0 0 0 0 4 2 0 8 2 2 0

Submitted to Physical Review

LBL-3577
Preprint

COMMENT ON "RESONANT SCATTERING OR ABSORPTION FOLLOWED BY EMISSION"

Y. R. Shen

RECEIVED
LIBRARY
DEC 10 1975
LIBRARY AND
DOCUMENTS SECTION

January 1975

Prepared for the U. S. Energy Research and
Development Administration under Contract W-7405-ENG-48

For Reference

Not to be taken from this room

LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY

LBL-3577

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

0 0 0 0 4 2 0 8 2 2 1

Submitted to The Physical Review

LBL-3577
Preprint

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
Berkeley, California

AEC Contract No. W-7405-eng-48

COMMENT ON "RESONANT SCATTERING OR ABSORPTION FOLLOWED BY EMISSION"

Y. R. Shen

January 1975

0 0 0 0 4 2 0 8 2 2 2

Comment on "Resonant Scattering or Absorption Followed by Emission"

Y. R. Shen

Department of Physics, University of California,
and
Inorganic Materials Research Division,
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory,
Berkeley, California 94720

ABSTRACT

The resonant scattering which is governed by transverse relaxation is physically different from absorption followed by emission which is affected by longitudinal relaxation. A number of physical examples are given.

Solin and Merkelo in a recent article[1] claimed that there is no difference between resonant Raman scattering (RRS) and hot luminescence (HL) (or emission after absorption). They extended Klein's intuitive theoretical derivation[2] to support their argument. Their conclusion is in contradiction with that derived from the density-matrix formalism[3]. The density-matrix approach shows that RRS is connected only with the off-diagonal density matrix elements and is governed by transverse relaxation, while HL is connected with real population change in the excited state and is affected by longitudinal relaxation. Here we want to reassert that RRS and HL are different physical processes and to point out that the apparent contradiction arises because Solin and Merkelo have ignored the difference between transverse and longitudinal relaxation.

Solin and Merkelo[1] considered only the collisionless case where the linewidths of all states are naturally broadened. Their conclusion was then based solely on the result that in the steady state, the resonant emission cross-section derived from an intuitive argument agrees with the Raman scattering cross-section from the <u>usual</u> scattering formula. In fact, for this special case, the same mathematical result was obtained in Ref. 3 with the density-matrix formalism but the physical interpretation is different. As shown there (Eqs. (7) - (10) of Ref. 3 with $u(t-t_o) = 1$), in the limiting case of lifetime broadening with $2T_n\Gamma_{ng} = 1$ and $T_g \gg T_n, T_f$ (We use the same notations here as in Ref. 3), it is the <u>overall</u> differential cross-section for Stokes emission (HL+RRS)

which reduces to the usual expression for resonant Raman scattering[2]. The integrated HL cross-section is equal to the integrated (HL+RRS) Stokes emission cross-section. This happens because of interference between HL and RRS in some frequency regions. In the more general cases, however, these results are not valid but the overall Stokes emission cross-section still consists of two parts, HL and RRS, as pointed out in Ref. 3. We emphasize here that even in the limiting case of lifetime broadening, the usual expression for resonant Raman scattering has actually had contributions from both HL and RRS. Therefore, the conclusion of Solin and Merkelo[1] is not correct.

For the matter of clarification, we should point out that the definitions of HL and RRS existing in the literature are not unique. Here, we follow the definition in Ref. 2. We start from a rather general definitions of differential scattering cross-section $d^2\sigma/d\omega_s d\Omega \propto \mathrm{Im} \langle \vec{p}^{(3)}(\omega_s) \cdot \vec{E}(\omega_s) \rangle$. We can write $\langle \vec{p}^{(3)}(\omega_s) = \langle \vec{p}^{(3)}_{HL}(\omega_s) + \langle \vec{p}^{(3)}_{RRS}(\omega_s) \rangle$, and hence $d^2\sigma/d\omega_s d\Omega = (d^2\sigma/d\omega_s d\Omega)_{HL} + (d^2\sigma/d\omega_s d\Omega)_{RRS}$. The HL part (or absorption followed by emission) arises from the excess population $\rho_{nn}^{(2)}(0)$ (longitudinal excitation) pumped into the intermediate state $\langle n|$ by the exciting field. The RRS part is connected only with the off-diagonal density matrix elements (transverse excitation). Clearly, from our definition, HL and RRS can interfere[4], and therefore cannot really be separated from each other, at least in steady-state measurements.

