



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Molecular Spectroscopy

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jms

Note

Edge effects in chirped-pulse Fourier transform microwave spectra



G. Barratt Park*, Robert W. Field

Department of Chemistry, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 22 December 2014

In revised form 13 March 2015

Available online 27 March 2015

Keywords:

Chirped-pulse

Microwave spectroscopy

Millimeter waves

Dynamics

ABSTRACT

Recent applications of chirped-pulse Fourier transform microwave and millimeter wave spectroscopy have motivated the use of short (10–50 ns) chirped excitation pulses. In this regime, individual transitions within the chirped pulse bandwidth do not all, in effect, experience the same frequency sweep through resonance from far above to far below (or vice versa), and “edge effects” may dominate the relative intensities. We analyze this effect and provide simplifying expressions for the linear fast passage polarization response in the limit of long and short excitation pulses. In the long pulse limit, the polarization response converges to a rectangular function of frequency, and in the short pulse limit, the polarization response morphs into a form proportional to the window function of the Fourier-transform-limited excitation pulse.

© 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Chirped-pulse Fourier-transform microwave (CP-FTMW) spectroscopy, invented in Professor Brooks Pate's lab [1,2], is rapidly becoming a mainstream technique for broadband (> 10 GHz) high-resolution microwave and millimeter-wave spectroscopy. Since its inception, CP-FTMW has also been a dynamically-relevant technique. Dian et al. [2] show that the spectral coalescence of the broadband rotational spectrum of a highly vibrationally-excited species can be used to extract dynamical information about intramolecular vibrational energy redistribution (IVR) and chemical isomerization. Fine structure in the chirped-pulse spectrum of the prism isomer of the water hexamer enables the measurement of hydrogen-bond network rearrangement [3]. Prozument et al. [4] have used chirped-pulse millimeter wave spectroscopy to obtain meaningful product branching ratios and vibrational population distributions from a flash pyrolysis reactor. Recent work in the A. G. Suits lab [5,6] has demonstrated the use of time-domain CP-FTMW measurements to measure the vibrationally-specific rate of appearance of unimolecular and bimolecular reaction products in a cold uniform flow.

Because of growing interest in CP-FTMW as a tool for kinetics and dynamics, there is an increasing necessity for reliable, quantitatively accurate measurement of relative intensity across broadband spectral regions. At the same time, several factors are driving researchers to use chirped excitation pulses of shorter

duration. First, there has been a push to extend chirped-pulse spectroscopy to higher millimeter-wave frequencies, where Doppler dephasing times become short [7–9]. Next, the use of CP-FTMW by Abeysekera et al. [6] to study bimolecular reactions at pressures as high as ~ 0.2 mbar leads to a regime where the coherence time is shortened by pressure broadening. Indeed, the authors of Ref. [6] found that when using 1 μ s long excitation pulses, dephasing phenomena had a significant effect on the relative intensities. As a result of dephasing during the excitation pulse, intensities of transitions that were excited early in the chirped pulse were weakened relative to those of transitions excited later in the pulse. The problem was mitigated by decreasing the pulse duration to 250 ns, or by taking the frequency-domain average between spectra from “up-chirp” and “down-chirp” excitation pulses. (See Fig. 2 of Ref. [6].) Proposed experiments to probe pure-electronic transitions in Rydberg molecules rely on chirped pulse schemes for rapidly populating non-core-penetrating high- l states before predissociation occurs [10,11]. Finally, kinetic schemes involving time-resolved broadband microwave spectroscopy [6] motivate fast excitation pulses to achieve the best time-resolution for monitoring state-resolved reactant and product populations.

References [4,12] discuss the need for the chirped excitation pulse to be in the weak-field (fast-passage) limit rather than the strong-field (adiabatic rapid passage) limit in order to avoid saturation effects on the relative intensities. References [6,13] and others discuss the need for the duration of the excitation pulse to be short relative to the coherence decay time in order to achieve accurate relative intensities. However, most authors have ignored “edge effects” on relative intensities in chirped-pulse spectra. Therefore, we will discuss these effects briefly. These effects

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: barratt@mit.edu, barratt.park@gmail.com (G.B. Park), rwfield@mit.edu (R.W. Field).

become pronounced as one uses shorter excitation pulses. It is important to point out that we do not derive any novel physics in this paper. Our results may all be obtained from analysis of the equations presented in Refs. [14,15] and reviewed in detail in Ref. [16].

