state rather oscillates with twice the frequency of $P_{ion}$ as function of $I_p$. Hence, the ionization step introduces an additional, nontrivial $I_p$-dependence. Note that the excited state energy $|E_1| \simeq 0.8$ varies little with $R$ so that in any case at least about 12 photons are required for ionization. Additionally, 2 up to 10 photons are needed to couple the initial electronic ground state of energy $E_0$ with the excited state of energy $E_1$. Below, in Sec. IV, we reproduce the VF qualitatively, using a two-level approximation in combination with the strong-field approximation (SFA).

### IV. 3D $H_2^+$ WITH FIXED INTERNUCLEAR DISTANCE

In order to show that the modulation in the DI yield is not an artifact of the low dimensionality of our models the 3D molecular ion with fixed ions and aligned along the laser po-
Fig. 4. (Color online) Same as Fig. 3 but for 3D H_2^+ aligned in polarization direction of the laser.

The Hamiltonian
\[ H = \frac{1}{2} (-i \nabla + A(t)e_z)^2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{(z-R/2)^2 + \rho^2}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{(z+R/2)^2 + \rho^2}} \]

is cylindrically symmetric so that the natural choice for the polarization axis was considered. The Hamiltonian is defined in terms of \( A(t) \), a cylindrically symmetric potential.

Visually, while at low electron energies the fringes are more tilted than in the 1D results, making the suppression of the yield for certain internuclear distances less electron energy-independent. The fringe pattern for the rescattered electrons is as vertical as in the 1D results, revealing the origin of this difference between 1D and 3D results requires further systematic investigations. In this work we are content with the fact that the modulation in the ionization yield as function of \( 1/R \) exists in 3D as well.

V. SINGLE-CENTER POTENTIAL

Next, we show that the two-center nature of the binding potential is not essential for the observed modulations of the ionization yield, while the existence of an excited state is. To that end we consider a Pöschl-Teller potential of the form
\[ V(x) = \frac{b(b-1)}{8a^2 \cosh^2[x/(2a)]} \]

for which the finite number of energy levels of energy \( E_n = -(b-n-1)^2/(8a^2), n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots < b-1 \) can be adjusted via the parameters \( a > 0 \) and \( b > 1 \).

First, we aim at mimicking the behavior of ground and excited state in the molecular model, i.e., \( E_1 = -0.85 \) is kept constant, and \( E_0 \) covers the range \(-1.35 < E_0 < -1\). Figure 5 shows the electron spectra collected such that they can be directly compared to Fig. 3. The VF are there, proving that they are not due to a two-center interference.

Figure 4 shows spectra for various internuclear distance \( R \) and electrons escaping in polarization direction. The modulation of the ionization yield as function of \( 1/R \) is clearly visible although at low electron energies the fringes are more tilted than in the 1D results, making the suppression of the yield for certain internuclear distances less electron energy-independent. The fringe pattern for the rescattered electrons is as vertical as in the 1D results. Revealing the origin of this difference between 1D and 3D results requires further systematic investigations. In this work we are content with the fact that the modulation in the ionization yield as function of \( 1/R \) exists in 3D as well.

Second, Fig. 6 shows the case of a Pöschl-Teller potential with ground and excited state energy tuned close to the molecular case. The laser intensity was increased to \( I_{\text{peak}} = 3.0 \cdot 10^{14} \text{ W/cm}^2 \) in order to have an ionization yield similar to the molecular models.

VI. TWO LEVELS + SFA

As long as the ionization probability is small we may model the occupation of the ground and first excited states...
by a simple two-level model. Plugging the ansatz $|\psi(t)| = a_0(t)|\psi_0\rangle + a_1(t)|\psi_1\rangle$ into the TDSE in length gauge

$$i\partial_t \psi(x,t) = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\partial_x^2 + E(t)x + V(x)\right)\psi(x,t)$$

one finds the well-known equations of motion for the density matrix elements $\rho_{i,j} = a_i^* a_j$, $i = 0, 1, j = 0, 1$,

$$\dot{\rho}_{00} = i d_{01} E(t)(\rho_{10} - \rho_{01})$$

$$\dot{\rho}_{10} = i d_{01} E(t)(\rho_{00} - \rho_{11}) + i \Delta E \rho_{10}$$

