

Can Extreme Electromagnetic Fields Accelerate the α Decay of Nuclei?

Adriana Pálffy¹ and Sergey V. Popruzhenko^{2,3}

¹Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, Saupfercheckweg 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany

²Prokhorov General Physics Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Vavilov Str. 38, 119991 Moscow, Russia

³Max-Planck-Institut für Physik komplexer Systeme, Nöthnitzer Strasse 38, 01187 Dresden, Germany



(Received 16 September 2019; revised manuscript received 7 March 2020; accepted 29 April 2020; published 28 May 2020)

The possibility to control the α decay channel of atomic nuclei with electromagnetic fields of extreme intensities envisaged for the near future at multipetawatt and exawatt laser facilities is investigated theoretically. Using both analytic arguments based on the Wentzel-Kramers-Brillouin approximation and numerical calculations for the imaginary time method applied in the framework of the α decay precluster model, we show that no experimentally detectable modification of the α decay rate can be observed with super-intense lasers at any so-far-available wavelength. Comparing our predictions with those reported in several recent publications, where a considerable or even giant laser-induced enhancement of the decay rate has been claimed, we identify there the misuse of a standard approximation.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.212505](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.212505)

Introduction.—The upcoming commissioning of new laser sources of few up to 10 petawatt (PW) power [1–7], and plans for more powerful subexawatt laser systems [6,8] have triggered theoretical revisions of phenomena induced or assisted by electromagnetic fields of extreme intensity. This includes generation of electron-positron pairs by electromagnetic fields from vacuum, laser initiation of quantum electrodynamic cascades of elementary particles and plasma dynamics in the classical or quantum radiation-dominated interaction regime, see for instance reviews in Refs. [9–11] and references therein. Several theoretical proposals consider the effect of laser radiation on nuclear processes. For example, zeptosecond laser-generated MeV photon pulses are expected to induce multiple nuclear excitations followed by neutron evaporation [12,13]. Also, predicted effects of laser radiation on α decay have been recently reported [14–20].

The radioactive α and β decays of atomic nuclei are most fundamental nuclear processes observed in the Universe and in laboratory experiments [21,22]. The theory of α decay was one of the early successes of quantum mechanics as in 1928 both Gamow [23] and independently Condon and Gurney [24] used the new concept of tunneling to calculate α decay lifetimes. Within this tunneling picture both α and proton radioactivity are related to widths of quasistationary states in the quantum mechanical two-potential approach [25] while accounting for the

spectroscopic factor for the proton and the preformation factor of the α particle in the nucleus. Intuitively, in order to significantly alter the α decay probability, an external electromagnetic field should be able to make a work comparable to the energy Q_α of the escaping α particle on the spatial length determined by the width of the Coulomb barrier l_α and during the time τ_α required for this particle to cross the barrier. We note that this notion of “time” does not truly describe a physical time, and requires a model-dependent definition. In terms of classical mechanics, the tunneling motion proceeds in the forbidden region and the corresponding time is imaginary. Here we use for τ_α the traversal time definition introduced by Büttiker and Landauer [26]. Considering a generic value of 5 MeV α particle energy, $l_\alpha \simeq 10^{-11}$ cm and $\tau_\alpha \simeq 10^{-20}$ s. On this timescale, any electromagnetic field generated by laboratory sources with photon energies $\hbar\omega$ from 0.1 eV (CO₂ laser) to 10 keV (x-ray free electron lasers) [27] can be considered quasistatic, as its oscillation cycle $T_\omega \gg \tau_\alpha$. The work made by an external static field of strength E is of the order of $\simeq Z_\alpha e E l_\alpha$ with e being the elementary charge and $Z_\alpha = 2$ the atomic charge of the α particle, respectively. Then an estimate for the electric field value that would produce a seizable modification of the α decay rate gives $E^* \simeq Q_\alpha / (Z_\alpha e l_\alpha) \approx 10^{18}$ V/cm. This value exceeds the critical field of quantum electrodynamics [28–30] $E_{\text{cr}} = m_e^2 c^3 / e \hbar = 1.32 \times 10^{16}$ V/cm with m_e being the electron mass, by almost two orders of magnitude and is far beyond present laser capabilities.

