arXiv:2303.12266v2 [quant-ph] 20 Apr 2023

Dynamic Stark shift of Hydrogen-like atoms in the presence of circularly polarized laser light

Behnam Nikoobakht[1]

[1] *Theoretische Chemie, Physikalisch-Chemisches Institut, Universität Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany*

Abstract

The analytic derivation of the dynamic Stark shift of hydrogenic energy levels in the presence of the circularly polarized laser light is presented. We use the classical framework with considering an adiabatically damped laser+atom interaction and an approach relies on time-independent perturbation theory with a second-quantized laser+atom dipole interaction Hamiltonian. We thus investigate the excitation process in atomic hydrogen or in a hydrogen like ion with low nuclear charge number in the presence of the circularly polarized laser light. The derived formula for the dynamic AC Stark shift of hydrogenic energy levels using these two methods are shown to be same in the limit of large photon numbers.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that the physical properties of atoms can be modified by their interaction with an electromagnetic radiation [1]. For instance, the virtual emission and reabsorption of photons result in a shift of the atomic energy levels. This effect either occurs spontaneously (in the absence of a light source) causing to the Lamb shift, or is induced by an external light, which result into the so-called AC Stark shift [2]. The AC Stark shift arises from virtual transitions induced by real photons and depends on the field intensity, while the Lamb shift arises from virtual transitions generated by virtual photons [3–5].

The AC Stark shift is one of the most important physical processes occurring in the precision spectroscopy, influencing the basic understanding of field-matter interactions, measurements of fundamental constants such as bound electron g factor, $1S$-$2S$ transition frequency [7–9]. This effect is responsible for line broadening and frequency shift, when an atom is located in the electromagnetic field [10]. Due to this effect, the AC Stark shift is considered the most basic systematic error associated in the high precision spectroscopy [11]. Due to this important rule in the high precision measurements of the fundamental constants, this aspect received considerable attention theoretically and experimentally in the literature [7–9, 12, 13].

In this investigation, our aim is to calculate the AC Stark shift due to the interaction of the Hydrogen-like atom with the circularly polarized laser light. We focus on the off-resonant, two-photon transition in which the frequency of the incident radiation is close to half of the atomic transition frequency. We assume that the laser light is monochromatic, implying that the finite band width effect of the laser light and the result dependence on the laser power are automatically negligible [14–16]. This paper is organized as follow. In Sec. II, the dynamic Stark shift for Hydrogen-like atom in the presence of the circularly polarized laser light is dealt with in the framework of time-dependent perturbation theory. In Sec. III, we applied the semiclassical description, in which Hydrogen-like atom is described in the framework of the quantum mechanics and the laser field is characterized in the framework of the classical mechanics and showed that a fully quantized-field treatment goes to a classical result when the photon number in the laser mode is large enough. Finally, the summary and concluding remarks were presented in Sec. IV.

II. CLASSICAL APPROACH

Consider a Hydrogen-like atom (ion) that is adiabatically embedded in the remote past and future in circularly polarized laser field

$$\boldsymbol{E}(t) = \frac{\varepsilon_L e^{-\epsilon|t|}}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\boldsymbol{e}_x \cos(\omega_L t) + \boldsymbol{e}_y \sin(\omega_L t)\right], \tag{1}$$

where the $\boldsymbol{e}_x$ and $\boldsymbol{e}_y$ refer to the unit vectors and ω_L is the laser frequency. We have assumed that the field energy density is normalized as ε_L^2. ϵ is an infinitesimal damping parameter. Here, we have adopted the dipole approximation which implies that the wavelength of the radiation is far greater than the atom size. The evolution of the unperturbed Hamiltonian of the atom H_0 with the eigenfunction $|\phi\rangle$ in the monochromatic laser field is determined by

