

# Spin-flip scattering as a driving mechanism of ultrafast demagnetization in ordered magnetic alloys

Stefan Günther<sup>1</sup>, Carlo Spezzani<sup>2</sup>, Roberta Ciprian<sup>2</sup>, Cesare Grazioli<sup>2,3</sup>, Barbara Ressel<sup>3</sup>, Marcello Coreno<sup>2,4</sup>, Maurizio Sacchi<sup>5</sup>, Giancarlo Panaccione<sup>2</sup>, Vojtěch Uhlíř<sup>6</sup>, Eric Fullerton<sup>6</sup>, Giovanni De Ninno<sup>3,2</sup>, and Christian H. Back<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *University of Regensburg*

<sup>2</sup> *Istituto Officina dei Materiali (IOM)-CNR,  
Laboratorio TASC, in Area Science Park,  
S.S.14, Km 163.5, I-34149 Trieste, Italy*

<sup>3</sup> *Laboratory of Quantum Optics, Nova Gorica University, Slovenia*

<sup>4</sup> *Institute of Inorganic Methodologies and Plasmas (CNR-IMIP), Montelibretti, Roma, Italy*

<sup>5</sup> *CNRS, Paris, France and*

<sup>6</sup> *UCSD, USA*

## Abstract

We use element resolved IR-pump / XUV-probe experiments to disentangle the ultrafast interplay of the magnetic sublattices of an ordered crystalline magnetic alloy. As a paradigmatic example, we investigate the case of the FeRh alloy. Furthermore, a detailed time resolved magneto-optic study in the visible regime shows that the data can be fully analyzed by only assuming Elliot-Yafet-like scattering as the underlying mechanism for ultrafast demagnetization. The model is also able to explain the time delayed response of different components of the magnetic alloy.

In recent years a substantial experimental effort has been devoted to the study of ultrafast demagnetization and all-optical switching of ferro- and ferrimagnetic alloys. Understanding these phenomena is of interest for heat assisted magnetic recording and all-optical magnetic recording [1]; however, unraveling the microscopic mechanisms behind the observed dynamic response has remained a formidable task. Several theories have been put forward claiming to be able to explain ultrafast demagnetization in general [2–9] and in particular the response of multi-sublattice systems where two or more magnetic elements form a ferro- or ferrimagnetically coupled ordered system [10–12]. In these systems, a crucial question is how different elements in an alloy interact on a ultrashort timescale close to the timescale corresponding to the exchange interaction (10–100 fs).

Element specific probes [13–15] as well as systematic studies using more conventional time resolved techniques [16] on ultrashort time scales have had a tremendous share in the advancement of knowledge in this particular field. For example, for ferrimagnetic 3d-transition metal / 4f-rare earth alloys (3d-4f) such as CoFeGd used for all-optical switching, that a transient ferromagnetic state exists in the process of ultrafast magnetization reversal [17]. In spite of their strong antiferromagnetic exchange coupling, the individual components of these systems show independent demagnetization dynamics characterized by different demagnetization times. Furthermore, it has been shown recently, that highly ordered 3d-4f multilayer systems can also be used for all-optical switching [18].

Theoretical models based on a description of different anti- or ferromagnetically coupled sublattices with distinct coupling constants have been put forward to explain the element-specific behavior of these systems [10–12]. However, no consensus on the underlying microscopic demagnetization process in multi-sublattice systems exists.