2. Polarization from a linearly chirped pulse in the weak coupling limit

The polarization response $P = 2(P_r \cos \omega t - P_i \sin \omega t)$ of a two-level system to a linearly swept excitation pulse of the form $E = 2\mathcal{E} \cos(\omega t - kz)$ is reported in the weak coupling limit by McGurk et al. [15,14] and is also discussed in Ref. [13] and reviewed in detail in Ref. [16]. If phenomenological dephasing terms are ignored, the optical Bloch equations for this situation is exactly solvable. The solution is given by

$$P_r = \frac{|\mu_{ab}|^2 \mathcal{E} \Delta N_0}{\hbar} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha}} \left\{ \sin \left(\frac{(\Delta\omega_f)^2}{2\alpha} \right) \left[-C \left(\frac{\Delta\omega_i}{(\pi\alpha)^{1/2}} \right) + C \left(\frac{\Delta\omega_f}{(\pi\alpha)^{1/2}} \right) \right] - \cos \left(\frac{(\Delta\omega_f)^2}{2\alpha} \right) \left[-S \left(\frac{\Delta\omega_i}{(\pi\alpha)^{1/2}} \right) + S \left(\frac{\Delta\omega_f}{(\pi\alpha)^{1/2}} \right) \right] \right\} \quad (1)$$

$$P_i = -\frac{|\mu_{ab}|^2 \mathcal{E} \Delta N_0}{\hbar} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha}} \left\{ \cos \left(\frac{(\Delta\omega_f)^2}{2\alpha} \right) \left[-C \left(\frac{\Delta\omega_i}{(\pi\alpha)^{1/2}} \right) + C \left(\frac{\Delta\omega_f}{(\pi\alpha)^{1/2}} \right) \right] + \sin \left(\frac{(\Delta\omega_f)^2}{2\alpha} \right) \left[-S \left(\frac{\Delta\omega_i}{(\pi\alpha)^{1/2}} \right) + S \left(\frac{\Delta\omega_f}{(\pi\alpha)^{1/2}} \right) \right] \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where $C(a)$ and $S(a)$ are the Fresnel integrals,

$$C(a) = \int_0^a \cos(\pi x^2/2) dx, \quad S(a) = \int_0^a \sin(\pi x^2/2) dx,$$

μ_{ab} is the transition dipole moment, ΔN_0 is the population difference of the two-level system, \mathcal{E} and α are the electric field strength and sweep rate of the driving pulse, respectively, and $\Delta\omega_i$ and $\Delta\omega_f$ are the initial and final values of the detuning from resonance. We have simplified the expression derived by McGurk et al. noting that the Fresnel integrals are odd functions, $C(-a) = -C(a)$ and $S(-a) = -S(a)$, which allows us to remove the absolute values and the \pm choices.

The solutions (1) and (2) seem complicated, but the form is simplified by the assumptions

$$|\Delta\omega_i| \gg (\pi\alpha)^{1/2}, \quad |\Delta\omega_f| \gg (\pi\alpha)^{1/2}. \quad (3)$$

With this assumption, we can use the limiting behavior of the Fresnel integrals,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{a \rightarrow -\infty} C(a) &= -0.5 & \lim_{a \rightarrow -\infty} S(a) &= -0.5 \\ \lim_{a \rightarrow +\infty} C(a) &= +0.5 & \lim_{a \rightarrow +\infty} S(a) &= +0.5, \end{aligned}$$

We assume the case where $\Delta\omega$ is swept through resonance from negative to positive ($\Delta\omega_i < 0$, $\Delta\omega_f > 0$, and $\alpha > 0$). From Assumption (3), we obtain

$$P_r \approx \frac{|\mu_{ab}|^2 \mathcal{E} \Delta N_0}{\hbar} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha}} \left\{ \sin \left(\frac{(\Delta\omega_f)^2}{2\alpha} \right) - \cos \left(\frac{(\Delta\omega_f)^2}{2\alpha} \right) \right\} \quad (4)$$

$$P_i \approx -\frac{|\mu_{ab}|^2 \mathcal{E} \Delta N_0}{\hbar} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha}} \left\{ \cos \left(\frac{(\Delta\omega_f)^2}{2\alpha} \right) + \sin \left(\frac{(\Delta\omega_f)^2}{2\alpha} \right) \right\}. \quad (5)$$

