Excitation Line Optimization for Krypton Tagging Velocimetry and Planar Laser-Induced Fluorescence in the 200-220 nm Range
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Krypton tagging velocimetry (KTV) requires high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) to observe high-speed boundary layers and flow structures. In order to optimize the choice of laser excitation line for use in KTV (212.556 nm, 214.769 nm, 216.667 nm), a theoretical and experimental investigation of excitation processes was undertaken. This paper presents a multi-path, two-photon excitation, cross-section calculation, using an assumed finite basis of states consisting of 4p, 5s, 6s, 7s, 5p, 6p, 4d, 5d, and 6d orbitals. From the relative magnitudes of two-photon cross-sections for five Krypton lines, an excitation spectrum is constructed and compared against excitation spectrum data, with encouraging results. From this work and the successful comparison to experiment from our lab and those in the literature, we conclude that the optimal line is 212.556 nm for Kr-PLIF and single-laser KTV. For KTV where the read step is performed with a continuous wave (CW) laser diode, the 216.667 nm write-laser excitation is optimal.

Nomenclature

\[ c = \text{Speed of Light (m/s)} \]
\[ e = \text{Electron Charge, (C)} \]
\[ \epsilon_0 = \text{Free Space Permittivity, (C}^2/(N\cdot m^2)) \]
\[ h = \text{Planck Constant, (J-s)} \]
\[ \hbar = \text{Reduced Planck Constant (J-s/rad)), } \hbar = h/(2\pi) \]
\[ m_{kr} = \text{Mass of a Kr Atom, (kg)} \]
\[ m_e = \text{Mass of an Electron, (kg)} \]
\[ Z = \text{Atomic Number of Kr} \]
\[ Z_e = \text{Effective Nuclear Charge} \]
\[ \alpha = \text{Fine Structure Constant, } \alpha = e^2/(4\pi\epsilon_0hc) \]
\[ a_o = \text{Bohr Radius, (cm), } a_o = 100\hbar/(\alpha m_e c) \]
\[ d_D = \text{Debye Length, (m)} \]
\[ R_y = \text{Rydberg Constant, (J), } R_y = \hbar^2/(2m_e a_o^2) = (1/2)m_e\alpha^2c^2 \]
\[ k_b = \text{Boltzmann Constant, (J/(atom-K))} \]
\[ r = \text{Radius, (Bohr Radii, } a_o) \]
\[ \theta = \text{Azimuth Angle, (rad)} \]
\[ \phi = \text{Polar Angle, (rad)} \]
\[ \hat{\epsilon} = \text{Polarization Unit Vector of Laser Electric Field} \]
\[ q = \text{Polarization Component} \]
\[ \hat{\epsilon} \cdot \vec{r} = \text{Dipole Operator, (Bohr Radius)} \]
\[ D = \text{Matrix Representation of Dipole Operator, (Bohr Radius)} \]
\[ G = \text{Matrix Representation of Green’s Function Operator, (s/ran)} \]
\[ M_{fg}^{(2)} = \text{Two-Photon Transition Matrix Element from states } |g\rangle \text{ to } |f\rangle, \langle a_o^2 \cdot s \]
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There are multiple excitation lines for the two-photon excitation of Kr in the 190-220 nm range: 192.749 nm, 193.494 nm, 193.947 nm, 202.316 nm, 204.196 nm, 212.556 nm, 214.769 nm, and 216.667 nm. The optimal choice of excitation line for krypton fluorescence experiments is subject to test requirements, such as signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), background luminosity, and, in the case of KTV, the write/read delay time. When determining the optimal scheme for krypton fluorescence experiments, evaluating the two-photon cross-section is the starting point and, as such, the motivation for the current work.

Krypton fluorescence experiments have attracted great interest over the last decade because of their promise in making fundamental contributions in subsonic and supersonic combustion in addition to supersonic and hypersonic aerodynamics. Two such experiments are krypton planar laser-induced fluorescence (Kr-PLIF) and krypton tagging velocimetry (KTV). Kr-PLIF and KTV are performed by the addition of a small mole fraction of Kr to a high-speed/reacting flow. This strategy has enabled the non-intrusive measurement of...
important quantities such as density, temperature, mixing-fraction, and velocity that were not previously possible in difficult-to-measure gas flows.

Initial Kr-PLIF work was performed at 214.7 nm, which now includes thermometry. Additionally, the 204.196 nm line has also been used for Kr-PLIF. Experimental Kr-PLIF excitation line comparisons have been performed by, with the observation that the 212.556 nm was superior. High-speed Kr-PLIF was performed at 212.556 nm by Grib et al. Original KTV work relied on write-line excitation at 214.769 nm to generate the metastable Kr state. In more recent KTV work and in this paper, we observe higher SNR for single-laser, unfiltered KTV with a 212.556 nm write-line excitation; additionally, we observe that two-photon excitation at 216.667 nm is optimal for KTV where the read step uses a laser diode.

In this paper, we calculate the two-photon cross-sections of Kr to (1) remove any ambiguity in the superiority of the 212.556 nm line for Kr-PLIF and single-laser KTV; (2) provide fundamental physical insights to verify the Richardson et al. excitation spectrum; (3) provide reliable cross-sections for modeling other Kr excitation schemes; and (4) prepare a framework for calculating multiphoton excitation spectra for other noble gas atoms. Herein, we detail our calculation method and compare the results of those calculations to experimental results with success. Additionally, we present time- and pressure-resolved experimental data of excitation performed with a near IR laser diode, for which the 216.667 nm line KTV is optimal.

II. Krypton Tagging Velocimetry

The current state of KTV rests on (2 + 1) resonant enhanced multiphoton ionization (REMPI) to partially ionize Kr gas and observe a long-lasting afterglow produced by electron-ion recombination and its resulting radiative cascade. REMPI is a compound process consisting of two-photon excitation followed by a one-photon ionization. It is magnitudes more efficient than direct three-photon ionization. In Table 1, there are multiple excitation lines for the two-photon excitation of Kr in the 190-220 nm range that are accessible with commercially available optics and laser systems. Krypton atoms can be excited to any of these levels during the write step to form the tagged tracer. This paper considers and compares the last three lines: 212.556 nm, 214.769 nm, and 216.667 nm.

Table 1: Accessible Kr levels with two-photon excitation. Racah nl[K] notation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>λL (nm)</th>
<th>Energy Level (-)</th>
<th>E (cm⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>192.749</td>
<td>6p[1/2]₀</td>
<td>103761.6336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.494</td>
<td>6p[3/2]₂</td>
<td>103362.6124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.947</td>
<td>6p[5/2]₂</td>
<td>103121.1419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.316</td>
<td>5p[1/2]₀</td>
<td>98855.0698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204.196</td>
<td>5p[3/2]₂</td>
<td>97945.1664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212.556</td>
<td>5p[1/2]₀</td>
<td>94092.8626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.769</td>
<td>5p[3/2]₂</td>
<td>93123.3409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216.667</td>
<td>5p[5/2]₂</td>
<td>92307.3786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the transitions in the energy level diagrams in Fig. 1 along with the relevant transition data in Table 2, the three KTV schemes are performed as follows.

1. λL = 216.667 nm

**Write Step:** Excite krypton atoms with a pulsed tunable laser to form two tagged tracers, metastable Kr and Kr⁺, through (2+1) photoionization. Two-photon excitation of 4p⁶(1S₀) → 5p[5/2]₂ (216.67 nm, transition A) and subsequent one-photon ionization to Kr⁺ (216.67 nm, transition B) occur. This is followed by decay to metastable 5p[5/2]₂ → 5s[3/2]₀ (transition D) and resonance states 5p[5/2]₂ → 5s[3/2]₁ (transition C), and other transitions, J, K and L resulting from the recombination process. I. Using a camera oriented normal to the flow, the position of the write line is recorded by gated imaging of the laser-induced-fluorescence (LIF) from transitions (C, D, J, K, L).
Read Step: After a prescribed delay, record the displacement of the tagged metastable krypton and Kr\(^{+}\). With an additional tunable laser, excite 5p[3/2]\(_{1}\) level by the 5s[3/2]\(_{0}\) \(\rightarrow\) 5p[3/2]\(_{1}\) transition (769.454 nm, E), which is followed by decay to metastable 5p[3/2]\(_{1}\) \(\rightarrow\) 5s[3/2]\(_{0}\) (829.81 nm, G) and resonance 5p[3/2]\(_{1}\) \(\rightarrow\) 5s[3/2]\(_{0}\) (769.454 nm, F) states. The position of the read line is marked by gated imaging of the LIF from transitions F and G and the residual fluorescence from transitions J, K and L that result from the recombination process, I.

2. \(\lambda_L = 214.769\) nm

Write Step: Excite krypton atoms with a pulsed tunable laser to form two tagged tracers, metastable Kr and Kr\(^{+}\), through (2+1) photoionization. Two-photon excitation of 4p\(^{6}\)(1S\(_{0}\)) \(\rightarrow\) 5p[5/2]\(_{2}\) (214.769 nm, transition A\(^{1}\)) and subsequent one-photon ionization\(^{31}\) to Kr\(^{+}\) (214.769 nm, transition B\(^{1}\)) occur. This is followed by decay to metastable 5p[3/2]\(_{2}\) \(\rightarrow\) 5s[3/2]\(_{0}\) (transition N) and resonance states 5p[3/2]\(_{2}\) \(\rightarrow\) 5s[3/2]\(_{0}\) (transition O), and other transitions, J, K and L resulting from the recombination process, \(^{32,33}\) I. The position of the write line is marked by gated imaging of the LIF from these transitions (N, O, J, K, L), recorded with a camera positioned normal to the flow.

Read Step: After a prescribed delay, record the displacement of the tagged metastable krypton and Kr\(^{+}\). With an additional tunable laser, excite 5p[3/2]\(_{1}\) level by the 5s[3/2]\(_{0}\) \(\rightarrow\) 5p[3/2]\(_{1}\) transition (769.454 nm, E), which is followed by decay to metastable 5p[3/2]\(_{1}\) \(\rightarrow\) 5s[3/2]\(_{0}\) (829.81 nm, G) and resonance 5p[3/2]\(_{1}\) \(\rightarrow\) 5s[3/2]\(_{0}\) (769.454 nm, F) states. The position of the read line is marked by gated imaging of the LIF from transitions F and G and the residual fluorescence from transitions J, K and L that result from the recombination process, I.

