A quantitative comparison of time-of-flight momentum microscopes and hemispherical analyzers for time-resolved ARPES experiments
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Time-of-flight-based momentum microscopy has a growing presence in photoemission studies, as it enables parallel energy- and momentum-resolved acquisition of the full photoelectron distribution. Here, we report table-top extreme ultraviolet (XUV) time- and angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy (trARPES) featuring both a hemispherical analyzer and a momentum microscope within the same setup. We present a systematic comparison of the two detection schemes and quantify experimentally relevant parameters, including pump- and probe-induced space-charge effects, detection efficiency, photoelectron count rates, and depth of focus. We highlight the advantages and limitations of both instruments based on exemplary trARPES measurements of bulk WSe$_2$. Our analysis demonstrates the complementary nature of the two spectrometers for time-resolved ARPES experiments. Their combination in a single experimental apparatus allows us to address a broad range of scientific questions in trARPES.

1 Introduction

Angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) is a key technique to investigate the electronic structure of solids. By extracting the kinetic energy and angular distribution of emitted photoelectrons, one gains direct access to the quasiparticle band structure. Combining this technique with a pump-probe approach allows studying the electron dynamics after optical excitation on a femtosecond timescale. In recent years, time-resolved ARPES (trARPES) has been successfully applied to many fields in materials science, such as control of quantum matter, photo-induced phase transitions and the investigation of electronic states and phases not accessible in equilibrium. Advances in laser-based extreme ultraviolet (XUV) sources using high harmonic generation in noble gases now enable space-charge free photoemission up to MHz repetition rates at high time and energy resolution (10s of fs/meV) and at wavelength up to the far XUV.

The most commonly used electron spectrometer in trARPES is the hemispherical analyzer (HA). Here, the photoelectrons enter an electrostatic lens system followed by two hemispherical deflector electrodes acting as a dispersive band-pass energy filter, as sketched in Fig. 1(a). Subsequently, the electrons are projected onto a 2D multi-channel plate (MCP) detector, which
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allows parallel detection of kinetic energy and emission angle. However, this detection approach is rather inefficient, as only a single two-dimensional (2D) cut in a narrow energy and momentum window of the 3D photoelectron distribution can be simultaneously captured.

The more recent detection scheme based on a time-of-flight (ToF) energy analyzer overcomes this limitation: The momentum microscope (MM) is based on a cathode-lens electron microscope. By applying a high positive voltage to an electrostatic objective lens placed close to the sample surface, all emitted photoelectrons are steered into the lens system resulting in an acceptance of the complete $2\pi$ solid angle. In analogy to optical microscopy, a reciprocal image is generated in the back focal plane of the objective lens, corresponding to the surface-projected band structure. Next, the photoelectrons pass through a field-free ToF drift tube. Finally, their 2D momentum distribution and kinetic energy (encoded in the arrival time) are detected at a single-electron level using an MCP stack combined with a position-sensitive delay-line detector (DLD). Ultimately, the ToF-MM enables parallel acquisition of the 3D photoelectron distribution $I(E_{\text{kin}}, k_x, k_y)$ across the full accessible in-plane momentum range (at low kinetic energies limited by the parabola of the photoemission horizon) and within a large energy range from the threshold energy to the hard X-ray regime, as illustrated in Fig. 1(b).

In principle, trARPES is expected to benefit greatly from the improved parallelization in data acquisition of the ToF-MM for several reasons: (i) The excited-state signal is usually orders of magnitude lower than that of the occupied states in equilibrium, which necessitates efficient detection. (ii) Prediction of the relevant energy-momentum regions of photoexcited states can be difficult, and a time-resolved mapping of the entire first Brillouin zone (BZ) with a HA is typically not feasible. (iii) Various photoinduced electronic processes can occur simultaneously, spread over a large energy-momentum range, which are now accessible within a single measurement. However, while the MM theoretically constitutes the ultimate photoelectron detector, certain limitations, such as increased space-charge effects and constraints of the DLD detection rate, compromise the experimental practicability in particular for pump-probe experiments. Therefore, a detailed benchmark of these two photoelectron detection schemes is of great interest.

