Optim ized tim e-dependent perturbation theory for pulse-driven quantum dynam ics in atom ic or molecular system s

D.Daems

Center for Nonlinear Phenom ena and Com plex System s, Universite Libre de Bruxelles, CP 231, 1050 Brussels, Belgium

S.Guerin and H.R.Jauslin Laboratoire de Physique de l'Universite de Bourgogne, UMR CNRS 5027, BP 47870, 21078 Dijon, France

A. Keller and O. Atabek Laboratoire de Photophysique Moleculaire du CNRS, Universite Paris-Sud, Bât. 210 - Campus d'Orsay, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France

(D ated: M arch 29, 2024)

W e present a time-dependent perturbative approach adapted to the treatment of intense pulsed interactions. We show there is a freedom in choosing secular terms and use it to optimize the accuracy of the approximation. We apply this formulation to a unitary superconvergent technique and improve the accuracy by several orders of magnitude with respect to the Magnus expansion.

PACS num bers: 31.15 M d, 03.65.-w, 42.50 H z

Perturbation theory when combined with a specic c treatment for resonances is quite well understood in classical and quantum mechanics for time-independent systems. This includes also time-periodic driven systems for which the periodicity can be treated by F loquet theory in a way that yields a time-independent formulation [1, 2]. One knows that resonances yield divergent terms, that appear as small denom inators, which have to be specifically removed. The counterpart of the concept of resonance for time-dependent systems is generally associated to secular terms whose size grows with time (see Ref. [3] and references therein).

W ith the advent of short (' 10 fs) and intense $(10^{13} \{ 10^{15} \text{ W / cm}^2)$ laser pulses, atom ic or molecular system s can be strongly perturbed in a timescale shorter than characteristic times corresponding to the free evolution of the system and adiabatic theories are not applicable (see, e.g., Ref. [4]). The goal of this paper is to form ulate a time-dependent perturbation theory well adapted for perturbations localized in time.

The conceptual fram ework of perturbation theory can be described as follows: The H am iltonian of the considered system can be decomposed as the sum of two terms s $H_1 = H_0 + V_1$. The statem H_0 is assumed to have a structure simple enough to lead to explicitly known solutions for its associated propagator U_{H_0} (t;t_0). The term V_1 is supposed to be small with respect to H_0 , in a sense speci ed below. Tim e-independent perturbation theories can be equivalently formulated at the level of eigenvectors or operators [5]. A large class of these approaches am ounts to construct a unitary transform ation T such that

$$T^{Y}H_{1}T = H^{e} + {}^{0}V^{0}$$
 (1)

where H $^{\rm e}$ is still of simple structure [i.e., its propagator $U_{\rm H} \circ (t; t_0)$ can be explicitly computed] and $^{\rm 0}V^{\,0}$ is a perturbation whose size is smaller than the original one. To compute the transformation T explicitly, one represents it in general either (i) in terms of som e power series

$$T = e^{iW}; W = \bigvee_{k}^{k} W_{k}; \qquad (2)$$

or (ii) by an iterative construction as a composition of transform ations

$$T = \bigvee_{k} e^{i W_{k}} :$$
 (3)

These procedures generally di er. The form er one is referred to as the tim e-independent Poincare-Von Zeipel technique, which has been shown to be equivalent to the usualRayleigh-Schrödinger perturbation theory [6]. The latter procedure includes the Van V leck technique (for which $_{\rm k}$ = $^{\rm k}$) and the superconvergent K olm ogorov-A mold-M oser (KAM) expansion (where $_{\rm k}$ = $^{2^{\rm k-1}}$ and W $_{\rm k}$ is $_{\rm k}$ -dependent) [7]. The perturbative procedure converges if the remaining perturbation $^{\rm O}$ V $^{\rm O}$ can be m ade to go to zero, as the number of terms in the power series (2) or as the number of com positions in Eq. (3) goes to in nity.

