Theory of third-order polarizability of interlayer excitons due to intra-excitonic energy level transitions
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In this paper, we employ a fully microscopic approach to the study of interlayer excitons in layered materials. We discuss the utilization of Fowler’s and Karplus’ method to access the dynamical polarizability of non–interacting interlayer excitons in a WSe₂/WS₂–based van der Waals heterostructure. Following from the calculation of the linear polarizability, we consider Svendsen’s variational method to the dynamic third–order polarizability. With this variational method, we study both two–photon absorption and third–harmonic generation processes for interlayer excitons in a WSe₂/WS₂ hetero–bilayer, discussing the various intra–excitonic energy level transitions observed.

I. INTRODUCTION

The advent of the study of two–dimensional layers with atomic thickness has renewed the interest in transition–metal dichalcogenides (TMDs) and their opto–electronic properties [1]. These materials, which have been studied in their bulk form since the 1960’s [2 3], have been shown to be good candidates for various optical and optoelectronic applications [4–7].

The optical response of these materials is dominated by excitons [8], and optically bright exciton absorption peaks have been shown to correspond to the excitation of states in the ns series [9 10]. As for np–series excitons, these can be controlled magnetically despite being optically dark in TMDs [11]. The selection rules of excitons in TMDs for absorption experiments have been recently thoroughly studied[12].

The linear dielectric response of TMDs consists of two distinct regimes: the interband regime, where electrons from the valence band are excited to the conduction band, leaving being a hole [6 13]. The attractive electrostatic interaction between this newly–formed electron–hole pair leads to the formation of a bound state (exciton), and its ns states are optically active and can be observed in absorption measurements [14]. The second regime, characterized by intra-excitonic transitions, consists on the transition between the excitonic ground state (1s) and the empty np states [15 16]. Each of the 1s → np transitions [17 19] is characterized by a peak in the dynamical polarizability which, in turn, determines the dielectric response of the system in a pump–probe experiment [20 21].

Interlayer excitons are formed when two monolayers are brought together with type–II band alignment, where the conduction band minimum and the valence band maximum are located in different layers [22 23]. This allows the intralayer electron–hole pairs to tunnel into interlayer excitons (Fig. 1 left), which have a significantly longer life–time due to the small overlap of the individual electron and hole wave functions [21 24]. Additionally, interlayer excitons exhibit luminescence at lower energies than their intralayer counterpart [26] which, together with their lower binding energies, allows for an easier identification of the specific species in question in polarizability measurements [21]. Recently, Merkl et al. [21] were able to observe the transition between interlayer and intralayer excitonic phases in van der Waals heterostructures. This observation was performed via the measurement of the linear dielectric function of the excitons in a pump–probe experiment (Fig. 1 right), observing a significant shift in maximum of the optical conductivity.

The excitonic energy levels are known to depend on whether the system is confined or not (for example, the Rydberg series for the two–dimensional Hydrogen atom is strongly affected by radial confinement [27]). Following recent advancements in the fabrication of TMD–based meta–materials with atomic precision [28 29], we focus our attention on radially confined interlayer excitons in a WSe₂/WS₂ bilayer.

From studying the dynamic polarizability of the excitonic states, the full dielectric response of the excited sample can be extracted. This transition from polarizability to dielectric response is one from the microscopic (individual exciton) to the macroscopic (when many excitons form a low–density exciton gas). The susceptibility of this exciton gas would be given, in a simplified form,
as \( \chi_{\text{inter}} = N_X^{\alpha} / N_X \), with \( N_X \) the exciton density in the two-dimensional material, \( \alpha \) the linear polarizability, and \( \epsilon_0 \) the vacuum dielectric constant. Separating the real and imaginary part of the susceptibility, these can be experimentally measured \([20, 21, 30, 31]\) and, therefore, would provide a good comparison point for the results we obtain for the linear polarizability.

The non–linear polarizabilities of the hydrogen atom have been thoroughly studied throughout the years \([32, 33]\), providing a good starting point for the study of these same non–linear processes in excitons. Recently, the non–linear optical effects from intra–excitonic transitions have been the focus of many theoretical and experimental works. This has been performed for several TMDs, including but not limited to WSe\(_2\) \([34, 35]\) and WS\(_2\) \([36, 37]\), as well as hBN homostructures \([38]\). Through doping processes, the optical non–linear properties of TMDs can be tuned \([39]\) which, along with their large non–linear optical coefficients \([40]\), increases their feasibility for practical applications \((\text{e.g., as optical modulators})\).

We begin this paper by discussing the necessary modifications to the Rytova–Keldysh potential \([41, 42]\) when dealing with interlayer excitons, followed by analyzing an harmonic oscillator approximation to this potential which will motivate the chosen variational wave–function. After defining this \( \text{ansatz} \), we outline the complete set of basis functions we will use to approximate the excited states of the exciton. The necessary material–dependent set of parameters characteristic of the specific van der Waals heterostructure in question will also be discussed, obtaining the desired energy levels.

In Section \( \text{III} \) we outline Fowler’s and Karplus’ method \([43, 44]\) to compute the dynamical polarizability of non–interacting excitons. We then apply this same method to interlayer excitons in a WSe\(_2\)/WS\(_2\)–based van der Waals heterostructure, comparing the obtained resonances against the transitions calculated both numerically and variationally via a finite–basis approach.