Present record intensities of electromagnetic fields generated at sub-PW and PW laser facilities hardly exceed 10^{22} W/cm² [31,32] which corresponds to the electric field strength $E_0 \approx 3 \times 10^{12}$ V/cm. Such laser fields can considerably modify the spectra of the decay products, since

Published by the American Physical Society under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license. Further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the published article's title, journal citation, and DOI. Open access publication funded by the Max Planck Society.

any charged particle promptly appearing in the continuum dressed by electromagnetic waves will be accelerated toward the detector with its momentum gain determined by the instant of release (see, e.g., Refs. [33,34] for β and Ref. [14] for α decay of nuclei). They however have no observable effect on the overall decay probability.

In a striking contrast to these estimates, several recent theoretical works have predicted a strong effect of laser radiation on α decay even at currently achievable intensities [15–19]. These spectacular claims brought superintense lasers in discussions about practical applications for recycling of nuclear waste [35]. This controversy and the appealing applications that are at stake call for a reliable and thorough theoretical investigation of laser-assisted α decay at novel ultra-strong laser facilities. In this Letter, we derive a correct value for the external electric field strength which can alter the decay rate using two different approaches, one analytical based on the Wentzel-Kramers-Brillouin (WKB) approximation of quantum mechanics and one numerical employing the imaginary time method (ITM) [36–38] extended for quasistationary states of α emitters considered in the precluster model [14,39]. Both these semiclassical approaches are well within their validity range for laser-assisted α decay, and their predictions agree well with each other. We apply them to calculate the corresponding decay rates of several α emitters with lifetimes spanning from 10^{-7} s to 10^{15} years and demonstrate that although the value E^* is an overestimate, neither present nor upcoming laser fields can produce any seizable effect on α decay rates. We address the controversy with results of Refs. [17–19] and conclude that the gross enhancements in α decay rates predicted there are most likely due to the misuse of an approximation.

WKB method.—In order to analytically quantify the effect of an electromagnetic field on the rate of α decay we employ the Gamow model [23]. Both WKB and the semiclassical limit of the two-potential approach have been widely and successfully used in the literature to predict α decay rates [40–46]. We note that (i) the relevant time over which the laser can assist the tunneling process is the traversal time τ_α [26]. This time is very short and does not coincide with the observed α -decay lifetimes $t_{1/2}$. While τ_α always remains shorter than 10^{-20} s, the lifetimes $t_{1/2}$ span orders of magnitude from ns to the age of the Universe. (ii) For electromagnetic fields with strength well below E^* the Coulomb forces at distances $r \leq l_\alpha$ exceed the Lorentz force acting on the particle in the field of a laser wave. Finally, (iii) the sub-barrier motion of the α particle remains nonrelativistic even in extremely strong fields, due to the shortness of τ_α and the large mass of the α particle compared to the one of the electron.

Thus (i) allows us to treat the electric field effect in the quasistatic approximation, while (ii) and (iii) justify to calculate laser-induced corrections to the barrier penetrability using a nonrelativistic perturbation theory. Within the

quasistatic approach, time is considered as a parameter, and, when the interaction with the laser field is described in the length gauge and the nuclear distortion of the Coulomb barrier at small distances is discarded, the variables are separable in parabolic coordinates [47]. These coordinates should be used to describe correctly the angular dependence of the decay rate [48]. However, a reliable estimate can be made simply assuming the sub-barrier trajectory of the α particle a straight line as in the field-free case. In the centimeter-gram-second system, the Gamow decay rate reads

$$R \approx \nu_0 \exp\left(-\frac{2}{\hbar} \int_0^b \sqrt{2m_r[V(r) - e z_{\text{eff}} \mathbf{E}(t) \cdot \mathbf{r} - Q_\alpha]} dr\right). \quad (1)$$