In this description one has to state precisely what class of H am iltonians H^e can be considered simple. For the rst order or the rst iteration, one considers H^e = H₀ + D₁ with the condition that D₁ should be compatible with H₀ in the sense that if the propagator of H₀ is known, that of H₀ + D₁ can also be obtained explicitly. In the

E lectronic address: ddaem s@ ulb.ac.be

].

case of tim e-independent H am iltonians the condition of com patibility is

$$[H_0; D_1] = 0: (4)$$

For the case of time-dependent H am iltonians, we show that the condition of compatibility can be generalized to

$$[H_{0}(t);D_{1}(t)] = i\frac{\partial D_{1}}{\partial t}:$$
 (5)

The construction of transform ations of the type of Eq. (2) or (3) involves nding the generator $i W_1$ (t) of the transform ation T_1 (t), that is the solution to

$$i [N_{1}(t); H_{0}(t)] + V_{1}(t) \quad D_{1}(t) = \frac{@W_{1}}{@t}:$$
 (6)

This equation, together with the constraint (5), are usually called cohom obgy equations in the tim e-independent case [8] and are here generalized to the tim e-dependent case. These cohom ology equations have the same form for higher orders or successive iterations.

Here we formulate the time-dependent perturbation theory by transform ing directly the evolution operator instead of considering the perturbed Ham iltonian as is usually done in tim e-independent theory. W e obtain perturbative corrections to the full propagator in the form of a product of propagators which exhibit free param eters appearing through the general solutions of related di erential equations. W e recover in particular the M agnus expansion [9] as a special case of the tim e-dependent Poincare-Von Zeipeltheory. This extension also gives the precise correspondence between tim e-independent resonances and tim e-dependent secular term s. In the context of pulsed perturbations with a nite duration, the secular term s need not be elim inated. W e show the rem arkable result that they can be used to im prove the convergence of the method at a given order. This optimization is achieved without any a priori know ledge of the solution by locating the minimum of a given eigenvalue as a function of the relevant free param eters that are identied. The e ciency of the method is illustrated on a two-level system driven by a short intense pulse.

P erturbation theory, resonances and secular term s.W e consider the H am iltonian H₁(t) = H₀(t) + V₁(t), where H₀(t) is associated to a known propagator U_{H₀}(t;t₀). The form ulation is presented here for the KAM m ethod, consisting in iterations of transform ations which are exactly of the same form at each step. The rst iteration involves a unitary operator T₁(t) which transforms the propagator U_{H₁}(t;t₀) according to

$$T_{1}^{y}(t)U_{H_{1}}(t;t_{0})T_{1}(t_{0}) = U_{H_{2}}(t;t_{0});$$
(7)

into a propagator U_{H_2} (t;t_0) associated with the sum H_2 (t) of an elective H am iltonian H_1^e (t) H_0 (t) + D_1 (t) which contains contributions up to order and a remainder 2V_2 (t). This new propagator, generated by a sum of two H am iltonians, can be written as the product

$$U_{H_{2}}(t;t_{0}) = U_{H_{1}^{e}}(t;t_{0})R_{2}(t;t_{0});$$
 (8)

where R_2 (t;t₀) satis es the Schrodinger equation whose H am iltonian is ${}^{2}U_{H_{1}^{e}}(t_{0};t)V_{2}$ (t) $U_{H_{1}^{e}}(t;t_{0})$. Similarly we can factorize $U_{H_{1}^{e}}(t;t_{0}) = U_{H_{0}}(t;t_{0})S_{1}(t;t_{0})$, where $S_{1}(t;t_{0})$ is a unitary operator related to $D_{1}(t)$:

$$\dot{u}_{0t}^{(d)} S_{1}(t;t_{0}) = U_{H_{0}}(t_{0};t) D_{1}(t) U_{H_{0}}(t;t_{0}) S_{1}(t;t_{0}):$$
(9)

The full propagator reads

$$U_{H_{1}}(t;t_{0}) = T_{1}(t)U_{H_{0}}(t;t_{0})S_{1}(t;t_{0})R_{2}(t;t_{0})T_{1}^{y}(t_{0}); (10)$$

which yields the rst order KAM approximation for R_2 (t;t_0) replaced by the identity. In this construction the only restriction on the self-adjoint operator D_1 (t) is that it be of order . Hence we have the freedom to choose the Ham iltonian in Eq. (9) as t-independent, giving

$$D_{1}(t) = U_{H_{0}}(t;t_{0})D_{1}(t_{0})U_{H_{0}}(t_{0};t);$$
(11)

with $D_1(t_0)$ arbitrary, which is the general solution of Eq. (5). This allows one to obtain the solution of Eq. (9) as

$$S_1(t;t_0) = \exp[i(t t_0) D_1(t_0)]:$$
 (12)

