Abstract

We show that the temperature rise in large ensembles of metal nanoparticles under intense illumination is dominated by the temperature dependence of the thermal conductivity of the host, rather than by the optical properties of the metal or the host. This dependence typically causes the temperature rise to become sublinear, with this photothermal nonlinear effect becoming unusually strong, reaching even several tens of percent. We then show that this can explain experimental observations in several recent plasmon-assisted photocatalysis experiments. This shows that any claim for dominance of non-thermal electrons in plasmon-assisted photocatalysis must account for this photothermal nonlinear mechanism.
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1 Introduction

The use of illuminated metallic surfaces to enhance the yield of chemical reactions (aka plasmon-assisted photocatalysis) was proposed by Nitzan and Brus already in 1981 and implemented experimentally shortly later. However, only after several decades of slow progress (see e.g., Refs. 3–8), this line of research has rapidly gained popularity following several high impact publications (see, e.g. Refs. 9–12 for some recent reviews). The growing interest was propelled by claims in some of the more famous papers on the topic that the reaction rate increases due to the excitation of high energy non-thermal electrons in the metal (aka “hot” electrons), which then tunnel out of the metal, and provide the necessary energy for the reactants to allow them to be converted into the products more efficiently.

However, the claims in these very papers (Refs. 13–17) were shown to suffer from technical and conceptual errors (including improper temperature measurements, improper data normalization etc., see discussion in Refs. 18–22). Instead, a purely thermal mechanism was shown to be able to explain the experimental data quite convincingly. In particular, a shifted Arrhenius Law for the reaction rate, \( R \sim \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon_n}{k_BT(r)+\alpha I_{inc}}\right) \) whereby the temperature of the system was corrected for the illumination-induced heating was shown to provide an excellent fit to the published data, essentially with no fit parameters. This result was corroborated with the first ever complete calculation of the steady-state electron non-equilibrium in metals, a consequent Fermi golden-rule argument that pointed to the
improbability of nonthermal electrons to cause the catalysis, and by detailed thermal sim-
ulations where the dynamics of the heat generated from each of the nanoparticles (NPs) in
the system was properly modelled.\textsuperscript{20}

In a consequent paper,\textsuperscript{26} it was shown that in many typical configurations, the tedious
modelling of the contributions of each of the heated NPs in the sample can be replaced by
an effective medium approximation. This approach also enabled accounting for the exact
reactor geometry, constituent materials and boundary conditions, thus, enabling a quantita-
tive comparison to the measured data. This series of works was lately extended to account
also for fluid dynamics effects and for redox reactions.\textsuperscript{27}

The bottom line of the thermal modelling was that when attempting to quantitatively
separate thermal and non-thermal effects in plasmon-assisted photocatalysis experiments,
one has to overcome a conceptual difficulty - the thermocatalysis control experiments must
reproduce the \textit{exact spatially non-uniform temperature profile} induced by the illumination,
otherwise, when subtracting the thermocatalysis rate from the photocatalysis rate (e.g., as in
Refs. 17,28), any difference between the temperature distributions in an inaccurate control
and the corresponding photocatalysis experiment is bound to be incorrectly interpreted as
“hot” electron action. This issue is particularly important because the Arrhenius Law shows
that the reaction rate has an exponential sensitivity to the temperature distribution.\textsuperscript{20}

Detailed measurements and/or calculations of the temperature distribution in the studied
samples indeed constituted a central role in several recent demonstrations of non-thermal
effects in plasmon-assisted photocatalysis.\textsuperscript{28–31} However, while the simple thermal calcula-
tions done so far were sufficient for relatively simple scenarios, they may not be sufficient to
account for more complicated ones. Those include, in particular, high intensity illumination
which invokes nonlinear thermo-optic and photothermal effects,\textsuperscript{32–36} which are usually sim-
ply ignored (without any justification). Already in the context of thin metal layers\textsuperscript{37–39} and
single NPs,\textsuperscript{33–36,40,41} this effect was shown to cause deviations of several tens to hundreds
of percent in the permittivity, and hence the field and temperature distributions compared
with the purely uniform linear thermal response. Note that such a nonlinear effect is far greater than conventional nonlinear optical effects.

In this work, we go beyond the study of the linear response, and evaluate the importance of nonlinear photothermal effects in large random ensembles of metal NPs, suitable to plasmon-assisted photocatalysis experiments, but also to many other types of experiments in nonlinear optics (see e.g., Refs. 32,42–46). First, in Section 2 we provide a qualitative analysis that points to the most important parameters that affect the overall nonlinear photothermal response of typical plasmon-assisted photocatalysis systems, and to those parameters which have a negligible effect. Then, in Section 3 we describe briefly the methodology we employ to calculate the temperature distribution in the samples considered. The qualitative analysis is then confirmed in Section 4, where we review two sets of experimental data taken from recent high impact plasmon-assisted photocatalysis experiments, and show that the photothermal nonlinearity is indeed a significant effect, such that a neglect to account for it is bound to lead to an overestimate of the role of non-thermal electrons. Section 5 provides a discussion and outlook.

2 A qualitative analysis

Typically, the samples used in plasmon-assisted photocatalysis experiments compose of a large number ($\sim 10^{12} - 10^{14}$) of few nm metal NPs randomly distributed within a highly sparse powder of micron-size metal oxide particles, see Fig. 1; the gases occupy the volume between the NPs, which is typically 80-90% of the total volume. The catalyst sample is usually disc-shaped, a few mm in size, placed on a (stainless steel) sample holder and inserted into a reaction chamber; the reaction rate is then measured under a specific illumination and/or an external heating condition at the steady-state. Importantly, the light penetration depth is usually designed to be much smaller than the sample thickness such that all the illumination energy is absorbed; the reaction rate is then enhanced due to the elevated
temperature\textsuperscript{20} (and maybe also due to non-thermal electrons).

