

# MAGNETO-OPTICS OF MULTI-WELL QUANTUM STRUCTURES WITH $D_2^-$ -CENTRES

**V.D. Krevchik<sup>1,2</sup>, A.B. Grunin<sup>1</sup>, V.V. Evstifeev<sup>1</sup>,  
M.B. Semenov<sup>1,2</sup>, A.K. Aringazin<sup>2,3</sup>**

- <sup>1)</sup> Physics Department, Penza State University, Penza, Russia,  
physics@diamond.stup.ac.ru
- <sup>2)</sup> Institute for Basic Research, P.O. Box 1577, Palm Harbor,  
FL 34682, USA  
ibr@verizon.net
- <sup>3)</sup> Institute for Basic Research, Eurasian National University,  
Astana 010008, Kazakhstan  
aringazin@mail.kz

The problem of electron binding states in field of two  $D^0$  – centres in semiconductive quantum well (QW) in the presence of an external longitudinal magnetic field (along the QW growth axis) is studied within the framework of zero-range potential model. It is found that the magnetic field leads to a considerable change in positions of  $g$ - and  $u$ -terms, and to a stabilization of the  $D_2^-$ -states in QW. It is shown that a form of impurity magneto-optical absorption spectrum essentially depends on the light polarization direction and on the spatial configuration of the  $D_2^-$  molecular ion in QW.

## 1. Introduction

As it has been experimentally shown [1], reactions of the type  $D^0 + e \rightarrow D^-$  are possible in low-dimensional systems under certain conditions. As the result of such reactions, neutral small donors bind an additional electron with the population formation of the so called “ $D^-$ -states”. Such states, which are confined by the structure potential, open new possibilities to study correlation effects in low-dimensional systems [1].

In the present paper we consider the following specific case:  $D^0$ -positions can not all be effectively filled by an electron transfer through a barrier [2]. In this case, a formation of the negative molecular ion  $D_2^-$  is possible; this depends on the distance  $R$  between the  $D^0$ -centers. It should be noted that the system consisting of a weakly bounded electron in the field of two equivalent potential centers appears in alkaline-haloids crystals [3]. This is the so called “dyeing center”  $M^-$ , which is electron in the field of neutral  $M$ -center (two neighbor  $F$ -centers). As it is known [4, 5],  $D^-$ -center is a simplest system, which can be simulated by an electron in the field of the zero-range potential. Earlier we have shown [6, 7] that the zero-range potential method allows to obtain analytical solution to the wave function and the binding energy of electron, which is localized on  $D^0$ -center. This method allows also to investigate the impurity magneto-optical absorption in nanostructures with a parabolic confinement potential.

The negative molecular ion  $D_2^-$  simulation and investigation of its magneto-optical properties in QW are of much interest. Since  $D_2^-$ -system is symmetric with respect to the center, electron states (at fixed distance  $R$  between  $D^0$ -centers) should be either symmetric ( $g$ -terms) or anti-symmetric ( $u$ -terms). Evidently, splitting of the  $g$ - and  $u$ -terms (which are degenerated at large  $R$ ) is determined by the value of  $R$  and by the QW-parameters (as a consequence of the

dimensional reduction). On the other hand, magnetic field (which is applied along the QW growth axis) plays the role of a variable parameter, which can change the system's geometric confinement and, hence, to control energies of optical transitions. This gives some perspectives to develop molecular electronics, particularly, one-molecule devices with controllable characteristics.

The aim of this work is to investigate magneto-optical spectrum of QW within the framework of the zero-potential model. Structure of the spectrum is related to electron optical transitions from  $g$ -term state to QW hybrid-quantized states, depending on the light polarization direction and on the spatial configuration of the  $D_2^-$ -molecular ion.

## 2. $D_2^-$ -molecular ion terms

To describe QW one-electron states one can use the parabolic confinement potential of the form

$$U(z) = \frac{m^* \omega_0^2 z^2}{2}, \quad (1)$$

where  $m^*$  is the electron effective mass,  $|z| \leq L/2$ ,  $L$  is the width of QW,  $\omega_0$  is the confinement potential characteristic frequency of QW.