In Section \( \text{IV} \) we turn to the non–linear response of the excitons \([45, 46]\). We focus our discussion on the third–order polarizability, first outlining a variational procedure based on the ideas of both Karplus and Svendsen \([43, 47, 48]\) for the calculation of the intra–excitonic third–order polarizability. This procedure was recently studied by Henriques \textit{et al.}, applied to for the study of the two–photon absorption for excitons in WSe\(_2\) \([49]\). After outlining this variational method, we look at the two–photon absorption for excitons in WSe\(_2\)/WS\(_2\), discussing the various intra–excitonic transitions observed. Finally, we consider the third–harmonic generation, first with an extremely small broadening as to clearly differentiate each individual resonance, and afterwards with two much larger broadenings as to ascertain the feasibility of experimental detection of each peak. A diagrammatic representation of the various transitions is also presented for both the two–photon absorption and third–harmonic generation processes.

We finish the paper with our closing remarks in Section \( \text{V} \).

II. INTERLAYER RYTOVA–KELDYSH POTENTIAL

We begin this section by discussing the Hamiltonian in which we focus our attention. This will lead to the discussion of the Rytova–Keldysh potential, and of the necessary modifications when dealing with interlayer excitons. Following from this discussion, we will approximate the interlayer potential as an harmonic oscillator, which will allow us to obtain an analytical solution that will serve as a starting point for the variational \( \text{ansatz} \) of the ground state we will use throughout this article. Considering the boundary conditions of the circular dot in question, we will then define a complete set of functions that will serve as the basis for our variational approach to the excitonic states (starting by the \( \text{np} \)–series states for Section \( \text{III} \) and then the \( \text{ns} \)– and \( \text{nd} \)–series for Section \( \text{IV} \)). Finally, we finish this section by analyzing the material dependent parameters required to study this system, comparing the various variational energies for the excitonic ground state against the result from numerical integration of the Schrödinger equation in a log–grid \([50, 52]\) via the Numerov shooting method.

A. Model Hamiltonian in the Dipole Approximation

Let us now begin by considering the following Hamiltonian (in atomic units, as will be used throughout this paper) in the dipole approximation

\[
H = H_0 - \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{F} (t) = -\frac{1}{2 \mu} \nabla^2 + V (r) - \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{F} (t),
\]

where \( \mu \) is the reduced mass of the electron–hole system, \( \nabla^2 \) is the Laplacian operator (taken in polar coordinates throughout this paper), \( V (r) \) is a potential energy term and \( \mathbf{F} (t) \) is an external time–dependent field. This external field will be initially ignored as to first outline the variational methods and wave functions that will be used, and its action will be studied in Sections \( \text{III} \) and \( \text{IV} \) when the methods to obtain both the linear and the third–order dynamical polarizability are described, respectively.

Considering this same electron–hole system in a van der Waals (vdW) heterostructure, their potential energy is accurately modeled by the Rytova–Keldysh potential \([41, 42]\)

\[
V_{\text{RK}} (r) = -\frac{\pi}{2 r_0} \left[ H_0 \left( \kappa \frac{r}{r_0} \right) - Y_0 \left( \kappa \frac{r}{r_0} \right) \right],
\]

with \( \kappa \) the mean dielectric constant of the media, \( r_0 \) an intrinsic parameter of the 2D material (interpretable as an in–plane screening length), and \( H_0, Y_0 \) the Struve–H...
and Bessel–Y (second kind) special functions of zero–th order, respectively.

When considering interlayer excitons, a minimum separation originating from the physical distance between the two layers appears in the Rytova–Keldysh potential. The interlayer modified Rytova–Keldysh potential then reads

$$V_{\text{I–RK}} (r) = -\frac{\pi}{2r_0} \left[ H_0 \left( \kappa \frac{\sqrt{r^2 + d^2}}{r_0} \right) - Y_0 \left( \kappa \frac{\sqrt{r^2 + d^2}}{r_0} \right) \right], \quad (3)$$

with $d$ this interlayer separation distance.

Presenting the same Coulomb tail behaviour as the Rytova–Keldysh potential [Eq. (2)] at large distances, the finite interlayer separation $d$ eliminates the logarithmic divergence at the origin. The absence of this divergence makes it so that an inverse–exponential ansatz for the excitonic wave function [53] is not the most adequate. This, together with the parabolic nature of the interlayer modified Rytova–Keldysh potential near $r = 0$, motivates the ansatz that will be obtained in the following section.

**B. Harmonic Oscillator Approximation: Gaussian–Based Ansatz**

For a first approach to the interlayer modified Rytova–Keldysh potential, given by Eq. (3), one can expand this potential as a power–series near $r = 0$. This will allow us to obtain an analytical solution in this regime which, in turn, will motivate the considered variational ansatz. Assuming $d \gg \sqrt{\langle r^2 \rangle}$ (where the average of the radius squared is taken with the exciton wave function), Eq. (3) can be expanded up to second order in $r$ as

$$V (r) \approx -V_0 + \gamma r^2, \quad (4)$$

where

$$V_0 = \frac{\pi}{2r_0} \left[ H_0 \left( \kappa \frac{d}{r_0} \right) - Y_0 \left( \kappa \frac{d}{r_0} \right) \right],$$

$$\gamma = -\frac{\pi \kappa}{4dr_0} \left[ H_1 \left( \kappa \frac{d}{r_0} \right) - Y_{-1} \left( \kappa \frac{d}{r_0} \right) \right]. \quad (5)$$

