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Abstract

Photoelectron circular dichroism results from one-photon ionization of chiral molecules by circularly polarized light and manifests itself in forward-backward asymmetry of electron emission in the direction orthogonal to the light polarization plane. What is the physical mechanism underlying asymmetric electron ejection? How “which way” information builds up in a chiral molecule and maps into forward-backward asymmetry?

We introduce instances of bound chiral wave functions resulting from stationary superpositions of states in a hydrogen atom and use them to show that the chiral response in one-photon ionization of aligned molecular ensembles originates from two propensity rules: (i) Sensitivity of ionization to the sense of electron rotation in the polarization plane. (ii) Sensitivity of ionization to the direction of charge displacement or stationary current orthogonal to the polarization plane. In the companion paper [1] we show how the ideas presented here are part of a broader picture valid for all chiral molecules and arbitrary degrees of molecular alignment.
I. INTRODUCTION

Photoelectron circular dichroism (PECD) [2–4] heralded the “dipole-approximation revolution” in chiral discrimination: chiral discrimination without using chiral light. PECD belongs to a family of methods exciting rotational [5–8], electronic, and vibronic [9, 10] chiral dynamics without relying on weak interactions with magnetic fields. In all these methods the chiral response arises already in the dipole approximation and is significantly higher than in conventional techniques, such as e.g. absorption circular dichroism or optical rotation, known since the XIX century (see e.g. [11]). The connection between all dipole-approximation-based methods is analyzed in [12]. In PECD, ionization with circularly polarized light of a non-racemic mixture of randomly-oriented chiral molecules results in a forward-backward asymmetry (FBA) in the photoelectron angular distribution (PAD) and is a very sensitive probe of photoionization dynamics and of molecular structure and conformation [13, 14]. PECD yields a chiral response as high as few tens of percent of the total signal and the method is quickly expanding from the realm of fundamental research to innovative applications, becoming a new tool in analytical chemistry [15–17]. PECD is studied extensively both experimentally [4, 18–44] and theoretically [2, 3, 12, 45–57] and was recently pioneered in the multiphoton [58–67], pump-probe [68], and strong-field ionization regimes [69, 70].

Here we focus on the physical mechanisms underlying the chiral response in one-photon ionization at the level of electrons and introduce “elementary chiral instances” - chiral electronic wave functions of the hydrogen atom.

In molecules, with the exception of the ground electronic state, the chiral configuration of the nuclei is not a prerequisite for obtaining a chiral electronic wave function. Thus, one may consider using a laser field to imprint chirality on the electronic wave
function of an achiral nuclear configuration. The ability to create a chiral electronic wave function in an atom via a laser field implies the possibility of creating perfectly oriented (and even stationary) ensembles of \textit{synthetic chiral molecules} (atoms with chiral electronic wave functions) with a well defined handedness in a time-resolved fashion from an initially isotropic ensemble of atoms. Such time-resolved chiral control may open new possibilities in the fields of enantiomeric recognition and enrichment if the ensemble of synthetic chiral atoms is made to interact with actual chiral molecules. From a more fundamental point of view, the elementary chiral instances could be excited in atoms arranged in a lattice of arbitrary symmetry to explore an interplay of electronic chirality and lattice symmetry possibly leading to interesting synthetic chiral phases of matter.

We first introduce three different classes of chiral bound states. The first class is characterized by the presence of a permanent dipole and a planar stationary current. The second class is characterized by the presence of a stationary helical current. The third class of states does not possess any currents, but is characterized by a helical electron density which can be decomposed into two helical currents flowing in opposite directions. In all cases the chiral structure of the electronic state can be characterized by a combination of two directions: rotation in the plane and displacement orthogonal to it (see Fig. 1, inset). Taking advantage of the simplicity of the hydrogenic chiral states representing each of these classes, we illustrate general mechanisms that may lead to PECD in aligned chiral molecules.

Specifically, we aim to answer the following questions: First, which molecular property determines the sign of the forward-backward asymmetry for a given chiral molecule? Second, how does this sign depend on the ionization regime? Here we focus on one-photon ionization. The case of strong-field ionization will be considered in a forthcoming publication.
The approach that we developed to answer these questions is outlined in Sec. II. In Sec. III we introduce the chiral hydrogenic states. In Sec. IV we focus on physical mechanisms underlying PECD in aligned molecules. In Sec. V we discuss the extension of our analysis to electronic chiral states in molecules. In the companion paper [1] we show that optical propensity rules also underlie the emergence of the chiral response in photoionization in the general case of arbitrary chiral molecules and arbitrary degree of molecular alignment, and we also expose the link between the chiral response in aligned and unaligned molecular ensembles. Section VI concludes this paper.

II. A SIMPLE QUANTUM MODEL FOR THE SIGN OF THE FBA

What is the mechanism behind the sign of the FBA in the aligned case? Important insight into the answer to this question can be gained from the analogy presented by Powis in section II.B.1 of Ref. [13] between PECD and the motion of a nut (which plays the role of an electron) on a threaded rod (which plays the role of the enantiomer) produced by a hand that rotates the nut (which plays the role of the field). If we rotate the nut clockwise/counterclockwise then the nut will move forward/backward. If we now take the opposite orientation of the same threaded rod and rotate the nut clockwise/counterclockwise again, it will move forward/backward again. Clearly, for a threaded rod of the opposite handedness the relation between the directions of rotation and displacement of the nut will be reversed.

Powis’s classical analogy not only illustrates the essence of all enantiosensitive electric-dipole-based methods, namely that a helix converts rotational motion into translation perpendicular to the rotation plane, but also brings to our attention the independence between handedness and orientation, which underlies the existence of
an asymmetry that doesn’t cancel upon averaging over two opposite orientations of the helix. This classical analogy relies on the electron scattering from the chiral molecular potential, which provides such a helix. Here we disentangle the role of the molecular potential and the chirality of the electronic bound state and focus on the latter. We provide a simple quantum model of PECD in aligned molecules which relies exclusively on the chirality of the initial wave function, and where the sign of the FBA is a consequence of robust propensity rules for the bound-unbound transition.

First we will introduce and characterize elementary instances of bound chiral wave functions whose defining feature is that they are superpositions of angular states involving different angular momentum quantum numbers in a specific pattern. For the sake of simplicity the radial parts accompanying these angular states will be chosen to be those of the hydrogen atom, so that we will be dealing with superpositions of hydrogenic states (Sec. III). Then, we will use these bound wave functions as models for the electronic wave function of a chiral molecule and we will calculate the average photoelectron current resulting from an aligned ensemble of such wave functions in Sec. IV. Again, for simplicity, but also to keep our calculations exact within our assumptions, the continuum scattering state in these calculations will be that of the hydrogen atom. We will analyze the resulting FBA in the calculated PADs and explain it in terms of propensity rules relying on generic features of the initial and final states, such as probability currents and polarization.