Interestingly, there seems to be no experimental consensus on the demagnetization dynamics even for ferromagnetically coupled multi-sublattice systems such as simple 3d-transition metal alloys. In the case of NiFe, for instance, two different element specific experimental probes performed at the 2p and 3p resonances (time resolved magneto-optics at the L-edges or M-edges) gave contrasting results, with Ni demagnetizing either faster [19] or slower [20] than Fe. There is thus the need to study and unravel the demagnetization behavior of multi-sublattice systems in particular in view of understanding the possibly technologically relevant all-optical switching mechanism. One experimental shortcoming that complicates a direct comparison to theoretical predictions (in particular predictions

based on the electronic band structure [21]), is the fact that so far only disordered or polycrystalline alloys have been studied experimentally. Concentrating on theoretically more easily accessible ordered crystalline alloys, can help understanding the origin of the different demagnetization dynamics of the alloy components, by comparing experiments to theoretical calculations. In this letter, we concentrate on an ordered multi-sublattice system, the ordered alloy, FeRh, a single-crystalline material with a well-known electronic band structure[22]. This ordered alloy undergoes a first order phase transition from an antiferromagnetically ordered phase to a ferromagnetically ordered phase at temperatures slightly above room temperature. The second order phase transition to the paramagnetic phase occurs around 660 Kelvin. Quite a few time resolved experiments have addressed the fundamental question of the ultimate time scale for the generation of magnetic order in this particular system when driven through the first order phase transition. However, only little is known about the demagnetization dynamics of the FeRh system when excited by a powerful laser pulses in its ferromagnetic state [23] which is at the heart of this article. Two experimental methods based on time-resolved magneto-optics are exploited. We use the time resolved magneto-optic Kerr effect (TR-MOKE) in the visible to IR range as well as in the XUV (TR-XUV-MOKE) domain. Using high harmonic generation (HHG), element specific information can be accessed at the M/N-edges. Our element specific experiments indicate that the demagnetization of Fe is delayed with respect to Rh, and has a slightly shorter demagnetization time. This finding is supported by the microscopic three temperature model (M3TM)[2] which we employ to model our data. Additional detailed TR-MOKE experiments, presented in the following, allow us to test the M3TM model more accurately and reveal a clear dependence of the spin-flip rate on the exciting laser fluence.

For the experiments we use epitaxially grown FeRh films with a thickness of 50 nm deposited onto a MgO(001) substrate by magnetron sputtering from a single equiatomic target. The FeRh films grow epitaxially with (001) orientation. The high quality films show a typical temperature hysteresis of 20 K with the first order phase transition from the anti-ferromagnetic to the ferromagnetic phase appearing around 360 K. The Curie temperature is reached at 660 K.

In order to study the element selective ultrafast demagnetization dynamics of FeRh, we have implemented a TR-XUV-MOKE experiment at the novel High Harmonic Generation (HHG) beamline CITIUS [24](see Fig. 1). This light source is based on standard HHG in




FIG. 1. Sketch of the CITIUS HHG light source. The 3 mJ/pulse Ti:Sapphire laser output is split in two branches: 2 mJ/pulse are used for HHG and 1 mJ/pulse for sample excitation (IR pump). The proper harmonic is selected by means of a time preserving monochromator based on conical diffraction gratings (CDG) and refocalized onto the sample. The IR pump is recombined with the HHG light in the experimental chamber IRMA on the sample in an almost collinear geometry. a) The higher harmonics spectrum from Ne after the monochromator captured with a photodiode and b) the normalized magnetic asymmetry ratio (A.R.), namely the difference of both field directions divided by their sum, for the T-MOKE like configuration in the IRMA setup.

noble gases [25, 26] and makes use of a high power Ti:Sapphire ultrashort laser amplifier delivering 3 mJ pulses at 800 nm (repetition rate 5 kHz) with a typical pulse duration of 35 fs [24]. A beam splitter is used to supply HHG with two thirds of the amplifier output. The remaining fraction is used for the excitation of the system using a variable time delay. High harmonics up to order (H)51 of the fundamental wavelength with a linear vertical polarization are obtained.

