Canadian Journal of Chemistry
Revue canadienne de chimie

XEOL spectroscopy of lanthanides in aqueous solution

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Chemistry</i>
Manuscript ID	cjc-2017-0038.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-May-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Jürgensen, Astrid; Leibniz-Institut für Analytische Wissenschaften - ISAS eV, Interface Processes
Is the invited manuscript for consideration in a Special Issue?:	TK Sham
Keyword:	XEOL spectroscopy, lanthanide ions, aqueous solutions, luminescence, rare earth elements Sm, Dy, and Tb

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

XEOL spectroscopy of lanthanides in aqueous solution*Astrid Jürgensen^{1,2 *}*¹ *Canadian Synchrotron Radiation Facility, Synchrotron Radiation Center, Stoughton WI, USA*² *Leibniz-Institut für Analytische Wissenschaften – ISAS – e.V.**Bunsen-Kirchhoff-Straße 11, 44139 Dortmund, Germany*** tel.: +49 (0)231 1392-294, fax: +49 (0)231 1392-120, e-mail: astrid.juergensen@isas.de*

Draft

9 Abstract

10 As part of an ongoing study of the electronic interactions between solute and solvent
11 molecules a method for X-ray Excited Optical Luminescence (XEOL) analysis of aqueous
12 solutions was developed at the double-crystal-monochromator beamline (DCM) of the Canadian
13 Synchrotron Radiation Facility (CSRF). It was tested using a series of solutions containing
14 lanthanide ions. The samples were contained in a sample holder for liquids with a 3 μm Mylar
15 window separating them from the vacuum ($\leq 3 \times 10^{-6}$ torr) in the solid state absorption chamber of
16 the DCM beamline.

17 Terbium, samarium and dysprosium have four intense and narrow luminescence peaks
18 between 450 and 700 nm, well separated from the luminescence peak of the Mylar window
19 between 300 and 425 nm. The intensity of the rare earth (RE^{3+}) luminescence peaks was lower
20 for the solutions than for solid $\text{RECl}_3 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$. In part, this was caused by the lower RE^{3+}
21 concentration in the solutions than in the solid. In addition, the solvent (water) acts as a quencher.
22 The disorder and the molecular motion in the solution increase the availability of non-radiative
23 de-excitation pathways. A high concentration of SO_4^{2-} in the solution enhanced the luminescence
24 intensity, probably by inhibiting some non-radiative de-excitation pathways. This study has
25 shown that it is in principle possible to investigate the luminescence of aqueous solutions with
26 XEOL spectroscopy. Furthermore, it is possible to use this technique as a quantitative analytical
27 tool for concentrated luminescent solutions and to study the shielding effects of anions in the
28 solution that increase the luminescence intensity.

29

30 **Keywords:** XEOL spectroscopy; lanthanide ions; aqueous solutions; luminescence; rare earth
31 elements Sm, Dy, and Tb

32 Introduction:

33 X-ray Excited Optical Luminescence (XEOL) Spectroscopy probes specific de-excitation
34 mechanisms of a system following the absorption of an x-ray photon, namely those involving the
35 emission of an optical photon.¹ It is used to study the origins of luminescence in materials,¹⁻⁵ and
36 it can be applied as a probe to monitor radiation damage during protein x-ray crystallography
37 studies⁶ and pH-triggered drug release from nanoparticles.⁷ The use of tunable x-rays from a
38 synchrotron source allows the injection of photons at specific energies, e.g. near the absorption
39 edge of an element leading to preferred core-excitation of that element. Thus, the technique is
40 element specific. For example, it can be used to determine which chemical elements, in particular
41 impurity elements, are involved in producing the luminescence, and how certain impurities might
42 affect both emission wavelength and decay rate of the excited state.⁸ In addition, x-ray absorption
43 energies depend on the chemical environment of the absorbing atom, making it possible to study
44 the correlation between luminescence and chemical environment of the absorbing atom of the
45 same element.⁹ The XEOL technique is also excitation channel specific. For example, the
46 luminescence yield following C(1s) excitation of organic molecules or organic-ligand metal
47 complexes depends on whether the core electron was excited to the π^* or the σ^* orbital.^{10,11} This
48 can provide information about the electronic structure of the valence shell and the chemical
49 bonding in the sample. Recent developments in the technique include time resolution in the
50 picosecond range^{12,13} and the collection of 2D XAFS-XEOL spectra.¹⁴