An isotropic continuum such as that of the hydrogen atom cannot yield a FBA in an isotropically oriented ensemble (see [71] and Appendix VIII A), because in this case the continuum is not able to keep track of the molecular orientations and therefore the information about the chirality of the bound state is completely washed out by the isotropic orientation averaging. However, this does not rule out the emergence
of the FBA in an aligned ensemble, where only a restricted set of orientations comes into play. Therefore, the fact that we use an isotropic continuum shall not affect our discussion on the origins of PECD in any way beyond what is already obvious, namely, that our model relies fully on the chirality of the bound state and therefore the FBA in our model will vanish in the isotropically oriented case.

III. HYDROGENIC CHIRAL WAVE FUNCTIONS

We will describe three types of hydrogenic chiral wave functions. The first type (p-type) is of the form

$$|\chi_{p}^{\pm}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|3p_{\pm1}\rangle + |3d_{\pm1}\rangle), \quad (1)$$

where $|nl_{m}\rangle$ denotes a hydrogenic state with principal quantum number $n$, angular momentum $l$, and magnetic quantum number $m$. $\chi_{p}^{+}(\vec{r})$ is shown in Fig. 1. The superposition of states with even and odd values of $l$ breaks the inversion symmetry and leads to a wave function polarized (hence the subscript $p$) along the $z$ axis, which is indicated by an arrow pointing down in Fig. 1. $m = \pm 1$ implies a probability current in the azimuthal direction\(^1\), and is indicated by a circular arrow in Fig. 1. The combination of these two features results in a chiral wave function, as is evident from its compound symbol. The sign of $m$ determines the enantiomer and, as usual, the two enantiomers are related to each other through a reflection; in this case, across the $x = 0$ plane, as follows from the symmetry of spherical harmonics\(^2\).

\(^1\) In general, for a wave function $\psi(\vec{r}) = |\psi(\vec{r})| e^{i\xi(\vec{r})}$ describing a particle of mass $m$, the probability current is given by $\vec{j} = \frac{\hbar}{m} |\psi(\vec{r})|^2 \nabla \xi(\vec{r})$, which means that the gradient of the phase of the wave function in coordinate space indicates the direction of the probability current.

\(^2\) We could have also defined opposite enantiomers through an inversion, and in this case instead of changing $m$ we would change the relative sign between $|3p_{1}\rangle$ and $|3d_{1}\rangle$. Both definitions of the opposite enantiomer are equivalent and are related to each other via a rotation.
Figure 1. Top: cut of $\chi_p^+ (\vec{r})$ [Eq. (1)] on the $y = 0$ plane. Bottom: isosurface $|\chi_p^+ (\vec{r})| = 0.01$ a.u. colored according to the phase. The symbol on the upper left corner indicates the polarization of the density (vertical arrow) and the probability current in the azimuthal direction (curved arrow).

The second type (c-type) is given by

$$|\chi_c^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |3p_{\pm 1}\rangle + i |3d_{\pm 1}\rangle \right),$$

(2)

which differs from $|\chi_p\rangle$ only in the imaginary coefficient in front of $|3d_{\pm 1}\rangle$. At first sight, since $\langle \vec{r}|3p_{\pm 1}\rangle$ and $\langle \vec{r}|3d_{\pm 1}\rangle$ are complex functions, one would not expect important differences between $p$ and $c$ states, however, as shown in Fig. 2, the $p$ and $c$ states are qualitatively different. We can see that instead of the polarization along
Figure 2. Top: cut of $\chi_{\sigma}^{+}(\vec{r})$ [Eq. (2)] on the $y = 0$ plane. The black lines indicate the contours of $|\chi_{\sigma}^{+}(\vec{r})|$ while the colors indicate its phase. The white arrows indicate the component of the probability current in the $y = 0$ plane. Bottom: isosurfaces $|\chi_{\sigma}^{+}(\vec{r})| = 0.005$ a.u. (left) and $|\chi_{\sigma}^{+}(\vec{r})| = 0.011$ a.u. (right) colored according to the phase.

Figure 3. Trajectory followed by an element of the probability fluid $|\chi_{\sigma}^{+}(\vec{r})|^2$ [Eq. (2)].
there is probability current circulating around a nodal circle of radius 6 a.u. in the $z = 0$ plane, as indicated by the two circular arrows in Fig. 2. Analogously to the p states, where the polarization of the probability density is determined by the relative sign between $|3p_{\pm1}\rangle$ and $|3d_{\pm1}\rangle$, in the c states the direction of the probability current is determined by the relative sign between $|3p_{\pm1}\rangle$ and $i|3d_{\pm1}\rangle$. This vertical current combined with the horizontal current in the azimuthal direction due to $m = \pm1$ leads to a chiral probability current (hence the c subscript), visualized in Fig. 3 via the trajectory followed by an element of the probability fluid $|\chi_c^+|^2$. This single trajectory (also known as a streamline in the context of fluids) clearly shows how, although pure helical motion of the electron is not compatible with a bound state, helical motion can still take place in a bound state via opposite helicities in the inner and outer regions. As can be inferred from the cut of $\chi_c^+(\vec{r})$ in the $y = 0$ plane (Fig. 2), trajectories passing far from the nodal circle, like that shown in Fig. 3, circulate faster in the azimuthal direction than around the nodal circle while those close to the nodal circle have the opposite behavior and look like the wire in a toroidal solenoid. Interestingly, a probability current with the same topology was found in Ref. [72] when analyzing the effect of the (chiral) weak interaction on the hydrogenic state $2p_{1/2}$.

So far we have only considered wave functions with achiral probability densities whose chirality relies on non-zero probability currents. The helical phase structure of $\chi_c^+(\vec{r})$ (see Fig. 2) suggests that we can construct a wave function $\chi_c^\rho(\vec{r})$ with chiral probability density (hence the subscript $\rho$) by taking the real part of $\chi_c^c(\vec{r})$, i.e.

$$\chi_c^\rho(\vec{r}) = \text{Re}(\chi_c^c(\vec{r}))$$

Although for simplicity we use the adjectives vertical and horizontal, we should use instead polar and azimuthal, respectively, to be rigorous.