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = H\psi, \tag{2}$$

where the Hamitonian of the atom + laser reads

$$H = H_0 + V(x, y, t) \tag{3}$$

In Eq. (3), H_0 is

$$H_0 = \frac{\boldsymbol{p}^2}{2m_e} - \frac{Ze^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 r}, \tag{4}$$

where Z refers t othe nuclear charge and $V(x, y, t)$ describes the interaction of the Hydrogen-like atom in the presence of the circularly polarized laser light (in the length gauge),

$$V(x, y, t) = e^{-\epsilon|t|} \left[V(x)\cos(\omega_L t) + V(y)\sin(\omega_L t)\right] \tag{5}$$

with $V(x) = -e\varepsilon x/\sqrt{2}$ and $V(y) = -e\varepsilon y/\sqrt{2}$. In this investigation, we shall take into account only the solutions of Eq. (2) corresponding the adiabatic switching of the perturbation $V(x, y, t)$ at the remote past and future ($t \to \pm\infty$). This indicates that the solution of Eq. (2) at $t \to \pm\infty$ turns into the eigenstate of the unperturbed Hamiltonian H_0, which for simplicity shall be assumed to be nondegenerate.

To describe the effect of the off-resonance perturbation by a time-dependent electric field Eq. (1) on the reference state $|\phi\rangle$ of the bare atom, we use the interaction picture, in which the field-atom interaction is represented as

$$V_I = e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}H_0 t} V(x, y, t) e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}H_0 t}, \tag{6}$$

From which we obtain the expansion of the time evolution operator in the interaction picture

$$U_I(x,y,t) = T\exp\left[-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_{-\infty}^{t} U_I(\tau)d\tau\right]$$
$$= 1 - \frac{i}{\hbar}\int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' V_I(x,y,t) + \left(\frac{-i}{\hbar}\right)^2 \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' \int_{-\infty}^{t'} dt'' V_I(x,y,t') V_I(x,y,t'') \quad (7)$$

where T is the time-ordering operator. Due to the laser-atom interaction, the reference state $|\phi\rangle$ evolves into a time dependent atomic state $|\psi_I(t)\rangle$,

$$|\psi_I(x,y,t)\rangle = U(x,y,t)|\psi(x,y,t=-\infty)\rangle = U(x,y,t)|\phi\rangle. \quad (8)$$

Since the interaction is weak compared to the Coulomb field of atom, we may expand $|\psi_I\rangle$ in a complete set $\{|m_i\rangle\}$ of eigenstates of H_0,

$$|\psi_I\rangle = \sum_m c_m(t)|m\rangle, \quad (9)$$

where $c_m(t) = \langle m|\psi_I(t)\rangle$ are expansion coefficients, that satisfy the initial condition $c_\phi(-\infty) = 0$ and $c_m(-\infty) = 0$ $(m \neq \phi)$. To obtain the energy shift and ionization rate of the reference state, we calculate the projection

$$c_\phi(t) = \langle\phi|\psi_I(t)\rangle = \langle\phi|U_I(r,t)|\phi\rangle. \quad (10)$$

We now substitute Eqs. (5), (6) and (8) into Eq. (10). Since $\langle\phi|x|\phi\rangle = \langle\phi|y|\phi\rangle = 0$, the expansion may be taken up to the second order,

$$c_\phi(t)1 - \frac{1}{\hbar^2}M, \quad (11)$$

where

$$M = \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' \int_{-\infty}^{t'} \langle\phi V_I(x,y,t') V_I(x,y,t'')|\phi\rangle$$
$$= \sum_m \int_{-\infty}^{t} dt' \int_{-\infty}^{t'} dt'' \langle\phi|V_I(x,y,t')|m\rangle\langle m|V_I(x,y,t'')|\phi\rangle \quad (12)$$