Considering this potential, the Hamiltonian will be

$$H = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \nabla^2 - V_0 + \gamma r^2$$

and its solution is given by [55, 57]

$$\Psi (\eta, \varphi) = A_{n,l} \left( \frac{\hbar}{\mu \omega} \right)^{1/2} \eta^{1/2} e^{-\eta/2} L_n^l (\eta) \frac{e^{i\varphi}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}, \quad (6)$$

where $\eta = \mu r^2/\hbar$, $\omega = \sqrt{2\gamma/\mu}$, $n = \{0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots \}$ and $l = \{0, \pm1, \pm2, \ldots \}$, $A_{n,l}$ is a normalization constant, and $L_n^l (x)$ is the associate Laguerre polynomial of degree $b$ and order $a$. The energy levels of this wave function are given by

$$E_n = \hbar \left( \frac{2n}{\mu} \right)^{1/2} (2n + |l| + 1) - V_0. \quad (7)$$

For the ground-state ($n = 0, l = 0$), Eq. (6) reads (discarding numerical factors)

$$\Psi (\eta) \propto e^{-\eta/2}.$$

As such, an ansatz based on this solution is given by

$$\psi (r) = C e^{-r^2/2\gamma}, \quad (7)$$

where $C$ is a normalization constant and $\beta$ is a variational parameter. As we are interested in studying interlayer excitons confined to a finite radius, a multiplicative factor is added to impose boundary conditions,

$$\psi_0 (r) = C e^{-\frac{r^2}{2\gamma}} (R - r), \quad (8)$$

where $R$ is the radius of the enclosure, considered $R = 1200$ throughout this paper (in atomic units). This radius is considered sufficiently large such that the variational wave functions become zero significantly before the boundary is reached (clearly seen in Fig. 2, where the wave functions are already zero at around $\sim R/3$).

Similarly to the ansatz defined by Pedersen in [54], we modify Eq. (8) into a sum of two gaussians, given by

$$\psi_0 (r) = C \left( e^{-\frac{r^2}{2\gamma} + be^{-\frac{r^2}{2\gamma}}} \right) (R - r), \quad (9)$$

which will be the ansatz of the excitonic ground state we will consider throughout this article. Additionally, a visual comparison of Eq. (8) against Eq. (9), as well as the approximate wave function obtained via the method described in Sec. IIC, is present in Fig. 2. Clearly the ansatz (9) performs much better than the ansatz (8).

**C. Variational Approach from Boundary Conditions**

In certain conditions, namely for a small interlayer separation $d$, the obtained eigenvalues from minimization of the Hamiltonian

$$H_0 = -\frac{1}{2\mu} \nabla^2 + V_{\text{I–RK}} (r) \quad (10)$$

with the ansatz from Eq. (9) are not significantly different from those obtained from numerical integration (a small difference is present for the present case in Table 11). Additionally, obtaining higher energy states involves orthogonalization against Eqs. (5) or (9), followed by
normalization, a process whose complexity increases substantially when increasing the number of excited states.

A different approach to obtaining variational solutions to the Schrödinger equation with the interlayer modified Rytova–Keldysh is by integrating the Hamiltonian matrix elements for a complete basis whose elements obey the necessary boundary conditions. Truncating this basis and diagonalizing the Hamiltonian matrix, we obtain a set of variational wave functions that converge towards the real wave functions of the system as the basis size increases.

Following [58], a basis of functions can be constructed from the solutions of the circular infinite well, given by

\[ \psi_{n,l}(r, \phi) = \frac{C_{n,l}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \epsilon^{i \phi} J_l \left( z_{n,l} \frac{r}{R} \right), \]

(11)

where \( J_l(x) \) is the Bessel function of the first kind of order \( l \), and \( z_{n,l} \) is the \( n \)-th zero of \( J_l(z) \). \( C_{n,l} \) is a normalization constant given by

\[ C_{n,l} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{R^2 J_l^2(z_{n,l})}} \]

and the eigenvalues of the infinite circular well are

\[ E_{n,l} = \frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \left( \frac{z_{n,l}}{R} \right)^2. \]

As both \( V_{RK}(r) \) and \( V_{1-RK}(r) \) are invariant under rotations, the quantum number \( l \) is well-defined. As such, we can integrate the Hamiltonian and diagonalize it for a finite number of functions with fixed \( l \). Knowing this, we will start the discussion by outlining the necessary material dependent parameters for a WSe\(_2\)/WS\(_2\) van der Waals heterostructure.

### D. Material Dependent Parameters in WSe\(_2\)/WS\(_2\)

To perform the necessary calculations and obtain the wave functions and energy eigenvalues, we must substitute the material–specific parameters characteristic of a WSe\(_2\)/WS\(_2\) van der Waals (vdW) heterostructure.