We will say that a point is in the inner/outer region if the $z$ component of its probability current is positive/negative.
\[ |\chi^\pm_{\rho} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\chi^\pm_c \rangle + \text{c.c.}) \] (3)

\[ = \frac{1}{2} (|3p_{\pm1} \rangle + i|3d_{\pm1} \rangle - |3p_{\mp1} \rangle + i|3d_{\mp1} \rangle) \]

\[ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [\mp|3p_x \rangle + |3d_{yz} \rangle]. \]

It turns out that this wave function is not chiral. Nevertheless, increasing the \( l \) values by one results in the wave function we are looking for\(^5\). The third type (\( \rho \)-type) of chiral wave function is given by

\[ |\chi^\pm_{\rho(421)} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\chi^\pm_{c(421)} \rangle + \text{c.c.}) \] (4)

\[ = \frac{1}{2} (|4d_{\pm1} \rangle + i|4f_{\pm1} \rangle - |4d_{\mp1} \rangle + i|4f_{\mp1} \rangle) \]

\[ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\mp|4d_{x^2} \rangle + |4f_{yz} \rangle) \]

and is shown in Fig. 5 for \( m = 1 \). In Eq. (4) we introduced the notation

\[ |\chi^\pm_{p(nl|\pm m|)} \rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|n, l, \pm m \rangle + |n, l + 1, \pm m \rangle) \] (5)

\[ |\chi^\pm_{c(nl|m|)} \rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|n, l, \pm m \rangle + i|n, l + 1, \pm m \rangle) \] (6)

---

\(^5\) It is also possible to obtain a chiral \( \rho \) state without increasing the value of \( l \) by replacing the \( c \) state in Eq. (3) by a superposition of the \( p \) [Eq. (1)] and \( c \) [Eq. (2)] states. However, the resulting state is less symmetric and does not provide any more insight than the one obtained in Eq. (4) so we decided to skip it for now in favor of clarity. It will be considered in Sec. V.
Figure 4. Top: cut of $\chi^{+}_{c(421)}(\vec{r})$ [Eq. (6)] on the $y = 0$ plane. The black lines indicate the contours of $|\chi^{+}_{c(421)}(\vec{r})|$ while the colors indicate its phase. Bottom: isosurfaces $|\chi^{+}_{c(421)}(\vec{r})| = 0.001$ a.u. (left) and $|\chi^{+}_{c(421)}(\vec{r})| = 0.004$ a.u. (right) colored according to the phase.

\[
|\chi^{\pm}_{\rho(nd|m)}\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |\chi^{\pm}_{c,(nd|m)}\rangle + \text{c.c.} \right), \quad l \geq 2,
\] (7)

which includes straightforward modifications to the simplest cases in Eqs. (1), (2), and (4) that we have already considered. Figure 4 shows $\chi^{+}_{c(421)}(\vec{r})$, which was used in Eq. (4), and Figs. 6 and 7 the $m = 2$ variations $\chi^{+}_{c(422)}(\vec{r})$ and $\chi^{+}_{\rho(422)}(\vec{r}) = (\langle \vec{r}|4d_{x^2-y^2} \rangle - \langle \vec{r}|4f_{xyz} \rangle) / \sqrt{2}$, which will be used for the analysis of PECD in the next subsection. As can be seen in Figs. 5 and 7, like the $c$ states, the $\rho$ states also have helical structures of opposite handedness in the inner and outer regions.

Interestingly, when plotted as in Fig. 7, the states $\chi^{\pm}_{\rho(l+1,l,l)}(\vec{r})$ form a topological structure known as torus link with linking number $\pm l$. 
The $\rho$ states are particularly meaningful because they mimic the electronic ground state of an actual chiral molecule in the sense that unlike the $p$ and the $c$ states, their chirality is completely encoded in the probability density and does not rely on probability currents. The decomposition of $\rho$ states into $c$ states is the chiral analogue of the decomposition of a standing wave into two waves traveling in opposite directions, and, as we shall see in the next subsection, it will provide the corresponding advantages.

Finally, note that according to Barron’s definition of true and false chirality [73], the $p$ states display false chirality because a time reversal yields the opposite enantiomer, while the $c$ and $\rho$ states display true chirality because a time-reversal yields the same enantiomer.
Figure 6. Top: cut of $\chi^+_{c(422)}(\vec{r})$ [Eq. (6)] on the $y = 0$ plane. Bottom: isosurfaces $|\chi^+_{c(422)}(\vec{r})| = 0.003$ a.u. (left) and $|\chi^+_{c(422)}(\vec{r})| = 0.005$ a.u. (right) colored according to the phase.

Figure 7. Isosurfaces $|\chi^+_{p(422)}(\vec{r})| = \pm 0.001$ a.u. (left) and $|\chi^+_{p(422)}(\vec{r})| = \pm 0.006$ a.u. (right) [Eq. (7)] viewed along the $x$ (top) and $z$ (bottom) axes.
Figure 8. Absolute value (top) and phase (bottom) of the scattering wave function $\psi_k^{(-)}$ [Eq. (8)] evaluated in a plane containing $\vec{k}$ for $k = 0.3$ a.u. $r_\parallel$ and $r_\perp$ are the coordinates parallel and perpendicular to $\vec{k}$, respectively.

IV. THE SIGN OF THE FORWARD-BACKWARD ASYMMETRY IN ALIGNED CHIRAL HYDROGEN

Now we consider photoionization from the chiral bound states just introduced via circularly polarized light. For this, we require the scattering wave function $\psi_k^{(-)}$. In the case of hydrogen, this wave function is known analytically [74] and can be expanded into partial waves as
\[
\psi_k^{(-)}(\vec{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-l}^{l} i^l e^{i\sigma_l} R_{E,l}(r) Y_l^m(\vec{r}) Y_l^{m*}(\hat{k}), \quad (8)
\]

where \(\psi_k^{(-)}\) is \(k\)-normalized, \(\sigma_l = \arg \left[ \Gamma \left( l + 1 + i \frac{Z}{k} \right) \right]\), and \(R_{E,l}\) is the energy-normalized, real, and spherically symmetric Coulomb wave function

\[
R_{E,l}(r) = (2Kr)^l \frac{1}{(2l+1)!} \sqrt{\frac{2k}{\pi}} \left| \Gamma \left( l + 1 - i \frac{Z}{k} \right) \right| e^{\frac{Z}{r} \pi/2 \left( l + 1 - i \frac{Z}{k} \right)}
\times \frac{\Gamma \left( l + 1 + i \frac{Z}{k} \right)}{\Gamma \left( 2l + 2 \right)} \, _1F_1 \left( l + 1 + i \frac{Z}{k}; 2l + 2; 2iKr \right). \quad (9)
\]

\(\psi_k^{(-)}(\vec{r})\) has cylindrical symmetry with respect to \(\vec{k}\) and is shown in Fig. 8 for \(k = 0.3\) a.u. in a plane containing \(\vec{k}\). Since only hydrogenic functions are involved, the calculation of the transition dipole matrix element \(\langle \psi_k^{(-)}|\vec{r}|\chi \rangle\) can be carried out analytically. The angular integrals reduce to 3-j symbols [75] and the radial integrals can be calculated using the method of contour integration described in [74].