where $\Delta E = E_1 - E_0$, $d_{01} = \langle \psi_0 | x | \psi_1 \rangle$ (assumed real), $\rho_{01} = \rho_{10}^*$, $\rho_{11} = 1 - \rho_{00}$. As we are interested in few-cycle pulses and the transient dynamics induced by them we cannot apply the rotating wave approximation, and a dressed or Floquet state approach does not make sense either. Instead, in the bottom panel of Fig. 7 the density matrix element $\rho_{11}$ at the end of the laser pulse $t = T_p$ from the numerical solution of the two-level model Eqs. (10) and (11) [initial conditions $\rho_{00}(t = 0) = 1$ and $\rho_{11}(t = 0) = 0$] is compared to the occupation of the first excited state from the numerical solution of the full TDSE. The agreement is very good apart from a shift along the ionization potential axis. This shift is caused by neglecting higher excited states and the coupling to the continuum in the two-level model. We checked that for lower field strengths (where even less ionization occurs and other excited states are negligibly populated) the agreement improves.

The results of the two-level system can be used to model ionization as well. In “standard” SFA only a single bound state (besides the continuum states of momentum $k$) is considered, and depletion of its population is neglected (see, e.g., Ref. 7). Instead, we plug the modulus of the occupation $|a_1(t)| = \sqrt{\rho_{11}(t)}$ of the first excited state into the SFA amplitude for direct ionization,

|\rho_{11}SFA(k,t)|^2 \approx \int_0^t \frac{dt'}{\pi} \rho_{11}(t')d_{1k}(A(t') + k)E(t') e^{i\int_0^t dt'' \frac{(A(t'') + k)^2 - E_1^2}{2}}.

Here, $d_{1k}(k) = \langle \psi_1 | x | k \rangle$, and we neglect the amplitude for ionization from the ground state because its contribution is several orders of magnitude smaller than the contribution of the first excited state. This is fortunate, as otherwise the phases of the complex $a_0(t)$ and $a_1(t)$ matter and should be calculated from a full SFA with two bound states and all relevant bound-bound and bound-continuum couplings. The top panel in Fig. 7 shows the collected electronic spectra for the molecular potential with fixed protons of Sec. III calculated using our simplified two-level SFA. The dipole moments and the eigenenergies $E_0$ and $E_1$ were calculated numerically from the TDSE data of Sec. III (see the bottom panel of Fig. 3 for the $R$-dependent energies and transition dipole moment $d_{01}$). Figure 7 shows that the simple two-level SFA reproduces the $I_p$-dependent features in the ionization probability qualitatively. In particular, the correlation between the oscillations of the excited-state population at the end of the pulse as function of $I_p$ and the oscillations in the ionization probability with only half the frequency is as observed in the TDSE results of Sec. III.

Employing $\rho_{11} \ll \rho_{00} = 1 - \rho_{11} \simeq 1$ in (11), Eqs. (10) and (11) can be solved analytically, leading to

$$\rho_{11}(\tau) = \left| \frac{d_{01}}{\omega} \int_\tau^0 d\tau' E(\tau') e^{-i\omega \tau'} \right|^2, \quad \tau = \omega t, \quad n = \Delta E/\omega.$$

Using $E(t) = -\partial_t A(t)$ with the vector potential (3) yields the occupation of the first excited state at the end of the sin$^2$ pulse

$$\rho_{11} = \frac{A_0 d_{01} \omega^3 (n_2^2 \omega^2 - \omega^2 + 3 \Delta E^2 n_2^2) \Delta E \sin \left(\pi \frac{\Delta E n_c}{\omega}\right)^2}{\omega^2 (n_c \omega - \omega)(n_c \omega + \omega)(n_c \omega + \omega)}$$

where $\omega_+ = \omega + \Delta E$ and $\omega_+ = \omega - \Delta E$. Expanding this expression in the small parameter $\eta = \omega/\Delta E = 1/n$ gives

$$\rho_{11} \simeq \frac{9 A_0^2 d_{01}^2 \sin^2 \left(\pi \frac{\Delta E n_c}{\omega}\right) \eta^5}{n_c^5}.$$
The occupation of the first excited state after the pulse thus decreases as $n_c$ increases. Hence the observed VF in the (dissociative) ionization yield are a few-cycle effect. Moreover, inspection of the sine’s argument in (14) shows that the frequency of the oscillation depends on the number of cycles $n_c$. The higher $n_c$, the more oscillations within a given $\Delta E/\omega$ interval. This is in agreement with the TDSE results in Fig. 11 where the 4-cycle laser pulse was found to generate more VF than the 3-cycle pulse. As $E_1$ is almost constant in the $H^+_2$ model the oscillations in Fig. 12 are of almost constant period when plotted vs $I_p = |E_0|$.