Here, ν_0 is the frequency of α particle oscillations inside the nucleus [49], m_r is the reduced mass of the nuclear system composed of α particle and daughter nucleus, and $V(r)$ is the Coulomb potential the particle tunnels through. Furthermore, $\mathbf{E}(t)$ is the time-dependent electric field of the laser, $b = 2Ze^2/Q_\alpha$ is the barrier exit point, Z and A are the charge and atomic numbers of the daughter nucleus and $z_{\text{eff}} = (2A - 4Z)/(A + 4)$ is the effective charge which accounts for the center of mass motion of the decaying system. For electromagnetic fields of amplitude $E_0 \ll E^*$ the potential energy in the laser field $|e z_{\text{eff}} \mathbf{E}(t) \cdot \mathbf{r}|$ is small compared to the absolute value of the kinetic energy $|Q_\alpha - V(r)|$ everywhere except the vicinity of the turning points. These however do not make a considerable contribution for the semiclassical integral in Eq. (1) above. Using a series expansion of the integrand up to the second order in $E(t)$ and performing the integration (see the Supplemental Material [50] for technical details of the derivation) we obtain for the laser-induced factor in the rate $R = R_0 \cdot R_L$

$$R_L \approx \exp\left(\frac{2E(t)}{E_{\text{eff}}} \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{n}_0 - \frac{35}{9\pi\nu_\alpha} \frac{E^2(t)}{E_{\text{eff}}^2} (\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{n}_0)^2\right) \quad (2)$$

where $R_0 = \nu_0 \exp(-2\pi\nu_\alpha)$ is the field-free rate, \mathbf{n} and \mathbf{n}_0 are the unit vectors along the particle emission direction and the laser polarization, respectively, and

$$E_{\text{eff}} = \frac{2\hbar\sqrt{2}Q_\alpha^{5/2}}{3\pi Z^2 z_{\text{eff}} e^5 \sqrt{m_r}}, \quad \nu_\alpha = \frac{2Ze^2}{\hbar v_\alpha}. \quad (3)$$

Here ν_α is the Sommerfeld parameter for α decay and v_α the α -particle velocity corresponding to Q_α .

These simple formulas show that a considerable electromagnetic effect on the rate of α decay will be achieved already at $E_0 \simeq E_{\text{eff}} \ll E^*$. It is not uncommon for tunneling phenomena that the actual value of the external field which considerably alters the rate appears much smaller than that necessary to strongly affect the value of the particle

TABLE I. Energy of the α particle, parameter c_1 of the model potential [41,42], experimental (ex) [52] and theoretical (th) half-lives (calculated from the model of [41,42]), and the corresponding field-free decay events N_0 in a λ^3 focal spot for $\lambda = 1 \mu\text{m}$ during the laser pulse duration $\tau = 100$ fs. Results from the WKB model: the characteristic electric field (3), the linear ($R_L - 1$) and average ($\bar{R}_L - 1$) corrections to the rate (4), and the laser-induced change of the number of α decay events $\Delta N = N_0(\bar{R}_L - 1)$. Results from ITM: the numerically calculated correction $R'_L - 1$ averaged over the laser period. The laser field strength $E_0 = 2.74 \times 10^{14}$ V/cm corresponds to $I = 10^{26}$ W/cm²; the nuclear potential depth was taken $U_0 = 135.6$ MeV [42].