The angle-integrated photoelectron current \(\vec{j}(k)\) can be extracted from the angular and energy dependent ionization probability \(W_\sigma \equiv |\langle \psi_k^{(-)}|\vec{r} \cdot \vec{E}_\sigma |\chi \rangle|^2\) as follows (see also Ref. [12]). First we do a partial wave expansion of \(W_\sigma\),

\[
W_\sigma(\vec{k}) = \sum_{l,m} b_{l,m}(k, \sigma) Y_l^m(\hat{k}), \quad (10)
\]

and then we replace it in the expression for the \(z\) component of the angle-integrated photoelectron current,
\[ j_z (k, \sigma) = \int \, d\Omega_k W_\sigma (\hat{k}) k_z \]
\[ = \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{3}} k \sum_{l,m} b_{l,m} (k, \sigma) \int \, d\Omega_k Y^m_l (\hat{k}) Y^0_1 (\hat{k}) \]
\[ = \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{3}} k b_{1,0} (k, \sigma). \] (11)

For normalization purposes, one can also consider the radial component of the angle-integrated photoelectron current, which yields

\[ j_r (k, \sigma) = \int \, d\Omega_k W_\sigma (\hat{k}) k \]
\[ = \sqrt{4\pi} k \sum_{l,m} b_{l,m} (k, \sigma) \int \, d\Omega_k Y^m_l (\hat{k}) Y^0_0 (\hat{k}) \]
\[ = \sqrt{4\pi} k b_{0,0} (k, \sigma). \] (12)

Fig. 9 shows \( j_z (k, \sigma) \) for the case of photoionization from the initial states \( |\chi_{p(311)}^\pm\rangle \) [see Eq. (1)] with their \( z \) molecular axis perpendicular to the plane of polarization of the ionizing light. Fig. 9 (b) clearly shows two features. First, \( j_z \) is correlated with the direction of the bound electronic polarization, indicated by the black vertical arrows in the diagrams listed in Fig. 9 (a). When the electronic polarization points up, \( j_z \) is positive and when it points down, \( j_z \) is negative, irrespectively of enantiomer or light polarization. In fact, this correlation between the polarization and the sign of \( j_z \) stays the same even for linearly polarized light, or when we remove the bound circular electronic current of the \( \chi_{p}^\pm \) states by setting \( m = 0 \). In other words, the sign of \( j_z \) is determined exclusively by the electronic polarization and is independent of the circular electronic current and of the light polarization. Second, Fig. 9 (b) shows that the magnitude of \( j_z \) is correlated with the relative direction between the
Figure 9. Photoelectron current along z as a function of photoelectron momentum resulting from photoionization of a p-type chiral state [see Eq. (5)] via light circularly polarized in the xy plane. (a) Diagrams indicating the electronic polarization (vertical arrow) and the electronic current (circular arrow) in the p-type chiral states for two opposite enantiomers and two opposite orientations. $\hat{R}_x^\pi$ is the operator that rotates the wave function by $\pi$ radians around the x axis. (b) Photoelectron current [Eq. (11)] for different enantiomer, orientation, and light polarization combinations. The enantiomer and its orientation is indicated by the diagrams explained in (a), and the light polarization is indicated by the circular arrows after the plus signs. Note that the sign of $j_z$ is determined by the direction of the electronic polarization and that the magnitude of $j_z$ is determined by the relative direction between the electronic current and the light polarization. (c) Photoelectron current averaged over two opposite orientations (equivalent to the aligned case) for different combinations of enantiomer and light polarization. There is no cancellation of the asymmetry because for one orientation the bound electron co-rotates with the field, while for the opposite orientation it counter-rotates. The calculations shown are for the states $\chi_{p(311)}^\pm$ but the conclusions are valid for any $\chi_{p(nlm)}^\pm$ state.
Figure 10. Total photoelectron current resulting from photoionization of a p-type chiral state [see Eq. (5)] via light circularly polarized in the xy plane for different enantiomer, orientation, and light polarization combinations. Diagrams are explained in Fig. 9 (a). Only the relative direction between the bound electronic current and the rotating electric field determines $j_r$. The calculations shown are for the states $\chi_{p(311)}^{\pm}$ but the conclusions are valid for any $\chi_{p(nlm)}^{\pm}$ state.

bound electronic current, indicated by the green circular arrows in the diagrams listed in Fig. 9 (a), and the light polarization, indicated by the blue and red circular arrows. $|j_z|$ is larger when the bound electronic current and the electric field rotate in the same direction, in comparison to when they rotate in opposite directions, irrespectively of enantiomer and electronic polarization direction. In fact, the relative direction between the bound electronic current and the light polarization does not only determine the magnitude of $j_z$ but that of $j_r$, the angle-integrated magnitude of the photoelectron current, as shown in Fig. 10.

Although the numerical results presented in Figs. 9 and 10 are specific to the states $\chi_{p(nlm)}^{\pm}$ with $(nlm) = (311)$, we have checked that the correlations we pointed out are always the same for any other $(nlm)$ values. That is, we have two propensity rules for the photoionization of $\chi_{p(nlm)}^{\pm}$ states when their orientation is perpendicular
Figure 11. Same as Fig. 9 but for the c-type chiral states [see Eq. (6)]. The role played by the electronic polarization in the p-type states is replaced by the vertical component of the probability current in the inner region in the c-type states. The results in (c) are also valid for photoionization from ρ-type chiral states (see text). The calculations shown are for the states $\chi_{c(422)}^\pm$ but the conclusions are valid for any $\chi_{c(nlm)}^\pm$ state.

to the light polarization plane: (i) the direction of $j_z$ is determined by the electronic polarization direction of $\chi_{p(nlm)}^\pm$ and (ii) the magnitude of $j_r$ (and as a consequence also that of $j_z$) is bigger when the bound electron rotates in the same direction as the electric field in comparison to when they rotate in opposite directions. The first propensity rule is a consequence of the non-plane-wave nature of the continuum wave function $\psi^\pm_k (\vec{r})$ (see Fig. 8), which resembles a bound polarized structure and leads to improved overlap between $\psi^\pm_k (\vec{r})$ and $\chi_{p(nlm)}^\pm (\vec{r})$ in the dipole matrix element when the direction of electronic polarization and the direction of the photoelectron coincide.
as compared to when they are opposite to each other. The polarized structure of
\( \psi_{k}^{(\pm)}(\vec{r}) \) decays monotonously with increasing \( k \) and vanishes in the plane-wave limit, which explains the monotonous decay of \( j_z(k) \). The second propensity rule is well known for the atomic case in the 1-photon-absorption regime \[74\]. It can be either read directly from the solution of the angular integrals or it can be deduced from considering the overlap between spherical harmonics.

