

Electron recollisional excitation of OCS^+ in phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ intense laser fields

Tomoyuki Endo,* Tomohito Otobe, and Ryuji Itakura†

*Kansai Institute for Photon Science, National Institutes for Quantum Science and Technology,
8-1-7 Umemidai, Kizugawa, Kyoto 619-0215, Japan*

(Dated: October 25, 2024)

Photoelectron-photoion coincidence momentum imaging has been performed to investigate excitation processes on dissociative ionization of OCS , $\text{OCS} \rightarrow \text{OCS}^+ + e^- \rightarrow \text{OC} + \text{S}^+ + e^-$, in phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ intense laser fields. The electron kinetic energy spectra depend on coincidentally produced ion species, OCS^+ or S^+ . The observed electron momentum distribution shows clear asymmetry along the laser polarization direction with a 2π -oscillation period as a function of the phase difference between the ω and 2ω laser fields. The asymmetry of electron emission in the OCS^+ channel flips at the electron kinetic energy of 8.2 eV where the dominant scattering direction switches from forward to backward. In the S^+ channel, the asymmetry flips at the lower kinetic energy of 4.2 eV. In comparison with a classical trajectory Monte Carlo simulation, it has been clarified that this energy shift between the OCS^+ and S^+ channels corresponds to the excitation energy of the parent ion and that electron recollisional excitation takes place to form the fragment ion in intense laser fields.

I. INTRODUCTION

Tunneling ionization and subsequent electron recollision processes in intense laser fields induce ultrafast molecular and electronic dynamics such as high-order harmonic generation [1–3], elastic electron scattering [4–7], electronic excitation leading to molecular dissociation [8–13], and non-sequential double ionization [14, 15]. The tunneling electron gains kinetic energy in alternating laser electric fields, and the excess energy causes such non-linear phenomena. The tunneling ionization and electron recollision processes occur within a single optical cycle (2.7 fs at 800 nm) as described in a three-step model [16, 17], thus these subsequent phenomena are promising for imaging ultrafast molecular and electronic dynamics [4, 18, 19]. Since the tunneling electron selectively collides with the parent ion and not with other neutral molecules, the electron recollision in intense laser fields is a powerful tool to investigate elastic/inelastic electron scattering by ions.

One of the applications of laser-induced electron scattering processes is laser-induced electron diffraction (LIED), which is a promising candidate to investigate ultrafast nuclear dynamics with attosecond and picometer resolutions with an elastic scattering process [4–7]. The structure and dynamics of molecules at the time when the electron recollides are encoded in the rescattered electron wavepacket. The contribution of an electron recollision process in LIED has been verified by measuring the maximum kinetic energy of the backward-scattered electron.

Another application of laser-induced electron scattering processes is electron recollisional ionization and excitation. The contributions of inelastic scattering in double ionization in intense laser fields have been discussed from the electron momentum distributions of the first

and second electrons [20]. The double ionization mechanisms such as non-sequential double ionization (NSDI) or recollision-induced excitation and subsequent field ionization (RESI) have been proposed. In contrast, although electronically excited cations would play important roles in molecular dissociation in intense laser fields, the contribution of an electron recollision process to form electronically excited cationic states is still unclear and has been discussed on the basis of dependencies on ellipticity [11, 21] and carrier-envelope-phase (CEP) [22] of laser fields.

The elucidation of inelastic scattering from electron kinetic energy is difficult. The electron kinetic energy is blurred because the final electron momentum depends not only on the tunneling (ionization) time but also on the excitation energy of the ions. In addition, other processes such as tunneling ionization from lower lying orbitals would compete. Therefore, the reaction pathway of molecular dissociation in intense laser fields has been discussed from the total kinetic energy release of fragments, which is determined by the difference between the potential energies before and after dissociation. However, intense laser fields can interact with molecules after ionization [23] and deform the shape of potential energy surfaces [9]. Although the assignment of the electronic state is required to discuss molecular dissociation dynamics precisely, it is not easy to assign the electronic states populated in intense laser fields from the kinetic energy of ions.

Using phase-locked two-color ($\omega + 2\omega$) laser fields is a simple and powerful method to obtain spatial asymmetry in laser fields and to investigate the ionization and dissociation mechanisms irrespective of polar or non-polar molecules [24–28]. An electric field of a phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ laser field can be expressed as

$$F(t, \Delta\phi) = F_\omega(t) \cos(\omega t + \phi_{\text{CEP}}) + F_{2\omega}(t) \cos(2\omega t + 2\phi_{\text{CEP}} + \Delta\phi), \quad (1)$$

where $F_\omega(t)$ and $F_{2\omega}(t)$ are the envelope functions of laser

* endo.tomoyuki@qst.go.jp

† itakura.ryuji@qst.go.jp

fields with the carrier frequencies of ω and 2ω , respectively, ϕ_{CEP} is the CEP of the fundamental (ω) pulse, and $\Delta\phi$ is the phase difference between the ω and second harmonic (2ω) pulses. Examples of the $\omega + 2\omega$ laser electric fields at different combinations of ϕ_{CEP} and $\Delta\phi$ are shown in Figs. 1(a) and (b). The asymmetry of the laser electric fields depends on $\Delta\phi$, but not on ϕ_{CEP} . When the one-color laser fields are employed, the electrons are ejected symmetrically along the laser polarization direction. In contrast, the phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ laser fields enable us to obtain the asymmetric electron and fragment momentum distributions along the laser polarization direction.

In this paper, photoionization of carbonyl sulfide (OCS) molecules in the phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ intense laser fields has been investigated by the photoelectron-photoion coincidence (PEPICO) three-dimensional momentum imaging technique to clarify the effects of electron recollision on molecular excitation in intense laser fields. The direction of electron ejection and its dependence on the shapes of laser electric fields have been measured and compared with a classical trajectory Monte Carlo (CTMC) simulation with a potential calculated using density functional theory (DFT).

