Distinguishing thermal from non-thermal (“hot”) carries in illuminated molecular junctions
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Abstract

The search for the signature of non-thermal (so-called “hot”) electrons in illuminated plasmonic nanostructures requires detailed understanding of the non-equilibrium electron distribution under illumination, as well as a careful design of the experimental system employed to distinguish non-thermal electrons from thermal ones. Here, we provide a theory for using plasmonic molecular junctions to achieve this goal. We show how non-thermal electrons can be measured directly and separately from the unavoidable thermo-electric response, and discuss the relevance of our theory to recent experiments.

Introduction

When a plasmonic nanostructure is continuously illuminated, two things happen simultaneously. First, the system unavoidably heats up, and second, non-thermal (so-called “hot”)
carriers (NTCs) are being generated. The latter effect leads to an electron (and hole) distribution that deviates from the equilibrium (Fermi-Dirac) distribution\(^{1,2}\). There has been growing interest in understanding the interplay between these two processes; non-thermal carriers were suggested to be beneficial for various applications, including, notably, photodetection\(^{3-6}\) and plasmon-driven chemistry\(^{7-14}\). However, the latter application is very sensitive to the temperature of the system. Thus, distinguishing between NTCs and thermal effects is crucial for understanding how (and if at all) NTCs can be used to, e.g., catalyse certain reactions.

Various indirect ways were proposed to determine the non-thermal electron population. These include primarily the study of the ultrafast dynamics of the metal permittivity\(^{15-19}\) and of the photoemission\(^{20-23}\) following illumination by an ultrashort pulse. Under such conditions, a relatively large number of high energy non-thermal electrons are being generated, but it is not clear when and how to separate those from mere heating. In contrast, under continuous wave illumination, it is clear that the information about heating is characterized by Fermi-like distribution of carriers close to the Fermi level, whereas the NTCs reside further away from the Fermi level in nearly-flat “shoulders”, see Ref. \(^{2,24}\). However, the practical separation between thermal and non-thermal carriers is very challenging, because the number of the high excess-energy non-thermal electrons is many orders of magnitude smaller compared to the number of thermal (i.e., low excess energy) carriers. Thus, the various attempts made to separate the contributions of these two types of charge carriers to chemical reaction rates in the context of plasmon-assisted photocatalysis, these are likely to fail\(^{25-28}\), because the control thermocatalysis (light off) experiments must reproduce exactly the temperature profile of the photocatalysis (light on) experiments\(^{14,26}\), a task which is nearly impossible (although progress has been made in this direction\(^{12,29-31}\)).

In an attempt to circumvent this problem, Reddy, Wang and co-authors\(^{32}\) (referred to as RW21 hereafter) recently suggested measuring directly the NTC distribution by coupling a plasmonic Au film to a molecular junction (schematically described in Fig. 1(a), adapted
from RW21). By measuring the I-V curves through the molecular junction (MJ) under illumination and in the dark, these authors assess directly the effect of illumination on the electronic distribution in the illuminated Au electrode.

The theoretical foundations to describe the non-thermal electron distribution as well as the current through such a plasmonic MJ were laid in Ref. [1]. We recently extended the model of Ref. [1] to provide a complete model of the electron non-equilibrium under CW illumination [24]. Here, we extend the second part of the theory of Ref. [1], namely, transport through a MJ coupled to two electrodes, by combining the standard Landauer theory of transport through MJs [33,34] and the analytic form for the electron non-equilibrium distribution of an illuminated metal [24], and suggest a scheme that can be used to measure the non-thermal electron distribution in the presence of strong heating and even large thermal gradients (i.e., regardless of the temperature distribution). Using this formulation we shed new light on the experimental results of Reddy, Wang et al. [32] demonstrating that it is possible that they indeed were able to distinguish (probably for the first time) non-thermal electrons from thermal ones, but not in the way interpreted in the original manuscript.