In the aligned case, thanks to the vector nature of the photoelectron current, it is enough to consider only two opposite orientations (see Sec. III in our companion paper \[1\]). In view of the first propensity rule we have that for the two opposite orientations the polarization will point in opposite directions and therefore \( j_z \) will have opposite signs. However, since for opposite orientations the bound electron current also rotates in opposite directions while the light polarization remains fixed, the magnitude of \( j_z \) will be different for each orientation, thus avoiding a complete cancellation of the asymmetry. Furthermore, as can be seen in Fig. 9 (c), the sign of the orientation-averaged \( j_z \) will be that of the orientation where the electron co-rotates with the electric field of the light. That is, the propensity rule for the aligned case says that the total photoelectron current \( \vec{j} = j_z \hat{z} \) will point in the direction of electronic polarization associated to the orientation where the bound electronic current co-rotates with the ionizing electric field.

A similar analysis can be carried out for the case of photoionization from the initial states \( |\chi^{\pm}_{c(nlm)}\rangle \), shown in Fig. 11 for the specific case where \( (nlm) = (422) \) but valid for any other values of \( (nlm) \). The only difference is that in this case the role which was played by the electronic polarization in the p-type states is now played by the vertical component of the electronic current in the inner region. Like before, this result can be understood by considering the overlap between the initial and final states. The polarized structure of the continuum state determines the region
contributing more to the dipole matrix element (see $|\psi_k^{-}(\vec{r})|)$ in Fig. 8) and the relative direction between the probability currents in the initial and final states in this region determines the amount of overlap. When the direction of the probability current of $\chi_{c(nlm)}^{+}(\vec{r})$ in the inner region (which is where $|\psi_k^{(-)}(\vec{r})|$ is greatest) is parallel to the direction of $\vec{k}$ the overlap is maximized. Therefore, the propensity rule in this case is that the sign of $j_z$ is positive/negative when the vertical component of the electronic current in the inner region points up/down. The non-monotonous behavior of $j_z$ as a function of $k$ obeys the fact that this propensity rule not only relies on the polarized nature of $|\psi_k^{(-)}(\vec{r})|$, but also on the direction of the continuum probability current, therefore, for $k \rightarrow 0$, although the density of the continuum state is maximally polarized, its probability current tends to zero, rendering it unable to distinguish the direction of the probability current of the bound state, which is the feature responsible for the FBA in the first place. At an intermediate photoelectron momentum $k \approx 0.1$ a.u. the probability current of the continuum state matches that of the bound state and the sensitivity of the continuum state to the direction of the probability current of the bound state is optimal. For larger values of $k$, the match worsens and the continuum also becomes less and less polarized leading to a monotonic decay of the FBA. The other propensity rule regarding the relative rotation of the bound current and the electric field remains the same and, again, the contributions from opposite orientations to $j_z$ do not completely cancel each other.

In the case where the photoionization takes place from the states $|\chi_{\rho(nlm)}^{\pm}\rangle$ [see Eq. (7)], there is neither any probability current nor any net polarization that we can rely on. Furthermore, one can see from Figs. (5) and (7) that the wave function $\chi_{\rho(nlm)}^{\pm}(\vec{r})$ is invariant with respect to rotations by $\pi$ either around the $x$ or the $y$ axis, so that $j_z$ is the same for both orientations. Thus the situation appears to be quite different from what we had for the states $|\chi_{c(nlm)}^{\pm}\rangle$ and $|\chi_{\rho(nlm)}^{\pm}\rangle$. However, we know that the
chiral probability density of $|\chi^\pm_{\rho(nlm)}\rangle$ is the result of the superposition of the chiral currents from $|\chi^\pm_{c(nlm)}\rangle$ and its complex conjugate, and we also know that the latter is simply the time-reversed version of the former. In other words, in the complex conjugate version the probability current flows backwards, so that if $|\chi^\pm_{c(nlm)}\rangle$ displays a probability current circulating counterclockwise(+)/clockwise(-) around $z$, then $|\chi^\pm_{c(nlm)}\rangle$ displays a probability current circulating clockwise(+) / counterclockwise(-) around $z$. And if $|\chi^\pm_{c(nlm)}\rangle$ displays a probability current moving upwards/downwards in the inner/outer region, then $|\chi^\pm_{c(nlm)}\rangle$ displays a probability current moving downwards/upwards in the inner/outer region. Therefore, when we subject $|\chi^\pm_{\rho(nlm)}\rangle$ to a field circularly polarized in the $xy$ plane, one part of $|\chi^\pm_{\rho(nlm)}\rangle$ will be counter-rotating and the other part will be co-rotating with the field. One part will have an upwards vertical current in the inner region and the other will have a downwards vertical current in the inner region. Thus the situation for a single orientation of $|\chi^\pm_{\rho(nlm)}\rangle$ is very similar to what we had before when we considered two opposite orientations of $|\chi^\pm_{c(nlm)}\rangle$. In fact, as shown in Appendix VIII B, both situations are exactly equivalent in the case of an isotropic continuum like that of hydrogen. That is, the $z$ component of the photoelectron current resulting from photoionization from the state $|\chi^\pm_{\rho(nlm)}\rangle$ is equal to that obtained from $|\chi^\pm_{c(nlm)}\rangle$ after averaging over two opposite orientations. The results plotted in Fig. 11 (c) are not only those obtained for $|\chi^\pm_{c(422)}\rangle$, but also those obtained for $|\chi^\pm_{\rho(422)}\rangle$. This shows that although the $\rho$-type states do not display any bound probability current, we can still make sense of the sign of the FBA displayed by their PAD through their decomposition into $c$-type states.

