A quantum optical description of photon statistics and cross-correlations in high harmonic generation
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We present a study of photon statistics associated with high-order harmonic generation (HHG) involving one-mode and intermodal correlations of the high harmonic photons. The aim of the paper is to give insight into the nonclassical properties of big-order harmonic modes. To this end, we use a simplified model describing an elementary quantum source, modelled by a two-level atom. While the material system is extremely simplified in this description, the conclusions and the methods may be generalized for more complex cases. We primarily give results of the effective model of HHG in which the exciting pulse is classical, and the harmonics are quantized, although we touch upon the more generalized, fully quantized model as well. Evolution of the Mandel-parameter, photon antibunching, squeezing and cross-correlations are calculated. Results imply that with respect to a single quantized emitter, nonclassicality of the scattered harmonics is present: sub-Poissonian photon statistic and squeezing can characterize certain optical modes, while strong anticorrelation can also be present.
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I. INTRODUCTION

High-order harmonic generation (HHG) is a strongly nonlinear effect that is observed in several state-of-the-art experiments [1–3]. One of the most important applications is the generation of attosecond pulses, which can monitor or induce physical processes on an experimentally unprecedented time scale [4, 5]. Therefore, deep understanding of the physical mechanisms underlying the phenomenon of HHG is of crucial importance.

Usually the strong-field physics and attosecond science employs semiclassical approach, treating the electron quantum-mechanically, and the electromagnetic field classically [6–8].

On the other hand, description of phenomena in strong fields has already been discussed in the early ’80s, [9] describes a non-perturbative treatment of HHG in the non-linear Compton process using a fully quantized framework. More recently, the idea that the photon number distribution of a laser pulse shows fingerprints of the generation of high-order harmonics after the interaction with matter appeared in a theoretical paper [10]. Later on, the effect has been demonstrated both with gaseous [11] and solid state targets [12].

In the most widely used picture that describes gaseous targets, the continuum energy levels and the charge acceleration plays important role [8]. However, for solid state targets, it is possible for only bound states to be populated during the process [13], and even the two-level approximation can be valid for quantum wells [14]. Previous works highlight how a driven two-level system can model the properties observed in HHG spectrum [15–18].

Let us note that a model with finite number of bound states can directly be related to the harmonic generation of solid-state targets described in velocity gauge using dipole approximation. Then all transitions are interband, that is, the dynamics of states with different \( k \) eigenvalues are independent [10, 20].

An interesting experimental aspect of HHG is the possibility of performing photon counting experiments. In order to obtain an exact photon statistics, one should calculate all higher-order correlation functions, but the experimentally most significant terms are those of up to second order [21].

Of particular interest are the intermode cross-correlation functions, the calculation of which is generally nontrivial. The properties of the two-mode correlation function are connected with the characterization of the electromagnetic field as a whole, which, as a first approximation, can be done by measuring second order intermode cross correlations.

Naturally, quantum-optical properties like the photon statistics are inherently unobtainable from a semiclassical approach. Although there have been numerous studies –both experimental and theoretical– about the photon statistics of second- and Nth order harmonics [22–24], fully quantum optical treatments of the HHG are relatively rare. Despite prior works, [10, 18, 24, 28] the circumstances under which spectral and statistical properties of the radiation considerably differs from the classical description is still unknown. Exploring such regimes could lead to novel sources of attosecond light with intrinsically quantum properties such as squeezing and entanglement.

The quantum properties of the radiation by an isolated, point-like system may be effected for example by the following properties: The structure of the relevant energy levels of the system and modes, and the transition dipole-moments; the polarization, intensity, and
quantum properties of the excitation (photon statistics, squeezing, etc.); the timescale of the harmonic generation, i.e. whether spontaneous emission plays role in the dynamics.

In this paper we will only deal with strong, coherent, excitation and its interaction with a two-level system.

The paper is organized in the following way: In Sec. II we give definitions of the correlation-functions and other quantities calculated in this article. Sec. III specifies the model we investigate. In Sec. IV we present semi-analytical and numerical results connected to the photon statistics of high-order harmonics induced by classical radiation, while the intermode correlations are treated in Sec. V. As an outlook, we give brief presentation of results concerning the quantized excitation in Sec. VI. Conclusions are contained in Sec. VII.

II. CORRELATION FUNCTIONS

The complete characterization of the radiation field in terms of intensity is only possible in limited cases. More accurate descriptions are possible by using a hierarchy of correlation functions as defined by optical coherence theory [21][29][30].

Correlation functions provide a concise method for expressing the degree to which two (or more) dynamical properties are correlated. Generally speaking, the response of a system to a specific weak probe is often directly related to a correlation function, therefore the determination of specific correlation functions have been the focus of many experimental settings and theoretical investigations [31][32].

In quantum optical experiments, the most relevant auto- and cross-correlation functions are between photon numbers. Usually, semiconductor avalanche photodiodes are used as detectors in these experiments [33]. These detectors typically can achieve time resolution of the order of 500-50 ps. Since detectors typically average over the detection time, fast fluctuations of the correlation function (which contain important information concerning the physics of ultrafast processes) are blurred. In recent years, picosecond resolution has become possible [34][35].

Below, we introduce quantities relevant in quantum optical experiments. The experimental setup to measure these quantities is typically similar to that of Hanbury Brown and Twiss [36].

Mandel Q parameter

\[ Q_n(t) \equiv \langle N_n(t) \rangle \left( g_n^2(t,0) - 1 \right) = \frac{(\Delta N_n)^2}{\langle N_n \rangle} - 1 \]

Whenever it takes negative values, the photon statistics is called sub-Poissonian, and is nonclassical [37]. We note that during time-evolution, there can be time instants when the photon number expectation value becomes (exactly or numerically) zero. This circumstance can cause difficulties during numerical evaluation.

The definition of the Q-parameter is related to the second-order coherence function \( g_n^2(t,\tau) \), specifically for the one-time \( \tau = 0 \) case. The second-order coherence function

\[ g_n^2(t,\tau) \equiv \frac{\langle a_n^\dagger(t)N_n(t+\tau)a_n(t) \rangle}{\langle N_n(t) \rangle \langle N_n(t+\tau) \rangle} \sim \frac{P(t+\tau|t)}{P(t+\tau)} \]

is related to the conditional probability \( P(t+\tau|t) \) of a detector measuring a second photon at time \( t+\tau \), granted that a first photon was measured at \( t \).

**Photon antibunching measure**

\[ \delta g_n^2(t,\tau) \equiv \lim_{\tau \to 0} \frac{g_n^2(t,\tau) - g_n^2(t,0)}{\tau} \]

Definitions and quantifications of photon bunching and antibunching are not completely unambiguous in the literature. Especially in experimental situations, when one considers the integration of signals by the detector, the concept of bunching needs careful handling [22][38][42]. For the sake of clarity, we list the commonly used definitions of photon antibunching for a single mode.

![Two-time correlation functions with fixed t. a) super-Poissonian bunching, b) super-Poissonian antibunching, c) sub-Poissonian bunching, d) sub-Poissonian antibunching.](image)

The presence of photon antibunching is equivalent to:

- Def.1) \( g_n^2(t,0) < 1 \) or \( Q(t) < 0 \) with the correlation function and Mandel-parameter respectively [43].
- Def.2) \( G_n^2(t,\tau) > G_n^2(t,0) \), where \( G_n^2(t,\tau) = \langle a_n^\dagger(t)a_n^\dagger(t+\tau)a_n(t+\tau)a_n(t) \rangle \) [21].
- Def.3) \( g_n^2(t,\tau) > g_n^2(t,0) \) [42].