The reduced mass of interlayer excitons in this vdW heterostructure is \( \mu = 0.15 \) and, as such, the effective Bohr radius will be \( a_0 \approx 0.581 \) Å. The thickness of each layer is considered \( d_{\text{mat}} = 5.7 \) Å and the gap distance is \( d_{\text{gap}} = 1 \) Å. As such, the effective \( d \) parameter will be

\[ d_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2} d_{\text{mat}} + d_{\text{gap}} + \frac{1}{2} d_{\text{mat}} = 6.7 \text{ Å}. \]

The permittivities for each material are given by

\[ \epsilon_n = \sqrt{\epsilon_{(n)}^+ \epsilon_{(n)}^-}, \]

(12)

where \( \epsilon_{(n)}^+ \) and \( \epsilon_{(n)}^- \) are the in- and out-of-plane relative permittivities of the material \( n \). The numerical values of each component of the relative permittivities in each material is presented in Table I. Knowing the permittivities in each material, the average permittivity of the vdW heterostructure is

\[ \kappa_{\text{mat}} = \frac{\epsilon_{\text{WSe}_2} + \epsilon_{\text{WS}_2}}{2} = 9.31. \]

Regarding the screening length \( r_0 \), this parameter can be separated as a sum for each layer (as described in [53])

\[ r_0 \rightarrow r_0^{(1)} + r_0^{(2)}, \]

where \( r_0^{(n)} \) denotes the screening length for the layer \( n \). The screening length for each individual layer can be obtained as [20]

\[ r_0^{(n)} = \frac{\epsilon_n^2 - 1}{2 \epsilon_n} d_n \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_n^+}{\epsilon_n^-}}, \]

(13)

where \( d_n \) is the thickness of the layer. As the in- and out-of-plane relative permittivities of the two materials are known, the total screening length is

\[ r_0 = 70.73 \text{ Å}. \]

Choosing a basis size of 120 and the same enclosure radius as in Sec. IIB \( (R = 1200) \), the ground–state energy eigenvalue is (in both atomic units and meV)

\[ E_{1,0} = -0.00143378 = -39.0152 \text{ meV}. \]

A comparison against both variational ansätze [Eqs. (8) and (9)] and the numerical results from considering the shooting method in a log–grid is given in Table II.
The time-dependent Schrödinger equation reads

\[ i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(t) = H \psi(t) \]

Closely following the approach presented in [59], serving as a quick outline of the procedure as some results will be necessary further ahead. We apply this method to calculate the linear polarizability of interlayer excitons in a WSe₂/WS₂ circular dot, comparing the obtained peaks with the calculated 1s \( \rightarrow \) np transitions.

Looking back to Eq. (1), we consider (without loss of generality) the external field pointing along the \( -x \) direction. Closely following the approach presented in [59], first outlined by Fowler and Karplus [43, 44], the time-dependent Schrödinger equation reads

\[ [H_0 + x F(t)] \psi(t) = i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(t) \]

where \( \psi(t) \) describes the wave function of the system in the presence of the electric field \( F \). The dynamical polarizability is defined as

\[ \alpha(\omega) = -\langle \psi_0 | x \psi_1^\dagger - \psi_0 | x \psi_1^\dagger \rangle \]

such that

\[ E(\omega) = E_0 + \frac{1}{2} \alpha(\omega) F^2. \]

As we are working on a finite disk of radius \( R \), Bessel functions of the first kind are an appropriate complete set of functions to describe in such a geometry. Using these functions as a basis, we write \( \psi_1^\dagger(x) \) as

\[ \psi_1^\dagger(x) = \cos \theta \sum_{n=1}^{N} c_n^+ J_1(\frac{z_1, n R}{R}), \]

where \( J_1(z) \) is the Bessel function of the first kind of order 1, \( z_1, n \) is the \( n \)-th zero of \( J_1(z) \), \( N \) is the number of Bessel functions we choose to use, and \( \{ c_n^+ \} \) are a set of coefficients yet to be determined. As proposed in Refs. [43, 60, 62], the values of \( \{ c_n^+ \} \) are determined from the minimization of the functional

\[ J_\pm = \int_0^R \left( \frac{\dot{a}}{R} \right) \left( \frac{a}{R} \right) \right|_{\psi_1^\dagger, n} \left[ H_0 - E_0 \pm i\hbar \omega \right] \psi_1^\dagger, n \left( \frac{a}{R} \right) + 2 \int_0^R \left( \frac{\dot{a}}{R} \right) \left( \frac{a}{R} \right) \right|_{\psi_1^\dagger, n} \left[ \frac{d}{R} \right] \left( \cos \theta \psi_0 \left( \frac{a}{R} \right) \right). \]

Recalling the orthogonality relation of Bessel functions on a finite disk of radius \( R \) [63],

\[ \int_0^R J_{\nu} \left( \frac{z_{vm} R}{R} \right) J_{\nu} \left( \frac{z_{vm} R}{R} \right) \right|_{\psi_1^\dagger, n} \left[ H_0 - E_0 \pm i\hbar \omega \right] \psi_1^\dagger, n \left( \frac{a}{R} \right) \right|_{\psi_1^\dagger, n} \left( \frac{a}{R} \right) + 2 \int_0^R \left( \frac{\dot{a}}{R} \right) \left( \frac{a}{R} \right) \right|_{\psi_1^\dagger, n} \left[ \frac{d}{R} \right] \left( \cos \theta \psi_0 \left( \frac{a}{R} \right) \right) \]

with \( z_{vm} \) the \( m \)-th zero of \( J_{\nu}(z) \), one easily shows that the functional can be rewritten as