In this article, we present a table-top XUV trARPES setup that combines a ToF-MM and a conventional HA and investigate their respective operational capabilities. We quantify critical parameters, such as depth of focus, experimental count rates, acquisition times, and space-charge effects. By two exemplary trARPES experiments – excited-state band structure mapping at a fixed time delay and tracking of the excited population dynamics – we demonstrate the advantages and limitations of both instruments and illustrate the benefits of combining both types of analyzers. After an overview of our experimental setup in Sec. 2, we will introduce some important aspects specific to the MM in Sec. 3. Section 4 finally compares the two spectrometers based on our experimental data, followed by a discussion in Sec. 5.

2 Description of the experimental setup

The table-top XUV light source consists of an optical parametric chirped pulse amplifier (OPCPA) generating fs light pulses at 1.55 eV and 500 kHz at an average power of 20 W (40 µJ pulse energy). A beamsplitter at the exit of the OPCPA extracts a portion of the pulse energy as a 1.55 eV or frequency-doubled 3.1 eV synchronized optical pump. The probe pulses are frequency-doubled in a beta barium borate crystal and focused onto a high-pressure argon jet for up-conversion to the XUV via high harmonic generation. By a combination of a multilayer mirror and metallic (Sn) filters, only the 7th harmonic (21.7 eV) is transmitted to the analysis
chamber. Then, the pump and probe beams are focused onto the sample in a near-collinear geometry, and the emitted photoelectrons are detected with a HA (SPECS PHOIBOS 150 2D-CCD) or a ToF-MM (SPECS METIS 1000). The MM is mounted on a linear translation stage connected to the analysis chamber by a vacuum bellows and can be retracted to avoid collision with the cryogenic 6-axis carving manipulator when using the HA.

The detection unit of the MM features an MCP followed by a DLD. Each registered event directly corresponds to a single photoelectron. Saving this data stream at a single-event level permits event-wise correction and calibration, and selective binning later during analysis. The operating principle of the DLD limits the count rate to a single electron per pulse, resulting in maximum rates of \( \sim 5 \times 10^5 \) cts/s, corresponding to the repetition rate of the laser system. For the case of the HA, the photoelectrons are first multiplied in an MCP and subsequently accelerated onto a phosphor screen, which is imaged by a CCD camera. Thus, a single photoelectron generates several counts spread over adjacent pixels. To obtain an estimate of the actual photoelectron count rate, we calibrated the CCD response in the regime of distinct single-electron events. To quantify relevant experimental parameters of both spectrometers (see Sec. 4), we introduce the metrics \( \text{emitted electrons per pulse} \) \( \text{detected electrons per pulse} \), corresponding directly to the count rate of the MM and to the rescaled CCD count rate of the HA, respectively.

The material used for the benchmark study is bulk tungsten diselenide (2H-WSe\(_2\)). This layered semiconductor exhibits an indirect bandgap, a sharp electronic band structure and a distinct electronic response upon near-infrared optical excitation. Exemplary datasets acquired with both detectors on WSe\(_2\) at temporal pump-probe overlap are shown in Figs. 1(c,e).
The MM captures the entire photoemission horizon (momentum disk with radius $k_{\parallel,\text{max}} \approx 2.15 \, \text{Å}^{-1}$), exceeding the first BZ of WSe$_2$, and the full energy range from the pump-pulse-induced population in the conduction band (CB) to the secondary electron cutoff. In contrast, the HA covers an energy window of a few electron volts (at a reasonable energy resolution) and a narrow momentum range resulting from the limited acceptance angle of $\pm 15^\circ$ (Wide Angle Mode). The momentum resolution orthogonal to the dispersing direction is determined by the width of the slit located at the entrance of the spherical deflector. All HA data were recorded with a slit width of 0.5 mm, corresponding to a momentum integration of $\approx 0.04 \, \text{Å}^{-1}$, and a pass energy of 30 eV.