51 In solids the x-ray absorption process creates holes in the valence shell and electrons in the
52 conduction band either by direct absorption or indirectly following Auger or fluorescence decay
53 of core-hole excited states. The drop of an electron from the conduction band into a valence band
54 hole can lead to the emission of a photon (band-gap or band-edge luminescence). The wavelength
55 of the emitted photon depends on the band-gap energy and the process is usually rapid due to the

56 short lifetime of the excited state (a few nanoseconds). Defects in the crystal structure or the
57 presence of impurity atoms can lead to the formation of energy levels within the band-gap.
58 Electrons from the conduction band can tunnel into these levels and then drop back into the
59 valence band. The emitted photon has a longer wavelength than the band-gap luminescence and
60 generally a longer decay rate, due to the longer lifetime of the excited state. Hence, there is a
61 correlation between the luminescence and the crystallinity and the electronic structure of the
62 sample. In particular, it provides information about the local electronic structure around the
63 excited atom.

64 Similarly, in aqueous solutions the x-ray excitation leads to the formation of ions and
65 molecules with valence shell holes, electrons in molecular antibonding orbitals and hydrated
66 photoelectrons. Again, these species could have been created by direct photoabsorption or as
67 products of core-hole de-excitation processes, e.g. Auger, fluorescence or fragmentation.
68 Emission of a visible photon could result from the drop of an electron from an antibonding orbital
69 into the valence shell, from the capture of a hydrated electron or from electron-transfer-reactions
70 between various solvent and solute species. The last two processes often involve two or more
71 steps. An XEOL study of ions in aqueous solution could thus provide information on the local
72 structure of the solvent molecules around the solute ion, i.e. the hydration shell, on the electronic
73 transitions between solute and solvent or between two different solute species, and on the specific
74 mechanisms of these electron-transfer-reactions.

75 One group of luminescent ions in aqueous solution are the lanthanides. With the exception of
76 $\text{La}^{3+}([\text{Xe}]4f^0)$ and $\text{Lu}^{3+}([\text{Xe}]4f^{14})$ the lanthanide cations have partially filled 4f orbitals. Electronic
77 de-excitation of a 4f excited state can lead to the emission of light which, depending on the
78 lanthanide ion, ranges from the near IR (Nd^{3+} , Er^{3+} and Yb^{3+}),¹⁵ through the visible (e.g. Tb^{3+} ,
79 Eu^{3+} , Dy^{3+} and Sm^{3+})¹⁶ to the near uv (some Gd^{3+} complexes, e.g. $\text{Gd}^{3+}_{(\text{aq})}$).^{17,18} The luminescence

80 originates from parity forbidden transitions within the 4f orbital shell. The 4f orbitals are
81 relatively deep inside the atom, i.e. localized. Hence, they are atomic in character. They interact
82 only weakly with ligand orbitals and generally do not participate in chemical bonding. In
83 consequence, the 4f excited states have long radiative lifetimes (0.1 – 1.0 ms) and very narrow
84 emission bands.¹⁹⁻²¹ Intensity and radiative lifetime depend upon the energy difference between
85 the excited and the ground state of the ion and the availability of other competing non-radiative
86 processes such as, internal conversion, intersystem crossing and cross-relaxation between
87 neighbouring complexes. The greatest intensity and longest lifetime are observed for Gd^{3+} ,
88 followed by Tb^{3+} and Eu^{3+} .²² In aqueous solution, however, the lanthanide luminescence is
89 effectively quenched by water molecules,²²⁻²⁴ and there have been numerous studies to find
90 ligand molecules that shield the lanthanide ion from the water molecules and enhance the
91 luminescence intensity relative to the aquo complex.^{15,16,21,23,25-28} This interest originates from the
92 fact that the lanthanide ions can be effective luminescent sensors and probes,^{19,29} e.g., for
93 temperature measurements³⁰ and for the detection of ions, organic molecules, water, and other
94 species.³¹⁻³⁵ They can aid in the characterization of the structure of biological macromolecules
95 such as proteins, nucleotides, nucleic acids and viruses,^{23,36-39} and they are also useful for various
96 bio-medical applications in drug development, genomic screening and clinical
97 diagnostics.^{16,20,27,30,40-46}

