



This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

Polarizability, Stark shifts, and field ionization of highly charged ions in ultraintense lasers

Evan C. Jones, Zachery P. Andreula, and Barry C. Walker

Phys. Rev. A **107**, 033102 — Published 6 March 2023

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.107.033102](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.107.033102)

Polarizability, Stark Shifts, and Field Ionization of Highly Charged Ions in Ultra-Intense Lasers

Evan C. Jones, Zachery P. Andreula, Barry C. Walker*

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716, USA

(Dated: February 22, 2023)

We have calculated the polarization and Stark shifted binding energy for ultraintense lasers interacting with highly charged ions across the periodic table from beryllium to uranium at intensities up to 10^{22} W cm $^{-2}$. The induced dipole and Stark shifts for the bound states can be as large as $0.1 e a_0$ and $50 E_h$. Calculations of tunneling show the impact of polarization and Stark shifts on the ionization rate are significant but counteracting. The work resolves a longstanding question of how field free derivations of the tunneling response for highly charged ions have been quantitatively successful in relativistic, ultrahigh intensity experiments. Using a scaling relationship the results can be generalized to give the induced electric dipole for any species across an intensity range from 10^{15} W cm $^{-2}$ to 10^{22} W cm $^{-2}$.

I. INTRODUCTION

Due to the advancement of chirped pulse amplification [1] laser intensities now exceed 10^{23} W cm $^{-2}$ [2] corresponding to electric fields reaching $1,500 E_h e^{-1} a_0^{-1}$ in atomic units (Hartree energy E_h , elementary charge e , and bohr distance a_0). There are more than one-hundred laser facilities across the world that can now deliver laser pulses with a peak power of more than a petawatt [3]. At high intensities, the electrons bound to the ions are no longer in a ‘field-free’ environment. Atomic ionization studies at intensities of 10^{19} W cm $^{-2}$ have reported charge states as high as Xe $^{26+}$ [4, 5]. The effect of the laser magnetic field and electron spin [6–9] in ultrastrong fields have been theoretically quantified [10, 11]. The Stark shift is well studied for high lying states of atoms and molecules in strong fields [12, 13], but is coming into focus as being important for lower lying and ground states [14–16] as well as states of condensed matter systems [17].

In this work, we characterize the net impact of intensities generated by terawatt [18, 19] and petawatt [20] laser systems on both the polarization and Stark shift of bound states in highly charged ions. We consider species across the periodic table from beryllium to uranium. As an application of the fundamental response, the tunneling ionization rates from the polarized and Stark shifted species are reported. An interplay between polarization and the Stark shift resolves how models based on a ‘field-free’ approximation can appear to agree with experimental measurements [5, 21–25] when, in fact, the atomic states are shifted and polarized in the field.

To introduce how fields change atomic states we examine the response of krypton [23]. In Fig. 1 the outermost electron wave function of Kr $^{25+}$ is shown at an intensity of 5×10^{18} W cm $^{-2}$. The outermost electron is often identified as the spherically symmetric, hydrogenic $3s$ about a closed shell neon $1s^2 2s^2 2p^6$ core. We choose




FIG. 1. Wave function magnitude $|\psi(x, 0, z)|$ (a) in the $y = 0$ plane for the Kr $^{25+}$ outermost electron in an external electric field (intensity) of $12.4 E_h e^{-1} a_0^{-1} \hat{z}$ (5.4×10^{18} W cm $^{-2}$). The electron probability $\psi(z)^* \psi(z)$ is shown (b) field free (red, upper bold line) and along the $12.4 E_h e^{-1} a_0^{-1} \hat{z}$ field direction (blue, lower bold line). The $\psi(z)^* \psi(z)$ probability (right y-axis) is shown offset to indicate the binding energy of $-42.2 E_h$ field free and $-45.1 E_h$ in the field. The binding ion potentials for the Kr $^{25+}$ outermost electron ion with no external field (red, thin line, light fill to x-axis) and in an electric field of $12.4 E_h e^{-1} a_0^{-1} \hat{z}$ (blue, thin line, dark fill to x-axis) are also shown in (b).

5×10^{18} W cm $^{-2}$ as it corresponds to an intensity that is one-half of the ‘barrier suppression ionization’ (BSI), or ‘classical ionization,’ of the outermost electron of Kr $^{25+}$. High field interactions are very nonlinear; an order of magnitude change in the intensity can change the amount of ionization by ten orders of magnitude [26, 27]. Modern experiments have an intensity range from a few percent of BSI up to BSI.

In Fig. 1(a) one can see the outermost electron wave

* Corresponding author bcwalker@udel.edu.




FIG. 2. Krypton ion population (a) as a function of the intensity for a single cycle of 800 nm radiation. The electron configuration for selected ionization steps is indicated above the graph. The semi-empirical polarizability α for krypton as a function of the ion charge is given in (b) with the symbol spectral value tied to the ionization (a). The experimental α values for neutral Kr and calculated one-electron, $1s$ state (black, open triangle) are included.

function $|\psi(x, 0, z)|$ in the plane of the electric field $\vec{E} = 12.4 E_h e^{-1} a_0^{-1} \hat{z}$. The force from the external field causes the electron to spatially displace away from the nucleus. Fig. 1(b) is a plot of $\psi(z)^* \psi(z)$ with no external field and in a field that is 71% of the BSI field (i.e. one-half of the BSI intensity). The shift of the peak electron probability to $z \approx -0.4 a_0$ is identifiable in Fig. 1(b) and evaluates to a similarly large electric dipole $\vec{p} = 0.33 e a_0 \hat{z}$. The binding atomic potential for the outer electron with and without the external field is also plotted in Fig. 1(b) as a function of the distance from the nucleus along the electric field (z -axis).

The Stark shift due to polarized state alignment in the external field can be a sizable fraction of the binding energy since $|\vec{p}| \sim 0.1 e a_0$ and ultrastrong fields are of order 10 to $10^2 E_h e^{-1} a_0^{-1}$. In Fig. 1(b) the Stark shift of the binding energy from $-42.2 E_h$ to $-45.1 E_h$ is displayed in the potentials as an offset of the electron wave function probability $\psi(z)^* \psi(z)$. The results in Fig. 1 were calculated according to the method described in section II. Theory.

