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The electronic excitation occurring on adsorbates at ultrafast timescales from optical lasers that initiate surface chemical reactions is still an open question. Here, we report the ultrafast temporal evolution of x-ray absorption spectroscopy (XAS) and x-ray emission spectroscopy (XES) of a simple well-known adsorbate prototype system, namely carbon (C) atoms adsorbed on a nickel [Ni(100)] surface, following intense laser optical pumping at 400 nm. We observe ultrafast (~100 fs) changes in both XAS and XES showing clear signatures of the formation of a hot electron-hole pair distribution on the adsorbate. This is followed by slower changes on a few picoseconds timescale, shown to be consistent with thermalization of the complete C/Ni system. Density functional theory spectrum simulations support this interpretation.
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Fundamental dynamical processes of adsorbates on surfaces, e.g., energy or charge transfer, desorption, etc., often define catalytic and especially photocatalytic activity and selectivity. These processes are typically in the femtosecond regime, where optical pump-probe experiments have been used to follow the adsorbate dynamics [1–3]. The optical pump excites high energy electron-hole (e-h) pairs in the metal which locally thermalize within ~100 fs to create a quasiequilibrium, often described by a two pairs model (2T) with one high temperature for the e-h pairs and one for substrate phonons [4,5], with equilibration between the two systems occurring on a several picosecond timescale. Both modes can excite vibrations of adsorbates and therefore ultimately drive chemistry. The focus of laser-induced chemistry on metals has traditionally been on the relative role of substrate vibrations or electronic excitations in inducing chemical change [6]. Inferences regarding the electronic structure changes of adsorbates due to optical laser excitation of the supporting metal have only been indirect, based on what surface chemistry is induced [5]. However, direct experimental probing of the electronic structure changes due to the laser excitation on the adsorbate atoms themselves has been lacking.

Recently, with the emergence of x-ray free-electron lasers, optical pump–x-ray probe measurements of ultrafast surface chemistry have become possible. Since the x-ray spectroscopic probe can measure element-specific changes in the electron structure, much more detailed information about the chemistry occurring in the ultrafast time regime can be obtained than in pure optical pump-probe experiments. For example, it has been possible to detect a transient precursor state in CO desorption [7,8], a transient adsorbed CHO intermediate [9], the transition state region in CO oxidation [10], and ultrafast vibrational excitations in adsorbed CO on a Ru(0001) surface [11], as well as, e.g., elucidate photooxidation of CO on oxides [12]. However, in none of the previous work done at x-ray lasers has it been possible to detect electronic structure changes on the adsorbate prior to the nuclear dynamics. In contrast, for bulk metals direct x-ray probing of the excited electronic system has been achieved [13,14].

In this Letter, we aim to provide, in an atom-specific way, this missing information on direct changes of the
The XAS spectrum at 0.3 ps delay shows two significant changes: increased intensity below 283 eV [orange region in Fig. 2(a)], and reduced intensity above 283 eV (turquoise region). The use of the C K-edge XAS directly implies that the observed changes occur in the electronic structure on the adsorbed C atoms. These two changes are diminished in the spectrum at 1.2 ps delay and instead additional intensity is seen in the region 284–285 eV (gray region). At 4.0 ps delay the spectrum is nearly identical to that at 1.2 ps.

Figure 2(b) shows C K-edge XES spectra generated with an incoming photon energy of 284 eV with the E vector parallel to the surface and the emitted soft x-rays detected at a grazing angle with respect to the surface. With grazing emission we probe the occupied C 2p-derived orbitals both parallel and perpendicular to the surface [17]. The emission energy scale for the spectrum at negative delay is calibrated by comparison with XES from synchrotron radiation [17]. At −0.5 ps delay the spectrum consists of a broad main peak centered around 278.5 eV with a clear asymmetry to higher energies and a cutoff at 283 eV corresponding to the Fermi level. The main peak is associated with the Ni 3d–C 2p bonding resonance. After laser excitation at 0.2 ps delay we observe three different changes in the XES spectrum,
(i) the main peak at 278.5 eV loses some intensity (red region), (ii) there is small additional intensity appearing between 275–277 eV (green region), and (iii) additional intensity above the Fermi level at 283 eV (blue region). These changes vanish in the 1.2 ps delay spectrum, except for a small intensity increase still remaining above 283 eV. It is important to note that the changes around the main peak (i) and below (ii) correspond to electronic states that are too far below the Fermi level to be energetically accessible for a single-photon excitation from the 400 nm (3.1 eV) laser light.