For one-electron states (which are undisturbed by impurities) under the longitudinal magnetic field  $\vec{B}(0,0,B)$ , Hamiltonian of the model is of the following form:

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{\pi^2}{2m^*} \left( \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \left( \rho \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \right) + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \rho^2} \right) + \frac{\omega_B}{2} \hat{M}_z + \frac{m^* \omega_B^2 \rho^2}{8} + \hat{H}_z, \quad (2)$$

where  $\omega_b = |e|B/m^*$  is the cyclotron frequency,  $\hat{M}_z = -it\partial/\partial\varphi$  is the operator of orbital angular momentum projection on the  $z$ -axis;

$\hat{H}_z = -(\hbar^2/2m^*)\partial z/\partial z^2 + m^*\omega_0^2 z^2/2$ . Double-center potential  $V_\delta(\rho, \varphi, z; \rho_{a_1}, \varphi_{a_1}, z_{a_1}; \rho_{a_2}, \varphi_{a_2}, z_{a_2})$  is modeled by the superposition of the zero-range potentials with intensity  $\gamma_i = 2\pi\hbar^2/(\alpha_i m^*)$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ):

$$V_\delta(\rho, \varphi, z; \rho_{a_1}, \varphi_{a_1}, z_{a_1}; \rho_{a_2}, \varphi_{a_2}, z_{a_2}) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \gamma_i \frac{\delta(\rho - \rho_{a_i})}{\rho} \delta(\varphi - \varphi_{a_i}) \delta(z - z_{a_i}) \times \left[ 1 + (\rho - \rho_{a_i}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} + (z - z_{a_i}) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right] \quad (3)$$

where  $\alpha_i$  is determined by the energy  $E_i = -\pi^2 \alpha_i^2 / (2m^*)$  of electron localized states on the same  $D^-$ -centers in a bulk semiconductor.

The wave function  $\Psi_\lambda(\vec{r}; \vec{R}_{a_1}, \vec{R}_{a_2})$  of the electron ( $\vec{R}_{a_i} = \rho_{a_i}, \varphi_{a_i}, z_{a_i}$  is the impurity center coordinates), which is localized on  $D_2^-$ -centre, satisfying Lippman-Schwinger equation for the bound state, is a linear combination

$$\Psi_\lambda(\vec{r}; \vec{R}_{a_1}, \vec{R}_{a_2}) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \gamma_i c_i G(\vec{r}, \vec{R}_{a_i}; E_\lambda), \quad (4)$$

where  $G(\vec{r}, \vec{R}_{a_i}; E_\lambda)$  is one-electron Green function corresponding to the source in point  $\vec{R}_{a_i}$  and to the energy  $E_\lambda = -\hbar^2 \lambda^2 / (2m^*)$  ( $E_\lambda$  is the electron binding energy in the field of  $D^0$ -centers under longitudinal magnetic field (this energy is measured from the bottom of QW). From mathematical point of view, the double-center problem leads to finding of nontrivial solutions of the algebraic equations for  $c_i$  coefficients; this implies a transcendental equation for  $E_\lambda$ . In the case when  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \gamma$ , the latter equation is split in two equations, which determine the symmetric ( $g$ -term) and anti-symmetric ( $u$ -term) electron states. Accounting for the one-electron Green function for the case when the  $D_2^-$ -center axis is along the QW – growth axis  $\vec{R}_{a_1}(0,0,0)$  and  $\vec{R}_{a_2}(0,0,z_{a_2})$ , these equations become

