

PROFESSOR: Today, we have to discuss harmonic perturbations. So we've done Fermi's golden rule for constant transitions. We saw transitions from a discrete state to a continuum. And by integrating over the continuum, we found a nice rule, Fermi's golden rule, that govern the transition rate for this process.

So the only thing we have to do different now is consider the case that the perturbation is not just a step that gets up and stays there, but it has a frequency dependence. So that will bring a couple of novel features. But at the end of the day, as we will see, our Fermi's golden rule is going to look pretty similar to the original Fermi's golden rule.

A nice application of Fermi's golden rule is the calculation of the ionization rate for hydrogen, in which you take a hydrogen atom, you put it in an electric field or send a light wave, and then suddenly the electron and the hydrogen atom from the ground state ionizes. And we can compute already-- we have the technology to compute the ionization rate. That's a pretty physical quantity. And that will be an example we'll develop today.

Those rates have the funny situation that the calculation can be somewhat involved and interesting. And the answers, generally, by the time you simplify them, are pretty simple and pretty nice. So it's a good idea. You have to have patience with those calculations to simplify it till the end, and that's pretty instructive.

So we begin with harmonic perturbations. So we did constant perturbations already. So now harmonic perturbations. So our situation is that in which $H(t)$ is equal to a known Hamiltonian plus $\delta H(t)$. And this time, $\delta H(t)$ is conventionally written as $2 H' \cos \omega t$ for some t between t_0 and 0 , and 0 otherwise.

All of us wonder why the 2 here. One reason for it-- it's all convention, of course. You have your perturbation, and what you call $E H'$ or what you call $2 H'$ is your choice. But this 2 has the advantage that when you describe the cosine in terms of exponentials-- $e^{i\omega t}$ plus $e^{-i\omega t}$ over 2 , it cancels this one.

And that makes Fermi's golden rule, that will follow also and will be valid for these perturbations, take exactly the same form as it did for the case of constant perturbation. So it's fairly convenient to put that 2 , and we'll put it in. Some books don't, and then they have different looking formulas for Fermi golden rule depending to which case you're talking about.

Of course, when we mean that this is the time dependence, we are implying that H prime is time independent. Because the time dependence is this one. That's what we're interested in considering. Of course-- this has been asked sometimes-- H prime can depend on all kinds of other thing-- position coordinates, some other quantities. But we're focusing on time here, so we'll leave it there.

Moreover, for reasons of convention, just let's always think of ω as positive. It wouldn't make a difference if it would be negative here with the cosine function, but let's just set by convention that ω is positive.

Finally, we're going to do transitions again from an initial to a final state. So we will consider the case when we go from an initial state to a final state. And therefore, we will work in this language with these constant coefficients C_n 's, these coefficients that multiply the states in ψ tilde. ψ tilde is equal to $\sum_n C_n \psi_n$ at time t . And these C_n 's, at time equals 0, will be equal to δ_{ni} , which means that they are all 0 except when we're talking about C_i at 0 is equal to 1 because we start with an initial state.

We had a general formula for the transition coefficient. And C_m of 1 at time equal t -- or I'll put t_0 -- is equal to $\sum_n \int_0^{t_0} e^{i\omega_{mn}t'} \frac{\delta H_{mn}}{\hbar} C_n dt'$. This was our general formula for transition coefficients.

The C_m 's is the coefficient or the amplitude for the state to be found in the m eigenstate at time t_0 to first order in perturbation theory. And it depends on where you started on. That's why the sum over n here with initial states. But this sum is going to collapse because we know we start with the state i . So when we substitute C_n equal to this, the sum only works when n is equal to i . So we'll put for δ_{ni} 's.

And, of course, we're going to also take for the final state to be f . So the formula now reads C_f 1 at t_0 is equal to $\int_0^{t_0} e^{i\omega_{fn}t'} \frac{\delta H_{fn}}{\hbar} C_n dt'$. And now the δH . The δH is this whole quantity, so we have to substitute it.

So δH prime is the only part that has matrix elements. The $\cos \omega t$ is just a function. So it's $H'_{fi} \cos \omega t$, and dt' . There's the \hbar .

So I think I got everything right. The sum collapsed. mn is being replaced by the right labels. mn here, this is the expectation value between m and n . And that becomes between f and i .

And it affects this whole thing, but it just ends up affecting the Hamiltonian H prime here.

So I think we're OK. We have everything there. And H_{fi} , of course, doesn't have time dependence. So we said H prime has no time dependence. So that thing can go out of the integral. So this will go out.

And the integral is simple because you have now H_{fi} prime over \hbar . And the 2, we leave it for the cosine. So we get two integrals. t_0 e to the $i\omega_f t$ plus ω t prime-- from the first exponential in the cosine-- plus an e to the $i\omega_f t$ minus ω t prime-- from the second exponential in cosine-- dt prime.

Well, that's very nice. This is all doable. The H_{fi} doesn't give us any trouble. It's a constant. It's out of the integral. It's all pretty nice and simple.

So we can do these two integrals. They're integrals of exponentials, so it's just an exponential divided by those coefficients. So I'll just do it and evaluate it between t_0 and 0.

So what do we get? Minus $i H_{fi}$ prime over \hbar , e to the $i\omega_f t_0$ plus ω t, minus 1, over ω_f plus ω . You can imagine that e to the $i\omega_f t$ integrates to e to the $i\omega_f t$ over ω_f . So that's why that works. And the two limits are t_0 and 0.

Plus e to the $i\omega_f t_0$ minus ω t, minus 1 again, over ω_f minus ω . Great. Our integral is there. It's done. And now it's time to appreciate what it tells us, because it tells us something very important, this formula.

So you look at this and you say, well, OK. This is the transition amplitude to state ω_f -- I'm sorry-- state f , final state. And it depends on ω_f . And ω_f just E_f minus E_i over \hbar . So if I know my final discrete state E_f , I can figure out what is the transition probability.

Now, these denominators are intriguing because maybe if you adjust the frequency ω -- suppose you have an initial state and a final state here. You may adjust the frequency ω to match them, and in that case maybe make the denominators equal to 0. And that's exactly what kind of happens here.

So, first of all, if you look at this expression, it's a sum of two terms that are added together and multiplied by a constant. As t_0 really goes to 0, completely goes to 0, t_0 , each factor, actually, if you see the Taylor expansion of the exponential, you cancel the 1 and you then cancel the linear term with the denominator. This is just $i t_0$. And this is also $i t_0$. So they're

comparable as time is really going to 0.

But time going to 0 is never of interest for us. For us, we need to be the time a little big already so that our calculations, as we did in the constant transitions that had lobes that decreases constants over t_0 -- we needed the time to be sufficiently large so that the lobes are narrow. And that, we could guarantee.

So t_0 going to 0 is not very interesting. We need t_0 a little bigger. Not too big that the rate of a process overwhelms the probability. But we need a little big.

So, in that case, the numerators are going to be bounded numbers. You see, you have an exponential minus 1. So that varies from-- the magnitude of this thing varies from 2 to 0, basically. In fact, in these numerators, you can see, if the phase is 0 for some particular value-- if the exponential has a phase that's proportional to 2π , this is 0. And then sometimes this exponential is minus 1, so it gets to minus 2. So it's finite.

And the same is here. So these are bounded numerators. On the other hand, you may have the possibility that these things become 0. And those are the cases that are of interest to us, the cases when those terms are going to be 0.