Results and Discussion

General Theory

Current through a molecular junction is typically described by the Landauer formula [33,34], which relates the total current to the electronic transmission function $T(E)$ and the electrodes’ electron distribution functions, $J = \frac{e}{h} \int dE T(E) (f_{\text{top}} - f_{\text{bottom}})$; here, $e$ is the electron charge, $h$ is Planck’s constant, and $f_{\text{top/bottom}}$ represent the electron distribution of the top/bottom electrodes (representing the Au slab and the STM tip, respectively); see Fig. 1(a). At equilibrium, $f_{\text{top}} = f_{\text{bottom}} = f^T(E,T_e)$, where $f^T(E,T_e) = \left(1 + \exp\left(\frac{E-\mu}{k_B T_e}\right)\right)^{-1}$ is the thermal (Fermi-Dirac) distribution, $T_e$ the (electron) temperature, $\mu$ the chemical potential and $k_B$ the Boltzmann constant. The transmission function is typically described by
a Lorentzian, \( \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{E}) = \frac{\Gamma^2}{(\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{E}_0)^2 + \Gamma^2} \), where \( \mathcal{E}_0 \) is the energy of the frontier molecular orbital and \( \Gamma \) is the level broadening (this is the so-called wideband approximation\(^{33,34}\)). Notably, this theoretical approach implicitly assumes that the electron and temperature distributions on the electrodes is uniform.

With equal distributions on the two electrodes, the current vanishes. As bias voltage \( V \) is applied, the chemical potentials shift such that \( \mu_{\text{top}} - \mu_{\text{bottom}} = V \) and current flows through the junction. Current can also be driven by a temperature difference (i.e., setting \( T_{e,\text{top}} \neq T_{e,\text{bottom}} \)), generating a thermo-electric effect\(^{33–35}\).

In order for the current to give an indication on the non-thermal electron distribution, it needs to be generated using optical illumination, such that electric field felt by the electrodes is substantially different, so that \( f_{\text{top}} \neq f_{\text{bottom}} \). To evaluate this effect, we follow Ref. [24], where it was shown that under continuous illumination (i.e., by monochromatic light at frequency \( \omega_L \)), the electron distribution in a Drude metal is (to an excellent approximation)

\[
f(\mathcal{E}; T_e, \omega_L, |E|^2) = f^T(\mathcal{E}; T_e) + \delta_E(\mathcal{E}) \left[ f^T(\mathcal{E} + \hbar \omega_L; T_e) + f^T(\mathcal{E} - \hbar \omega_L; T_e) \right],
\]

where \( \delta_E \) measures the population of non-thermal carriers, and is given by

\[
\delta_E \equiv \left| \frac{E}{E_{\text{sat}}} \right|^2, \quad |E_{\text{sat}}|^2 \equiv \frac{1}{\tau_{e-e}(\mathcal{E}) R}.
\]

Here, \( |E|^2 \) is the local electric field intensity and \( \tau_{e-e}(\mathcal{E}) = \{K \left[ (\pi k_B T_e)^2 + (\mathcal{E} - \mu)^2 \right] \}^{-1} \) is the \( e-e \) collision rate, derived from Fermi liquid theory where \( K \) is the \( e-e \) scattering constant\(^{40}\), and \( R \) is a constant that depends on the (imaginary part of the) metal permittivity at the laser frequency \( \epsilon''_m \), and electron density \( n_e \) but not on \( T_e \), see SI Section 4.\(^{4} \) In a simpler form, \( \delta_E = \delta_E^{(0)} \left[ (\pi k_B T_e)^2 + (\mathcal{E} - \mu)^2 \right]^{-1} \). Notably, the solution for the non-equilibrium distribution \(^{11} \) is also obtained under the assumption of uniform(ized) field, or alternatively, relies on the value of the local field.

