

## Temperature-independent non-linear terahertz transmission by liquid water

Fabio Novelli<sup>1,†,\*</sup>, Célia Millon<sup>2,†</sup>, Johannes Schmidt<sup>3</sup>, Sashary Ramos<sup>1</sup>, Eliane P. van Dam<sup>1</sup>, Adrian Buchmann<sup>1</sup>, Clara Saraceno<sup>2</sup>, Martina Havenith<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physical Chemistry II, Ruhr University Bochum, 44801 Bochum, Germany

<sup>2</sup>Photonics and Ultrafast Laser Science, Ruhr University Bochum, 44801 Bochum, Germany

<sup>3</sup>Elettra Sincrotrone Trieste S.C.p.A., 34127, Basovizza, Trieste, Italy

<sup>†</sup>contributed equally

\*fabio.novelli@rub.de

\*martina.havenith@rub.de

Liquid water is one of the most studied substances, yet many of its properties are difficult to rationalize. The uniqueness of water is rooted in the dynamic network of hydrogen-bonded molecules that rearranges within about one picosecond. Terahertz fields oscillate on a picosecond timescale and are inherently suited to study water. Recent advances in non-linear terahertz spectroscopy have revealed large signals from liquid water, which have been interpreted with different, sometimes competing, theoretical models. Here we show that the non-linear response of liquid water at  $\sim 1$  THz is similar at 21 °C and 4 °C, thus suggesting that the most appropriate microscopic models should depend weakly on temperature.

### Introduction

On the microscopic scale, water molecules in the liquid phase make hydrogen bonds with tetrahedral structures that fluctuate on the picosecond (ps) timescale<sup>1</sup>. On the macroscopic scale, several thermodynamic properties of liquid water are anomalous, as they vary strongly upon cooling<sup>2</sup>. However, it is unclear how the macroscopic behavior emerges from the microscopic properties<sup>3</sup>. An inherently powerful spectroscopic tool to study liquid water is terahertz (THz) radiation because it can reveal the fluctuations of the water network on the picosecond time scale. In fact, THz radiation between about 0.01 and 20 THz is strongly absorbed by the intermolecular, collective modes of liquid water<sup>4–10</sup>.


Recently, non-linear THz spectroscopy at 1 THz<sup>11–15</sup> and 12 THz<sup>16,17</sup> has been applied to the study of liquid water. While these experiments reported non-linear signals with similar sizes, i.e., a third-order nonlinear response with a magnitude of about  $\chi^3 \sim 10^{-13}$  cm<sup>2</sup>/V<sup>2</sup> (see Table 1 in ref.<sup>17</sup>), the results have been rationalized in different ways. Previously, we performed THz-pump THz-probe experiments at  $\sim 12$  THz<sup>16,17</sup> and z-scan measurements at  $\sim 1$  THz on water<sup>15</sup>. In ref.<sup>16</sup>, with the aid of a dedicated model and molecular dynamics simulations, we successfully proposed that the non-linear response of water in the THz range is due to the resonant reorientation of hydrogen-bonded water molecules. The Elsaesser group<sup>13,14</sup> performed THz-pump THz-probe experiments at about 1 THz. They suggested that the THz pump is

responsible for the irreversible ionization of water molecules and the subsequent generation of solvated electrons. Additionally, the Kozlov group<sup>11,12</sup> performed z-scan measurements also at  $\sim 1$  THz on water. They suggested that the non-linear response could originate from cascaded anharmonicity of the intramolecular O-H stretch mode.

The cascaded anharmonicity model implies that the non-linear response should be proportional to the thermal expansivity (see, e.g., Figure 4 in ref.<sup>12</sup>). Thus, considering that the expansivity of water is dependent on temperature and becomes null at<sup>18</sup> 4 °C, one expects the non-linear THz response of water to decrease upon cooling. Contrary to this expectation, here we show that the transmission of intense radiation at  $\sim 1$  THz by water is the same at 21 °C and 4 °C, within the experimental uncertainty.