Comparison of possible definitions are discussed in [22][43][44]. We have used antibunching according to Def 3), similarly to [47]. The positivity of \( \partial_\tau g_n^2(t,\tau) |_{\tau=0} \) implies (assuming that photon absorption happened at time \( t \)) that the probability of photon absorption is larger some small \( \tau \) time later than the simultaneous absorption of two photons.

**Intermodal cross-correlation for two modes**

\[ g_{ij}^2(t) = \frac{\langle N_i(t)N_j(t) \rangle}{\langle N_i(t) \rangle \langle N_j(t) \rangle} \]

The field is nonclassical, if \( g_{ii}^2(t)g_{jj}^2(t) < (g_{ij}^2(t))^2 \) inequality stands [45]. There are additional inequalities...
but here we only consider one. Specifically, non-classical entanglement between two \((i\) and \(j\)) modes is implied if the
\[
\langle N_i N_j \rangle < \langle |a_i a_j|^2 \rangle
\]
relation is fulfilled \cite{49}.

Another quantity of interest is the squeezedness of the harmonic modes. Light is considered squeezed in a given mode if there exists a quadrature-variance such that
\[
\Delta X_n^2 < \frac{1}{2}
\]
\cite{50, 51}. The minimal variance (and its associated phase) can be calculated through the smaller eigenvalue (and associated eigenvector) of the noise-ellipse matrix. To quantify it, we use the following notations:
\[
X_n \equiv \frac{a_n^\dagger + a_n}{2}, Y_n \equiv i \frac{a_n^\dagger - a_n}{2}, X_2n \equiv \frac{a_{2n}^\dagger + a_{2n}}{2}, Y_2n \equiv i \frac{a_{2n}^\dagger - a_{2n}}{2}.
\]
Then the noise-ellipse is:
\[
\left(\frac{\langle (\Delta X)^2 \rangle}{\frac{1}{2} \langle (\Delta X, \Delta Y) \rangle}, \frac{\frac{1}{2} \langle (\Delta X, \Delta Y) \rangle}{\langle (\Delta Y)^2 \rangle} \right)
\]
(1)
The eigenvalues \cite{52}, expressed with the above notations are:
\[
\lambda_{\pm} = \frac{1}{4} \left[ \langle \{\Delta a, \Delta a^\dagger\} \rangle \pm 2 \langle |\Delta a|^2 \rangle \right]
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{4} \left[ 1 + 2 \left( \langle N \rangle - \langle X \rangle^2 - \langle Y \rangle^2 \right) \pm 2 |\langle X_2 + i Y_2 \rangle - \langle X + i Y \rangle^2 | \right].
\]
(2)

III. MODEL

In our investigation, we assumed that the excitations are –at least before interaction– characterized by coherent states. The model of the material is a two-level system. The simplicity of two-level systems help forming qualitatively (and sometimes quantitatively) correct predictions, and offer insight into the dynamics of the HHG. Furthermore, the methods used in this article can be generalized to more complex high harmonic sources as well.

Although harmonic generation is a nonlinear optical effect, only relevant in high-field settings, the intensities of the harmonics are typically much lower than that of the excitation. Therefore, especially when investigating the "one-atom response", assumption of classicality for the scattered harmonic radiation is generally not valid.

Let us consider the following Hamiltonian terms:
\[
H_a = \hbar \omega_0 \sigma_z,
\]
\[
H_h = \sum_{n \in HH} \hbar \omega_n a_n^\dagger a_n, \quad H_{ah} = \sum_{n \in HH} \hbar \Omega_n \sigma_x (a_n + a_n^\dagger),
\]
\[
H_e = \sum_{n \in E} \hbar \omega_n a_n^\dagger a_n, \quad H_{ae} = \sum_{n \in E} \hbar \Omega_n \sigma_x (a_n + a_n^\dagger),
\]
where the first term corresponds to a two-level atom, with the operators \(\sigma_1\) being the Pauli-matrices, the second(fourth) term describes the quantized scattered( excitation) electromagnetic modes, and the third(fifth) term expresses the interaction using dipole approximation. Summations over HH(E) refers to summation over modes of the high harmonics(excitation).

The general Hamiltonian, with both quantized harmonics and excitation can be written as:
\[
H_{qq} = H_a + H_{ah} + H_h + H_{ae} + H_e.
\]
(3)

Usually it is assumed that the interaction of the pulse with matter changes the quantum statistics of the pulse only slightly. While this is not generally true, in our experience the backaction on the excitation, while can be noticeable, (at least for short interaction times) does not have significant effect on the dynamics of the dipole-operator. For this reason, we will be utilizing the classical approximation of the excitation, leading to the following effective Hamiltonian \cite{18}:
\[
H_{ee}(t) = H_a + H_h + H_{ah} + H_{ex}(t).
\]
(4)
Where the electromagnetic field of the excitation can be described as:
\[
H_{ex}(t) = -DE(t) = -d \sigma_x E(t) = \frac{\Omega(t)}{2} \sigma_x.
\]
(5)
We note that \(\Omega_n = 2d \sqrt{\frac{\hbar \omega_n}{eV}}\), where \(V\) is the quantization volume. Let us denote the eigenstates of the atomic Hamiltonian by \(|e\rangle\) and \(|g\rangle\), i.e., \(H_a|e\rangle = \frac{\hbar \omega_0}{2} |e\rangle, H_a|g\rangle = \frac{-\hbar \omega_0}{2} |g\rangle\). Further, we will later use \(|+\rangle\) and \(|-\rangle\), so that \(\sigma_x(\pm) = (\pm)\).

In this model, in principle all the electromagnetic modes would need to be accounted for, with proper initial conditions. For simplicity, we will assume the initial condition to be \(|\Psi(0)\rangle = |g\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |0\rangle\).

The dynamics of the high-order harmonics are induced by the quantized dipole driven by strong classical and weak quantized fields. For practical reasons, we need to utilize some kind of approximation for the calculations. While the semiclassical theory of radiation assumes that the atomic quantities and field quantities are independent \cite{54} i.e. \(|\sigma, a_j\rangle = \langle a_j|\langle j|\), that assumption is clearly unacceptable when one investigates correlation-functions.

On the other hand, it is true that the effect of the low intensity high-harmonic radiation on a classically driven dipole—and thus on each other— is weak. As the cumulative effects of the mode-mode interactions become palpable at the timescale of the spontaneous emission lifetime, and since in experimental settings the pulse is in the order of femtoseconds, (typically many orders of magnitude shorter than the transition lifetime) we will neglect the interplay between different harmonics and consider the high harmonic modes independently unless stated otherwise.
Within this model, we will assume a linearly polarized laser pulse, with electric field:

\[ E(t) = A \sin^2(\omega_c t) \sin(\omega_f t + \phi) \quad \text{if} \quad t \in [0, \pi/\omega_c] \]

where \( \omega_c \ll \omega_f \), and \( \phi \) is the carrier envelope-phase.