II. EXPERIMENT

A schematic diagram of the experimental setup is shown in Fig. 1(c). The output of a Ti:Sapphire chirped pulse amplifier ($\lambda \sim 795$ nm, 70 fs, 1 kHz) is introduced into a β -barium borate (BBO, type I, $\theta = 29.2$ deg, 0.1 mm thickness) crystal to generate the 2ω pulses ($\lambda \sim 400$ nm). The ω and 2ω pulses are separated by a dielectric mirror (Layertec, 106853), which reflects the 2ω pulses and transmits the ω pulses. The polarization direction of the ω pulses is rotated by a half-waveplate to be parallel to that of the 2ω pulses. The ω and 2ω pulses are co-linearly combined again by another dielectric mirror, and the ω and 2ω pulses are focused on an effusive molecular beam of gas mixture (He 95% + OCS 5%) introduced into an ultrahigh vacuum chamber (residual gas pressure $< 10^{-8}$ Pa) by an off-axis parabolic mirror with an effective focal length of 200 mm. The effective laser field intensity of the ω and 2ω pulses at the focal spot is estimated to be 5×10^{13} W/cm² and 5×10^{12} W/cm², respectively, from the ponderomotive energy shift U_p measured in the photoelectron spectra of Xe. The phase difference $\Delta\phi$ at the focal spot is calibrated by measuring the phase difference dependence of the maximum kinetic energy of backward-scattered electrons from Xe [29].

To stabilize $\Delta\phi$ over a long acquisition period, a feedback system is used in the present study. The $\omega + 2\omega$ laser pulses passed through the experimental chamber are introduced into another β -BBO crystal to generate the 2ω pulses from the residual ω pulses. The shift of $\Delta\phi$ is monitored by measuring the interference spectrum between the 2ω pulses generated at two β -BBO crystals, being




FIG. 1. Examples of the phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ laser electric fields at the different (a) ϕ_{CEP} and (b) $\Delta\phi$. (c) Schematic of the experimental setup. MM: motorized mount, BBO: β -barium borate crystal, DM: dielectric mirror, HWP: halfwave plate, WP: wedge plate, OAP: off-axis parabolic mirror, W: window, PSD: position sensitive detector, L: lens, WW: wedged window, CCD: charge-coupled device camera, P: polarizer, SP: spectrometer. (d) Distributions of phase difference $\Delta\phi$ measured with feedback loop stabilization (red solid line) and without stabilization (grey broken line).

compensated by using a pair of fused silica wedge plates mounted on a linear motorized stage [23, 26, 27, 30]. Distributions of $\Delta\phi$ measured for 15 minutes with and without stabilization are shown in Fig. 1(d). The measured $\Delta\phi$ without stabilization is distributed over 0.5π , which is large enough to change the shape of the laser electric fields from asymmetric to symmetric (see Fig. 1(b)). The

standard deviation of $\Delta\phi$ with stabilization is kept below 0.06π over a week. A part of the $\omega + 2\omega$ laser pulses is reflected by a wedged window to monitor and stabilize the beam position at the focal spot by using a charge-coupled device camera and a motorized mirror mount.

Details of the PEPICO momentum imaging system used in this study are described elsewhere [31–33]. Briefly, the generated ions and electrons in the phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ laser fields are accelerated to the opposite directions by an electrostatic field, and detected by using respective fast micro-channel plate detectors with position-sensitive delay-line anodes (RoentDek HEX80). The three-dimensional momentum vector of each charged particle $\mathbf{p} = (p_x, p_y, p_z)$ is obtained by measuring the position on the detector (x, z) and the arrival time t in a single-shot acquisition mode. The event rate is kept at about 0.3 per shot to reduce false events.

III. SIMULATION

The electron momentum distribution in the phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ laser fields is simulated with a CTMC method [34]. The following equations are given in atomic units. Here, we employ a \sin^2 envelope for both pulses for simplicity. Thus, the envelope functions in Eq. (1) are given by

$$F_\omega(t) = F_\omega \sin^2(\pi t/\tau_\omega), \quad (2)$$

$$F_{2\omega}(t) = F_{2\omega} \sin^2(\pi t/\tau_{2\omega}), \quad (3)$$

where F_ω and $F_{2\omega}$ are the amplitudes of the laser electric fields, and τ_ω and $\tau_{2\omega}$ are the full width of the ω and 2ω pulses. The durations of $\tau_\omega = \tau_{2\omega} = 1033.54$ a.u. (25 fs) are employed in the simulation.

The initial electron flux is obtained as the tunneling ionization rate from the highest occupied molecular orbital (HOMO) based on weak-field asymptotic theory [35, 36], which includes the effects of permanent dipole moment as well as the shape of HOMO. The tunneling ionization rate $\Gamma(\beta, F)$ as a function of the molecular orientation angle β with respect to the laser polarization direction and the fields strength F can be expressed as

$$\Gamma(\beta, F) = \left[|G_{00}(\beta)|^2 + \frac{F}{2\kappa^2} |G_{01}(\beta)|^2 \right] W_{00}(F), \quad (4)$$

$$W_{00}(F) = \frac{\kappa}{2} \left(\frac{4\kappa^2}{F} \right)^{2/\kappa-1} \exp\left(-\frac{2\kappa^3}{F}\right), \quad (5)$$

where $G_{00}(\beta)$ and $G_{01}(\beta)$ are the structure factors, $W_{00}(F)$ is the field factor, and $\kappa = \sqrt{2I_p}$ with I_p being the ionization potential of OCS. The structure factors of OCS are taken from [37]. The molecular orientation β is chosen randomly in each trajectory simulation. By taking into account the effect of depletion of neutral molecules, the effective tunneling ionization rate Γ_{eff} at