Isotope	Q_α (MeV)	c_1 (fm)	$t_{1/2}^{\text{ex}}$ (s)	$t_{1/2}^{\text{th}}$ (s)	E_{eff} (V/cm)	$R_L - 1$	$\bar{R}_L - 1$	$R'_L - 1$	N_0	ΔN
¹⁰⁶ ₅₂ Te	4.325	1.486	7×10^{-5}	6.1×10^{-5}	9.83×10^{17}	5.57×10^{-4}	2.59×10^{-8}	6.37×10^{-8}	10^2	3×10^{-6}
¹⁴⁴ ₆₀ Nd	1.907	1.484	7.2×10^{22}	5.6×10^{22}	2.12×10^{16}	2.57×10^{-2}	5.54×10^{-5}	1.59×10^{-4}	10^{-25}	5×10^{-30}
¹⁶² ₇₄ W	5.675	1.432	1.39	2.45	4.05×10^{17}	1.35×10^{-3}	1.52×10^{-7}	4.35×10^{-7}	5×10^{-3}	8×10^{-10}
²¹² ₈₄ Po	8.953	1.409	2.99×10^{-7}	1.6×10^{-7}	3.88×10^{17}	1.35×10^{-3}	1.66×10^{-7}	4.88×10^{-7}	2×10^4	4×10^{-3}
²³⁸ ₉₄ Pu	5.593	1.390	2.77×10^9	4.4×10^9	9.81×10^{16}	5.58×10^{-3}	2.60×10^{-6}	7.69×10^{-6}	3×10^{-12}	6×10^{-18}
²³⁸ ₉₂ U	4.274	1.394	1.4×10^{17}	4.3×10^{17}	4.84×10^{16}	1.13×10^{-2}	1.06×10^{-5}	3.16×10^{-5}	5×10^{-20}	5×10^{-25}

momentum under the barrier. As an example, fast tunneling of atomic electrons in a static external electric field may happen already at field strengths on the level of 5% of the characteristic atomic field on the respective Bohr orbit [36,51]. In our case, the reason for that is the numerically large value of the field-free sub-barrier action $2\pi\nu_\alpha \gg 1$. At $E(t) = E_{\text{eff}}$ the time-dependent factor R_L enhances the rate by approx. the square of the natural logarithm base $e^2 = 7.78$. The characteristic electric field E_{eff} is a factor $3\pi\nu_\alpha z_{\text{eff}}/16$ times less than E^* , which gives, for ²³²Pu with $Z = 92$ and $Q_\alpha \approx 5$ MeV, $E_{\text{eff}} \approx 8 \times 10^{16}$ V/cm $\approx 0.15E^*$. Consequently, expression (2) which was obtained by perturbative expansion is valid for $E \ll E^*$ and therefore applies for electric field strengths $E \approx E_{\text{eff}}$, i.e., when the laser effect on the rate is already numerically large, $R_L \gg 1$. At the same time, as long as $E_0 \ll E^*$, the second term in the exponent of (2) can be neglected. We may therefore treat E_{eff} as threshold electric field strength that is sufficient to modify the α decay process, a conclusion which is independent of the laser photon energy in a broad frequency domain $\hbar\omega \ll Q_\alpha/\nu_\alpha$. The values of E_{eff} for several α -decaying nuclei are shown in Table I; the lowest of them (for ¹⁴⁴Nd) corresponds to the intensity $I \approx 5 \times 10^{29}$ W/cm². Thus, for practical calculations, the series expansion can be used in Eq. (2) to find the relative effect of the laser field on the α decay rate. The time-dependent and time- and angle-averaged field-induced factors in the decay rate, respectively, read

$$R_L - 1 \approx \frac{2E(t)}{E_{\text{eff}}} \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{n}_0, \quad \bar{R}_L - 1 \approx \frac{E_0^2}{3E_{\text{eff}}^2}. \quad (4)$$

Estimates made along Eqs. (4) are shown in Table I for the α emitters ¹⁰⁶₅₂Te, ¹⁴⁴₆₀Nd, ¹⁶²₇₄W, ²¹²₈₄Po, ²³⁸₉₄Pu, and ²³⁸₉₂U at the laser intensity $I = 10^{26}$ W/cm² which is currently considered as an optimistic upper limit for the experimental achievements expected in a near future [8].

