This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

Macroscopic excitation energy transport in a structured Co nanolayer

Igor Khmelinskii and Vladimir I. Makarov

Phys. Rev. B **96**, 195405 — Published 3 November 2017

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.96.195405](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.96.195405)

Macroscopic excitation energy transport in a structured Co nanolayer

Igor Khmelinskii⁽¹⁾ and Vladimir I. Makarov⁽²⁾

¹ University of the Algarve, FCT, DQF, 8005-139, Faro, Portugal

² University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras Campus, PO Box 23343, San Juan, PR 00931-3343, USA

*Corresponding Author: Dr. Vladimir Makarov
Department of Physics,
UPR, Rio Piedras Campus,
PO Box 23343
San Juan PR 00931
USA*

Abstract

We report absorption spectra of the 7.3 and 11.3 nm Co nanolayers, and emission of a structured Co nanolayer. The structure contains a 7.3 nm Co nanolayer covering a 25×25 mm² fused silica substrate, with a thicker 11.3 nm Co track in the middle of the substrate. We report that the radiation energy absorbed by the entire Co nanolayer is transferred to the thicker nanotrack. The transferred energy is reemitted by the track, with the emission spectra containing well defined emission bands, strongly dependent on the excitation wavelength. We report that the bands appearing in the emission spectra of the nanotrack correspond to the transitions from the higher electronic excited states of the nanotrack to its first excited state. We therefore identify the observed emission as the superemission of the Co nanotrack. The superemission quantum yield is dependent of the excitation wavelength, decreasing at higher excitation energies. We propose a theoretical model that explains the results obtained. The model analysis produced estimates of several model parameters.

I. Introduction

Many interesting physical phenomena are observed in nanoscaled systems¹⁻¹³. Among these, plasmon generation in nanostructures was studied quite extensively¹⁻⁴. The electromagnetic field radiation could be focused to nanoscale spot size using nanocapillaries and nanofibers covered

by a highly conductive material, typically gold¹⁻⁴. Oulton et al. (2008)¹⁴ proposed a new approach that integrates dielectric waveguiding with plasmonics. They¹⁴ defined a hybrid optical waveguide as a device that consists of a dielectric nanowire separated from a metal surface by a nanoscale dielectric gap. It was noted¹⁵ that coupling between the plasmonic and waveguide modes across the gap enables 'capacitor-like' energy storage that allows effective subwavelength transmission in non-metallic regions. They also¹⁴ demonstrated that in this case surface plasmons can travel over 40–150 μm with a strong mode confinement. Maier et al. (2003)¹⁵ studied electromagnetic energy transfer from a localized subwavelength source to a localized detector, over distances of ca. 0.5 μm in plasmon waveguides, built of closely-spaced silver rods. The waveguides were excited by the tip of a near-field scanning optical microscope, and the energy transport was probed by fluorescent nanospheres. These studies^{14,15} are directly related to the data than we reported earlier⁵⁻¹³, with quantum confinement always observable. We also reported exchange-resonance spectra for three-nanolayer sandwich structures, with nanolayers of different physical and chemical nature, and spin-polarized state transport in the same structures. Interesting results were obtained in a single-atomic-layer graphene (SLG) film¹⁶, due to the *p*-wave triggered superconductivity in graphene layer on an electron-doped oxide superconductor. Electron pairing in a vast majority of superconductors follows the Bardeen–Cooper–Schrieffer theory of superconductivity, which describes the condensation of electrons into pairs with antiparallel spins into a singlet state with an s-wave symmetry. Unconventional superconductivity was predicted in SLG, with the electrons pairing with a *p*-wave or chiral *d*-wave symmetry, depending on the position of the Fermi energy with respect to the Dirac point. By placing SLG on an electron-doped (non-chiral) *d*-wave superconductor and performing local scanning tunnelling microscopy and spectroscopy, the authors obtained evidence for a *p*-wave triggered superconducting density of states in SLG. These results offer a new exciting route for the development of *p*-wave superconductivity using two-dimensional materials with transition temperatures above 4.2 K¹⁶.