FIG. 2. Two-dimensional plot of potential energy $V(\beta = 0, r, z)$ employed in the CTMC simulation at $\beta = 0$. The carbon atom is at the origin, the oxygen atom is at $z < 0$, and the sulfur atom is at $z > 0$. The laser polarization direction is along the z -axis.

the ionizing time t_i can be expressed as

$$\Gamma_{\text{eff}}(\beta, F, t_i) = \left[1 - \int_{-\infty}^{t_i} \Gamma_{\text{eff}}(\beta, F, t) dt \right] \Gamma(\beta, F). \quad (6)$$

The position and velocity of the tunneling electron as a function of the time are calculated by sequentially solving the classical equations of motion:

$$\frac{d^2 r}{dt^2} = -\frac{d}{dr} V(\beta, r, z), \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{d^2 z}{dt^2} = F(t, \Delta\phi) - \frac{d}{dz} V(\beta, r, z), \quad (8)$$

where r, z are the perpendicular and parallel components of cylindrical coordinates with respect to the laser polarization direction, respectively, $V(\beta, r, z)$ is a potential energy of OCS^+ , and $F(t, \Delta\phi)$ is the $\omega + 2\omega$ laser electric fields given by Eq. (1). The potential energy surface is obtained by combining a DFT potential V_{DFT} for the inner region ($|r| < 5.9, -5.9 < z < 10.6$) and a three-center Coulomb potential V_{Coulomb} for the outer region ($|r| > 14, z < -9, 18 < z$). The middle region is interpolated with a cubic spline. The DFT potential is calculated with the Krieger-Li-Iafrate self-interaction correlation [38]. The Coulomb potential V_{Coulomb} is given by

$$V_{\text{Coulomb}} = -\sum_i \frac{q_i}{\sqrt{(r-r_i)^2 + (z-z_i)^2}}, \quad (9)$$

where $q_i, r_i,$ and z_i are a charge and positions of the i -th atom, respectively. Net charge on each atom is evaluated as the electron distribution perceived by a HOMO

electron: -0.30 , 0.55 , and 0.75 for the oxygen, carbon, and sulfur atoms, respectively. The employed potential for $\beta = 0$ is shown in Fig. 2. The carbon atom is at the origin, the oxygen atom is at $z < 0$, and the sulfur atom is at $z > 0$.

The initial position at the ionizing time t_i along the z -axis is determined as the tunnel exit point given by solving the equation $zF(t_i, \Delta\phi) + V(r = 0, z) = -I_p$. The distribution of the initial transverse velocity [39] is given as

$$w(v_r, t_i) = \frac{4\pi\kappa}{F(t_i, \Delta\phi)} \exp\left[-\frac{\kappa v_r(t_i)^2}{F(t_i, \Delta\phi)}\right]. \quad (10)$$

The other initial conditions are $r(t_i) = 0$, $v_z(t_i) = 0$. In this simulation, t_i , ϕ_{CEP} , β , and v_r are randomly chosen for each trajectory.

In order to take an inelastic scattering process into account, a boundary is determined as the position where the potential energy is equal to the field-free ionization potential of OCS^+ , $V(\beta, r, z) = -I_{p,2} = -30.3 \text{ eV}$, and the energy transfer between the photoelectron and the parent ion is assumed to occur at an incoming boundary. When the electron, which has larger kinetic energy than the threshold energy for the A - X transition of OCS^+ , approaches the parent ion across the boundary, the electron loses the excitation energy of $E_{\text{th}} = 4 \text{ eV}$ [40]. The relationship between the kinetic energies before and after the inelastic scattering can be written as

$$\frac{1}{2}v_r^2(t) + \frac{1}{2}v_z^2(t) = \frac{1}{2}v_r'^2(t) + \frac{1}{2}v_z'^2(t) + E_{\text{th}}, \quad (11)$$

where $v_r'(t)$ and $v_z'(t)$ are the velocity along the r and z axes, respectively, after the inelastic scattering, the propagation directions of electron are assumed to be conserved at the moment of the energy transfer.

The propagation is performed using a standard fourth-order Runge-Kutta algorithm and proceeds until the time of $16 \times 10^5 \text{ a.u.}$ sufficiently after the end of the laser pulse (1033.54 a.u.) [34]. After the propagation, the momentum of the electron with a distance from the origin larger than $10\,000 \text{ a.u.}$ is used for the following analysis.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Here, we focus on the following two major ionization channels; (i) $\text{OCS} \rightarrow \text{OCS}^+ + e^-$, (ii) $\text{OCS} \rightarrow \text{OCS}^{+*} + e^- \rightarrow \text{OC} + \text{S}^+ + e^-$. The former is the OCS^+ channel, and the latter is the S^+ channel. Since the ground X state of OCS^+ is a stable state, S^+ would be generated via electronically excited states OCS^{+*} such as A or B states, which are lying 4 - 5 eV above the X state [40]. In our experimental conditions, the yield of the S^+ channel is about 5% of that of the OCS^+ channel. Other channels, e.g. OC^+ and CS^+ channels, are minor.

A. Measurement of channel-resolved photoelectron momenta

The electron kinetic energy E_{kin} distributions are obtained by averaging over $\Delta\phi$ from 0 to 2π . The phase-averaged E_{kin} distribution of the OCS^+ channel in Fig. 3(a) has a series of peaks with the interval of 1.55 eV , which corresponds to the photon energy of the ω pulses. The periodic peak structure can be attributed to above threshold ionization [41]. On the other hand, the E_{kin} distribution of the S^+ channel in Fig. 3(b) has only a broad peak.

The following mechanisms for the S^+ channel are possible as combinations of ionization and excitation processes;

- I) multi-photon or tunneling ionization to the ground state of OCS^+ , and multi-photon excitation to the excited state,
- II) tunneling ionization to the excited state (tunneling ionization from the inner valence orbital, e.g. HOMO-1),
- III) tunneling ionization to the ground state, and electron recollisional excitation to the excited state.