For introductory purposes, we briefly describe ionization and polarizability for highly charged ions. When the laser field is comparable to the atomic Coulomb field, an effective potential barrier is created through which the electrons tunnel ionize [28, 29]. In Fig. 1(b) the effective laser and Coulomb potential barrier through which Kr^{25+} tunnel ionizes is located between $-3 a_0 < z < -0.75 a_0$. The tunneling time under the barrier [30–32] is impacted by the polarization and Stark shift of the tunneling electron.

Tunneling ionization is commonly described with a model derived by Ammosov, Delone, and Krainov (ADK) [33], which will be discussed in depth in the Tunneling Ionization section. For the moment, Fig. 2(a) depicts the ion charge state probability of krypton due to field ionization as a function of the laser intensity for a single cycle of $\lambda=800$ nm light calculated using the ADK

model. One can see in the figure a single electron from ground state krypton is ionized at $10^{14} \text{ W cm}^{-2}$. The sequential field ionization process continues with the increasing intensity over ten orders of magnitude until the last ‘ $1s$ ’ electron is field ionized at $10^{24} \text{ W cm}^{-2}$ leaving a bare Kr^{36+} nucleus. Gaps in the ionization potential, such as occur across electron shells, are seen in the figure with the core identified above the ion population at that intensity region.

While the above ionization response is focused on the photoelectron in the continuum, the strong external field also polarizes the initial bound state for the electron of the highly charged ion. The homogeneous polarizability model $\alpha = |\vec{p}|/|\vec{E}|$ approximates [34] highly charged ions as a sphere with $\alpha = Kr^3$, where r is the atomic radii for the outermost electron and K is a factor accounting for the radial structure in an atom with atomic number of Z . Using the experimentally measured neutral atom polarizability and the calculated hydrogenic quantum $1s$ polarizability as endpoint requirements for K gives the approximate weak field polarizability in atomic units as,

$$\alpha = \frac{9}{2} \frac{n^{7/2}}{Z(2E_{IP})^{3/2}} \quad (1)$$

This semi-empirical model for the polarization of an ion with the outermost electron having an ionization potential E_{IP} and principal quantum number n is shown for krypton in Fig. 2(b) as the ion charge state Q proceeds from the neutral atom to the bare $Z = 36$ nucleus. With the increase in Q the larger force binding the electrons decreases the outer electron radius and polarizability. In addition to an inverse relationship between α and Q , large changes occur at the shell gaps ($Q=8, 26, 34$) where the radial expectation value of the bound state electron decreases abruptly. As the ion states span from Kr to Kr^{35+} the polarizability changes by a factor of 10^6 . It is interesting to note that, while the ADK formulation has yielded excellent agreement with experiments, it does not include the physics of field polarizability or the Stark shift of the binding energy.

In this work, we calculate the electron wave function of highly charged ions in ultrastrong fields. This is done to obtain insight into the electron wave function polarization and Stark shifted bound state energies. We demonstrate the impact of these field induced changes to determine the ionization rates at intensities created with modern ultrahigh intensity laser facilities. Our study concludes by demonstrating the generalization of the wave function polarization for highly charged ions in ultrastrong laser fields using a scaling relationship between species.

II. THEORY

Our model approximates the atomic response as a ‘frozen’ ion core with an ‘active,’ least tightly bound out-




FIG. 3. Potential energy (a) for the ion core $\text{Kr}[1s^2 2s^2 2p^6]$ (left axis) including the Kr^{36+} Coulomb potential (gray, thick line), the ion core potential $V_{\text{core}}(\vec{r})$ (red, solid line), which asymptotically is Kr^{26+} , and electron correlation energy for the core (black, dashed line). A split scale is used in (a) for electron correlation energy. The radial probabilities, right axis of (a), for the electron core states (green fill shading) are offset according to binding energy. The ion core is displayed as the radially dependent effective charge in (b).

ermost electron interacting with external field ($\vec{E} \cdot \vec{r} = |\vec{E}|z$), nucleus and ion core ($V_{\text{core}}(\vec{r})$). The Hartree approximation [35] is used for electron correlation. By way of example, the calculated ion core potentials, bound states, and radially dependent effective charge for Kr^{25+} are shown in Fig. 3. The core state radial probabilities in Fig. 3(a), which are consistent with [36], are offset in the figure to correspond to the binding energy in the potentials as an aid to the reader's eye. The electron correlation energy is included in Fig. 3(a). As shown by the radially dependent effective charge for Kr^{25+} , core screening is involved for $r < 0.25 a_0$. By comparing to Fig. 1, where the peak value of $\psi^*(z)\psi(z)$ is at $0.4 a_0$, one can see a significant fraction of the outermost electron penetrates the core.

Using the quasi-static approximation, the Schrödinger equation for electron states of a highly charged ion is numerically solved in a hydrogenic basis set for the electron states in an external electric field [35]. The wave function for the outermost electron is used to determine the polarization and energy shift in the field. The interaction for each species ranges typically from a field strength of $0.1 \times \text{BSI}$ (0.01 of the BSI intensity) to $0.9 \times \text{BSI}$. In this range, the energy and dipole of the outermost electron wave function converge with a basis set of $n=25$ for the principal quantum number. The field free ionization energy of the calculated bound states typically ranges within $\sim 10\%$ of NIST values [37].

Intensities up to $10^{22} \text{ W cm}^{-2}$ are considered, which are well into the relativistic regime when the electron is in the continuum [8]. This occurs as the photoelectron gains energy as it is accelerated and displaced from the parent ion; in Fig. 1(b) the photoelectron will not reach a kinetic energy of $100 E_h$ from the $12.4 E_h e^{-1} a_0^{-1} \hat{z}$ field until $z = -11 a_0$.