Earlier we have reported superemission in metal nanolayers and vertically aligned carbon nanotubes^{17,18}. We also reported absorption, emission and superemission in Cr nanolayers¹⁷, providing experimental estimates of the energy density and power density of superemission of Cr nanolayers, along with the estimates of the diffraction-limited light divergence. We reported that

the divergence of the superemission normal to the nanolayer corresponds to that of a point source, with the divergence angle of ca. 0.2 rad. We also reported surprising long-range transfer of the excitation energy in Cr metal films, at macroscopic distances of 1 cm. We additionally reported superemission of vertically aligned carbon nanotubes¹⁸ in two samples sized $0.02 \times 0.2 \times 1.0 \text{ cm}^3$ and $0.2 \times 0.2 \times 1.0 \text{ cm}^3$. Both absorption and emission of nanotubes were strongly anisotropic. We found¹⁷ that the emission spectra of such nanotubes extend from the mid-IR range to the near-IR range, obtaining such extended spectra for the first time. Optical pumping of nanotube bundles in the direction normal to their axis produced superemission directed along their axis. The superemission band peaked at $7206 \pm 0.4 \text{ cm}^{-1}$. We estimated the superemission energy and power density, along with diffraction-limited beam divergence. We found¹⁷ that at the pumping energy of 3 mJ/pulse, the total superemission energy achieved 1.48 mJ/pulse, with the energy density of $18.5 \text{ mJ cm}^{-2}/\text{pulse}$ and power density of $1.2 \times 10^5 \text{ W cm}^{-2}/\text{pulse}$. We also developed a detailed theory, describing with an acceptable accuracy all of the results obtained^{17,18}.

Presently we report the excitation energy transport to a linear Co nanotrack 11.3 nm thick and 0.1 mm wide in the middle of the 7.3 nm Co nanolayer deposited on a $25 \times 25 \text{ mm}^2$ fused silica substrate. The nanotrack is thus 4 nm higher than the nanolayer and 25 mm long. According to our earlier results^{19,20}, the electronic state density in the nanotrack system should be larger than that in the nanolayer, with lower-lying excited states that may accept the excitation energy. Thus, we can expect that the nanotrack will receive the light energy absorbed by the entire sample surface, reemitting it primarily along its length, similarly to what we observed with superemission of a laser-excited Cr nanolayer. Indeed, we detected directional energy transport towards the nanotrack. We measured the energy transfer efficiency, the nanotrack emission spectrum and the beam divergence at different excitation wavelengths. The results obtained may be used to build efficient solar energy concentrators based on nanolayers.

I. Experimental methods

Sample preparation

Square fused silica substrate (Shin-Etsu Quartz Products Co., $25 \times 25 \times 3 \text{ mm}^3$) was cleaned for 20 min by sonication in 30 ml of isopropanol with 25 mg commercial diamond powder (Diamond Technology Inc.). Next the substrate was washed in pure isopropanol and deionized water. A

commercial Co target (Diamond Technology Inc.) was used to deposit nanocrystalline films on a commercial sputtering/thermo-evaporation Benchtop Turbo deposition system (Denton Vacuum). The substrate temperature was 475°C. After deposition the samples were annealed at 600°C in N₂ at 1 atm for 2 hours. We performed annealing to reduce the concentration of defects in the nanolayers. The film thickness was controlled by XRD (11), on an XPert MRD system (PANalytic) calibrated with standard nanofilms of the same material. The estimated absolute uncertainty of film thickness was 2.5%; the relative uncertainties were much smaller, determined by the shutter opening times of the deposition system. The Co nanotrack was created using a variable-width slit. Figure 1 shows the diagram of the structured nanolayer sample.

<Insert Figure 1>

Measurement methods

The absorption spectra were recorded on a Hitachi U-3900H UV-Visible and Shimadzu UV-3600 Plus Spectrophotometers. The spectral peak maxima and widths were calculated using the PeakFit software (Sigmaplot). The samples were reproducibly installed into a support of blackened aluminium.

The emission spectra were measured using a high-pressure 200-500 W Xe-Hg lamp (Research Arc Lamp Sources, Newport Inc.), the radiation was collected by appropriate lenses, filtered by a water-cooled glass filter to separate the individual emission bands, and defocused onto the entire sample surface. The UV-VIS emission was collected by a CaF₂ lens onto the entrance slit of the monochromator (Cornerstone 130 1/8m Monochromator, Newport Inc.), and detected by a photodiode (PD1; DET10A Si biased detector, THORLABS). The output of the PD1 signal was digitized by PCI-6034E DAQ I/O board (National Instruments), with the control code in the LABVIEW environment running on a Dell PC. The NIR and middle IR emission was focused onto the input slit of a FTIR spectrometer, the spectra were scanned and the data collected by a PC computer.