In this article, we will use the notations below.
The photon number operator: \( N_n \);
The atomic operators: \( U = \sigma_x, V = -\sigma_y, W = \sigma_z \);
The first and second order field-operators:
\( \{a_n^\dagger + a_n, i(a_n^\dagger - a_n), a_n^\dagger a_n^\dagger + a_n^2, a_n^2 \} \);
The first-order atom-field operators:
\( U_n^{\pm} = (\pm 1)^{1/2} \sigma_x (a_n \mp a_n^\dagger), \)
\( V_n^{\mp} = -i(\pm 1)^{1/2} \sigma_y (a_n \mp a_n^\dagger), \)
\( W_n^{\pm} = i(\pm 1)^{1/2} \sigma_z (a_n \mp a_n^\dagger). \)

### IV. ONE-MODE PROPERTIES

The harmonic spectrum is composed of odd-order harmonics, and optical lines which, in this paper, we call even-order harmonics. To clarify our nomenclature, it is worth pointing out that these spectral lines correspond to even-order harmonics. We introduce the notation \( \delta_\omega \) for the spectral distance between the optical lines and the first-order atom-field operators:

\( \delta_\omega = \frac{\text{spectral distance between the optical lines and the first-order atom-field operators}}{\text{spectral distance between the optical lines and the base harmonic}}. \)

Arguments exist [55] that harmonics should be defined based on the phase and carrier-frequency, (through \( \chi^k \) nonlinear susceptibility) without reference to the position in the optical spectrum. From this argument, the radiation which we call even-harmonics should be more precisely called odd-harmonics disguised as even harmonics [55].

According to [57][59], results obtained through time-dependent density functional theory for molecular targets suggests that in macroscopic harmonic spectrum, the intensity of Mollow sidebands remain around the same order of magnitude as odd-harmonics. However they are also radiated at wider angles, therefore can be distinguished from the main harmonics, and in principle can also be isolated. It is of special interest to us that recent experiments observed these hyper-Raman lines for atomic targets [60]. For these reasons, as their emission has been demonstrated from ordinary material targets, we will give special attention to the properties of these –usually ignored concerning HHG– lines.

#### A. Mandel-parameter

The one-time statistical properties, characterized by typically low Mandel-parameters are following similar oscillatory dynamics as the mean photon numbers, tied to the half-cycles of the excitation.

When we consider pulsed excitation, the photon statistics –just like the spectrum– becomes hard to track. The narrow peaks at the early stage of the time evolution, visible in Fig.(2b) are signatures of the initial transient effects. Then rapid oscillations appear, which have considerably more regular pattern when the pulse is over \( t > \tau \). These ”final” oscillations are solely due to the interaction of the atomic system and the quantized mode. Note that the detuning has strong effect on the photon statistical properties in the case of general pulsed excitations..

The qualitative difference between the even and odd harmonics gets even more pronounced at the level of photon statistics. However it is transparent to analysis only when the excitation is monochromatic. This difference is illustrated on Fig.(3). We note that the visible, strongly super-Poissonian modes (positioned between the harmonics) are characterized by very low photon-number expectation values, and their super-Poissonian quality can be considered a numerical artefact.

**FIG. 2:** Mandel-parameter under pulsed excitation. Subfigure a) shows \( \sin^{-1}(10^5Q) \) on the central panel, the excitation on the left panel. Top panel of subfigure b) shows time-evolution of \( Q \) of an even (18th) harmonic with the \( \omega_0/\omega \) detuning being 0.8 (blue) and 1.2 (red), while the bottom panel shows the excitation.
The Mandel-parameters of odd harmonic modes usually displays both positive and negative values within an optical cycle, being zero on average. Even harmonic lines have more complicated behaviour:

-If $\delta \omega = 0$, the single even harmonic line will first become sub-Poissonian, then super-Poissonian [Fig.(3/c)]. An intuitive explanation is that this optical line develops significant squeezing while the photon-number mean value is only increasing moderately, rendering the photon-number fluctuation large as the interaction time increases.

-If $\delta \omega$ is large, one of the even-harmonic mode will be super-Poissonian, and usually lowly populated, while the other spectral line develops significantly sub-Poissonian statistics [Fig.(3/d)]. Our calculation shows that $Q \approx -\langle N \rangle$, which is equivalent to $\langle N^2 \rangle \approx \langle N \rangle$, in other words, the photon statistic of such even harmonic mode is essentially a superposition of zero and one-photon states.

![FIG. 3: Mandel-parameter under monochromatic excitations. The parameters are chosen such that $\delta \omega = 0$ on subfigure a) and c) and $\delta \omega = 0.1 \omega$ on subfigure b) and d), similarly to Fig.(5). Subfigure a) and b) shows evolution of the rescaled Mandel-parameter $\sinh^{-1}(10^5 Q)$. Subfigure c) and d) shows time-evolution of the Mandel-parameter of given odd-harmonic line (blue) and even harmonic line(s) (red and orange).](image)

These results imply that sub-Poissonian behaviour is present in the even-harmonic radiation, and in principle, with specific excitations, HHG can be the source of broadband one-photon radiation (notably with detuning, the spectra can become quasi-continuum). In order to check that our results remain valid for the case of higher photon-numbers, we considered a very long, nearly monochromatic pulsed excitation. Taking the asymptotic values, and averaging over the trivial oscillations, we found our statements to be, up to a good approximation, valid. It is worth noting however that in these calculations the odd-harmonics themselves could display super-, or sub-Poissonian behaviour, but for them the $|Q| \ll \langle N \rangle$ relation is fulfilled.
B. Time-evolution of quadrature-variance

The quadrature variance-spectrum, that is, the value of the variances as the function of parameter $\omega_n$, can display distinct properties depending on the chosen parameters, but it can largely be summarized in the following way: The odd-harmonics on the plateau display weak squeezing, which, however, is usually weak. The even harmonics have quantum properties very sensitive to the excitation. If the parameters are chosen such that $\delta \omega$ is practically zero, particularly strong squeezing is present, primarily among the even harmonics, whereas if $\delta \omega$ is large, strongly anti-squeezed states will be produced, mainly in the more populated mode of the even harmonic lines.

FIG. 4: Asymptotical averaged photon number expectation values (blue) and Mandel-parameters (red). Subfigure a) shows results for a resonant, b) for a strongly red-detuned excitation.

FIG. 5: Time evolution of field-quantities under monochromatic excitations (left panels), subfigure a) and d) shows photon-number expectation values, b) and e) shows $\delta \lambda_-$, c) and f) shows $\delta \lambda_+$. Vertical axis is time measured in $T$, horizontal axis is harmonic order. Amplitudes of the excitation has been chosen so that $\delta \epsilon = 0$ for a) to c) and $\delta \epsilon = 0.1$ for d) to f).
For illustration, we plotted relevant quantities on Fig. 5. Time evolution of $\delta \lambda_-$ is in subfigure b) and e), while $\delta \lambda_+$ can be observed in subfigure c) and f). For the sake of clarity, we showed $\langle N \rangle$ in subfigures a) and d). The upper and lower row of figures corresponds to two different monochromatic excitations.

One may conclude, that as far as producing squeezed states are concerned (obviously within the limits of this model) special attention is to be given to the parameter space for which $\delta \omega = 0$. In such cases, the even harmonic lines display unusual behaviour compared to other lines. The squeeze in these modes will grow faster then the photon number expectation values, rendering the photon statistics super-Poissonian beyond given interaction timescale.

The perturbative approach leads us to the the following approximately valid statements:

Odd-harmonics: The quantum state of the field, up to the order presented can be written as $|\Psi\rangle^{(4)}_{HH} \approx |0\rangle + |\alpha (1) + \alpha^2 / \sqrt{2} |2\rangle$. By assuming that coefficients follow a similar pattern at higher-order, we can infer that the quantum states of odd-order harmonics are approximately coherent states, with $\alpha = \Omega_2 / 2F[c_2](-\omega_n \pm \delta \omega)t$. Naturally, the perturbative calculation is not strictly true. Predicted intensities are smaller than the numerically calculated values, but the (on average) (nearly-)Poissonian statistics is correctly reproduced.