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi\beta\eta_i}} \left\{ \int_0^\infty dt e^{-\left(\beta\eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{1}{2}\right)t} \left[ 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta a_B^{*-2} (1 - e^{-2t})^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{-1}(t) \text{sh}^{-1}(\beta a_B^{*-2} t) \times \right. \right. \\
& \times \left. \left( 1 \pm \exp\left(-\frac{z_{a_2}^{*2} c t h t}{4\beta}\right) \right) - t^{\frac{3}{2}} \left( 1 \pm e^{-\frac{z_{a_2}^{*2}}{4\beta t}} \right) \right] - 2\sqrt{\pi} \left( \sqrt{\beta\eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{1}{2}} \mp \right. \\
& \left. \mp \exp\left(-\sqrt{\beta\eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{1}{2}} \cdot |z_{a_2}^*|/\sqrt{\beta}\right) \cdot \sqrt{\beta}/|z_{a_2}^*| \right) \left. \right\} = 1, \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\beta = L^*/(4\sqrt{U_0^*})$ ,  $L^* = L/a_\alpha$ ,  $a_\alpha$  is the effective Bohr radius,  $U_0^* = U_0/E_d$ ,  $U_0$  is the QW confinement potential amplitude;  $E_d$  is the effective Bohr energy,  $\eta_B^2 = |E_\lambda|/E_d$ ,  $\delta(t) = \exp(-\beta a_B^{*-2} t)$ ,  $a_B^2 = a_B/a_d$ ,  $z_{a_2}^* = z_{a_2}/a_d$ ; upper sign in Eq. (5) corresponds to symmetric ( $g$ -term), and lower sign to anti-symmetrical ( $u$ -term) electron states.

In the case when  $D_2^-$ -center axis ( $\vec{R}_{a_1}(0,0,0)$  and  $\vec{R}_{a_2}(\rho_{a_2}, \varphi_{a_2}, 0)$ ) is transverse to the magnetic field direction, the corresponding equations can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi\beta\eta_i}} \left\{ \int_0^\infty dt e^{-\left(\beta\eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{1}{2}\right)t} \left[ 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta a_B^{*-2} (1 - e^{-2t})^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{-1}(t) \text{sh}^{-1}(\beta a_B^{*-2} t) \times \right. \right. \\
& \times \left. \left( 1 \pm \exp\left(-\frac{\rho_{a_2}^{*2} c t h(\beta a_B^{*-2} t)}{4a_B^{*-2}}\right) \right) - t^{\frac{3}{2}} \left( 1 \pm e^{-\frac{\rho_{a_2}^{*2}}{4a_B^{*-2} t}} \right) \right] \pm 2\sqrt{\pi} \times \\
& \times \left. \left( \exp\left(-\sqrt{\beta\eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{1}{2}} \cdot \frac{\rho_{a_2}^*}{a_B^*}\right) \frac{\rho_{a_2}^*}{a_B^*} \mp \sqrt{\beta\eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{1}{2}} \right) \right\} = 1, \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\rho_{a_2}^* = \rho_{a_2}/a_d$ .

Our numerical analysis for Eqs. (5) and (6) shows that the magnetic field leads to a considerable change in positions of the terms and to a stabilization of the QW  $D_2^-$ -states. With the transfer from Eq. (5) to Eq. (6) the role of spatial configuration for the QW

$D_2^-$ -center becomes apparent: the closeness of QW boundaries for the configuration (5) leads to the energy levels break (cleavage), for degenerated  $g$  - and  $u$  - states.

### 3. Spectral dependence for the impurity magneto-optical absorption coefficient for the multi-well quantum structure

In this Section, we calculate the impurity magneto-optical absorption coefficient  $K_B(\omega)$  for the semiconductive structure, which consists of the tunnelly non-binding QWs taking into account their width dispersion  $u = L/\bar{L}$ , where  $\bar{L}$  is the mean value of the QW width. It is supposed that in every QW there is one  $D_2^-$ -centre, with two possible spatial configurations, which are described by Eqs. (5) and (6). In the general case, the light absorption coefficient  $K_B(\omega)$  can be represented as

$$K_B(\omega) = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar I_0 E_d \bar{L}_c S} \sum_{m=0}^M \sum_{n=n_{\min}}^N \sum_{n_1=0}^{N_1} P(u^*) |M_{f,\lambda}^{(j,k)}|_{u=u^*}^2 \cdot \beta^{*2} \left[ \bar{\beta} \left( n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right]^{-1}, \quad (7)$$