Time resolved emission experiments were carried using the fundamental harmonic and frequency-doubled (BBO crystal) radiation of a dye laser (LPD-2000, A-Physics, with Coumarin-4 dye, 370-580 nm range; frequency-doubled radiation at 220-290 nm) pumped by the

fourth harmonic (266.8 nm) a YAG laser (Surelight-II, Continuum Inc.). The laser pulse duration was about 7-10 ns. The dye laser radiation was defocused onto the entire sample surface. The emission was collected by a 30-cm spherical CaF₂ lens and registered by a photodiode (PD1; DET10A Biased Si Detector from THORLABS), after passing through a neutral density filter. The data acquisition system was controlled by a PC computer, using a digital oscilloscope (WaveSurfer 400, LeCroy). The detected emission was selected by an appropriate interference filter. The presently developed experimental methods allowed recording the time evolution of the emission with 2.5 ns resolution. All of the experiments were carried out at 77 K, unless expressly specified otherwise.

II. Results and Discussion

Absorption spectra

Absorption spectra of separate Co nanolayers with 7.3 and 11.3 nm thickness deposited on fused silica substrates are shown in Figure 2.

<Insert Figure 2>

The recorded spectra are in agreement with the data reported earlier¹⁹, however, some difference should be noted in the band intensity distribution and small band position shifts, as compared to the spectra reported earlier¹⁸. These differences may apparently be caused by differences in the sample preparation procedure, as the earlier reported samples were not annealed¹⁹, contrary to the samples used in the present study. Note that we have not attempted to explore the effect of the annealing upon the absorption spectra, however, we assume that as a result the nanolayer will acquire a structure with a lower concentration of defects. This should have some effect on the spectra, at least due to increased film density and smaller film thickness. We found that the spectral maxima are well described by the relation

$$\Delta E_{mn} = 3029.2 \frac{1}{fa^2} [2mn + m^2] \text{ cm}^{-1} \quad (1)$$

Here, for the Co nanolayers, $f = 0.1712$, $n = 8$ or 9 , a is the nanolayer thickness in nm and m is the quantum number change in the electronic $n \rightarrow n + m$ transition. To obtain the correct transition energies for the band maxima, we used $n = 8$ for $a = 7.3$ nm, and $n = 9$ for $a = 11.3$ nm.

Emission spectra

Taking into account the spectra of Figure 2, we studied the emission properties of the sample assembly shown in Figure 1. The sample was excited by an external radiation source, with the excitation beam normal to the sample surface. As we already noted, the beam was defocused, so that the entire sample surface was excited homogeneously. We recorded the emission spectra for the excitation radiation with the wavelengths of 528.5, 376.5 and 286.9 nm, respectively, separated from the emission spectrum of the Xe-Hg lamp by appropriate interference filters (Optical Filters Inc.). We report that in all cases the strongest emitting zones were located at the two extremities of the Co track (see Figure 1), with Figure 3 showing the respective emission spectra.

<Insert Figure 3>

The emission spectra were fitted by a superposition of several bands, each described by a combination of Gaussian and Lorentzian functions:

$$I_{em}(\omega) = \sum_i \left[A_G e^{-\left(\frac{\omega_i - \omega}{\Omega_G}\right)^2} + \frac{A_L}{1 + \left(\frac{\omega_i - \omega}{\Omega_L}\right)^2} \right] \quad (2)$$

here, $A_{G,i}$, $A_{L,i}$, $\Omega_{G,i}$, $\Omega_{L,i}$, ω_i are the fitting parameters describing each of the two functions, respectively, and i is the band number. We fitted the emission spectra using commercial PeakFit software package. The resulting values of the fitting parameters are presented in Table 1.

<Insert Table 1>

Table 1. Values of the spectral fitting parameters $A_{G,i}$, $A_{L,i}$, $\Omega_{G,i}$, $\Omega_{L,i}$ and ω_i for the emission spectra, and the quantum numbers for the emission bands of Fig. 3.