98 The present paper describes a methodology for soft x-ray (1800 – 4200 eV) XEOL
99 measurements of aqueous solutions. It involves the use of a liquid cell⁴⁷ to isolate the solution
100 from the vacuum of the sample chamber. Using aqueous solutions of TbCl_3 , DyCl_3 and SmCl_3 as
101 examples, this technique is investigated and discussed.

102

Experiment:

DyCl₃·6H₂O, SmCl₃·6H₂O and TbCl₃·6H₂O powders ($\geq 99\%$ purity) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich and used without further purification. A solid sample was prepared by crushing the powder with a mortar and pestle and then spreading a thin layer ($\sim 0.15\ \mu\text{m}$) onto a piece of double-sided carbon tape that was attached to a steel disk. This sample disk was then attached to a sample holder with the aid of double-sided carbon tape. $\sim 1.0\ \text{mol/L}$ solutions were prepared by dissolving appropriate amount of the powder in deionized water (5.00 ml for DyCl₃ and SmCl₃ and 2.00 ml for TbCl₃). Solutions with lower [Tb³⁺] for a concentration dependence study were prepared in the following way: An $\sim 0.5\ \text{M}$ TbCl₃ solution was prepared by dissolving the appropriate amount of solid in 10.00 ml of deionized water. Then 1.00 ml aliquots of this solution were diluted to 2.00 ml and 4.00 ml with deionized water to prepare $\sim 0.25\ \text{M}$ and $\sim 0.125\ \text{M}$ solutions, respectively. A summary of the solutions and their concentrations is given in Table 1. An aliquot (0.6 ml) of each solution was put into the sample holder for liquids that was designed for use at the double-crystal-monochromator beamline (DCM) of the Canadian Synchrotron Radiation Facility (CSRF).⁴⁷ A 3 μm Mylar window isolated the sample in the holder from the vacuum ($\sim 3 \times 10^{-6}$ torr) in the solid-state absorption chamber.

The XEOL spectra were collected at the DCM beamline of CSRF which was located at the Synchrotron Radiation Center (SRC) of the University of Wisconsin, Madison in Stoughton, WI USA. Energy calibration of the incident x-ray photons was achieved by measurement of the XANES spectra of standards (powders of SiO₂, Na₄P₂O₇, ZnSO₄, KCl and CaCO₃) and then adjusting the energy scale using a 4th order polynomial function obtained from these standard spectra. The optical luminescence of the samples was recorded using a Jobin-Yvon 100 Spex H10/1200@450 spectrometer with a Hamamatsu R943 photomultiplier tube and C2761 detection unit. The incident photon beam was at a 45° angle to the sample surface, and the optical

spectrometer was mounted on a port of the vacuum chamber situated at a 90° angle to the incoming x-ray beam (Fig. 1). The wavelength scale was calibrated by measuring the XEOL spectrum of Cu-doped ZnS (commercial P-31 phosphor powder from USR Optonix Inc.) and setting the main peak of this spectrum to 530 nm. The total-electron-yield (TEY) signal from a gas cell containing ~1.3 torr air and located upstream from the sample was used to normalize the intensity of the XEOL spectra with respect to the incident photon flux.