\[ J_\pm = \pi \sum_{n=1}^{N} c_n^+ c_k^+ \delta_{kn} + 2 \pi \sum_{n=1}^{N} c_n^+ S_n + \]

\[ + \frac{\pi R^2}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left( c_n^+ \right)^2 \left[ \frac{\lambda^2}{2 \mu R^2} - E_0 \pm i\hbar \omega \right] \left[ J_2 (z_{1n}) \right]^2, \]

where \( \delta_{kn} \) and \( S_n \) refer to the following integrals involving one and two Bessel functions, respectively

\[ \delta_{kn} = \int_0^R J_1 (\frac{z_{1n} R}{R}) V_{\text{RHK}} (r) J_1 (\frac{z_{1n} R}{R}) \psi_0 (r) dr, \]

\[ S_n = \int_0^R J_1 (\frac{z_{1n} R}{R}) \psi_0 (r) \psi_0^{\text{fin}} (r) dr. \]

Differentiating \( J_\pm \) with respect to the different \( c_n^+ \) coefficients, one finds

\[ c_j^+ \left\{ \frac{R^2}{2} \left[ J_2 (z_{1j}) \right]^2 \left[ \frac{z_{1j}^2}{2 \mu R^2} - E_0 \pm i\hbar \omega \right] + \delta_{jj} \right\} \]

\[ + \sum_{n \neq j}^{N} c_n^+ \delta_{jn} = -S_j, \]

with \( j \in \{ 1, 2, ..., N \} \). This equation defines a linear system of equations whose solution determines the values of the coefficients \( c_n^+ \).

We can write Eq. (23) in a more concise manner, using matrix notation, as

\[ M \cdot c^+ = -S, \]

where \( c^+ \) and \( S \) are column vectors defined as

\[ \left[ c^+ \right]^T = \left[ c_1^+ , c_2^+ , ..., c_N^+ \right], \]

\[ S^T = \left( S_1, S_2, ..., S_N \right), \]

and \( M \) is a \( N \times N \) matrix with:

\[ (M)_{ij} = g_i^+ (\omega) \delta_{ij} + \delta_{jj}, \]

where \( \delta_{ij} \) is the Kronecker delta and

\[ g_i^+ (\omega) = \frac{R^2}{2} \left[ J_2 (z_{1i}) \right]^2 \left[ \frac{z_{1i}^2}{2 \mu R^2} - E_0 \pm i\hbar \omega \right]. \]

After \( M \) and \( S \) are computed using Eqs. (21) and (27), and (22), respectively, the coefficients that determine \( \psi_1^\dagger (r) \) are readily obtained as

\[ c^+ = -M^{-1} \cdot S, \]
and the solution of the differential equation is found.

At last, to compute the dynamical polarizability we look back at Eq. (17) and write

\[
K = \langle \xi_{\alpha\beta} (\omega_1, \omega_b) | H_0 - E_0 + \omega_1 + \omega_b | \psi_\alpha (\omega_1) \rangle + \langle \xi_{\alpha\beta} (\omega_1, \omega_b) | d_{\beta} | \psi_\alpha (\omega_1) \rangle + \langle \psi_\alpha (\omega_1) | d_{\beta} | \xi_{\alpha\beta} (\omega_1, \omega_b) \rangle
\]  

(30)

where \(d\) is the dipole operator defined previously, \(E_0\) the ground-state energy, \(H_0\) the unperturbed Hamiltonian [defined in Eq. (10)] and |\(\psi_\alpha\)\rangle the basis obtained via the \(c^+\) coefficients and the Bessel functions \(J_1 (z_{1,n})\) in Eq. (17). This functional is then minimized with respect to \(\xi_{\alpha\beta}\), defined analogously to Eq. (17) as

\[
\xi_{\alpha\beta} (\omega_1, \omega_b; r) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|l|=0}^{\infty} \zeta^{\alpha,\beta}_{l,n} (\omega_1, \omega_b) J_l (z_{l,n} \frac{r}{R}) e^{i l \theta} / \sqrt{2\pi}.
\]

Focusing on the xx component of \(\xi_{\alpha\beta}\), and defining

\[
\alpha (\omega) = -g_v \pi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_n^+ + c_n^-) \times \int_0^R J_1 (\frac{z_{1,n} r}{R}) r \psi_\alpha^{in} (r) r dr
\]

\[
= -g_v \pi (c^+ + c^-) \cdot S.
\]

(29)

where \(g_v = 2\) is the valley degeneracy. The \(\omega\) dependence on the right hand side is present in the coefficients \(c_n^\pm\); more explicitly, this dependence is present in \(M\) from the \(g^\pm (\omega)\) term, as defined in Eq. (27).

The polarizability for interlayer excitons in a WSe\(_2\)/WS\(_2\) heterostructure is plotted in Fig. 3 normalized by its value at the maximum for the excitonic \(1s \rightarrow 2p\) transition (with \(E_{1s \rightarrow 2p} \approx 29.0576\) meV) for easier visualization.

Having outlined and obtained the linear polarizability in Section III, we now consider a similar method for the third-order polarizability of interlayer excitons in this same vdW heterostructure.

IV. SVENDSEN’S METHOD FOR THE THIRD–ORDER POLARIZABILITY

Having outlined Fowler’s and Karplus’ method to obtain the linear dynamical polarizability in Section III, we will now consider a similar method for the third-order polarizability. We will follow the procedure delineated by Svendsen [47, 48] and recently applied by Henriques et al [49] to intralayer excitons in TMDs.