If the mechanism I is dominant for both channels, since the photoelectrons are not affected by the excitation process after photoelectron ejection, the periodic peak structure should also appear in the E_{kin} spectrum of the S^+ channel. The disappearance of the periodic peak structure means that the different ionization process from the OCS^+ channel or coupling between the ionization and excitation processes play an important role in the S^+ channel. Therefore, the mechanism I is not appropriate for the S^+ channel. To clarify the mechanism further, the dependence on the shape of the laser electric fields will be investigated.

Figures 3(c) and (d) show the sliced images of the three-dimensional momenta ($|p_y| < 0.05$ atomic units) of the photoelectrons of the OCS^+ and S^+ channels, respectively, in the phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ intense laser fields ($I_\omega = 5 \times 10^{13} \text{ W/cm}^2$, $I_{2\omega} = 5 \times 10^{12} \text{ W/cm}^2$) at $\Delta\phi = \pi$. The shape of the laser electric field at $\Delta\phi = \pi$ is schematically shown in the inset of Fig. 3. The electron momentum images show anisotropic distributions with respect to the laser polarization direction ε along the z -axis. The electron image of the OCS^+ channel shows a periodic peak structure corresponding to a series of peaks appearing in the E_{kin} distribution and an asymmetric distribution with larger electron yields on the larger amplitude side of the laser electric fields ($p_z < 0$). On the other hand, the electrons of the S^+ channel show a broad distribution and less pronounced asymmetry than those of the OCS^+ channel at $\Delta\phi = \pi$. The electron momentum distributions vary depending on channel and $\Delta\phi$, suggesting that different electron ejection processes take place in the OCS^+ and S^+ channels.




FIG. 3. Electron kinetic energy E_{kin} distribution of (a) OCS⁺ channel and (b) S⁺ channel obtained by averaging over $\Delta\phi$ from 0 to 2π . Momentum images of the photoelectron coincidentally detected with (c) OCS⁺ and (d) S⁺ in the phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ laser fields ($I_\omega = 5 \times 10^{13}$ W/cm², $I_{2\omega} = 5 \times 10^{12}$ W/cm²) with $\Delta\phi = \pi$. The laser polarization direction is indicated as ε . The shape of the $\omega + 2\omega$ laser electric field at $\Delta\phi = \pi$ is schematically shown in the inset at the bottom-right corner.

B. Asymmetry of electron ejection direction

To evaluate the electron ejection direction quantitatively, the asymmetry parameter α is defined as

$$\alpha(E_{\text{kin}}, \Delta\phi) = \frac{Y_+(E_{\text{kin}}, \Delta\phi) - Y_-(E_{\text{kin}}, \Delta\phi)}{Y_+(E_{\text{kin}}, \Delta\phi) + Y_-(E_{\text{kin}}, \Delta\phi)}, \quad (12)$$

where Y_+ and Y_- are yields of electrons with positive and negative momenta, respectively, along the z -axis. The yields are obtained as the number of electrons ejected within a polar angle of 30° with respect to the laser polarization direction.

Figure 4(a) shows the two-dimensional plots of $\alpha(E_{\text{kin}}, \Delta\phi)$ of the OCS⁺ channel. The asymmetry parameter shows a 2π -oscillatory behavior depending on $\Delta\phi$. In addition, the asymmetry parameter flips at the kinetic energy of 8 eV at $\Delta\phi = 0$. These $\Delta\phi$ and E_{kin} dependencies can be qualitatively explained on the basis of a semi-classical picture of a tunneling electron in alternating electric fields.

The 2π -oscillatory behavior depending on $\Delta\phi$ can be explained with a vector potential. After the tunneling ionization, the electron is accelerated by the alternating electric fields. Under the assumptions that the initial momentum is zero and the effects of the Coulomb force is negligible, the final momentum of the tunneling electron \mathbf{p}_f generated at the ionization time of t_i can be given as the vector potential,

$$\mathbf{p}_f(t_i) = \mathbf{A}(t_i, \Delta\phi) = - \int_{t_i}^{\infty} F(t, \Delta\phi) dt, \quad (13)$$

showing an asymmetric distribution along the laser polarization direction depending on $\Delta\phi$.

The asymmetry flip at $E_{\text{kin}} = 8$ eV can be attributed to a change in the main contribution from the forward- to backward-scattered electrons. Under the same assumptions of the initial momentum and the Coulomb force, the maximum kinetic energy of the forward-scattered electron $E_{f, \text{max}}$ would be given by

$$E_{f, \text{max}} = 2U_p = \frac{F^2}{2\omega^2}. \quad (14)$$

Thus, the electrons with the kinetic energy below and above $2U_p$ are mainly assigned to the forward- and backward-scattered electrons, respectively. Since the electrons ejected around the peak of the electric field amplitude recollide to the parent ion at the time when the amplitude is close to 0, the electric field direction flips before and after the collision. Thus, after the collision, the forward-scattered electron is decelerated while the backward-scattered electron is accelerated. As a result of the entire interaction with the laser field, the backward-scattered electron has a higher kinetic energy and is ejected to the opposite direction compared to the forward-scattered electron. Since only the backward-scattered electrons contributed in the higher kinetic region than $2U_p$, the asymmetry flip occurs around $2U_p = 6$ eV in the present experimental condition. In the experiment, the asymmetry flips at 8 eV, which is slightly larger than $2U_p$. This would be attributed to the effects of the Coulomb force.

To clarify the $\Delta\phi$ dependence of two kinetic energy regions, the E_{kin} -integrated asymmetry parameters are shown in Fig. 4(c). The electrons in the low kinetic energy region ($E_{\text{kin}} < 5$ eV) are preferentially ejected to the larger amplitude side of the laser electric fields; the asymmetry parameter shows the positive values at $\Delta\phi = 0$. On the other hand, the electrons in the high kinetic energy region ($E_{\text{kin}} > 10$ eV) are preferentially ejected to the lower amplitude side of the laser electric fields; the asymmetry parameter shows the negative values at $\Delta\phi = 0$.