A spectral selection of the light sent to the sample is made by means of a pulse-duration preserving monochromator [27, 28]. The IR pump (spot size about 500  $\mu\text{m}$  FWHM) and XUV probe beam (spot size about 200  $\mu\text{m}$  FWHM) are recombined on the sample in an almost collinear geometry in the IRMA reflectometer featuring a vertical scattering plane [29]. The maximum temporal inaccuracy by changing the XUV wavelength, due to movements in the monochromator, is estimated to be below 5 fs for the chosen harmonics. The scattered light is detected using a photodiode mounted on the detector arm, shielded with a 200 nm

thick Al filter to block the IR pump. In the T-MOKE-like configuration using p-polarized XUV light, one is sensitive to the magnetization component perpendicular to the scattering plane. Choosing the incoming/scattering angle close to the Brewster condition (about 45 deg at 54 eV), the magnetization contrast is maximized with respect to the strongly suppressed non-magnetic scattered background [30, 31]. By varying the photon energy, the harmonics for the Fe M-(H35, i.e. 54 eV) and Rh N-edges (H31/H33, i.e. 48/51 eV) can be identified and the signals of the two chosen harmonics (H31 and H35) are clearly separated, see Fig. 1b). To avoid longterm drifts, the magnetic asymmetry for Fe and Rh is measured via field reversal at every time delay between IR pump and XUV probe and then multiple demagnetization traces are averaged. In the following  $t_0$  is defined as the average value for the beginning of the initial drop of the magnetization of Fe and Rh.




FIG. 2. Element resolved demagnetization dynamics of FeRh (Fe: blue open squares, Rh: red open circles) obtained by TR-XUV-TMOKE. The reduced magnetization ( $M/M_0$ ) after excitation with a) 11 mJ/cm<sup>2</sup> and b) 16 mJ/cm<sup>2</sup>. The inset in b) shows a zoom to the initial drop of the signal. Fe demagnetization is delayed with respect to Rh by approximately 60 fs.

In addition, two color TR-MOKE experiments are performed. For these measurements we use a regenerative amplified Ti:Sapphire laser, which provides up to 4  $\mu$ J pulses with a pulse length below 50 fs and a repetition rate which is adjustable between 70-250 kHz. We use the fundamental IR pulse (800 nm) for pumping and the second harmonic visible pulse (400 nm) for probing the magnetic state. The temperature is kept constant at 400 K for all measurements.

Two typical TR-XUV-MOKE demagnetization traces in the fully ferromagnetic phase (which is verified by recording a static temperature hysteresis loop) are plotted for two different fluences in Fig. 2a,b). The fit (solid line) is performed using the M3TM with initial parameters obtained by TR-MOKE on the same sample and will be further addressed

below. A small but non negligible shift in time zero of the two different element specific demagnetization traces appears within the experimental accuracy in all measurements. We find that Fe is delayed with respect to Rh by approximately 60 fs and the evolution of the shift as a function of pump fluence (or respective quenching) is summarized in Fig. 4c). Moreover we find that the demagnetization time of Fe is slightly shorter (by about 25 fs) than the one of Rh.

To shed further light on the experimental findings and to validate the use of the M3TM, we perform detailed TR-MOKE experiments at lower pump fluences with higher signal to noise ratio with respect to XUV-MOKE. We observe partial demagnetization of the FeRh films with an initial fast drop of the magnetization followed by a decay with a much lower rate before the system starts to relax back to its equilibrium value, see Fig 3, which – in the classification of Koopmans et al.[2] – is called type II demagnetization behavior with a transition to type I (no slow decay) for the lowest fluence. When increasing the incident fluence the quenching ( $1 - M/M_0$ ) increases and the type II behavior becomes more pronounced.

Since for type II behavior the definition of the time scale for the initial fast drop of the magnetization is somewhat arbitrary, in this paper the demagnetization time for type II demagnetization is defined as the time where the system has completed 1/e of its demagnetization with respect to its value at 1 ps after time zero  $t_0$ . The quenching is consequently defined as the value at 1 ps, see Fig 3.