Using the MM, the angle between the pump and probe beams and the sample surface normal is fixed at 65°. For comparability between the detectors, we align the sample in a similar geometry in the HA measurements, which yields the $\Sigma$-K momentum cut shown in Fig. 1(e). All samples are cleaved at room temperature in ultra high vacuum ($< 1 \times 10^{-10} \, \text{mbar}$).

Whereas the energy resolution of our trARPES setup is limited by the bandwidth of the XUV probe pulses to $\sim 150 \, \text{meV}$, the HA offers an improved momentum resolution over the MM. Based on band structure data, we estimate an effective momentum resolution of the MM and the HA of 0.08 Å$^{-1}$ and 0.04 Å$^{-1}$ ($\sim 1^\circ$), respectively. The ultimate instrument resolution is reported as $< 4 \times 10^{-3} \, \text{Å}^{-1}$ ($< 0.1^\circ$) for the HA and $< 5 \times 10^{-3} \, \text{Å}^{-1}$ for the MM\cite{34,35,46}. However, achieving such optimal conditions with the MM requires very high extractor voltages and tedious optimization of the lens settings and corrector elements.

### 3 Depth of focus in Momentum Microscopy

Before starting our systematic comparison of the two spectrometers, we introduce further features of the MM arising from the similarity to optical microscopy. Firstly, both a reciprocal and a Gaussian real-space image plane form consecutively in the electron-optical lens column, which can be selectively projected onto the DLD. Thus, by choice of lens settings, the instrument can be used either for band structure mapping or to investigate the real-space distribution of photoelectrons via photoemission electron microscopy (PEEM)\cite{47}. Secondly, apertures can be inserted in both image planes, which enables trARPES at high spatial selectivity and time- and momentum-resolved PEEM.

We first focus on the use of field apertures inserted into the Gaussian image plane, which can be used to study the electronic band structure of spatially inhomogeneous or small samples below the size of the probe spot down to the micrometer range, see Fig. 2(a). The electron transmission losses resulting from field apertures are shown in Fig. 2(b) for various probe spot sizes.

The effective source size, defined by the field aperture or the spot size, also determines the depth of focus (DoF), i.e., the energy window with sharp momentum resolution, resulting from the chromatic aberrations of the electron lenses. To investigate the DoF, we insert a grid in the momentum image plane, and analyze the sharp-
ness of the resulting grid lines as a function of kinetic energy for various field apertures, shown in Fig. 3. For the aperture diameter $d_{FA} = 200 \mu m$, we observe sharp grid lines superimposed on the band structure of WSe$_2$ reaching from the valence band (VB) down to almost the entire secondary electron tail. However, with increasing aperture size, the energy window of sharp momentum imaging narrows. To quantify this trend, we perform a 2D Fourier transform of the iso-energy contours, and analyze the magnitude of the spatial frequency peaks corresponding to the grid periodicity as a function of energy, shown in Fig. 3(c-d). Similar to the depth of field in optical imaging, we find that the DoF follows an inverse square dependence of the aperture diameter, see Fig. 3(e).

To achieve a uniform performance in a typical range of interest of few eV, it is necessary to have a DoF of $\sim 10$ eV. For this, the effective source size has to be reduced to $\sim 25 \mu m$, which corresponds to a field aperture diameter of 200 µm for the chosen magnification settings. At the given spot size of $80 \times 80 \mu m^2$, this reduces the photoelectron transmission to 6 % of the total yield, as shown in Fig. 2(b). However, to compensate for transmission losses, the XUV flux and thereby the total number of emitted electrons cannot be arbitrarily increased. Here, space-charge effects have to be considered, as discussed in the following section. Thus, for high spatial selectivity and a large DoF without significant transmission losses, the size of the XUV spot is an important parameter to consider.