In order to achieve a qualitative understanding of the high temperature and/or intensity response of these systems (i.e., the photothermal nonlinearity), we start by considering a simplified configuration, namely, we assume that the sample consists of metal NPs (with dielectric permittivity $\varepsilon_m = \varepsilon'_m + i\varepsilon''_m$ and thermal conductivity $\kappa_m$) distributed in a disc-shape volume and immersed in a uniform host material with $n_p$ being the NP number density.

In our previous work,\textsuperscript{26} we have shown that in the weak illumination limit, the temperature rise at the top center of the sample can be approximately written as

$$\Delta T_{\text{top}} \approx \frac{I_{\text{inc}} \rho_b}{2\kappa_h} \left(1 - e^{-H/\delta_{\text{skin}}} \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $\rho_b$ is the beam radius, $H$ is the sample thickness and $\delta_{\text{skin}}$ is the penetration (skin) depth of light in the catalyst sample. The inverse of the penetration (skin) depth (i.e., the absorption coefficient) is related to the NP number density $n_p$ and the absorption cross-section $\sigma_{\text{abs}}$ via

$$1/\delta_{\text{skin}}(\omega) = n_p \sigma_{\text{abs}}(\omega).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

Finally, $\kappa_h$ represents the thermal conductivity of the (idealized) uniform host.

Eq. (1) shows that for the typical optically-thick samples (i.e., when $H \ll \delta_{\text{skin}}(\omega)$ for all wavelengths in the illumination), the temperature rise simply becomes $\Delta T_{\text{top}} \approx \frac{I_{\text{inc}} \rho_b}{2\kappa_h}$, so that the overall temperature rise is weakly-sensitive to the illumination spectrum, NP shape, size and density, but exhibits an inverse proportion to the host thermal conductivity.\textsuperscript{26}

When the illumination intensity is increased, the illumination-induced heating of the NPs causes a modification of the optical and thermal properties of the NPs and their surrounding. This effect gives rise to a nonlinear dependence of the sample temperature on the illumination intensity. Specifically, the increase of the imaginary part of the metal permittivity ($\varepsilon''_m$) with temperature reduces the quality factor of the plasmonic resonance of the NPs.\textsuperscript{34–36}
Meanwhile, the change of the real part of the metal permittivity ($\varepsilon'_m$) causes a resonance shift of the absorption spectrum. Although the impact of the change of the metal permittivity on the absorption cross-section varies in a complex manner with the NP size and the illumination wavelength, see e.g. Refs. 34–36, and although the sensitivity of the metal permittivity to the rising temperature is relatively high, $^{34,39}$ the metal permittivity has a relatively small contribution to the overall photothermal response of the sample when the penetration depth is much thinner than the sample thickness, see Eq. (1). Moreover, since the temperature dependence of the optical properties of the host has a similar effect on the absorption cross-section as the real part of the metal permittivity $^{35,36}$ (i.e., it causes a resonance shift), the nonlinear response due to the change of the host permittivity is also small. On the other hand, the contribution of the thermal properties to the overall photothermal nonlinearity is significant; it naturally depends on the volume fraction of the various materials. Because the metal occupies a small fraction of the sample volume, one can appreciate that the change of the metal thermal properties hardly contribute to the nonlinear response of the sample. In contrast, Eq. (1) shows that the thermal properties of the *host* matters much more. Clearly, an illumination-induced increase of the thermal conductivity with the temperature means that the overall temperature rise in the sample would slow down when the illumination intensity increases. Judging by the typical thermoderivative of these properties, the nonlinearity is expected to manifest itself at a temperature rise of several hundreds of degrees, see Refs. 35,36; this estimate is found below to be in good agreement with the experimental data.

As pointed out, the above analysis of the dependence of the temperature rise on the various system parameters was performed for a simplified configuration, in Ref. 26 we showed using direct numerical simulations that it holds also for fully realistic reactor design which involve a variety of additional materials and a non-trivial geometry.
3 Methodology

Now, having understood the expected qualitative behaviour, we turn to describe the rigorous methodology employed to study the photothermal nonlinearity in plasmon-assisted photocatalysis; more details can be found in the Methods Section below.

Previously in Refs. 20,26, the temperature distribution in plasmon-assisted photocatalysis systems was calculated from a steady-state solution of the linear (i.e., temperature-independent coefficient) heat equation. Specifically, one solved

\[
\begin{align*}
\nabla \cdot (\kappa_h \nabla T(r)) &= -p_{\text{abs}}(r), & \text{for } r \text{ inside the catalyst}, \\
\nabla \cdot (\kappa_h \nabla T(r)) &= 0, & \text{for } r \text{ outside the catalyst}.
\end{align*}
\]

(3)

where \(T(r)\) is the temperature distribution; \(\kappa_h\) now represents the homogenized temperature-independent thermal conductivities of the host and the catalyst.\(^{20,26}\) Finally, \(p_{\text{abs}}\) is the heat source density induced by the light absorption in the many metal NP random array sources; it is well described by applying the effective medium approximation for the electromagnetic properties of the catalyst sample.\(^ {26}\) namely,

\[
p_{\text{abs}}(r) = \int i_{\text{inc}}(\rho, \omega) \exp \left( -\frac{z}{\delta_{\text{skin}}(\omega)} \right) d\omega,
\]

(4)

where \(\rho\) is the distance from the propagation optical axis, \(z\) is the distance along the propagation direction of the incident beam from the top surface of the catalyst sample, and \(i_{\text{inc}}(\rho, \omega)\) describes the transverse spatial and spectral profile of the incident beam.