Note that $\rho_{11}$ is very sensitive to the pulse shape. In fact, for a Gaussian pulse $\rho_{11}$ according (13)—with the integration limits stretched to $\pm \infty$—becomes the (modulus squared) Fourier transform of a Gaussian, which is a Gaussian and thus does not oscillate with $\Delta E$ and $n_c$ (full-width half maximum) at all.

VII. CONCLUSION

Numerical simulations of the dissociative ionization process in $H^+_2$ for short laser pulses reveal patterns of vertical fringes in the joint energy spectra, i.e., strong variations of the yield as function of the ion energy that are almost independent of the electron energy. Identifying the kinetic energy release with the inverse internuclear distance, the effect is also found in calculations with fixed ions, ruling out vibrational excitations as its origin.

Instead, ionization proceeds via the first excited electronic state. In few-cycle pulses the population of the first excited state depends strongly on the number of cycles and the pulse shape in general. The vertical fringes in the continuous dissociative ionization spectra are clearly correlated with the population of the first excited state at the end of the pulse, as qualitatively reproduced using a simple two-state model combined with the strong-field approximation.

The observed effect relies on the ultrashort, transient dynamics in few-cycle laser pulses and not on resonances, specially chosen detunings, or interference. In fact, in the limit of long laser pulses the vertical fringes disappear and one approaches—depending on the laser frequency—either ordinary non-resonant multiphoton or tunneling ionization, or well-known resonance-enhanced multiphoton ionization.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the SFB 652 of the German Science Foundation (DFG).

Appendix A: Numerical details

The TDSE was solved numerically by propagating the wavefunction with the Crank-Nicolson time propagator. The wavefunction and the potentials were discretized on a Cartesian grid with the spatial derivatives in the Hamiltonian approximated by finite differences. An iterative block Gauss-Seidel method and the Thomas algorithm were applied for the solution of the linear system of equations of the Crank-Nicolson method in the two and one dimensional case, respectively. The initial ground-state wavefunctions for the time propagation and the first excited state were obtained by the shift-invert method [21]. For the numerical solution of the cylindrically symmetric Hamiltonian (7) the coordinate transformation $\xi = \rho^{3/2}$ was used [22]. Numerical parameters for the TDSE simulations are summarized in Table I.

Appendix B: t-SURFF for the $H^+_2$ model

Assuming that $V_{\text{pe}}$ in (2) can be neglected for $x > X_{DI}$ the wavefunction there separates in the form $\psi_k(x, t)\phi_p(R) e^{-itE_p}$ where $\phi_p(R)$ are the solutions of the Coulomb scattering problem

$$\left( T_N + \frac{1}{R} \right) \phi_p(R) = E_p \phi_p(R), \quad T_N = -\frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial R^2},$$

and

$$\psi_k(x, t) = (2\pi)^{-1/2} e^{-\alpha(t)+ikx}, \quad \alpha(t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t dt' [k^2 + 2kA(t')]$$

are Volkov wavefunctions.

The DI amplitude (restricted to the electrons escaping in positive direction) is approximated by the integral

$$\langle \Psi(T)|DI \rangle \simeq a_{DI}(k, p) \equiv \langle \Psi(T)|\Theta(x - X_{DI})|p(T)|k(T)\rangle = \int dR \int_{x > X_{DI}} dx \Psi^*(x, R, T)\psi_k(x, T)\phi_p(R) e^{-itE_p}.$$  

This expression is not yet useful for practical purposes because $T$ needs to be large enough to allow the slow electrons arriving in the region $x > X_{DI}$. On the other hand, the fast electrons need to be kept on the grid as well, necessitating a huge grid size. In
order to avoid large grids the t-SURFF method [5,15] was adapted to the problem at hand. Writing the right hand side of (B3) as a time integral we obtain

\[ a_{DI}(k, p) = \langle \Psi(0)|\Theta(x - X_{DI})|p(0)\rangle|k(0)\rangle + \int_0^T dt \partial_t \langle \Psi(t)|\Theta(x - X_{DI})|p(t)\rangle|k(t)\rangle. \]  

(B4)

For sufficiently large \( X_{DI} \) and a bound initial state \(|\Psi\rangle\) we have \( \langle \Psi(0)|\Theta(x - X_{DI})|p(0)\rangle|k(0)\rangle \simeq 0 \). Employing the TDSE with \( V_{pe} \simeq 0 \) yields

\[ a_{DI}(k, p) \simeq a_{DLA-SURFF}(k, p) \equiv i \int_0^T dt \langle \Psi(t) | \left[ -\frac{1}{2\mu} \partial_x^2 - \frac{1}{M} \partial_R^2 - i\beta A(t) \partial_x + \frac{1}{R} \Theta(x - X_{DI}) \right]|p(t)\rangle|k(t)\rangle. \]  