\(^{1}\)Note that the expression for \( R \) in the original derivation\(^{24} \) had a small typo; it was corrected in an errata, and noted in Ref. \(^{41} \).
Evaluating the current through the asymmetrically illuminated MJ can now be easily done by setting $f_{\text{top}} = f(\mathcal{E} + V; T_{e,\text{top}}, |E_{\text{top}}|^2)$, $f_{\text{bottom}} = f(\mathcal{E}; T_{e,\text{bottom}}, |E_{\text{bottom}}|^2)$ (assuming that the bottom electrode is grounded\cite{32}) and plugging these distributions into the Landauer formula for the current. To isolate the contribution of illumination, we follow the authors of Ref. \cite{32} who subtracted from the current under illumination the current in the dark (both as a function of voltage). In this case, the contribution to the current from illumination is simply

$$\Delta J_{\text{light}} = J_{\text{light}}(V, T_{e,\text{top}}, T_{e,\text{bottom}}, |E|^2) - J_{\text{dark}}(V, T_{\text{dark}}).$$

(3)

Eq. (3) implies that the current is determined by the electric field and electron temperature rise induced by the illumination at both electrodes. We use numerical simulations to evaluate these quantities qualitatively, and then we evaluate $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ for various molecular and illumination conditions. We show that, depending on the properties of the molecular system, $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ has a dominant feature coming from either the temperature difference or the NTC contribution. These calculations are supplemented by evaluation of the electric field in the MJ as described above. We show that excellent fits to the data of RW21 can be achieved, corroborated by the electromagnetic calculations.

Results - nearly-resonant molecules

We start with addressing a ”nearly-resonant” molecule, i.e., a molecule for which the orbital energy is close to the electrodes’ Fermi level. In Fig. [1(b)], we plot (the log of) $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ as a function of voltage for a molecular junction, taking relevant parameters for a typical MJ, $\mathcal{E}_0 = 0.15$ eV and $\Gamma = 10$ meV; the relatively small value of $\mathcal{E}_0$ makes this molecule ”nearly-resonant” (with respect to the electrodes’ Fermi level). We take $\delta E_0^{(0)} = 10^{-7}$ eV$^2$ and $\hbar \omega_L = 1.48$ eV (corresponding to 833 nm wavelength); note that the chosen wavelength is sufficiently longer than the $\sim 1.77$eV threshold for interband transitions\cite{42}, thus, validating the use of the analytic solution for Drude metals (Eqs. (1)-(2)). We further set $T_{\text{dark}} = 300$
K, and assume that under the STM tip the illuminated sample is heated by 5 K (i.e., 
\(T_{e,\text{bottom}} = 305\) K). Note that we assume (as in RW21) that the STM tip is not heated. 
These parameters are close to those presented in RW21.

In this case, since the non-thermal part of the distribution is negligible for realistic values 
of voltage bias (\(\sim \pm 0.3V\) in RW21), the contribution of the light to the current is given by

\[
\Delta J_{\text{light}} = \frac{e}{h} \int d\epsilon \mathcal{T}(\epsilon + V/2) \left\{ f^T(\epsilon; T_{e,\text{bottom}}) - f^T(\epsilon + V; T_{e,\text{top}}) 
- \left( f^T(\epsilon; T_{\text{dark}}) - f^T(\epsilon + V; T_{\text{dark}}) \right) \right\}
\approx \frac{e}{h} \int d\epsilon \mathcal{T}(\epsilon + V/2) \left\{ f^T(\epsilon; T_{e,\text{bottom}}) - f^T(\epsilon; T_{\text{dark}}) \right\},
\]

where the second equality follows from setting \(T_{e,\text{top}} = T_{\text{dark}}\). \(\Delta J_{\text{light}}\) is plotted in Fig. 1(b), showing two prominent features. The first is that at low voltages, the dominant effect is 
the thermal effect (coming from the heating of the slab under illumination), centered a 
distance \(\sim \Gamma\) around the orbital resonance \(E_0\). The second is the onset of non-thermal 
electron “shoulders” in \(\Delta J_{\text{light}}\), which extend into the high-V regime, where the thermal 
effect becomes small. The relative importance of thermal and non-thermal effects can readily 
be seen in the inset to Fig. 1(b), which shows the same data on a linear scale. We point 
that the absolute temperature of \(T_{e,\text{bottom}}\) induced by the illumination will only have a minor 
effect on the results of Fig. 1(b); it is the difference between the temperature of the bottom 
electrode upon illumination and its temperature in the dark which is responsible for the 
large changes near \(V = 0\). In the same vain, we also point that this thermal feature is not a 
“thermo-electric” effect, meaning that it is not a result of a temperature difference between 
the electrodes.