The role of relativistic effects and the external laser magnetic field for the bound states of highly charged ions




FIG. 4. Binding energy (a) for the outermost electron of O^{7+} (red, dark line, filled circle), Kr^{26+} (blue, dark line, open triangle), and Hf^{61+} (black, dark line, filled square) notated by the assignment $\text{O } 1s^1$, $\text{Kr } 2p^6$, and $\text{Hf } 3s^1$, respectively. As an aid to the eye the field free binding energy is indicated as (horizontal, light line) in each case. The dipole magnitude for the outermost electron for O^{7+} (red, filled circle), Kr^{26+} (blue, open triangle), and Hf^{61+} (black, filled square) is shown in (b) as a function of intensity. A larger symbol is used for the 0.71 BSI point, which is the field used in (c-e). $\psi(z)^*\psi(z)$ for the outermost electron are shown for O^{7+} (c) at field of $22.6 E_h e^{-1} a_0^{-1}$ (red, solid line, fill); Kr^{26+} (d) at $102.5 E_h e^{-1} a_0^{-1}$ (blue, solid line, fill); and Hf^{61+} (e) at $173 E_h e^{-1} a_0^{-1}$ (black, solid line, dark fill). The field free $\psi(z)^*\psi(z)$ are also shown in (c-e) for reference (light gray, dash line, light fill). The extent of the Zeeman energy splittings ($0.08 E_h$ for O^{7+} , $0.6 E_h$ for Kr^{26+} , and $1.1 E_h$ for Hf^{61+} is smaller than the symbol size) are indicated by a highlighted horizontal bar ΔE_h region within the 0.71 BSI Stark shift symbols in (a).

have been examined with semiclassical [11] and quantum [38] treatments. Including the external laser magnetic field in calculations changes the bound state energy by a few percent at $10^{22} \text{ W cm}^{-2}$. For reference, the Zeeman energy from the laser magnetic field acting on the calculated polarized states is given in Fig. 4(a) relative to the Stark shift and bound state energy.

For tunneling ionization, the angular distribution of the bound electron wave function as it appears in the




FIG. 5. Intensity dependent ionization rates for O^{7+} (red, left), Kr^{26+} (blue, middle), and Hf^{61+} (black, right) notated above the curves by the assignment $O\ 1s$, $Kr\ 2p^6$, and $Hf\ 3s^1$, respectively. Four tunneling rate calculations are displayed under the conditions: field polarized wave function with the field free ionization energy (inverted solid triangle, light line); field free wave function with the Stark shifted ionization energy (open triangle, light line); field polarized and Stark shifted (filled square, bold line); and ADK (open circle, bold dashed line).

continuum [39] from under the barrier [40] is deflected by ~ 0.1 radian at intensities above 10^{22} W cm^{-2} . This amount is negligible relative to changes in the angular distributions due to the Lorentz force for the photoelectron in the continuum [41]. Despite changes to the angle-resolved photoionization current, the magnetic field does not significantly affect the total ionization rate [11, 42] up to intensities of 10^{22} W cm^{-2} .

The energies for the bound states we consider are $< 2.5\%$ of the electron rest mass. As a result, the kinetic energy relativistic energy fine structure shift is neglected. Due to the weakness of the atomic magnetic field relative to the laser magnetic field, we also neglect spin-orbit.

Extensions of our work to highly charged ions with intensities above 10^{22} W cm^{-2} [42, 43] will need to involve careful consideration of the nonrelativistic approximation and role of the external laser magnetic field as well as the linear or circular external field polarization [44].

III. POLARIZATION AND STARK SHIFT

An analysis of the outermost electron properties for O^{7+} , Kr^{26+} , and Hf^{61+} are presented in this section. The field free orbital descriptions for these species are $O\ 1s^1$, $Kr\ 1s^22s^22p^6$, and $Hf\ 1s^22s^22p^63s^1$. These three cases were chosen as they demonstrate key characteristics of the response. Additional cases are given in the Appendix.

The calculated field free binding energy and Stark shifted binding energy of the outermost electron for O^{7+} , Kr^{26+} , and Hf^{61+} are plotted in Fig. 4(a). Depending on the orientation of the electron state, $\vec{p} \cdot \vec{E}$ can increase the ionization energy as the state becomes more tightly bound (more negative binding energies). This is the case for O^{7+} and Hf^{61+} when the induced dipole is parallel to the field. Conversely, the dipole of the outermost electron in Kr^{26+} has an anti-parallel alignment. This lifts the energy of the state in the field, decreasing the ionization energy [45]. The magnitude of the outermost electron dipole for O^{7+} , Kr^{26+} , and Hf^{61+} are shown in Fig. 4(b). The alignment of the electron probability $\psi^*(z)\psi(z)$ at an external field $0.71 \times \text{BSI}$ can be compared to the field free solution in Fig. 4(c-e).

We begin with O^{7+} at an intensity of 10^{17} W cm^{-2} . The binding energy shifts in the field from $-32\ E_h$ to $-32.5\ E_h$ approaching the BSI intensity. The small induced dipole is due to the slight polarizability of the $n=1$ state foreshadowed by the weak field homogeneous polarizability model in Fig. 2(b). The $2.5 \times 10^{-2}\ e\ a_0$ dipole response at one-half of the BSI intensity is barely observable in Fig. 4(c) as a $-0.025\hat{z}\ a_0$ shift of $\psi^*(z)\psi(z)$ from the field free probability.

Turning next to Hf^{61+} , Fig. 4(a) portrays the binding energy changes from the field free value of $-234\ E_h$ to $-262\ E_h$ as one approaches the BSI intensity at $2 \times 10^{21}\text{ W cm}^{-2}$. The induced dipole is of order $10^{-1}\ e\ a_0$ due to a combination of the larger radial values for the $n=3$ state and the extremely high intensity. The peak value of $\psi^*(z)\psi(z)$ for the outermost electron in a field strength of $\sim 173\ E_h\ e^{-1}\ a_0^{-1}$ is seen in Fig. 4(e) to be approximately $0.15\ a_0$ along $-\hat{z}$.