For a quantitative evaluation, the E_{kin} -integrated asymmetry parameter $\alpha(\Delta\phi)$ is fitted with a cosine function;

$$A_0 \cos(\Delta\phi - \eta), \quad (15)$$

where A_0 is the amplitude of $\alpha(\Delta\phi)$ and η is the phase offset, where $\alpha(\Delta\phi = \eta)$ has a maximum value. The phase offsets η are 2.17π and 1.39π in the low and high kinetic energy regions, respectively. The shift in the phase offsets of the two energy regions is $\Delta\eta = \eta_{\text{high}} - \eta_{\text{low}} = -0.78\pi$, clearly indicating that the electrons in these regions are ejected to the opposite direction because of forward- and backward-scattering as described in the above discussion without the Coulomb interaction. To determine the electron kinetic energy at which the dominant scattering process is changed from forward to backward, the phase offset η as a function of the electron




FIG. 4. Two-dimensional plot of asymmetry parameter of (a) the OCS^+ channel and (b) the S^+ channel. Dotted lines indicate the phase offset η at which the asymmetry parameter has a maximum value at each kinetic energy. (c) Integrated asymmetry parameters of the OCS^+ channel over the ranges of 0-5 eV (red circles) and 10-20 eV (green triangles). (d) Integrated asymmetry parameters of the S^+ channel over the ranges of 0-4 eV (orange circles) and 5-12 eV (blue triangles). Lines are the fitting results by a cosine function.

kinetic energy is obtained as a dotted line in Fig. 4(a). The asymmetry flipping energy E_{flip} is defined by the kinetic energy where the shift in the phase offsets is the middle point between those in the low and high kinetic energy regions, being evaluated as 8.2 eV in the OCS^+ channel. Obtained results are qualitatively explained by the semi-classical picture of the tunneling electron. However, it should be noted that the asymmetry parameter expected from the vector potential $\mathbf{A}(t_i, \Delta\phi)$ in Eq. (13) is symmetric at $\Delta\phi = 0$ and π unlike the experimental results. This discrepancy can be attributed to the effects of the Coulomb force. Therefore, we perform the numerical CTMC simulation including the Coulomb interaction for quantitative discussion.

The two-dimensional plot of the asymmetry parameter of the S^+ channel is shown in Fig. 4(b), indicating a clear difference from that of the OCS^+ channel. In the S^+ channel, the asymmetry is weaker and flips at the lower kinetic energy than that in the OCS^+ channel. The larger asymmetry is observed in a high kinetic energy region than in a low kinetic energy region, in contrast to the OCS^+ channel. The phase offsets η are 2.18π and 1.63π for the low ($E_{\text{kin}} < 4\text{ eV}$) and high ($E_{\text{kin}} > 5\text{ eV}$) kinetic energy regions, respectively, as shown in Fig. 4(d). The shift in the phase offsets of the two energy regions is $\Delta\eta = -0.55\pi$, which is 0.23π larger than that of the OCS^+ channel. In addition, the asymmetry flipping energy of $E_{\text{flip}} = 4.2\text{ eV}$ is 4 eV lower than that in the OCS^+ channel. These changes in the phase offset η and the asymmetry flipping energy E_{flip} indicate that the ionization and excitation processes in the S^+ channel are

coupled. Therefore, the mechanism I plays a minor role for the S^+ channel. If the mechanism II, tunneling ionization to the excited states, is dominant to generate the electronically excited OCS^+ , the asymmetry parameters $\alpha(E_{\text{kin}}, \Delta\phi)$ of the OCS^+ and S^+ channels would show similar phase and kinetic energy dependence because the electron trajectory mainly depends on the shape of the laser electric fields, but not on the electronic state generated by tunneling ionization. Thus, the E_{flip} should be independent of the orbital from which an electron is ejected, such as HOMO and HOMO-1. Meanwhile, the experimental results indicate the weak asymmetry in the low kinetic energy region and the channel dependence in the E_{flip} , suggesting that the ejected electron is involved in the excitation process in the S^+ channel. Furthermore, in the S^+ channel, the asymmetry flips at the 4 eV lower kinetic energy than in the OCS^+ channel, which is consistent with the excitation energy of OCS^+ to the first excited state [40]. This energy difference suggests that the molecular excitation occurs by the energy transfer from the ejected electron to the ion. From the above discussions, the mechanism III including tunneling ionization and electron recollisional excitation is considered to be most likely to occur. For more detailed evaluation, we perform the CTMC simulation.

C. CTMC simulation

The simulated results of electron trajectories in the phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ laser fields ($I_\omega = 3.5 \times 10^{13}\text{ W/cm}^2$, $I_{2\omega} = 3.5 \times 10^{12}\text{ W/cm}^2$) are summarized in Fig. 5. The momentum image of the OCS^+ channel at $\Delta\phi = \pi$ is shown in Fig. 5(a). A strong asymmetric distribution along the laser polarization direction ε is obtained as clearly as that in Fig. 3(c). No periodic peak structure is observed because the tunneling ionization is assumed instead of the multiphoton ionization and the interference between electron wavepackets emerging every optical cycles is not included in the CTMC simulation. Nevertheless, the simulated results of asymmetric photoelectron momentum distributions are comparable with the experimental results. The electrons are preferentially ejected to the larger amplitude side of the $\omega + 2\omega$ laser fields ($p_z < 0$), reproducing the experimental results. The momentum image of the S^+ channel, where the inelastic collision between the electron and the ion is included, is shown in Fig. 5(b). The electrons show a weak asymmetric distribution along the laser polarization direction in contrast to the OCS^+ channel. The CTMC momentum images qualitatively reproduce the experimental results that the electron is preferentially ejected to the larger amplitude side in the OCS^+ channel and weak asymmetry is observed in the S^+ channel.