In the following we will relate our findings to existing models for demagnetization in multisublattice systems [10, 12]. Not all existing models can be applied to our experimental system since typical input parameters for these models are related to the "pure" phase, in our case pure Fe or pure Rh. Even though the magnetic moments of Fe and Rh in the ferromagnetic phase are known [32, 33], the moment of Rh in the pure phase vanishes and consequently a demagnetization time can not be determined. In systems where a 'pure' phase exists like in Fe-Ni alloys it was shown that the difference in  $t_0$  and  $\tau$  is related to the strength of exchange coupling between the involved sublattices [20].

Note that the experimentally observed shift in  $t_0$  can be explained by using Elliot-Yafet-type spin-flip scattering as a key mechanism and therefore our data can be analyzed within the M3TM model [2, 12]. Although other theories relying on Elliott-Yafet-type spin flip scattering (with and without dynamic feed-back mechanism) [21, 34] should be able to




FIG. 3. TR-MOKE demagnetization traces of FeRh for various fluences ( $0.4 - 10 \text{ mJ/cm}^2$ ). The solid line (red) is a fit using the M3TM-model, where only the spin-flip rate and the excitation strength is allowed to vary. The demagnetization time  $\tau$  (dotted line) referenced to the quenching  $q$  (defined as the loss of magnetization at 1 ps, dashed-dotted line) is visualized for the trace with the highest fluence ( $10 \text{ mJ/cm}^2$ ).

explain the data as well. In our case we refrain to the simple M3TM model which in principle can be applied without the need of band structure calculations. We would also like to note that we neglect super diffusive transport, which is probably an additional source for the loss of magnetic contrast [4], but is not discussed in this paper.

The rate equations of the M3TM read:

$$C_e[T_e] \frac{dT_e}{dt} = g_{ep}(T_p - T_e) + G(t_0, T_{e,max}) \quad (1)$$

$$C_p \frac{dT_p}{dt} = g_{ep}(T_e - T_p) \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{dm}{dt} = R[g_{ep}, a_{sf}] m \frac{T_p}{T_C} (1 - m \coth(\frac{mT_c}{T_e})) \quad (3)$$

where  $T_e$ ,  $T_p$ , denote the electronic and the phononic temperatures,  $G(t_0, T_{e,max})$  the Gaussian excitation due to the pump pulse at time zero ( $t_0$ ) with a maximum electronic temperature  $T_{e,max}$ ,  $m = \frac{M}{M_S}$ , the magnetization relative to its expected zero temperature value,  $T_C$  the Curie temperature,  $g_{ep}$  the electron-phonon coupling and  $C_p$  and  $C_e[T - e]$  the specific heat of the phononic system and the electronic system (in linear approximation with a proportionality constant  $\gamma$ ).  $C_p$  is treated as a constant value for the whole covered temperature range, in agreement with static measurements [35].  $R = (8a_{sf}g_{ep}k_B T_C^2)V_{at}/(\frac{\mu_{at}}{\mu_B} E_D^2)$  is a material specific parameter, where  $\frac{\mu_{at}}{\mu_B}$  is the ratio of the atomic magnetic moment and the Bohr magnetron,  $V_{at}$  the atomic volume,  $E_D$  the Debye energy and  $a_{sf}$  the spin-flip pa-

parameter. A cooling mechanism by heat diffusion to the substrate was found to be negligible for the behavior during the first 4 ps and is therefore neglected.

To obtain values for those variables that can not be determined from static experiments, but are necessary to model the dynamic data (e.g.  $a_{sf}$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $g_{ep}$ ), the transient optical response for all fluences is fitted by eq. 1-2. With the assumption that the optical response is a good approximation for the electronic temperature, the electron specific heat shows a linear dependence and thus validates  $C_e = \gamma T_e$ . By additionally assuming  $T_p \ll T_e$ ,  $g_{ep}$  can be determined on short timescales.

When fitting the traces for all fluences, it is possible to keep only 3 modeling parameters free, namely the  $a_{sf}$ ,  $T_{e,max}$  and  $t_0$ . Before fitting the experimental data with the Levenberg–Marquardt algorithm, the solution for  $M/M_0$  of the M3TM model is convoluted with a Gaussian pulse to account for the influence of the finite pulse length and the shape of the probing pulse.