Where  $M = [C_1]$  is even part of the number  $C_1 = (X - \eta_B^2 - (\bar{\beta})^{-1} \cdot u_{\max}^{-1} (n_{\min} + 1/2)) / (2a_B^{*-2}) - 1/2$ ;  $n_{\min} = 0$  or  $n_{\min} = 1$  depending on selection rules;  $N = [C_2]$  is even part of the number  $C_2 = (X - \eta_B^2 - a_B^{*-2} (|m| + m + 1)) \bar{\beta} u_{\max} - 1/2$ ;  $N_1 = [C_3]$  is even part of the number  $C_3 = (X - \eta_B^2 - (\bar{\beta})^{-1} \cdot u_{\max}^{-1} (n + 1/2)) / (2a_B^{*-2}) - (|m| + m + 1)/2$ ;  $X = \hbar\omega/E_d$  is the photon energy, in effective Bohr energy units;  $I_0$  is the light intensity;  $\bar{L}_c$  is the mean value of structure period;  $S$  is the area of QW in the plain, which is perpendicular to the growth axis;  $u^* = (\bar{\beta})^{-1} (n + 1/2) (X - \eta_B^2 - a_B^{*-2} (2n_1 + |m| + m + 1))^{-1}$ ;  $\beta^* = \bar{\beta} \cdot u^*$ ;  $u_{\min}, u_{\max}$  are minimal and maximal dispersion values of  $u$ ;  $n_1 = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  is the ra-

dial quantum number corresponding to the Landau level;  $m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$  is the magnetic quantum number;  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  is the oscillator quantum number;  $\bar{\beta} = \bar{L}^*/(4\sqrt{U_0^*})$ ;  $P(u)$  is the distribution function for the QW width dispersion,

$$P(u) = 2 \left[ \sqrt{\pi} (\Phi(u_{\max} - u_0) + \Phi(u_0 - u_{\min})) \right]^{-1} e^{-(u-u_0)^2}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\Phi(z)$  is the error function [8];  $u_0 = (u_{\min} + u_{\max})/2$ .

The upper indices  $j, k_i$  in matrix element  $M_{f,\lambda}^{(j,k_i)}$ , which determines the oscillator force value for the dipole optical transition from  $g$ -state to the state of the QW quasi-discrete spectrum, denote the light polarization direction (with respect to the QW growth axis, ( $j = s, t$ )) and the molecular ion  $D_2^-$  spatial configuration, which is described by Eqs. (5) and (6),  $K_1 = (0, 0, 0 \text{ and } 0, 0, z_{a_2})$ ;  $K_2 = (0, 0, 0 \text{ and } \rho_{a_2}, \varphi_{a_2}, 0)$ , correspondingly. For the optical transition with maximal oscillator force ( $n_1 = 0, m = 0, n = 0$ ), the expression for  $M_{f,\lambda}^{(j,k)}$  can be written as

$$M_{f,\lambda}^{(s,k_1)} = -2 \frac{5}{4} \pi \frac{5}{4} i \lambda_0 \sqrt{\frac{\alpha^* I_0}{\omega}} \gamma \mathcal{B}_1 \beta^4 a_B^{-1} a_d^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \left( \beta \eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} + \left( \beta \eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{5}{2} \right)^{-1} \times \right. \\ \left. \times 2\pi \exp\left( \frac{z_{a_2}^2}{(2a^2)} \right) \left[ \left( \beta \eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} + \left( \beta \eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{5}{2} \right) \cdot \left( 1 - 2 \left( \frac{z_{a_2}}{a} \right)^2 \right) \right] \right\}, \quad (9)$$