The sum counts all bound and continuum states. Since the time dependence of the potentials is harmonic, the integrations can be easily worked out and thus Eq.(12) reads

$$M = -\frac{\hbar}{4i}\sum_{m,\pm}\frac{e^{2\epsilon t}}{2\epsilon}\left[\frac{\langle\phi|V(x)|m\rangle\langle m|V(x)|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m \pm \hbar\omega_L + i\hbar\epsilon} + \frac{\langle\phi|V(y)|m\rangle\langle m|V(y)|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m \pm \hbar\omega_L + i\hbar\epsilon}\right.$$
$$\left. \pm i\frac{\langle\phi|V(x)|m\rangle\langle m|V(y)|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m \pm \hbar\omega_L + i\hbar\epsilon} \mp i\frac{\langle\phi|V(y)|m\rangle\langle m|V(x)|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m \pm \hbar\omega_L + i\hbar\epsilon}\right] \quad (13)$$

Inserting this result into Eq. (11), and considering

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\ln c_\phi(t) = -\frac{i}{4\hbar}\sum_{m,\pm}\frac{e^{2\epsilon t}}{2\epsilon}\left[\frac{\langle\phi|V(x)|m\rangle\langle m|V(x)|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m \pm \hbar\omega_L + i\hbar\epsilon} + \frac{\langle\phi|V(y)|m\rangle\langle m|V(y)|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m \pm \hbar\omega_L + i\hbar\epsilon}\right.$$
$$\left. \pm i\frac{\langle\phi|V(x)|m\rangle\langle m|V(y)|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m \pm \hbar\omega_L + i\hbar\epsilon} \mp i\frac{\langle\phi|V(y)|m\rangle\langle m|V(x)|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m \pm \hbar\omega_L + i\hbar\epsilon}\right], \tag{14}$$

here $e^{2\varepsilon t}$ has been replaced by 1. The solution of Eq. (14) is

$$c_\phi(t) = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\Delta E_{AC}(\phi)t}, \tag{15}$$

where we have defined the dynamic stark shift $\Delta E_{AC}(\phi)$ of the reference state $|\phi\rangle$,

$$\Delta E_{AC}(\phi) = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{m,\pm}\left[\frac{\langle\phi|V(x)|m\rangle\langle m|V(x)|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m \pm \hbar\omega_L + i\hbar\epsilon} + \frac{\langle\phi|V(y)|m\rangle\langle m|V(y)|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m \pm \hbar\omega_L + i\hbar\epsilon}\right.$$
$$\left. \pm i\frac{\langle\phi|V(x)|m\rangle\langle m|V(y)|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m \pm \hbar\omega_L + i\hbar\epsilon} \mp i\frac{\langle\phi|V(y)|m\rangle\langle m|V(x)|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m \pm \hbar\omega_L + i\hbar\epsilon}\right]. \tag{16}$$

Considering Eq. (9), the wavefunction of the system in the Schrödinger picture reads

$$|\psi(t) = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}H_0 t}|\psi_I(t)\rangle = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}H_0 t}\left[c_\phi(t)|\phi\rangle + \sum_{m\neq\phi} c_m(t)|m\rangle\right]. \tag{17}$$

Thus we obtain the projection

$$\langle\phi|\psi(t)\rangle = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}[E_\phi + \Delta E_{AC}]t}, \tag{18}$$

which shows the perturbative effect on the time-evolution of the reference state. $\Delta E_{AC}(\phi)$ is generally complex arising from the fact that the atomic system may exchange virtual and real photons with the laser field in the course of interaction (see below, Eq. (23)). Introducing the complex coordinates

$$x_{+1} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x + iy)$$
$$x_{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x - iy) \tag{19}$$

we may cast the dynamic Stark shift of Eq. (16) into a more concise form

$$\Delta E_{AC}(\phi) = -\frac{e^2\varepsilon_L^2}{4}\sum_{\pm}\langle\phi|x_{\mp1}\frac{1}{H_0 - E_\phi \pm \hbar\omega_L}x_{\pm1}|\phi\rangle \tag{20}$$