The consideration of these three families of chiral states shows us that the FBA in the aligned case with the $z$ molecular axis perpendicular to the light polarization plane emerges from two propensity rules valid for each orientation. One rule determines the direction of the asymmetry, and the other determines its magnitude. For the $p$-
and c-type states, the FBA changes sign from one orientation to the opposite, but the magnitude is different for each orientation and therefore the FBA does not cancel exactly when averaging over the two orientations. Instead, the effect of the averaging is to reduce the bigger asymmetry by a certain factor that is almost constant as a function of $k$. Whether the FBA is positive or negative for a given orientation is determined only by the asymmetry of the initial state along the direction perpendicular to the polarization plane and the way in which this asymmetry is picked up by the asymmetry of the scattering state, independently of the light polarization. The rule determining which orientation dominates the signal depends only on the relative direction between the rotation of the field and the rotation of the bound current in the light polarization plane in the initial state. The orientation where the bound electron co-rotates with the electric field dominates the signal. The p- and c-type states possess both asymmetry in the direction perpendicular to the polarization plane and a bound current circulating in the light polarization plane and therefore call for both propensity rules and yield a non-zero FBA even after averaging over the two opposite orientations. Although the $\rho$-type states do not possess neither probability current circulating in the polarization plane nor asymmetry in the direction perpendicular to the polarization plane, they can be decomposed into two parts, one co-rotating with the field and with a given asymmetry, and another counter-rotating with the field and with the opposite asymmetry. This way the $\rho$-type chiral states also call for both propensity rules and display a non-zero FBA.

In the less symmetric cases where the orientation of the molecular $z$ axis is in the $(xy)$ plane of the light polarization, the bound state neither exhibits an asymmetry along the lab $z$ axis nor a circular bound current in the $xy$ plane. However, one can rewrite the molecular frame spherical harmonics (quantized along the lab $x$ axis for example) in terms of lab frame spherical harmonics (quantized along the lab $z$ axis).
Here we yield a part co-rotating with the field and a part counter-rotating with the field. Then, one proceeds analogously as for the $\rho$ state using the same propensity rules we already discussed. An example of this procedure is presented in Appendix VIIIC, and it shows that the cases where either the $x$ or the $y$ molecular axes are aligned (i.e. parallel and anti-parallel) with the lab $z$ axis may yield a FBA of the opposite sign to that obtained when the molecular and lab $z$ axes coincide. This result is to be expected from the fact that the FBA for the isotropically oriented case can be reduced to the six orientations shown in Fig. 2 of the companion paper [1], and the fact that the FBA necessarily vanishes for an isotropic continuum (see Appendix VIIIA) like that of the hydrogen atom, which cannot keep track of the molecular orientation we introduced artificially by rotating the initial wave function.

V. EXTRAPOLATION TO ACTUAL CHIRAL WAVE FUNCTIONS

Our model suggests that the ground state electronic wave function of a real chiral molecule can be treated in a way analogous to the $\rho$-type hydrogenic chiral state. An expansion of the wave function in spherical harmonics will yield a component rotating clockwise coupled to a given asymmetry, a component rotating anti-clockwise coupled to the opposite asymmetry, and a non-rotating component with its own asymmetry. The response of the component co-rotating with the field will be dominant over that of the counter-rotating component, and the asymmetry of the non-rotating component will cancel after averaging over two opposite orientations. However, unlike the states we considered, in the case of actual chiral molecules the expansion will contain several $l$ and $m$ values, and furthermore, the phases between the consecutive $l$ components will not be necessarily zero (p-type states) or $\pi/2$ (c-type states), but any number in between. Although analyzing the impact of these differences is beyond
Figure 12. Normalized photoelectron current [Eqs. (11) and (12)] as a function of photoelectron energy for the states indicated next to each curve for left(+)/right(-) circular polarization. In every case we assume alignment perpendicular to the light polarization plane. The state with three \( l \) components (solid red line) displays a FBA that changes sign as a function of photoelectron energy.

the scope of this work, we will briefly point out some of the consequences that can be inferred from our simple model.

Extending our model to chiral hydrogenic wave functions with more than two different consecutive \( l \) components simply introduces the possibility of having a single wave function with more than one handedness and therefore a FBA which may change sign as a function of energy, a feature seen in actual molecules but absent in the simplest possible chiral wave functions we have presented. Consider for example the p-type wave function with three \( l \) values \( \chi_p = w_p |4p_1\rangle + w_d |4d_1\rangle - w_f |4f_1\rangle \) with \( w_p, w_d, w_f > 0 \). On the one hand the first two terms alone yield polarization pointing down while the two last terms alone yield polarization pointing up. On the other
Figure 13. Normalized photoelectron current [Eqs. (11) and (12)] as a function of photoelectron energy for the states indicated next to each curve for left(+)/right(-) circular polarization. In every case we assume alignment perpendicular to the light polarization plane. The mixed state which contains both a p-like and c-like character (solid red line) displays a FBA that changes sign as a function of photoelectron energy.

On the other hand the scattering wave function will probe differently each \( l \) component of \( \chi_p \) at different energies. Therefore, as shown in Fig. 12, for appropriate weight factors \( w_p \), \( w_d \), and \( w_f \), photoionization from the state \( \chi_p \) yields a FBA which changes sign as a function of energy, reflecting the response from \( w_p |4p_1\rangle + w_d |4d_1\rangle \) at higher energies and the response from \( w_d |4d_1\rangle - w_f |4f_1\rangle \) at lower energies.

Introduction of phases differing from zero or \( \pi/2 \) between consecutive \( l \) components simply means that instead of having a pure p- or a pure c-type state we have a superposition of both. This can also lead to a FBA that changes sign as a function of energy because the behavior of the FBA as a function of energy is different for
p and c states. For example, as shown in Fig. 13, a state \( \chi_{p(311)}^+ + \chi_{c(311)}^+ \) displays a FBA which is negative at lower energies and positive at higher energies, i.e. it reflects the p character at lower energies and the c character at higher energies (see Fig. 13).

As shown in Appendix VIII B, an isotropic continuum does not couple different values of \( m \) in the initial wave function into the FBA and therefore each set of components with a given \( m \) value acts separately on the FBA. Furthermore, the associated Legendre polynomials satisfy \( P_l^m (-\cos \theta) = (-1)^{l+m} P_l^m (\cos \theta) \), which implies that a superposition of \( |l, m\rangle \) and \( |l + 1, m + 1\rangle \) is symmetric with respect to the \( xy \) plane and therefore achiral. Thus, although an anisotropic continuum wave function may couple different \( m \) values in the initial wave function into the resulting FBA, this coupling will not take place for pairs with \( \Delta m = 1 \), but instead for pairs with \( \Delta m = 2 \), which seems to indicate that a strong deviation from an isotropic continuum is required in order to produce considerable \( m \)-coupling effects, not accounted by our model, in the FBA.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have introduced three families of hydrogenic chiral wave functions that serve as basic tools for the analysis of electronic chiral effects. The chirality of these wave functions may be due either to a chiral density, a chiral probability current, or a combination of achiral density and achiral probability current.