4 Quantitative comparison of the MM and the HA

4.1 XUV-induced space charge

A fundamental limitation of photoemission with ultrashort light pulses is space charge. The Coulomb repulsion within a dense photoelectron cloud can modify the electrons’ angular and energy distribution, and can significantly deteriorate momentum and energy resolution. Space charge and its dependence on source parameters, such as pulse duration, flux, and spot size, have already been studied extensively. Here, we compare the space-charge effects for both detection schemes using the energy shift and broadening of the energy dispersion curve (EDC) of the spin-orbit split VBs at the K point of WSe$_2$, 

Fig. 3: 2D cut of a MM measurement along the K-Γ-K direction with a square grid in the momentum image plane for field apertures of diameters (a) 200 µm and (b) 500 µm. (c) Iso-energy contour at the focus energy (sharpest momentum image), see the white dashed line in panel (b), for $d_{FA} = 500 \mu m$. (d) Intensity of the Fourier transform peak corresponding to the grid spacing, see the red box in the inset, as a function of energy. The FWHM of the peak is extracted from a Gaussian fit (black dashed curve). The inset shows the Fourier transform of the iso-energy contour in c. (e) Depth of focus (FWHM) versus aperture diameter with an inverse quadratic fit.
In the regime of few emitted photoelectrons per pulse, the band structure measurements of both detectors are in excellent agreement, see panels (a) and (c). When increasing the XUV source flux (and thereby the density within the photoelectron cloud), the MM spectrum rapidly shifts towards higher energies and becomes drastically broadened, while the HA spectrum is only weakly affected, see panels (b) and (d).

For the MM, energy distortions arise above \(\sim 100\) emitted electrons per pulse, roughly one order of magnitude before distortions appear in HA measurements, see Figs. 4(e-f) and the discussion below. While the transmission and thereby the effective count rate decrease for a smaller field aperture size, we find that space charge is rather independent of the apertures. This demonstrates that its major contribution stems from the Coulomb interaction of photoelectrons on their trajectories prior to the Gaussian image plane, in agreement with simulation results for the case of hard X-ray ARPES\(^{40}\). In other words, to employ the MM at a reasonable resolution, the source flux and the resulting number of emitted photoelectrons per pulse have to be chosen carefully. For instance, when using the aperture \(d_{FA} = 200\) \(\mu\)m (allowing for a large DoF), at \(\sim 350\) emitted photoelectrons per pulse the spectrum is already critically broadened. However, due to transmission losses and an imperfect detection efficiency, this corresponds only to a final DLD photoelectron detection rate of \(\sim 0.5\) cts/pulse – significantly below the instrumental limit of a single event per pulse.

These observations demonstrate that space-charge effects can be a major limitation of the MM using femtosecond pulses compared to HAs. In MMs, as the entire electron cloud is guided into the lens column containing several focal planes, electron densities are significantly increased compared to HAs. Furthermore, the effective interaction travel length and interaction time between fast electrons of the primary spectrum and slow, inelastically scattered secondary electrons is significantly higher, as their effective velocities barely differ due to the high initial acceleration field. Since the secondary electrons travel close to the optical axis, the primary electron spectrum features a Lorentzian profile of iso-energy surfaces, with space-charge distortions most pronounced at the \(\Gamma\) point\(^{37,40}\). In contrast, using a HA, space-charge effects are spatially uniform and arise only in proximity to the sample surface, when fast and slow electrons are spatially confined to a dense photoelectron disk.

For illustration, we estimate the involved time and length scales of the spread of the photoelectron cloud along its trajectory for both instruments. In the HA, it takes \(\approx 90\) ps to separate electrons of highest kinetic energy (corresponding to the VB maximum, \(E_{\text{kin}} \approx 17\) eV) from the secondary electron tail (exemplary energy \(E_{\text{kin}} \approx 5\) eV) by \(100\) \(\mu\)m, during which the fast electrons have traveled \(220\) \(\mu\)m. In the MM (at an approximate average potential within the initial lens elements of 2 kV), it takes \(\approx 1.3\) ns to achieve the same distance spread between fast and slow electrons, during which the primary electrons have traveled \(220\) \(\mu\)m. In the MM (at an approximate average potential within the initial lens elements of 2 kV), it takes \(\approx 1.3\) ns to achieve the same distance spread between fast and slow electrons, during which the primary electrons have traveled several centimeters, reaching already into the lens column. Detailed simulations of the space-charge effects in momentum microscopy can be found elsewhere\(^{40}\).