In this relation, we have used the closure relation over the spectrum of H_0. If we define the dynamic polarizability

$$P_{\omega_L}(\phi) = \sum_{\pm}\langle\phi|x_{\mp1}\frac{1}{H_0 - E_\phi \pm \hbar\omega_L}x_{\pm}|\phi\rangle, \tag{21}$$

then the dynamic Stark shift reads,

$$\Delta E_{AC}(\phi) = -\frac{1}{4}e^2\varepsilon_L^2 P_{\omega_L}(\phi) = -\frac{e^2}{2\varepsilon_0 c} I_L P_{\omega_L}(\phi), \tag{22}$$

where $I_L = \varepsilon_0 c\varepsilon_L^2/2$ is the intensity of the laser field. Eq. (21) can be interpreted as the sum of the amplitudes of two-photon processes. In the first process the atom absorbs one quantum and goes into a virtual state (the term involving $-$ sign in the denominator) and after emitting the same $\hbar\omega_L$ quantum it returns to the initial state. In the second process (the term involving $+$ sign in the denominator) the atom emits the $\hbar\omega_L$ quantum first and goes into the virtual state and after absorbing the same quantum, it returns to the initial state. The result is the shift of an energy level.

We would like to mention that in the evaluation of the matrix element of Eq. (21), the contribution of two intermediate states with energies $E_\phi - \hbar\omega_L$ and $E_\phi + \hbar\omega_L$ must be summed. For the evaluation of these energies, one needs to set the frequency of the laser field $\omega_L = (E_e - E_g)/2\hbar$ in the two-photon resonant spectroscopy of the transition $g \Leftrightarrow e$. Since in the study of dynamic Stark shift the final state is in the continuum, energies of the intermediate states are always positive. Thus, the dynamic polarizability of Eq. (21) gains an imaginary part. It characterizes the population loss rate (decay rate) due to ionization, while the real part of the dynamic polarizability is associated with the level shift $|\phi\rangle$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Re}\left[\Delta E_{AC}(\phi)\right] &= \hbar I_L \beta_{\mathrm{AC}}(\phi) \\ \mathrm{Im}\left[\Delta E_{AC}(\phi)\right] &= -\pi\hbar I_L \beta_{\mathrm{ioni}}(\phi), \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where β_{AC} and β_{ioni} are called dynamic Stark shift and ionization coefficients, respectively. The decay rate $\gamma_i(\phi)$ and ionization cross section $\sigma_i(\phi)$ as a function the ionization coefficient reads

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i(\phi) &= 2\pi\beta_{\mathrm{ioni}}(\phi) I_L \\ \sigma_i(\phi) &= 2\pi\hbar\omega_L \beta_{\mathrm{ioni}}(\phi). \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

The dynamic Stark shift coefficients and total correction σ_{ioni} in Eq. (24) can be scaled by $\frac{1}{Z^4}$ and $\frac{1}{Z^2}$, respectively and thus one can generalize the results to any Hydrogen-like atoms (ions) up to $Z = 11$.

III. TREATMENT IN THE SECOND QUANTIZATION

In the preceding section, we dealt with the interaction between Hydrogen-like atomic energy levels and the electromagnetic radiation and assumed that the field to be classical. In this section, in view of light being a photon field, we discuss the interaction of the quantized radiation field with a Hydrogen-like atom.