Maintaining the definition for the \(c^\pm\) coefficients given in Eq. (28), and following closely [43, 48, 49], we write the functional

\[
y_n^{(l)} (\omega) \text{ as a more general form of Eq. (27)}
\]

\[
y_n^{(l)} (\omega) = \frac{R^2}{2} [J_{l+1} (z_{l,n})]^2 \left[ \frac{z_{l,n}^2}{2\mu R^2} - E_0 + \omega \right]
\]

and \(y_n^{(l)}\) analogously to Eq. (21)

\[
\psi_{nm}^{(l)} = \left\langle J_l (z_{l,n} \frac{r}{R}) V_{l-RK} | J_l (z_{l,m} \frac{r}{R}) \right\rangle
\]

\[
= \int_0^R J_l (z_{l,n} \frac{r}{R}) V_{l-RK} J_l (z_{l,m} \frac{r}{R}) r dr,
\]

the functional of Eq. (30) can then be rewritten using

\[
\psi_{nm}^{(l)}
\]
the both the $c_{r,n}^\pm$ and the $\zeta_{l,n}$ coefficients as

$$
\mathcal{K} = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \sum_{|l|=0}^{+\infty} [\zeta_{l,n}]^\dagger g^{(l)}_{n} (\omega_a + \omega_b) \zeta_{l,n} + 
+ \sum_{n,m=1}^{+\infty} \sum_{|l|=0}^{+\infty} [\zeta_{l,n}]^\dagger Y_{nm}^{(l)} \zeta_{l,m} + 
+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n,m=1}^{+\infty} \left\{ [\zeta_{l,n}^0] \alpha_{n,m}^0 \right\},
$$

(31)

In Eq. (31), $T_{nm}^{l}$ is the dipole transition amplitude between the functions of the basis, denoted by $\langle \psi_\alpha (\omega_a) | d_\beta | \xi_{\alpha \beta} (\omega_a, \omega_b) \rangle$ in Eq. (30) and given by

$$
T_{nm}^{l} = \langle J_{l} (z_{n,1}^{-1} r) | r | J_{l} (z_{1,1}^{-1} r) \rangle
= \int_{0}^{R} J_{l} (z_{n,1}^{-1} r) J_{l} (z_{1,1}^{-1} r) r dr.
$$

The solution of this integral can be written in a closed form by applying the more general expression

$$
\int_{0}^{1} J_{\nu} (\alpha r) r J_{\nu+1} (\beta r) r dr = \frac{\alpha J_{\nu+1} (\alpha)}{\alpha^2 - \beta^2} \times
\left\{ -2 \beta J_{\nu} (\beta) + \left( \alpha^2 - \beta^2 \right) J_{\nu+1} (\beta) \right\},
$$

(32)

valid as long as $J_{\nu} (\alpha) = 0$. Comparing with the definition of $T_{nm}^{l}$, Eq. (32) can be simplified further as $J_{\nu+1} (\beta) = 0$. Performing the necessary changes of variable, and substituting $J_{\nu+1} (\beta)$ into Eq. (32), $T_{nm}^{l}$ can be written as

$$
T_{nm}^{(l=0)} = -2R^2 \frac{\xi_{0,0} z_{1,0} z_{1,1} J_{1} (z_{0,1}) J_{0} (z_{1,1})}{(z_{0,1}^2 - z_{1,1}^2)^2},
$$

$$
T_{nm}^{(l=2)} = -2R^2 \frac{\xi_{2,0} z_{2,0} z_{2,1} J_{2} (z_{0,1}) J_{0} (z_{1,1})}{(z_{0,1}^2 - z_{1,1}^2)^2}.
$$

(33)

As done in the appendix of [49], we separate the $l = 0$ and the $l = 2$ cases. Looking first at the more complicated case of $l = 0$, we must ensure that $|\xi_{\alpha \beta}|$ is orthogonal to the considered ground–state [in our case, the ansatz of Eq. (39)]. As such, to ensure this, we must have

$$
\langle \psi_0 | \xi_{\alpha \beta} \rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \xi_{0,n}^{\alpha \beta} (\omega_a, \omega_b) \langle \psi_0 | J_{0} (z_{0,1}^{-1} R) \rangle
= 0,
$$

(34)

where non–zero angular momentum terms vanish upon angular integration due to the isotropic nature of the ground–state ansatz. Separating the first term of the sum, this condition can then be rewritten as

$$
\xi_{0,1}^{\alpha \beta} (\omega_a, \omega_b) \langle \psi_0 | J_{0} (z_{0,1}^{-1} R) \rangle
+ \sum_{n=2}^{+\infty} \xi_{0,n}^{\alpha \beta} (\omega_a, \omega_b) \langle \psi_0 | J_{0} (z_{0,1}^{-1} R) \rangle = 0,
$$

which can then be rearranged as

$$
\xi_{0,1}^{\alpha \beta} (\omega_a, \omega_b) = -\sum_{n=2}^{+\infty} \xi_{0,n}^{\alpha \beta} (\omega_a, \omega_b) \frac{\langle \psi_0 | J_{0} (z_{0,1}^{-1} R) \rangle}{\langle \psi_0 | J_{0} (z_{0,1}^{-1} R) \rangle}.
$$