Even-harmonics: The quantum state of both lines can be written as $|\Psi\rangle^{(4)}_{HH} \approx |0\rangle + \beta (1)$ where, if we choose initial condition $|\Psi\rangle_0 (0) = |g\rangle$, the $\beta$ parameter is nonzero only for one even harmonic line, characterized by sub-Poissonian statistics. The observed $Q \equiv -\langle N \rangle$ relation follows straightforwardly, since $\langle N^2 \rangle = \langle N \rangle$.

D. Photon-bunching properties

By the definition that we use, photon (anti)bunching is implied by the sign of $\partial_\tau g^2 (t, \tau)$. Expanding $g^2 (t, t + \tau) - g^2 (0, t)$ up to the first order in $\tau$, we get:

$$g^2 (t) - g^2 (0) \approx \frac{\Omega}{2} \frac{\langle a^\dagger U^- a \rangle \langle N \rangle - \langle a^\dagger N a \rangle \langle U^- \rangle}{\langle N \rangle \langle N + \frac{\Omega}{2} U^- \rangle},$$

which can be simplified further. Since $\langle N \rangle > 0$ and $\langle a^\dagger N a \rangle \approx 0$ in the limit of small $\tau$, the presence of photon bunching is determined by the sign and relative size of $(U^-) \propto \langle N \rangle$ and $\langle a^\dagger U^- a \rangle$.

FIG. 6: Time-evolution of photon-antibunching measure (red) of a given even harmonic mode, with the monochromatic excitation parameters chosen so that $|\delta \omega|$ is large. For illustration, rescaled and displaced function of the mean photon value is shown (blue).

The only significant dynamics that we observed –both for pulsed and monochromatic excitation– is the roughly $2\pi / \omega_n$ periodic photon antibunching. For most modes, the average value of $\delta g$ is indistinguishable from zero, but for the sub-Poissonian even harmonic that have been
plotted on Fig. (6), the average is slightly negative. That the sub-Poissonian statistic coincides with (on statistical average) photon bunching, can be interpreted as a consequence of the non-stationary state of the mode as the Mandel-parameter (on average) decreases in time.

V. INTERMODE CORRELATION BETWEEN HARMONICS

As a first step of characterizing the radiation field as a whole, i.e., calculating the emerging cross-correlations, the two-mode approximation proves to be useful. First, we treat the case of monochromatic excitation, with parameters chosen so that $|\delta \omega| = 0$ and $|\delta \omega| = 0.1\omega$ is fulfilled. Results can be seen on Fig. (7) and Fig. (8) respectively. Specifically for the $|\delta \omega| = 0$ parameter – which we can associate with particularly significant squeezing being present within the even harmonic modes – numerical results imply that:
- Odd harmonic photons tend to be correlated with other odd harmonics, generally close to the classical limit;
- Even and odd harmonic photons tend to be anti-correlated;
- Even harmonic photons tend to be strongly anti-correlated. This implies the possibility that HHG can be the source of one-photon states in wide spectral ranges.

For $|\delta \omega| = 0.1\omega$ parameter – which is relatively close to the maximal $|\delta \omega|$ case, which we can associate with particularly nonclassical, nearly one-photon states being present within the even harmonic modes – numerical results imply that:
- Odd harmonic photons tend to be correlated with other odd harmonics, generally close to the classical limit;
- Even and odd harmonic photons tend to be significantly anti-correlated;
- Even harmonic photons tend to be strongly anti-correlated. This implies the possibility that HHG can be the source of one-photon states in wide spectral ranges.

For pulsed excitation, the cross-correlations becomes more complicated, but certain qualitative statements can be made:
- Odd harmonic photons tend to be correlated with other odd harmonics, generally close to the classical limit;
- Even and odd harmonic photons tend to be significantly anti-correlated;
- Even harmonics photon’s correlation with other even harmonic photons can be either stronger or weaker than classical.
excitation can be constructed using analytical methods. As in the previous section, we will only consider the special cases of extremal $\delta \omega$.

Since our goal here is to gain a simple physical picture we will assume that the state of each electromagnetic mode spans a minimal space containing $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ photon number states, that is, we focus only on the terms with dominant contributions in intermodal cross-correlations. For the sake of transparency, we will consider two electromagnetic modes (of arbitrary $\omega_1$ and $\omega_2$ respectively). The quantum state can be written explicitly as:

$$|\Psi\rangle = U e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}t \sum_{\mathbf{lm}} (b_{00}^{\mathbf{00}}(t)|\tilde{e}\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle + b_{01}^{\mathbf{01}}(t)|\tilde{e}\rangle|0\rangle|1\rangle e^{-i\omega_1 t} + b_{10}^{\mathbf{10}}(t)|\tilde{e}\rangle|1\rangle|0\rangle e^{-i\omega_1 t} + b_{11}^{\mathbf{11}}(t)|\tilde{e}\rangle|1\rangle|1\rangle e^{-i\omega_1 t} + b_{10}^{\mathbf{10}}(t)|\tilde{g}\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle e^{-i\omega_2 t} + b_{11}^{\mathbf{11}}(t)|\tilde{g}\rangle|1\rangle|1\rangle e^{-i\omega_2 t} + b_{10}^{\mathbf{10}}(t)|\tilde{g}\rangle|1\rangle|0\rangle e^{-i\omega_2 t} + b_{11}^{\mathbf{11}}(t)|\tilde{g}\rangle|1\rangle|1\rangle e^{-i\omega_2 t})$$

where $U = e^{\frac{4\pi}{\hbar} \delta \omega} e^{\frac{\delta \theta}{\hbar}} e^{\frac{i}{2} (\omega_1 + \omega_2) t}$. We fix the initial condition so that at time $t = 0$, $b_{lm}^{\mathbf{00}} = b_{lm}^{\mathbf{11}} = 0$ unless $l = m = 0$. The time-evolution of the $b$ coefficients is induced by

$$\hbar W(t) + \hbar \left( \sigma^+ e^{i(\omega t + \phi_0)} + \sigma^- e^{-i(\omega t + \phi_0)} \right) \left[ \frac{\Omega}{2} (a_1^+ + a_1) + \frac{\Omega_2}{2} (a_2^+ + a_2) \right].$$

Below we will give a perturbative treatment of the problem, neglecting second-order contributions of $\hbar W(t)$, and all nonresonant terms.