3. \(\lambda_L = 212.556\) nm

Write Step: Excite krypton atoms with a pulsed tunable laser to form two tagged tracers, metastable Kr and Kr\(^{+}\), through (2+1) photoionization. Two-photon excitation of 4p\(^{6}\)(1S\(_{0}\)) \(\rightarrow\) 5p[1/2]\(_{0}\) (212.556 nm, transition A\(^{1}\)) and subsequent one-photon ionization\(^{31}\) to Kr\(^{+}\) (212.556 nm, transition B\(^{1}\)) occur. This is followed by decay to the resonance state 5p[1/2]\(_{0}\) \(\rightarrow\) 5s[3/2]\(_{0}\) (transition M) and other transitions, J, K and L resulting from the recombination process, \(^{32,33}\) I. The metastable state is formed through transition J. The position of the write line is marked by gated imaging of the LIF from these transitions (M, J, K, L), recorded with a camera positioned normal to the flow.

Read Step: After a prescribed delay, record the displacement of the tagged metastable krypton and Kr\(^{+}\). With an additional tunable laser, excite 5p[3/2]\(_{1}\) level by the 5s[3/2]\(_{0}\) \(\rightarrow\) 5p[3/2]\(_{1}\) transition (769.454 nm, E), which is followed by decay to metastable 5p[3/2]\(_{1}\) \(\rightarrow\) 5s[3/2]\(_{0}\) (829.81 nm, G) and resonance 5p[3/2]\(_{1}\) \(\rightarrow\) 5s[3/2]\(_{0}\) (769.454 nm, F) states. The position of the read line is marked by gated imaging of the LIF from transitions F and G and the fluorescence from transitions J, K and L that result from the recombination process, I.

The extent of ionization in all three schemes is proportional to the intensity of the laser beam, which is limited by the available laser power and the experimental setup (ex. window transmission and laser beam splitting). Lower laser power reduces (and can effectively eliminate) ionization and its subsequent radiative cascade, which may or may not be good for tracing. At low power, fluorescence from transitions J, K and L become insignificant. At the write step, this is not an issue in the three schemes because the fluorescence from transitions C, D, N, O and M dominates that of transitions J, K and L. At the read step, the schemes behave differently. The schemes that use \(\lambda_L = 214.769\) and 216.67 nm create metastable Kr through transitions D and N, which do not rely on ionization. The fluorescence from the re-excitation of the metastable state, transitions F and G is often sufficient on its own without the need for the fluorescence from transitions J, K and L. Therefore, these two schemes can be used even without ionization. However, the \(\lambda_L = 212.556\) nm scheme is completely reliant on recombination processes and their resulting radiative cascade to create fluorescence at the read step. Metastable Kr in this scheme is produced through recombination, I, and subsequently, transition J. Hence, if there is no ionization, I and J do not occur. Then at the read step, there is no metastable Kr to re-excite (transitions E, F and G do not occur), and there would be no fluorescence from transitions J, K and L. Therefore, this scheme requires the Kr atoms to be ionized to form Kr\(^{+}\) and metastable Kr as the tracers. Consequently, the power requirement for this scheme is higher than that of
Figure 1: Energy diagrams (not to scale) with Racah nl[K] notation for the three excitation schemes. Left: 212.556 nm. Center: 214.769 nm. Right: 216.667 nm. Transition details in Table 2. States 5p and 5s represent the numerous 5p and 5s states (tabulated in Mustafa et al.\textsuperscript{27}) that are created by the recombination process, I. Transitions J, K and L represent the numerous transitions in the 5p-5s band. 14.0 eV marks ionization limit of Kr.

Table 2: Relevant NIST Atomic Spectra Database Lines Data, labels match Fig. 1. Racah nl[K] notation. Transition I is not listed because it is not an atomic-level transition. It represents the recombination process. Entries in the J/K/L row represent ranges and order of magnitude estimates since J, K and L in Fig. 1 represent numerous transitions in the 5p-5s band. $k$ and $i$ denote the upper and lower energy levels respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>$\lambda_{air}$ (nm)</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Lower Level</th>
<th>Upper Level</th>
<th>$A_{ij}$ (1/s)</th>
<th>$E_j$ (cm$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$E_i$ (cm$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>216.670</td>
<td>Two-Photon</td>
<td>4s$^2$4p$^6$, $^1S_0$</td>
<td>5p$[5/2]_2$</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92307.3786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A$^\dagger$</td>
<td>214.769</td>
<td>Two-Photon</td>
<td>4s$^2$4p$^6$, $^1S_0$</td>
<td>5p$[3/2]_2$</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93123.3409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A$^*$</td>
<td>212.556</td>
<td>Two-Photon</td>
<td>4s$^2$4p$^6$, $^1S_0$</td>
<td>5p$[1/2]_0$</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94092.8626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>216.667</td>
<td>Single-Photon</td>
<td>5p$[5/2]_2$</td>
<td>Kr+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>92307.3786</td>
<td>112917.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B$^\dagger$</td>
<td>214.769</td>
<td>Single-Photon</td>
<td>5p$[3/2]_2$</td>
<td>Kr+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>93123.3409</td>
<td>112917.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B$^*$</td>
<td>212.556</td>
<td>Single-Photon</td>
<td>5p$[1/2]_0$</td>
<td>Kr+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>94092.8626</td>
<td>112917.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>877.675</td>
<td>Single-Photon</td>
<td>5s$[3/2]_1$</td>
<td>5p$[5/2]_2$</td>
<td>$2.2 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>80916.7680</td>
<td>92307.3786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>810.436</td>
<td>Single-Photon</td>
<td>5s$[3/2]_2$</td>
<td>5p$[5/2]_2$</td>
<td>$8.9 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>79971.7417</td>
<td>92307.3786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/F</td>
<td>769.454</td>
<td>Single-Photon</td>
<td>5s$[3/2]_2$</td>
<td>5p$[3/2]_1$</td>
<td>$4.3 \times 10^6$</td>
<td>79971.7417</td>
<td>92964.3943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>829.811</td>
<td>Single-Photon</td>
<td>5s$[3/2]_1$</td>
<td>5p$[3/2]_1$</td>
<td>$2.9 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>80916.7680</td>
<td>92964.3943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>123.584</td>
<td>Single-Photon</td>
<td>4s$^2$4p$^6$, $^1S_0$</td>
<td>5s$[3/2]_1$</td>
<td>$3.0 \times 10^8$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80916.7680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J/K/L</td>
<td>750-830</td>
<td>Single-Photon</td>
<td>5s$^5$</td>
<td>5p$[5/2]_1$</td>
<td>$10^6 - 10^7$</td>
<td>80000.0000</td>
<td>90000.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>758.950</td>
<td>Single-Photon</td>
<td>5s$[3/2]_1$</td>
<td>5p$[1/2]_0$</td>
<td>$4.3 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>80916.7680</td>
<td>94092.8626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>760.364</td>
<td>Single-Photon</td>
<td>5s$[3/2]_2$</td>
<td>5p$[3/2]_2$</td>
<td>$2.732 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>79971.7417</td>
<td>93123.3409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>819.230</td>
<td>Single-Photon</td>
<td>5s$[3/2]_1$</td>
<td>5p$[3/2]_2$</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>80916.7680</td>
<td>93123.3409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other two.

A simplified version of KTV that utilizes only a write laser\textsuperscript{26,27} can also be implemented by omitting the read laser and its re-excitation of the metastable state (transition E). Therefore, in all three schemes, the fluorescence imaged at the read step is generated solely from transitions J, K and L. As mentioned earlier, transitions J, K and L result from the radiative cascade of a cold Kr plasma. While the use of only one laser offers significant reductions in cost and experimental complexity, the use of a single laser necessitates high laser power, sufficient to ionize krypton atoms.

Fig. 2 shows the time resolved fluorescence signal from schemes that utilize $\lambda_L = 212.556$ and 214.769 nm. This data is from the single-laser version of an excitation scheme with no read laser, and was taken in a 99% N$_2$/1% Kr gas mixture at 5 torr. The yellow region in the graph indicates the camera gate at the write step, which is typically a 5 ns exposure. The two green regions are indicative of the camera gate at the read step.
with a 500 (left) and 1000 (right) ns delay, and a 50 ns exposure. The results show that the signal-to-noise ratio, SNR, of the 212.556 nm scheme is higher relative to the 214.769 nm scheme when no laser diode is used.

Figure 2: Time-resolved Kr Fluorescence Signal in a P = 5 torr, 99% N₂/1% Kr gas mixture using 212.556 nm and 214.769 nm two-photon excitation wavelengths with no read laser. The yellow region is representative of the camera gate at the write step. The two green regions are representative of the camera gate at the read step with a delay of 500 and 1000 ns respectively.

III. Relation of Cross-section to Signal-To-Noise Ratio

By definition, the fluorescence signal, $Q$, from an atomic transition is calculated per Eckbreth\textsuperscript{34} as,

$$Q = h f_e N_u A \Omega V/(4\pi)$$

(1)

where $h$ is Planck’s constant, $f_e$ is the frequency of emitted light, $N_u$ is the population of the upper level, $A$ is the overall Einstein coefficient, $\Omega$ is the collection solid angle, and $V$ is the emitting volume. As Eq. 1 shows, SNR $\propto Q \propto N_u$.

During a laser pulse, the two-photon excited state population, denoted by $N_f$, is governed by

$$\frac{dN_f}{dt} = W_{f,g} N_g - (W_{pi} + A_f + W_{f,g} + q)N_f,$$

(2)

where $W_{f,g}$ is the two-photon excitation rate from the ground state $|g\rangle$ to final state $|f\rangle$, $W_{pi}$ is one-photon photoionization rate from final state $|f\rangle$ to the ionized state, $N_g$ is the population of the ground state Kr atoms, $A_f$ is the overall Einstein coefficient, and $q$ is the quenching rate for the excited state. At the rising edge of the laser pulse, $N_f$ is small and is approximately proportional to $W_{f,g}$,

$$N_f \approx W_{f,g} N_g \Delta t.$$ 

(3)

The one-photon photoionization rate $W_{pi}$ in Eq. 2 is

$$W_{pi} = F \sigma_{pi},$$

(4)

where the photoionization cross-section $\sigma_{pi}$ is calculated by Khambatta et. al\textsuperscript{35} as

$$\sigma_{pi} = \frac{8 \times 10^{-18}}{Z_e \sqrt{\left(\frac{-E_f}{Ry}\right) \left(\frac{\hbar \omega_L}{-E_f}\right)^3}},$$

(5)
In Eq. 5, $Z_e = 1$ is the charge of the Kr ion, $R_y$ is the Rydberg constant, and $E_f$ is the energy of the final state. The one-photon photoionization cross-section $\sigma_{pi}$ is approximately the same for the different Kr excitation lines because of the closely clustered energies of the eight states. Therefore, the two-photon cross-section $\sigma_{o}^{(2)}$ is the most significant in determining the excitation spectrum for the Kr lines. Researchers, such as Saito et al.\textsuperscript{30} and Khambatta et al.\textsuperscript{35} respectively developed detailed analytical and numerical population models, featuring Eq. 2. In this work, the solution to Eq. 2 is not explored beyond Eq. 3.