## Methods

We performed experiments at the beam-line TeraFERMI of the free-electron laser (FEL) in Trieste. The source and the available optical setups are detailed elsewhere<sup>19</sup>. In short, the FEL generates intense and almost single-cycle THz fields lasting approximately 1 ps (Figure 1a) with a spectrum centered at  $\sim 1$  THz (Figure 1b); the THz fields are detected via electro-optical sampling in a 0.1 mm thick gallium phosphide (GaP) crystal. A 2" off-axis parabolic mirror with an effective focal length of 2" focuses the THz field into a static cell with 0.5 mm thick diamond windows enclosing a 100  $\mu\text{m}$  thick layer of pure water. The static cell is magnetically attached to a copper plate, whose temperature is stabilized to either 21 °C or 4 °C by a recirculating chiller, with an accuracy of  $\pm 0.1$  °C. As shown in Figure 1c, the area of the THz spot size at the sample position was measured to be about 0.6  $\text{mm}^2$  with a camera (Pyrocam IIIHR). A maximum THz power of 388  $\mu\text{W}$  was measured with a power detector (THZ12D-3S-VP-INT-D0). Considering the reflection losses at the diamond window, we estimate that the maximum THz power on the liquid water sample is 321  $\mu\text{W}$ . This results in a maximum THz energy of  $321\mu\text{W}/50\text{Hz}\sim 6.4$   $\mu\text{J}/\text{pulse}$ , fluence of  $6.4\mu\text{J}/0.6\text{mm}^2\sim 1.07$   $\text{mJ}/\text{cm}^2$ , peak power of  $1.07\text{ mJ}/\text{cm}^2/1\text{ps}\sim 1.07$   $\text{GW}/\text{cm}^2$ , and peak field amplitude<sup>20</sup> of  $(2\cdot 376.7\Omega\cdot 1.07\text{GW}/\text{cm}^2)^{0.5}\sim 0.9$   $\text{MV}/\text{cm}$ . We controlled the THz intensity at the sample with two polarizers with a  $10^4$ :1 contrast ratio (infraspes P01).



**Figure 1.** Terahertz transmission by liquid water in a static cell with diamond windows. *a)* We show the terahertz fields transmitted by a 100  $\mu\text{m}$  thick layer of liquid water at two temperatures (21 °C and 4 °C, in red and blue, respectively). *b)* The transmitted frequency-dependent spectra obtained by Fourier transformation of the THz fields shown in panel *a)*. The error bars are standard errors of the mean from

27 independent measurements. c) The spot size of the THz beam at the sample position measured with a camera, see text for details.

The thermalization time of the sample can be estimated to<sup>21</sup>  $\tau \sim L^2/D \sim 17$  ms, where  $L=50$   $\mu\text{m}$  is penetration depth of liquid water at 1 THz, and  $D=1.5 \cdot 10^{-7}$   $\text{m}^2/\text{s}$  is the thermal diffusivity. The FEL emits radiation at a repetition rate of 50 Hz and the time delay between subsequent THz pulses is 20 ms. The thermal relaxation time ( $\tau \sim 17$  ms) is comparable to the time-delay between pulses (20 ms) and we expect that the temperature build-up of the sample due to the pulse train of the FEL is negligible. Thus, we are able to estimate the temperature increase of the sample due to the absorption of THz radiation from the energy of a single pulse<sup>17</sup>. For simplicity, if we assume that the energy of one THz pulse is fully and instantaneously absorbed and transformed into heat in a water layer as thick as one penetration depth at 1 THz ( $L=50$   $\mu\text{m}$ ), the temperature increase of the water sample is  $1.07 \text{ mJ}/\text{cm}^2/50 \mu\text{m}/(4.2 \text{ J}/(\text{cm}^3 \cdot ^\circ\text{C})) \sim 0.05$   $^\circ\text{C}$ . As this temperature increase is smaller than the accuracy of the recirculating chiller that stabilizes the sample within  $\pm 0.1$   $^\circ\text{C}$ , we can ignore heating effects.