In the current study, in order to model the high temperature regime in which the photothermal nonlinearity causes the physical parameters to be modified by the temperature, we added the temperature dependence to the physical parameters into Eq. (3). In addition, we distinguish between the thermal conductivities of the catalyst sample and of its surrounding
to account for the inhomogeneity of the thermal properties, namely,

\[
\begin{align*}
\nabla \cdot \left[ \kappa_{\text{cata}}(T(r)) \nabla T(r) \right] &= -p_{\text{abs}}(r), \quad \text{for } r \text{ inside the catalyst,} \\
\nabla \cdot \left[ \kappa_{\text{gas}}(T(r)) \nabla T(r) \right] &= 0, \quad \text{for } r \text{ in the gases,} \\
\nabla \cdot \left[ \kappa_{\text{holder}}(T(r)) \nabla T(r) \right] &= 0, \quad \text{for } r \text{ in the sample holder.}
\end{align*}
\]

(5)

Here, \( \kappa_{\text{cata}}(T(r)) \) is the homogenized temperature-dependent thermal conductivity of the catalyst\(^{20,26} \) (see Section Methods), \( \kappa_{\text{gas}}(T(r)) \) and \( \kappa_{\text{holder}}(T(r)) \) are the temperature-dependent thermal conductivity of the gases and of the sample holder; this is a refinement of the modelling used so far. Accordingly, Eq. (4) becomes

\[
p_{\text{abs}}(r) = -\int i_{\text{inc}}(\rho, \omega) \frac{\partial \zeta(\rho, z, \omega)}{\partial z} d\omega,
\]

(6)

where \( \zeta(\rho, z, \omega) \) is an unknown longitudinal spatial profile of the incident illumination which needs to be determined by solving the Beer-Lambert equation for the absorption of light with a space-dependent penetration depth \( \delta_{\text{skin}}(T(r), \omega) \) (elucidated below), namely, \( \partial \zeta(\rho, z, \omega)/\partial z = -\zeta(\rho, z, \omega)/\delta_{\text{skin}}(T(r), \omega) \). This enables us to accommodate the temperature gradient build-up in the catalyst sample under the illumination.

As before, we neglect the temperature non-uniformity within the individual NPs due to
their small size and their high thermal conductivity, see justification in Refs. 47,48. Furthermore, we assume that the temperature varies slowly on a length scale of the illumination wavelength. These assumptions allow us to evaluate the temperature dependence of the absorption cross-section using a uniform metal permittivity and a uniform host permittivity, i.e., \( \sigma_{\text{abs}}(\omega, T) = \sigma_{\text{abs}}(\varepsilon_m(\omega, T), \varepsilon_h(\omega, T), \omega) \). In this case, the absorption coefficient becomes \( 1/\delta_{\text{skin}}(T, \omega) = n_p \sigma_{\text{abs}}(\varepsilon_m(\omega, T), \varepsilon_h(\omega, T), \omega) \), in analogy to Eq. (2), and the absorbed power density has a closed form expression

\[
p_{\text{abs}}(\rho, z) = \int i_{\text{inc}}(\rho, \omega) n_p \sigma_{\text{abs}}(\omega, T(\rho, z)) e^{-n_p \int_0^z \sigma_{\text{abs}}(\omega, T(\rho, z')) dz'} d\omega.
\]

(7)

The temperature distribution is obtained by solving Eq. (5) coupled with Eq. (7) self-consistently. In order to properly account for the non-trivial reactor geometry and multitude of materials, we used a numerical software (COMSOL Multiphysics) to solve Eq. (5).

Evaluating Eq. (7) requires the temperature dependence of the permittivities which is usually unavailable for many metals used in photocatalysis experiments. Fortunately, when the penetration depth is much smaller than the sample thickness, one can neglect the temperature dependence of the permittivities. In this case, Eq. (7) becomes

\[
p_{\text{abs}}(\rho, z) \approx \int i_{\text{inc}}(\rho, \omega) n_p \sigma_{\text{abs}}(\omega, T_0) e^{-n_p \int_0^z \sigma_{\text{abs}}(\omega, T(\rho, z')) dz'} d\omega.
\]

(8)

Eq. (8) is the same as Eq. (4) except for the parameter \( T_0 \) which should be chosen to minimize the difference between Eq. (7) and (8). Eq. (8) not only allows significant time and computational resource saving, but also is a good approximation for Eq. (7) when the temperature dependence of the optical properties are unavailable. In the calculation below, we chose \( T_0 \) to be 300K since the only available data for Ru and Cu are at 300 K.

In the following, we apply the model described above to two representative experiments. For simplicity, we neglect the effect of the gas flow. This was justified by simplistic estimates which showed that standard gas flow level used is not expected to be significant in
removing the generated heat, and further supported by simulations of natural and forced convection done in Ref. 27.

4 Analysis of Experiments

4.1 Li et al. [Duke team, 49]

First, we look at the experimental results of Li et al.\textsuperscript{49} who studied ammonia synthesis using a cesium-promoted, magnesium-oxide supported, ruthenium (Ru-Cs/MgO) catalyst. The Ru NPs in this study were estimated to be $\sim 2$ nm in diameter. The catalyst sample (3 mm height and 6 mm diameter) was put in a reaction chamber equipped with a quartz window (which allows the catalyst sample to be illuminated at varied intensity and wavelength) and a temperature controller (which is used to heat up the catalyst sample). The illumination spot was set to have the same size as the catalyst surface area. Two thin thermocouples were inserted into the catalyst sample, one to measure the top-surface temperature (denoted by $T_1$) and the other to measure the bottom-surface temperature (denoted by $T_2$). A mixture of N\textsubscript{2}, H\textsubscript{2}, and Ar with a ratio of 1:3 for N\textsubscript{2}/H\textsubscript{2} flowed into the reactor at a total flow rate of 75 sccm. The gaseous product (NH\textsubscript{3}) was monitored by an online mass spectrometer.