The Stark effect gives a splitting of the energy levels by mixing the atomic states and then interacting with the resulting electric dipole moments [46]. States shifting to lower energies, such as for O^{7+} and Hf^{61+} , result from an alignment with the field. Kr^{26+} illustrates the impact of the external laser field on states shifting to higher energies due to an alignment opposite to the field. In terms of $|nlm\rangle$ states $|200\rangle$, $|210\rangle$, $|21-1\rangle$, and $|211\rangle$ in an electric field mix to create eigenstates with a dipole moment parallel and anti-parallel to a \hat{z} field: $1/\sqrt{2}(|200\rangle - |210\rangle)$ and $1/\sqrt{2}(|200\rangle + |210\rangle)$. This high-energy state of the Stark-shifted manifold has its binding energy shifted by $\vec{p} \cdot \vec{E}$ up from the field free value of $-125\ E_h$ to the $-115\ E_h$ shown in Fig. 4(a). The external field forces the electron in the direction of $-\hat{z}$, pushing back the initial alignment along \hat{z} ; the initial $0.08\ e\ a_0$ dipole at 10^{19} W cm^{-2} drops to $0.07\ e\ a_0$ as one approaches 10^{21} W cm^{-2} . $\psi^*(z)\psi(z)$ for the outermost Kr^{26+} electron is shown in Fig. 4(d).

IV. TUNNELING IONIZATION

Polarization and Stark shifts change the ionization response of the atom in an ultra-intense laser. The polar-

ization of the bound state, for example with O^{7+} , Kr^{25+} , and Hf^{61+} , shows an electron displacement toward the tunneling barrier (see Fig. 1). The additional electron probability at the barrier increases the tunneling rate. As the tunneling ionization rate is known to be an exponential function of the height of the barrier, Stark energy shifts also affect E_{IP} and the ionization rate.

Many experiments and theory models with atoms and molecules in strong and ultrastrong fields rely on tunneling ionization [47]. Atomic ionization rates are used to calibrate the peak field of high intensity lasers [4]; an error in ionization rates can lead to a systemic error in the reported peak intensity for experiments. In this section, we focus on ionization by considering tunneling with and without the polarizability and Stark shift of the wave function. We also compare our rates to a widely used [25, 48–53] ADK model of tunneling ionization.

The tunneling ionization rate for a state may be obtained from the ionization probability current [54]. The probability current gives the tunneling ionization rate W which for hydrogen-like systems takes the form [54],

$$W = \frac{|B|^2}{2^{|m|}|m|!} \frac{1}{\kappa^{(\frac{2Q}{\kappa}-1)}} \left(\frac{2\kappa^3}{|\vec{E}|} \right)^{(\frac{2Q}{\kappa}-|m|-1)} \exp^{-\left(\frac{2\kappa^3}{3|\vec{E}|}\right)} \quad (2)$$

where $\kappa = \sqrt{2E_{IP}}$, and B is determined by matching the quantum mechanical wave function of the ionizing bound state to the asymptotic radial form ψ_c given by,

$$\psi_c(r) = Dr^{(Q/\kappa)-1} e^{-\kappa r} \quad (3)$$

$$D = B \times (-1)^{-(m+|m|)/2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{2l+1} \frac{(l-|m|)!}{(l+|m|)!}} \quad (4)$$

D and B are normalization constants only known in analytical form for the one-electron Coulomb problem.

Ammosov, Delone, and Krainov derived an analytical expression [33, 54, 55] for D using an effective quantum number $n^* = Q/\sqrt{2E_{IP}}$. The resulting ionization rate is known as the complex atom tunneling rate W_{ADK} ,

$$W_{ADK}(|\vec{E}|) = C_{n^*l^*}^2 E_{IP} \frac{(2l+1)(l+|m|)!}{2^{|m|}(|m|)!(l-|m|)!} \left(\frac{2(2E_{IP})^{3/2}}{|\vec{E}|} \right)^{2n^*-|m|-1} \exp\left(-\frac{2(2E_{IP})^{3/2}}{3|\vec{E}|}\right) \quad (5)$$

where $C_{n^*l^*}^2$ is given by,

$$C_{n^*l^*}^2 = \frac{2^{2n^*}}{n^*\Gamma(n^*+l^*+1)\Gamma(n^*-1)} \quad (6)$$

and $\Gamma(x)$ is the gamma function of x , $l^* = n_0^* - 1$, and n_0^* represents the effective principal quantum number of the lowest state with the given quantum number l . As mentioned, the complex atom ADK model does not take into account the polarization of the electron wave function by the laser field or the Stark shift.

Our analysis uses the calculated wave function at the barrier to match the asymptotic tunneling wave function Eq. 3. This fitting is done at the inner classical turning point of the barrier (e.g. $z \approx -0.75 a_0$ in Fig. 1) to obtain D . We include the Stark shift in the ionization rate by modifying the ionization potential and replacing it with the intensity dependent binding energy. Fitting the coefficients in ψ_c to the polarized wave function solution addresses the change in the probability of the bound state at the tunneling barrier. Stark shifts are incorporated via E_{IP} in Eq. 2.

Our tunneling discussion begins with the response of O^{7+} at $10^{19} \text{ W cm}^{-2}$. The ionization curves are noted in Fig. 5 by the field free orbital description $O 1s^1$. The tunneling ionization rate is plotted from 10^7 s^{-1} to its highest point at $0.9 \times \text{BSI}$ field. In keeping with the smaller polarization and Stark shift for O^{7+} , we do not find the O^{7+} tunneling rate to be strongly affected by including

the polarization or Stark shift. At the highest field, the polarization shift toward the barrier increases the ionization and the shifted ionization energy decreases the tunneling rate. These counteracting effects in the tunneling change the rate by a negligible amount for rates $< 10^{10} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and by a factor of three as the ionization rate approaches 10^{16} s^{-1} at BSI. In addition, our results agree with the ADK rate, deviating only slightly as one approaches BSI, which is arguably expected for a hydrogen-like $1s$ response.

Proceeding next to Hf^{61+} , the ionization rate curve is noted in Fig. 5 by $Hf 3s^1$. Considering only the $0.2 e a_0$ polarization of the wave function toward the barrier (see Fig. 4(e)) gives a tunneling rate of $5 \times 10^{15} \text{ s}^{-1}$, which is fifty times higher than the ADK rate of $1 \times 10^{14} \text{ s}^{-1}$ near the BSI intensity of $2 \times 10^{21} \text{ W cm}^{-2}$. Including only the Stark shift (magnitude $28 E_h$) gives a rate of $4 \times 10^{12} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Accounting for both the polarization and Stark shift gives an offsetting result; near BSI the rate including both polarization and the Stark shift is $4 \times 10^{13} \text{ s}^{-1}$, which differs from the ‘field free’ ADK rate of $2 \times 10^{14} \text{ s}^{-1}$ by a factor of five. In terms of the potential impact on the experimental measurements, a factor of five change in the rate for Hf^{61+} at $10^{21} \text{ W cm}^{-2}$ corresponds to a $\sim 20\%$ change in the intensity. This change in the intensity is comparable to the best calibrations for high intensity lasers [56, 57].