Figure 2(c) shows XES spectra at 0.3 ps delay and for the unpumped case (−0.6 ps delay) after x-ray excitation to 282.5 eV, i.e., 0.5 eV below the Fermi edge. In the unpumped spectrum, the intensity in this (nominally Pauli blocked) region is due to phonon, core-hole lifetime, and instrumental broadening of the XAS spectrum, giving rise to a low-energy tail [18]. Both spectra are normalized by the incoming fluence; the total intensity therefore increases after pumping, corresponding to the increased XAS intensity at 282.5 eV at 0.3 ps delay. The difference spectrum between the pumped and unpumped corresponds to selective probing of atoms where holes have been generated below the Fermi level by the 400 nm laser excitation increasing the overall x-ray absorption cross section and thereby the total XES intensity. We observe in the difference XES spectrum that the main peak is shifted from 279 to 277.5 eV, and additional intensity appears above the Fermi level. This is consistent with the XES spectral changes due to the laser pump shown in Fig. 2(b), but more enhanced since the selective x-ray excitation leads to a decreased background signal from nonexcited species.

Figure 3 shows the time traces from the spectral changes in Figs. 2(a) and 2(b). Starting with the XAS time-dependent changes shown in Fig. 3(a), we observe changes for both the holes (orange) and electrons (turquoise) at 0.25 ps with an apparent Gaussian rise time of around 0.1 ps, and with a slower recovery of around 0.2 ps. There is a delayed onset of around 0.15 ps as determined by the Gaussian rise half maximum. The long-term spectral change (gray) is delayed until 0.5 ps with a rise time of 0.2 ps with no detectable recovery within the measured 4.0 ps. The XES spectral changes around the main peak (green and red) appear to be faster with the onset at almost 0 ps and with a slightly faster rise time; the recovery time of ~0.25 ps appears somewhat slower than in the XAS. Both the XAS and XES rapid changes have decayed within 0.5 ps. The changes above the Fermi level (blue) in the XES...
spectra have an onset of 0.1 ps and then remain, similar to the long-term time component in the XAS. We note that the XAS and XES data were not measured simultaneously and it is not possible to exclude timing drift defining the temporal overlap of the optical and x-ray beam \( t_0 \) over 24 h, so that uncertainties in defining \( t_0 \approx \pm 0.1 \) ps are realistic.

In order to assist in the interpretation of the experimental data we have computed x-ray spectra with both electronic and nuclear excitations. This was done by density functional theory calculations at the generalized-gradient approximation (GGA) level using the \textsc{quantum espresso} \cite{60,61} code, with spectra calculated using the \textsc{xspectra} \cite{62–64} code. Details on the method are found in Supplemental Material \cite{24}. Calculation of the frequency-dependent dielectric constant for the C/Ni system relative to the pure Ni metal indicate minimal optical absorption in the C relative to that in the Ni metal (see Supplemental Material \cite{24}) so that all electronic structure changes of the C is a result of excitations in the Ni substrate. For the optical fluence used, the 2T model gives a peak electronic temperature of \( T_e \approx 5000 \) K within \( \sim 100 \) fs of the optical laser excitation, followed by a surface equilibration to \( T \approx 1000 \) K after \( \sim 2 \) ps via electron-phonon coupling (for details see Supplemental Material \cite{24}). By comparing with measurements on other transition metals \cite{65,66}, we assume that thermalization of the hot electrons and holes occurs on a timescale of \( \sim 100 \) fs.

Figure 4(a) shows the calculated XAS from the ground state and excited systems corresponding to a high electronic temperature \( T_e \approx 5000 \) K and a fully thermalized system at \( T = 800 \) K. The effect of high \( T_e \) on the calculated XAS is twofold. The absorption onset, which at 0 K can be identified with \( E_F \), is shifted (see Supplemental Material, Fig. S3 [24]). In addition, the broad Fermi-Dirac distribution at high \( T_e \) means that states well above \( E_F \) are populated, thus lowering the XAS intensity which probes unoccupied states. Since we have populated electronic states above the Fermi level, as indicated by the XAS, we should also observe these in the occupied states as probed by XES. Indeed the 5000 K electron distribution of the XES spectra shown in Fig. 4(b) shows intensity appearing above the Fermi level.