Excitation wavelength	Spectrum number on Fig. 3	Initial state quantum number n'	Final state quantum number n	$A_{G,i}$	$A_{L,i}$	$\Omega_{G,i}$, cm^{-1}	$\Omega_{L,i}$, cm^{-1}	ω_i , cm^{-1}
528.5 nm/ 18921 cm^{-1}	1	14	10	0.55	0.45	1967	1893	13522
376.5 nm/ 26560 cm^{-1}	2	14	10	0.028	0.024	1879	1975	13521
	2	15	10	0.171	0.069	1907	1903	17596
	2	16	10	0.346	0.359	1762	1892	21946
286.9 nm/ 34855 cm^{-1}	3	14	10	0.0027	0.0023	1897	1895	13523
	3	15	10	0.0167	0.0067	1934	1842	17591
	3	16	10	0.0338	0.0351	1903	1769	21944
	3	17	10	0.0517	0.0543	1801	1879	26573
	3	18	10	0.4237	0.3730	1923	1905	31478

Optical transitions that correspond to the bands appearing in the emission spectra of the 11.3 nm thick Co nanotrack are described by the quantum numbers shown in Table 1. The higher n' excited electronic states of the Co nanotrack are populated by energy transfer from the excited states of the 7.3 nm Co nanolayer. Thus, the Co nanotrack is an energy acceptor, while the thinner 7.3 nm Co nanolayer is an energy donor. Since no transitions to the $n = 9$ are observable in the emission spectra, we interpret the emission as the superemission of the Co track. Note that only those bands appear in the emission of the 11.3 nm layer that have their energy below $E_{\text{exc}} - 2384 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, the latter value being the energy difference between levels 9 and 10 in the 11.3 nm film, compare Tables 1 and 3. Earlier we reported superemission (SE) from a homogeneous metal nanolayer that was excited directly¹³, while here the nanotrack receives excitation via energy transfer. We measured both the excitation pulse energy reaching the sample surface and the SE pulse energy. The ratio of SE energy to the excitation energy equals 0.73 (1), 0.58 (2) and 0.39 (3), respectively, for the respective excitation wavelengths of Fig. 3. This ratio is the SE yield. We shall describe the model used to interpret these results below.

Time resolved emission

Time resolved experiments were carried out using the same excitation wavelengths of Fig. 3, with the relevant emission band isolated using an appropriate interference filter: (1) – 740 nm; (2) – 570 nm; and (3) – 320 nm. Typical emission kinetics are shown in Fig. 4.

<Insert Figure 4>

The kinetics of Figure 4b may be fitted by a double-exponential function

$$I_{em} = C(e^{-k_2 t} - e^{-k_1 t}) \quad (3)$$

here k_1 and k_2 are the rate constants of the emission growth and decay, respectively, and C is the relative intensity. The values of the fitting parameters are listed in Table 2.

<Insert Table 2>

Table 2. Values of the k_1 , k_2 and k'_1 rate constants for the emission growth and decay and the emission amplitude C . We fitted Eq. 3 to the data of Fig. 4.

Excitation wavelength, nm	$k_1, \mu s^{-1}$	$k_2, \mu s^{-1}$	C , arbitrary units	$k'_1, \mu s^{-1}$
528.5	67±5	17±2	452	51±7
376.5	81±5	21±3	752	62±8
286.9	89±6	26±3	326	67±9

We shall analyze the k_1 rate constant, describing the energy transfer as defined by the following system of equations, with CoI corresponding to the thin 7.3 nm layer and CoII to the thicker 11.3 nm track:

1. $CoI^* + CoII \rightarrow CoI + CoII^*$; k'_1
2. $CoI + h\nu \rightarrow CoI^*$;
3. $CoI^* \rightarrow CoI + h\nu_{em}$; $1/\tau_{1,em}$
4. $CoI^* \rightarrow CoI$; $k_{1,nr}$
5. $CoII^* \rightarrow CoII + h\nu_{em}$; $1/\tau_{2,em}$
6. $CoII^* \rightarrow CoII$; $k_{2,nr}$

where $\tau_{1,em}$, $\tau_{2,em}$ are the emission lifetimes of the CoI^* and CoII^* layers, and $k_{1,nr}$ and $k_{2,nr}$ are the rate constants of the radiationless processes in CoI^* and CoII^* . The resulting excited state dynamics is described by the system of differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dn_{\text{CoI}^*}}{dt} &= -\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{1,em}} + k_{1,nr} + k'_{11}\right)n_{\text{CoI}^*} \\ \frac{dn_{\text{CoII}^*}}{dt} &= k'_{11}n_{\text{CoI}^*} - \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{2,em}} + k_{2,nr}\right)n_{\text{CoII}^*}\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