In the case where $\Delta\omega$ is swept in the other direction, the phase of Eqs. (4), (5) will change, but the magnitude will remain the same. Assumption (3) will hold for most chirped pulse experiments as long as the sweep rate is not too fast and the molecular resonance

is not too close in frequency to the initial or final frequency of the linearly swept excitation pulse—i.e., if the transition is not too close to the high- or low-frequency edge of the spectrum. For a typical chirped pulse experiment, the excitation pulse sweeps through a bandwidth of ~ 10 GHz during a time interval of $\sim 1 \mu\text{s}$, so $\alpha \approx 10^{16} \text{ s}^{-2}$ and $(\pi\alpha)^{1/2} \approx 180$ MHz. Furthermore, in this case, the values of the square-bracketed terms in Eqs. (1) and (2) will be within $\sim 20\%$ of unity for any transition not within 30 MHz of the boundaries $\Delta\omega_i$ or $\Delta\omega_f$, so the approximation in Eqs. (4) and (5) will usually apply. With these typical conditions, the approximation will be invalid only for transitions located in the outer 0.3% wings of the frequency span of the applied pulse.

Eqs. (4) and (5) may be simplified even further to give the magnitude of the oscillating polarization. Recalling the definitions of P_r and P_i , we see that the bracketed sin and cos terms in Eqs. (4) and (5) merely describe the rapid oscillation of the polarization in the rotating frame of the applied electromagnetic field. Because the polarization of the molecular resonance will oscillate at a frequency ω_0 in the non-rotating frame, we may write

$$P \approx \frac{2|\mu_{ab}|^2 \mathcal{E} \Delta N_0}{\hbar} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha}} \sin(\omega_0 t + \phi), \quad (6)$$

where ϕ is a phase that may be determined from Eqs. (4) and (5), and the prefactor, $2|\mu_{ab}|^2 \mathcal{E} \Delta N_0 / \hbar$ gives the magnitude of the oscillating polarization.

3. Limiting behavior of the polarization response with respect to pulse duration

For very short excitation pulses, Assumption 3 is invalid. Therefore, it is useful to examine the limiting behavior of Eqs. (1) and (2) as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ and $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. The evolution of the polarization response from a 10 GHz bandwidth excitation pulse is shown in Fig. 1. We define the nominal bandwidth, $\Delta\omega_p$, and duration, T_p , of the chirped excitation pulse such that

$$\Delta\omega_p = \Delta\omega_f - \Delta\omega_i$$

$$T_p = \frac{\Delta\omega_p}{\alpha}.$$

3.1. Long pulse limit

In the limit of very long pulse duration ($\alpha \rightarrow 0$), Assumption (3) applies and the limiting behavior of the Fresnel integrals is relevant. Note that the signs of the Fresnel integrals in Eqs. (1), (2) depend on the signs of $\Delta\omega_i$ and $\Delta\omega_f$. Assuming $\Delta\omega_f > \Delta\omega_i$, there are three cases:

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} |P| = \begin{cases} 0 & \Delta\omega_f < 0 \text{ and } \Delta\omega_i < 0 \\ \frac{2|\mu_{ab}|^2 \mathcal{E} \Delta N_0}{\hbar} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha}} & (\Delta\omega_i < 0 \text{ and } \Delta\omega_f > 0) \\ 0 & \text{or } (\Delta\omega_i > 0 \text{ and } \Delta\omega_f < 0) \\ 0 & \Delta\omega_f > 0 \text{ and } \Delta\omega_i > 0. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

The first and third cases of Eq. (7) apply when the resonance is below or above the excitation pulse bandwidth and the second case applies when the resonance is within the excitation bandwidth. Thus, we see that in the $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ limit of an infinitely long excitation pulse, Eqs. (1) and (2) become a square wave excitation with a completely flat polarization response. (See Fig. 1(f).) Of course, Eqs. (1) and (2) also assume the weak field limit ($\mu\mathcal{E}/\hbar \ll \alpha^{1/2}$, i.e. the Rabi frequency is slow compared with the sweep rate) and neglects dephasing. Thus, to obtain this result we have also implicitly assumed an infinitesimal $\mu\mathcal{E}$ and $1/T_2$ coherence dephasing rate. Therefore, panel (f) of Fig. 1 is not intended to represent a physically

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5414424>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5414424>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)