The appearance of intensity below \( E_F \) and a decreased intensity above \( E_F \) is consistent with the experimental XAS at early time as shown in Fig. 2(a). We therefore find that the features of the experimental XAS at \( t = 0.2 \) ps are all qualitatively reproduced in the theoretical spectra by simply considering the hot \( e-h \) pair distribution on the C. While the observation (and thermalization) of a hot \( e-h \) pair distribution in bulk metals has been extensively studied via two-photon photoemission studies \cite{65,66} and time-resolved XAS \cite{14,67}, here we show the direct observation of this in an adsorbate.

The increase at the high-energy side of the main XAS peak at 4 ps delay is qualitatively reproduced in the simulation of the spectrum from a fully thermalized system at 800 K, as shown by the curve labeled AIMD in Fig. 4(a). The increasing intensity in this region is consistent with thermalization of C atoms towards lower coordinated bonding geometries than the fourfold hollow sites they occupy initially (Supplemental Material, Fig. S4 [24]). We observe that the excited \( e-h \) population seen in the experimental XAS decays on a timescale of \( \sim 300 \) fs, simultaneous with an increase in the intensity \( \sim 1 \) eV above \( E_F \). Thus, these spectral changes are consistent with a decreasing electronic temperature via electron-phonon coupling and corresponding heating of the phonon modes, and in good agreement with the timescales of the 2T model for Ni (Supplemental Material, Fig. S2 [24]). In the XES we also observed a similar decay of the intensity around \( E_F \) but it does not return to the intensity prior to the pump. This is most likely related to the broadening and shift of the Fermi level at the equilibrated 800 K temperature.

In addition to these effects, the experimental XES spectrum shows some redistribution of intensities in the main peak [Figs. 2(b) and 2(c)] at 0.3 ps delay, that cannot be explained by simply a high \( T_e \), since these changes occur far below \( E_F \). They decay on similar timescales as the holes and electrons in the XAS, indicating that these XES

![Figure 4](image-url)
changes are also related to the high electronic temperature. One possibility is that extremely strong nonadiabatic coupling occurs to the parallel vibration of C on the Ni lattice (see Supplemental Material [24]). Ultrafast vibrational excitation (~0.1 ps) has been observed previously [11, 68, 69], although this is not well explained through conventional coupling via electronic frictions which predicts slower vibrational excitations. Another possibility is that many-body or demagnetization effects [70–72] in this highly excited electronic system could affect the width and position of the resonance, and ultimately cause the main XES line shape changes far from $E_F$ in the short time regime. The XES depends sensitively on the two-dimensional band structure [73], where intensity of C character could be redistributed between different critical points in the Brillouin zone to cause the XES spectral change, and as the simulations indicate parallel C excitation does induce such a redistribution.

In conclusion, we have obtained XAS and XES of an atomic surface adsorbate with a well understood ground state electronic structure using a pump-probe scheme with an intense femtosecond 400 nm laser pulse as pump and a femtosecond x-ray pulse as probe. The simultaneous measurement of x-ray absorption and emission spectra reveals details of the dynamics on distinct timescales, as summarized in Figs. 4(c)–4(e). We see a direct effect on both XAS and XES of the initially high electronic temperature, which manifests itself as clearly identifiable changes in the line shape close to the Fermi level and only persists during the first picosecond. We can identify this as the timescale of thermal electronic excitation. Our observation constitutes direct experimental evidence that ultrafast laser excitation immediately leads to a highly excited e-h pair distribution not just in the substrate, but also in the adsorbate. The XAS high-energy shoulder at longer delays is a clear signature of a high overall temperature, and its gradual buildup indicates equilibration of the system, which takes place over several picoseconds. We identify this timescale as that of phonon excitation and the response of all substrate degrees of freedom to the excitation pulse. We also observe an immediate short time redshift of the main XES peak where the mechanism is more elusive. It could be due to ultrafast excitation of in-plane adsorbate vibrations but also many-body effects in the electronic system itself. This would give a third timescale associated with nonthermal electron-hole pairs and highly selective adsorbate excitation far from equilibrium conditions. Our results underscore the importance of taking high electronic temperature into account when studying, e.g., adsorbate dynamics or excitation spectra within a few picoseconds after intense optical pumping. Furthermore, the impact of how the adsorbate electron systems respond to optical stimuli could bring insights into photothermal catalysis, as recently observed for Ni nanoparticles on SiO$_2$ for sustainable fuel production [74].
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