Allowing only the spin-flip rate to vary – which strongly influences the demagnetization time and the quenching – the variation in the demagnetization time is also reflected by a drastic change in the spin-flip rate  $a_{sf}$  (Fig 4a/b). The demagnetization time  $\tau$  shows a drastic change for low fluences while for intermediate and high fluences only small variations are observed. In the low fluence range the fast increase of the demagnetization time is caused by the steep decrease of the spin flip-rate  $a_{sf}$ . The non linear behavior of  $a_{sf}$  extracted from the M3TM is a clear indication that the electronic band structure changes and can not be treated as being rigid with increasing fluence [36], however the trend and the clearly visible minimum around 10 percent quenching still remain unclear. A recent theoretical approach including dynamic feed-back of the electronic band structure [21] might be able to explain the observed behavior.

The value for the spin-flip rate is in good agreement with calculated values [22] for the spin-mixing parameter  $\langle b^2 \rangle$ , with  $a_{sf} = p \langle b^2 \rangle$  and  $p$  ranging from 1.8 to 4. Furthermore  $\langle b^2 \rangle$  is calculated to be smaller on the Fe site than on the Rh site, which is also qualitatively reflected in the element selective measurements (Fig 4b). Nevertheless, it is not possible to fit the fluence dependence by only varying the excitation energy. Although  $g_{ep}$  is expected not to change much in this fluence regime [37, 38], the fit of the optical response reveals a different behavior (Fig 4d), and may be related to changes of  $a_{sf}$  in the fit since  $a_{sf}$  and  $g_{ep}$  are somehow entangled. Fortunately, variations of  $g_{ep}$  are found to hardly influence




FIG. 4. Fit parameters from the M3TM for element resolved measurements, Rh (red open circles), Fe (black open squares) and for TR-MOKE and the transient optical response (black open triangles, errorbars are within the symbol size). a) The demagnetization time  $\tau$  and the b) spin-flip rate  $a_{sf}$  which is a key parameter for describing the demagnetization time and the quenching versus fluence. c) The difference in  $t_0$  for the element resolved demagnetization times shows that Fe starts delayed by about 60 fs with respect to Rh for various fluences. Errorbars for lower fluence appear bigger due to a lower signal and a nearly constant noise level in all measurements. d) The electron phonon coupling  $g_{ep}$  is not constant as a function of the maximum electronic temperature or the resulting calculated quenching.

the signature of  $a_{sf}$ , neither with  $g_{ep}$  as a fitting parameter, nor with fixed values for each fluence, as indicated by carefully analyzing the transient optical response (Fig 4d).

In summary, in this paper we have presented a fluence dependent demagnetization experiment for an ordered single crystalline alloy, with elemental resolution and additional information obtained by TR-MOKE. The data can be explained using Elliot-Yafet-like scattering as a driving mechanism for ultrafast demagnetization within the framework of the M3TM. Furthermore the observed element dependent shift in  $t_0$  can be qualitatively described within this theory. The strong hybridization between the Fe and Rh states results in a strong coupling of the Fe and Rh moments [22] and may therefore explain the relatively small differences between the demagnetization traces, in contrast to the larger differences observed in the much weaker coupled 3d-transition metals rare earth alloys [17]. However, the observed dependence of the spin-flip rate  $a_{sf}$  with a clear visible minimum as a function

of quenching (or fluence) is still an unsolved question and awaits further theoretical input. We would like to emphasize that the spin-flip rate should be accessible for single crystalline ordered alloys from *ab initio* theories. A possible contribution from superdiffusive transport should also be present, but has not been treated in this paper since the emphasis has been put on the explanation of the distinct demagnetization behavior of the two sublattices.