We have used the chiral hydrogenic wave functions as a tool to explore the basic physical mechanisms underlying the chiral response in photoionization at the level of electrons. We have shown that two basic photoionization propensity rules determine the sign of the forward-backward asymmetry in photoelectron circular dichroism.
(PECD) in aligned molecules. One propensity rule selects the molecular orientations in which the electron and the electric field rotate in the same direction, and the other propensity rule determines whether the photoelectrons are emitted preferentially forwards or backwards. This simple picture illustrates that the propensity rules lie the heart of photoelectron circular dichroism. In the companion paper [1] we show how these ideas can be extended to the case of randomly oriented molecules, where another layer of effects of geometrical origin add to this simple picture.
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VIII. APPENDIX

A. Vanishing of the FBA for an orientation-independent continuum and an isotropically oriented ensemble

In this appendix we give a simple demonstration that an orientation-independent continuum yields a zero FBA when all molecular orientations are equally likely (see also [71]). Consider the lab-frame orientation-averaged PAD

$$W_{\sigma}(\vec{k}) = \int d\lambda \left| \langle \psi_{\sigma}^{(-)} | \hat{\epsilon}_{\sigma} | \hat{D}(\lambda) \chi \rangle \right|^2,$$

(13)

where $\hat{\epsilon}_{\sigma} \equiv (\hat{x} \pm i\hat{y})$, and $\hat{D}(\lambda)$ is the operator that rotates the bound wave function $\chi(\vec{r})$ by the Euler angles $\lambda \equiv \alpha \beta \gamma$. We assumed that the scattering wave function
\( \psi_k^{(-)}(\vec{r}) \) is independent of the molecular orientation \( \lambda \) and therefore there is no need to rotate it. Here we consider rotations in the active sense, i.e. we always have the same frame of reference (the lab frame) and we rotate the functions. If we expand the bound wave function in spherical harmonics as

\[
\chi(\vec{r}) = \sum_{l,m} u_{l,m}(r) Y^m_l(\hat{r}),
\]

then the rotation operator \( \hat{D}(\lambda) \) acts on \( \chi(\vec{r}) \) through the Wigner D-matrices \( D_{m',m}(\lambda) \) according to

\[
\hat{D}(\lambda) \chi(\vec{r}) = \sum_{l,m,m'} D_{m',m}(\lambda) u_{l,m}(r) Y^{m'}_{l}(\hat{r}) = \sum_{l,m,m'} D_{m',m}(\lambda) \chi_{l,m,m'}(\vec{r}).
\]

Replacing this expansion in the expression for the PAD we obtain

\[
W_\sigma(\vec{k}) = \sum_{l_1,m_1,l_2,m_2} \left[ \int d\lambda D_{m_2,m_1}^{(l_2)*}(\lambda) D_{m_1,m_1}^{(l_1)}(\lambda) \right]
\times \left\langle \psi_k^{(-)}(\vec{r})\mid \hat{\epsilon}_\sigma \mid \chi_{l_2,m_2,m_2} \right\rangle^* \left\langle \psi_k^{(-)}(\vec{r})\mid \hat{\epsilon}_\sigma \mid \chi_{l_1,m_1,m_1} \right\rangle
\times \frac{8\pi^2}{2l_1 + 1} \left| \left\langle \psi_k^{(-)}(\vec{r})\mid \hat{\epsilon}_\sigma \mid \chi_{l_1,m_1,m_1} \right\rangle \right|^2.
\]

where we used the orthogonality relation for the Wigner D-matrices [75]. Now we expand the scattering wave function in spherical harmonics with respect to \( \hat{k} \)

\[
\psi_k^{(-)}(\vec{r}) = \sum_{l,m} \psi_{k,l,m}(\vec{r}) Y^m_l(\hat{k}),
\]

and replace it in the expression for the PAD.
\[
W_{\sigma}(\vec{k}) = \sum_{l,m,l_1,m_1,l',m_1} \frac{8\pi^2}{2l_1 + 1} \left| \langle \psi_{k,l,m} | \hat{\epsilon}_{\sigma} | \chi_{l_1,m_1} \rangle Y_l^m(\hat{k}) \right|^2
\]
\[
= \sum_{l,m} f_{\sigma,l,m}(k) \left| Y_l^m(\hat{k}) \right|^2
\]
(18)

where

\[
f_{\sigma,l,m}(k) = \sum_{l_1,m_1,m_1'} \frac{8\pi^2}{2l_1 + 1} \left| \langle \psi_{k,l,m} | \hat{\epsilon}_{\sigma} | \chi_{l_1,m_1,m_1'} \rangle \right|^2.
\]
(19)

Since \( |Y_l^m(\hat{k})|^2 \) is symmetric with respect to the \( xy \) plane for every \( l \) and \( m \), Eq. (18) shows that \( W_{\sigma}(\vec{k}) \) is also symmetric with respect to the \( xy \) plane, and thus exhibits no FBA, irregardless of the values of the coefficients \( f_{\sigma,l,m}(k) \) which encode the information about the chiral bound state and the light polarization. Any deviation from an orientation-independent scattering wave function will introduce cross-terms in Eqs. (16) and (18), and therefore will open the possibility of non-zero FBA.

**B. Absence of m-coupling in the photoelectron current for isotropic continua**

Consider the PAD resulting from a single molecular orientation

\[
W_{\sigma}(\vec{k}) = \left| \langle \psi_{k}^{(-)} | \hat{\epsilon}_{\sigma} | \chi \rangle \right|^2,
\]
(20)

where \( \hat{\epsilon}_{\sigma} \equiv (\hat{x} \pm i\hat{y}) \), \( \chi \) is the bound wave function that has already been rotated by the Euler angles \( \lambda \equiv \alpha \beta \gamma \), and the scattering wave function is molecular-orientation independent, i.e. it only depends on the relative direction between the position vector \( \vec{r} \) and the photoelectron momentum \( \vec{k} \). Both wave functions can be expanded as
\[
\chi(\vec{r}) = \sum_{l,m} \chi_{l,m}(\vec{r})
\]

\[
\psi_{l,m}(\vec{r}) = \sum_{l,m} \psi_{l,m}(k,\vec{r}) Y^m_l(\hat{k}),
\]