The two-dimensional plots of the simulated asymmetry parameter $\alpha(E_{\text{kin}}, \Delta\phi)$ of both channels are shown in Figs. 5(c) and (d). As observed in the experiment, the simulated $\alpha(E_{\text{kin}}, \Delta\phi)$ shows clear dependencies on $\Delta\phi$




FIG. 5. Results of the CTMC simulation. Simulated momentum image of the photoelectron in (a) the OCS^+ and (b) the S^+ channels in the phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ laser fields ($I_\omega = 3.5 \times 10^{13} \text{ W/cm}^2$, $I_{2\omega} = 3.5 \times 10^{12} \text{ W/cm}^2$) with $\Delta\phi = \pi$. The laser polarization direction is indicated as ε . Simulated two-dimensional plots of asymmetry parameter of (c) the OCS^+ channel and (d) the S^+ channel. Dotted lines indicate the phase offset η at which the asymmetry parameter has a maximum value at each kinetic energy. (e) Integrated asymmetry parameters of the OCS^+ channel over the ranges of 0-5 eV (red circles) and 10-20 eV (green triangles). (f) Integrated asymmetry parameters of the S^+ channel over the ranges of 0-2 eV (orange circles) and 5-12 eV (blue triangles). Lines are the fitting results by a cosine function.

and E_{kin} ; 2π -oscillatory behavior and asymmetry flip. To evaluate the phase offset η in the high and low energy regions, the E_{kin} -integrated asymmetry parameters $\alpha(\Delta\phi)$ are shown in Figs. 5(e) and (f). In the OCS^+ channel, the phase offsets η are 1.82π for the low energy region ($E_{\text{kin}} < 5 \text{ eV}$) and 1.03π for the high energy region ($E_{\text{kin}} > 10 \text{ eV}$). Although absolute values of the phase offsets in the simulation are lower than those observed in the experiment, the shift in the phase offsets of $\Delta\eta = -0.79\pi$ well reproduces the experimental results (-0.78π) in Fig. 4(c). In the S^+ channel, the phase offsets are 1.77π and 1.02π for the low ($E_{\text{kin}} < 2 \text{ eV}$) and high ($E_{\text{kin}} > 5 \text{ eV}$) energy regions, respectively. The shift in the phase offsets of $\Delta\eta = -0.75\pi$ is almost the same as in the OCS^+ channel. In addition, the asymmetry flipping energy E_{flip} changes from 10.1 eV in the OCS^+ to 3.7 eV in the S^+ channels.

The simulated results qualitatively reproduce the experimental results, indicating that the tunneling ionization and recollisional excitation play important roles in molecular dissociation processes in the intense laser fields. However, there are some quantitative discrepancies between the experimental and simulated results such as absolute values of η and E_{flip} , and $\Delta\eta$ in the OCS^+ and S^+ channels. In the present CTMC simulation, the volume effects are not considered, which affects not only the effective laser field intensity but also $\Delta\phi$ due to the Gouy phase. The Gouy phase shift can be written as

$$\phi_{\text{Gouy}} = -\arctan\left(\frac{x}{x_R}\right), \quad (16)$$

where x_R is the Rayleigh length, which depends on the wavelength. The laser pulses are focused at $x = 0$. Thus, the phase difference $\Delta\phi$ between the ω and 2ω pulses depends on the x -position along the laser propagation direction. The difference in ϕ_{Gouy} between the ω and 2ω pulses is about 0.1π at the largest. Considering that fragment ions are more likely to be generated in a high intensity region because of increase in the recolliding energy of the tunneling electrons, the difference in intensity would be responsible for the larger $\Delta\eta$ in the S^+ channel than in the OCS^+ channel. Other concerns are about the assumptions in the CTMC simulation, such as the initial position and momentum ($r(t_i) = 0, v_z(t_i) = 0$), neglecting a motion of nuclei, and combining the DFT and Coulomb potentials of OCS^+ . These volume effects and the assumptions in the simulation may cause discrepancies in the absolute values of the experimental and simulated phase offset η and asymmetry flipping energy E_{flip} . Nevertheless our simulation with a simple model sufficiently well reproduces the experimental results.

V. SUMMARY

In this study, we have investigated electron recollisional excitation leading to molecular dissociation of OCS^+ in the phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ intense laser fields. Three-dimensional momenta of photoelectrons show clear asymmetric distribution depending on the phase difference $\Delta\phi$ of the two electric fields, and the photoelectron ejection direction is flipped at a specific photoelectron energy E_{flip} . The electrons in the lower and higher kinetic energy than E_{flip} are attributed to the forward- and backward-scattered electrons, respectively, showing that the forward-scattered electrons are preferentially emitted toward the larger amplitude side of the laser electric field and the backward-scattered electrons are emitted to the opposite side through the inversion of the photoelectron momentum direction at recollision. In addition, the asymmetry of photoelectrons also depends on the coincidentally produced cations, OCS^+ and S^+ . The asymmetry flipping energy E_{flip} of the OCS^+ channel and the S^+ channel were measured to be 8.2 eV and 4.2 eV, respectively, whose difference is consistent with the excitation

energy of OCS^+ to the first excited state. The CTMC simulation with the DFT potential has been performed and describes the experimental results well, including the difference in the asymmetry flipping energy E_{flip} and the phase offset η of both channels.

These results indicate that the molecules are excited by electron recollision in the phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ laser fields and that the excited states generated in the intense laser fields could be clarified on the basis of the observed asymmetry flipping energy E_{flip} . Our approach by a combination of the PEPICO momentum imaging with the phase-locked $\omega + 2\omega$ laser fields provides a clue of the excited state assignment and enables us to discuss

molecular dissociation dynamics induced by inelastic electron scattering in intense laser fields.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partly supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 19K15515, 22K14654, 22H02043, 23K23311. The authors are grateful to T. Morishita (UEC) for valuable discussions, Y. Hagihara for technical support, and J. Cao for data acquisition.