(35)

This means that $\xi_{0,1}$ is no longer considered an independent variable and, as such, we will focus our attention on the $n \geq 2$ terms. For compactness, we define

$$
f_n = \frac{\langle \psi_0 | J_{0} (z_{0,1}^{-1} R) \rangle}{\langle \psi_0 | J_{0} (z_{0,1}^{-1} R) \rangle},
$$

(36)

which lets us write Eq. (35) as

$$
\xi_{0,n}^{\alpha \beta} (\omega_a, \omega_b) = -\sum_{n=2}^{+\infty} \xi_{0,n}^{\alpha \beta} (\omega_a, \omega_b) f_n.
$$

(37)

Substituting Eq. (37) into Eq. (31) and then differentiating the resulting expression with respect to $[\zeta_{l,n}]^\dagger$, we obtain for $n \geq 2$,

$$
\zeta_{0,x}^{\alpha \beta} (\omega_a, \omega_b) = \left[ F + M^{(0)} (\omega_a + \omega_b) \right]^{-1} \cdot \left[ W^{x,x} (\omega_a) + f_0^{x,x} (\omega_a) \right],
$$

(39)
Having defined Eq. (43), we will now utilize it to compute the

\[
\chi_{x,x,x}^{(3)} (-\omega_1^\prime, \omega_2, \omega_3^\prime) = \frac{1}{3!} \mathcal{P} \left\{ -c^\dagger \left( -\omega_1^\prime \right)^\dagger \right\} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_0 \cdot \zeta_0^x (-\omega_2, -\omega_3) + T_2 \cdot \zeta_2^x (-\omega_2, -\omega_3) \\ [\mathbf{S} \cdot c (-\omega_1^\prime)] \cdot \sum_{n=1}^N c_n^\dagger (-\omega_2^\prime) c_n (\omega_1) 2\pi R^2/2 |J_2 (\tilde{z}_1, n)|^2 \end{bmatrix},
\]

looking now at the simpler \( l = 2 \) case, and as no orthogonality–based restrictions need to be applied to its coefficients, we can directly differentiate Eq. (51) with respect to \( [\zeta_l, n] \) and then minimize the resulting expression, obtaining

\[
+ \infty \sum_{n=1} \gamma_n^{(2)} (\omega_a + \omega_b) \zeta_{2, n} + \sum_{n,n=1}^{+\infty} \gamma_{nm}^{(2)} \zeta_{2, m} +
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n,m=1}^{+\infty} \mathcal{T}_{nm}^{l=2} \cdot c_m + \mathcal{T}_{nm}^{l=2} \cdot c_m = 0.
\]

This expression results in a similar system to the one in Eq. (28), given by

\[
\zeta_2^x (\omega_a, \omega_b) = \left[ \mathcal{M}^{(2)} (\omega_a + \omega_b) \right]^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{W}_2^{x,x} (\omega_a),
\]

with \( \mathbf{W}_2^{x,x} \) defined analogously to \( \mathbf{W}_0^{x,x} \), after simplifications from parity of Bessel functions.

Having defined both \( \zeta_0^x \) and \( \zeta_2^x \), the third–order susceptibility follows from (49) (with \( \omega_\sigma = \omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 \) as

A. Two–Photon Absorption in WSe\(_2\)/WS\(_2\)

We will now compute the \( xxxX \) component of the two–photon absorption third–order susceptibility, defined as

\[
\chi_{xxxx}^{TPA} (\omega) = \chi_{xxxx}^{(3)} (-\omega_3 - \omega, -\omega, \omega),
\]

transition at \( \sim 16.6 \text{ meV} \), along with a diagram representing the \( 1s \rightarrow ns \) and \( 1s \rightarrow nd \) transitions.

B. Third–Harmonic Generation

To finalize this paper, we will now compute the \( xxxx \) component of the third–order susceptibility third–
harmonic generation of interlayer excitons in WSe$_2$/WS$_2$, which is defined as $\chi^{\text{THG}}_{xxxx}(3\omega) = \chi^{(3)}_{xxxx}(-3\omega,\omega,\omega)$. Following the same approach as in Sec. IV.A we will begin by computing $\chi^{\text{THG}}_{xxxx}(3\omega)$ for a small enough broadening such that each resonance is clear.

As previously, $\chi^{\text{THG}}_{xxxx}(3\omega)$ can be quickly obtained by modifying Eq. (43), reading

$$
\chi^{\text{THG}}_{xxxx}(3\omega) = \frac{1}{3!} P \left\{ -c^1 \left( (-3\omega)^i \right)^f \cdot \left[ T_0 \cdot \zeta_{0}^{x,x}(-\omega,-\omega) + T_2 \cdot \zeta_{2}^{x,x}(-\omega,-\omega) \right] + \left[ S \cdot c(-3\omega) \right] \times \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{N} c_n^{1} \left( (-\omega)^i \right)^f c_n(\omega) 2\pi R^2 J_2(z_1,n)^2 \right] \right\}.
$$

The left–hand side of Fig. 4 has been normalized by the peak value for the resonance at $3h\omega = E_{1s\rightarrow2p}$, whilst the right–hand side features a diagram representing the various transitions.