$W_{f,g}$ is defined as

$$W_{f,g} = F^2 \sigma^{(2)},$$

where $\sigma^{(2)}$ is the two-photon excitation rate-coefficient and $F = I/(\hbar \omega_L)$ is the photon flux. $I$ is the laser intensity; $\hbar$ is the reduced Planck’s constant; and $\omega_L$ is the laser angular frequency. The rate-coefficient, $\sigma^{(2)}$, is a function of the excitation wavelength and is directly proportional to the cross-section $\sigma_o^{(2)}$. Consequently, the wavelength with the highest value of $\sigma_o^{(2)}$ will result in the highest fluorescence signal after the laser pulse. That is, $\text{SNR} \propto \sigma_o^{(2)}$ right after the rising edge of the laser pulse.

IV. Two-Photon Cross-Section Calculation for Kr for 190 – 220 nm Excitation Range

Methods for calculating two-photon cross-sections include first-order perturbation theory, the Green’s function method, R-matrix theory, and time-dependent density-functional theory (TDDFT). First-order perturbation theory for multiphoton excitation and ionization is described by Lambropoulos\textsuperscript{36} who provides a thorough review of multiphoton processes and calculations, and demonstrates the matrix mechanics nature of the problem. Khambatta et al.\textsuperscript{35, 37} uses the first-order perturbation theory of Lambropoulos\textsuperscript{36} and the oscillator formulas from Hillborn\textsuperscript{38} to calculate two- and three-photon cross-sections for argon and krypton. He presents both a single-path and multi-path calculation. However, that calculation is limited by the availability of tabulated Einstein coefficients. Additionally in that work, the dipole-matrix element is asymmetric, thus unable to capture the mathematical symmetry of the two-photon transition matrix element. A similar single-path calculation for the excitation of Kr to the 6s level was made by Bokor et al.\textsuperscript{39} The calculations in Bokor et al.\textsuperscript{39} and Khambatta et al.\textsuperscript{35, 37} serve as important benchmarks for the two-photon cross-section calculation and (2+1) photoionization modeling. Mustafa et al.\textsuperscript{27} used the single-path approximation to estimate the two-photon cross-section for the 212,556 nm excitation line for krypton. An additional motivation for the current work was to assess the validity of the results of Mustafa et al.\textsuperscript{27} and explore if other excitation lines might result in higher fluorescence.

A two-photon cross-section calculation was conducted using multi-path, first-order accurate perturbation theory. The matrix mechanics formulation of Lambropoulos,\textsuperscript{36} who provides a thorough review of multiphoton processes and calculations, is used because it obtains all excitation pathways for a finite basis of states. A Hartree-Fock radial wave function of the krypton ground state $(4p^61S_0)$ \textsuperscript{a} was assumed,\textsuperscript{40} and oscillator-strength (OS) formulas were used upon the availability of NIST transition probabilities and data.\textsuperscript{41} We note that a Kr gas mixture with naturally-occurring isotope mole fractions was considered because the NIST line spectra database presents spectroscopic data for a naturally-occurring mixture of Kr,\textsuperscript{41} and the laser pulse width is at least two orders of magnitude greater than the isotopic shifts of Kr. Additionally, quantum-defect theory (QDT) was used to calculate electric dipole matrix elements $\langle i | \hat{r} \cdot \vec{F} | j \rangle$ when NIST transition probabilities were unlisted. This last inclusion of QDT is key to the success of our approach as it enabled the inclusion of additional excitation pathways not included in previous works; and it determined the sign of all pathway contributions to the two-photon matrix element.

When QDT is used to evaluate the purely radial matrix elements $\langle r \rangle$, scaled hydrogen radial wave functions are constructed to represents excited Kr states. This is because a Hartree-Fock calculation showed that excited krypton states exhibited hydrogenic behavior and could be approximated well by quantum-defect radial wave functions that are calibrated by NIST line data. With the aid of QDT, a truncated spectral expansion of a Green’s function was effectively constructed from a basis of intermediate Kr states (5s, 6s, 7s, 4d, 5d, and 6d states) that approximately satisfy the nonrelativistic Schrödinger equation. Within the

\textsuperscript{a}Russell-Saunders Notation $^{2S+1}L_J$ with $S = 0$, $L = 0$, and $J = 0$.  
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framework of matrix mechanics, this expansion ultimately allowed the evaluation of the two-photon-transition matrix element.

The two-photon cross-section \( \sigma_o^{(2)} \) is independent of laser intensity, time, and Kr concentration. It is a constant, and it is a solution to the time-independent, non-relativistic Schrödinger equation \(^b\). At the rising edge of the laser pulse, \( \sigma_o^{(2)} \propto \sigma^{(2)} \propto Q \propto \text{SNR}. \)\(^{34} \) The two-photon cross-section \( \sigma_o^{(2)} \) is related to the two-photon excitation rate-coefficient \( \sigma^{(2)} \) via the lineshape function \( g(2\omega_L) \) as

\[
\sigma^{(2)} = \sigma_o^{(2)} g(2\omega_L). \tag{7}
\]

The two-photon excitation cross-section is calculated as

\[
\sigma_o^{(2)} = (2\pi)^3(\alpha)^2\omega_L^2 |M_f^g|_o^2, \tag{8}
\]

where \( \alpha \) is the fine structure constant, \( a_o \) is the Bohr radius, and \( M_f^g \) is the two-photon-transition matrix element. The line shape function \( g(2\omega_L) \) is assumed to be of Gaussian form with a peak:

\[
g(2\omega_L = \omega_T) = \frac{2\sqrt{\ln(2)/\pi}}{\sqrt{2(\Delta\omega_L)^2 + (\Delta\omega_T)^2}}. \tag{9}
\]

The linewidth of the laser is \( \Delta\omega_L \) (1350 MHz in this work), and the Doppler linewidth, \( \Delta\omega_T \), is calculated by

\[
\Delta\omega_T = (2\omega_L)\sqrt{\frac{8\ln(2)k_bT}{m_{kr}c^2}}, \tag{10}
\]

where \( k_b \) is the Boltzmann constant, \( c \) is the speed of light, \( m_{kr} \) is the mass of one krypton atom, and \( T \) is the temperature of the Kr gas mixture.

The two-photon-transition matrix element is expressed as

\[
M_f^g = \sum_{k=g}^{\infty} \frac{\langle f | \hat{r} \cdot \hat{r} | k \rangle \langle k | \hat{r} \cdot \hat{r} | g \rangle}{\omega_k - \omega_g - \omega_L}. \tag{11}
\]

For practical calculation on a computer, the summation over the intermediate state index \( k \) is truncated at the \( N^{th} \) state. Therefore, the transition matrix element,

\[
M_f^g = \sum_{k=g}^{N} \frac{\langle f | \hat{r} \cdot \hat{r} | k \rangle \langle k | \hat{r} \cdot \hat{r} | g \rangle}{\omega_k - \omega_g - \omega_L}, \tag{12}
\]

is summed over a finite basis of states, such as those listed in Table 5. The truncation criterion for two-photon excitation is determined by a constraint on the maximum principal quantum number \( n \) of a bound state: \( n_{\text{max}}. \) As \( n \) becomes large, the expected radius of a one-electron atom of effective nuclear charge \( Z_e \) is \( \langle r \rangle = n^2/Z_e \) in Bohr radii.\(^{43} \) Per Park,\(^{44} \) the \( \langle r \rangle \) is proportional to the Debye length \( d_D: \)

\[
n_{\text{max}} = \sqrt{\frac{Z_e d_D}{10a_o} \approx \left( \frac{Z_e^2 e^2 k_b}{e^2 (\frac{N_i}{T_e} + \frac{N_i}{T_T}) (10a_o)^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \tag{13},
\]

where \( N_e/V \) is the electron number density and \( N_i/V \) is the ion number density, \( T_e \) is the electron temperature, and \( T_i \) is the Kr ion temperature. The factor of 10\( a_o \) describes approximately the krypton van der Waals diameter and represents a 90% reduction in the Debye potential, \( \Phi_D, \) which is non-dimensionally described by \( \Phi_D = 1/r \exp(-r a_o/d_D). \) For the (2+1) resonance-enhanced multiphoton excitation (REMPI) of Kr at laser wavelength \( \lambda_l = 212.556 \text{ nm}, \) room temperature \( T = 298 \text{ K}, \) and pressure \( P = 1 \text{ torr}, \) the electron temperature is \( T_e = 27626 \text{ K} \) and number densities are calculated as \( N_e/V = N_i/V = 1.62 \times 10^{21} \text{ electrons/m}^3. \)

\(^b\)Relativistic effects were neglected in the Schrödinger equation because the energy of the laser was much less than the rest energy of an electron \( 3\hbar\omega_L \ll m_e c^2. \)\(^{42} \)
The electron temperature was obtained from \(2(3h\omega_L-|E_{\text{ion}}|)/3k_b\), and number densities were obtained via the analytical population model of Saito et al.\textsuperscript{30} Assuming \(Z_e = 1\) for the Kr ion, the result is \(n_{\text{max}} = 7.42\). Therefore, \(N\) accommodates all states with a principal quantum number equal to or less than 7: \(n \leq 7\). This is convenient because NIST transition probability data is limited for states with \(n \leq 8\).\textsuperscript{41}

An approximate Green’s function, expressed as a truncated spectral expansion, is nested in the center of the expression for \(M_{fg}^{(2)}\):

\[
G(\vec{r}, \vec{r}') = \sum_{k=g}^{N} \frac{|k\rangle \langle k|}{\omega_k - \omega_g - \omega_L}.
\]

(14)

Since Green’s functions are symmetric about variable exchange \((\vec{r} \leftrightarrow \vec{r}')\), \(G(\vec{r}, \vec{r}') = G(\vec{r}', \vec{r})\), so \(M_{fg}^{(2)} = M_{gf}^{(2)}\). This mathematical property is a fundamental deviation from the oscillator-strength approach in Khambatta et al.,\textsuperscript{35} which is one-sided and asymmetric. Therefore, the use of oscillator formulas, while valid, causes the loss of symmetry in the transition-matrix element. This symmetry loss is problematic in describing higher-order multiphoton excitation (three-photon and higher).