A set of at least 4 scans was collected for each XEOL spectrum, using an incident x-ray energy of 2115 eV. Spikes caused by electrical noise were removed manually. Each scan was then normalized with respect to the incident photon flux by first subtracting the dark background signal, and then dividing by the TEY signal from the gas cell. The normalized data from the scans was averaged (Fig. 2a). Then the XEOL peak of the window was removed (Fig. 2b). For this, a least-squares fit was done on the spectral region between 200 and 450 nm using two XEOL spectra of water. The fit result is then subtracted from the spectrum of the solution to obtain the spectrum of the ion without the contribution from the window. Two water spectra are needed for the fit in order to account for changes in the XEOL of the window due to radiation damage. Finally, corrections for the variation in uv-visible light transmission of the window are made by dividing the measured XEOL spectrum of the aqueous ion by the uv-visible transmission of the 3 µm Mylar window material (Fig. 2c), determined experimentally with an Ocean Optics USB2000-UV-VIS spectrometer. The spectrum of an incandescent lamp was measured with and without the window between the light source and the detector, and the former spectrum was then divided by the latter to obtain the window transmission shown in Fig. 2c.

Results and Discussion

As discussed in detail previously,⁴⁷ the XANES analysis of aqueous solutions with soft x-

rays (~ 1800 to ~ 4000 eV) requires storage of the sample in a container that isolates it from the vacuum, while exposing it to the x-rays. This is accomplished with the aid of a thin-film window in the container. The material for this window has to withstand the pressure differential between the solution inside and the vacuum outside. It should be transparent to the x-rays, and it should also be robust, i.e. damage caused by the radiation should be minimal or, better yet, non-existent. For XEOL experiments the cell window must also be transparent to optical photons, and it should not luminesce in the visible region of the spectrum. Water is a very good quenching agent of optical luminescence,²²⁻²⁴ and thus maximizing the incoming x-ray photon flux and the transmission by the window of both x-rays and optical photons is essential. Hence, a 3 μm Mylar window was used, and the experimental spectra were collected with the ring energy at 1 GeV and a photon energy of 2115 eV. This window material is transparent to visible light with a transmission of 70% – 90% over the entire range up to the cut-off point at ~ 330 nm (3.75 eV) in the near uv (Fig. 2c). Unfortunately, the window material, a polycarbonate, luminesces. The XEOL spectrum has a peak at 365 nm (3.40 eV) (Fig. 2b, centre). Furthermore, the shape of the XEOL peak changes with prolonged x-ray exposure (Fig. 2b, centre) caused by the gradual deterioration of the Mylar by the x-rays (radiation damage). Thus, with the present experimental setup XEOL spectroscopy of aqueous solutions is limited to systems which emit optical photons with wavelengths greater than ~ 450 nm, as is the case for the rare-earth ions Dy^{3+} , Sm^{3+} and Tb^{3+} .

Of the three rare-earth elements studied, Tb^{3+} has the most intense luminescence (Fig. 3a, Table 2) with four intense and narrow peaks between 450 and 650 nm, well separated from the luminescence peak of the Mylar window. These four peaks result from the $^5\text{D}_4 \rightarrow ^7\text{F}_{6,5,4,3}$ transitions (Table 2). There are also peaks at longer ($^5\text{D}_4 \rightarrow ^7\text{F}_{2,1}$ transitions) wavelengths with much lower intensity. An energy level schematic for these transitions is shown in Fig. 4. The

intensity of the four main peaks decreases by a factor of ~ 50 for the 0.913 M Tb^{3+} solution, compared to solid state $\text{TbCl}_3 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$ (Fig. 3b, Table 2). Although $[\text{Tb}^{3+}]$ in the solution (5.5×10^{20} atoms/ cm^3) is only $\sim 8\%$ of the value in the solid (7×10^{21} atoms/ cm^3), the actual number of Tb^{3+} ions probed in the solution (8.82×10^{15}) is $\sim 50\%$ of that probed in the solid (1.67×10^{16}) due to the larger attenuation length in the solution ($6.972 \mu\text{m}$) than in the solid ($1.036 \mu\text{m}$). Thus, the lower number of ions in the sample should only account for a factor of 2 in the luminescence intensity reduction.