## Results and discussion

At equilibrium, the linear absorption coefficient of liquid water at THz frequencies depends strongly on temperature<sup>21–24</sup>. Between about 0.1 and 3 THz, the linear absorption increases upon heating and decreases upon cooling. Based on previous works<sup>21–24</sup>, by decreasing the liquid temperature from 21  $^\circ\text{C}$  down to 4  $^\circ\text{C}$ , the absorption coefficient of liquid water at 1 THz is expected to drop by  $\Delta\alpha_0=(50 \pm 9)$   $\text{cm}^{-1}$ . In Figure 1, we show the THz fields transmitted by the diamond sample cell when filled with a 100  $\mu\text{m}$  layer of water at two temperatures, 21  $^\circ\text{C}$  and 4  $^\circ\text{C}$ . When we cool the liquid to 4  $^\circ\text{C}$ , the transmission increases, compared to that at 21  $^\circ\text{C}$ , as shown in the blue curves in Figure 1a and Figure 1b. Please note that the error bars in Figure 1 and Figure 2 are the standard errors of the mean calculated from 27 independent measurements. The ratio between the peak field transmitted by water at 21  $^\circ\text{C}$  and the peak field transmitted by water at 4  $^\circ\text{C}$  reveals the temperature-dependent absorption coefficient of liquid water. At equilibrium conditions (linear optics), the ratio between the transmitted THz peak fields at 21  $^\circ\text{C}$  and 4  $^\circ\text{C}$  is

$$T = e^{-\Delta\alpha_0 d/2} \quad (1)$$

where  $\Delta\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(21^\circ\text{C}) - \alpha_0(4^\circ\text{C})$  is the difference between the equilibrium absorption coefficients,  $d$  is the sample thickness, and the factor 2 accounts for the proportionality between the intensity and electric field squared. Experimentally, when the THz intensity (peak field) impinging upon the water sample is set to 0.4  $\text{GW}/\text{cm}^2$  (0.33  $\text{MV}/\text{cm}$ ), we find that the ratio between the peak field transmitted by water at 21  $^\circ\text{C}$  and the one transmitted at 4  $^\circ\text{C}$  is  $T = (79.4 \pm 0.5)\%$ . By inserting  $T = (79.4 \pm 0.5)\%$  and  $d = 100$   $\mu\text{m}$  in eq.1, we estimate an absorption change of  $\Delta\alpha_0 = (46 \pm 1.5)$   $\text{cm}^{-1}$  upon cooling water from 21  $^\circ\text{C}$  to 4  $^\circ\text{C}$ . This value agrees with the literature result at equilibrium<sup>21–24</sup>,  $\Delta\alpha_0 = (50 \pm 9)$   $\text{cm}^{-1}$ .

When the intensity of the input radiation source is high enough, the absorption coefficient of any material – including liquid water – displays a non-linear response. At simplest, the absorption coefficient becomes intensity-dependent via the equation

$$\alpha(I) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_{\text{NL}} \cdot I \quad (2)$$

where  $\alpha_0$  is the absorption coefficient of the material at equilibrium introduced previously,  $I$  is the source intensity, and  $\alpha_{NL}$  is the non-linear term. It has been demonstrated before<sup>11,12,16</sup> that liquid water at a temperature close to 21 °C displays a sizeable non-linear absorption at 1 THz, i.e.,  $\alpha_{NL}(21\text{ °C}) \sim 80\text{ cm/GW}$ . The cascaded anharmonic effect introduced by the Kozlov group<sup>11,12</sup> was shown to scale with the thermal expansivity (see Figure 4 in ref.<sup>12</sup>) that, in turn, vanishes at the temperature of 4 °C in liquid water<sup>18</sup>. For this reason, we expected to detect a smaller THz non-linearity at 4 °C than at 21 °C in pure water. Thus, by plotting the ratio between the peak THz field transmitted by water at 21 °C and the one transmitted at 4 °C, we expected to detect an increasing value at increasing THz intensities. Instead, as shown in Figure 2, the same transmission value was detected at increasing THz intensities ( $I=0.4, 0.77, 1.07\text{ GW/cm}^2$ ). This experimental finding suggests that the non-linear response of liquid water at 21 °C and 4 °C is the same, within the experimental uncertainty that amounts to about  $\pm 0.5\%$  in transmission or  $\pm 1.5\text{ cm}^{-1}$  in absorption.