\(M_{fg}^{(2)}\) is a double tensor contraction of an infinite matrix space \(M = DGD\). More importantly, due to the invariance of multiphoton excitation with respect to reference frame and basis \(|k\rangle\) (See Appendix A for a proof.), \(M = DGD\) is a symmetric, rank-2 tensor.

The evaluation of \(M_{fg}^{(2)}\) requires the evaluation of two reduced matrix elements of the form

\[
\langle i | \hat{e} \cdot \hat{r} | j \rangle = D_{ij},
\]

(15)

where \(D_{ij}\) is an element of the matrix representation of the dipole operator \(D\):

\[
D = \begin{bmatrix}
\langle g|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|g \rangle & \langle g|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|1 \rangle & \langle g|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|2 \rangle & \cdots & \langle g|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|N \rangle \\
\langle 1|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|g \rangle & \langle 1|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|1 \rangle & \langle 1|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|2 \rangle & \cdots & \langle 1|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|N \rangle \\
\langle 2|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|g \rangle & \langle 2|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|1 \rangle & \langle 2|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|2 \rangle & \cdots & \langle 2|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|N \rangle \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\langle N|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|g \rangle & \langle N|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|1 \rangle & \langle N|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|2 \rangle & \cdots & \langle N|\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}|N \rangle 
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

(16)

The two indices \(i, j\) of the matrix \(D\) represent the final state \(|i\rangle\) and initial state \(|j\rangle\), respectively. The dipole operator, \(\hat{e} \cdot \hat{r}\), describes the rotation of two electric charges of opposite sign by an external electric field. The denominator of Eq. 12,

\[
G_{ii} = \frac{1}{\omega_i - \omega_g - \omega_L},
\]

(17)
can also be rewritten in matrix form as a diagonal matrix \(G\):

\[
G = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{\omega_g - \omega_g - \omega_L} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{1}{\omega_1 - \omega_g - \omega_L} & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \frac{1}{\omega(N-1) - \omega_g - \omega_L} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \frac{1}{\omega_N - \omega_g - \omega_L}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

(18)

\(G\) is the matrix representation of the Green’s function, Eq. 14. Rewriting Eq. 12, the transition matrix element can be represented in matrix form:

\[
M_{fg}^{(2)} = \sum_{k=g}^{N} D_{fk} G_{kk} D_{kg} = \hat{e}_f^T DGD \hat{e}_g,
\]

(19)
where $\hat{e}_i$ is a unit vector that identifies the state of the system. For example, the vector representations of states $|g\rangle$, $|1\rangle$, $|2\rangle$, and $|N\rangle$ are

$$
\hat{e}_g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{e}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{e}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{e}_N = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.
$$

Eq. 19 substantiates to a rank 2 tensor contraction of the Green’s function matrix $G$. The $f^{th}$ row of matrix $D$ is post-multiplied by the matrix $G$, which is then post-multiplied by the $y^{th}$ column of matrix $D$, resulting in the scalar $M_{yf}^{(2)}$.

**IV.A. The Calculation of Dipole Matrix Elements $D_{ij}$ Using QDT**

In this section, the dipole matrix elements $D_{ij}$ are calculated via the central-field approximation,\(^{43,46}\) which allows one to separate the effects of angular and radial components in the Schrödinger equation, expressed in spherical coordinates. This allows a state $|k\rangle$ to be expressed as a product of one-electron, radial wave functions $R_{nl}(r) \prod_p R_{p\mu}(r_p)$ multiplied by a tensor spherical harmonic $Y_{LM}^p(\theta, \phi)$. Here, subscript $p$ denotes an unexcited krypton electron, and $nl$ denotes the quantum numbers of the valence electron to be excited by the laser. This state is represented as $|nLSJM\rangle$, assuming LS spin-orbit coupling. The radius of the excited valence electron from the Kr nucleus is $r$. The orientation of its angular momentum is described by azimuth angle $\theta$ and polar angle $\phi$. The set of all principal quantum numbers for the Kr atom is $n$, and the principal quantum number of the excited electron is $n$. $L$ is the total orbital angular momentum quantum number of the atom, and $l$ is the single-electron angular momentum number of the excited electron. $S$ is the total electron spin quantum number of the atom. For a true dipole moment transition, $S$ remains constant because the dipole moment operator $\hat{e} \cdot \vec{r}$ does not act on electron spin coordinates. The dipole moment operator is solely written in terms of scalar spherical harmonics.\(^{46}\)

$$\hat{e} \cdot \vec{r} = \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{3}} r \sum_{q=(0,\pm 1)} \epsilon_q Y_q^0, \quad (21)$$

where the polarization component is $\epsilon_q$; $q = 0$ for linear polarization; $q = 1$ for right-handed circular polarization; and $q = -1$ for left-handed circular polarization of the laser’s electric field.\(^{47}\) The orientation of the laser electric field defines the orientation of the $z$-axis in the spherical coordinate system imposed on the nucleus of a Kr atom.

To evaluate the reduced matrix elements $D_{ij}$, a simplified expression must first be obtained. By applying the Wigner-Eckart Theorem,\(^{47}\) $D_{ij}$ may be rewritten as

$$D_{ij} = \langle i | \hat{e} \cdot \vec{r} | j \rangle = \langle nL_iS_iJ_iM_i | \hat{e} \cdot \vec{r} | n_jL_jS_jJ_jM_j \rangle = \langle nL_iS_iJ_iM_i | \vec{r} | n_jL_jS_jJ_j \rangle \times \sum_{q=(0,\pm 1)} \epsilon_q \begin{pmatrix} J_i & 1 \\ -M_i & q \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} J_j \\ M_j \end{pmatrix} (-1)^{1-J_j-M_i}. \quad (22)$$

By using the definition of a vector $\vec{r} = r\hat{e}_r$, radial coordinates are separated from angular coordinates:

$$D_{ij} = \langle i | r | j \rangle \langle L_iS_iJ_i | \hat{e}_r | L_jS_jJ_j \rangle \times \sum_{q=(0,\pm 1)} \epsilon_q \begin{pmatrix} J_i & 1 \\ -M_i & q \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} J_j \\ M_j \end{pmatrix} (-1)^{1-J_j-M_i}. \quad (23)$$
Using the following expression from Messiah\textsuperscript{47} (Eq. C.89) for reduced matrix elements and irreducible tensor operators of tensor rank $k$,

\[
\left\langle \tau_1 \tau_2 J_1 J_2 J \right| T^{(k)} \left| \frac{\tau_1' \tau_2' J_1' J_2' J'}{2} \right\rangle = 
\delta_{\tau_2 \tau_2'} \delta_{J_2 J'} \left\langle \tau_1 J_1 \right| T^{(k)} \left| \frac{\tau_1' J_1'}{2} \right\rangle (-1)^{J_1 + J_2 + k}
\times \sqrt{(2J_1 + 1)(2J_1' + 1)} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} J_1 & k & J_1' \\ J_2 & J' \\ \end{array} \right\},
\]

(24)

the angular term $\langle L_i S_i J_i | \hat{e}_r L_j S_j J_j \rangle$ can be further simplified, noting $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 1$. The reduced matrix element $D_{ij}$ becomes

\[
D_{ij} = \delta_{S_i S_j} \langle r \rangle \left( \langle L_i | \hat{e}_r | L_j \rangle \right) (-1)^{L_i + J_j + S_i + 1}
\times \sqrt{(2J_i + 1)(2J_i + 1)} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} L_i & 1 & L_j \\ J_i & S_j & J_i \\ \end{array} \right\}
\times \sum_{q=\left(0, \pm 1\right)} \epsilon_q \left( \begin{array}{ccc} J_i & 1 & J_j \\ -M_i & q & M_j \\ \end{array} \right) (-1)^{-J_j - M_i},
\]

(25)

where $\langle r \rangle = \langle i | r | j \rangle$ is the purely radial matrix element. The term $\delta_{S_i S_j}$ implies that the dipole moment operator does not act on electron coordinates. Next, using the Wigner-Eckart Theorem\textsuperscript{47} for the expected value of a spherical tensor $Y_k$ of rank $k$,

\[
\left\langle l_1 | Y_k | l_2 \right\rangle = 
= (-1)^{l_1} \sqrt{\frac{2l_1 + 1)(2l_1 + 1)(2l_2 + 1)}{4\pi}} \left( \begin{array}{ccc} l_1 & k & l_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{array} \right)
\]

(26)

the expected value of the rank-1 unit vector $\hat{e}_r$, $\langle L_i | \hat{e}_r | L_j \rangle$, can be evaluated. $D_{ij}$ becomes

\[
D_{ij} = \delta_{S_i S_j} \langle r \rangle \sqrt{(2L_i + 1)(2L_i + 1)}
\times \left( \begin{array}{ccc} L_i & 1 & L_g \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{array} \right) \sqrt{(2J_i + 1)(2J_i + 1)}
\times (-1)^{2L_i + J_j + S_i + 1} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} L_i & 1 & L_j \\ J_i & S_j & J_i \\ \end{array} \right\}
\times \sum_{q=\left(0, \pm 1\right)} \epsilon_q \left( \begin{array}{ccc} J_i & 1 & J_j \\ -M_i & q & M_j \\ \end{array} \right) (-1)^{-J_j - M_i},
\]

(27)

which rearranges into

\[
D_{ij} = \delta_{S_i S_j} \langle r \rangle \sqrt{(2J_1 + 1)(2J_1 + 1)(2L_i + 1)(2L_i + 1)}
\times \left( \begin{array}{ccc} L_i & 1 & L_g \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{array} \right) \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} L_i & 1 & L_j \\ J_i & S_j & J_i \\ \end{array} \right\} (-1)^{2L_i + J_j + S_i + 1}
\times \sum_{q=\left(0, \pm 1\right)} \epsilon_q \left( \begin{array}{ccc} J_i & 1 & J_j \\ -M_i & q & M_j \\ \end{array} \right) (-1)^{-J_j - M_i},
\]

(28)

For allowable dipole transitions, the effect of the factor of $-1^{-J_j - M_i + 1}$, which arises from the definition of the Wigner-Eckart Theorem, has no effect on the transition matrix element summation due to the consistent parity of $J$, as shown in Table 3.
Table 3: Parity Table for term \(-1^{-J_j-M_i+1}\). \(J_j = 0, 1\) correspond to 2-photon transitions, and \(J_j = 0, 1, 2\) correspond to 3-photon transitions. The term \(-1^{-J_j-M_i+1}\) does not contribute to the transition matrix element summation because it is consistently the same value for each stage of a multiphoton transition for all possible pathways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(J_j)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(M_i)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-1^{-J_j-M_i+1})</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2 x 3 matrix terms in parentheses are \(3j\)-Wigner Symbols, and the 2 x 3 matrix term in brackets is the \(6j\)-Wigner Symbol. \(3j\)-Wigner Symbols enforce dipole moment selection rules, and the \(6j\)-Wigner Symbol quantifies the degeneracy of a transition occurring (it amounts to a normalization factor). Our research only considers linear polarization of the laser electric field, \(q = 0\), forcing \(M_i = M_j = 0\) for all transitions \(j \rightarrow i\). \(S_i = S_j = 0\) for all transitions because the Kr ground state has a total electron spin of zero, and the dipole moment operator \(\hat{\epsilon} \cdot \vec{r}\) does not act on electron spin coordinates. \(L_i\) is the norm of the addition of two angular momenta, \(L_i = |\vec{l}_i + \vec{l}_g|\), which describes the angular momentum coupling between the excited electron and a 4p valence electron of opposite electron spin. Since the dipole moment operator does not operate on electron coordinates, it turns out that \(L_i = J_i\) for the dipole transitions we analyzed. A cartoon summarizing how angular momentum changes during (2 + 1)-photoionization is shown in Fig. 3, and an angular momentum table is provided in Table 4 to show how to calculate the coupled quantum \(L\) from the angular momenta of two electrons, each with an azimuth orbital quantum number \(m = 0\).

