Angular dependence of Wigner-Eisenbud-Smith time delay in photoionization: A case study on $4f$ subshell of atomic mercury

A. Mandal*^{[1](#page-0-0)}, P. C. Deshmukh†[#2](#page-0-1), V. K. Dolmatov[‡3](#page-0-2), A. Kheifets $^{\$4}$, and S. T. Manson $^{\$}$

[∗] Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai, 600036, India

† Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Tirupati, Tirupati, 517506, India

Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Tirupati, Tirupati 517507, India

‡ Department of Physics and Earth Science, University of North Alabama, Florence, AL 35632, USA

§ Research School of Physics and Engineering, The Australian National University, Canberra ACT 0200, Australia

¶ Department of Physics and Astronomy, Georgia State University, Atlanta, 30303, USA

Synopsis The angular dependence of Wigner-Eisenbud-Smith (WES) time delay in photoionization from the 4f subshell of atomic mercury is computed using the relativistic-random-phase approximation [\[11\]](#page-0-5). Specifically, the angular dependence of WES time delay is investigated in the near-threshold region of the $4f$ photoionization channels.

Time domain studies of light-matter interactions is now a very hot field. This covers a variety of research with different focii, extending from astrophysical to biological relevance to foundational aspects of quantum theory $[1, 2]$ $[1, 2]$ $[1, 2]$. The time scale of electronic motion is now experimentally observable with the aid of the recent development of ultrafast laser technologies [\[3\]](#page-0-8).

The time taken for a process to occur is a measurable quantity. The Wigner-Eisenbud-Smith (WES) time delay $[4, 2, 5]$ $[4, 2, 5]$ $[4, 2, 5]$ $[4, 2, 5]$ $[4, 2, 5]$ is highly sensitive to the potential (local and nonlocal) and correlation effects [\[6\]](#page-0-11). It has been realized that WES time delay is angle dependent in general [\[7\]](#page-0-12). How exactly it depends on angle of emission with respect to the photon polarization is very much specific to the channels and energies under inspection.

Single photon, dipole photoionization from *np* and *nd* subshells have been studied earlier [\[7,](#page-0-12) [8\]](#page-0-13). Hence the next step is to examine the angular dependence for *nf*.

It has been found that the $4f$ photoionization cross section of atomic mercury undergoes a minimum in the energy region just above the 4f threshold because of the energy-dependent behaviors of the $4f \rightarrow \varepsilon g$ and $4f \rightarrow \varepsilon d$ oscillator strength [\[9,](#page-0-14) [10\]](#page-0-15). This minimum impacts the angle dependent of WES time delay.

Following the formalism of $[11]$ and $[7]$ we compute the WES time delay. For a one-electron transition from an initial state characterized by quan t um numbers *l jm* to a final continuum state \overline{l} \overline{j} *m* with the spin described by a two-component spinor χ_v the dipole transition matrix element is given by [\[7\]](#page-0-12),

$$
T_{JM}^{(\lambda)} = i\sqrt{\frac{2\pi^2}{Ep}}\sqrt{\frac{(2J+1)(J+1)}{J}}\frac{\omega^J}{(2J+1)!!}
$$

$$
\times \sum_{\vec{k}\bar{m}} (\chi_v^{\dagger} \Omega_{\vec{k}\bar{m}}(\hat{p})) (-1)^{\bar{j}-\bar{m}} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{j} & J & j \\ -\bar{m} & M & m \end{pmatrix}
$$

$$
\times i^{1-\bar{l}} e^{i\delta_{\bar{k}}} \langle \bar{a} || Q_J^{(\lambda)} || a \rangle (-1)^{\bar{j}+j+J}.
$$

All possible dipole channels originating from the 4f subshell are studied. The interference between different channels produces an angle dependence of the WES time delay which become particularly interesting in the neighborhood of the minimum in $4f$ cross section mentioned above.

References

- [1] R. Pazourek *et al.* 2015 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 87 [765](http://journals.aps.org/rmp/abstract/10.1103/RevModPhys.87.765)
- [2] M. Schultze *et al.* 2010 *Science* 3[28 1658](http://science.sciencemag.org/content/328/5986/1658)
- [3] S. Neppl *et al.* 2012 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 109[, 087401](http://journals.aps.org/prl/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.087401)
- [4] E. P. Wigner 1955 *Phys. Rev.* 98 [145](http://journals.aps.org/pr/abstract/10.1103/PhysRev.98.145)
- [5] P. C. Deshmukh *et al.* 2014 *Phys. Rev. A* 89 [053424](http://journals.aps.org/pra/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevA.89.053424)
- [6] M. Ossiander *et al.* 2016 *Nature Physics* [doi:10.1038/nphys3941](http://www.nature.com/nphys/journal/vaop/ncurrent/full/nphys3941.html)
- [7] A. Kheifets *et al.* 2016 *Phys. Rev. A* 94 [013423](http://journals.aps.org/pra/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevA.94.013423)
- [8] A. Mandal *et al.* 2017 *NCAMP XXI, January 3-6, PRL, Ahemadabad, India*
- [9] Tanima Banerjee *et al.* 2006 *XXIV ICPEAC, July 20- 26, Rosario, Argentina*
- [10] Tanima Banerjee 2007 *PhD Thesis, IIT Madras, India*
- [11] W. R. Johnson *et al.* 1979 *Phys. Rev. A* 20 [964](http://journals.aps.org/pra/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevA.20.964)

¹E-mail: amankur@physics.iitm.ac.in

²E-mail: pcd@iittp.ac.in

³E-mail: vkdolmatov@una.edu

⁴E-mail: a.kheifets@anu.edu.au

 ${}^{5}E$ -mail: smanson@gsu.edu