Figure 2. The transmission value is equal to the ratio between the THz peak fields transmitted by liquid water at 21 °C and at 4 °C. The transmission is evaluated at three intensities ( $I=0.4, 0.77, \text{ and } 1.07\text{ GW/cm}^2$ ; top axis) or, equivalently, for the maximum terahertz fields shown on the bottom axis (0.33, 0.65, and 0.9 MV/cm). The transmission values measured are the same within the error bars, which are lower than about  $\pm 0.5\%$ . Thus, the water transmission at 21 °C and 4 °C is independent on the terahertz intensities probed here. This is highlighted by the dashed line, which is a guide to the eye.

In other words, we obtain the non-linear and intensity-dependent transmission of a sample,  $T(I)$ , by combining eq.1 and eq.2

$$T(I) = e^{-\Delta\alpha_0 \cdot d/2} e^{-\Delta\alpha_{NL} \cdot I \cdot d/2} \quad (3)$$

where  $\Delta\alpha_{NL} = \alpha_{NL}(21\text{ °C}) - \alpha_{NL}(4\text{ °C})$  is the difference between the non-linear THz coefficients of water at the two temperatures. The transmission described by eq.3 becomes independent of the THz intensity when the argument of the second exponential is negligible, i.e., when  $\Delta\alpha_{NL} \cdot I \cdot d/2 \sim 0$ . As demonstrated before<sup>11,12,16</sup>, the maximum THz intensity used here is enough to induce a large non-linear response in water at 21 °C. For example, by substituting in eq.2 the values  $\alpha_{NL}(21\text{ °C}) \sim 80\text{ cm/GW}$  and  $I=1.07\text{ GW/cm}^2$ , the non-linear drop of the absorption coefficient is about  $-86\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , which is almost half of the absorption coefficient at equilibrium. Thus, the only condition by which eq.3 becomes independent of the THz intensity is at  $\Delta\alpha_{NL} \sim 0$ , implying  $\alpha_{NL}(21\text{ °C}) \sim \alpha_{NL}(4\text{ °C})$ . Only when this condition is valid, it is possible to obtain a transmission that is independent of the THz intensity, as experimentally demonstrated in Figure 2.

## Conclusion

We measured the THz transmission of a 100- $\mu\text{m}$  thick water layer at two temperatures (21 and 4 °C) as a function of the intensity of the input THz radiation (0.4, 0.77, and 1.07 GW/cm<sup>2</sup>). For THz fields high enough to trigger a sizeable non-linearity in water, we showed that the transmission is the same at 21 °C and 4 °C. This implies that the non-linear response of liquid water at  $\sim 1$  THz is the same at these two temperatures, within the experimental error ( $\pm 0.5\%$  in transmission and  $\pm 1.5$  cm<sup>-1</sup> in absorption). While several models have been proposed to explain the non-linear THz signals in water<sup>12,13,16,17</sup>, the novel experimental finding reported here suggests that we should prefer models predicting a weakly temperature-dependent non-linear THz response by liquid water. In particular, it is known that both the absorption of the librational band<sup>22</sup> and the generation of solvated electrons<sup>25</sup> depend weakly on temperature. Thus, it might be possible that the large non-linear responses detected in water at THz frequencies could be related either to tunneling ionization<sup>13,14</sup> or to the resonant excitation of librational motions<sup>16,17</sup>.

## Acknowledgements

We acknowledge financial support from the Cluster of Excellence RESOLV (EXC 2033 – 390677874) funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) and by the ERC Advanced Grant 695437 (THz Calorimetry). This project received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 801459 - FP-RESOMUS. We thank CNR-IOM for the use of the MENLO C-Fiber780 laser. We are grateful to P. Di Pietro and A. Perucchi for experimental support and discussions during the beam time.

## Conflict of Interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

## Data availability

The data are available from the authors upon reasonable request.