The additional quenching is caused by the greater number of H_2O molecules in the first coordination shell and by the greater disorder in the solution compared to the solid. The main non-radiative de-excitation of Tb^{3+} is via vibronic coupling of the $^5\text{D}_4$ excited state to the O-H oscillators in the first coordination shell,³⁶ as shown in Fig. 4. The coordination number of Tb is 8 in solid $\text{TbCl}_3 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$, all six H_2O molecules and two Cl^- ions are part of the first coordination shell: $(\text{Tb}(\text{H}_2\text{O})_6\text{Cl}_2)^+$. The Tb^{3+} aquo complex in solution has 9 H_2O molecules in the first coordination shell: $(\text{Tb}(\text{H}_2\text{O})_9)^{3+}$.³⁶ There is thus an addition to the first coordination shell, changing its size and shape, and there is also a change in its composition: two Cl^- ions are replaced by three H_2O molecules. This increases the rate constant for the radiationless de-excitation pathway, thus decreasing the luminescence intensity. The greater mobility of the ions and water molecules in the solution might cause an additional increase in the radiationless de-excitation rate.

The relative intensities of the peaks also change in solution compared to the solid. In particular, there is a 10% intensity increase of peaks #1 and #3 relative to peak #2. This might also be caused by the change in the local chemical environment – i.e. the first coordination shell – of the Tb^{3+} ion, see above (peaks #1 and #3 are sensitive to the chemical environment³⁸). Alternatively, this could be caused by a difference in the transmission of optical photons between

the solid and the solution, or it could be an artifact of the background removal mechanism. Further experiments are needed in order to clarify this.

The intensity of the luminescence from solid state $\text{DyCl}_3 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$ (Fig. 5a) is about a factor of 30 less compared to that from solid state $\text{TbCl}_3 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$ (Fig. 3a). The four observable peaks result from $^4\text{F}_{9/2} \rightarrow ^6\text{H}_{x/2}$ transitions (Table 2). The two most intense of these Dy^{3+} peaks occur in the same wavelength region as those of Tb^{3+} , and these two are the only ones observed in the XEOL spectrum of an ~ 0.9 M aqueous DyCl_3 solution (Fig. 5b). Due to the intensity decrease caused by the decreased Dy^{3+} concentration and the H_2O quenching, the two peaks are barely resolved from the background (Fig. 5b). The loss in intensity for the solution relative to the solid is of comparable magnitude for Dy^{3+} as for Tb^{3+} , a factor of ~ 50 . There also appears to be a change of the relative peak intensities (Fig. 5, Table 2), but given the overall low intensity of the solution spectrum, this might be an artifact of the background removal.

The luminescence intensity of Sm^{3+} from solid state $\text{SmCl}_3 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$ is even less (Fig. 6a) – about $1/10^{\text{th}}$ that of solid $\text{DyCl}_3 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$ and about $1/400^{\text{th}}$ that of solid $\text{TbCl}_3 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$ – and the peak positions are shifted toward the red by 50 – 85 nm compared to the main peaks of Tb^{3+} (Table 2). The peaks result from $^4\text{G}_{5/2} \rightarrow ^6\text{H}_{x/2}$ transitions. No luminescence was detected for a 0.913 M aqueous solution of SmCl_3 . This is not unexpected: an intensity reduction by a factor of ~ 50 , as observed for Tb^{3+} and Dy^{3+} , would reduce the height of the most intense Sm^{3+} peak to 9 counts, well below the detection limit of the spectrometer.

The dependence of the signal intensity on the ion concentration was tested for Tb^{3+} by measurement of the XEOL spectra of solutions with different ion concentrations, listed in Table 1. The XEOL spectra obtained for these solutions show that measurement is possible for Tb^{3+} concentrations as low as 0.120 M (Fig. 7a). The intensity of the signal increases with increasing ion concentration. For all four luminescence peaks the increase in peak height with respect to ion

concentration is not linear, as can be seen from Fig. 7b. The formula for the luminescence intensity I_L ,

$$(1) \quad I_L(\lambda_{ex}) = \Phi_L I_0(\lambda_{ex}) (1 - 10^{-\varepsilon_L(\lambda_{ex})bC_L})$$

with Φ_L = luminescence quantum yield, $I_0(\lambda_{ex})$ = incident light intensity, $\varepsilon_L(\lambda_{ex})$ = molar absorptivity, λ_{ex} = wavelength of the incident light, b = path length, and C_L = solute concentration,⁴⁸ significantly overestimated the peak height at the lowest concentration (0.120 M) for all four peaks. However, adding a constant intensity loss term I_c (equation (2)) resulted in a good fit to the experimental data over the entire concentration range investigated (Fig. 7b).