Armed with these insights from Fig. 1 (mainly that at low bias voltages thermal effects 
are dominant, because the orbital energy \(E_0\) is rather small), we used Eq. (3) to fit the 
measured values of \(\Delta J_{\text{light}}\) of RW21 for their L1 molecule (a charge-transfer complex of 
quaterthiophene (T4) and tetracyanoethylene (TCNE) with terminal thiophenes containing
gold-binding methyl sulfides; data extracted from the supplementary material (Fig. S16A RW21). We use data from two sets of measurements in RW21, using Au slabs with thicknesses 6 and 13nm. We set as free parameters both the molecular parameters $E_0$ and $\Gamma$ and the local temperature in the Au slab segment directly under the STM tip, $T_e = T_{dark} + \delta T$, where $T_{dark}$ is the ambient temperature and $\delta T$ is the excess temperature (above ambient), such that $T_{e,\text{bottom}} = T_{dark} + \delta T$ (as in RW21, we assume that the top electrode remains unheated). We simultaneously fit both data sets with the same $E_0$ and $\Gamma$, leaving only $\delta T$ to vary between experiments.

In Fig. 1(c)-(d) we plot the experimental data and a best fit to Eq. (3) (black squares) with common parameters $E_0 = 0.155\text{eV}$ and $\Gamma = 0.057\text{eV}$, with $\delta T = 2.21\text{K}$ and $1.14\text{K}$ for the 6 and 13nm slabs (red and blue circles, respectively). These fits indicate that a thermal origin for the experimental results is plausible. Importantly, associating $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ with a thermal effect naturally explains the two energy scales appearing in the data (the position of the peak $E_0$ and the linewidth $\Gamma$), which cannot be associated with any feature of NTCs. Note that while these same results were interpreted in RW21 as the “hot” carrier contribution, no direct fit between theory and experiment was presented in RW21.

Finally, we note that our best fit parameters mentioned above yield a rather small temperature rise in the Au slab below the STM tip ($\sim 1 - 2\text{K}$). In SI Section 4.2 we show that these values, as well as the negligible heating assumed in RW21 and in our analysis, are likely to match numerical thermal simulations of the experimental system for a several micron-wide STM tip, as indeed were supposedly used in RW21.

However, despite the compelling match of the fit and our simulations and analysis, a few words of caution are in order. Our fits seem to be somewhat inconsistent with some of the data presented in RW21. For instance, the fitted values for $E_0$ and $\Gamma$ are different from those obtained in RW21 (although the estimates in RW21 are also inconsistent with some of their data, see SI Section 1), but are consistent with earlier measurements of a similar junction. Our results also show a discrepancy with the control experiments per-
formed in RW21, where current in the dark was measured at increased temperatures (RW21, Fig. S12), and showed essentially no sign of being temperature sensitive. On the other hand, these control experiments are inconsistent with the formalism and parameters used within RW21. Indeed, plugging the RW21 parameters into a calculation of the current reveals a strong dependence on temperature (for the same parameters of RW21 Fig. S12), yet no such temperature dependence was measured (see SI Section 2).

Off-resonance molecule

The difficulty in distinguishing the thermo-electric and non-thermal electron contributions to $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ stems from the two following points: (i) one cannot measure directly the sample temperature under the STM tip, and (ii) because of the relatively small $E_0$ (the nearly-resonant nature of the molecule), and the fact that thermal current response is limited to a distance $\sim \Gamma$ around the molecular orbital $E_0$, the thermal effect is most important for low (hence realistic) voltages, i.e., for molecular resonances around the Fermi level.