We would like to acknowledge Hubert Ebert for fruitful discussions. UCSD was supported under DOE-BES Award No. DE-SC0003678. The CITIUS project is funded by the program for crossborder cooperation between Italy and Slovenia 2007-2013.

- 
- [1] B. C. Stipe, T. C. Strand, C. C. Poon, H. Balamane, T. D. Boone, J. A. Katine, J.-L. Li, V. Rawat, H. Nemoto, A. Hirotsune, *et al.*, Nature Photonics **4**, 484 (2010)
  - [2] B. Koopmans, G. Malinowski, F. Dalla Longa, D. Steiauf, M. Fähnle, T. Roth, M. Cinchetti, and M. Aeschlimann, Nat. Mater. **9**, 259 (2009)
  - [3] M. Krauß, T. Roth, S. Alebrand, D. Steil, M. Cinchetti, M. Aeschlimann, and H. C. Schneider, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 180407 (Nov 2009), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.80.180407>
  - [4] M. Battiato, K. Carva, and P. M. Oppeneer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 027203 (Jul 2010), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.027203>
  - [5] M. Fähnle, M. Haag, and C. Illg, JMMM **347**, 45 (2013), ISSN 0304-8853, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304885313005404>
  - [6] E. Carpene, E. Mancini, C. Dallera, M. Brenna, E. Puppini, and S. De Silvestri, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 174422 (Nov 2008), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.78.174422>
  - [7] G. P. Zhang and W. Hübner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3025 (Oct 2000), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.85.3025>
  - [8] B. Koopmans, J. J. M. Ruigrok, F. D. Longa, and W. J. M. de Jonge, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 267207 (Dec 2005), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.267207>
  - [9] J.-Y. Bigot, M. Vomir, and E. Beaurepaire, Nat. Phys. **5**, 515 (2009)
  - [10] J. H. Mentink, J. Hellsvik, D. V. Afanasiev, B. A. Ivanov, A. Kirilyuk, A. V. Kimel, O. Eriksson, M. I. Katsnelson, and T. Rasing, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 057202 (Jan 2012), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.057202>

- [11] V. López-Flores, N. Berggaard, V. Halté, C. Stamm, N. Pontius, M. Hehn, E. Otero, E. Beaurepaire, and C. Boeglin, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 214412 (Jun 2013), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.87.214412>
- [12] A. J. Schellekens and B. Koopmans, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 020407 (Jan 2013), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.87.020407>
- [13] C. Boeglin, E. Beaurepaire, V. Halté, V. López-Flores, C. Stamm, N. Pontius, H. Dürr, and J.-Y. Bigot, Nature **465**, 458 (2010)
- [14] C. Graves, A. Reid, T. Wang, B. Wu, S. de Jong, K. Vahaplar, I. Radu, D. Bernstein, M. Messerschmidt, L. Müller, *et al.*, Nature materials **12**, 293 (2013)
- [15] B. Vodungbo, J. Gautier, G. Lambert, A. B. Sardinha, M. Lozano, S. Sebban, M. Ducouso, W. Boutu, K. Li, B. Tudu, *et al.*, Nature communications **3**, 999 (2012)
- [16] I. Radu, G. Woltersdorf, M. Kiessling, A. Melnikov, U. Bovensiepen, J.-U. Thiele, and C. H. Back, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 117201 (Mar 2009), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.117201>
- [17] I. Radu, K. Vahar, C. Stamm, T. Kachel, N. Pontius, H. Dürr, T. Ostler, J. Barker, R. Evans, R. Chantrell, *et al.*, Nature **472**, 205 (2011)
- [18] S. Mangin, M. Gottwald, C. Lambert, D. Steil, V. Uhlíř, L. Pang, M. Hehn, S. Alebrand, M. Cinchetti, G. Malinowski, *et al.*, Nature materials **13**, 286 (2014)
- [19] A. Eschenlohr, *Element-resolved ultrafast magnetization dynamics in ferromagnetic alloys and multilayers*, Ph.D. thesis, Universität Potsdam (2012)
- [20] S. Mathias, L.-O. Chan, P. Grychtol, P. Granitzka, E. Turgut, J. M. Shaw, R. Adam, H. T. Nembach, M. E. Siemens, S. Eich, *et al.*, PNAS **109**, 4792 (2012)
- [21] B. Y. Mueller, T. Roth, M. Cinchetti, M. Aeschlimann, and B. Rethfeld, New J. Phys. **13**, 123010 (2011), <http://stacks.iop.org/1367-2630/13/i=12/a=123010>
- [22] L. M. Sandratskii and P. Mavropoulos, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 174408 (May 2011), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.83.174408>
- [23] I. Radu, C. Stamm, N. Pontius, T. Kachel, P. Ramm, J.-U. Thiele, H. A. Dürr, and C. H. Back, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 104415 (Mar 2010), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.81.104415>
- [24] C. Grazioli, C. Callegari, A. Ciavardini, M. Coreno, F. Frassetto, D. Gauthier, D. Golob, R. Ivanov, A. Kivimäki, B. Mahieu, B. Bučar, M. Merhar, P. Miotti, L. Poletto, E. Polo,

