X-ray-induced electronic damage of matter by post-ionization mechanisms

Wojciech Błachucki

Institute of Nuclear Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences, 31-342 Kraków, Poland

E-mail: wojciech.blachucki@ifj.edu.pl

















Radiation damage



M. Kubin et al., Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 20, 1681 (2018).



Radiation damage

Radiation damage manifests itself through different effects like electronic structure change, bond breaking, Coulomb explosion, and structural changes.



M. Kubin et al., Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 20, 1681 (2018). Systematic review of spectral differences in literature data in a function of X-ray dose.



J. El. Spectr. Rel. Phenom. 198, 31-56 (2015). WODNICZAŃSKI **TUTE OF NUCLEAR PHYSICS** POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Radiation damage

Radiation damage manifests itself through different effects like electronic structure change, bond breaking, Coulomb explosion, and structural changes.



M. Kubin et al., Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 20, 1681 (2018). Systematic review of spectral differences in literature data in a function of X-ray dose.

A



M. M. van Schooneveld, S. DeBeer, J. El. Spectr. Rel. Phenom. 198, 31-56 (2015). WODNICZAŃSKI TUTE OF NUCLEAR PHYSICS POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

X-ray diffraction (XRD)



H. N. Chapman et al., Nature 470, 73-77 (2011).

Radiation damage

Radiation damage manifests itself through different effects like electronic structure change, bond breaking, Coulomb explosion, and structural changes.



640 645 650 655 635 Photon energy (eV)

b

Absorption (a.u.)

d

M. Kubin et al., Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 20, 1681 (2018). Systematic review of spectral differences in literature data in a function of X-ray dose.



M. M. van Schooneveld, S. DeBeer, J. El. Spectr. Rel. Phenom. 198, 31-56 (2015). WODNICZAŃSKI UTE OF NUCLEAR

POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

X-ray diffraction (XRD)



H. N. Chapman et al., Nature 470, 73-77 (2011).



proteopedia.org

Radiation damage - prevention

Liquid sample delivery systems



M. Faubel, B. Steiner, J. P. Toennies, J. Chem. Phys. 106, 9013 (1997).



J. Schulz *et al.*, J. Synchrotron Rad. **26**, 339 (2019).



Radiation damage - prevention

Liquid sample delivery systems



M. Faubel, B. Steiner, J. P. Toennies, J. Chem. Phys. **106**, 9013 (1997).



J. Schulz *et al., J. Synchrotron* Rad. **26**, 339 (2019).

Cryo-cooling techniques



M. Salome et al., J. Phys 425, 182004 (2013).



Radiation damage - prevention

Liquid sample delivery systems



M. Faubel, B. Steiner, J. P. Toennies, *J. Chem. Phys.* **106**, 9013 (1997).



J. Schulz *et al., J. Synchrotron* Rad. **26**, 339 (2019).

Cryo-cooling techniques



M. Salome et al., J. Phys 425, 182004 (2013).

"Probe-before-destroy" approach



R. Neutze et al., Nature 406, 752 (2000).



X-ray free-electron laser (XFEL) beam interaction with matter

Nature 466, 56 (2010)

Femtosecond electronic response of atoms to ultra-intense X-rays

L. Young¹, E. P. Kanter¹, B. Krässig¹, Y. Li¹, A. M. March¹, S. T. Pratt¹, R. Santra^{1,2}, S. H. Southworth¹, N. Rohringer³, L. F. DiMauro⁴, G. Doumy⁴, C. A. Roedig⁴, N. Berrah⁵, L. Fang⁵, M. Hoener^{5,6}, P. H. Bucksbaum⁷, J. P. Cryan⁷, S. Ghimire⁷, J. M. Glownia⁷, D. A. Reis⁷, J. D. Bozek⁸, C. Bostedt⁸ & M. Messerschmidt⁸

[...] At this fluence, the neon target inevitably changes during the course of a single femtosecond-duration X-ray pulse—by sequentially ejecting electrons—to produce fully-stripped neon through absorption of six photons. Rapid photoejection of inner-shell electrons produces 'hollow' atoms and an intensity-induced X-ray transparency. Such transparency, due to the presence of inner-shell vacancies, can be induced in all atomic, molecular and condensed matter systems [...]