However, the relaxations of longitudinal and transverse excitations (and hence the relaxations of HL and RRS) are in general very different and are most appropriately taken care of by the density-matrix formalism. We have, for the density matrix operator ρ, the equation of motion[5-8]

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} = [\mathcal{H}_o + \mathcal{H}',\rho] + i\hbar\left(\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t}\right)_{\text{damping}}. \tag{1}$$

We normally assume for optical transitions,[8,9]

$$\left(\frac{\partial\rho_{ij}}{\partial t}\right)_{\text{damping}} = \sum_{n\neq i}[W_{in}\rho_{nn} - W_{ni}\rho_{ii}] \quad \text{for } i = j$$

$$= -\Gamma_{ij}\rho_{ij} \qquad \text{for } i \neq j \tag{2}$$

where W_{in} is the transition probability from $\langle n|$ to $\langle i|$. The same equations have been used in many magnetic resonance problems[5-7]. It is seen clearly from Eq. (2) that the relaxations for longitudinal excitations ($\Delta\rho_{ii}$) and for transverse excitations ($\Delta\rho_{ij}$ with $i\neq j$) are different. Only in special cases, the two are connected. For a two-level system, Eq. (2) leads to the well-known longitudinal and transverse relaxations times, T_1 and T_2 respectively. Recently, Rousseau et al.[10] have indeed observed these two relaxation processes in their work on resonant Raman scattering and fluorescense in I_2 vapor.

In response to the suggestion of Ref. 1 that the results of Ref. 3 (Eq. (6) and (7)) may not be correct, we now feel obliged to give a brief discussion on the derivation in Ref. 3 to confirm those results.[11] We consider only the steady-state case ($u(t - t_o) = 1$ with $t_o \to \infty$ in

Eqs. (6) and (7) of Ref. 3). The transient case follows essentially the same derivation. The detailed procedure of deriving Eq. (6) of Ref. 3 has been spelled out clearly by Bloembergen.[12] In fact, the expresssion of $\langle P^{(3)}(\omega_s)\rangle_{RRS}$ follows directly from his derivation, taking into account only the resonant term with the damping constants incorporated. A similar derivation leads to $\langle P^{(3)}(\omega_s)\rangle_{HL}$. That the steady-state expression of $\langle P^{(3)}(\omega_s)\rangle_{HL}$ in Eq. (6) of Ref. 3 is correct can be seen as follows. For hot luminescence from $\langle n|$ to $\langle f|$, the system is equivalent to a two-level system with the populations $\rho_{nn} = \rho_{nn}^{(2)}(0)$ and $\rho_{ff} = 0$. It is well-known that for such a system, we have[8,12]

$$\langle\vec{P}(\omega_s)\rangle = \frac{(\vec{P}_s)_{fn}(\vec{P}_s^{\,\dagger}\cdot\vec{\mathcal{E}}_s)_{nf}}{\hbar(\omega_s - \omega_{nf} + i\Gamma_{nf})}(\rho_{ff} - \rho_{nn})e^{-i\omega_s t}. \tag{3}$$

We also know from the well-known formula for resonance saturation that the second-order population change $\rho_{nn}^{(2)}$ induced by the exciting field is[7,8,13]

$$\rho_{nn}^{(2)} = 2\Gamma_{ng}T_n|(\vec{P}_\ell^{\,\dagger}\cdot\vec{\mathcal{E}}_\ell)_{ng}|^2/\hbar^2[(\omega_\ell - \omega_{ng})^2 + \Gamma_{ng}^2]. \tag{4}$$

Substitution of Eq. (4) into Eq. (3) leads immediately to the steady-state expression of $\langle P^{(3)}(\omega_s)\rangle_{HL}$ in Eq. (6) of Ref. 3. We should also comment in passing that the damping term which appears in the equation for $\rho_{nn}^{(2)}$ in Eq. (5) of Ref. 3 is an approximation. According to Eq. (2), it should be

$$\left(\frac{\partial \rho_{nn}^{(2)}}{\partial t}\right)_{damping} = -(W_{gn} + W_{fn})\rho_{nn}^{(2)} + (W_{nf}\rho_{ff}^{(2)} + W_{ng}\rho_{gg}^{(2)}) \qquad (5)$$

but since $\rho_{ff}^{(2)} = 0$, $\rho_{gg}^{(2)} = -\rho_{nn}^{(2)}$, and $W_{ng}/W_{gn} \ll 1$ from thermal statistical consideration, we have, as a good approximation,

$$\left(\frac{\partial \rho_{nn}^{(2)}}{\partial t}\right)_{damping} = -\Gamma_{nn}\rho_{nn}^{(2)} \qquad (6)$$

where $\Gamma_{nn} = W_{gn} + W_{fn}$. This approximation is not generally true for ρ_{nn}, especially when $\rho_{nn}^{(0)}$ is non-negligible.

We note that the resonant scattering cross-section derived in Ref. 1 is different from that in Ref. 3. This is because Solin and Merkelo[1] used a specific model in their derivation. Normally, the scattering cross-section we are interested in is proportional to the steady-state transition rate. Solin and Merkelo however considered a different case. They assumed that initially ($t = t_o$) the system was in an excited state $|i\rangle$. They calculated the total time-integrated (from $t = t_o$ to $t = \infty$) transition probability for the system making transition from $|i\rangle$ to another excited state $|\ell\rangle$ while scattering a photon at ω_ℓ into a photon at ω_s. Their scattering cross-section was then defined as proportional to this time-integrated transition probability. In their case, we expect no steady-state population in any state involved in the transition (as can be seen, for example, from Eq. (13a) of Ref. (1)). Consequently, they did not obtain the same result as the one given in Ref. 3. The

implication of Ref. 1 that they had used essentially the same expression for the scattering cross-section as in Ref. 3 was wrong. The results derived in Ref. 1 are also not valid when the equilibrium populations of either $|i\rangle$ or $|\ell\rangle$ or both are non-negligible.