The last species shown Fig. 5 is Kr^{25+} ($Kr 2p^6$). Consistent with Hf^{61+} , we observe the impact of the polar-




FIG. 6. Average of the scaled wave function probability $\psi^*(\zeta)\psi(\zeta)$ (bold line) for outermost electron of C^{3+} , Ne^{6+} , Ar^{14+} , and Xe^{51+} when field free (a) and when in a field of $0.71 \times \text{BSI}$ (b). The minimum and maximum $\psi^*(\zeta)\psi(\zeta)$ values across the species are indicated by shading. The average $\psi^*(\zeta)\psi(\zeta)$ when field free (c) and at $0.71 \times \text{BSI}$ (d) for the outermost electron of $n=1$ ions Ar^{16+} , Be^{2+} , O^{7+} (dotted line); $n=2$ ions C^{3+} , Ne^{6+} , Ar^{14+} , and Xe^{51+} (solid line); and $n=3$ ions Kr^{25+} , Hf^{61+} and U^{80+} (dashed line).

ization and Stark shift largely cancel each other to give a rate that is within a factor of two as one approaches the BSI at $3 \times 10^{20} \text{ W cm}^{-2}$. However, the filled shell results in the outermost electron having an antiparallel dipole and Stark shift that decreases the ionization energy E_{IP} . The wave function in the field is polarized away from the tunneling barrier. As a result, tunneling is significantly lower due to reduced probability near the tunneling barrier. Overall the Stark shift of E_{IP} is sufficient to raise the electron in the effective potential (decreasing the tunneling barrier height) so the rate increase from the Stark shift is comparable to the reduction from the amount of the wave function at the barrier.

Across multiple species included in the Appendix, we find an isolated consideration of the wave function polarization or Stark shift can change the ionization rate by up to two orders of magnitude. However, in all cases, these offsets in the rate counteract within a typical factor of two to five. The achieved experimental intensity for studies using an ADK rate calibration would need to be adjusted by between 5% to 20%. We add there may be other techniques [56–59] to calibrate ultrahigh field experiments that could employ the Stark shift [60].

V. SCALING OF THE RESPONSE

In this section, we present the calculated high field states in a scaled distance unit $\vec{\zeta} \equiv \frac{Q\vec{z}}{n^2} \hat{z}$, which is based on the Bohr model. Fig. 6 is a plot of the electron prob-

ability for the outermost electron as a function of ζ for a variety of highly charged ions. For simplicity, we have limited the consideration here to s-states.

Fig. 6(a) shows the average $\psi^*(\zeta)\psi(\zeta)$ for $n = 2$ species when the ions have no laser field, i.e. ‘field free.’ The minimum and maximum values for $\psi^*(\zeta)\psi(\zeta)$ across the species are indicated by shading around the average. These extreme values represent the differentiation between the states due to the outermost electron state character and highly charged ion cores. One can see when scaled the differences in the field free states are arguably small. $\psi^*(\zeta)\psi(\zeta)$ for these same $n = 2$ states at a field of $0.7 \times \text{BSI}$ are shown in Fig. 6(b). One can see from the figure, the minimum / maximum extremes with the scaled polarized wave function across C^{3+} to Xe^{51+} are only a factor of two to three larger than for the field free case (Fig. 6(a)).

The inspection of $\psi^*(\zeta)\psi(\zeta)$ is extended to the $n = 1, 2, 3$ states in Fig. 6(c,d). The average field free wave functions for $n = 1, 2, 3$ are graphed in Fig. 6(c). When the field free electron probability for $n = 1, 2, 3$ are expressed as $\psi^*(\zeta)\psi(\zeta)$ they are directly comparable; deviations due to the changes in the principal quantum number are not out of line with the changes in the wave function due to the various ion cores (Fig. 6(a)).

Finally, in an effort to generalize the polarizability and Stark shift we plot in Fig. 6(d) the average $\psi^*(\zeta)\psi(\zeta)$ for $n = 1, 2, 3$ at a field of $0.7 \times \text{BSI}$ for each species. We note the BSI values for the species involved in the average range in intensity from $10^{15} \text{ W cm}^{-2}$ to $10^{22} \text{ W cm}^{-2}$. The scaled dipole for the average with $n = 1, n = 2$, and $n = 3$ states is $-0.17 e a_0 Q n^{-2}$, $-0.67 e a_0 Q n^{-2}$, and $-1.01 e a_0 Q n^{-2}$, respectively. Given the similarity of the scaled wave functions, the expectation value for the dipole moments as a function of the principal quantum number gives predictive power across the periodic table. By the way of example, we give the dipole from the scaled average ($p_{scaled} = \frac{n^2}{Q} p_\zeta$): O^{7+} is $p_{scaled} = 0.021 e a_0$ compared with the calculated $p = 0.021 e a_0$; Ar^{14+} is $p_{scaled} = 0.18 e a_0$ compared with $p = 0.20 e a_0$; Hf^{61+} is $p_{scaled} = 0.15 e a_0$ compared with $p = 0.15 e a_0$.

VI. CONCLUSION

As matter interacts with ultrastrong fields, the bound electrons in ion states are both polarized and Stark shifted. The unprecedented range of laser intensities from $10^{15} \text{ W cm}^{-2}$ to $10^{24} \text{ W cm}^{-2}$ can take the interaction from the neutral atom to a bare nucleus. We have used a single active electron approximation to calculate the polarization and Stark shifted binding energy of the outermost electron as a function of the external field strength. The calculated response with atoms from beryllium to uranium shows induced dipole and Stark shifts as significant as $0.1 e a_0$ and $50 E_h$. An application of the findings to tunneling revealed the change of the ionization rate due to the polarization of the wave function

was countered by an offsetting change due to the Stark shift of the binding energy. The opposing role of polarization and Stark shift resolve a longstanding question on how field free derivations of the tunneling response have been successful in relativistic, ultrahigh intensity experiments. When scaling with the ion charge and principal quantum number, the polarized wave functions reveal a common polarization response that can be used to predict the dipole moment for highly charged ions across the periodic table and intensity range from 10^{15} W cm^{-2} to 10^{22} W cm^{-2} .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 2133728 and 2110462.