Science 340, 491 (2013)

Simultaneous Femtosecond X-ray Spectroscopy and Diffraction of Photosystem II at Room Temperature

Jan Kern^{1,2}, Roberto Alonso-Mori², Rosalie Tran¹, Johan Hattne¹, Richard J. Gildea¹, Nathaniel Echols¹, Carina Glöckner³, Julia Hellmich³, Hartawan Laksmono⁴, Raymond G. Sierra⁴, Benedikt Lassalle-Kaiser^{1,‡}, Sergey Koroidov⁵, Alyssa Lampe¹, Guangye Han¹, Sheraz Gul¹, Dörte DiFiore³, Despina Milathianaki², Alan R. Fry², Alan Miahnahri², Donald W. Schafer², Marc Messerschmidt², M. Marvin Seibert², Jason E. Koglin², Dimosthenis Sokaras⁶, Tsu-Chien Weng⁶, Jonas Sellberg^{6,7}, Matthew J. Latimer⁶, Ralf W. Grosse-Kunstleve¹, Petrus H. Zwart¹, William E. White², Pieter Glatzel⁸, Paul D. Adams¹, Michael J. Bogan^{2,4}, Garth J. Williams², Sébastien Boutet², Johannes Messinger⁵, Athina Zouni³, Nicholas K. Sauter¹, Vittal K. Yachandra^{1,*}, Uwe Bergmann^{2,*}, and Junko Yano^{1,*}

[...] Our simultaneous XRD/XES study shows that the PS II crystals are intact during our measurements at the LCLS, not only with respect to the structure of PS II, but also with regard to the electronic structure of the highly radiation sensitive Mn_4CaO_5 cluster, opening new directions for future dynamics studies.

beam parameters:

2000 eV (above Ne K edge) pulse duration: 40 fs $10^{11} - 10^{12}$ photons per pulse beam spot size: 1.0 × 1.0 µm²

beam parameters:

7000 eV (above Mn *K* edge) pulse duration: 45 fs $3 - 6 \times 10^{11}$ photons per pulse beam spot size: $1.5 \times 1.5 \ \mu m^2$



Experimental

Fe Kβ X-ray emission spectroscopy (XES) at X-ray free-electron laser (XFEL) for changing photon flux



Experimental

Fe Kβ X-ray emission spectroscopy (XES) at X-ray free-electron laser (XFEL) for changing photon flux



Results and discussion

Fe K β dependence on the incident photon flux



The Fe K β X-ray emission spectra measured for K₄[Fe(CN)₆·3H₂O] water solution for different fluxes of the incident photon beam.

The spectra were scaled to obtain the integral over entire studied energy domain equal to 1 to ensure constant 1s shell ionization cross section and the $3p \rightarrow 1s$ transition fluorescence yield and is supported by experimental studies showing that the influence of oxidation state change on the ratio of Fe Ka to $K\beta$ fluorescence yields is below 10 %. The intensity measurement uncertainty does not exceed 2 % in the energy range 7054 - 7062 eV.

S. K. Kulshreshtha, D. N. Wagh, H. N. Bajpei, X-Ray Spectrom. 34, 200-202 (2005). O. K. Köksal, G. Apaydın, E. Cengiz, K. Karabulut, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. 707, 012004 (2016).

Results and discussion Fe K β dependence on the incident photon flux 0.15 - not caused by the molecule's spin photon flux: change as in W. Zhang et al., Nature - 5.75 Intensity (a.u.) **•** 9.72 **509**, 345 (2014). 0.10 - 18.9 - 50.3 - not caused by sequential - 244 $\times 10^{30} \ s^{-1} \mathrm{cm}^{-2}$ 0.05 photoionization as, e.g., in 7054 7056 - 7058 7060 7062 A. Rudenko et al., Nature 546, 129 (2017). $0.00 \\ 0.01$ Difference (a.u.) 0.00 photon flux: - 9.72 18.9 -0.01 - 50.3 - 244 $\times 10^{30} \ s^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}$ -0.027020 7030 7040 7050 7060 7070 Emission energy (eV)



Motivation

15 % of the incident photons are absorbed, 82 % of the photoabsorption events result in O 1s photoionization.

T. Schoonjans et al., Spectrochim. Acta, Part B 66, 776-784 (2011).



he henryk niewodniczański NSTITUTE OF NUCLEAR PHYSICS POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Motivation

15 % of the incident photons are absorbed, 82 % of the photoabsorption events result in O 1s photoionization.