In first-, and second-order, we get:

$$b_{00}^{\mathbf{00}}(t)^{(1)} = b_{00}^{\mathbf{00}}(0)[1 + i \zeta_1(t)] - i b_{00}^{\mathbf{00}}(0) \zeta_2(t)$$
$$b_{00}^{\mathbf{00}}(t)^{(1)} = b_{00}^{\mathbf{00}}(0)[1 + i \zeta_1(t)] - i b_{00}^{\mathbf{00}}(0) \zeta_2(t)$$
$$b_{10}^{\mathbf{10}}(t)^{(2)} = -i \frac{\Omega_1 t}{2} e^{-i\phi_0} F[b_{00}^{\mathbf{00}}(0)[1 + i \zeta_1(t)] - i b_{00}^{\mathbf{00}}(0) \zeta_2(t)](-\omega_1 - i\delta \omega)$$
$$b_{10}^{\mathbf{10}}(t)^{(2)} = -i \frac{\Omega_2 t}{2} e^{i\phi_0} F[b_{00}^{\mathbf{00}}(0)[1 + i \zeta_1(t)] - i b_{00}^{\mathbf{00}}(0) \zeta_2(t)](-\omega_2 - i\delta \omega)$$

The most important third-order effect is that induced by $\hbar W(t)$, between the populations $b_{10}^{\mathbf{10}}$, $b_{10}^{\mathbf{10}}$, and $b_{01}^{\mathbf{01}}$, approx-
Then, at the fourth order we get:

\[ b_{11}^{(4)}(t) \approx -i \frac{\Omega_1 t}{2} \left( e^{-i \phi_0} \mathcal{F}[b_{00}^g(0)[1 - i \zeta_1] - i b_{00}^g(0) \zeta_2^*](-\omega_1 - \delta \omega) - e^{i \phi_0} \mathcal{F}[b_{00}^g(0)[1 + i \zeta_1] - i b_{00}^g(0) \zeta_2](1 + i \zeta_1) + b_{21}^{(4)}(t) \right) \]

(16)

\[ b_{10}^{(4)}(t) \approx -i \frac{\Omega_1 t}{2} \left( e^{i \phi_0} \mathcal{F}[b_{00}^g(0)[1 + i \zeta_1] - i b_{00}^g(0) \zeta_2](1 + i \zeta_1) - e^{-i \phi_0} \mathcal{F}[b_{00}^g(0)[1 - i \zeta_1] - i b_{00}^g(0) \zeta_2^*](-\omega_1 - \delta \omega) \right) \]

(17)

\[ b_{01}^{(4)}(t) \approx -i \frac{\Omega_2 t}{2} \left( e^{i \phi_0} \mathcal{F}[b_{00}^g(0)[1 + i \zeta_1] - i b_{00}^g(0) \zeta_2^*](-\omega_2 + \delta \omega)(1 - i \zeta_1) - e^{-i \phi_0} \mathcal{F}[b_{00}^g(0)[1 - i \zeta_1] - i b_{00}^g(0) \zeta_2^*](-\omega_2 + \delta \omega)(1 - i \zeta_1) \right) \]

(18)

\[ b_{01}^{(4)}(t) \approx -i \frac{\Omega_2 t}{2} \left( e^{i \phi_0} \mathcal{F}[b_{00}^g(0)[1 + i \zeta_1] - i b_{00}^g(0) \zeta_2^*](-\omega_2 + \delta \omega)(1 - i \zeta_1) - e^{-i \phi_0} \mathcal{F}[b_{00}^g(0)[1 - i \zeta_1] - i b_{00}^g(0) \zeta_2^*(1 - i \zeta_1) \right) \]

(19)

Then, at the fourth order we get:

\[ b_{11}^{(4)}(t) \approx -i \frac{\Omega_1 \Omega_2 t^2}{8} \left( \mathcal{F}[b_{00}^g(0)[1 - i \zeta_1] - i b_{00}^g(0) \zeta_2^*](-\omega_1 - \delta \omega) - e^{i 2 \phi_0} \mathcal{F}[b_{00}^g(0)[1 + i \zeta_1] - i b_{00}^g(0) \zeta_2^*](-\omega_1 + \delta \omega) \mathcal{F}[1 + i \zeta_1](-\omega_2 + \delta \omega) \right) \]

(20)

Due to the coefficients constituting a quickly decreasing series, the intermode photon cross-correlation between two \((\omega_1, \omega_2)\) high-order harmonic can be reasonably represented by:

\[ g_{12}(t) \approx \frac{|b_{11}^*|^2 + |b_{11}^*|^2}{(|b_{10}^*|^2 + |b_{10}^*|^2)(|b_{01}^*|^2 + |b_{01}^*|^2)} \]

where, during evaluation, it is worth separating the special cases below. For the sake of simplicity, we will consider only the initial condition \(|g\rangle\), which does not limit the validity of the conclusions.

**Odd-odd harmonic modes:** Let the frequencies be \(\omega_1 = (2k_1 + 1)\omega\) and \(\omega_2 = (2k_2 + 1)\omega\), where \(k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}\).

Between two odd harmonic lines, the cross-correlation is

\[ g_{12}(t) \approx \frac{\Omega_1^2 \Omega_2 t^4}{4} \left| e^{-i \phi_0} \mathcal{F}[\zeta^*](-\omega_1 - \delta \omega) \mathcal{F}[\zeta^*](-\omega_2 - \delta \omega) \right|^2 = 1, \]

(22)
which is close to the numerically calculated value.

**Even-even harmonic modes:** Let us choose the frequencies as \( \omega_1 = 2k_1 \omega + \delta \omega \) and \( \omega_2 = 2k_2 \omega + \delta \omega \). Between such even harmonic lines, the cross-correlation is

\[
g_{12}(t) \approx \frac{\Omega_1^2 \Omega_2^2 \xi^4}{16} |\mathcal{F}[\zeta_1]|(-\omega_1 - \delta \omega) \mathcal{F}[\zeta_1]|(-\omega_2 - \delta \omega) + e^{i \phi_0} \mathcal{F}[\zeta_1]|(-\omega_1 - \delta \omega) \mathcal{F}[\zeta_1]|(-\omega_2 + \delta \omega)|^2 = 0. \tag{23}
\]

We can check that the perturbative calculation predict a nonclassical entanglement between even harmonic modes, since \( \langle N_1 N_2 \rangle = 0 < |b_{10} b_{01}|^2 = |\langle a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle| \).

and similarly, there is nonclassical entanglement between even and odd harmonic modes.

**Odd-even harmonic modes:** To calculate the correlation between odd and even harmonics, let us choose the mode-frequencies as \( \omega_1 = (2k_1 + 1) \omega \) and \( \omega_2 = 2k_2 \omega + \delta \omega. \)

\[
g_{12}(t) \approx \frac{\Omega_1^2 \Omega_2^2 \xi^4}{16} |\mathcal{F}[\zeta_2]|(-\omega_1 + \delta \omega) \mathcal{F}[\zeta_1]|(-\omega_2 - \delta \omega) + e^{i \phi_0} \mathcal{F}[\zeta_2]|(-\omega_1 - \delta \omega) \mathcal{F}[\zeta_1]|(-\omega_2 + \delta \omega)|^2 = 0, \tag{24}
\]

the transformation

\[
D_{\text{Exc}} \equiv \prod_{n \in \text{Exc}} D_n (\alpha_n e^{-i \omega_n t}) \tag{25}
\]

\[
|\Psi\rangle' = D_{\text{Exc}}^\dagger |\Psi\rangle
\]

\[
H'_{qq} = D_{\text{Exc}}^\dagger H_{qq} D_{\text{Exc}} + i \hbar D_{\text{Exc}} \partial_t D_{\text{Exc}}^\dagger \tag{26}
\]

The value of \( \alpha_n \) in the above transformation is determined by the spectral composition of the excitation. After simplifications, the Hamiltonian can be reduced to:

\[
H'_{qq} = \hbar \frac{\omega_0}{2} \sigma_z + \sum_{n \in \text{HH}} \hbar \left( \omega_n \sigma_z n + \frac{\Omega_n}{2} \sigma_x \left( a_n^\dagger + a_n \right) \right)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{n \in \text{E}} \hbar \left( \omega_n A_n^\dagger A_n + \frac{\Omega_n}{2} \sigma_x \left( A_n^\dagger + A_n \right) \right) - \frac{\Omega(t)}{2} \sigma_x. \tag{27}
\]

Naturally, the driving term \( \Omega(t) \) that dominates the time-evolution of the harmonics, is unaffected by the quantum state of the excitation. At the same time, this term drives the base harmonic mode as well, and (considering that the interaction is resonant) the backaction on the excitation can be significant.