(B5)

Only terms of the Hamiltonian containing derivatives with respect to \( x \) contribute in the commutator, leading to

\[ a_{DLA-SURFF}(k, p) = \int_0^T dt \int_0^\infty dR \left[ \beta A(t) \Psi^*(X_{DI}, R, t) \psi_k(X_{DI}, t) \right. \]

\[ \left. - \frac{i}{2\mu} \left( \Psi^*(X_{DI}, R, t) \partial_x \psi_k(x, t) \bigg|_{x = X_{DI}} - \psi_k(X_{DI}, t) \partial_x \Psi^*(x, R, t) \bigg|_{x = X_{DI}} \right) \phi_p(R, t) \right]. \]  

(B6)

The scattering states \( \phi_p(R) \) were used as implemented in the GNU Scientific Library (GSL) [23].

**Appendix C: t-SURFF for 1D calculations**

For the one dimensional systems the probability amplitude for ionization with final electron momentum \( k \) is approximated as

\[ \langle \Psi(T)|\Theta(x - X_1)|k(T)\rangle \simeq \int_0^T dt \left( A(t) \Psi^*(X_1, t) \psi_k(X_1, t) - \frac{i}{2} (\Psi^*(X_1, t) \partial_x \psi_k(x, t) \big|_{x = X_1} - \psi_k(X_1, t) \partial_x \Psi^*(x, t) \big|_{x = X_1}) \right). \]  

(C1)

Again, only electrons escaping in positive \( x \) direction, passing the t-SURFF boundary \( X_1 \), are considered, and the binding potential is neglected for distances \( x > X_1 \).

**Appendix D: t-SURFF for cylindrically symmetric system**

The probability amplitude for an electron escaping with a momentum \( \vec{k} = k_x \hat{e}_x + k_z \hat{e}_z \) can be approximated by the integral

\[ \langle \vec{k}(T)|\Psi(T)\rangle \simeq \int_0^T dt \int dV \partial_t \left( \psi_k(\rho, z, t)^* \left( \theta(R_1 - \rho) \theta(z - Z_1) + \theta(R_1 - \rho) \theta(-z - Z_1) + \theta(\rho - R_1) \right) \Psi(\rho, z, t) \right). \]  

(D1)

The integral (D1) can be divided into three terms which are evaluated separately. Using the TDSE, the first term reads (dropping the arguments of \( \psi_k \) and \( \Psi \))

\[ s_1(k_\rho, k_z) = \int_0^T dt \int dV \partial_t \left( \psi_k^* \theta(R_1 - \rho) \theta(z - Z_1) \Psi \right) \]

\[ = -\frac{i}{2} \int_0^T dt \int dV \psi_k^* \left[ \rho^{-1} \partial_\rho \rho \partial_\rho + \partial_z^2 + 2iA(t) \partial_z \theta(R_1 - \rho) \theta(z - Z_1) \right] \Psi \]

\[ = \frac{i}{2} \int_0^T dt \int dV \psi_k^* \left( \theta(z - Z_1) \left( \Psi \partial_\rho \delta(R_1 - \rho) + 2(\partial_\rho \Psi) \delta(R_1 - \rho) + \rho^{-1} \Psi \delta(R_1 - \rho) \right) \right. \]

\[ \left. - \theta(R_1 - \rho) \left( \Psi \partial_\rho \delta(z - Z_1) + 2(\partial_\rho \Psi) \delta(z - Z_1) + 2iA(t) \Psi \delta(z - Z_1) \right) \right) \]

\[ = \frac{i}{2} \int_0^T dt \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_{Z_1}^{\infty} dz \left( -\partial_\rho (\rho \psi_k^* \Psi) + 2 \rho \psi_k^* (\partial_\rho \Psi) + \psi_k^* \Psi \right) \big|_{\rho = R_1} \]

\[ - \int_0^{R_1} \rho d\rho \left( -\partial_z (\psi_k^* \Psi) + 2 \psi_k^* (\partial_z \Psi) + 2iA(t) \psi_k^* \Psi \right) \big|_{z = Z_1}. \]  