The solution of this system is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}n_{\text{CoI}^*}(t) &= n_{\text{CoI}^*}(0)e^{-\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{1,em}} + k_{1,nr} + k'_{11}\right)t} \\ n_{\text{CoII}^*}(t) &= \frac{k'_{11}n_{\text{CoI}^*}(0)}{\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{1,em}} + k_{1,nr} + k'_{11}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{2,em}} + k_{2,nr}\right)} \left[e^{-\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{2,em}} + k_{2,nr}\right)t} - e^{-\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{1,em}} + k_{1,nr} + k'_{11}\right)t} \right]\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(a) \quad k_1 &= \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{1,em}} + k_{1,nr} + k'_{11}\right) \\ (b) \quad k_2 &= \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{2,em}} + k_{2,nr}\right)\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

The respective experimental values are presented in Table 2, and will be discussed later. To separate in (6a) the rate constant k'_{11} from the $\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{1,em}} + k_{1,nr}\right)$ term, we carried out an additional experiment. We measured the $\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{1,em}} + k_{1,nr}\right)$ value for a 7.3 nm planar Co nanolayer excited at 528.5, 376.5 and 286.9 nm. The emission was detected perpendicular to the nanolayer surface, with the resulting emission kinetics shown in Fig. 5.

<Insert Figure 5>

In these measurements, the oscilloscope was triggered with 5 ns delay after the. The decay kinetics were fitted using the relationship

$$I_{em}(t) = A_1 e^{-\left(\frac{t}{\tau_{las}}\right)^2} + A_2 e^{-\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{1,em}} + k_{1,nr}\right)t} \quad (7)$$

where the first term describes the scattered excitation pulse and the second term describes the emission decay of the 7.3 nm Co nanolayer. The laser pulse duration τ_{las} is known quite well, therefore we adjusted only A_1 , A_2 and $\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{1,em}} + k_{1,nr}\right)$ parameters. Note that Fig. 5 also shows the fitting curves. Thus the fitted decay rate $\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{1,em}} + k_{1,nr}\right)$ values were 16 ± 2 , 19 ± 3 and $22 \pm 3 \mu s^{-1}$, for the respective excitation wavelengths. These values are in acceptable agreement with the k_2 values (see Table 2), which describe the emission decay rate of the 11.3 nm Co nanolayer. Using these results, we calculated the values of the k'_1 rate constant, also listed in Table 2.

Modeling analysis of the superemission

The referential used is shown in Fig. 1; the model assumed the existence of a common continuum spectrum of states quantized in the horizontal plane (defined by the x and y axes) for the entire sample. This continuum spectrum only weakly interacts with the discrete spectra of the 7.3 nm nanolayer and the 11.3 nm track, quantized along the z direction. The energies of the electronic transitions between the electronic states of such nanostructures are described by the relationship (1), with the calculated values listed in Table 3.

Table 3. Calculated energies for the experimentally observed absorbance transitions in the two nanolayers, cm^{-1} ($n \rightarrow n'$ transitions).

Band number	$a = 7.3 \text{ nm}$			$a = 11.3 \text{ nm}$		
	Energy	n	n'	Energy	N	n'
1	18922*	8	11	12413	9	12
2	26557*	8	12	16209	9	13
3	34857*	8	13	20283**	9	14
4	43820	8	14	24633	9	15
5				29260**	9	16
6				34165	9	17
7				39347**	9	18
8				44805	9	19
9				50541	9	20

* the bands excited by the dye laser,

**the bands excited by energy transfer from the 7.3 nm film.

Comparing the absorption and the emission bands, we conclude that the emission transition occurs into an excited state; therefore we conclude that superemission takes place. In the emission spectra (2) and (3), we additionally observe lower-energy transitions with significantly lower intensities as compared to the main emission band (Fig. 3 and Table 1), apparently resulting from the subsequent relaxation of the initially populated state.