Dierentiating Eq. (10) and substituting $T_1(t) = \exp(i W_1(t))$ leads to Eq. (6). The rest involves a series of k nested commutators that reads ${}^2V_2(t) = {}^1 \frac{1}{(k+1)!} i^{k-k+1} W_1(t);$ ${}_1[(t); kV_1(t) + D_1(t)]$ It has exactly the same structure at each iteration which is useful for applications, particularly when high-order com putations are needed.

Iterating the time-dependent KAM algorithm reduces the size of the remaining perturbation in a superconvergent way from order 2^{n-1} to 2^n at step n. The timedependent Van V leck technique would allow one to reduce the size of the remainder from order ⁿ to ⁿ⁺¹. These m ethods, in the formulation presented here, are unitary upon truncation. The superconvergent character of the KAM algorithm has been shown num erically by applying the m ethod to a two-level system perturbed by a short time-dependent interaction [10].

The time-independent problem, i.e., the problem of nding a transformation T_1 that enables one to sim plify the tim e-independent H am iltonian H 1 according to $T_1^{y}H T_1 = H_0 + D_1 + {}^2V_2$, is recovered when one conveniently chooses T_1 as time-independent. In this case all the operators, and in particular D_1 and W_1 , are timeindependent and the standard cohom ology equations are recovered: $[H_0; D_1] = 0$ and $V_1 \quad D_1 + i[W_1; H_0] = 0$. Their solutions can be determ ined using the following key property [8]: W_1 exists if and only if H_0 (D₁ V₁) = 0, where H_0 is the projector in the kernel of the application A 7 [A; H₀] (for an operator A acting on the same Hilbert space as H $_0$). The projector $_{H_0}$ applied on an operator A captures thus all the part B of A which com mutes with H_0 : $[B; H_0] = 0$. The unique solution D_1 allowing W $_1$ to exist and satisfying Eq. (4) is thus

$$D_{1} = {}_{H_{0}}V_{1} \lim_{T \stackrel{!}{!} 1} \frac{1}{T} {}_{0}^{Z_{T}} e^{itH_{0}}V_{1}e^{itH_{0}}:$$
(13)

The resonances are associated with terms of V_1 which commute with H₀. Application of Eq. (13) can be interpreted as an averaging of V_1 with respect to H₀ which allow s one to extract resonances.

For the time-dependent problem, the general solution of Eq. (6) reads (up to a term U_{H_0} (t;t_0) $B_1U_{H_0}$ (t_0;t) with B_1 any self-adjoint operator that we set here to 0)

$$W_{1}(t) = \int_{t_{1}^{0}}^{\Delta_{t}} ds U_{H_{0}}(t;s) (V_{1}(s) D_{1}(s)) U_{H_{0}}(s;t); (14)$$

with t_1^0 any real number. De ning the average

$$V_{1} = \lim_{! = 1}^{1} \frac{1}{t} \int_{t}^{2} ds U_{H_{0}}(t;s) V_{1}(s) U_{H_{0}}(s;t); \quad (15)$$

one can show the following property: if W₁ (t) is bounded for negative in nite times, then $(V_1 D_1) = 0$. This is satisfied by D₁ = V_1 , the only solution compatible with Eqs. (5) and (15). Hence, the averaging D₁ = V_1 allows one to remove secular terms at negative in nite times. This gives the precise correspondence between the resonances of stationary problems and the secular terms of time-independent problems. We remark that the denition (15) of the average can be in fact recovered from the formal calculation of the average K_0V_1 [cf. Eq. (13)] with respect to $K_0 = i\frac{0}{\theta_t} + H_0$ in an extended space, which includes time as a coordinate [10, 11].