In summary, space-charge effects and DoF constrain the XUV spot size and photon flux in MM experiments. In the discussed configuration (spot size \(80 \times 80\) \(\mu\)m\(^2\)), a reduction of the spot size would allow to omit field apertures in typical band mapping experiments. Due to the increased transmission for smaller spot sizes, the XUV flux could be lowered significantly, effectively reducing space-charge constraints, which would permit acquisition close to the DLD detection limit of 1 count per pulse. While decreasing the spot size below a certain limit again leads to critical space-charge distortions, the MM requires photocurrents of only few photoelectrons per pulse. Thus, the lower limit of the XUV spot size due to space-charge effects is expected to be in the range of a few micrometers\(^{51}\).
4.2 Count rates

Next, we discuss the total count rate of both instruments achievable under these space-charge restrictions. From the total photoelectron yield, the detector count rate and effective electron transmission, we estimate a detection efficiency of 5% of the MCP/DLD stack of the MM. Taking into account the transmission losses at the field aperture ($d_{FA}=200\ \mu m$), roughly 0.3% of the total emitted photoelectrons are detected. For the HA, the effective transmission is on the order of 0.03%, as only a narrow 2D energy-momentum plane is detected in parallel. Therefore, the fraction of detected electrons (at an MCP efficiency of 10%) is 0.003%.

Taking into account the space-charge limit of approximately 100 emitted photoelectrons per pulse, the MM count rate is restricted to $\sim 0.3$ cts/pulse. However, a substantial portion of these electrons originates from the secondary electron tail and deep-lying VBs. Focusing only on the topmost VB region from the VB maximum to 1.5 eV below, which is typically of most interest in time-resolved studies, yields 0.006 cts/pulse, or 3000 cts/s at a repetition rate of 500 kHz. In contrast, when using the HA, the XUV flux can be increased by approximately an order of magnitude to 1000 emitted photoelectrons per pulse before critical space-charge effects emerge. For a typical cut, such as shown in Fig. 4(e), we detect approximately 15000 cts/s. In comparison, when extracting a comparable cut from the MM dataset, the count rate is roughly 40 cts/s, $\sim 350$ times below the rate of the HA, resulting from the reduced XUV source flux ($\sim 10\times$), transmission losses at the aperture ($\sim 17\times$) and a lower detection efficiency ($\sim 2\times$).

4.3 Experimental scenarios

Next, we discuss common trARPES scenarios to highlight the advantages of each instrument and the benefit of combining both detectors in a single setup. As a first use case we
show the (excited-state) band mapping of WSe₂ upon excitation with near-infrared optical pulses (λ_{pump} = 800 nm). Using the MM, we acquire the quasiparticle dispersion across the full photoemission horizon in a single measurement at a fixed sample geometry. We gain access to the band structure of the first projected BZ up to 1.55 eV above the VB, see the transient occupation of the CB at the K and Σ points in Figs. 5(b,c). For a static 3D band mapping using the MM, typically 10^7 − 10^8 total events are required, at our count rate achievable in ∼ 1 − 10 minutes (Fig. 5(a)). In order to accurately resolve the much weaker signal of excited states, typically ∼ 10^9 events are detected within ∼ 2 hours, producing data as shown in Fig. 5(b,c). For comparison, the energy-momentum window covered in a single HA measurement along the Σ-K direction is shown in panel (d), recorded within ∼ 10 minutes. Mapping the full irreducible part of the BZ with the HA (by sample rotation or by using a deflector arrangement) requires at a comparable momentum resolution ∼ 60 sequential scans. This procedure is further complicated by the fact that high emission angles are difficult to access and spectra have to be merged and mapped from angle to momentum space. In addition, light polarization, fluence and photoemission matrix elements might change during such a mapping procedure using a sample manipulator. Thus, to get an overview of the full (excited-state) dispersion relation, band mapping with the MM is highly advantageous.