Appendix: Compilation of Polarization and Stark Shift for Highly Charged Ions

This appendix provides a broader survey of results across the periodic table. Fig. 7 gives a graphical summary of the species as a function of the ion core charge, peak interaction intensity, and principal quantum number. The Stark shift and magnitude of the laser field induced dipole moment for the species not displayed in Fig. 4 are included here in Fig. 8. Fig. 9 is a compilation of the rates for species not included in the main text.




FIG. 7. Peak intensity (BSI) for the species calculated as a function of binding ion charge Q . The principal quantum number is indicated by the symbol color: $n=1$ (red, filled triangle); $n=2$ (blue, filled circle); $n=3$ (black, filled square).




FIG. 8. Stark shifted binding energy (a) and magnitude of the dipole moment for the outermost electron, (b) as a function of the laser intensity for: C^{3+} (blue, filled inverted triangle), Be^{2+} (black, open circle), Ne^{6+} (red, filled diamond), Ar^{9+} (gray, filled square), Ar^{14+} (dark yellow, filled circle), Kr^{25+} (green, cross), Ar^{16+} (red, open inverted triangle), Xe^{51+} (green, filled triangle), and U^{80+} (black, plus sign).




FIG. 9. Intensity dependent tunneling ionization rates of C^{3+} (left), Kr^{25+} (middle), and Ar^{16+} (right) shown in (a); Be^{3+} (left), Ar^{9+} (middle), and U^{80+} (right) shown in (b); Ne^{6+} (left), Ar^{14+} (middle), and Xe^{51+} (right) shown in (c). As an aid to the eye, the field-free orbital assignment is given above the corresponding curve. Four calculations are shown: field polarized wave function with the field free ionization energy (inverted solid triangle, light line); field free wave function with the Stark shifted E_{IP} (open triangle, light line); polarized wave function with Stark shifted E_{IP} (filled square solid line); and the ADK rate (open circle dashed line).

- [1] D. Strickland and G. Mourou, Compression of amplified chirped optical pulses, *OPTICS COMMUNICATIONS* **56**, 219 (1985).
- [2] J. W. Yoon, Y. G. Kim, I. W. Choi, J. H. Sung, H. W. Lee, S. K. Lee, and C. H. Nam, Realization of laser intensity over 10^{23} w/cm², *OPTICA* **8**, 630 (2021).

- [3] International Committee on Ultrahigh Intensity Lasers, Intense laser labs world wide, www.icuil.org/activities/laser-labs.html (2020).
- [4] K. Yamakawa, Y. Akahane, Y. Fukuda, M. Aoyama, J. Ma, N. Inoue, H. Ueda, and H. Kiriya, Super strong field ionization of atoms by 10^{19} wcm⁻², 10