(D2)
The second term is, analogously,

\[
s_2(k_p, k_z) = \frac{i}{2} \int_0^T dt \int_{0}^{2\pi} d\varphi \left( \int_{-\infty}^{Z_1} dz \left(-\partial_\rho (\rho \psi_k^\ast \Psi) + 2 \rho \psi_k^\ast (\partial_\rho \Psi) + \psi_k^\ast \Psi \right) \big|_{\rho = R_1} + \int_{0}^{R_1} \rho \ d\rho \left(-\partial_z (\psi_k^\ast \Psi) + 2 \psi_k^\ast (\partial_z \Psi) + 2i A(t) \psi_k^\ast \Psi \right) \big|_{z = -Z_1} \right),
\]

and

\[
s_3(k_p, k_z) = \int_0^T dt \int dV \partial_\rho \left( \psi_k^\ast \theta (\rho - R_1) \Psi \right)
= -\frac{i}{2} \int_0^T dt \int_{0}^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz \left(-\partial_\rho (\rho \psi_k^\ast \Psi) + 2 \rho \psi_k^\ast (\partial_\rho \Psi) + \psi_k^\ast \Psi \right) \big|_{\rho = R_1}.
\]

Inserting the Volkov wavefunction

\[
\psi_k(\rho, z, t) = (2\pi)^{-3/2} e^{-i\alpha(t) + ik_z z + i k_p \rho \cos \varphi}, \quad \alpha(t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t dt^\prime [k^2 + 2k_z A(t^\prime)]
\]

and collecting all integrals over \( z \) in \( s_3' \) such that \( s_1' + s_2' + s_3' = s_1 + s_2 + s_3 \) yields

\[
s_1'(k_p, k_z) = -\frac{i}{2} (2\pi)^{-1/2} e^{-ik_z Z_1} \int_0^T dt e^{i\alpha(t)} \int_{0}^{R_1} \rho \ d\rho J_0(k_p \rho) (ik_z \Psi + \partial_z \Psi + 2i A \Psi) \big|_{z = Z_1},
\]

\[
s_2'(k_p, k_z) = \frac{i}{2} (2\pi)^{-1/2} e^{ik_z Z_1} \int_0^T dt e^{i\alpha(t)} \int_{0}^{R_1} \rho \ d\rho J_0(k_p \rho) (ik_z \Psi + \partial_z \Psi + 2i A \Psi) \big|_{z = -Z_1},
\]

and

\[
s_3'(k_p, k_z) = -\frac{i}{2} (2\pi)^{-1/2} R_1 \int_0^T dt e^{i\alpha(t)} \int_{Z_1}^{Z_1} dz e^{-ik_z z} (\Psi k_p J_1(k_p R_1) + J_0(k_p R_1) \partial_z \Psi) \big|_{\rho = R_1}.
\]

where \( J_0 \) and \( J_1 \) are Bessel functions of the first kind. Denoting the Fourier transform

\[
\Psi(\rho, k_z, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz e^{-ik_z z} \Psi(\rho, z, t)
\]

and the Hankel transform

\[
\Psi(k_p, z, t) = \int_{0}^{R_1} d\rho \rho J_0(k_p \rho) \Psi(\rho, z, t)
\]

the approximation of the probability amplitude reads

\[
s_1 + s_2 + s_3 = -\frac{i}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^T dt e^{i\alpha(t)} \left( e^{-ik_z Z_1} (ik_z + \partial_z + 2i A) \Psi(\rho, z, t) \big|_{z = Z_1} - e^{ik_z Z_1} (ik_z + \partial_z + 2i A) \Psi(\rho, z, t) \big|_{z = -Z_1} + R_1 (k_p J_1(k_p R_1) + J_0(k_p R_1) \partial_z) \Psi(\rho, z, t) \big|_{\rho = R_1} \right).
\]

The GSL \[23\] was used for the Hankel transform and the Bessel functions.

In order to suppress spurious effects introduced by the finite time \( T \) in the t-SURFF time integrals a Hanning window

\[
H(t) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } t < T/2 \\
[1 - \cos(2\pi t/T)]/2 & \text{if } t \geq T/2
\end{cases}
\]

was multiplied to the integrands \[B6\], \[C1\], and \[D11\].

## TABLE I. Parameters for the numerical simulations. All values in atomic units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Spatial grid</th>
<th>t-SURFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>$\Delta x = 0.1, \Delta R = 0.01,$</td>
<td>$X_{DI} = 110$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x \in [-300, 300), R \in (0, 20]$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fixed $R$ (1D)</td>
<td>$\Delta x = 0.1, x \in [-300, 300)$</td>
<td>$X_I = 100$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fixed $R$ (3D)</td>
<td>$\Delta z = 0.1, z \in [-200, 200)$</td>
<td>$Z_I = 150$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta \rho = 0.05, \rho \in (0, 100]$</td>
<td>$R_I = 50$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all simulations: $\Delta t = 0.0125, T = 3T_p$.

---