## References

- <sup>1</sup> D. Laage and J.T. Hynes, *Science* **311**, 832 (2006).
- <sup>2</sup> A. Nilsson and L.G.M. Pettersson, *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 8998 (2015).
- <sup>3</sup> P. Ball, *Nature* **452**, 291 (2008).
- <sup>4</sup> F. Novelli, B. Guchhait, and M. Havenith, *Materials (Basel)*. **13**, 1311 (2020).
- <sup>5</sup> M. Cho, G.R. Fleming, S. Saito, I. Ohmine, and R.M. Stratt, *J. Chem. Phys.* **100**, 6672 (1994).
- <sup>6</sup> M. Heyden, J. Sun, S. Funkner, G. Mathias, H. Forbert, M. Havenith, and D. Marx, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **107**, 12068 (2010).
- <sup>7</sup> D.C. Elton and M. Fernández-Serra, *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 10193 (2016).
- <sup>8</sup> I. Popov, P. Ben Ishai, A. Khamzin, and Y. Feldman, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **18**, 13941 (2016).
- <sup>9</sup> D.C. Elton, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **19**, 18739 (2017).
- <sup>10</sup> C. Hölzl, H. Forbert, and D. Marx, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **23**, 20875 (2021).
- <sup>11</sup> A.N. Tcypkin, M. V. Melnik, M.O. Zhukova, I.O. Vorontsova, S.E. Putilin, S.A. Kozlov, and X.-C. Zhang, *Opt. Express* **27**, 10419 (2019).
- <sup>12</sup> A. Tcypkin, M. Zhukova, M. Melnik, I. Vorontsova, M. Kulya, S. Putilin, S. Kozlov, S. Choudhary, and R.W. Boyd, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **15**, 054009 (2021).
- <sup>13</sup> A. Ghalgaoui, L.-M.M. Koll, B. Schütte, B.P. Fingerhut, K. Reimann, M. Woerner, and T. Elsaesser, J.

Phys. Chem. Lett. **11**, 7717 (2020).

<sup>14</sup> A. Ghalgaoui, B.P. Fingerhut, K. Reimann, T. Elsaesser, and M. Woerner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 97401 (2021).

<sup>15</sup> F. Novelli, C.Y. Ma, N. Adhlakha, E.M. Adams, T. Ockelmann, D. Das Mahanta, P. Di Pietro, A. Perucchi, and M. Havenith, Appl. Sci. **10**, 20 (2020).

<sup>16</sup> F. Novelli, L. Ruiz Pestana, K.C. Bennett, F. Sebastiani, E.M. Adams, N. Stavrias, T. Ockelmann, A. Colchero, C. Hoberg, G. Schwaab, T. Head-Gordon, and M. Havenith, J. Phys. Chem. B **124**, 4989 (2020).

<sup>17</sup> F. Novelli, C. Hoberg, E.M. Adams, J.M. Klopff, and M. Havenith, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **24**, 653 (2022).

<sup>18</sup> J. Prakash, M.M. Seyedebrahimi, A. Ghazaryan, J. Malekzadeh-Najafabadi, V. Gujrati, and V. Ntziachristos, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **117**, 4007 (2020).

<sup>19</sup> P. Di Pietro, N. Adhlakha, F. Piccirilli, L. Capasso, C. Svetina, S. Di Mitri, M. Veronese, F. Giorgianni, S. Lupi, and A. Perucchi, Synchrotron Radiat. News **30**, 36 (2017).

<sup>20</sup> B. Liu, H. Bromberger, A. Cartella, T. Gebert, M. Först, and A. Cavalleri, Opt. Lett. **42**, 129 (2017).

<sup>21</sup> F. Novelli, J.W.M. Chon, and J.A. Davis, Opt. Lett. **41**, 5801 (2016).

<sup>22</sup> H.R. Zelsmann, J. Mol. Struct. **350**, 95 (1995).

<sup>23</sup> P. Lunkenheimer, S. Emmert, R. Gulich, M. Köhler, M. Wolf, M. Schwab, and A. Loidl, Phys. Rev. E **96**, 1 (2017).

<sup>24</sup> W.J. Ellison, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data **36**, 1 (2007).

<sup>25</sup> F.Y. Jou and G.R. Freeman, J. Phys. Chem. **83**, 2383 (1979).