-
- [1] J. Itatani, J. Levesque, D. Zeidler, H. Niikura, H. Pépin, J. C. Kieffer, P. B. Corkum, and D. M. Villeneuve, Tomographic imaging of molecular orbitals, *Nature* **432**, 867 (2004).
- [2] S. Baker, J. S. Robinson, C. A. Haworth, H. Teng, R. A. Smith, C. C. Chirilă, M. Lein, J. W. G. Tisch, and J. P. Marangos, Probing proton dynamics in molecules on an attosecond time scale., *Science* **312**, 424 (2006).
- [3] H. J. Wörner, J. B. Bertrand, D. V. Kartashov, P. B. Corkum, and D. M. Villeneuve, Following a chemical reaction using high-harmonic interferometry, *Nature* **466**, 604 (2010).
- [4] M. Meckel, D. Comtois, D. Zeidler, A. Staudte, D. Pavićić, H. C. Bandulet, H. Pepin, J. C. Kieffer, R. Dörner, D. M. Villeneuve, and P. B. Corkum, Laser-induced electron tunneling and diffraction, *Science* **320**, 1478 (2008).
- [5] C. I. Blaga, J. Xu, A. D. DiChiara, E. Sistrunk, K. Zhang, P. Agostini, T. A. Miller, L. F. DiMauro, and C. D. Lin, Imaging ultrafast molecular dynamics with laser-induced electron diffraction., *Nature* **483**, 194 (2012).
- [6] M. G. Pullen, B. Wolter, A.-T. Le, M. Baudisch, M. Hemmer, A. Senftleben, C. D. Schröter, J. Ullrich, R. Moshhammer, C. D. Lin, and J. Biegert, Imaging an aligned polyatomic molecule with laser-induced electron diffraction, *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 7262 (2015).
- [7] U. D. Giovannini, J. Küpper, and A. Trabattini, New perspectives in time-resolved laser-induced electron diffraction, *J. Phys. B: At Mol. Opt. Phys.* **56**, 054002 (2023).
- [8] H. Niikura, F. Légaré, R. Hasbani, M. Y. Ivanov, D. M. Villeneuve, and P. B. Corkum, Probing molecular dynamics with attosecond resolution using correlated wave packet pairs, *Nature* **421**, 826 (2003).
- [9] M. F. Kling, C. Siedschlag, A. J. Verhoef, J. I. Khan, M. Schultze, T. Uphues, Y. Ni, M. Uiberacker, M. Drescher, F. Krausz, and M. J. J. Vrakking, Control of electron localization in molecular dissociation, *Science* **312**, 246 (2006).
- [10] H. Li, A. S. Alnaser, X. M. Tong, K. J. Betsch, M. Kübel, T. Pischke, B. Förg, J. Schötz, F. Süßmann, S. Zhrebtsov, B. Bergues, A. Kessel, S. A. Trushin, A. M. Azzeer, and M. F. Kling, Intensity dependence of the attosecond control of the dissociative ionization of D_2 , *J. Phys. B: At Mol. Opt. Phys.* **47**, 124020 (2014).
- [11] T. Endo, A. Matsuda, M. Fushitani, T. Yasuike, O. I. Tolstikhin, T. Morishita, and A. Hishikawa, Imaging Electronic Excitation of NO by Ultrafast Laser Tunneling Ionization, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 163002 (2016).
- [12] V. Wanie, H. Ibrahim, S. Beaulieu, N. Thiré, B. E. Schmidt, Y. Deng, A. S. Alnaser, I. V. Litvinyuk, X.-M. Tong, and F. Légaré, Coherent control of D_2/H_2 dissociative ionization by a mid-infrared two-color laser field, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **49**, 025601 (2016).
- [13] A. Alnaser, M. Kübel, R. Siemering, B. Bergues, N. G. Kling, K. Betsch, Y. Deng, J. Schmidt, Z. Alahmed, A. Azzeer, J. Ullrich, I. Ben-Itzhak, R. Moshhammer, U. Kleineberg, F. Krausz, R. de Vivie-Riedle, and M. Kling, Subfemtosecond steering of hydrocarbon deprotonation through superposition of vibrational modes, *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 3800 (2014).
- [14] A. Hishikawa, A. Matsuda, M. Fushitani, and E. Takahashi, Visualizing Recurrently Migrating Hydrogen in Acetylene Dication by Intense Ultrashort Laser Pulses, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 258302 (2007).
- [15] B. Bergues, M. Kübel, N. G. Johnson, B. Fischer, N. Camus, K. J. Betsch, O. Herrwerth, A. Senftleben, A. M. Sayler, T. Rathje, T. Pfeifer, I. Ben-Itzhak, R. R. Jones, G. G. Paulus, F. Krausz, R. Moshhammer, J. Ullrich, and M. F. Kling, Attosecond tracing of correlated electron-emission in non-sequential double ionization, *Nat. Commun.* **3**, 813 (2012).
- [16] P. B. Corkum, Plasma perspective on strong field multiphoton ionization, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 1994 (1993).
- [17] M. Lewenstein, P. Balcou, M. Ivanov, A. L’Huillier, and P. Corkum, Theory of high-harmonic generation by low-frequency laser fields., *Phys. Rev. A* **49**, 2117 (1994).
- [18] P. M. Kraus and H. J. Wörner, Time-resolved high-harmonic spectroscopy of valence electron dynamics, *Chem. Phys.* **414**, 32 (2013).
- [19] J. Xu, C. I. Blaga, P. Agostini, and L. F. DiMauro, Time-resolved molecular imaging, *J. Phys. B: At Mol. Opt. Phys.* **49**, 112001 (2016).
- [20] A. Rudenko, K. Zrost, B. Feuerstein, V. L. B. de Jesus, C. D. Schröter, R. Moshhammer, and J. Ullrich, Correlated multielectron dynamics in ultrafast laser pulse interactions with atoms, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 253001 (2004).
- [21] H. Niikura, F. Légaré, R. Hasbani, A. D. Bandrauk, M. Y. Ivanov, D. M. Villeneuve, and P. B. Corkum, Sub-