![Figure 3: Angular momenta of a Kr atom during linearly polarized (2 + 1) multiphoton photoionization. This cartoon demonstrates LS spin-orbit coupling for each Kr state at each stage of excitation: ground state \(|g\rangle\), intermediate state \(|k\rangle\), two-photon state \(|f\rangle\), and ionized state \(e^-\). For dipole transitions, \(\Delta S = 0\) and consequently, \(J = L\).](http://arc.aiaa.org/doi/10.2514/6.2021-1300)

Table 4: Addition of the angular momentum of two electrons \(l_1\) and \(l_2\): \(\vec{L} = \vec{l}_1 + \vec{l}_2\). \(m = 0\) for both electrons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>(L^2 = l_1^2 + l_2^2 + 2l_1 \cdot l_2)</th>
<th>(L)</th>
<th>(J)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(</td>
<td>g\rangle)</td>
<td>(1^2 + 1^2 + 2(1)(-1) = 0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(</td>
<td>k\rangle)</td>
<td>(1^2 + 0^2 + 2(1)(0) = 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(</td>
<td>f\rangle)</td>
<td>(1^2 + 1^2 + 2(1)(\pm 1) = \left{ \begin{array}{c} 4 \ 0 \end{array} \right} \left{ \begin{array}{c} 2 \ 0 \end{array} \right} \left{ \begin{array}{c} 2 \ 0 \end{array} \right} )</td>
<td>(\left{ \begin{array}{c} 2 \ 0 \end{array} \right} \left{ \begin{array}{c} 2 \ 0 \end{array} \right} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, the simplified dipole matrix element is
\[
D_{ij} = \delta_{l_i,l_j\pm 1} \langle r \rangle (2J_i + 1)(2J_j + 1) \\
\times \left( \begin{array}{ccc} J_i & 1 & J_j \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)^2 \left( \begin{array}{ccc} J_i & 1 & J_j \\ J_j & 0 & J_i \end{array} \right),
\] (29)
noting that for a dipole transition \( \Delta l = \pm 1 \). The factor of \((-1)^{2L_i+J_i+S_i+1}\) is omitted because it does not contribute any meaningful sign change in the summation. For dipole moments, parity is conserved, resulting in consistent state parity. \( S_i + 1 \) is always 1; \( 2L_i \) is always even; and \(-1^{J_i}\) is consistent for all considered transitions. More interestingly, due to the consistent parity of \( J \) for transition states, Eq. 29 is symmetric about variable exchange \( i \leftrightarrow j \), which conforms to the symmetry property of a Green’s function Eq. 14. Using identity (C.37) from,\(^{47}\) Eq. 29 can be further simplified to
\[
D_{ij} = \delta_{l_i,l_j\pm 1} \langle r \rangle \sqrt{(2J_i + 1)(2J_j + 1)} \\
\times \left( \begin{array}{ccc} J_i & 1 & J_j \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)^2.
\] (30)

Now, the main difficulty with calculating \( D_{ij} \) is the evaluation of the radial wave function integral \( \langle r \rangle \):
\[
\langle r \rangle = \langle R_i(r) | r | R_j(r) \rangle \prod_p \langle R_{i,p}(r_p)|R_{j,p}(r_p) \rangle \\
= \int_0^\infty r^3 R_i(r)R_j(r)dr
\] (31)
because the form of the wave functions \( R_i(r) \) must be assumed from prior knowledge. The one-electron model of \( \text{Kr} \) also assumes that only the radial wave function of the excited electron changes, an assumption justified by a Hartree-Fock calculation.\(^{40}\) Therefore, \( \prod_p \langle R_{i,p}(r_p)|R_{j,p}(r_p) \rangle = 1 \) due to the normalization of the radial wave functions.

Excited states of noble gas atoms approximate one-electron atoms, and to first order, electric dipoles. Quantum-defect theory correctly assumes that the excited states of atoms exhibit scaled, hydrogen-like behavior, as verified by our Hartree-Fock calculation shown in Fig. 4. This observation was first made by Rydberg\(^{48}\) and was later exploited by Bethe et al.,\(^{42}\) Bebb et al.,\(^{49}\) and McGuire.\(^{50,51}\) While Hartree-Fock iterates for an explicit electron repulsion potential,\(^{40,46}\) quantum-defect theory directly incorporates the effect of electron repulsion through the use of excited state energy as an input to scale the wave function. With the verified assumption of hydrogenic behavior for excited \( \text{Kr} \) states, quantum-defect radial wave functions can be used with confidence to describe the excited states of \( \text{Kr} \).

Properly normalized hydrogen radial wave functions\(^{52}\) are expressed as
\[
R_{nl}(r) = \left[ \frac{(n-l-1)!}{2n((n+l)!)} \right] \left( \frac{2Ze}{n} \right)^l \times \exp \left( \frac{-Zer}{n} \right) r^{2l+1} \frac{L_{n-l-I_m(l)-1}}{n^{l+1}},
\] (32)
with effective nuclear charge \( Z_e = 1 \) and energy \( E_n = -Ry/n^2 \). Meanwhile, quantum-defect radial wave functions\(^{48}\) are scaled hydrogen radial wave functions and are written similarly as
\[
R_{nl}(E,I_m,r) = \frac{2}{(n^*)^3} \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(n-l-I_m(l))}{\Gamma(n^*+l^*+1)}} \left( \frac{2r}{n^*} \right)^l \\
\times \exp \left( \frac{-r}{n^*} \right) L_{n-l-I_m(l)-1}^{2l+1} \left( \frac{2r}{n^*} \right),
\] (33)
where the effective principal quantum number is

\[ n^* = n - \delta_d, \] (34)

the quantum defect is

\[ \delta_d = n - \sqrt{-\frac{Ry}{E}}, \] (35)

and the effective angular momentum quantum number is

\[ l^* = l - \delta_d + I_m(l). \] (36)

\( \Gamma \) is the gamma function; \(( \ )! \) is the factorial function; and \( L_n^l(x) \) is the associated Laguerre polynomial function of degree \( n \) and input \( y \) evaluated at \( x \). Eq. 33 is a scaled version of Eq. 32.

Quantum-defect radial wave functions are generated by four input parameters \( n, l, E, \) and \( I_m \), which are determined by NIST data and are listed in Table 5 for a basis of Kr states. \( n \) and \( l \) are reported in the Racah notation of a state. Absolute energy \( E \) is obtained by subtracting the first ionization energy of Kr (13.9996053 eV) from the reported NIST energy because NIST reports energy relative to the ground state. For the selection of the integer \( I_m \), Einstein coefficients are used to ensure that the radial wave functions reflect experimental observations. Also, \((\delta_d - l - 1/2) \leq I_m < (n - l - 1)\). By minimizing the discrepancy between calculated Einstein coefficients and tabulated NIST Einstein coefficients through integer variation of \( I_m \), acceptable radial wave functions are constructed for excited Kr states.
Table 5: Input Parameters for Quantum-Defect Radial Wave Functions. This table also provides the basis of states used to calculate two-photon transition matrix element. Data was obtained from NIST. States [5], [6], [9], [11], [12], [15], [16], and [17] are of critical interest for the laser excitation lines considered in this paper. The two-photon excitation wavelengths, $\lambda_L$, are measured in vacuum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>State (Term Symbol)</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$l$</th>
<th>$E$ (eV)</th>
<th>$I_m$</th>
<th>$\lambda_L$ (nm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^5s\ ^2[3/2]_1$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.96720476</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^5s\ ^2[3/2]_2$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4.08437309</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$(2P_{1/2})^5s\ ^2[1/2]_1$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.35597053</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$(2P_{1/2})^5s\ ^2[1/2]_0$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.43719109</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^6p\ ^2[1/2]_0$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.33357724</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>212.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^6p\ ^2[3/2]_2$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.45378261</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>214.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^6p\ ^2[1/2]_1$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.69615013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>219.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^6p\ ^2[5/2]_3$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.55655804</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>216.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^6p\ ^2[5/2]_2$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.55494904</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>216.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^6p\ ^2[3/2]_1$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.47348948</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>215.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$(2P_{1/2})^6p\ ^2[3/2]_2$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.85595245</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>204.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$(2P_{1/2})^6p\ ^2[1/2]_0$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.74313881</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$(2P_{1/2})^6p\ ^2[1/2]_1$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.85917847</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>204.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$(2P_{1/2})^6p\ ^2[3/2]_1$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.89925407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>204.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^6p\ ^2[1/2]_0$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.13480243</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>192.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^6p\ ^2[3/2]_2$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.18427475</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>193.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^6p\ ^2[5/2]_2$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.21412382</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>193.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$(2P_{1/2})^6s\ ^2[1/2]_1$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.96312195</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$(2P_{1/2})^6s\ ^2[3/2]_1$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.61432186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$(2P_{1/2})^7s\ ^2[1/2]_1$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.88570977</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^4d\ ^2[3/2]_2$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1.64504967</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^4d\ ^2[1/2]_2$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1.12982331</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^6d\ ^2[3/2]_1$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.57723040</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>$(2P_{3/2})^6d\ ^2[1/2]_1$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.64946439</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial state $|i\rangle$ has a degenerate azimuth quantum number $m_i$. In a pure dipole moment transition, the only active quantum number is the angular momentum quantum number $l$. Unlike Hillborn, a weighted summation must take place over both $m_i$ and $m_j$ to account for the degeneracy of both quantum numbers in an isotropic electric field $q = 0, \pm 1$. Therefore,

$$A_{ij} = \frac{2e^2\omega_i^2\omega_j^2}{3c^3\hbar\epsilon_0} \sum_{m_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{w_i}} \sum_{m_j} \sum_{q=0,\pm 1} \left| \langle n_i, l_i, m_i, r | n_j, l_j, m_j \rangle \right|^2$$

$$= \frac{2e^2\omega_i^2\omega_j^2}{3c^3\hbar\epsilon_0} \left[ \left( r \right) \sqrt{\frac{(2l_i + 1)(2l_j + 1)}{w_i}} \begin{pmatrix} l_i & 1 & l_j \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right]^2$$

$$= \frac{2e^2\omega_i^2\omega_j^2}{3c^3\hbar\epsilon_0} \left[ \left( r \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right]^2 \text{ for } s \leftrightarrow p \text{ transitions}$$

$$= \frac{2e^2\omega_i^2\omega_j^2}{3c^3\hbar\epsilon_0} \left[ \left( r \right) \frac{2}{\sqrt{9}} \right]^2 \text{ for } p \leftrightarrow d \text{ transitions}$$