A. Atom and quantized radiation interaction Hamiltonian

The interaction of a monochromatic laser mode of angular frequency ω_L with a Hydrogen-like atom can be formulated in a general way [see *e.g.*, Ref. [17, 18]]. One can characterize the Hamiltonian corresponding to the atom + laser system in terms of three parts as follows,

$$H_I = H_0 + \hbar\omega_L + \hbar\omega_L a_L^\dagger a_L + H_L, \tag{25}$$

where the first two terms are the Hydrogen-like atom H_0 and the quantized field Hamiltonians, respectively. In Eq. (25), H_0 reads

$$H_0 = \sum_m |m\rangle\langle m| + \frac{\boldsymbol{p}^2}{2m_e} - \frac{Ze^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0 r} \tag{26}$$

where $|m\rangle$ represents a complete set of atomic energy eigenstates including both the discrete and continuum region of the spectrum (m_e and e are electron mass and charge, respectively). Since we restrict ourselves to a single-mode field with the frequency ω_L, the corresponding Hamiltonian of the laser field can be written in terms of the creation and annihilation operators $a_L^\dagger$ and a_L, respectively. The corresponding eigenstates are called Fock states [21]. The energy eigenvalues are discrete, in contrast to the classical electromagnetic theory, where the energy is continuous. The last part of the Eq. (25) denotes the perturbed term of the Hamiltonian which is responsible for the interaction between a Hydrogen-like atom and the monomode electromagnetic radiation. In the framework of the length gauge and dipole approximation, this term H_L reads

$$H_L = -e\boldsymbol{r}\cdot\boldsymbol{E} \tag{27}$$

In view of the fact that the laser field is polarized circularly, thus H_L reads

$$H_L = -e\varepsilon_L\left[-x_{+1}a_L + x_{-1}a_L^\dagger\right], \tag{28}$$

where $\varepsilon_L = \sqrt{\hbar\omega_L/2\epsilon_0 V}$, V is the normalization volume and x_{+1} and x_{-1} were introduced in Eq. (19). Eq. (19) implies that $x_{+1}^\dagger = -x_{-1}$ and $x_{-1}^\dagger = -x_{+1}$ indicating that the Hamiltonian H_L is hermitian.

B. Quantized field approach

We are now in a position to discuss the interaction between circularly polarized laser light and the Hydrogen-like atom from the quantum nature point of view of the radiation field using Eqs. (25) and (28). Working in the Schrödinger picture, perturbation theory leads to the second-order energy shift of the unperturbed eigenstate $|\phi, n_L\rangle$,

$$\Delta E_{AC}(\phi) = \sum_m \left[\frac{\langle \phi, n_L|H_L|m, n_L-1\rangle\langle m, n_L-1|H_L|\phi, n_L\rangle}{E_\phi + n_L\hbar\omega_L - (E_m + (n_L-1)\hbar\omega_L)} + \frac{\langle \phi, n_L|H_L|m, n_L+1\rangle\langle m, n_L+1|H_L|\phi, n_L\rangle}{E_\phi + n_L\hbar\omega_L - (E_m + (n_L+1)\hbar\omega_L)} \right]. \tag{29}$$

Inserting Eq. (28) into Eq. (28), $\Delta E_{AC}(\phi)$ reads

$$\Delta E_{AC}(\phi) = \frac{e^2\hbar\omega_L}{2\varepsilon_0 V} \sum_m \left[\frac{\langle\phi|x_{-1}|m\rangle\langle m|x_{+1}|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m + \hbar\omega_L} n_L + \frac{\langle\phi|x_{+1}|m\rangle\langle m|x_{-1}|\phi\rangle}{E_\phi - E_m - \hbar\omega_L}(n_L+1) \right]. \tag{30}$$

Eq. (30) derived using the time-dependent field operator is suitable for the represention the dynamic AC stark shift of the coupled system, atom+laser field when the photon number n_L is not large. In nonrelativistic quantum mechanics, the classical description is trustworthy whenever the noncommutativity of dynamical variables is unimportant [see, *e.g.*, textbook [19]]. Likewise, in the quantum theory of radiation, if we could ignore the right-hand-side of $[a_L, a_L^\dagger] = 1$ then we would return to the classical description. Due to the proportionality the nonvanishing matrix elements of a_L and $a_L^\dagger$ to the occupation number $\sqrt{n_L}$, the classical description Eq. (21) can be obtained again from Eq. (30) in the limit of a large occupation number. In other words, in the classical limit, $n_L \to \infty$,$V \to \infty$, whereas $n_L/V = \text{const.}$, Eq. (30) becomes