ITM in the precluster model.—Our second approach considers the field-assisted tunneling of the preformed α particle following the phenomenological precluster model

[41,42]. In this modification of the Gamow model, deviations of the interaction potential $V(r)$ from the pure Coulomb form at short distances from the nucleus are considered. The preformed α cluster is initially confined in a potential well with depth $-U_0$, which is taken as the mean field nuclear potential that the nucleons of the parent nucleus experience. This nuclear potential has a finite length which is given by $x_0 = c_1 A_p^{1/3}$ with c_1 a constant that defines the radius of the parent nucleus and A_p the mass number of the latter [41,53]. For distances larger than x_0 , the interaction is dictated by the Coulomb force acting between the protons of the daughter nucleus and the α particle. Technically this more realistic description for the nuclear potential results in a better estimate for the frequency ν_0 in (1) and in the replacement of the lower integration limit there by the potential well radius $x_0 \ll b$. For field-free decays this model gives a fairly good agreement with experimental data on nuclear half-lives, as it is shown in Table I where both experimental and theoretical values are given.

The effect of laser radiation on the decay rate is the highest when the particle escapes along the electric field vector. Thus for the upper estimate of the possible laser-induced decay acceleration, a 1D model can be employed, following successful models in nonrelativistic laser-atom interactions [54]. According to the ITM [36,37], a 1D trajectory $x(t)$ satisfying the Newton equation

$$m_r \ddot{x} = \frac{ZZ_\alpha}{x^2} + e z_{\text{eff}} E(t), \quad (5)$$

can be found along which the particle starts its motion at the complex time instant $t = t_s$ inside the well, $x(t_s) = x_0$, arrives at the exit of the barrier when $t = t_0$ and has at $t \rightarrow \infty$ the energy equal to Q_α . The exit point is separated from the well by the classically forbidden region, so that the solution of the Newton equation satisfying the assigned initial conditions only exists in complex time, $t = t_0 + i\tau$. The tunneling rate is given by [36,37] $R \approx \nu_0 \exp(-2\text{Im}[W]/\hbar)$ where the

classical action W is found along the complex trajectories under the barrier [14,39] (see also the Supplemental Material [50]). For all numerical cases $\text{Im}[W] \gg \hbar$ holds, confirming the applicability of the semiclassical approximation. Note that, compared to the WKB model approach presented above, the ITM takes into account numerically the field-induced modifications of the α particle trajectory.

For an estimate of the laser effect on the α decay rate, we have considered the idealized case of a monochromatic linearly polarized field with $E_0 = 2.74 \times 10^{14}$ V/cm, corresponding to an intensity $I = 10^{26}$ W/cm², and 800 nm wavelength. We average the field-assisted α decay rate over the laser field period which corresponds to the second of Eqs. (4) without the factor 1/3 which comes from the angular integration. Comparing the relative rates $\bar{R}_L - 1$ and $R'_L - 1$ shown in Table I, we find a very good agreement between the WKB and ITM results. Our results are also consistent with previous results in Ref. [14] when taking into account that there the charge $Z_\alpha = 2$ was used instead of z_{eff} , neglecting the motion of the daughter nucleus in the laser field.

Possible observation.—Equation (3) and the numerical results in Table I show that the value of the threshold electric field E_{eff} grows with the α particle energy and decreases with the charge Z of the daughter nucleus. Therefore, the laser-induced effect on α decay grows exponentially for heavy nuclei with large atomic number $Z_p = Z + 2$ and for decays characterized by small values Q_α . Indeed, the Coulomb barrier width grows as $b = 2Ze^2/Q_\alpha$, such that the quasistatic electric field of the laser can make a more significant work during the (longer) tunneling process. However, with decreasing Q_α the field-free penetrability drops down much faster than R_L grows, prohibiting experimental detection. The nucleus becomes practically stable despite the α decay not being formally forbidden, see, e.g., the case of $^{144}_{60}\text{Nd}$ in Table I with $Q_\alpha = 1.9$ MeV, the minimal value $E_{\text{eff}} \approx 2.2 \times 10^{16}$ V/cm, but field-free half-life 7.2×10^{15} years.