$$(2) \quad I_L(\lambda_{ex}) = \Phi_L I_0(\lambda_{ex}) (1 - 10^{-\varepsilon_L(\lambda_{ex})bC_L} - I_c)$$

Equation (1) is based on the assumption that the incident light is either transmitted or absorbed by the solution, and the additional term I_c required to fit the experimental data suggests the presence of another material which absorbs a constant amount of the incident light independent of $[Tb^{3+}]$. A possible candidate for this is the Mylar window that according to theoretical calculations⁴⁹ absorbs ~14% of the incident radiation I_0 at 2115 eV, in reasonable agreement with the average value of 0.20 ± 0.02 (20% of I_0) determined for I_c (Fig. 7b, Table 3). However, other factors, e.g. scattering of the incident radiation by the solution, probably also contribute to I_c . Extrapolation of the best fit curves down to zero intensity gives a detection limit of $[Tb^{3+}] \sim 0.08$ mol/L.

It is possible to reduce the quenching effect of the H₂O molecules by using rare-earth complex ions, where the coordinated ligands exclude water from the first coordination sphere,^{36, 37} or act as an antenna enhancing the luminescence.^{27,40} Even the presence of some anions in high concentration can enhance the intensity of the observed luminescence.⁵⁰ With the present experimental setup it was possible to detect the luminescence of a 0.0121 M TbCl₃ solution containing 3.99 M (NH₄)₂SO₄ (Fig. 8). Initial results from molecular dynamics calculations

(Supplementary Material) suggest that SO_4^{2-} anions replace some of the H_2O molecules in the first hydration shell, thereby reducing the quenching of the luminescence.

248

249 Conclusions

This study has shown that it is in principle possible to investigate the luminescence of aqueous solutions with incident radiation in the soft x-ray region (1800 – 4200 eV). Furthermore, it is possible to use XEOL spectroscopy as a quantitative analytical tool for concentrated Tb^{3+} solutions, and to study the shielding effects of anions in the solution that increase the luminescence intensity. Combining XEOL spectroscopy with x-ray photoabsorption could aid in the study of ligand-ion interactions and electron-transfer-reactions in aqueous solution. The recent addition of timing capabilities to the optical spectrometer^{12,13,51,52} will also allow the determination of decay rates of the luminescence, providing additional information about the systems being studied. However, the experimental setup imposes some restrictions on the types of system to be studied. Of the lanthanides only Tb and perhaps Eu emit visible light in the correct wavelength range ($\lambda > 450$ nm) and at sufficiently high intensity to make the study of aqueous solutions with concentrations much less than 1.0 M feasible. Similarly, other luminescent species, e.g. $\text{Ru}(\text{bipyridyl})_3^{2+}$, various nanoparticles or other luminophores in solution, can only be investigated, if the emitted light has a wavelength greater than 450 nm and an intensity comparable to that of $\text{Tb}^{3+}(\text{aq})$.

265

266 Supplementary Material

Information on the molecular dynamics calculations of aqueous TbCl_3 and $\text{TbCl}_3 + (\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$ solutions is provided online.

269

270 Acknowledgements

271 The experimental work was conducted at the Canadian Synchrotron Radiation Facility
272 (CSRF) which was funded by NSERC – CRSNG (Natural Sciences and Engineering Research
273 Council of Canada – Conseil de recherches en sciences naturelles et en génie du Canada) and
274 NRC – CRNC (National Research Council Canada – Conseil national de recherches du Canada).
275 It was located at the Synchrotron Radiation Center (SRC) of the University of Wisconsin-
276 Madison. Funding for this facility was provided by NSF (Award No.: DMR-00537588). The
277 author also thanks Dan Wallace for providing the Ocean Optics USB2000-UV-VIS spectrometer
278 of SRC to measure the uv-vis transmission of the 3 μm Mylar film. The Leibniz Institut für
279 Analytische Wissenschaften – ISAS – e.V. is funded by the Ministerium für Innovationen,
280 Wissenschaft und Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany and by the
281 Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Germany.