$$\Delta E_{AC}(\phi) = -\frac{e^2 n_L \hbar\omega_L}{2\varepsilon_0 V} P_{\omega_L}(\phi), \tag{31}$$

where $P_{\omega_L}(\phi)$ is given by Eq. (21). Comparing Eq. (31) with the classical result in Eq. (21), we find

$$I_L = \varpi c, \tag{32}$$

where $\varpi = n_L\hbar\omega_L/V$ is the energy density of the field in the quantum version.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The analytic relation for dynamic stark shift of hydrogen-like atom was obtained in two approaches. In the first treatment (the classical method), it was assumed that the hydrogen-like atom is shined by the circularly laser light, where Hydrogen-like atom adiabatically embedded in the remote past and future in this field. In the second treatment, the dynamic stark shift was studied in the view of the fact that the radiation field being quantized. The later approach concurs with the classical field description in the limit of high photon density. This (quantized field) approach showed that the AC stark shift results from self-energy like formalism when the sum over virtual modes of the photon field is limited to a single mode thus the AC stark shift can be expressed as a stimulated radiative correction.

[1] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, R. Dupont-Roc, and G. Grynberg Phys. Rev. A **5** 968 (1972).

[2] H. A. Bethe and E. E Salpeter *Quantum Mechanics of One and Two Electron Atioms* (Springer, Berlin and Academic press, New York, 1957).

[3] M. Brune, P. Nussenzveig, F. Schmidt-Kaler, F. Bernardot, A. Maali, J. M. Raimond, and S. Haroche Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3339 (1994).

[4] A. Kastler J. Opt. Soc. Am. **53**, 902 (1963).

[5] J. Camparo and P. Lambropoulos J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **19**, 1169 (2002).

[6] J. J. Sakurai, *Modern Quantum Mechanics* (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc. 1985).

[7] N. Kolachevsky, M. Haas, U. D. Jentschura, M. Herrmann, P. Fendel, M. Fischer, R. Holzwarth, Th. Udem, C. H. Keitel, and T. W. Hänsch, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 052504 (2006).

[8] M. Niering *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5496 (2000).

[9] C. T. M. Weber, N. Leefer, and D. Budker, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 062503 (2013).

[10] D. Cho *et al* Phys. Rev. A **55**, 1007 (1997).

[11] M. Haas, U. D. Jentschura, C .H. Keitel, Am. J. Phys. **74**, 77 (2006).

[12] P. Rosenbusch, S. Ghezali, V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, K. Beloy, and A. Derevianko, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 013404 (2009).

[13] F. Levi, J. Camparo, B. Francois, C. E. Calosso, S. Micalizio, and A. Godone Phys. Rev. A **93**, 023433 (2016).

[14] J. C. Garreau, M. Allegrini, L. Julien, and F. Biraben J. Phys. (France) **51** (1990) 2263.

[15] J. C. Garreau, M. Allegrini, L. Julien, and F. Biraben J. Phys. (France) **51** (1990) 2275.

[16] J. C. Garreau, M. Allegrini, L. Julien, and F. Biraben J. Phys. (France) **51** (1990) 2293.

[17] M. O. Scully and M. S. Zubairy, Quantum optics . (Cambridge university, Cambridge, U.K., 1997).

[18] M. Fox, Quantum optics . (Oxford university Press Inc. New York, 2006).

[19] E. Merzbacher, Quantum mechanics . (John Wiley and sons, New York, 1970).

[20] R. A. Swainson and G. W. F. Drake J. Phys. A: Math. Gen **24** (1991) 95.

[21] J. Evers, U. D. Jentschura and C. H. Keitel, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 062111 (2004).

[22] M. Haas et al. Phys. Rev. A **73** (2007) 052501.