- hz laser pulses, *JOURNAL OF MODERN OPTICS* **50**, 2515 (2003).
- [5] N. Ekanayake, S. Luo, P. D. Grugan, W. B. Crosby, A. D. Camilo, C. V. McCowan, R. Scalzi, A. Tramonozzi, L. E. Howard, S. J. Wells, C. Mancuso, T. Stanev, M. F. Decamp, and B. C. Walker, Electron shell ionization of atoms with classical, relativistic scattering, *PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS* **110**, 10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.203003 (2013).
- [6] M. Klaiber, E. Yakaboylu, C. Mueller, H. Bauke, G. G. Paulus, and K. Z. Hatsagortsyan, Spin dynamics in relativistic ionization with highly charged ions in super-strong laser fields, *JOURNAL OF PHYSICS B-ATOMIC MOLECULAR AND OPTICAL PHYSICS* **47**, 10.1088/0953-4075/47/6/065603 (2014).
- [7] M. Walser, D. Urbach, K. Hatsagortsyan, S. Hu, and C. Keitel, Spin and radiation in intense laser fields, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **65**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.65.043410 (2002).
- [8] M. Klaiber, K. Hatsagortsyan, and C. Keitel, Above-threshold ionization beyond the dipole approximation, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **71**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.71.033408 (2005).
- [9] M. Klaiber and K. Z. Hatsagortsyan, Spin-asymmetric laser-driven relativistic tunneling from p states, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **90**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.90.063416 (2014).
- [10] M. Klaiber, E. Yakaboylu, and K. Z. Hatsagortsyan, Above-threshold ionization with highly charged ions in superstrong laser fields. i. coulomb-corrected strong-field approximation, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **87**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.87.023417 (2013).
- [11] P. D. Grugan, S. Luo, M. Videtto, C. Mancuso, and B. C. Walker, Classical study of ultrastrong nonperturbative-field interactions with a one-electron atom: Validity of the dipole approximation for the bound-state interaction, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **85**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.85.053407 (2012).
- [12] R. Freeman, P. Bucksbaum, H. Milchberg, S. Darack, D. Schumacher, and M. Geusic, Above-threshold ionization with subpicosecond laser-pulses, *PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS* **59**, 1092 (1987).
- [13] P. Agostini, P. Breger, A. L’Huillier, H. Muller, G. Petite, A. Antonetti, and A. Migus, Giant stark shifts in multiphoton ionization, *PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS* **63**, 2208 (1989).
- [14] N. I. Shvetsov-Shilovski, D. Dimitrovski, and L. B. Madsen, Ionization in elliptically polarized pulses: Multielectron polarization effects and asymmetry of photoelectron momentum distributions, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **85**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.85.023428 (2012).
- [15] W. Yang, J. Li, W. Jia, H. Zhang, X. Liu, M. Zhu, X. Song, and J. Chen, Effect of the stark shift on the low-energy interference structure in strong-field ionization, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **103**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.103.053105 (2021).
- [16] S. Themelis and C. Nicolaidis, Field-induced tunneling rates, polarizabilities, and hyperpolarizabilities for low-lying excited-states of li and na, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **51**, 2801 (1995).
- [17] N. S. Koester, K. Kolata, R. Woscholski, C. Lange, G. Isella, D. Chrastina, H. von Kaenel, and S. Chatterjee, Giant dynamical stark shift in germanium quantum wells, *APPLIED PHYSICS LETTERS* **98**, 10.1063/1.3580630 (2011).
- [18] A. DiChiara, E. Chowdhury, G. Ongadi, B. Walker, and R. Tamosaitis, Tem00 terawatt amplification by use of micro-optic spatial mode conversion, *OPTICS LETTERS* **28**, 2106 (2003).
- [19] B. Walker, C. Toth, D. Fittinghoff, T. Guo, D. Kim, C. Rose-Petruck, J. Squier, K. Yamakawa, K. Wilson, and C. Barty, A 50-ew/cm(2) ti : sapphire laser system for studying relativistic light-matter interactions, *OPTICS EXPRESS* **5**, 196 (1999).
- [20] M. Perry, D. Pennington, B. Stuart, G. Tietbohl, J. Britten, C. Brown, S. Herman, B. Golick, M. Kartz, J. Miller, H. Powell, M. Vergino, and V. Yanovsky, Petawatt laser pulses, *OPTICS LETTERS* **24**, 160 (1999).
- [21] E. Chowdhury, C. Barty, and B. Walker, “nonrelativistic” ionization of the l-shell states in argon by a “relativistic” 10(19) w/cm(2) laser field, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **63**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.63.042712 (2001).
- [22] S. Palaniyappan, R. Mitchell, R. Sauer, I. Ghebregziabher, S. L. White, M. F. Decamp, and B. C. Walker, Ionization of methane in strong and ultrastrong relativistic fields, *PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS* **100**, 10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.183001 (2008).
- [23] S. Palaniyappan, A. DiChiara, I. Ghebregziabher, E. L. Huskins, A. Falkowski, D. Pajeroski, and B. C. Walker, Multielectron ultrastrong laser field ionization of arⁿ⁺, krm⁺ and xel⁺ (n j= 9, m j= 9, l j= 12) at intensities from 10(15) w cm (-2) to 10(18) w cm (-2), *JOURNAL OF PHYSICS B-ATOMIC MOLECULAR AND OPTICAL PHYSICS* **39**, S357 (2006), 10th International Conference on Multiphoton Processes (ICOMP 2005), Orford, CANADA, OCT 09-14, 2005.
- [24] A. D. DiChiara, I. Ghebregziabher, R. Sauer, J. Waesche, S. Palaniyappan, B. L. Wen, and B. C. Walker, Relativistic mev photoelectrons from the single atom response of argon to a 10(19) w/cm(2) laser field, *PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS* **101**, 10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.173002 (2008).
- [25] A. S. Kornev, E. B. Tulenko, and B. A. Zon, Multiple ionization of ar, kr, and xe in a superstrong laser field, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **84**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.84.053424 (2011).
- [26] B. Walker, B. Sheehy, L. Dimauro, P. Agostini, K. Schafer, and K. Kulander, Precision-measurement of strong-field double-ionization of helium, *PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS* **73**, 1227 (1994).
- [27] S. Larochelle, A. Talebpour, and S. Chin, Non-sequential multiple ionization of rare gas atoms in a ti : Sapphire laser field, *JOURNAL OF PHYSICS B-ATOMIC MOLECULAR AND OPTICAL PHYSICS* **31**, 1201 (1998).
- [28] P. Corkum, Plasma perspective on strong-field multiphoton ionization, *PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS* **71**, 1994 (1993).
- [29] W. Becker, F. Grasbon, R. Kopold, D. Milosevic, G. Paulus, and H. Walther, Above-threshold ionization: From classical features to quantum effects, in *ADVANCES IN ATOMIC, MOLECULAR, AND OPTICAL PHYSICS, VOL 48*, Advances In Atomic Molecular and Optical Physics, Vol. 48, edited by B. Bederson and H. Walther (2002) pp. 35–98.
- [30] P. Eckle, A. N. Pfeiffer, C. Cirelli, A. Staudte, R. Doerner, H. G. Muller, M. Buettiker, and U. Keller, Attosecond ionization and tunneling delay time measurements in