Finally, we note that a modification of the instant decay rate by $\simeq 1\%$ and that of the averaged one by $\simeq 10^{-5}$ which may happen for some nuclei according to our predictions in Table I at intensities $I \simeq 10^{26}$ W/cm² leaves no chance for experimental detection. Extreme laser intensities can only be reached under a tight focusing limiting the interaction volume by $\simeq \lambda^3 \approx 10^{-12}$ cm³ for infrared lasers ($\lambda \simeq 1$ μm) and by a much smaller volume for x-ray lasers. Assuming a solid state density target with a generic concentration of 10^{23} cm⁻³, the number of atoms in the interaction volume is $N \simeq 10^{11}$. The number N_0 of field-free decays per laser shot and its change ΔN due to the laser effect are shown in the last two columns of Table I considering a pulse duration $\tau = 100$ fs. These numbers show clearly that the laser-induced corrections are for all practical purposes negligible. For $^{144}_{60}\text{Nd}$ where the correction (4) achieves its maximum, the field-free decay rate is so small that no events will ever

practically happen in the laser focus during the laser pulse action. The case of x-ray lasers is even less realistic due to a much smaller volume over which one would need to focus to achieve extreme intensity values.

Contradicting theoretical predictions.—We turn now to recent publications where a gross effect of laser fields on α decay has been predicted. In a Letter [17], Delion and Ghinescu claimed based on analytical considerations that α -decay can be significantly accelerated in a strong laser field with intensity $I \sim 10^{20} \div 10^{22}$ W/cm². For a quantitative analysis, Ref. [17] introduces the dimensionless parameter D which is proportional to the ratio of the quiver amplitude the α particle has in an external electromagnetic field to the nuclear radius R_0 , $D \propto \sqrt{I}/(\omega^2 R_0)$. Reference [17] claims that for laser fields with $D > 1$, a considerable modification of the α -decay rate can be achieved, and in particular for $D = 3$, this would lead to a six orders of magnitude enhancement for the case of ^{232}Pu . But for a Ti:sapphire laser with $\hbar\omega \approx 1.5$ eV, D reaches unity already at modest intensities of $I \approx 5 \times 10^{11}$ W/cm². Were the theoretical predictions of Ref. [17] correct, this enhancement by many orders of magnitude in the α -decay rate could have been easily achieved with lasers routinely used in labs for the last several decades, or even using a sufficiently powerful microwave oven [55].

Upon close inspection, it appears that these surprising predictions stem from the misuse of an approximation. In order to approach the problem of α decay in the presence of an external time-dependent field analytically, Ref. [17] employs the Kramers-Henneberger transformation (KHT) [56] and proceeds with an essential approximation by replacing the transformed time-dependent Coulomb potential by its static (i.e., averaged over the laser period) component. This ansatz is applicable only provided that the characteristic time of the processes under consideration remains greater (ideally, much greater) than the laser period. As this is indeed the case for a broad variety of atomic phenomena in laser fields, KHT is widely used in atomic physics (see, e.g., [57] and references therein or [58]). However, for the considered problem exactly the opposite condition $T_\omega \gg \tau_\alpha$ is satisfied, as we have pointed out above. This invalidates all results of Ref. [17]. A similar error appears also in Refs. [18,19]. The predictions on Refs. [15,16] based on the KHT and a numerical solution of the Schrödinger equation are even more counterintuitive than the ones of Ref. [17–19] and are likely to stem from numerical inaccuracies.

Finally, calculations by Qi *et al.* in [20] are close to those we have presented here, and the linear correction agrees quantitatively with our estimates. In contrast to our conclusions, the authors expect the effect to be experimentally detectable and suggest to use elliptically polarized radiation to avoid the cancellation of the linear term in (4) after the time averaging. However, the angular averaging of the term $\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{n}_0$ will lead to the cancelation of the linear contribution irrespectively of the laser polarization state. Furthermore,

the authors of Ref. [20] do not consider the realistic number of nuclei decaying within the small laser focus.

Conclusions.—By employing two complementary approaches, one analytical based on the WKB approximation and one numerical using the ITM applied to the precluster model for α decay, we have shown that electromagnetic fields of strengths (3) exceeding the critical field of quantum electrodynamics are needed to considerably alter the rate of nuclear α decay. Proposals have been put forward to overcome the critical field limit by collisions of ultra-relativistic nuclear beams with laser pulses of sub-critical intensity [10]. Furthermore, simulations indicate that the QED cascades which are expected at ultrahigh electromagnetic fields [59,60] and put a conceptual limit to extreme laser intensities due to the laser energy depletion, may be controllable [61]. However, these methods remain far beyond the present experimental capabilities and many orders of magnitude in laser intensity are yet to be conquered. We conclude that laser-assisted α decay is practically out of reach and refute recent optimistic claims on the efficiency of this process and prospects for nuclear waste recycling.