- B. Ressel, C. Spezzani, and G. De Ninno, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **85**, 023104 (2014)
- [25] X. F. Li, A. L’Huillier, M. Ferray, L. A. Lompré, and G. Mainfray, *Phys. Rev. A* **39**, 5751 (Jun 1989), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.39.5751>
- [26] Z. Chang, A. Rundquist, H. Wang, M. M. Murnane, and H. C. Kapteyn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2967 (Oct 1997), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.79.2967>
- [27] L. Poletto and F. Frassetto, *Appl. Opt.* **49**, 5465 (2010)
- [28] L. Poletto and F. Frassetto, *Appl. Sci.* **3**, 1 (2013)
- [29] M. Sacchi, C. Spezzani, P. Torelli, A. Avila, R. Delaunay, and C. F. Hague, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **74**, 2791 (2003)
- [30] C. La-O-Vorakiat, M. Siemens, M. M. Murnane, H. C. Kapteyn, S. Mathias, M. Aeschlimann, P. Grychtol, R. Adam, C. M. Schneider, J. M. Shaw, H. Nembach, and T. J. Silva, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 257402 (Dec 2009), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.257402>
- [31] S. Valencia, A. Gaupp, W. Gudat, H.-C. Mertins, P. Oppeneer, D. Abramssohn, and C. Schneider, *new Journal of Physics* **8**, 254 (2006)
- [32] C. Stamm, J.-U. Thiele, T. Kachel, I. Radu, P. Ramm, M. Kosuth, J. Minár, H. Ebert, H. A. Dürr, W. Eberhardt, and C. H. Back, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 184401 (May 2008), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.77.184401>
- [33] C. Bordel, J. Juraszek, D. W. Cooke, C. Baldasseroni, S. Mankovsky, J. Minár, H. Ebert, S. Moyerman, E. E. Fullerton, and F. Hellman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 117201 (Sep 2012), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.117201>
- [34] C. Illg, M. Haag, and M. Föhnle, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 214404 (Dec 2013), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.88.214404>
- [35] D. W. Cooke, F. Hellman, C. Baldasseroni, C. Bordel, S. Moyerman, and E. E. Fullerton, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 255901 (Dec 2012), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.255901>
- [36] A. J. Schellekens and B. Koopmans, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 217204 (May 2013), <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.217204>
- [37] J. Hohlfeld, S.-S. Wellershoff, J. Güdde, U. Conrad, V. Jähnke, and E. Matthias, *J. Chem. Phys.* **251**, 237 (2000), ISSN 0301-0104, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301010499003304>

[38] J. Gdde, J. Hohfeld, J. Mller, and E. Matthias, *Appl. Surf. Sci.* **127–129**, 40 (1998), ISSN 0169-4332, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169433298000026>