where \(\chi_{l,m}(\vec{r}) = u_{l,m}(r) Y^m_l(\hat{r})\) and \(\psi_{l,m}(k,\vec{r}) = v_{l,m}(k,r) Y^m_l(\hat{r})\). Replacing these expansions in \(W_\sigma(\hat{k})\) we get

\[
W_\sigma(\hat{k}) = \sum_{l_1,m_1,l_2,m_2,k_{1}',k_{2}'} \langle \psi_{l_1',m_1'+\sigma} | \hat{\epsilon}_\sigma | \chi_{l_1,m_1} \rangle^* \langle \psi_{l_2',m_2'+\sigma} | \hat{\epsilon}_\sigma | \chi_{l_2,m_2} \rangle \times Y^{m_{1}'+\sigma*}(\hat{k}) Y^{m_{2}'+\sigma*}(\hat{k})
\]

where we used the selection rules \(m_1' = m_1 + \sigma\) and \(m_2' = m_2 + \sigma\) for the dipole transitions. The product of the spherical harmonics \(Y^{m_{1}'+\sigma*}_l Y^{m_{2}'+\sigma*}_{l_2}\) can be rewritten as a superposition of spherical harmonics \(Y^m_l\) with \(m = -m_1 + m_2\), and the calculation of \(j_z\) only requires the term \(l, m = 1, 0\) [see Eq. (11)]. Therefore we must only consider the terms in Eq. (23) where \(m_1 = m_2\), which means that the different \(m\) components in the bound wave function \(\chi\) do not interfere in \(j_z\). That is, the calculation of \(j_z\) for a coherent superposition \(\chi_{l_1,m_1} + \chi_{l_2,m_2}\) yields the same result as the sum of the \(j_z\)'s obtained for each state of the superposition separately.

C. An example of propensity rules for the in-plane orientation.

Consider the state \(|\chi_{p(311)}^+\rangle\) when the molecular frame is related to the lab frame by a rotation of \(\pi/2\) around \(\hat{y}^L\). In this case, the electronic polarization points along \(-\hat{x}^L\) and the bound probability current is in the \(\hat{y}^L\hat{z}^L\) plane. For light circularly polarized
in the \hat{x}L\hat{y} plane, neither the asymmetry of the initial state (i.e. its electronic polarization) is along the direction perpendicular to the light polarization nor the bound probability current is in the plane of the light polarization. Nevertheless, with the help of the Wigner rotation matrices \[75\] we can write the rotated spherical harmonics in terms of unrotated spherical harmonics as

\begin{align}
\hat{R}_y^{\pi/2}Y_1^1 &= \frac{1}{2}Y_1^1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}Y_1^0 + \frac{1}{2}Y_1^{-1}, \tag{24}
\hat{R}_y^{\pi/2}Y_2^1 &= -\frac{1}{2}Y_2^1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}Y_1^1 + \frac{1}{2}Y_2^{-1} + \frac{1}{2}Y_2^{-2}. \tag{25}
\end{align}

Replacing Eqs. (24) and (25) in the expression for \(\chi^{+}_{p(311)}\) [Eq. (1)] and using \(\hat{R}_y^{\pi}Y_l^m = (-1)^{l+m}Y_l^{-m}\) we obtain

\begin{align}
\hat{R}_y^{\pi/2}\chi^{+}_{p(311)} &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left[ R_{3,1}Y_1^1 - R_{3,2}Y_2^1 - R_{3,2}Y_2^2 \right]
+ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left[ R_{3,1}Y_1^{-1} + R_{3,2}Y_2^{-1} + R_{3,2}Y_2^{-2} \right]
+ \frac{1}{2}R_{3,1}Y_1^0
+ \frac{1}{2}\hat{R}_y^{\pi}\chi^{+}_{p(311)} + \frac{1}{2}\chi^{+}_{p(311)} \right] + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Phi \tag{26}
\end{align}

where \(R_{n,l}(r)\) are the bound radial functions of hydrogen and we defined

\begin{align}
\Phi (\vec{r}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ R_{3,1}(r)Y_1^0 (\vec{r}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}R_{3,2}(r) \left[ Y_2^{-2} (\vec{r}) - Y_2^2 (\vec{r}) \right] \right\}. \tag{27}
\end{align}

In analogy to what we did before with the \(p\) state, we separated the wave function according to the direction of its probability current with respect to the \(z\) axis, i.e. into positive, negative, and zero \(m\)'s. In general, this is as far as we can go with the
simplification, and at this point we must only figure out the sign of the asymmetry that the part co-rotating with the electric field yields to tell the sign of the FBA asymmetry that the full wave function yields. However, in this particularly simple case we can recognize that not only the \( m = 0 \) but also the \( m = \pm 2 \) terms do not contribute to the chirality of neither the co-rotating nor the counter-rotating parts. We have grouped this achiral terms into \( \Phi \). Furthermore, the remaining terms can be rewritten in terms of p states with their polarizations pointing along \( \hat{z}^L \) and \( -\hat{z}^L \).

From the discussion of the propensity rules in Sec. IV and from Fig. 9 we already know the \( j^L_z \) that will result from each of the p states appearing in Eq. (26). Furthermore, from Appendix VIIIIB we know that each \( m \) component will have an independent effect on \( j_z \). Therefore, although the unrotated state \( \chi^+_{p(311)}(\vec{r}^+L) \) exhibits a negative \( j^L_z \) for both left and right circularly polarized light, once we rotate this state by \( \pi/2 \) around \( \hat{y}^L \) Eq. (26) shows that it will exhibit a negative/positive \( j^L_z \) for right/left circularly polarized light because the signal from the second/first term will dominate.

We can also use Eq. (26) to verify that \( j_z \) vanishes in the isotropically-oriented case [see Eq. (7) of the companion paper [1]] by taking into account the 6 orientations of \( |\chi^+_{p(311)}\rangle \) displayed in Fig. 2 of [1]

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{j}_z &= \frac{1}{6} \left[ j_z (\chi^+_p) + j_z \left( \hat{R}^{\pi}_{y} \chi^+_p \right) + 4 j_z \left( \hat{R}^{\pi/2}_{y} \chi^+_p \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{6} \left[ j_z (\chi^+_p) + j_z \left( \hat{R}^{\pi}_{y} \chi^+_p \right) + j_z \left( \hat{R}^{\pi}_{y} \chi^-_p \right) + j_z \left( \chi^-_p \right) \right] \\
&= 0
\end{align*}
\]

where the arguments of \( j_z \) on the right hand side of Eq. (28) indicate the orientation of the initial wave function, and from symmetry we know that the four orientations
where $\hat{z}^M$ lies on the $\hat{x}^L\hat{y}^L$ plane yield the same photoelectron current.
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