Here, we employ the model (5) and (8) using the heat transfer module of COMSOL Multiphysics to calculate the temperature distribution in the sample. This enables us to account for the temperature dependence of the thermal conductivity, which dominates the photothermal nonlinear response of the sample. The temperature-dependent thermal conductivities of the input gases\textsuperscript{50–52} are shown in Fig. 2(a). Since H\textsubscript{2} has a small molecular mass and a small molecule size, its thermal conductivity is much larger than that of N\textsubscript{2} and Ar. As a result, the thermal conductivity of the gas mixture is $\sim 0.6$ of the H\textsubscript{2} thermal conductivity. The thermal conductivity of the catalyst sample is related to the volume fraction of the oxide using the Maxwell Garnett equation\textsuperscript{20,53,54} (see Sec. Methods).

The absorption cross-section of the Ru NPs and the light penetration depth in the sample
is calculated using the permittivity of Ru at 300K from Ref. 55 and Eq. (2), see Fig. 2(b). For wavelengths $300 < \lambda < 600$nm, the penetration (skin) depth (Eq. (2))) is $\delta_{\text{skin}} < 750$µm, indeed much smaller than the sample thickness; thus, by Ref. 26, we do not expect the numerical results to be sensitive to the exact parameters in this spectral regime. However, for $\lambda > 700$nm, we find that $\delta_{\text{skin}} \gtrsim 1$ mm, so that now the penetration (skin) depth is only 2 - 3 times thinner than the sample thickness, see Fig. 2(b); accordingly, one may expect a slightly greater sensitivity to the various parameters in this regime.
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Figure 2: (Color online) (a) Temperature dependence of the thermal conductivities of $N_2$ (blue dotted line), $H_2$ (orange dashed line), Argon (green dash-dotted line) and the mixture used in Ref. 49 (red solid line). (b) Light penetration (skin) depth and the absorption cross-section of the Ru NP (inset) as a function of the illumination wavelength.

A realistic model of the catalyst sample in the reaction chamber has to take into account the thermal properties (in particular, the thermal conductivity) of the various components of the system - the solid chamber, the heater, the outer host, the window through which the laser beam illuminates to the catalyst sample etc.. However, such simulations require extensive computational resources and are time-consuming. To obtain a quick result without compromising accuracy, we simplified the complicated reaction chamber, by assuming it has a cylindrical shape (1 cm height and 2 cm diameter) and that the catalyst sample (having the same size as used in the experiment) is placed on a steel support, see Fig. 3(a). At the outer surfaces of the chamber, we set a convection heat flux boundary condition to model the heat transfer driven by the temperature difference between the chamber and the surrounding (assumed to be at 20°C). The heat transfer coefficient $h$ is used as an adjustable parameter.
to fit the experimental results at room temperature (and small intensity limit); its value has a negligible effect on the photothermal nonlinearity (not shown).

In Ref. 49, two experiments were performed. In the first, the catalyst sample was not heated externally; the simulation results of the top \( (T_1) \) and bottom \( (T_2) \) surface temperatures for \( h \approx 70\text{W/(m}^2\cdot\text{K)} \) demonstrate an excellent match to the experimental data, see Fig. 3(b). In order to demonstrate the actual level of the photothermal nonlinearity, we also perform a simulation in a linear approximation, namely, we neglect the temperature-dependence of the thermal conductivity of the gas mixture. Fig. 3(b) shows that the linear approximation overestimates the nonlinear solution by more than 30\% for a temperature rise of \( \sim 300^\circ\text{C} \); this is an unusually large nonlinearity.

In the second experiment, the authors studied the effect of the temperature gradient on the reaction rate and the dependence of the temperature gradient on the illumination wavelength and intensity. To do that, they measured the intensity-dependent \( T_1, T_2 \) and reaction rate using four different light sources (UV, blue light, white light and NIR) and controlled the external heating such that the equivalent temperature\(^1\) remains the same (325\(^\circ\text{C}\)) for all four light sources and all intensities.\(^49\) Accordingly, we use the same simulation configuration to calculate the temperature distribution. Since the description of the external heating apparatus is not available in Ref. 49, we simply set the temperature of the bottom of the catalyst sample to the reported \( T_2 \) as a constraint so as to mimic the external heating. The simulation results for the top surface temperature \( T_1 \) again demonstrate an excellent match with the experimental data for blue, UV and white light sources\(^2\), see Fig. 3(c). We find that the linear approximation deviates from the nonlinear solution by \( \sim 10\% \) for a temperature rise of \( \sim 100^\circ\text{C} \). For the NIR light source, the simulation results fit well the equivalent temperature \( T_e \) is defined in Refs. 49,56 through the relation $e^{-E_a/k_BT_e} = \frac{1}{T_2 - T_1} \int_{T_1}^{T_2} e^{-E_a/k_BT} dT$.