For a pulsed perturbation that is switched on at t_i and o at t_f , Eq. (15) becomes [10] $V_1 = U_{H_0}(t;t_i)V(t_i)U_{H_0}(t_i;t)$. This is a particular solution of Eq. (5) corresponding to the choice $D_1(t_0) = U_{H_0}(t_0;t_i)V(t_i)U_{H_0}(t_i;t_0)$ in Eq. (11). An alternate de nition of the average: $+V_1$ lim $_{!-1} = \frac{1}{t} K_{t+} dsU_{H_0}(t;s)V_1(s)U_{H_0}(s;t)$ gives a di erent averaging $+V_1 = U_{H_0}(t;t_f)V(t_f)U_{H_0}(t_f;t)$ and allows one to remove secular terms at positive in nite times.

Generally one cannot remove simultaneously the secular terms at negative and positive large times. This shows a conceptual di erence between stationary resonances and secular terms associated with perturbations localized in time. Furthermore, it appears that the averaging such as Eq. (15) is not appropriate, but that a de nition which combines the two de nitions gives a new secular term that could improve the convergence of the algorithm. This suggests to work with the general solution (11) of Eq. (5), written with the perturbation evaluated at a free time t_1 as the arbitrary operator:

$$D_{1}(t) = U_{H_{0}}(t;t_{1})V_{1}(t_{1})U_{H_{0}}(t_{1};t):$$
(16)

The free t_1 can then be chosen to minimize the rest after the st iteration, as we describe below. One has n such free parameters t_k ; k = 1; n for n iterations of the KAM algorithm. There is only one such free parameter for the time-dependent Poincare-Von Zeipel and Van V leck methods that are order by order techniques. An interesting result is that we recover the M agnus expansion from the time-dependent Poincare-Von Zeipel in the particular case of D $_k = 0$ and $t_k^0 = t_0$ for k = 1; n.

O ptim ization of the perturbation theory. A fler one iteration, the rest $R_2(t;t_0)$ de ned in Eq. (8) is associated with a second order operator through $R_2(t;t_0)$ e^{i ²G₂(t)} with $G_2(t_0) = 0$: The closer $R_2(t;t_0)$ is to the identity, the smaller the correction terms are, i.e., the more accurate the approximation is. We evaluate the lowest order contribution to ${}^{2}G_{2}(t)$ as

$${}^{2}G_{2}^{(2)}(t) = {}^{2}\int_{t_{0}}^{t_{t}} du U_{H_{1}^{e}}(t_{0};u) V_{2}(u) U_{H_{1}^{e}}(u;t_{0}): (17)$$

It is this operator that has to remain small for the algorithm to converge. The size of an operator A can be characterized by the norm $jA jj = \sup_{jj \ j \neq 1} jA jj w ith$

in the appropriate H ilbert space. For an Herm itian m atrix this norm reduces to the largest of the absolute values of its eigenvalues.

In order to improve the accuracy we thus seek to minimize _2 (t), the largest of the absolute values of the eigenvalues of ${}^{2}G_{2}^{(2)}$ (t), with respect to the free parameters. To optimize the KAM algorithm, we have at our disposal two free parameters t_{k} and t_{k}^{0} at each iteration. We expect the parameters t_{k} to signi cantly a ect the convergence, as they are related to secular term s.

Perturbation theory for short intense pulses. We consider a system described by the Hamiltonian HP (autonom ous or not) and perturbed by a time-dependent Ham iltonian \oint (s) whose characteristic duration is . The perturbation is assumed to satisfy $[(s_0); (s_0)] = 0$, 8s;so which is realized in many situations of interest. We de ne a sudden parameter as follows. A dimensionless time t and dimensionless operators H and V (t) are de ned through s t; ₽ ~! H ; and ♥ (s) -V (t), leading to the dimensionless Schrodinger equation $i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}U(t;t_0) = fV(t) + H gU(t;t_0)$, where the sudden param eter is de ned as ! . We then apply the perturbation theory described above with the identi cation H_0 (t) V (t) and V_1 H. This formulation is suited to treat intense short pulses.

Illustration on a pulsed-driven two-level system .

We consider the case where H₀(t) = (t) ₁ and V₁ = ₃ with (t) a pulse that is switched on at t_i and o at t_f, and _k the Paulim atrices. Notice that, as discussed above, the role of the perturbation and reference H am iltonian is interchanged. The pulse area A R_{t_f} (u) du is a dimensionless parameter that can be xed independently of the sudden parameter . The error between the num erical solution of the Schrödinger equation at the end of the pulse and the result of n iterations is de ned as

n $jj U_{H_1}$ (t_f;t_i) $U_{H_1}^{(n)}$ (t_f;t_i) jj. We use the pulse shape (t) = 2A sin² (t) for 0 t 1; and 0 elsewhere.