Overcoming the first point is very challenging. However, overcoming the second point is actually quite easy. In a molecular junction where the molecular orbital energy $E_0$ is far from the Fermi level but in resonance with the illumination energy (i.e., $E_0 \sim \hbar \omega_L$), low voltage measurements of $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ will only show the non-thermal part of the distribution. This is because, as is evident from Eq. (1), the non-thermal features extend to a distance $\hbar \omega_L$ from the molecular resonance, and will thus be prominent at low voltages.

In this case, since the thermal contribution is negligible, the contribution of the illumination to the current is given by

$$\Delta J_{\text{light}} \approx \frac{e}{\hbar} \int d\mathcal{E} T(\mathcal{E} + V/2) \left\{ \delta_{E,\text{bottom}} f(\mathcal{E} - \hbar \omega_L, T_{e,\text{bottom}}) - \delta_{E,\text{top}} f(\mathcal{E} + V - \hbar \omega_L, T_{e,\text{top}}) \right\},$$

(5)

where $\delta_{E,\text{bottom/top}}$ are derived (using Eq. (2)) from the local field on the bottom/top electrodes.
Figure 1: (Color online) (a) Schematic depiction of the experimental setup, comprising an Au slab with nanofabricated gratings, and a molecular junction (MJ) formed between the slab and an STM tip. Surface plasmons are excited in the slab by CW illumination of the grating, and propagate towards the MJ (wiggly arrows). (b) $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ as a function of bias voltage (log scale) for a molecular junction with resonance close to the Fermi level (see text for details). Near zero bias, the most dominant feature is the thermal contribution to the current. Spikes in the plot correspond to voltages at which the current changes sign. Inset: same plot in linear scale. (c)-(d) Fits to experimental data of Reddy et al.\textsuperscript{32} for a 6nm (c) and 13nm (d) thick slabs, assuming non-zero temperature difference between the slab and the STM tip. Red and blue circles are the experimental data and black squares are the fits, yielding $\delta T = 2.21\text{K}$ and $1.14\text{K}$ for (c) and (d) respectively (see text for further discussion on these parameters).
In Fig. 2 we plot (the log of) $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ as a function of bias voltage (as in Fig. 1(b)) for the case of $\mathcal{E}_0 = 1.4$ eV, at resonance with $\hbar \omega_L$ (all other parameters are the same as for L1, solid line), for $\delta_{E,\text{top}} = 10^{-5}$ eV$^2$, $\delta_{E,\text{bottom}} = 0$. It is clear that now the thermal feature only appears at high voltages, while at low voltages, the non-thermal electron “shoulder” provides the prominent contribution to the current. For comparison, the dashed line shows $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ for $\delta_{E,\text{bottom}} = 0$ (i.e., no non-thermal electrons), demonstrating the orders-of-magnitude larger contribution of non-thermal electrons at low voltages. Importantly, there are also qualitative differences with respect to L1, most prominent is the fact that $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ does not change sign, a feature which can be easily recognized experimentally.

A somewhat similar experiment was, in fact, conducted in RW21, using a MJ with a 1,4-benzenediisonitrile molecule (dubbed L2 in RW21). This molecule has a LUMO level which is far from the Fermi level, $\mathcal{E}_{\text{LUMO}} - \mu \sim 0.77$ eV, and thus is somewhat similar to the situation described above. In the SI to RW21 (Fig. S18) the authors plot $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ vs. the bias voltage. We use these data to fit Eq. (3), and find that for this molecular energy indeed the thermal contribution is negligible for that range of voltages, and that the data can be fitted very well (within the experimental error) with the contribution coming solely from the non-thermal part of the distribution. This is shown in the inset to Fig. 2 where the experimental data (blue points) and the theoretical points (black squares) are shown. The molecular parameters $\Gamma = 0.18$ eV and $\mathcal{E}_0 = 0.77$ eV are taken from Ref. [44], and the only fit parameters are $\delta_{E,\text{bottom}}$ and $\delta_{E,\text{top}}$.