\(^1\) The simulation results for UV and white light sources are not shown in Fig. 3(c) because they almost overlap with the results for the blue light source. This is a direct consequence of the weak sensitivity of the temperature distribution to the illumination wavelength when the penetration depth is much smaller the sample thickness, conforming with the analysis in Ref. 26.
experimental data, see Fig. 3(c). As mentioned, in this case, the light penetration depth is comparable to the sample thickness (see Fig. 2(b)) so that the temperature distribution might become less insensitive to the change of permittivity of the Ru NPs with temperature. In that regard, the use of the Ru permittivity data at 300K in the simulation is one possible reason for the small mismatch between the simulation results and the experimental data. Except for this minor discrepancy, the analysis here reinforces the conclusion of Ref. 49 that the catalytic effect of the Ru-Cs/MgO system on the ammonia synthesis reaction is purely thermal.
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**Figure 3:** (Color online) (a) Details of the photocatalytic chamber and the temperature distribution at the illumination intensity $I_{\text{inc}} = 5\, \text{W/cm}^2$. (b) $T_1$ (solid symbols and blue solid line) and $T_2$ (open symbols) as a function of the illumination intensity. The symbols represent the experimental data extracted from Ref. 49 for blue light and without external heating. (c) Same as (b) for different light sources (UV: orange diamond, blue light: blue circles and white light: red upper-triangles) but under external heating. The COMSOL simulation results of $T_1$ for the blue light and for the NIR light source are represented by the blue solid line and the green dashed line, respectively. The linear approximation of $T_1$ for the blue light source is represented by the blue dotted line.

An earlier work\textsuperscript{56} by the same group employed a similar experimental system to study the carbon dioxide hydrogenation reaction using a titanium oxide supported Rhodium catalyst. Although the gas composition was different from that in Ref. 49, the thermal conductivities of the gas mixtures\textsuperscript{51,52,57} were similar since the gas mixtures had a similar flow rate fraction of H$_2$ in these two works. We simulated the temperature for the experiment without external heating at low temperatures (25°C < $T_1$ < 120°C) and found very good agreement with the experimental data (not shown). This explains the observed photothermal nonlinearity.
(\sim 10\%) for a similar temperature rise of \sim 100^\circ\text{C}, see Fig. S8 in Ref. 56. However, a much larger nonlinearity was reported in the experiments with external heating at high temperatures (250^\circ\text{C} < T_1 < 450^\circ\text{C}); in fact, some of the data shows an unusual acceleration of growth rate in $T_1$ for $300^\circ\text{C} \lesssim T_1 \lesssim 375^\circ\text{C}$ and then a slowdown of growth rate in $T_1$ for $T_1 \gtrsim 375^\circ\text{C}$. Accordingly, it cannot be explained by our (nonlinear) thermal model. Ruling out possible measurement artefacts in the data, it is natural to advocate for the possibility of non-thermal electrons contributing to the catalyzed reaction rate. However, a convincing interpretation of this experiment might require a dedicated explanation of the origin of the large nonlinearity.

4.2 Zhou et al. [Rice team, 17]

We now move on to show that the photothermal nonlinearity also explains the experimental measurements described in Ref. 17. This work employed a similar setup to study ammonia decomposition on a MgO-Al$_2$O$_3$ supported Cu-Ru catalyst, however, unlike the Duke team papers (Section 4.1), the nonlinearity is much stronger due to higher temperature rises caused by the much smaller thermal conductivity of NH$_3$\textsuperscript{58,59} (see Fig. 4(a)), as well as the higher incident intensities used (see Fig. 4(c)). More importantly, while the Duke team measured the sample temperature properly, significant questions regarding the validity of the temperature measurements by the Rice team have been raised (see discussion in Refs. 18–20,22,23). Therefore, in what follows, we rely on a calculation of the temperature but also on an extraction of it from the reaction rate using Arrhenius and ignore the temperature reports in the original manuscript. These calculations were shown to match well the fitted temperatures, see Refs. 18,20,22.

We follow the procedure described in Ref. 20 to extract the temperature out of the reaction rate. Specifically, we first obtain the activation energy 1.18eV by fitting the experimental data in the dark (Fig. 1d in Ref. 17) to an Arrhenius curve. Next, due to the experimental errors in Ref. 17, we distinguish between the actual temperature of the reactor
The difference between $T(I_{\text{inc}})$ and $T_M$ is found to follow $T(I_{\text{inc}}) = T_M + \tilde{a}I_{\text{inc}} + \tilde{b}I_{\text{inc}}^2$, where $I_{\text{inc}}$ is in W/cm$^2$, $T(I_{\text{inc}})$ and $T_M$ are in K. The experimentally-measured temperature $T_M$ vs. $I_{\text{inc}}$ is also fitted to a second-order polynomial, giving $T_M = 298 + 80I_{\text{inc}} - 3.8I_{\text{inc}}^2$. Then, we fit the measured reaction rate data under the illumination (Fig. 1d in Ref. 17) to a temperature-shifted Arrhenius curve,$^{20}$ i.e., $R(I_{\text{inc}}) = R_0 \exp \left(-\frac{E_a}{k_BT(I_{\text{inc}})}\right)$, leading to $T(I_{\text{inc}}) = T_M + 180I_{\text{inc}} - 8I_{\text{inc}}^2$, see Figs. 4(c) and (d). This shows that the photothermal nonlinearity becomes nearly $\sim 50\%$ at the highest intensity used. This also shows that the temperature rise due to photon absorption slows down at high temperatures (as predicted in Refs. 34–36 for a single metal nanoparticle) so that unlike the claims in Ref. 60 p. 270 and on, the maximal temperature reached is $\sim 1400^\circ\text{C}$ rather than $\sim 2700^\circ\text{C}$.