The cross section for electronimpact Fe ionization is up to the order of 10⁴ larger than the Fe 1s shell photoionization cross section. 10^{-1} 10^{-2} 10^{-3}



T. Schoonjans et al., Spectrochim. Acta, Part B 66, 776-784 (2011).

B. Tsipinyuk, A. Bekkerman, E. Kolodney, https://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0407030 (2005).

Motivation

15 % of the incident photons are absorbed, 82 % of the photoabsorption events result in O 1s photoionization.

The cross section for electronimpact Fe ionization is up to the order of 10⁴ larger than the Fe 1s shell photoionization cross section. 10^{-1} 10^{-2} 10^{-3} 10^{-3}

Photoelectrons and Auger electrons travel in average tens of nm between interactions and may reach the nearest Fe atoms in less than 1 fs.

Unlike photons, free electrons interact with the material multiple times losing the energy gradually.

T. Schoonjans et al., Spectrochim. Acta, Part B 66, 776-784 (2011).

B. Tsipinyuk, A. Bekkerman, E. Kolodney, https://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0407030 (2005).

H. Shinotsuka et al., Surf. Interface Anal. 49, 238-252 (2016). ACADEMY OF SCIENCES



Energy and time distribution of photons and electrons, Fe ionization probability

 $dE = -\overline{E_{loss,e\leftrightarrow a}}(E)f_e(E)dt$ *E* - electron energy, *t* - time *f_e(E)* - average collision frequency per electron $\overline{E_{loss,e\leftrightarrow a}}(E)$ - average energy loss per interaction

Energy and time distribution of photons and electrons, Fe ionization probability

 $dE = -\overline{E_{loss,e\leftrightarrow a}}(E)f_e(E)dt$ *E* - electron energy, *t* - time *f_e(E)* - average collision frequency per electron $\overline{E_{loss,e\leftrightarrow a}}(E)$ - average energy loss per interaction

 $f_e(E) = n_a \sigma_{i,e\leftrightarrow a}(E) \overline{v_e}(E)$ $n_a \text{ - concentration of atoms } a$ $\sigma_{i,e\leftrightarrow a}(E) \text{ - cross section for}$ inelastic electron-atom interaction $\overline{v_e}(E) \text{ - average electron speed}$

Energy and time distribution of photons and electrons, Fe ionization probability

 $dE = -\overline{E_{loss,e\leftrightarrow a}}(E)f_e(E)dt$ *E* - electron energy, *t* - time *f_e(E)* - average collision frequency per electron $\overline{E_{loss,e\leftrightarrow a}}(E)$ - average energy loss per interaction

 $f_e(E) = n_a \sigma_{i,e\leftrightarrow a}(E) \overline{v_e}(E)$ $n_a \text{ - concentration of atoms } a$ $\sigma_{i,e\leftrightarrow a}(E) \text{ - cross section for}$ inelastic electron-atom interaction $\overline{v_e}(E) \text{ - average electron speed}$

 $S_a(E) = n_a \sigma_{i,e\leftrightarrow a}(E) \overline{E_{loss,e\leftrightarrow a}}(E)$ $S_a(E) - \text{linear stopping power for } a$

P. M. Banks, *Planet. Space Sci.* 14, 1085-1103 (1966).
V. Vinogradov, V. P. Shevel'ko, *Sov. Phys. JETP* 44, 542 (1976).
M. Inokuti, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 43, 297 (1971).

Energy and time distribution of photons and electrons, Fe ionization probability

 $dE = -\overline{E_{loss,e\leftrightarrow a}}(E)f_e(E)dt$ *E* - electron energy, *t* - time *f_e(E)* - average collision frequency per electron $\overline{E_{loss,e\leftrightarrow a}}(E)$ - average energy loss per interaction

 $f_e(E) = n_a \sigma_{i,e\leftrightarrow a}(E) \overline{v_e}(E)$ $n_a \text{ - concentration of atoms } a$ $\sigma_{i,e\leftrightarrow a}(E) \text{ - cross section for}$ inelastic electron-atom interaction $\overline{v_e}(E) \text{ - average electron speed}$