The presently discussed energy transfer between the 7.3 nm nanolayer and the 11.3 nm nanotrack might occur by both exchange and dipole-dipole mechanisms^{21,22}. The rate constant of the energy transfer may be described by the golden Fermi rule^{23,24} presented as follows:

$$k_{DA} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \left[|V_{DA,Exch}|^2 + |V_{DA,dd}|^2 \right] \int_0^\infty \delta(E_D - E_A) dE_A = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \left[|V_{DA,Exch}|^2 + |V_{DA,dd}|^2 \right] \rho_A(E_D) \quad (8)$$

where the D and A subscripts refer to the energy donor (7.3 nm nanolayer) and the energy acceptor (11.3 nm nanotrack), $V_{DA,Exch}$ and $V_{DA,dd}$ are the matrix elements of exchange and dipole-dipole interactions coupling the initial state:

$$\Psi_{DA,1} = \psi_D^{exc} \psi_A^{ground} = \frac{4}{\sqrt{a_1 a_2}} \sin\left(\frac{\pi(n_1 + m_1)}{a_1} z_1\right) \sin\left(\frac{\pi(n_2)}{a_2} z_2\right) \quad (9)$$

to the final state

$$\Psi_{DA,2} = \psi_D^{ground} \psi_A^{exc} = \frac{4}{\sqrt{a_1 a_2}} \sin\left(\frac{\pi(n_1)}{a_1} z_1\right) \sin\left(\frac{\pi(n_2 + m_2)}{a_2} z_2\right) \quad (10)$$

here superscripts *ground* and *exc* refer to the ground and excited electronic states, respectively, $\rho_A(E_D)$ is the active mode state density in the excited acceptor at the energy level E_D of the excited donor; $n_1 = 8$, $m_1 = 3, 4, 5$, $a_1 = 7.3$ nm, $n_2 = 9$, $m_2 = 5, 7, 9$, $a_2 = 11.3$ nm. We analyzed three coupling schemes: $m_1 = 3$ to $m_2 = 5$, $m_1 = 4$ to $m_2 = 7$, and $m_1 = 5$ to $m_2 = 9$. We took into account single-electron excited states both in the donor and the acceptor, using the two-electron exchange interaction in our analysis:

$$\hat{V}_{DA,Exch} = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon\epsilon_0} \frac{e^2}{|\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2|} = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon\epsilon_0} \frac{e^2}{|z_1 - z_2|} \quad (11)$$

here $\mathbf{r}_1$ and $\mathbf{r}_2$ are radius-vectors defining positions of the two electrons in space, in the referential defined in Fig. 1. The dipole-dipole interaction is given by the Förster formula:

$$\hat{V}_{DA,dd} = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon\epsilon_0} \frac{e^2}{r^3} \left[(r_D \cdot r_A) - \frac{3}{r^2} (r_D \cdot r)(r_A \cdot r) \right] \quad (12)$$

Here, r is the distance between the oscillator centers, r_D and r_A the distances between the centers of the oscillators and the respective optical electrons in D and A . The latter relationship may be rewritten as:

$$\hat{V}_{DA,dd} = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon\epsilon_0} \frac{e^2}{r^3} (r_D \cdot r_A) [1 - 3\cos^2(\theta)] \quad (13)$$

where θ is the angle between the z axis and the r vector direction. Averaging over the angles, we obtain:

$$\hat{V}_{DA,dd} = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2\epsilon\epsilon_0} \frac{e^2}{r^3} (z_1 \cdot z_2) \quad (14)$$

We calculated the value of the matrix element

$$R = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \left[|V_{DA,Exch}|^2 + |V_{DA,dd}|^2 \right] \quad (15)$$

using a homemade FORTRAN code, with the results of these calculations listed in Table 4.

<Insert Table 4>

Table 4. The calculated values of the matrix elements, the energy transfer rate, and the effective state density $\rho_A(E_D)$.

Transitions	$R, 10^{-6} \text{ cm}^{-2}$	$\rho_A(E_D), 1/\text{cm}^{-1}$	$\tau_{2,em} k_{2,nr}$
$m_1 = 3 \rightarrow m_2 = 5$	3.7	459	0.37
$m_1 = 4 \rightarrow m_2 = 7$	4.1	503	0.72
$m_1 = 5 \rightarrow m_2 = 9$	5.8	384	1.56

Taking into account the value of $k'_1 = k_{DA}$ (Table 2), Eq.(7) and the R values, we estimated the values of the effective state density $\rho_A(E_D) = (k'_1/R)$, also listed in Table 4. We believe that the high effective state densities in the acceptor result from the interactions of the discrete states with the continuum of the electronic states generated in the xy plane of the assembly. Presently we are not analyzing these interactions, leaving this task for the future *ab initio* calculations.