Spectral broadening as low as $\Delta \sim 2$ meV (i.e., the broadening that was considered for Fig. 3) can be achieved for low temperature encapsulated systems [64]. Considering much higher values of the broadening than in Fig. 5 namely $\Delta = 1$ meV and $\Delta = 2$ meV, we recompute Eq. (45), obtaining Fig. 6.

Although some $1s \rightarrow np$ resonances are already apparent at $\Delta = 2$ meV, namely at $\sim 40$ meV ($1s \rightarrow 5p$) and $\sim 60$ meV ($1s \rightarrow 8p$), most $1s \rightarrow ns$ and $1s \rightarrow nd$ transitions only become clearly visible in the sub–meV regime. At those broadenings, the most clear peaks are at $3h\omega \approx 50$ meV ($1s \rightarrow 3d$) and at $3h\omega \approx 56$ meV ($1s \rightarrow 4s$). The two resonances at $\sim 72$ meV and $\sim 75$ meV are joined into one at $\Delta = 1$ meV, although their presence is noticeable from comparison with the adjacent $1s \rightarrow np$ transition peaks.

The $1s \rightarrow np$ resonance peaks occur for $3h\omega = E_{1s\rightarrow np}$, while the $1s \rightarrow ns$ and $1s \rightarrow nd$ peaks are situated at $3h\omega = \frac{3}{4} E_{1s\rightarrow ns/nd}$. Additionally, the peak at $3h\omega = 87.1727$ meV corresponds to $3h\omega = 3 E_{1s\rightarrow 2p}$. This is due to the response at both $2\omega$ [65] and $\omega$ also being present in this process, described in detail in Section 3.2 of [65], i.e. $2h\omega = E_{1s\rightarrow ns/nd}$ and $h\omega = E_{1s\rightarrow 2p}$. No other peaks for $h\omega = E_{1s\rightarrow np}$ are visible, as they would already be outside the considered frequency domain ($3 E_{1s\rightarrow 3p} \sim 105.872$ meV, barely outside of the plot).
V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we discussed interlayer excitons in a WSe$_2$/WS$_2$–based van der Waals heterostructure, for which recent experimental measurements of the polarizability through pump–probe experiments [21] have been performed. In these experiments, the transition from bright to dark states has been accessed for both interlayer and intralayer excitons. In this paper, we focused ourselves solely on the transitions between intra–excitonic states for interlayer excitons in a circular WSe$_2$/WS$_2$ dot.

Approximating the interlayer modified Rytov–Keldysh potential in a power series, we motivate a Gaussian variational ansatz for the ground state of the system. After discussing the necessary material–dependent parameters, we consider both this ansatz and a complete set of basis functions the Bessel functions of the first kind to estimate the excitonic wave functions through variational methods.

We apply Fowler’s and Karplus’ method variational method to access the linear polarizability of two–dimensional interlayer excitons, focusing on the transition from bright to dark states (more specifically, $1s \rightarrow np$ transitions) in a circular dot of a WSe$_2$/WS$_2$–based
van der Waals heterostructure with Dirichlet boundary conditions.

For the linear regime we consider a broadening of $\Delta = 2 \text{meV}$, allowing for the clear observation of the multiple peaks in the excitonic polarizability. We observe an almost perfect agreement between the frequency of each resonance and the energy differences between the ground state and the excited states of the exciton. These energy differences were calculated both numerically (via the Numerov shooting method) and variationally (via both a Gaussian ansatz for the ground-state and a finite basis of Bessel function of the first kind), allowing for a greater confidence in their values.

Onto the third-order polarizability, we began by providing an in-depth discussion of Svendsen’s variational method [17-18]. After outlining this method and analyzing the required modifications due to the necessity of orthogonality between the various states, we work on the algebraization of the method, arriving at a purely vectorial problem after the necessary integrals are computed. The obtained expression is then tested first with the two-photon absorption, and then with third-harmonic generation.

Starting by two-photon absorption, a process which was discussed in-depth by Henriques et al. [19], we perform the necessary calculations with a broadening small enough such that the resonance associated with each individual intra-excitonic energy level transition can be clearly identifiable ($\Delta = 0.05 \text{meV}$). The two-photon absorption third-order susceptibility is then normalized by the value at the $E_{1s\rightarrow 3d}$ resonance as to facilitate the comparison of each peak. Of note is the amplitude of the resonance associated with the $E_{1s\rightarrow 7d}$ transition, peaking at around 40% of the maximum.

Finally turning to the third-harmonic generation in the third-order susceptibility, we begin our discussion by again performing the calculation with a very small broadening ($\Delta = 0.05 \text{meV}$). Each individual transition was clearly identifiable, with resonances at $\hbar \omega = E_{i\rightarrow f}$ and $3\hbar \omega = E_{i\rightarrow f}$ for $1s \rightarrow n\sigma$ transitions, and at $2\hbar \omega = E_{i\rightarrow f}$ for both $1s \rightarrow ns$ and $1s \rightarrow nd$ transitions. Considering experimentally-observable values of the broadening, we compare the third-harmonic generation third-order susceptibility for $\Delta = 1 \text{meV}$ and $\Delta = 2 \text{meV}$, arguing for the possibility of experimentally observing few well resolved resonance peaks, namely those associated with $1s \rightarrow 3d$ and $1s \rightarrow 4s$ transitions.
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