 $S_a(E) = n_a \sigma_{i,e \leftrightarrow a}(E) \overline{E_{loss,e \leftrightarrow a}}(E)$ $S_a(E) - \text{linear stopping power for } a$

 $\mathrm{d}E = -S_a(E)\overline{v_e}(E)dt$

P. M. Banks, *Planet. Space Sci.* 14, 1085-1103 (1966).
V. Vinogradov, V. P. Shevel'ko, *Sov. Phys. JETP* 44, 542 (1976).
M. Inokuti, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 43, 297 (1971). *Spectrochim. Acta, Part B* 66, 776-784 (2011). *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A.* 269, 2307 (2011). *Appl. Phys.* 103, 063707 (2008). *Phys. Med. Biol.* 30, 331-335 (1985).

Energy and time distribution of photons and electrons, Fe ionization probability

 $\mathrm{d}E = -\overline{E_{loss,e\leftrightarrow a}}(E)f_e(E)dt$ E - electron energy, t - time $f_e(E)$ - average collision frequency per electron $\overline{E_{loss.e\leftrightarrow a}}(E)$ - average energy loss per interaction

 $f_e(E) = n_a \sigma_{i,e \leftrightarrow a}(E) \overline{\nu_e}(E)$ n_a - concentration of atoms a $\sigma_{i,e\leftrightarrow a}(E)$ - cross section for inelastic electron-atom interaction $\overline{v_e}(E)$ - average electron speed

 $S_a(E) = n_a \sigma_{i,e \leftrightarrow a}(E) \overline{E_{loss,e \leftrightarrow a}}(E)$ $S_a(E)$ - linear stopping power for a

 $dE = -S_a(E)\overline{v_e}(E)dt$

P. M. Banks, Planet. Space Sci. 14, 1085-1103 (1966). V. Vinogradov, V. P. Shevel'ko, Sov. Phys. JETP 44, 542 (1976). J. Appl. Phys. 103, 063707 (2008). M. Inokuti, Rev. Mod. Phys. 43, 297 (1971).



Dephys. Med. Biol. 30, 331-335 (1985).

Energy and time distribution of photons and electrons, Fe ionization probability



Energy and time distribution of photons and electrons, Fe ionization probability



Energy and time distribution of photons and electrons, Fe ionization probability

$$f_{Fe}(t) = \int \sigma_{i,e\leftrightarrow Fe}(E)\overline{v_e}(E)n_e(E,t)dE$$

$$f_{Fe}(t) - \text{electron-impact ionization}$$
frequency for single Fe atom
$$n_e(E,t) - \text{simulated energy and time}$$
evolution of the energetic electrons
$$F_{Fe}(t) = \frac{\sigma_{ph\leftrightarrow Fe}}{S}n_{ph}(t)$$

$$F_{Fe}(t) - \text{Fe 1s photoabsorption}$$
ionization frequency for single Fe atom
$$\sigma_{ph\leftrightarrow Fe} - \text{Fe 1s photoabsorption cross}$$
section
$$n_{ph}(t) - \text{simulated time evolution of}$$
the incident photons
$$\frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F_{Fe}(t)[\int_{-\infty}^{t} f_{Fe}(t)dt]dt}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F_{Fe}(t)dt} \approx 5\%$$
P. M. Banks, *Planet, Space Sci.* 14, 1085-1103 (1966).
V. Vinogradov, V. P. Shevel'ko, *Son. Phys. JETP* 44, 542 (1076), Spectrachim. Acta, Part B 66, 776-784 (2011).
N. Inokuti, *Ren. Mod. Phys.* 43, 297 (1971).

Multiple ionization of Fe atoms through Auger decays – probability



The estimated multiple electron hole-states' relative occurrences are approximately 0.29 : 0.32 : 0.21 : 0.12 : 0.04 : 0.02 for respectively 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 electron holes or equivalently for Fe oxidation state 3+, 4+, 5+, 6+, 7+, 8+.

T. Schoonjans et al., Spectrochim. Acta, Part B 66, 776-784 (2011).

A. Thompson, X-ray Data Booklet (Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Berkeley, USA, ed. 3, 2009), pp. 9-64.

Multiple ionization of Fe atoms through Auger decays - time



The estimated multiple electron hole-states' relative occurrences are approximately 0.29 : 0.32 : 0.21 : 0.12 : 0.04 : 0.02 for respectively 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 electron holes or equivalently for Fe oxidation state 3+, 4+, 5+, 6+, 7+, 8+.