The question remains - what is the reason for this massive slow down of the temperature rise? To answer this question, we adapt the simulation configuration used in Section 4.1 to the experimental setup described in Ref. 17 and simulate the temperature distribution via the heat transfer module of COMSOL Multiphysics. The thermal conductivity of NH$_3$ is taken from the experimental measurement of Refs. 58,59 for the temperature range of 52 - 652°C.$^3$ The measured data were also fitted in Ref. 58 by the following cubic polynomial, $\kappa_{\text{NH}_3}(T) = 5.237 \times 10^{-4} + 5.179 \times 10^{-5}T + 8.404 \times 10^{-8}T^2 + 1.557 \times 10^{-11}T^3$, where $\kappa_{\text{NH}_3}$ is in W/(m·K) and $T$ is in K, as shown in Fig. 4(a). This cubic polynomial is used to extrapolate the NH$_3$ thermal conductivity for temperatures higher than 652°C in our simulations.

The catalyst sample was illuminated by a pulsed broadband white-light source without applying any external heating. The penetration (skin) depth to the sample is calculated using the permittivity data of Cu$^{55}$ and Ru$^{55}$ at 300K. We find that the penetration depth is much smaller than the sample thickness, see Fig. 4(b). In addition to the temperature

$^3$Although the thermal conductivity of NH$_3$ was measured at the pressures of 12.9, 26.5, and 45.0 kN/m$^2$ (0.127, 0.262 and 0.444 atm) in Ref. 58, this data can be used for the simulation at 1 atm since the gas thermal conductivity is very weakly-dependent on the pressure.$^{61}$ To justify this, we compared the data from Ref. 58 with the data measured at 1 atm but in a lower temperature range ($-33.6 - 426.9^\circ\text{C}$) provided in Ref. 59 and found good agreement between these two sets of data.
distribution, we also calculated the reaction rate based on the Arrhenius equation using the calculated temperature at the center of the top sample surface. Our independent simulation results show satisfactory agreement with the fitted data up to 1000°C, even slightly beyond the expected bound for the validity of the used values for the thermal conductivity of the host, see Figs. 4(c) and (d). In particular, the temperature at the center of the top surface increases monotonically with the illumination intensity but with a decreasing slope, see Fig. 4(c). In the original manuscript, this slowdown of the temperature rise was incorrectly attributed to the temperature dependence of the thermal conductivity of the oxide support. This claim is, however, invalid for two reasons. First, this claim would lead to an opposite trend to that observed since the thermal conductivity of the MgO-Al$_2$O$_3$ support decreases with temperature. Second, the temperature dependence of the thermal conductivity of the oxide support, in fact, was shown in Ref. 26 to have a negligible effect on the overall nonlinearity because of the small volume fraction of oxides in the catalyst sample (using the sample mass and the sample volume reported in Ref. 17). Instead, in agreement with the qualitative analysis and the modelling of the Duke team papers above, the slowdown of the temperature rise is mainly due to the increase of the gas thermal conductivity with temperature.

One of the possible reasons for the slight discrepancy observed for $T > 1000°C$ between the simulation results and the fitted data at high intensities is the inaccuracy induced by the extrapolation to the thermal conductivity data of NH$_3$. This is because the third-order term ($T^3$) in the cubic polynomial used for the extrapolation has the same order of magnitude as the second-order term ($T^2$) for temperatures higher than 1000°C, i.e., it is likely that higher-order terms are required for a better accuracy. Another possible but minor reason is the usage of the permittivity data at 300K for Cu in the simulation. However, since the light penetration depth is quite smaller than the sample thickness, the change of the optical properties of Cu could only have a minor effect on the overall photothermal nonlinearity.
Figure 4: (Color online) (a) Temperature dependence of the thermal conductivity of NH$_3$.\textsuperscript{58,59} (b) Light penetration depth and the absorption cross-section of the Cu-Ru NP (inset) as a function of the wavelength. (c) Simulation results of the temperature at the center of the top surface as a function of the illumination intensity (blue solid line) and its linear approximation (blue dotted line); The black dashed line represents the upper bound of the temperature range of the NH$_3$ thermal conductivity measured in Ref. 58. (d) Calculated reaction rates (the blue solid line and the blue dotted line) as a function of the illumination intensity. The blue circles in (c) and (d) represent the numerical fit of the experimental data using the temperature-shifted Arrhenius law.

see discussion in Ref. 26. Since comprehensive data of the temperature dependence of the metal permittivity and of the gas thermal conductivity hardly exist at such high temperature regimes, the resolution of this discrepancy requires further experimental study. Nevertheless, our simulation result shows that the photothermal nonlinearity plays a non-negligible role in reducing the growth rate of the rising temperature and, hence, of the photocatalysis reaction rate.
5 Discussion

The analysis presented above was based on the initial modelling of the low temperature response. Once the unknown system parameters were determined by fit to the experimental data, the nonlinear photothermal response observed experimentally was modelled accurately using the known temperature dependence of the various material constituents, i.e., using no additional fit parameters. The success of the photothermal analysis shows that as predicted in Section 2, the nonlinear response in the temperature rise originates from the temperature dependence of the (effective) thermal conductivity of the host, and not from the response of the metal itself. This also confirms the error in previous claims on a different source of nonlinearity for this systems, and shows that claims that the thermal model leads to unrealistic high temperatures are simply incorrect, see discussion in Ref. 19. The metal nonlinearity could be of significance only for very thin plasmonic catalysts or even on the single nanoparticle level (see discussion in Refs. 34–36). These systems are, however, usually of more fundamental rather than practical importance.