$$M_{f,\lambda}^{(t,k_1)} = -2 \frac{1}{4} \pi \frac{1}{4} i \lambda_0 \sqrt{\frac{\alpha^* I_0}{\omega}} \gamma \mathcal{B}_1 \beta^4 a_B^{-2} a_d^{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \left( 1 + \exp\left( -\frac{z_{a_2}^2}{(2a^2)} \right) \right) \times \\ \times \left[ e^{-i\psi} \delta_{m,+1} \left( \beta \eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} + e^{i\psi} \delta_{m,-1} \left( \beta \eta_B^2 + 3\beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right], \quad (10)$$

$$M_{f,\lambda}^{(s,k_2)} = 2 \frac{5}{4} \pi \frac{5}{4} i \lambda_0 \sqrt{\frac{\alpha^* I_0}{\omega}} \gamma \mathcal{B}_1 \beta^4 a_d^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \left( \beta \eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} + \left( \beta \eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{5}{2} \right)^{-1} + \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left( \frac{\rho_{a_2}}{\sqrt{2}a_B} \right)^{|m|} \exp \left( -\frac{\rho_{a_2}^2}{4a_B^2} \right) \left[ \left( \beta\eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} (|m| + m + 1) + \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} + \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left( \beta\eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} (|m| + m + 1) + \frac{5}{2} \right)^{-1} \right], \quad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{f,\lambda}^{(t,k_2)} = & -2^{\frac{1}{4}} \pi^{\frac{1}{4}} i \lambda_0 \sqrt{\frac{\alpha^* I_0}{\omega}} \gamma \mathcal{B}_1 \beta^{\frac{3}{4}} a_B^{-2} a_d^{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \left\{ e^{-i\psi} \delta_{m,+1} \left( \beta\eta_B^2 + \beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \right. \\
& + e^{i\psi} \delta_{m,-1} \left( \beta\eta_B^2 + 3\beta a_B^{*-2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} + \frac{a_B^{*2}}{(2\beta)} \exp \left( -\frac{\rho_{a_2}^2}{4a_B^2} \right) \cdot e^{-im\varphi_{a_2}} \left[ \Theta(m) (m!)^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \right. \\
& \times \left( m \left( \frac{\rho_{a_2}^2}{2a_B^2} \right)^{\frac{m-1}{2}} e^{i(\varphi_{a_2} - \psi)} \left( \nu_0 + m - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} - e^{-i(\varphi_{a_2} - \psi)} \left( \frac{\rho_{a_2}^2}{2a_B^2} \right)^{\frac{m+1}{2}} \left( \nu_0 + m + \frac{3}{2} \right)^{-1} \right) - \\
& \left. \left. - \Theta(-m-1) (|m|)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-i(\varphi_{a_2} - \psi)} \left( \frac{\rho_{a_2}^2}{2a_B^2} \right)^{\frac{m+1}{2}} m + \frac{\rho_{a_2}^2}{2a_B^2} \left( \nu_0 + \frac{3}{2} \right)^{-1} \right] \right\}, \quad (12)
\end{aligned}$$


where  $\nu_0 = \left( \beta\eta_B^2 + \frac{1}{2} \right) / (2\beta a_B^{*-2})$ ;  $\lambda_0$  is the local field coefficient;  $\alpha^* = |e|^2 / (4\pi\epsilon_0 \sqrt{\epsilon} \hbar c)$  is the fine structure constant which accounts for the static relative dielectric permeability  $\epsilon$ ;  $c$  is the speed of light in vacuum;  $\delta_{i,k}$  is Kronecker symbol;  $\Theta(x)$  is Havyside function;

$$\begin{aligned}
B_1 = & \left( \pi^{\frac{3}{2}} a_B^2 a E_d^2 / (\gamma^2 \beta^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[ \sqrt{\pi} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Gamma \left( \frac{d}{2} \right) G \Psi(d) / \left( 4\Gamma \left( \frac{d+1}{2} \right) + \beta^{-2} a_B^{*4} \exp \left( -\frac{\rho_{a_2}^2}{4a_B^2} \right) \right) \right] \times \\
& \times \Gamma \left( \frac{\beta\eta_B^2 + 1/2}{\beta a_B^{*-2}} \right) G_2 \left( \left( \frac{\beta\eta_B^2 + 1/2}{\beta a_B^{*-2}} \right), 0, \left( \frac{\rho_{a_2}^2}{4a_B^2} \right) \right)^{-1/2}; \quad G_2(\alpha, \gamma, z) \text{ is the degenerate}
\end{aligned}$$