T. Schoonjans *et al.*, *Spectrochim. Acta, Part B* **66**, 776-784 (2011). A. Thompson, X-ray Data Booklet (Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Berkeley, USA, ed. 3, 2009), pp. 9-64.

Understading the mechanism Summary



J. Kern *et al.*, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **109**, 9721-9726 (2012). S. M. Durbin, T. Clevenger, T. Graber, R. Henning, *Nat. Photonics* **6**, 111-114 (2012).

Fe K_β X-ray emission spectrum calculation

Effect of Fe oxidation state in $Fe(CN)_6$



The spectra were calculated within density functional theory (DFT). The field splitting parameter 10 Dq of 4.2 eV was used in the multiplet calculations and metal-to-ligand charge transfer was not included.



Fe Kß X-ray emission spectrum calculation

Extraction of populations of different Fe oxidation states





Fe K_β X-ray emission spectrum calculation

Extraction of populations of different Fe oxidation states





THE HENRYK NIEWODNICZAŃSKI INSTITUTE OF NUCLEAR PHYSICS POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Summary

- Fe K β XES for K4[Fe^2+(CN)_6 \cdot 3H_2O]/H2O solution at XFEL
- 30 fs-short pulses of 4×10^{11} 7200 eV-photons at the repetition rate of 120 Hz (typical operation parameters), beam focusing with movable Be lenses
- \bullet Observed: monotonic dependence of Fe K β XES spectra on the incident XFEL beam flux
- Mechanism: multiple ionization on the molecule's Fe site caused by electron impact and Auger decays
- The molecule at this short moment (< 50 fs) is in a unique high valence state where the bonds between Fe and C atoms are broken but the molecule's constituents have not moved yet.
- The effect is solvent dependent.



Thank you for your attention.

W. Błachucki ^[1]		W. Blachucki et al., Structural Dynamics 6	, 024901 (2019).
Y. Kayser ^[2]		GCG Structural Dynamics	
J. Czapla-Masztafiak ^[1]		HOME BROWSE INFO FOR AUTHORS COLLECTIONS	SIGN UP FOR ALERTS
M. $Guo^{[3]}$		Home > Structural Dynamics > Volume 6, issue 2 > 10.1063/1.5090332	
P. Juranić ^[4]		Open • Submitted: 26 January 2019 • Accepted: 21 March 2019 • Published Online: 05	April 2019
M. Kavčič ^[5]		photon-driven post-ionization mecha	nisms (E)
E. Källman ^[3]		Structural Dynamics 6, 024901 (2019); https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5090332	
G. Knopp ^[4]		W. Blachucki ^{1,a)} , Y. Kayser ² , J. Czapla-Masztafiak ³ , M. Guo ⁴ , P. Juranić ⁵ , M. Kavčić ⁶ , E. Källn Milna ⁵ (0) 1 Pehanek ⁵ (0) 1 Sa ^{1,4,a)} and (0) 1 Szlachetko ^{5,a)}	nan ⁴ , G. Knopp ⁵ , 🐌 M. Lundberg ⁴ , 🕲 C.
M. Lundberg ^[3]	[1] Institute of Nuclear Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences, 31-342 Kraków, Poland		
C. Milne ^[4]	[2] Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt, 10587 Berlin, Germany		
J. Rehanek ^[4]	[3] Department of Chemistry, Uppsala University, 75120 Uppsala, Sweden		
J. Sá ^[3,6]	[4] Paul Scherrer Institute, CH-5232 Villigen-PSI, Switzerland		
J. Szlachetko ^[1]	[5] Jozef Stefan Institute, SI-1000 Ljubljana [6] Institute of Physical Chemistry, Polish Ad	a, Slovenia cademy of Sciences, 01-224 Warsaw, Poland	

Acknowledgements:

- Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education, project no. IdPII2015000164 (W. B., J. Sá)
- National Science Centre, Poland (NCN), grant no. 2015/19/B/ST2/00931 and 2017/27/B/ST2/01890 (J. Sz.)
- Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation, grant no. KAW-2013.0020 (M. L.)
- Linac Coherent Light Source (LCLS), SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory



Follow us on Facebook: **@AppliedXRays**