Taking into account the data of Table 2, the emission quantum yields of 0.73 (1), 0.58 (2) and 0.39 (3), and the relationship

$$k_2 = \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{2,em}} + k_{2,nr} \right) \quad (16)$$

we estimated the $\tau_{2,em}k_{2,nr}$ parameter defining the intensity distribution between the bands (see Table 4). Assuming as a rough approximation that the emission lifetime is independent on the excited state (m_2), we conclude that the radiationless relaxation rate constant increases by a factor of 4 as m_2 grows from 5 to 9. A very similar behavior is in fact observed experimentally, as the lower-energy emission bands are progressively weaker than the principal band (Table 1 and Fig. 3).

These results are quite notable as refers to the energy transfer from the excited state of the 7.3 nm Co nanolayer with a macroscopic surface area to the 11.3 nm Co nanotrack. Here the nanotrack works as an energy trap, with a larger state density and lower-energy excited states. Apparently we observe quiresonant energy transfer, as presented in Fig. 6.

<Insert Figure 6>

An external excitation source induces $n = 8 \rightarrow n = 11$ transition in the 7.3 nm Co nanolayer (Fig. 5, the potential box at the right). The energy of the latter transition is in quiresonance with that of the $n = 9 \rightarrow n = 14$ transition of the 11.3 nm Co nanotrack. The energy transfer in these conditions operates at high efficiency, by the mechanism we already discussed. We expect that the excitation is distributed homogeneously over the nanotrack, with the population inversion created with respect to the $n = 10$ level causing superemission along the nanotrack surface towards both of its ends. Similar results are frequently obtained for the active optical media used in laser technology.²⁵ Note that no superemission was observed for the $n = 9 \leftarrow n = 11$ transition of the 7.3 nm Co nanolayer. This is probably caused by fast energy transfer to the nanotrack. However, superemission was observed earlier¹⁷ for a homogeneous Cr nanolayer, with excitation by a laser beam focused into a narrow line. The superemission in this case was observed along the thin pumped rectangle, with the emission times much shorter than the energy transfer rates along the Cr layer.

Conclusions

We reported that a structured Co nanolayer can work as a light energy concentrator. We found that the concentrated emission quantum yield is dependent on the excitation energy, decreasing for higher photon energies: 0.73 at 528.5 nm; 0.58 at 376.5 nm; 0.39 at 286.9 nm. We analyzed the values of the $\tau_{2,em}k_{2,nr}$ parameter, concluding that the radiationless decay rate constant of the nanotrack states increases with the excitation energy. We developed a simple model for the energy transfer from the thinner nanolayer (7.3 nm) to a thicker nanotrack (11.3 nm), describing the experimental results with acceptable accuracy. We conclude that similar devices on a larger scale may be used for solar energy harvesting.

Acknowledgements: The authors are grateful for the PR NASA EPSCoR NNX13AB22A grant for V.M.

References

- [1] M. T. Allen, J. Martin, A. Yacoby, *Nature Communications*, **3**, (2012). Article number: 934, doi:10.1038/ncomms1945.
- [2] J.D. Joannopoulos, R.D. Meade, J.N. Winn, *Photonic Crystals. Molding the Flow of Light, Second edition* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press) (1995).
- [3] A.V. Zayats, *J. Opt. A: Pure Appl. Opt.*, **5** S16–S50 (2003). doi:10.1088/1464-4258/5/4/353.
- [4] F.R. Oulton, V.J. Sorger, T. Zentgraf, R.M. Ma, C. Gladden, L. Dai, G. Bartal, Z. Zhang, *Nature* **461**, 629–632 (2009).
- [5] I. Khmelinskii, V. Makarov, *Materials Research Bulletin*, **72**, 50-59 (2015).
- [6] V. Makarov, I. Khmelinskii, *Materials Research Bulletin*, **64**, 156-162 (2015).
- [7] V. Makarov, I. Khmelinskii, *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids*, **75**, 670–679 (2014): <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022369714000316> .
- [8] V. Makarov, I. Khmelinskii, *Material Research Bulletin*, **50**, 514-523 (2014).
- [9] V. Makarov, I. Khmelinskii, *J. Appl. Phys.*, **113**, 084304 (+9 pp.) (2013); <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.4792658>.
- [10] V. Makarov, I. Khmelinskii, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **138**, 074705 (+13 pp.) (2013).
- [11] V. Makarov, I. Khmelinskii, S. Kochubei, *J. Appl. Phys.*, **112**, 084310 (+21 pp.) (2012).
- [12] V. Makarov, S. Kochubei, I. Khmelinskii, *J. Appl. Phys.*, **110**, 063717 (+11 pp.) (2011).