(38)
where \( w_i \) is the number of nonzero transitions produced by the degeneracy of \( m_i \) and \( m_j \) in an isotropic radiation field. \( 1/w_i \) is the probability of a transition occurring. See Appendix B for the determination of \( w_i \). For fixed \( l_i \) and \( l_j \), the value of \( w_i \) can be determined from the number of nonzero Clebsch-Gordon coefficients for varying \( m_i \), \( m_j \), and polarization component \( q \). For \( s \leftrightarrow p \) transitions, \( w_i = 3 \); and for \( p \leftrightarrow d \) transitions, \( w_i = 9 \). Eq. 38 amounts to practical means to calculate Einstein coefficients from a set of radial wave functions. Results are shown in Table 6. For the ground state \(|g\rangle\), a Hartree-Fock radial orbital, composed of a linear combination of Slater-type orbitals, from Clementi et al.\(^{40}\) is used:

\[
R_{4p}(r) = 0.08488 \times \text{STO}(2,17.03660, r) + \\
0.00571 \times \text{STO}(2, 26.04380, r) + \\
0.04169 \times \text{STO}(3, 15.51000, r) + \\
-0.07425 \times \text{STO}(3, 9.49403, r) + \\
-0.26866 \times \text{STO}(3, 6.57275, r) + \\
0.01341 \times \text{STO}(4, 5.38507, r) + \\
0.51241 \times \text{STO}(4, 3.15603, r) + \\
0.42557 \times \text{STO}(4, 2.02966, r) + \\
0.18141 \times \text{STO}(4, 1.42733, r),
\]

(39)

where the normalized Slater Type Orbital (STO) function is defined as

\[
\text{STO}(n, \zeta, r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2n)!}} (2\zeta)^{n+1/2} r^{n-1} e^{-\zeta r}.
\]

(40)

This ground-state Hartree-Fock radial wave function assumes a spherically symmetric electric charge distribution and accounts to first order the electron-repulsion exerted on a \( 4p \) electron. Electron repulsion shields a valence \( 4p \) electron from the attractive potential of the Kr nucleus, increasing its ground state energy beyond that of a pure one-electron atom of atomic number \( Z = 36 \). In eq. (40), \( \zeta \) is interpreted as a shielding parameter obtained by curve fitting the numerical results of a Hartree-Fock calculation.

In Table 6, Einstein coefficients are calculated via Eq. 38 with varying accuracy but to the correct order of magnitude. The QDT parameter, \( I_m \), is tuned to maximize the accuracy of \( A_{ij} \). By obtaining the correct order of magnitude and in some cases the correct Einstein coefficient, Table 6 further validates the use of quantum-defect radial wave functions Eq. 33.

With a basis of wave functions calibrated on NIST atomic spectra data, Eqs. 19 and 8 are directly evaluated, producing the two-photon cross-section data shown in Fig. 5. The values of cross-sections are shown in Tables 7, 8, and 9. When quantum-defect radial wave functions are used in conjunction with oscillator strength formulas for linear polarization,\(^{37}\) such as

\[
\langle i | \hat{\epsilon} \cdot \hat{r} | j \rangle = \frac{3A_{ij}\hbar c^2\epsilon_o}{2e^2\omega_{ij}} \sqrt{2J_i+1} \left( \begin{array}{ccc} J_i & 1 & J_j \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right),
\]

(41)

good agreement is obtained with the Richardson et al.\(^{13}\) excitation spectrum, especially using basis sets 2 and 3, which include \( d \) orbitals. In Table 10, single-path cross-section results are also calculated and tabulated for comparison to results listed in Table 9.

The resulting approach is a hybrid method for the evaluation of dipole matrix elements, consisting of quantum defect theory and where possible, oscillator strengths. Another contribution of quantum defect theory is the prediction of the sign of the radial matrix element from the evaluation of Eq. 31. The oscillator strength, Eq. 41, must retain the same sign as Eq. 31 and Eq. 29. This sign determines which excitation pathways make constructive and destructive contributions to the two-photon transition matrix element. Also, wherever Eq. 41 is used for the evaluation of a matrix element, the equality, \( D_{ij} = D_{ji} \), must be

\(^{41}\)Two Notations:\(^{41}\) (1) Russell-Saunders \( ^{2S+1}L_J \) notation for Kr ground state \(|g\rangle\). (2) Racah \( ^{(2S+1)}P_{\frac{J_o}{2}} \) \( nl^{(2S+1)}|K\rangle_J \) notation\(^{41}\) for excited Kr states. \( \vec{K} = \vec{J} + \vec{s} \), \( \vec{J} = \vec{K} + \vec{s} \), and \( \vec{K} = \vec{L} + \vec{S}_t \). \( S_t \) is the total electron spin of the ion, \( s \) is the spin of the excited electron, and \( L \) is the total orbital angular momentum. \( S = S_t + \vec{s} \).
Table 6: Calculation of Einstein coefficients using quantum defect functions and comparison with NIST experimental data.41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Wavelength (nm)</th>
<th>( A_{ij} (1/s) )</th>
<th>Acc.</th>
<th>( A_{ij} (1/s) )</th>
<th>% Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[23] ( \rightarrow ) [g]</td>
<td>92.3713</td>
<td>1.14 \times 10^8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.16 \times 10^7</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[24] ( \rightarrow ) [g]</td>
<td>92.8711</td>
<td>3.87 \times 10^6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.64 \times 10^5</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[22] ( \rightarrow ) [g]</td>
<td>96.3374</td>
<td>3.35 \times 10^7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.13 \times 10^6</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[20] ( \rightarrow ) [g]</td>
<td>94.5441</td>
<td>2.81 \times 10^8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.0450 \times 10^8</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[18] ( \rightarrow ) [g]</td>
<td>95.1056</td>
<td>2.58 \times 10^7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6.8928 \times 10^7</td>
<td>167.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[19] ( \rightarrow ) [g]</td>
<td>100.1061</td>
<td>3.42 \times 10^8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.68 \times 10^8</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[21] ( \rightarrow ) [g]</td>
<td>100.3550</td>
<td>1.82 \times 10^8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.37 \times 10^8</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] ( \rightarrow ) [g]</td>
<td>116.4867</td>
<td>3.09 \times 10^8</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>2.33 \times 10^8</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] ( \rightarrow ) [g]</td>
<td>123.5838</td>
<td>2.98 \times 10^8</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>4.97 \times 10^8</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[15] ( \rightarrow ) [2]</td>
<td>427.5172</td>
<td>1.99 \times 10^6</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>1.74 \times 10^6</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[16] ( \rightarrow ) [1]</td>
<td>437.7351</td>
<td>3.74 \times 10^6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.45 \times 10^6</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[15] ( \rightarrow ) [1]</td>
<td>445.5168</td>
<td>3.97 \times 10^5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.92 \times 10^5</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17] ( \rightarrow ) [1]</td>
<td>450.3617</td>
<td>7.8 \times 10^5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.59 \times 10^5</td>
<td>488.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] ( \rightarrow ) [1]</td>
<td>758.7414</td>
<td>4.310 \times 10^7</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>4.77 \times 10^7</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] ( \rightarrow ) [2]</td>
<td>760.1546</td>
<td>2.732 \times 10^7</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>2.78 \times 10^7</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12] ( \rightarrow ) [3]</td>
<td>768.7361</td>
<td>4.064 \times 10^7</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>2.98 \times 10^7</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10] ( \rightarrow ) [2]</td>
<td>769.6658</td>
<td>4.27 \times 10^6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.74 \times 10^7</td>
<td>540.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[13] ( \rightarrow ) [4]</td>
<td>785.6984</td>
<td>2.041 \times 10^7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.14 \times 10^7</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14] ( \rightarrow ) [4]</td>
<td>806.1721</td>
<td>1.583 \times 10^7</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>2.19 \times 10^7</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8] ( \rightarrow ) [2]</td>
<td>811.5132</td>
<td>3.610 \times 10^7</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>3.50 \times 10^7</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] ( \rightarrow ) [1]</td>
<td>819.2308</td>
<td>8.94 \times 10^6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.75 \times 10^7</td>
<td>207.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] ( \rightarrow ) [1]</td>
<td>877.9161</td>
<td>2.217 \times 10^7</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>2.43 \times 10^7</td>
<td>9.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7] ( \rightarrow ) [3]</td>
<td>893.1145</td>
<td>2.289 \times 10^7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.24 \times 10^7</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

used to ensure symmetry. This properly interfaces quantum-defect theory with oscillator strength formulas, creating the hybrid dipole matrix element evaluation method and thus allowing for the eventual extension of Eq. 19 to general multiphoton excitation. For example, for three photon excitation, the entire dipole matrix \( D \) is used:

\[
M^{(3)}_{fg} = \sum_{k=g}^{N} \sum_{p=g}^{N} D_{jk}G_{kk}D_{kp}G_{pp}D_{pg} = e_f^T DGDGD\hat{e}_g. \tag{42}
\]