Unlike the generally weak effect of “hot” electrons, the photothermal nonlinearity is very strong. Therefore, this effect must be quantified before any claim for “hot” electron action can become convincing, and should not be ignored even at low illumination intensities. In practice, the rather large uncertainty in the magnitude of the associated nonlinear response coefficients means that only “hot” electron effect which are clearly greater than this uncertainty can be deduced. Unfortunately, satisfying these conditions poses a severe constraint on claims for “hot” electron dominance.

While the effect of the rising temperature on the absorptivity of the metal NPs may have a negligible effect on the overall temperature distribution, it may have a significant effect on the thermal emissivity via the Kirchhoff Law of Radiation, an effect already demonstrated experimentally.\textsuperscript{65} This is relevant for a correct determination of the temperature using thermal imaging at mid-IR frequencies, i.e., the change of emissivity at those frequencies would need to be accounted for at high temperatures. To the best of our knowledge, this was not
done so far in the context of plasmon-assisted photocatalysis, see discussion in Ref. 21.

At the high temperatures at which significant photothermal nonlinearity may be observed, the NPs themselves may undergo geometrical and morphological changes and eventually may even melt (at a temperature which may be significantly lower than the bulk melting temperature). This possibility was discussed in great detail in Ref. 60 p. 270 and on. Briefly, while this effect may be possible, it was not probed directly, and it is a-priori expected not to affect the temperature distribution so much, especially not when $\delta_{\text{skin}} \ll H$.\textsuperscript{26} Therefore, although melting may occur, it does not affect the results discussed in the current work in a significant manner.

Lastly, we note that systems similar to those studied here were extensively studied in the past in the context of composites with a high thermo-optical nonlinearity, see e.g., Refs. 32,42–45 and in the context of various applications such as optical limiting\textsuperscript{46} or tunable optical devices.\textsuperscript{32,66} The main difference is that the particle density in those systems was typically much lower, such that some (even most) of the light was transmitted through the sample. In addition, the focus in these systems was on (nonlinear) changes of the optical response (permittivity, transmission etc.) rather than on the temperature rise (as above).

Thermal effects in these systems were usually ignored, and the optical response was typically interpreted using a temporally- and spatially-local response. In that sense, it would be intriguing to study the thermal response in such systems, to see if (the temporally- and spatially-nonlocal) thermal effects could explain some of the experimental observations, in particular, the strong dependence on the spatial\textsuperscript{67,68} and temporal extent of the illumination and on the host properties.\textsuperscript{34–36} In these cases, changes to the host permittivity may be more important, because of macroscopic transmission changes and thermal lensing effects, which were the main motivation for these studies in the first place.
Methods

In the experiments, the catalyst pellet was a mixture of a highly sparse powder of metal nanoparticles and metal oxide microparticles; the gas mixture occupies the empty regions between the various particles. The catalyst pellet sits in a stainless steel sample holder and is put in a reaction chamber, see Fig. 1.

In the electromagnetic simulations, the absorption of light is modeled using the effective medium approximation for the electromagnetic properties of the catalyst sample, see Sec. 3 and Eq. (7). The absorption cross-section of the NPs is calculated using Mie theory\textsuperscript{69} and the bulk permittivity. This could be somewhat inaccurate for NPs of very small sizes (diameter < 10 nm) because the metal permittivity is different from the bulk permittivity due to the nonlocal effect.\textsuperscript{70,71} However, for the conditions under which these experiments are conducted, the penetration depth is much shorter than the sample thickness (see Fig. 2(b) and 4(b)), so that effectively all light that enters the sample gets absorbed. Under these conditions, a change of the absorption cross-section of the NPs would only slightly modify the penetration depth, and will have essentially no effect on the overall temperature distribution in the sample (and hence, on the results in this work).

The temperature distribution is obtained from the steady-state solution of the heat equation with temperature-dependent coefficients. Since the thermal conductivities of the sample and of the (solid) oxide are much higher than that of the gases, heat conduction can be expected to occur mostly through the sample holder and oxides. However, the experimental setup is such that the opposite happens. Indeed, it is the thermal conductivity of the gases that dominates.

First, to understand why the sample holder is inefficient in releasing heat, we discuss separately the two experimental conditions - when the catalyst sample is not being externally heated and when it is.

For experiments where the catalyst sample is externally heated, the sample holder temperature is controlled by the heater which is connected to the sample holder. In that sense,
the sample holder serves only as a sort of “boundary condition” and its thermal conductivity is of no consequence. For the same reason, in this case the temperature dependence of the thermal conductivity of the sample holder cannot play any significant role on the photothermal nonlinearity.

For experiments where the catalyst sample is not externally heated, since the heat generation occurs primarily on the top layer of the catalyst, i.e., away from most of the sample holder, the sample holder plays a minor role. Moreover, since the increase of the holder temperature (which is almost equal to $T_2$) is much smaller than the that of the top-surface temperature $T_1$ when the illumination intensity increases (see Fig. 3(b)), and since the temperature dependence of the thermal conductivity of the sample holder \(^5\) is 2.5 to 4 times weaker than that of gases, the sample holder plays only a minor role on the photothermal nonlinearity.