We would like to acknowledge discussions with A. M. Fedotov, M. Ivanov, C. H. Keitel, and G. Röpke. S. V. P. acknowledges financial support from the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (Grant No. 19-02-00643).

-
- [1] J.-P. Chambaret, O. Chekhlov, G. Cheriaux *et al.*, *Proc. SPIE Int. Soc. Opt. Eng.* **7721**, 77211D (2010).
- [2] Extreme Light Infrastructure—Nuclear Physics official website www.eli-np.ro (2020).
- [3] A. S. Pirozhkov, Y. Fukuda, M. Nishiuchi *et al.*, *Opt. Exp.* **25**, 20486 (2017).
- [4] Z. Guo, L. Yu, J. Wang, C. Wang, Y. Liu, Z. Gan, W. Li, Y. Leng, X. Liang, and R. Li, *Opt. Exp.* **26**, 26776 (2017).
- [5] S. Weber, S. Bechet, S. Borneislet *et al.*, *Matter Radiat. Extremes* **2**, 149 (2017).
- [6] E. Cartlidge, *Science* **359**, 382 (2018).
- [7] C. Danson, C. Haefner, J. Bromage *et al.*, *High Power Laser Sci. Eng.* **7**, e54 (2019).
- [8] A. V. Bashinov, A. A. Gonoskov, A. V. Kim, G. Mourou, and A. M. Sergeev, *Eur. Phys. J. Special Topics* **223**, 1105 (2014).
- [9] G. A. Mourou, T. Tajima, and S. V. Bulanov, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 309 (2006).
- [10] A. DiPiazza, C. Müller, K. Z. Hatsagortsyan, and C. H. Keitel, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 1177 (2012).
- [11] N. B. Narozhny and A. M. Fedotov, *Contemp. Phys.* **56**, 249 (2015).
- [12] A. Pálffy and H. A. Weidenmüller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 192502 (2014).
- [13] A. Pálffy, O. Buss, A. Hofer, and H. A. Weidenmüller, *Phys. Rev. C* **92**, 044619 (2015).
- [14] H. M. Castañeda Cortes, C. Müller, C. H. Keitel, and A. Pálffy, *Phys. Lett. B* **723**, 401 (2013).
- [15] S. Misicu and M. Rizea, *J. Phys. G* **40**, 095101 (2013).
- [16] S. Misicu and M. Rizea, *Open Phys.* **14**, 81 (2016).
- [17] D. S. Delion and S. A. Ghinescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 202501 (2017).
- [18] D. P. Kis and R. Szilvasi, *J. Phys. G* **45**, 045103 (2018).
- [19] D. Bai, D. Deng, and Z. Ren, *Nucl. Phys.* **A976**, 23 (2018).
- [20] J. Qi, T. Li, R. Xu, L. Fu, and X. Wang, *Phys. Rev. C* **99**, 044610 (2019).
- [21] J. M. Blatt and V. F. Weisskopf, *Theoretical Nuclear Physics* (Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1991).
- [22] M. Pfützner, M. Karny, L. V. Grigorenko, and K. Riisager, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 567 (2012).
- [23] G. Gamow, *Z. Phys. A* **51**, 204 (1928).
- [24] R. W. Gurney and E. U. Condon, *Phys. Rep.* **33**, 127 (1929).
- [25] S. A. Gurvitz and G. Kalbermann, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 262 (1987).
- [26] M. Büttiker and R. Landauer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 1739 (1982).
- [27] T. Ishikawa, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **377**, 20180231 (2019).
- [28] F. Z. Sauter, *Z. Phys.* **69**, 742 (1931); **73**, 547 (1932).
- [29] W. Heisenberg and H. Z. Euler, *Z. Phys.* **98**, 714 (1936).
- [30] J. Schwinger, *Phys. Rev.* **82**, 664 (1951).
- [31] C. Danson, D. Hillier, N. Hopps, and D. Neely, *High Power Laser Sci. Eng.* **3**, e3 (2015).
- [32] V. Yanovsky, V. Chvykov, G. Kalinchenko *et al.*, *Opt. Express* **16**, 2109 (2008).
- [33] V. I. Ritus, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **56**, 986 (1969) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* **29**, 532 (1969)].
- [34] W. Becker, G. T. Moore, R. R. Schlicher, and M. O. Scully, *Phys. Lett.* **94A**, 131 (1983).
- [35] C. Qi, R. Liotta, and R. Wyss, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **105**, 214 (2019).
- [36] V. S. Popov, *Phys. Usp.* **47**, 855 (2004).
- [37] V. S. Popov, *Phys. At. Nucl.* **68**, 686 (2005).
- [38] S. V. Popruzhenko, *J. Phys. B* **47**, 204001 (2014).
- [39] H. M. Castañeda Cortes, S. V. Popruzhenko, D. Bauer, and A. Pálffy, *New J. Phys.* **13**, 063007 (2011).
- [40] B. Buck and A. C. Merchant, *Phys. Rev. C* **39**, 2097(R) (1989).
- [41] B. Buck, A. C. Merchant, and S. M. Perez, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 2975 (1990).
- [42] B. Buck, A. C. Merchant, and S. M. Perez, *J. Phys. G* **17**, 1223 (1991).
- [43] B. Buck, A. C. Merchant, and S. M. Perez, *Phys. Rev. C* **45**, 2247 (1992).
- [44] B. Buck, J. C. Johnston, A. C. Merchant, and S. M. Perez, *Phys. Rev. C* **53**, 2841 (1996).
- [45] C. Xu and Z. Ren, *Nucl. Phys.* **A760**, 303 (2005).
- [46] N. G. Kelkar and H. M. Castañeda, *Phys. Rev. C* **76**, 064605 (2007).
- [47] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics. Nonrelativistic Theory*, 2nd ed. (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1965).
- [48] V. D. Mur, V. S. Popov, and A. V. Sergeev, *JETP Lett.* **53**, 455 (1991).
- [49] E. Fermi, *Nuclear Physics* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1950).
- [50] See the Supplemental Material at <http://link.aps.org/supplemental/10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.212505> for technical details on the derivation of the field-induced corrections

