

Comment on “Saturation of the all-optical Kerr effect”

In a recent Letter [1], Brée, Demircan, and Steinmeyer calculated higher-order Kerr coefficients n_{2k} in noble gases using a generalized Kramers-Kronig (KK) relation applied to high order nonlinear processes. They found that the nonlinear index Δn for argon obtained from $\Delta n = \sum n_{2k} I^k$ saturates and goes negative in the intensity range $I \sim 40\text{-}50 \text{ TW/cm}^2$, well below the threshold for ionization.

While a recent experiment has shown conclusively that there is no nonlinear index saturation below the ionization threshold [2], here we show on theoretical grounds that the calculation leading Brée *et al.* to their conclusion is incorrect. It errs by using multiphoton ionization (MPI) rates in a regime where perturbation theory breaks down.

The KK relation used by [1] is

$$n_{2k}(\omega) = \frac{\hbar\omega}{\pi} \mathcal{P} \int_0^\infty (\Omega + \omega) \frac{\sigma_{k+1}(\xi)}{\Omega^2 - \omega^2} d\Omega, \quad (1)$$

where σ_k is the coefficient for k^{th} order MPI with rate $w_k = \sigma_k I^k$, $\xi = (\Omega + k\omega)/(k+1)$, and \mathcal{P} denotes principal value. The coefficients σ_k used by Brée *et al.* (Eq. (1) of [1]) are obtained from the $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ or MPI limit of a recently derived ionization rate R [3], where, in atomic units, $\gamma = (2I_p)^{1/2}\omega/E_0$ is the Keldysh parameter and where I_p is the ionization potential, ω is the laser frequency and E_0 is the peak laser field. The rate R (Eq. (6) of [3]) handles both the $\gamma \gg 1$ MPI limit and the $\gamma \ll 1$ tunneling limit, and provides a reasonably accurate interpolation for γ lying in between.

In Fig. 1 we plot R for argon ($I_p = 15.76 \text{ eV}$) for $\hbar\omega = 1.55 \text{ eV}$ ($\lambda = 800 \text{ nm}$) as a function of intensity (red dashes). At low intensities $R \propto I^M$, where M ($=11$ for Ar) is the minimum number of photons for ionization, and at higher intensities R shows the characteristic roll off as the tunneling regime is approached. We also plot the total MPI rate $w = \sum_{k=11}^{50} w_k$ (blue dots), where the contributions for $k > 11$ correspond to above threshold ionization. Above $\sim 70 \text{ TW/cm}^2$, w diverges badly. However, even as low as 5 TW/cm^2 , R and w differ by a factor of ~ 2 . Thus we immediately see that the terms containing σ_k contributing to w are quite inadequate to describe ionization in the $> 40 \text{ TW/cm}^2$ region where the novel behavior of Δn is claimed. Thus, these σ_k are problematic for use in Eq. (1). Forcing a mathematical fit of w to R , using the σ_k as free parameters, would require some of the σ_k to be negative for large k , an unphysical result.

We now show how Brée *et al.* obtain saturation and negative excursion of Δn . In [1] it is stated that $n_{2k} > 0$ for $k \leq 9$ and $n_{2k} < 0$ for $k \geq 10$. It is the $k \geq 10$ contributions which cause Δn to saturate and go negative.




FIG. 1: (color online) Ionization rates w (blue dots), w_k (solid black), and R (red dashes) calculated for Ar using the models in [1] and [3]. Here w_k is the k^{th} order MPI rate applicable for $\gamma \gg 1$ (shown for $k = 11$), w is the sum over w_k from $k = 11$ to 50, and R is the rate from [3] applicable from the MPI though tunneling regimes ($\gamma \ll 1$).

First, we note that it is the $0 < \Omega < \omega$ portion of the KK integral (1) which can contribute negatively to n_{2k} . In that interval, ξ in $\sigma_{k+1}(\xi)$ ranges from $\omega k/(k+1)$ to ω . However, $\sigma_{k+1}(\xi) = 0$ for $\xi < \xi_{\text{thresh}} = I_p/[(k+1)\hbar]$, as appropriate for a MPI coefficient [3]. Suppose $k = 1$. Then the KK integral would contribute negatively for $\omega/2 < \xi < \omega$, except for the fact that $\sigma_2(\xi) = 0$ in this range. Thus $n_2 > 0$. For the same reasons, $n_{2k} > 0$ for $k \leq 9$. However, for $k = 10$, the KK integral contributes negatively in the interval $(10/11)\omega < \xi < \omega$ because $\xi \sim \xi_{\text{thresh}}$ and $\sigma_{11}(\xi) > 0$. Similar negative contributions occur for $k > 10$, where $\xi > \xi_{\text{thresh}}$. Thus, *all* negative Kerr coefficients n_{2k} for $k \geq 10$ are computed using $\sigma_{k+1}(\xi)$ for $\xi \sim \omega$, a region for which $\gamma \sim 1.8$ at 40 TW/cm^2 in Ar. In using Eq. (1) to calculate the terms n_{2k} in $\Delta n = \sum n_{2j} I^j$, γ has therefore been implicitly sampled from $\gamma = 10$ ($k = 1$) to $\gamma = 1.8$ ($k = 10$), a range over which an underlying theory of ionization should encompass the transition from MPI to tunneling. Instead, Brée *et al.* have used MPI exclusively, as appropriate for a perturbative expansion. It is not a coincidence that $n_{2k} < 0$ for $k \geq 10$: this is the $\lambda = 800 \text{ nm}$ MPI threshold for Ar, where $\sigma_{11}(\omega) > 0$. Essentially, the saturated and negative intensity dependence of Δn obtained by Brée *et al.* is an artifact of a perturbation expansion in a laser intensity region where it is far from appropriate. We note that Brée *et al.* justify their use of rates in the MPI limit by quoting $\gamma = 1.62$ at 50 TW/cm^2 . While this might be an adequate assumption if the rates are to be used only for order-of-magnitude estimates of ionization yields, it

is clearly incorrect for calculating nonlinear coefficients using KK theory.

Finally, we note the remarkable coincidence that an experiment [4] and a theory [1] both show apparent saturation of the Kerr effect in the same intensity range for completely different reasons. In the experiment the saturating and negative phase shift was likely caused by diffraction from a plasma grating [5]; here it is caused by the extension of a perturbative theory of ionization to an intensity range where it breaks down.

J. K. Wahlstrand and H. M. Milchberg

Institute for Research in Electronics and Applied Physics,
University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742

-
- [1] C. Brée, A. Demircan, and G. Steinmeyer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 183902 (2011).
 - [2] J. K. Wahlstrand, Y.-H. Cheng, Y.-H. Chen, and H. M. Milchberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 103901 (2011).
 - [3] S. V. Popruzhenko, V. D. Mur, V. S. Popov, and D. Bauer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 193003 (2008).
 - [4] V. Lorient, E. Hertz, O. Faucher, and B. Lavorel, *Opt. Express* **17**, 13429 (2009).
 - [5] J. K. Wahlstrand and H. M. Milchberg, *Opt. Lett.* **36**, 3822 (2011).