- [13] V. Makarov, I. Khmelinskii, *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids*, **107**, 140–149 (2017).
- [14] R. F. Oulton, V. J. Sorger, D. A. Genov, D. F. P. Pile, Zhang, *Nature Photonics* **2**, 496 - 500 (2008), Published online: 11 July 2008 | doi:10.1038/nphoton.2008.131
- [15] S. A. Maier, P. G. Kik, H. A. Atwater, S. Meltzer, E. Harel, B. E. Koel, A. A. G. Requicha, *Nature Materials* **2**, 229 - 232 (2003). Published online: 2 March 2003 | doi:10.1038/nmat852
- [16] A.D. Bernardo, O. Millo, M. Barbone, H. Alpern, Y. Kalcheim, U. Sassi, A.K. Ott, D. De Fazio, D. Yoon, M. Amado, A.C. Ferrari, J. Linder, J.W.A. Robinson, *Nature Communications*, **8**, 14024 (2016) | DOI: 10.1038/ncomms14024 | www.nature.com/naturecommunications
- [17] I. Khmelinskii, V. Makarov, *J. Material Research Bulletin*, **80**, 88-95 (2016). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.materresbull.2015.12.047>
- [18] I. Khmelinskii, V. Makarov, *Photonics and Nanostructures – Fundamentals and Applications*, **21** 67–81 (2016).
- [19] I. Khmelinskii, V. Makarov, *Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer*, **175**, 68–75 (2016).
- [20] I. Khmelinskii, V. Makarov, *Photonics and Nanostructures - Fundamentals and Applications*, **19**, 39-47 (2016).
- [21] J.M.G. Martinho, J.C. Conte, *Can. J. Chem.*, **61**, 1693 (1983).
- [22] M.D. Dave, C. Pande, *IOSR Journal of Applied Chemistry* **3**, 2278-5736 (2012). www.iosrjournals.org
- [23] B.H. Bransden, C.J. Joachain, *Quantum Mechanics*, (2nd ed.) p. 443 (1999) ISBN 978-0582356917
- [24] P.J. Robinson, K.A. Holbrook, *Unimolecular Reactions*, Wiley Interscience, (1972).
- [25] W. Silfvast, *Laser Fundamentals*, Cambridge Press, (1996).

Author Information

1. University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras Campus, PO Box 23343, San Juan, PR 00931-3343, USA
Prof. Dr. Vladimir Makarov
2. Universidade do Algarve, FCT, DQB and CIQA, 8005-139, Faro, Portugal
Prof. Dr. Igor Khmelinskii

Contributions

V.M. and I.K. designed experiments and analyzed the data; V.M. performed the experiments; V.M. and I.K. designed and analyzed theoretical models; V.M. and I.K. prepared the manuscript.

Corresponding author

Correspondence to Dr. Vladimir Makarov.

Phone: (1)787-529-2010

E-mail: vmvimakarov@gmail.com

Figure captions

Figure 1. Design of the structured Co nanolayer.

Figure 2. Absorption spectra of Co nanolayers deposited on fused silica substrates: (1) 7.30 nm layer thickness, and (2) 11.3 nm layer thickness.

Figure 3. Emission spectra of the track with the sample excited at: (1) 528.5 nm, (2) 376.5 nm, and (3) 286.9 nm, respectively.

Figure 4. Time evolution of the emission bands centered at 13522, 21946 and 31478 cm^{-1} . The excitation wavelengths were the same as in Fig. 3: (1) 528.5 nm, (2) 376.5 nm, and (3) 286.9 nm. (a) Original data; (b) Data after subtracting the scattered excitation laser pulse.

Figure 5. Emission kinetics of the 7.3 nm planar Co nanolayer excited at (1) 528.5 nm, (2) 376.5 nm, and (3) 286.9 nm.

Figure 6. Energy diagram of the superemission generated in the nanostructured Co device.

Figure 1. Makarov, Khmelinskii

Figure 2. Makarov, Khmelinskii

Figure 3. Makarov, Khmelinskii

Figure 4. Makarov, Khmelinskii

Figure 5. Makarov, Khmelinskii

Figure 6. Makarov, Khmelinskii