According to the definitions of HL and RRS in Ref. 3, the distinction between the two processes comes mainly from the difference between longitudinal and transverse relaxations of the intermediate state $\langle n|$. While it may be difficult to distinguish unambiguously HL and RRS without transient time-resolving measurements,[10,14] there are innumerable physical cases[15] which are based on the difference between longitudinal and transverse relaxations, some of them being similar to the case of HL and RRS. A few examples have already been given in Ref. 3. Here, we consider a few more. One well-known example is anti-Stokes scattering[16,17] in a medium in the presence of strong laser and Stokes fields. It can be generated by both direct and indirect (two-step) processes. In the direct process, the laser and the Stokes fields excite the vibrational wave (proportional to the off-diagonal density matrix element between the ground state and the excited vibrational state) and the vibrational wave in turn couples with the laser field to create the anti-Stokes field. The response is governed by the transverse relaxation time T_2 of the vibrational state. In the indirect process, the laser and the Stokes fields actually pump a non-negligible excess population into the vibrational excited state via the Raman process. This excess population can then yield an anti-Stokes

scattering which decays with the longitudinal relaxation time T_1 of the vibrational state. Kaiser and his coworkers[18] have used these direct and indirect processes in their time-resolving experiments to measure respectively T_1 and T_2 of vibrational or phonon relaxation in liquids and solids. They are also contemplating the method of exciting the vibrational excitation directly by a coherent infrared source.[19] The same situation should appear if a laser beam at ω_1 is used to excite an optically excited state and another laser beam at ω_2 is used to induce emission at $\omega_1-\omega_2$. This latter case is equivalent to the case of HL and RRS, except that induced two-photon emission to the ground state occurs instead of one-photon emission to a lower excited state. In the discussion of Solin and Merkelo,[1] they have ignored the question of longitudinal and transverse relaxations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by the U.S. Energy Reserach and Development Agency.

0 0 0 0 4 2 0 8 2 2 6

REFERENCES

1. J. R. Solin and H. Merkelo, Phys. Rev. 12, 624 (1975).
2. M. V. Klein, Phys. Rev. B8, 919 (1973).
3. Y. R. Shen, Phys. Rev. B9, 622 (1974).
4. While $d^2\sigma/d\omega_s d\Omega$ is always positive for $\rho_{gg}^{(o)} = 1$, its RRS component can be negative at certain ω_ℓ and ω_s.
5. R. K. Wangsness and F. Bloch, Phys. Rev. 89, 728 (1953).
6. A. G. Redfield, IBM Journal 1, 19 (1957).
7. See, for example, A. Abragam, Principles of Nuclear Magnetism (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1961) p. 276; C. P. Slichter, Principles of Magnetic Resonance (Harper and Row, N.Y., 1963)p. 127.
8. N. Bloembergen and Y. R. Shen, Phys. Rev. 133, A37 (1964).
9. See, for example, L. R. Wilcox and W. E. Lamb, Phys. Rev. 119, 1915 (1960); W. E. Lamb and T. M. Sanders, Phys. Rev. 119, 1901 (1960); W. E. Lamb, Phys. Rev. A134, 1429 (1964); M. O. Scully and W. E. Lamb, Phys. Rev. A159,208 (1967).
10. D. L. Rousseau, G. D. Patterson, and P. F. Williams, Phys. Rev. Lett. 34, 1306 (1975).
11. In Eq. (6) of Ref. 2, there should be a factor $\exp[-i\omega_s t_o]$ attached to $u(t - t_o)$ in each term, except those terms proportional to $[1 - u(t - t_o)]$.
12. N. Bloembergen, Nonlinear Optics (Benjamin, N.Y., 1965), Chapter II.
13. F. Bloch, Phys. Rev. 102, 104 (1956).

14. P. F. Williams, D. L. Rousseau and S. H. Swortesky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32, 196 (1974). In this case, the transverse relaxation is too short to be seen. The results have been averaged over Doppler broadening and hyperfine splittings.

15. Many examples are associated with Magnetic resonance phenomena. See, for example, Ref. 7.

16. Y. R. Shen and N. Bloembergen, Phys. Rev. 137, A1786 (1965).

17. J. A. Giordmaine and W. Kaiser, Phys. Rev. 144, 676 (1966).

18. D. von der Linde, A. Laubereau, and W. Kaiser, Phys. Rev. Lett. 26, 954 (1971); A. Laubereau, D. von der Linde and W. Kaiser, Phys. Rev. Lett. 27, 802 (1971); 28, 1162 (1972); Opt. Comm. 7, 173 (1973).

19. A. Laubereau, A. Grieter, and W. Kaiser, Appl. Phys. Lett. 25, 87 (1974).

0 0 0 0 4 2 0 0 2 2 7

LEGAL NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Energy Research and Development Administration, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION DIVISION
LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720