Another typical use case of trARPES is the investigation of the transient carrier relaxation dynamics along certain pathways in momentum space. In WSe₂, electrons are initially excited into the conduction band (CB) at the K valley, followed by a relaxation into the global CB minimum at the Σ point, discussed in detail elsewhere [4,5,55,56]. As such relaxation dynamics are often highly localized in momentum space, information on selective regions in momentum space is sufficient to study the temporal evolution. Measuring such dynamics with the MM results in a 4D data set (3D + time) of the full energy-, momentum- and time-dependent band structure, which requires ∼ 10^{10} events and acquisition times of 20 hours and more. In contrast, using the HA, only the relevant energy-momentum region is recorded, and we can utilize the higher photon flux and larger transmission within this window, yielding an acquisition time in the range of 1-2 hours for a time trace. To illustrate these differences, Fig. 6(a) shows the time traces of the conduction band population at the K and Σ points for both spectrometers, measured for 1 hour (HA) and 20 hours (MM), respectively. Both data sets show similar statistics and scatter, as visible from the residuals of the exponential fits. In contrast, comparing
Fig. 6: Time traces of the integrated excited-state signal at the K and Σ valleys for acquisition times of (a) 1 hour (HA) and 20 hours (MM), and (b) an equal acquisition time of 1 hour for both instruments. The excited-state signal of the MM data is extracted from an energy-momentum plane corresponding to the HA measurement. The time traces are fitted with a single-exponential (Σ) and double-exponential (K) decay curve convolved with a Gaussian, respectively. The fit results are shown in solid curves, along with the time constants (standard deviation as uncertainty) of the fast decay component of the transient population at K. While the residuals in panel (a) show similar levels of noise for both instruments, the MM time traces in (b) feature substantial scatter.

4.4 Optical pump-induced space charge

A further critical aspect in trARPES are the space-charge effects induced by electrons emitted by the pump pulses. Multi-photon photoemission and emission at surface inhomogeneities can generate a significant number of low-energy electrons. Depending on the pump-probe time delay, this can lead to complex interactions with the probe-pulse-induced electron cloud. While this phenomenon plays a secondary role when exciting WSe$_2$ at $h\nu = 1.55$ eV, it becomes increasingly important as the photon energy of the pump pulses approaches the material’s work function, since the order of the nonlinearity needed for multiphoton ionization decreases. In the following, we systematically study the pump-induced space-charge effects at $h\nu = 3.1$ eV, utilizing the metrics introduced in Sec. 4.1, i.e., the energy shift and broadening of the VB at the K point.

Already at moderate excitation densities ($F_{abs} = 20 \mu$J/cm$^2$), the MM spectra exhibit a severe non-uniform broadening and shift most pronounced at the Γ point, see Fig. 7. In this fluence regime, the low-energy electrons released by the pump pulses greatly outnumber probe-pulse-induced photoelectrons, shown in panel (e). The pump-pulse-induced space-charge effects strongly depend on delay and extend over several ps around the temporal pump-probe overlap, see panel (d). Here, one has to carefully distinguish the true temporal overlap from the space-charge maximum at positive delays. As sketched in Fig. 7(f), space-charge interaction is particularly critical at positive delays (pump pulse precedes the XUV probe), since the fast probe photoelectron cloud traverses through the cloud of slow, pump-pulse-emitted electrons on its path to the detector. In the MM, the relative difference between the velocities of the two electron species is minute due to the high acceleration field of the extractor, similar to the interaction between the primary and secondary electrons within the probe-pulse electron cloud.
discussed in Sec. 4.1. As a result, the critical interaction region extends far into the lens column. Moreover, also the low-energy electrons emitted by the pump pulses travel along the optical axis, which enhances the energy shift and broadening at the Γ point. In contrast, in the field-free region between the sample and the HA, the relative speeds of both electron clouds differ strongly, so the interaction region is limited to a small volume close to the sample. This leads to pump-pulse-induced space-charge effects already at significantly lower excitation densities when using the MM as compared to a HA, as shown in Figs. 7(g-h).