**VI. ON QUANTIZED EXCITATION**

In this section, the quantized nature of the excitation has been incorporated into calculational schemes through

**A. Backaction of HHG on quantized excitation**

During the interaction, the photon statistical properties of the excitation modes are dynamically changing. While this (in our experience) has minor effect on the high harmonic spectrum, the modifications taking place in the quantum state of the excitation can be nevertheless experimentally relevant.
We calculated backaction on a single monochromatic excitation. Our results show that the modification is comparatively small if the parameters are chosen in such a way that \( |\delta\omega| \) is extremal. For this perceived behaviour, we give an approximate analytical explanation, by neglecting the high harmonic modes.

The Hamiltonian then becomes

\[
H'_{\text{qc}} = \hbar \frac{\omega_0}{2} \sigma_z + \hbar \left( \omega a^\dagger a + \frac{\Omega}{2} \sigma_x(a^\dagger + a) + \frac{\Omega}{2} \sigma_x \left( e^{i\omega t} + e^{-i\omega t} \right) \right).
\]

The quantum state is written as:

\[
|\Psi\rangle = e^{i \frac{\Delta}{2} \sin(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_z} e^{i \frac{\omega}{2} (t + \phi_0) \sigma_x} e^{-i \frac{\Delta}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j^\dagger |j\rangle, \alpha e^{-i\omega t}} e^{-i j \omega a t}
\]

Insight can be achieved by following the calculations in the Appendix, but without limiting ourselves to the special case of \( \cos \theta = 0 \). The dynamical equations turn out to be:

\[
\begin{align*}
ib_j^\dagger(t) &= \langle \tilde{\epsilon}|W(t)|\tilde{\epsilon}\rangle b_j^\dagger(t) + \langle \tilde{\epsilon}|W(t)|\tilde{g}\rangle e^{i \frac{\epsilon - \tilde{\epsilon}}{\hbar} t} b_j(t) + \frac{\Omega}{2} e^{i(\delta\omega t - \phi_0)} \sum_{k} \langle j|a + a^\dagger|k\rangle e^{-i \omega(k-j) t} b_k^\dagger(t) \\
-\Omega \cos \theta e^{i \frac{\epsilon + \tilde{\epsilon}}{\hbar} - t} \cos(\omega t + \phi_0) \sum_{k} \langle j|a + a^\dagger|k\rangle e^{-i \omega(k-j) t} b_k^\dagger(t) + \frac{\Omega}{2} \sin(2\theta) \cos(\omega t + \phi_0) \sum_{k} \langle j|a + a^\dagger|k\rangle e^{-i \omega(k-j) t} b_k^\dagger(t),
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
ib_j(t) &= \langle \tilde{g}|W(t)|\tilde{g}\rangle b_j(t) + \langle \tilde{g}|W(t)|\tilde{\epsilon}\rangle e^{-i \frac{\epsilon - \tilde{\epsilon}}{\hbar} t} b_j(t) + \frac{\Omega}{2} e^{-i(\delta\omega t + \phi_0)} \sum_{k} \langle j|a + a^\dagger|k\rangle e^{-i \omega(k-j) t} b_k(t) \\
-\Omega \cos \theta e^{i \frac{\epsilon - \tilde{\epsilon}}{\hbar} - t} \cos(\omega t + \phi_0) \sum_{k} \langle j|a + a^\dagger|k\rangle e^{-i \omega(k-j) t} b_k(t) - \frac{\Omega}{2} \sin(2\theta) \cos(\omega t + \phi_0) \sum_{k} \langle j|a + a^\dagger|k\rangle e^{-i \omega(k-j) t} b_k(t).
\end{align*}
\]

It is easy to check, that unlike in the case of harmonic modes, the dynamical equations regarding the excitation mode have a resonant term (proportional to \( \sin(2\theta) \)) already at first-order perturbation.

To quantify the backaction, that is, the difference from the initial Poissonian photon statistic that develops over time—let us simply use the weighted sum \( \sum_j (|b_j^\dagger|^2 + |b_j|^2) \), which characterizes components orthogonal to the coherent state.

Its evaluation, together with the above considerations, leads us to the following conclusion: The backaction can be maximalized if \( \cos \theta \) is maximal, that is, when \( \delta\omega = 0 \), whereas for parameters which fulfill the \( \cos \theta = 0 \) condition, the backaction on the excitation is minimal. This can be observed in Fig.\((12)\), where the dominant feature, besides the continuous growth is the \( T \)-periodic oscillation, which largely corresponds to the periodical dynamics on phase space as described in \([28]\).

FIG. 10: Time-evolution of the measure of backaction. Parameters are chosen so that \( |\delta\omega| \) is maximal (blue) and \( |\delta\omega| = 0 \) (red), with the parameter \( \Omega/\sqrt{\omega} = 0.005 \).

**B. Quantized excitation, quantized harmonics**

Incorporating the fully quantum nature of the dynamics in a model is numerically challenging without some...
kind of approximation. During our calculations, we employed the two-mode approximation, that is, considered only a single excitation and a single scattered mode.

A meaningful question, only treatable within the fully quantized formalism, is whether there are meaningful correlations arising between absorption from the excitation mode and emission in the scattered modes. Let us introduce an operator measuring the number of absorbed photons in the excitation mode:

$$\delta N \equiv |\alpha^2| - N.$$  (30)

We define correlation function between $\delta N$ and $N_n$ as:

$$g_{ki} \equiv \frac{\langle \delta NN_i \rangle}{\langle \delta N \rangle \langle N_i \rangle},$$  (31)

which, unlike previously introduced correlation functions, can be of negative value, since $\delta N$ can be negative. The parameters have been chosen so that the monochromatic excitation contains $\approx 10^8$ photons.

![Figure 11](image)

**FIG. 11**: a) shows time-evolution of $\delta N$. Subfigures b) and c) shows the correlation between the absorption of a photon in the excitation mode and the emission of a photon in an odd-, and even harmonic mode respectively, with the parameter chosen so that $|\delta \omega| = 0$. Subfigures d) and e) are analogous, but with $|\delta \omega| = 0.1\omega$.

In Fig.11/a we can observe that photon absorption from the highly populated excitation mode happens in discrete steps in each half-cycle. There is nearly of unit correlation between the absorption from excitation mode and emission in odd-harmonic modes [see Fig.11/b and d], however the even harmonic photon emissions are uncorrelated to the photon emission from the excitation [see Fig.11/c and e]).

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We analyzed photon statistics of high-order harmonics specific to a two-level radiating system. The harmonics induced by monochromatic excitations follow a relatively simple behaviour: Odd harmonics oscillate between super-Poissonian and sub-Poissonian statistics, usually fulfilling the $Q \ll \langle N \rangle$ relation. Even harmonics can be, depending on the parameters, be either strongly squeezed or effectively in the superposition of zero-, and one-photon states.

Intermodal correlations within the radiation field has been investigated. Generally speaking, the odd-odd harmonic photons are classically cross-correlated, while the odd-, and even-harmonic photons are anticorrelated in all case investigated by us. The even-even harmonic photons can be, depending on the parameters, either be strongly correlated or anti-correlated. Our results suggest that the anti-correlations correspond to nonclassical entanglement.