- helium, *SCIENCE* **322**, 1525 (2008).
- [31] A. S. Landsman, M. Weger, J. Maurer, R. Boge, A. Ludwig, S. Heuser, C. Cirelli, L. Gallmann, and U. Keller, Ultrafast resolution of tunneling delay time, *OPTICA* **1**, 343 (2014).
- [32] U. S. Sainadh, H. Xu, X. Wang, A. Atia-Tul-Noor, W. C. Wallace, N. Douguet, A. Bray, I. Ivanov, K. Bartschat, A. Kheifets, R. T. Sang, and I. V. Litvinyuk, Attosecond angular streaking and tunnelling time in atomic hydrogen, *NATURE* **568**, 75+ (2019).
- [33] M. V. Ammosov, Tunnel ionization of complex atoms and of atomic ions in an alternating electromagnetic field, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **64**, 1191 (1987).
- [34] D. Ghosh and B. Raka, Theoretical calculation of absolute radii of atoms and ions. part 1. the atomic radii, *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MOLECULAR SCIENCES* **3** (2002).
- [35] J. Izaac and J. Wang, *Computational Quantum Mechanics* (Springer Cham, 2018).
- [36] F. Salvat, A. Jablonski, and C. Powell, Elsepa - dirac partial-wave calculation of elastic scattering of electrons and positrons by atoms, positive ions and molecules, *COMPUTER PHYSICS COMMUNICATIONS* **165**, 157 (2005).
- [37] A. Kramida, Yu. Ralchenko, J. Reader, and and NIST ASD Team, NIST Atomic Spectra Database (ver. 5.9), [Online]. Available: <https://physics.nist.gov/asd> [2022, August 15]. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD. (2021).
- [38] H. Bauke, H. G. Hertzheim, G. R. Mocken, M. Ruf, and C. H. Keitel, Relativistic ionization characteristics of laser-driven hydrogenlike ions, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **83**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.83.063414 (2011).
- [39] J. Peatross, C. Mueller, and C. H. Keitel, Electron wavepacket dynamics in a relativistic electromagnetic field: 3-d analytical approximation, *OPTICS EXPRESS* **15**, 6053 (2007).
- [40] M. Klaiber, E. Yakaboylu, H. Bauke, K. Z. Hatsagortsyan, and C. H. Keitel, Under-the-barrier dynamics in laser-induced relativistic tunneling, *PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS* **110**, 10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.153004 (2013).
- [41] S. Palaniyappan, I. Ghebregziabher, A. DiChiara, J. MacDonald, and B. C. Walker, Emergence from non-relativistic strong-field rescattering to ultrastrong-field laser-atom physics: A semiclassical analysis, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **74**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.74.033403 (2006).
- [42] N. Milosevic, V. Krainov, and T. Brabec, Relativistic theory of tunnel ionization, *JOURNAL OF PHYSICS B-ATOMIC MOLECULAR AND OPTICAL PHYSICS* **35**, 3515 (2002).
- [43] M. Klaiber, K. Z. Hatsagortsyan, and C. H. Keitel, Fully relativistic laser-induced ionization and recollision processes, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **75**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.75.063413 (2007).
- [44] S. S. Luo, P. D. Grugan, and B. C. Walker, Classical study of atomic bound state dynamics in circularly polarized ultrastrong fields, *JOURNAL OF PHYSICS B-ATOMIC MOLECULAR AND OPTICAL PHYSICS* **47**, 10.1088/0953-4075/47/13/135601 (2014).
- [45] N. Zettili, *Quantum Mechanics: Concepts and Applications* (Wiley, 2009).
- [46] N. Delone and V. Krainov, Ac-stark shift of atomic levels, *USPEKHI FIZICHESKIKH NAUK* **169**, 753 (1999).
- [47] T. Otobe, K. Yabana, and J. Iwata, First-principles calculations for the tunnel ionization rate of atoms and molecules, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **69**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.69.053404 (2004).
- [48] A. Yandow, T. Toncian, and T. Ditmire, Direct laser ion acceleration and above-threshold ionization at intensities from $10(21)$ w/cm 2 to $3 \times 10(23)$ w/cm 2 , *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **100**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.100.053406 (2019).
- [49] K. Yamakawa, Y. Akahane, Y. Fukuda, M. Aoyama, N. Inoue, H. Ueda, and T. Utsumi, Many-electron dynamics of a xe atom in strong and superstrong laser fields, *PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS* **92**, 10.1103/PhysRevLett.92.123001 (2004).
- [50] E. Murakami, R. Mizoguchi, Y. Yoshida, A. Kitashoji, N. Nakashima, and T. Yatsushashi, Multiple strong field ionization of metallocenes: Applicability of adk rates to the production of multiply charged transition metal (cr, fe, ni, ru, os) cations, *JOURNAL OF PHOTOCHEMISTRY AND PHOTOBIOLOGY A-CHEMISTRY* **369**, 16 (2019).
- [51] P. Wustelt, M. Moeller, T. Rathje, A. M. Saylor, T. Stoehlker, and G. G. Paulus, Momentum-resolved study of the saturation intensity in multiple ionization, *PHYSICAL REVIEW A* **91**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.91.031401 (2015).
- [52] V. M. Ristic and J. M. Stevanovic, Atom charge states, z and comparing the adk and cadk-theories, *LASER PHYSICS* **19**, 989 (2009).
- [53] E. Gubbini, U. Eichmann, M. Kalashnikov, and W. Sandner, Core relaxation in atomic ultrastrong laser field ionization, *PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS* **94**, 10.1103/PhysRevLett.94.053602 (2005).
- [54] C. Bisgaard and L. Madsen, Tunneling ionization of atoms, *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHYSICS* **72**, 249 (2004).
- [55] M. Ammosov, N. Delone, and V. Krainov, Tunnel ionization of complex atoms and atomic ions in a varying electromagnetic-field, *ZHURNAL EKSPERIMENTALNOI I TEORETICHESKOI FIZIKI* **91**, 2008 (1986).
- [56] C. Z. He, A. Longman, J. A. Perez-Hernandez, M. de Marco, C. Salgado, G. Zeraouli, G. Gatti, L. Roso, R. Fedosejevs, and W. T. Hill, III, Towards an in situ, full-power gauge of the focal-volume intensity of petawatt-class lasers, *OPTICS EXPRESS* **27**, 30020 (2019).
- [57] M. Kalashnikov, A. Andreev, K. Ivanov, A. Galkin, V. Korobkin, M. Romanovsky, O. Shiryaev, M. Schnuerer, J. Braenzel, and V. Trofimov, Diagnostics of peak laser intensity based on the measurement of energy of electrons emitted from laser focal region, *LASER AND PARTICLE BEAMS* **33**, 361 (2015).
- [58] K. A. Ivanov, I. N. Tsymbalov, O. E. Vais, S. G. Bochkarev, R. V. Volkov, V. Y. Bychenkov, and A. B. Savel'ev, Accelerated electrons for in situ peak intensity monitoring of tightly focused femtosecond laser radiation at high intensities, *PLASMA PHYSICS AND CONTROLLED FUSION* **60**, 10.1088/1361-6587/aada60 (2018).
- [59] K. A. Ivanov, I. N. Tsymbalov, A. V. Rusakov, R. V. Volkov, and A. B. Savel'ev, High energy electrons accelerated in the field of tightly focused relativistic laser pulse for peak intensity evaluation, in *III INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LASER AND PLASMA RESEARCHES AND TECHNOLOGIES*, Journal of

Physics Conference Series, Vol. 941 (Inst Laser & Plasma Technologies, 2018) 3rd International Conference on Laser and Plasma Researches and Technologies, Natl Res Nucl Univ MPhI, Moscow, RUSSIA, JAN 24-27, 2017.

[60] G. Stevens, C. IU, T. Bergman, H. Metcalf, I. Seipp, K. Taylor, and D. Delande, Absolute calibration of electric-fields using stark spectroscopy, PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS **75**, 3402 (1995).