When using a hybrid dipole matrix element calculation scheme, selection of states with adequate experimental data is crucial for reasonable results. Insufficient transition probability data rendered some state omissions in the finite basis of states listed in Table 5. For example, only one 4d orbital, state [21], was used in basis sets 2 and 3 (Tables 8 and 9) because it had the highest, observed transition probability of all 4d states between itself and ground, and it had the highest experimentally measured, transition probability between itself and a 5p state: [21] \( \rightarrow \) [10]. It was the only state with high transition probabilities between 4d and 5p levels. More importantly, state [21] exhibited dipole-moment behavior, which could be described by quantum-defect theory. The effect of other 4d orbitals on the excitation process is small but can be better determined once more transition probabilities become available for transitions between 4d and 5p states. However, the inclusion of other 4d states will not significantly change the excitation spectrum shown in Fig. 5. The same reasoning was made for the inclusion of 5d and 6d states in basis set 3.
### Table 7: Two-photon Cross-sections using Basis Set 1: 5s, 6s, and 7s states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Quantum-Defect</th>
<th>Quantum-Defect with Oscillator Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_L$ (nm)</td>
<td>$\sigma_o^{(2)}$ (cm$^4$)</td>
<td>$\sigma^{(2)}$ = $\sigma_o^{(2)} g(2\omega L)$ (cm$^4 \cdot s$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\frac{\sigma^{(2)}}{|\sigma^{(2)}|_\infty}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192.749</td>
<td>$7.02 \times 10^{-37}$</td>
<td>$2.29 \times 10^{-47}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.494</td>
<td>$5.01 \times 10^{-37}$</td>
<td>$1.64 \times 10^{-47}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.947</td>
<td>$7.28 \times 10^{-37}$</td>
<td>$2.39 \times 10^{-47}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.316</td>
<td>$2.17 \times 10^{-35}$</td>
<td>$7.39 \times 10^{-46}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204.196</td>
<td>$2.55 \times 10^{-35}$</td>
<td>$8.74 \times 10^{-46}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212.556</td>
<td>$1.39 \times 10^{-34}$</td>
<td>$4.91 \times 10^{-45}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.769</td>
<td>$5.56 \times 10^{-35}$</td>
<td>$1.98 \times 10^{-46}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216.667</td>
<td>$6.23 \times 10^{-35}$</td>
<td>$2.24 \times 10^{-46}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8: Two-photon Cross-sections using only Basis Set 2: 5s, 6s, 7s, and 4d states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Quantum-Defect</th>
<th>Quantum-Defect with Oscillator Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_L$ (nm)</td>
<td>$\sigma_o^{(2)}$ (cm$^4$)</td>
<td>$\sigma^{(2)}$ = $\sigma_o^{(2)} g(2\omega L)$ (cm$^4 \cdot s$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\frac{\sigma^{(2)}}{|\sigma^{(2)}|_\infty}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192.749</td>
<td>$2.56 \times 10^{-35}$</td>
<td>$8.37 \times 10^{-46}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.494</td>
<td>$9.85 \times 10^{-35}$</td>
<td>$7.42 \times 10^{-46}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.947</td>
<td>$1.73 \times 10^{-35}$</td>
<td>$5.67 \times 10^{-46}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.316</td>
<td>$1.04 \times 10^{-34}$</td>
<td>$3.55 \times 10^{-45}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204.196</td>
<td>$9.85 \times 10^{-35}$</td>
<td>$3.37 \times 10^{-45}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212.556</td>
<td>$2.51 \times 10^{-34}$</td>
<td>$8.86 \times 10^{-45}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.769</td>
<td>$1.32 \times 10^{-34}$</td>
<td>$4.71 \times 10^{-45}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216.667</td>
<td>$1.38 \times 10^{-34}$</td>
<td>$4.95 \times 10^{-45}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9: Two-photon Cross-sections using only Basis Set 3: 5s, 6s, 7s, 4d, 5d, and 6d states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Quantum-Defect</th>
<th>Quantum-Defect with Oscillator Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_L$ (nm)</td>
<td>$\sigma_o^{(2)}$ (cm$^4$)</td>
<td>$\sigma^{(2)}$ = $\sigma_o^{(2)} g(2\omega L)$ (cm$^4 \cdot s$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\frac{\sigma^{(2)}}{|\sigma^{(2)}|_\infty}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192.749</td>
<td>$6.53 \times 10^{-35}$</td>
<td>$2.13 \times 10^{-45}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.494</td>
<td>$5.31 \times 10^{-35}$</td>
<td>$1.74 \times 10^{-45}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.947</td>
<td>$4.46 \times 10^{-35}$</td>
<td>$1.47 \times 10^{-45}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.316</td>
<td>$1.46 \times 10^{-34}$</td>
<td>$4.96 \times 10^{-45}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204.196</td>
<td>$1.32 \times 10^{-34}$</td>
<td>$4.53 \times 10^{-45}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212.556</td>
<td>$2.92 \times 10^{-34}$</td>
<td>$1.03 \times 10^{-44}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.769</td>
<td>$1.62 \times 10^{-34}$</td>
<td>$5.79 \times 10^{-45}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216.667</td>
<td>$1.67 \times 10^{-34}$</td>
<td>$6.01 \times 10^{-45}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: Single-Path Approximation Calculations.

| $\lambda_L$ (nm) | State | State | $\sigma^{(2)}_0$ ($cm^4$) | $\sigma^{(2)}$ ($cm^4 \cdot s$) | $||\sigma^{(2)}||_\infty$ |
|------------------|-------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 192.749          | 1     | 15    | $4.73 \times 10^{-37}$ | $1.55 \times 10^{-47}$ | 0.016           |
| 193.494          | 1     | 16    | $1.04 \times 10^{-37}$ | $3.40 \times 10^{-48}$ | 0.004           |
| 193.947          | 1     | 17    | $2.01 \times 10^{-37}$ | $6.60 \times 10^{-48}$ | 0.007           |
| 202.316          | 3     | 12    | $1.40 \times 10^{-35}$ | $4.75 \times 10^{-46}$ | 0.496           |
| 204.196          | 3     | 11    | $2.80 \times 10^{-35}$ | $9.57 \times 10^{-46}$ | 1.000           |
| 212.556          | 1     | 5     | $1.72 \times 10^{-35}$ | $6.08 \times 10^{-46}$ | 0.635           |
| 214.769          | 1     | 6     | $8.54 \times 10^{-35}$ | $3.05 \times 10^{-46}$ | 0.318           |
| 216.667          | 1     | 9     | $2.50 \times 10^{-35}$ | $8.98 \times 10^{-46}$ | 0.939           |

Figure 5: Two-photon excitation cross-sections using basis set 3 as the basis of intermediate states, which included 5s, 6s, 7s, 4d, 5d, and 6d states. Via quantum-defect theory (QDT) and oscillator strength formulas, cross-sections were calculated and compared to the excitation data of Richardson et al., Grib et al., and our lab. Richardson data was obtained by fs-laser excitation in a 1 bar, 95% Ar/5% gas mixture. Grib data were obtained by both fs-laser and ns-laser excitations in a 1 atm, 77% N$_2$/33% Kr gas mixture. Our lab data was obtained via ns-laser excitation in 1 torr, 99% N$_2$/1% Kr gas mixture to minimize collisional effects. Calculated cross-sections and normalized experimental excitation data are listed in Appendix A.

V. Comparison of Two-Photon Cross-section Calculation with Experiment

Cross-section calculations are reported for eight excitation lines (192.749 nm, 193.494 nm, 193.947 nm, 202.316 nm, 204.196 nm, 212.556 nm, 214.769 nm, 216.667 nm) in Tables 7, 8, and 9 for basis sets 1, 2, and 3 respectively. Due to short timescales, these cross-section calculations are then directly compared to

$^a$NIST estimated accuracy of Einstein Coefficient. AAA $\leq$ 0.3%, AA $\leq$ 1%, A $\leq$ 3%, B+ $\leq$ 7%, B $\leq$ 10%, C+ $\leq$ 18%, C $\leq$ 25%.
three sets of excitation spectrum data in Fig. 5 with good agreement. The first experimental data set is from our lab’s nanosecond excitation at 212.556 nm, 214.769 nm, and 216.667 nm. Excitation lines at lower wavelengths with the setup are not currently accessible. Additionally, we present the Richardson et al.\textsuperscript{13} excitation spectrum from a femtosecond excitation at 202.316 nm, 204.196 nm, 212.556 nm, 214.769 nm, and 216.667 nm. This spectrum approximates the impulse/natural response of the Kr atom. Due to the short timescales of excitation of Richardson et al.\textsuperscript{13} and due to the closely clustered energies of eight, two-photon excited krypton states, the two-photon cross-section can be compared directly to the fluorescence results. The plotted, relative fluorescence signal magnitudes for 212.556 nm and 214.769 nm excitation of Grib et al.\textsuperscript{14} also agree with both Richardson et al.\textsuperscript{13} excitation spectrum and our excitation spectrum, regardless of fs- or ns- laser excitation. Normalized experimental excitation data are listed in Table 11 for all considered data sets. In Fig. 5, comparison is also made to the single-path approximation, whose cross-section values are listed in Table 10. Single-path approximation is unable to reconstruct the experimentally observed excitation spectrum, but it can obtain rough estimates of cross-sections.

The convergence of the summation over the intermediate basis set $|k\rangle$ is shown in tables 7, 8, and 9, which agrees with the convergence criterion of Eq. 13: $n_{\text{max}} \leq 7$. The rate of convergence cannot be inferred, but for basis sets 1-3, the Richardson trend is present for the 212.556 nm, 214.769 nm, and 216.667 nm excitation lines.

In Table 9, the calculated cross-section for 214.769 nm excitation is $4.18 \times 10^{-35}$ cm$^4$. This cross-section agrees well with the experimentally measured 214.769 nm two-photon cross-section of Dakka et al.\textsuperscript{33} $5.2 \pm 2.2 \times 10^{-35}$ cm$^4$. This validates the order of magnitude and accuracy of calculated cross-sections for basis set 3.

Overall, the comparison of the calculated two-photon cross-sections with the experimental data of multiple research groups is good for lines between 200-220 nm. Cross-sections for lines between 190-200 nm are predictions calculated by the method described within this paper. The multi-path, finite basis approximation of the two-photon transition matrix element, $M_{ji}^{(2)}$, generated context for each calculated excitation cross-section. From a first order perturbation calculation, an entire excitation spectrum was constructed with sufficient accuracy. This paper improved the effectiveness of first order perturbation theory for multiphoton processes beyond a mere order of magnitude calculation.

### VI. Experimental Setup

The experiments were performed in a test cell that had optical ports for a laser and camera. The cell was maintained at room temperature. Two quiescent gas mixtures were used, 99% N$_2$/1% Kr and 75% N$_2$/20% O$_2$/5% Kr. The pressure was varied from 1-100 torr in the 99% N$_2$/1% Kr mixture and from 1-50 torr in the 75% N$_2$/5% Kr/20% O$_2$ mixture. The maximum pressure for the 75% N$_2$/5% Kr/20% O$_2$ mixture is lower because beyond 50 torr the signal was entirely quenched owing to the presence of O$_2$ at the current laser power.