To reduce the number of fit parameters further, we have conducted numerical simulations of the electric field under the experimental conditions (see SI Section 4.1). These simulations show that the field (squared) in the tip is actually larger than the field (squared) in the slab by a factor of $\sim 10$, due to the plasmonic enhancement around the tip.

In the inset to Fig. 2 we plot the experimental data of RW21 (blue points, along with the experimental error bars), and the theoretical $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ as a function of bias voltage, where $\delta_{E,\text{top}} = 8 \times 10^{-6}$ eV$^2$ (and keeping $\delta_{E,\text{bottom}} \approx 0.1 \delta_{E,\text{top}}$) is the best fit value. This fit between
Figure 2: (Color online) $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ (see Eq. (3)) as a function of bias voltage (log scale) for a molecular junction with molecular resonance far to the Fermi level, but in resonance with the illumination frequency (see text for details and parameters). Dashed line: same, without any NTCs, showing that the thermal contribution in these case is negligible near the Fermi level. Inset: Fit between experimental data for molecule L2 and a 6nm slab (Fig. S18 of RW21, blue circles) and theory (black squares), demonstrating that this measurement may indeed be an indication for NTCs (see text for parameters and discussion).

Data and theory provides further experimental corroboration to Eq. (3), providing what is, to the best of our knowledge, the first direct measurement of the steady-state non-thermal contribution to the electron distribution. These values for $\delta E$ match the calculated values for the electric field (see SI Section 4).

However, somewhat unintuitively, the experimental data of the L2 molecule in WR21 can also be fitted with a thermal effect. Indeed, by setting the $\delta E$’s to be zero and assuming $\delta T_{e,\text{bottom}} \sim 20\text{K}$ we obtain a fit essentially similar to that shown in the inset of Fig. 2; note that this is not a contradiction with Fig. 2 because the energy of molecule L2 obtained from the fit is much lower (i.e., not as far from resonance) compared with the value used for the illustration of Fig. 2; in that respect, the experiment in RW21 involves an intermediate case, whereby the molecular energy is partially off-resonance. One is thus facing a situation where both NTCs and thermal effects can reproduce the experimental data.
Figure 3: (Color online) $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ as a function of bias voltage (log scale) for different values of electron temperature, $T_{e,\text{bottom}} = T_{\text{dark}} + 50, 100, 150, 200$ K (see text for other parameters). The thermal effect (which appears close to the molecular resonance) strongly depends on temperature, while the NTCs contribution is temperature independent, thus providing a simple way for discriminating between the two effects.

Fortunately, unlike the situation in plasmon-assisted photocatalysis experiments (e.g., Ref. [25]), the MJ setup offers a simple way to further discriminate between the two effects, by simply measuring $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ (for the off-resonance molecule) as a function of ambient temperature. The reason is that while the thermal contribution would be strongly influenced by the temperature, the NTCs would not. In order to demonstrate this, in Fig. 3 we plot $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ as a function of bias voltage for $T_{e,\text{bottom}} = T_{\text{dark}} + 50, 100, 150, 200$ K, and as can be seen, the low-voltage NTC contribution to $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$ is essentially unchanged. Another way to overcome the situation is to choose a molecular junction which has frontier orbitals which are even further away from the Fermi level of the electrodes, such as Au-benzenedithiol-Au junctions, where the HOMO level is $\sim 1.2$ eV away from the Fermi level [45]. Under such circumstances, the thermal effect is expected to contribute only a tiny fraction of the NTC contribution to $\Delta J_{\text{light}}$. 
Summary

In conclusion, we have shown that our analytical prediction of the electron distribution under continuous wave illumination can be used to interpret recent experiments (RW21). This sheds new light on these experiments, and demonstrates that they seem to measure directly the NTC contribution to the distribution function, however, surprisingly, not as they originally interpreted their data. We suggest further experiments that can be analyzed within our theory, thus providing a direct route to solving one of the outstanding questions in plasmonic systems, namely, the form of the electron distribution under continuous illumination.

References


(34) Di Ventra, M. Electrical transport in nanoscale systems. *Electrical Transport in Nanoscale Systems* 2008,