Second, we need to understand why the heat conduction does not occur through the oxide microparticles. For that, we note that a calculation of the fill factor of the oxide indicates that it only reaches $\sim 10\%$. In that sense, the sample should be thought of as consisting of a highly sparse random array of micron size oxide particles, which are barely touching each other, see Fig. 1; as a result, the heat conduction through the oxide is highly inefficient and the gas provide the primary channel for heat conduction.\(^7\)\(^3\),\(^7\)\(^4\) To verify this conceptual picture, in Ref. 74, the effective thermal conductivity of such powder samples has been analyzed with a hierarchy of effective medium approaches, and found to be in good agreement with experimental results. Specifically, that work showed that the Maxwell-Garnett model\(^5\)\(^3\),\(^5\)\(^4\) in fact provides an excellent approximation for the effective thermal conductivity $\kappa_{\text{cata}}$ of the catalyst sample we analyze, namely,

$$
\kappa_{\text{cata}} = \kappa_{\text{gas}} + \frac{3\kappa_{\text{gas}}(f_{\text{m}} + f_{\text{ox}})}{\kappa_{\text{solid}} + 2\kappa_{\text{gas}}} - \frac{(f_{\text{m}} + f_{\text{ox}})}{\kappa_{\text{solid}} - \kappa_{\text{gas}}},
$$

\(^5\)The thermal conductivity of the steel support is\(^7\)\(^2\) $\kappa_{\text{steel}}(T) = 14.6 + 1.27 \times 10^{-2}T$, where $\kappa_{\text{steel}}$ is in W/(m-K) and $T$ is in $^\circ\text{C}$.\(^2\)
where \( f_m \) and \( f_{ox} \) are the metal and the oxide volume fraction in the catalyst pellet, respectively. \( \kappa_{\text{gas}} \) is the thermal conductivity of the gas and \( \kappa_{\text{solid}} \) is the effective thermal conductivity of the solid material which itself can be again approximated by Maxwell-Garnett model\(^{53,54}\)

\[
\kappa_{\text{solid}} = \kappa_{\text{ox}} + \frac{3\kappa_{\text{ox}} f_m}{\kappa_m + 2\kappa_{\text{ox}}} - \frac{\kappa_m - \kappa_{\text{ox}}}{f_m + f_{\text{ox}}}
\]

(10)

where \( \kappa_m \) and \( \kappa_{\text{ox}} \) are the metal thermal conductivity and the oxide thermal conductivity, respectively. The volume fraction of the metal and of the oxide can be deduced from the mass \( (m_{\text{cata}}) \) and the volume \( V_{\text{cata}} \) of the pellet,

\[
f_m = \frac{m_{\text{cata}} w_m / \rho_m}{V_{\text{cata}}} \quad \text{and} \quad f_m \rho_m + f_{\text{ox}} \rho_{\text{ox}} + (1 - f_m - f_{\text{ox}}) \rho_{\text{gas}} = \frac{m_{\text{cata}}}{V_{\text{cata}}},
\]

(11)

where \( w_m \) is the weight percentage of the metal, \( \rho_m, \rho_{\text{ox}} \) and \( \rho_{\text{gas}} \) are the mass densities of the metal, of the oxide and of the gas, respectively. Since the metal volume fraction is usually much smaller than the oxide volume fraction, the effective thermal conductivity of the solid material is dominated by the thermal conductivity of the oxide, justifying the ignorance of the metal NPs in Section 3. Finally, when the gas is a mixture of reactants, products and carrier gas, the thermal conductivity of the gas mixture can be calculated using

\[
\kappa_{\text{gas}} = \sum_i x_i \kappa_i,
\]

where \( x_i \) and \( \kappa_i \) are the mole fraction and the thermal conductivity of the \( i \)-th gas.

For ideal gases, the thermal conductivity can be deduced using the kinetic theory of gases\(^{61}\)

\[
\kappa = \frac{f}{3D^2} \sqrt{\frac{k_B T}{\pi^3 M}},
\]

(12)

where \( f \) is the number of degrees of freedom, \( D \) is the collision diameter, \( M \) is the molecule
mass and $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant. Thus, the thermal conductivity of ideal gases increases with the temperature because the gas molecules collide with each other and transfer energy more frequently at high temperatures. For the same reason, the thermal conductivity of gases with lighter molecules is higher than that of gases with heavier molecules. Moreover, gases with larger molecules have lower thermal conductivity than gases with smaller molecules because of their larger collision diameter.

The heat transfer from the chamber to the outer environment is modelled using a heat flux boundary condition driven by the temperature difference between the chamber boundary and the outer environment $h(T_{\text{boundary}} - T_{\text{env}})$. Therefore, a smaller value of $h$ gives rise to a stronger linear photothermal response. Based on this understanding, one can determine the value of $h$ by fitting the simulation results to the results of the experiments where the catalyst sample is not being externally heated and small intensity limit, see e.g. Fig. 3(b). The value of $h$ ensures that the rate of the illumination energy absorbed by the catalyst sample is equal to the rate of the thermal energy released to the outer environment through the boundary. For example, when the illumination intensity is 1 W/cm$^2$, the side boundary temperature is around 1°C higher than the $T_{\text{env}}$ whereas the average temperature of the top- and of bottom-boundary are around 5.5°C higher than the $T_{\text{env}}$, so that the releasing rate of the thermal energy is around $hA_{\text{side}}(T_{\text{side}} - T_{\text{env}}) + hA_{\text{top}}(T_{\text{top}} - T_{\text{env}}) + hA_{\text{bottom}}(T_{\text{top}} - T_{\text{env}}) \approx 0.285W$ for $h \approx 70$ W/(m$^2$·K), here $A_{\text{side}}$, $A_{\text{top}}$ and $A_{\text{bottom}}$ are the area of the side-, of the top- and of the bottom-boundary, respectively. This is in agreement with the rate of energy absorbed by the sample 0.283W. Moreover, once the value of $h$ is determined, it plays nearly no role on the nonlinear photothermal response. Finally, the value of $T_{\text{env}}$ was taken to be 20°C. This is equal to the catalyst temperature when the catalyst sample is not heated externally and there is no illumination.
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