A frequency-doubled Quanta Ray Pro-350 Nd:YAG laser pumping a frequency tripled Sirah PrecisionScan Dye Laser (DCM dye, DMSO solvent) is the approach used for nanosecond excitation in this work. A schematic of the optical setup is shown in Fig. 6. The Nd:YAG laser pumps the dye laser with 1000 mJ/pulse at a wavelength of 532 nm. The dye laser is tuned to output a 637.67/644.31/650.01 nm beam and frequency tripling (Sirah THU 205) of the dye-laser output results in a 212.56/214.77/216.67 nm beam, with 3 mJ energy, 1350 MHz linewidth and 7 ns pulselwidth at a repetition rate of 10 Hz. The write beam was focused into the test section with a 200 mm focal-length, fused-silica lens. The beam fluence and spectral intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\lambda_e$ (nm)</th>
<th>202.316</th>
<th>204.196</th>
<th>212.556</th>
<th>214.769</th>
<th>216.667</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richardson et al. fs-excitation</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grib et al. fs-excitation</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grib et al. ns-excitation</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Work ns-excitation</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Experimental Kr Excitation Signal normalized against 212.556 nm Excitation Signal.
at the waist were $1.28 \times 10^4 \text{ J/cm}^2$ and $1.35 \times 10^3 \text{ W/(cm}^2 \text{ Hz)}$, respectively.

Excitation of the Kr metastable state was accomplished by a continuous wave 2.65 W Toptica TA Pro Laser diode, which outputted a $\lambda_L = 769.45470 \text{ nm}$ beam with a waist of 3.28 mm. The diode wavelength was regulated by feedback control on the piezoelectric voltage input of the DCL Pro, which powered the diode. The feedback and control signals were provided by a WS7-4150 Wavelength Meter, which measured the wavelength of the diode to 0.00001 nm precision and implemented the PI-control law. Online tuning obtained PI-control gains. The sampling rate of the wavelength meter was set between 90-100 ms. In order to prevent saturation of the piezoelectric voltage, manual tuning of the diode diffraction grating via a 2.5 mm Allen key was used to bring the diode within $\pm 0.02 \text{ nm}$ from the desired operating wavelength, prior to the implementation of the control law.

The intensified CCD camera used for all experiments is a Princeton Instruments PIMAX-4 (PM4-1024i-HR-1P46-CM) with a Nikon NIKKOR 24-85mm f/2.8-4D lens in “macro” mode and positioned approximately 200 mm from the write/read location. The camera gate opens once immediately after the write laser pulse, for 50 ns to capture the fluorescence from transitions C, D, M, N, O in Fig. 1. The raw image from the camera was processed using a Gaussian peak finding algorithm from O’Haver to quantify the value of the peak in each row of the fluorescence image. The final value of the signal that is reported is the average value of the peaks in the rows closest to the focus of the tagged line.

VII. Experimental Results

In Figs. 7 and 8, experimental data is presented for each stage of Kr laser-induced fluorescence (LIF) to highlight physical features that would otherwise be difficult to model. One example would be the signal contribution of radiative cascade in a cold, partially ionized Kr plasma and the relative SNR of laser excitation schemes at different times $\Delta t$ after the rising edge of the laser pulse, both with and without an 800 nm highpass filter.

In the fluorescence vs. pressure curves shown in Figs. 7 and 8, the 212.556 nm excitation line has the greatest fluorescence of the lines considered at zero time delay, indicating its optimality for Kr-PLIF. Also evident from Figs. 7 and 8 is that 216 nm is the best excitation line for KTV with the read excitation performed with a CW laser diode.

Time-dependent phenomena such as pressure-dependent collisional de-excitation and collision-driven electron cooling become important and affect the fluorescence signal, notably more in air than in N$_2$.

VIII. Conclusions

This paper presents multi-path, two-photon excitation cross-section calculations for krypton that compare well to experiment for lines between 200-220 nm, as shown in fig. 5. Cross-sections were also calculated for excitation wavelengths lying between 190-200 nm.
Figure 7: Kr Fluorescence signal in 99% N$_2$/1% Kr at Time $\Delta t$ after dye laser pulse: (Top Left) 0 ns, (Top Right) 250 ns, (Bottom Left) 500 ns, and (Bottom Right) 1000 ns. This is two-laser excitation. A 769.4547 nm continuous diode was used to excite metastable Kr. The filter used was an 800 highpass filter.

To make these calculations, a hybrid method was used, consisting of oscillator-strengths, and where those are unlisted in the NIST data, QDT, to evaluate reduced matrix elements $\langle \vec{r} \rangle$ and purely radial matrix elements $\langle r \rangle$. QDT was used to (1) construct radial wave functions for excited Kr states and (2) predict the sign of tabulated and calculated oscillator strengths from NIST. Including the transition pathways unlisted in the NIST data was key to increasing the accuracy of the calculation. These pathways were constructed from a finite basis of states (listed in Table 5) consisting of 4p, 5s, 6s, 7s, 5p, 6p, 4d, 5d, and 6d orbitals.

Most importantly, this work provides a fundamental physical understanding in identifying the optimal Kr fluorescence excitation line (i.e., Kr-PLIF or KTV). This paper resolved the fine structure nature of eight 5p and 6p Kr states produced by two-photon excitation. From this work and the successful comparison to experiment from our lab and those in the literature, we conclude that the optimal line is 212.556 nm for Kr-PLIF and single-laser KTV. For KTV where the read step in performed with a CW laser diode, the 216.667 nm write-laser excitation is optimal.
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Figure 8: Kr Fluorescence Signal in 5%-Kr, 20%-O₂, and 75%-N₂ at Time Δt after laser pulse. (a) 0 ns, (b) 250 ns, (c) 500 ns, and (d) 1000 ns.

method in the Hartree-Fock method.
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Appendix A: An Intermediate State in Two-Photon Excitation

This section is included to discuss the nature of intermediate states $|i\rangle$ and why it is valid to assume a basis of normalized eigenstates $|k\rangle$. Consider intermediate state $|i\rangle$ composed of a linear combination of states $|k\rangle$, weighted by coefficients $c_{ik}$:

$$|i\rangle = \sum_k c_{ik} |k\rangle. \quad (43)$$

A physical property that intermediate state $|i\rangle$ must satisfy is expected energy:

$$E_g + \hbar \omega_L = \langle i | \hat{H} | i \rangle, \quad (44)$$

where $\hat{H}$ is the Hamiltonian operator. Another property that must be satisfied is normalization:

$$1 = \langle i | i \rangle = \sum_{k,k'} \delta_{k,k'} c_{ik} c_{ik'} \langle k | k' \rangle = \sum_k c_{ik} c_{ik}. \quad (45)$$

Let us revisit equation eq. (19) but perform the summation in the physical intermediate basis $|i\rangle$:

$$M_{fg}^{(2)} = \sum_{i=g}^N D_{fi} G_{ii} D_{ig}. \quad (46)$$

Applying eqs. (43) and (45),

$$M_{fg}^{(2)} = \sum_{k=g}^N \sum_{k'=g}^N \sum_{i=g}^N \delta_{kk'} D_{fi} c_{ik} c_{ik'} G_{ii} D_{ig}. \quad (47)$$

Since $|i\rangle$ is expressed by basis set $|k\rangle$, $c_{ik}$ is a diagonal matrix and $k = i$. Hence,

$$M_{fg}^{(2)} = \sum_{k=g}^N D_{fk} (c_{kk} c_{kk}) G_{kk} (c_{kk} c_{kk}) D_{kg}$$

$$= \sum_{k=g}^N D_{fk} G_{kk} D_{kg} = \hat{e}_f DGD\hat{e}_g. \quad (48)$$

By recovering the result of eq. (19), basis set $|k\rangle$ correctly describes the intermediate state of two-photon excitation. For intermediate states, it is not necessary to solve for a mixed state $|\tilde{i}\rangle$, i.e. the sum of linearly weighted states described in eq. (45). Basis set $|k\rangle$ serves perfectly well, essentially due to the tensor properties of the two-photon transition matrix $M^2$.

Appendix B: Determination of Weighting parameter $w_t$

The probability of a dipole transition occurring between two degenerate states in an isotropic electric field is $1/w_t$. Thus, the weight on a single dipole moment is $1/\sqrt{w_t}$ because the probability rate of a dipole transition is proportional to the square of the dipole moment. This section also showcases the symmetry of the 3j-Wigner symbol (the Clebsch-Gordan coefficient) due to the even parity of the sum, $J_i + 1 + J_j$, which represents the sum of the first row. This further cements the symmetry of the dipole matrix $D$. Matrix $D$ is indeed a rank 2 tensor.

**Case 1a:** Transitions with $l_j = 0$ to $l_i = 1$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$$

(49)

In this case, there are three possible transitions: $w_t = 3$. The 2-norm is 1.
Case 1b: Transitions with $l_j = 1$ to $l_i = 0$

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & -1
\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & -1 & 1
\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}
\]

This case also has three possible transitions: $w_t = 3$. The 2-norm is 1.

Case 2a: Transitions with $l_j = 1$ to $l_i = 2$

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
2 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{15}} \begin{pmatrix}
2 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & -1
\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{30}} \begin{pmatrix}
2 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & -1 & 1
\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{30}}
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
2 & 1 & 1 \\
-1 & 1 & 0
\end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \begin{pmatrix}
2 & 1 & 1 \\
-1 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \begin{pmatrix}
2 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & -1 & 0
\end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}}
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
2 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & -1
\end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \begin{pmatrix}
2 & 1 & 1 \\
-2 & 1 & 1
\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \begin{pmatrix}
2 & 1 & 1 \\
2 & -1 & -1
\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}}
\]

This case has nine possible transitions: $w_t = 9$. The 2-norm is 1.

Case 2b: Transitions with $l_j = 2$ to $l_i = 1$

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 2 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{15}} \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 2 \\
-1 & 1 & 0
\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{30}} \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 2 \\
1 & -1 & 0
\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{30}}
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 2 \\
0 & 1 & -1
\end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 2 \\
0 & -1 & 1
\end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 2 \\
1 & 0 & -1
\end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}}
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 2 \\
-1 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 2 \\
1 & 1 & -2
\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 2 \\
-1 & -1 & 2
\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}}
\]

This case also has nine possible transitions: $w_t = 9$. The 2-norm is 1.