Ultimately, this significantly limits the experimental flexibility of the MM with regard to excitation wavelengths approaching the sample work function, and strongly restricts the applicable excitation fluences. For our test case of $\hbar \nu = 3.1 \text{ eV}$, two-photon processes dominate the pump-induced photoemission from WSe$_2$. Here, pump-induced space charge strongly shifts and distorts the spectra near the Γ point, and at the same time heavily blurs the dispersion at K, which makes it difficult to discern the excited-state signal at $10^{-3}$ of the level of the VB. In contrast, at comparable excitation densities, the HA delivers a sharp band dispersion, a well-resolved spin-orbit splitting of the VB, and a clear excited-state signal within reasonable integration times, illustrated in Fig. 8. Also, the HA permits significantly increased excitation fluences creating a larger excited-state population without considerable distortions and allows even higher excitation photon energies providing a larger window into the conduction band dispersion.
5 Discussion

Our case studies show that, despite the parallel detection of the full energy and momentum range, the ToF-MM in its current state does not replace, but rather complement the HA. The combination of the two complementary detection schemes in a single setup allows us to address a broad variety of scientific questions. To illustrate the complementary role of both instruments, let us consider the scenario of studying a novel material. For an initial characterization, the MM is best suited, as it permits an efficient mapping of the full band structure and gives an overview of all relevant carrier relaxation pathways within the entire projected BZ. After identifying central energy-momentum regions with the MM, the HA can be used to quickly analyze the dynamics within specific energy-momentum regions at high momentum resolution, and to systematically explore the experimental parameter space (e.g., fluence and temperature dependence) in a time-resolved fashion. Moreover, the HA can provide access to experimental parameter ranges, e.g., excitation wavelengths, fluences and polarizations, that are not feasible using the MM due to space-charge restrictions or the experimental geometry (grazing-incidence illumination).

A complementary advantage of the MM is the possibility to measure samples that are susceptible to XUV beam damage, as only a very limited XUV flux is required due to the efficient photoelectron detection. In addition, we note here also a few additional experimental difficulties connected with the MM. Firstly, flat sample surfaces are needed to prevent field emission resulting from the high extractor voltage. Secondly, a flat and isotropic sample holder is required to prevent distortions of the extractor fields. Thirdly, acquisition with the MM requires processing and storage of large data sets (∼100 GB for a typical data set of 10^10 events), and involves complex data binning and analysis procedures.

Determination of the complete (time-resolved) electronic band structure dynamics with the MM bears an enormous potential. Most directly, it allows to track complex momentum- and energy-dependent scattering phenomena, shines light on quasiparticle lifetimes, and permits benchmark comparison to band structure theory. As the MM measurements are performed at a fixed sample geometry, it allows to investigate higher-order modulation effects of the photoemission intensity, such as orbital interference. In addition to comprehensive band structure mapping, the MM bears further conceptually new measurement configurations. The use of apertures in the real-space image plane permits spatial selectivity of band structure measurements down to the micrometer scale. Furthermore, the use of apertures in the reciprocal image plane allows...
to extract the real-space photoelectron distribution at high momentum-selectivity via PEEM. This novel technique allows to study spatial inhomogeneities that involve subtle momentum-variations, such as the formation of domain boundaries of symmetry-broken states, the impact of defects on ordering phenomena, and the spatial distribution of intertwined complex phases after photoexcitation\textsuperscript{[63,64]}

6 Conclusion

We have demonstrated a dual-detector XUV time-resolved ARPES setup, and benchmarked the characteristics of a time-of-flight electron momentum microscope and a hemispherical analyzer, using metrics such as depth of focus, pump- and probe-pulse-induced space-charge effects, and experimental acquisition times. The unique combination of analyzers enables a full view of the band structure dynamics across the entire photoemission horizon using the momentum microscope and a rapid data acquisition across a limited energy-momentum region at high momentum resolution using the hemispherical analyzer. Furthermore, the possibility to achieve high spatial selectivity and the option of mapping the (time-dependent) real space photoelectron distribution of confined spectral features via momentum-resolved photoemission electron microscopy allow for entirely new perspectives.

7 Supplementary material

See the supplementary material for a video of the temporal evolution of the excited-state signal in WSe\textsubscript{2} acquired with the MM (iso-energy contour at 1.6 ± 0.2 eV) and the HA (cut along the Σ-K direction, CB signal enhanced).
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