In other words, we have found that nonclassical properties, potentially of experimental interest, can be associated primarily with the modes of what we called even-order harmonics in this article, and which in the literature is often called Hyper-Raman lines or Mollow-sidebands. HHG as a source of nonclassical light can be realized in the same experimental settings that allows observation of these optical lines, see E.g. [60].
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Appendix A: Analytical result for monochromatically driven two-level atom

The spectrum of scattered radiation from an elementary two-level system is structured into qualitatively different odd- and even harmonics. This property is inherent in the classically driven two-level system, but while the two-level system has been investigated in the literature thoroughly [61, 62]—usually involving approximations that limit the validity of analytical results, or being given in a complicated form that offers little insight [63]—a transparent analytical characterization of the dynamics with respect to HHG, has not been given in the literature according to our knowledge.

Here we give a transparent solution that agrees with
Floquet-calculations. Consider the semiclassical $H_{cc}$ Hamiltonian
\[ H_{cc}(t) = \frac{\hbar \omega_0}{2} \sigma_z + \frac{\hbar A}{2} \sigma_x \cos(\omega t + \phi_0), \quad (A1) \]
and use the unitary transformation:
\[ |\Psi(t)\rangle = e^{\Lambda(t)} |\Psi(0)\rangle, \quad (A2) \]
\[ H'_{cc}(t) = e^{\Lambda(t)} H_{cc} e^{-\Lambda(t)} + i \hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} e^{\Lambda(t)}, \quad (A3) \]
with the choice
\[ \Lambda(t) \equiv i \frac{A}{2 \omega} \xi \sin(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x. \quad (A4) \]

Here $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ is to be determined in the following. The transformed Hamiltonian can be written as:
\[ H'_{cc}(t) = \frac{\hbar \omega_0}{2} \left\{ \frac{\cos \left[ \frac{A}{\omega} \xi \sin(\omega t + \phi_0) \right]}{\sin(\omega t + \phi_0)} \right\} \sigma_z + \sin \left[ \frac{A}{\omega} \xi \sin(\omega t + \phi_0) \right] \sigma_y \]
\[ + \frac{\hbar A}{2} (1 - \xi) \cos(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x. \quad (A5) \]

Using the Anger-Jacobi identity, we can divide the Hamiltonian $H'_{cc}$ into $H'_0 + H'_1(t) + H'_2(t)$, where the terms are the following:
\[ H'_0 = \frac{\hbar \omega_0}{2} J_0 \left( \frac{A}{\omega} \xi \right) \sigma_z; \quad (A6) \]
\[ H'_1(t) = \frac{\hbar A}{2} (1 - \xi) \cos(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x + \hbar \omega_0 J_1 \left( \frac{A}{\omega} \xi \right) \sin(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_y; \quad (A7) \]
\[ H'_2(t) = \hbar \omega_0 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} J_{2n} \left( \frac{A}{\omega} \xi \right) \cos[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)] \sigma_z + \hbar \omega_0 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} J_{2n+1} \left( \frac{A}{\omega} \xi \right) \sin[2(n+1)(\omega t + \phi_0)] \sigma_y. \quad (A8) \]

The eigenvectors are:
\[ |\bar{e}\rangle = \sin \theta |g\rangle + \cos \theta |\bar{e}\rangle, \quad |\bar{g}\rangle = \sin \theta |e\rangle - \cos \theta |g\rangle, \quad (A11) \]
where the $\theta$ parameter is given as:
\[ \theta = \arctan \left[ \sqrt{\frac{(J_0(\frac{A}{\omega} \xi) \omega_0 - \omega)^2 + B^2/4 - (J_0(\frac{A}{\omega} \xi) \omega_0 - \omega)}{B^2}} \right]. \quad (A12) \]

The solutions can be found straightforwardly after applying the rotation transformation $e^{i \frac{A}{2}(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x}$, employing the $e^{i \frac{A}{2}(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x} e^{-i \frac{A}{2}(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x} = \sigma_x e^{i \frac{A}{2}(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x}$ relation. The transformed Hamiltonian and its eigenvalues turn out to be:
\[ H'_0 + H'_1(t) = \frac{\hbar \omega_0}{2} J_0 \left( \frac{A}{\omega} \xi \right) \sigma_z + \frac{\hbar B}{4} e^{i(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x} + e^{-i(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x} \sigma_x \]
\[ \epsilon_\pm = \pm \frac{\hbar}{2} \sqrt{(J_0(\frac{A}{\omega} \xi) \omega_0 - \omega)^2 + B^2/4}. \quad (A10) \]

The time-evolution can then be understood on the basis of eigenstates $|\bar{e}\rangle$ and $|\bar{g}\rangle$ in interaction picture. The driving is done by $\hbar W(t) \equiv e^{i \frac{A}{2}(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x} H'_2(t) e^{-i \frac{A}{2}(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x}$, where:
\[ W(t) = \omega_0 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} J_{2n} \left( \frac{A}{\omega} \xi \right) \cos[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)] \sigma_z + \omega_0 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} J_{2n+1} \left( \frac{A}{\omega} \xi \right) \sin(2(n+1)(\omega t + \phi_0)) \]
\[ \times (\sin(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x + \cos(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_y). \]

The quantum state is written as:
\[ |\Psi(t)\rangle = b^*_e(t) e^{i \frac{A}{2 \omega} \sin(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x} e^{i \frac{A}{2}(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x} |\bar{e}\rangle e^{-i (\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x} \]
\[ + b^*_g(t) e^{i \frac{A}{2 \omega} \sin(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x} e^{i \frac{A}{2}(\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x} |\bar{g}\rangle e^{-i (\omega t + \phi_0) \sigma_x}. \quad (A13) \]
with the time-dependence of coefficients, $b^\sigma$ and $b^\delta$ are given by:
\[
\begin{align*}
ib^\sigma(t) &= \langle \hat{e}|W(t)|\hat{e}\rangle b^\sigma(t) + \langle \hat{e}|W(t)|\tilde{g}\rangle e^{-i\frac{\epsilon^r - \epsilon_f}{\hbar}t}b^\delta(t), \\
ib^\delta(t) &= \langle \tilde{g}|W(t)|\tilde{g}\rangle b^\delta(t) + \langle \tilde{g}|W(t)|\hat{e}\rangle e^{-i\frac{\epsilon^r - \epsilon_f}{\hbar}t}b^\sigma(t).
\end{align*}
\]

The physical picture emerging is the following: The eigenstates of $\tilde{H}_0(t) + \tilde{H}_1(t)$ define two energy levels, which together with the unitary transform defines a set of infinite virtual energy levels (essentially equivalent to the Floquet quasi-energies). At the same time, $\hbar W(t)$ corresponds to higher-order optical processes and induces transitions between the eigenstates.