The upper panel of F igure 1 shows a comparison of the error $_1$ for the rst order D yson, rst order M agnus and one-iteration KAM m ethods as a function of t_1, for a non-perturbative area chosen to produce comparable errors

 $_1$ for the M agnus and non-optim ized (t₁ = 0) KAM techniques. The lower panel displays $_2$ the largest of the



FIG.1: (a) Common logarithm of the error $_1$ for the rst order D yson expansion (dashed line), the rst order M agnus expansion (dotted line) and the rst KAM iteration (solid line); and (b) largest eigenvalue of ${}^2G_2^{(2)}(t_f)$ as a function of t_1 , for A = 1, = 0.5 and $t_1^0 = 0$.

absolute values of the eigenvalues of ${}^{2}G_{2}^{(2)}$ (t_f) de ned in Eq. (17). We clearly see that the error of the rst KAM iteration is correctly estimated by this eigenvalue $_{2}$ and, in particular, m inimized when $_{2}$ is m inimized, i.e., for the value t_{1}^{2} . It is worth noting that modifying t_{1} covers m ore than one order of magnitude in the error, a situation that is not restricted to these values of the parameters. The optimized solution provides an improvement of the accuracy by alm ost one order of magnitude with respect to the M agnus calculation.

Figure 2 displays a comparison of the error $_2$ for the second order D yson, second order M agnus and twoiteration KAM methods as a function of t_2 , for $t_1 = t_1^2$. It is seen that the D yson approach is not applicable in this context of strong eld as the second order perform s worse than the stone. Figure 2 also shows that the



FIG.2: Common logarithm of the error $_2$ for the second order D yson expansion (dashed line), the second order M agnus expansion (dotted line) and the second KAM iteration (solid line) with the same parameters as Fig. 1 and $t_1 = t_1^2 \quad 0.39.$

second KAM iteration can be enhanced by about two orders of magnitude with an appropriate choice of t_1 and t_2 . This optimized second KAM iteration provides an improvement by two and a half orders of magnitude with respect to the second order M agnus technique. Higher iterations of the KAM technique can also be optimized and produce still better improvement owing to its super-convergent character.

In conclusion, we have presented an optim ized perturbation theory forpulse-driven system s, which applies to a wide class of processes controlled by intense fem to second laser pulses. The optim ization reduces to the evaluation of eigenvalues and is therefore easy to im plem ent. We anticipate that this approach will be usefull in the context of the laser control of atom ic and molecular processes, such as the phase space localisation of Rydberg electron [12], or the alignm ent and orientation of molecules [4].

This research was supported in part by FNRS, ACI Photonique and ConseilRegional de Bourgogne.

- [L] J.C.A.Barata and W.F.W reszinski, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 2112 (2000).
- [2] S.Guerin and H.R.Jauslin, Adv.Chem. Phys. 125, 147 (2003).
- [3] P.W. Langho, S.T. Epstein, and M. Kamplus, Rev. M od. Phys. 44, 602 (1972).
- [4] H. Stapelfeldt and T. Seidem an, Rev. M od. Phys. 75, 543 (2003).
- [5] H.Prim as, Rev. M od. Phys. 35, 710 (1963).
- [6] W .Scherer, J.Phys.A 27, 8231 (1994).
- [7] W .Scherer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 1495 (1995).

- [8] H.R. Jauslin, S.Guerin and S.Thomas, Physica A 279, 432 (2000).
- [9] P. Pechukas and J. C. Light, J. Chem. Phys. 44, 3897 (1966).
- [10] D. Daems, A. Keller, S. Guerin, H. R. Jauslin and O. Atabek, Phys. Rev. A 67, 052505 (2003).
- [11] W .Scherer, Phys.Lett.A 233, 1 (1997).
- [12] D.G.Arbo, C.O.Reinhold, J.Burgdorfer, A.K.Pattanayak, C.L.Stokely, W. Zhao, J.C.Lancaster, and F. B.Dunning, Phys. Rev. A 67, 063401 (2003).