- laser-cycle electron pulses for probing molecular dynamics, *Nature* **417**, 917 (2002).
- [22] X. Xie, K. Doblhoff-Dier, S. Roither, M. S. Schöffler, D. Kartashov, H. Xu, T. Rathje, G. G. Paulus, A. Baltuška, S. Gräfe, and M. Kitzler, Attosecond-recollision-controlled selective fragmentation of polyatomic molecules, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 243001 (2012).
- [23] T. Endo, K. M. Ziemis, M. Richter, F. G. Fröbel, A. Hishikawa, S. Gräfe, F. Légaré, and H. Ibrahim, Post-Ionization Dynamics of the Polar Molecule OCS in Asymmetric Laser Fields, *Front. Chem.* **10**, 859750 (2022).
- [24] Q. Song, X. Gong, Q. Ji, K. Lin, H. Pan, J. Ding, H. Zeng, and J. Wu, Directional deprotonation ionization of acetylene in asymmetric two-color laser fields, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **48**, 094007 (2015).
- [25] K. Doblhoff-Dier, M. Kitzler, and S. Gräfe, Theoretical investigation of alignment-dependent intense-field fragmentation of acetylene, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 013405 (2016).
- [26] T. Endo, H. Fujise, A. Matsuda, M. Fushitani, H. Kono, and A. Hishikawa, Coincidence momentum imaging of asymmetric Coulomb explosion of CO₂ in phase-locked two-color intense laser fields, *J. Electron Spectros. Relat. Phenomena* **207**, 50 (2016).
- [27] T. Endo, H. Fujise, Y. Kawachi, A. Ishihara, A. Matsuda, M. Fushitani, H. Kono, and A. Hishikawa, Selective bond breaking of CO₂ in phase-locked two-color intense laser fields: laser field intensity dependence, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **19**, 3550 (2017).
- [28] H. Hasegawa, T. Walmsley, A. Matsuda, T. Morishita, L. B. Madsen, F. Jensen, O. I. Tolstikhin, and A. Hishikawa, Asymmetric dissociative ionization of tetrafluoromethane in ω - 2ω intense laser fields, *Front. Chem.* **10**, 857863 (2022).
- [29] D. Ray, Z. Chen, S. De, W. Cao, I. V. Litvinyuk, A. T. Le, C. D. Lin, M. F. Kling, and C. L. Cocke, Momentum spectra of electrons rescattered from rare-gas targets following their extraction by one- and two-color femtosecond laser pulses, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 013410 (2011).
- [30] T. Endo, H. Fujise, H. Hasegawa, A. Matsuda, M. Fushitani, O. I. Tolstikhin, T. Morishita, and A. Hishikawa, Angle dependence of dissociative tunneling ionization of NO in asymmetric two-color intense laser fields, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 053422 (2019).
- [31] K. Hosaka, A. Yokoyama, K. Yamanouchi, and R. Itakura, Correlation between a photoelectron and a fragment ion in dissociative ionization of ethanol in intense near-infrared laser fields, *J. Chem. Phys.* **138**, 204301 (2013).
- [32] T. Ikuta, K. Hosaka, H. Akagi, F. Kannari, and R. Itakura, Multichannel dissociative ionization of ethanol in intense ultraviolet laser fields: Energy correlation between photoelectron emission and fragment recoil, *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, 023106 (2022).
- [33] S. Fukahori, T. Otobe, H. Akagi, K. Yamanouchi, and R. Itakura, Orientation-angle-resolved photoelectron angular distribution in dissociative ionization of methanol induced by an intense ultraviolet laser pulse, *Phys. Rev. A* **107**, 053118 (2023).
- [34] B. Wolter, C. Lemell, M. Baudisch, M. G. Pullen, X.-M. Tong, M. Hemmer, A. Senftleben, C. D. Schröter, J. Ullrich, R. Moshhammer, J. Biegert, and J. Burgdörfer, Formation of very-low-energy states crossing the ionization threshold of argon atoms in strong mid-infrared fields, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 063424 (2014).
- [35] O. I. Tolstikhin, T. Morishita, and L. B. Madsen, Theory of tunneling ionization of molecules: Weak-field asymptotics including dipole effects, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 053423 (2011).
- [36] L. B. Madsen, O. I. Tolstikhin, and T. Morishita, Application of the weak-field asymptotic theory to the analysis of tunneling ionization of linear molecules, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 053404 (2012).
- [37] L. B. Madsen, F. Jensen, O. I. Tolstikhin, and T. Morishita, Structure factors for tunneling ionization rates of molecules, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 013406 (2013).
- [38] X.-M. Tong and S.-I. Chu, Density-functional theory with optimized effective potential and self-interaction correction for ground states and autoionizing resonances, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 3406 (1997).
- [39] V. N. T. Pham, O. I. Tolstikhin, and T. Morishita, Molecular Siegert states in an electric field. II. Transverse momentum distribution of the ionized electrons, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 033426 (2014).
- [40] R. G. Orth and R. C. Dunbar, Photofragmentation of OCS⁺ and CS₂⁺, *Chem. Phys.* **45**, 195 (1980).
- [41] P. Agostini, F. Fabre, G. Mainfray, G. Petite, and N. K. Rahman, Free-Free Transitions Following Six-Photon Ionization of Xenon Atoms, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 1127 (1979).