hypergeometric function of the second kind [8];  $\Psi(x)$  is the logarithmic derivative of Euler gamma-function;  $d = \beta\eta_B^2$ ;  $G \approx 0,916$  is the Katalane constant [8];  $\psi$  is the polar angle for the polarization unit vector  $\vec{e}_{\lambda}$  in the cylindrical system of reference.

Figures 1 (a, b) and 2 (a, b) show the spectral dependences  $K_B^{(t,k_1)}(\omega)$ ,  $K_B^{(s,k_1)}(\omega)$  and  $K_B^{(t,k_2)}(\omega)$ ,  $K_B^{(s,k_2)}(\omega)$ , which are correspondingly calculated due to Eq. (7) for the multi-well quantum structure based on InSb. As seen from Figs. 1 and 2, the change of direction of the light polarization leads to a drastic modification of the profile of absorption spectral curve (compare (a) and (b) in Figs. 1 and 2). This is partially related with the change of selection rules for the magnetic quantum number. From a comparison of Figs. 1(a) and 2(a), and Figs. 1(b) and 2(b) one can observe an essential role of the spatial configuration for the QW  $D_2^-$  molecular ion. Namely, one can see not only spatial curve profile, but also the absorption value too.

In summary, we have shown that the magneto-optical absorption anisotropy in multi-well quantum structure is related with not only the light polarization direction but also with the  $D_2^-$ -ion spatial configuration.



**Fig. 1.** The spectral dependence for the magneto-optical impurity absorption coefficient: (a) the transversal polarization case ( $K_B^{(t, K_1)}(\omega)$ ); (b) the longitudinal polarization case ( $K_B^{(s, K_1)}(\omega)$ );  $|E_i| = 5,5 \cdot 10^{-2} eV$ ,  $\bar{L} = 71,6 nm$ ,  $U_0 = 0,2 eV$ ,  $z_{a_2}^* = 0,25$ ,  $B = 5 T$ ,  $\vec{R}_{a_1} = (0,0,0)$ ,  $\vec{R}_{a_2} = (0,0, z_{a_2})$ .



**Fig. 2.** The spectral dependence for the magneto-optical impurity absorption coefficient: (a) the transversal polarization case ( $K_B^{(t, K_2)}(\omega)$ ); (b) the longitudinal polarization case ( $K_B^{(s, K_2)}(\omega)$ );  $|E_i| = 5,5 \cdot 10^{-2} eV$ ,  $\bar{L} = 71,6 nm$ ,  $U_0 = 0,2 eV$ ,  $\rho_{a_2}^* = 0,25$ ,  $B = 5 T$ ,  $\vec{R}_{a_1} = (0,0,0)$ ,  $\vec{R}_{a_2} = (\rho_{a_2}, \varphi_{a_2}, 0)$ .

## References

- [1] S. Huant, S.P. Najda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1986 (1990).
- [2] A. Larsen, Phys. Rev. B. **48**, 3458 (1999).
- [3] Yu.N. Demkov, V.N. Ostrovsky, *The zero-range potential method in atomic physics*. (L, Nauka, 1975).
- [4] A.A. Pakhomov, K.V. Khalipov, I.N. Yassievich, FTP **30**, 1387 (1996).
- [5] V.D. Krevchik, R.V. Zaitsev, FTP **34**, 1244 (2000).
- [6] V.D. Krevchik, A.B. Grunin, FTT **45**, 1272 (2003).
- [7] V.D. Krevchik, A.A. Marko, A.B. Grunin, FTT **46**, 2099 (2004).
- [8] G. Beitmen, A. Erdeyi, *Highest transcendental functions*. (Moscow, Nauka, 1973). Vols. 1, 2.