- to the tunneling rate and on the time-dependent imaginary time method applied to α decay.
- [51] M. F. Ciappina, S. V. Popruzhenko, S. V. Bulanov, T. Ditmire, G. Korn, and S. Weber, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 043405 (2019).
- [52] Evaluated Nuclear Structure Data Files, <https://www.nndc.bnl.gov/ensdf/> (2019).
- [53] H. F. Zhang and G. Royer, *Phys. Rev. C* **77**, 054318 (2008).
- [54] J. Javanainen, J. H. Eberly, and Q. C. Su, *Phys. Rev. A* **38**, 3430 (1988), Q. Su and J. H. Eberly, *Phys. Rev. A* **44**, 5997 (1991).
- [55] We are thankful to M. Ivanov for this illuminating argument which points out once more the physical inconsistency of Refs. [17–19].
- [56] W. C. Henneberger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **21**, 838 (1968).
- [57] M. V. Fedorov, in *Atomic and Free Electrons in a Strong Light Field* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1997), p. 362, <https://doi.org/10.1142/3320>.
- [58] A. M. Popov, O. V. Tikhonova, and E. A. Volkova, *J. Phys. B* **32**, 3331 (1999).
- [59] A. R. Bell and J. G. Kirk, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 200403 (2008).
- [60] A. M. Fedotov, N. B. Narozhny, G. Mourou, and G. Korn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 080402 (2010).
- [61] M. Tamburini, A. DiPiazza, and C. H. Keitel, *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 5694 (2017).