Using the following formulae:
\[
\begin{align*}
\langle \hat{e}|\sigma_x|\hat{e}\rangle &= \cos^2 \theta - \sin^2 \theta \\
\langle \tilde{g}|\sigma_x|\tilde{g}\rangle &= \sin^2 \theta - \cos^2 \theta \\
\langle \hat{e}|\sigma_z|\hat{e}\rangle &= 2\sin \theta \cos \theta \\
\langle \tilde{g}|\sigma_z|\tilde{g}\rangle &= -2\sin \theta \cos \theta \\
\langle \tilde{g}|\sigma_x|\hat{e}\rangle &= \langle \hat{e}|\sigma_x|\tilde{g}\rangle = \sin^2 \theta - \cos^2 \theta \\
\langle \tilde{g}|\sigma_y|\hat{e}\rangle &= \langle \hat{e}|\sigma_y|\tilde{g}\rangle = 0
\end{align*}
\]

the dynamical equations can be expanded, using the nonlinear optical parameter $\eta \equiv \frac{A\epsilon}{\omega}$ as below.
\[
\begin{align*}
\ib^\sigma(t) &= b^\sigma(t)\omega_0 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[ J_{2n}(\eta) \cos(2\theta) \cos[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)] + \frac{J_{2n+1}(\eta)}{2} \sin(2\theta) \left( \cos[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)] - \cos[(2n + 2)(\omega t + \phi_0)] \right) \right] \\
&+ b^\delta(t)\omega_0 e^{-i\frac{\epsilon^r - \epsilon_f}{\hbar}t} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[ J_{2n}(\eta) \sin(2\theta) \cos[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)] - \frac{J_{2n+1}(\eta)}{2} \cos(2\theta) \left( \cos[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)] - \cos[(2n + 2)(\omega t + \phi_0)] \right) \right] \\
&\quad + i\frac{J_{2n+1}(\eta)}{2} \left( \sin[(2n + 2)(\omega t + \phi_0)] + \sin[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)] \right) \\

\ib^\delta(t) &= -b^\delta(t)\omega_0 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[ J_{2n}(\eta) \cos(2\theta) \cos[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)] + \frac{J_{2n+1}(\eta)}{2} \sin(2\theta) \left( \cos[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)] - \cos[(2n + 2)(\omega t + \phi_0)] \right) \right] \\
&+ b^\sigma(t)\omega_0 e^{-i\frac{\epsilon^r - \epsilon_f}{\hbar}t} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[ J_{2n}(\eta) \sin(2\theta) \cos[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)] - \frac{J_{2n+1}(\eta)}{2} \cos(2\theta) \left( \cos[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)] - \cos[(2n + 2)(\omega t + \phi_0)] \right) \right] \\
&\quad - i\frac{J_{2n+1}(\eta)}{2} \left( \sin[(2n + 2)(\omega t + \phi_0)] + \sin[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)] \right)
\end{align*}
\]

In semiclassical spectral calculations, the quantity of interest is $\langle D(t) \rangle \equiv \langle \Psi|d\sigma_x|\Psi \rangle$, the expectation value of the dipole-moment.
\[
\frac{\langle D \rangle}{d} = \left( |b^+|^2 - |b^-|^2 \right) \cos(\omega t + \phi_0) 2 \sin \theta \cos \theta \\
+ 2Re \left[ b^+ (t)b^-(t)e^{-i\frac{\epsilon^r - \epsilon_f}{\hbar}t} \cos(\omega t + \phi_0)(\sin^2 \theta - \cos^2 \theta) \right] \\
+ 2Im \left[ b^+(t)b^-(t)e^{-i\frac{\epsilon^r - \epsilon_f}{\hbar}t} \sin(\omega t + \phi_0) \right]
\]

Evaluation shows that the terms with not odd-harmonic frequencies have (plus-minus) $\delta \omega \equiv \frac{\epsilon^r - \epsilon_f}{\hbar} - \omega$ detuning from even-order multiples of the basic harmonic.

If we fix the gap $\omega_0$, and detuning $\omega/\omega_0$ ratio, both $\cos \theta$ and $\delta \omega$ are functions of only the amplitude, and are asymptotically (albeit with slow convergence) zero, see Fig. [12]. Let us note that zero points of $\cos \theta$ are corresponding to local extrema of $\delta \omega/\omega$, that is, at these parameters the dual lines of even harmonics have maximal separation. The $\cos \theta$ function has zero points in all intensity range, more or less being distributed evenly.
FIG. 12: Dependence of $\delta \omega/\omega$ (red) and $\cos \theta$ (blue) on the amplitude of resonant excitation.

Appendix B: First-order perturbative expansion

In the dynamical equations \[A14\]-\[A15\] there is no resonant contribution, that is, the $b^{(e/g)}$ coefficients follow high-frequency, small-amplitude oscillations around their initial values, which implies that perturbation methods are applicable. Comparison between spectra calculated numerically and through first-order perturbation – within realistic excitation intensity values – can be seen on Fig. (13). We note that the dominant spectral lines (odd or even harmonics, depending on the initial conditions) are reproduced by the perturbative treatment typically within $\sim 10\%$ relative error.

Here we give the analytical expression of the first-order perturbation calculation results which have been employed in the article. For the sake of simplicity, we will only focus on the special case of $\cos \theta = 0$, which, as mentioned above, corresponds to the maximal spectral gap between the dual lines of even-harmonics. This simplification is not unrealistic, considering that a careful selection of the parameters allows this condition to be fulfilled in all, not too specific intensity interval. Then equations (A14-A15) become:

Then the first-order perturbative solution can be written as:

\[
\begin{align*}
ib^e(t) &= -b^e(t)\omega_0 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[J_{2n}(\eta) \cos[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)]\right] \\
&+ b^g(t)\omega_0 e^{-i\frac{\epsilon - \epsilon_0}{\hbar}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[i \frac{J_{2n+1}(\eta)}{2} \left( \exp[2ni(\omega t + \phi_0)] - \exp[-(2n + 2)i(\omega t + \phi_0)] \right) \right] \\
ib^g(t) &= b^g(t)\omega_0 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[J_{2n}(\eta) \cos[2n(\omega t + \phi_0)]\right] \\
&+ b^e(t)\omega_0 e^{-i\frac{\epsilon - \epsilon_0}{\hbar}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[i \frac{J_{2n+1}(\eta)}{2} \left( \exp[-2ni(\omega t + \phi_0)] - \exp[(2n + 2)i(\omega t + \phi_0)] \right) \right]
\end{align*}
\]

Then the first-order perturbative solution can be written as:

\[
\begin{align*}
b^e(t) &\approx b^e(0) + ib^e(0)\zeta_1(t) - ib^g(0)\zeta_2(t) \\
b^g(t) &\approx b^g(0) - ib^g(0)\zeta_1(t) - ib^e(0)\zeta_2^*(t)
\end{align*}
\] (B1)
The dipole-operator expectation value can be expressed through $b^\ast(t)b(t)e^{\frac{\epsilon - \epsilon_0}{\hbar}t}$ which term, after simplifications can be rewritten as:

$$b^\ast(t)b(t)e^{\frac{\epsilon - \epsilon_0}{\hbar}t} = b^\ast(0)b(0)\left[1 - i\zeta_1(t)\right]e^{\frac{\epsilon - \epsilon_0}{\hbar}t} + b^\ast(0)b(0)\left[\zeta_2(t)\right]e^{\frac{\epsilon - \epsilon_0}{\hbar}t} + \left(|b(0)|^2 - |b(0)|^2\right)[i\zeta_1(t) + \zeta_1(t)\zeta_2(t)]e^{\frac{\epsilon - \epsilon_0}{\hbar}t} \quad \text{(B2)}$$

The evaluation of the dipole-moment can be done in a lengthy but straightforward manner. The dipole-oscillation contains frequencies $(2n + 1)\omega$ and $(2n + 1)\omega \pm \frac{\epsilon - \epsilon_0}{\hbar} = (2n + 2)\omega \pm \delta \omega$

If either $b^\ast(0)$ or $b(0)$ is zero, we can expect the lack of even-order harmonics in semiclassical solutions. We note in passing, that the two spectral lines within even harmonics carry different multiples of the excitation phase, which can have consequences when macroscopic wave-propagation is considered.