282

283 References:

- 284 (1) Sham, T. K. *J. Electron Spectrosc.* **2015**, 204, 196. doi: 10.1016/j.elspec..04.004
- 285 (2) Peng M.; Li Y.; Gao J.; Zhang D.; Jiang Z.; Sun X. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2011**, 115, 11420.
286 doi: 10.1021/jp201884y
- 287 (3) Paik T.; Gordon T. R.; Prantner A. M.; Yun H.; Murray C. B. *ACS Nano* **2013**, 7, 2850.
288 doi: 10.1021/nn4004583
- 289 (4) Ward M. J.; Rupar P. A.; Murphy M. W.; Yiu Y.-M.; Baines K. M.; Sham T.K. *J. Phys.*
290 *Conf. Ser.* **2013**, 430, 012046. doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/430/1/012046
- 291 (5) Zhang D.; Zhang H.; Zhang X.; Sham T.-K.; Hu Y.; Sun X. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*

- 292 **2016**, 18, 6406. doi: 10.1039/c5cp05764g
- 293 (6) Owen R. L.; Yorke B. A.; Pearson A. R. *Acta Crystallogr. D* **2012** 68, 505. doi:
294 10.1107/S0907444912002946
- 295 (7) Chen H.; Moore T.; Qi B.; Colvin D. C.; Jelen E. K.; Hitchcock D. A.; He J.; Mefford O.
296 T.; Gore J. C.; Alexis F.; Anker J. N. *ACS Nano* **2013**, 7, 1178. doi: 10.1021/nn304369m
- 297 (8) Soderholm, L.; Liu, G. K.; Antonio, M. R.; Lytle, F. W. J. *Chem. Phys.* **1998**, 109, 6745.
298 doi: 10.1063/1.477320
- 299 (9) Sham, T.; Jiang, D.; Coulthard, I.; Lorimer, J.; Feng, X.; Tan, K.; Frigo, S.; Rosenberg,
300 R.; Houghton, D.; Bryskiewicz, B. *Nature* **1993**, 363, 331. doi:10.1038/363331a0
- 301 (10) Naftel, S.; Kim, P.-S. G.; Sham, T.; Sammynaiken, R.; Yates, B.; Hu, Y.-F. *J. Appl. Phys.*
302 **2003**, 93, 5191. doi: 10.1063/1.1565492
- 303 (11) Naftel, S.; Zhang, P.; Kim, P.-S.; Sham, T.; Coulthard, I.; Antel Jr. W.; Freeland, J.;
304 Frigo, S.; Fung, M.-K.; Lee, S.; Hu, Y.; Yates, B. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **2001**, 78, 1847. doi:
305 10.1063/1.1358360
- 306 (12) Ward M. J.; Regier T. Z.; Vogt J. M.; Gordon R. A.; Han W.-Q.; Sham T. K. *J. Phys.*
307 *Conf. Ser.* **2013**, 425, 092006. doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/425/9/092006
- 308 (13) Mosselmans J. F. W.; Taylor R. P.; Quinn P. D.; Finch A. A.; Cibir G.; Gianolio D.;
309 Sapelkin A. V. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **2013**, 425, 182009. doi: 10.1088/1742-
310 6596/425/18/182009
- 311 (14) Ward M. J.; Smith J. G.; Regier T. Z.; Sham T. K. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **2013**, 425, 132009.
312 doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/425/13/132009

- 313 (15) Klink, S. I.; Hebbink, G. A.; Grave, L.; Peters, F. G. A.; van Veggel, F. C. J. M.;
314 Reinhoudt, D. N.; Hofstraat, J. W. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2000**, 1923. doi:
315 10.1002/(SICI)1099-0690(200005)2000:10<1923::AID-EJOC1923>3.0.CO;2-W
- 316 (16) Petoud, S.; Cohen, S. M.; Bünzli, J.-C. G.; Raymond, K. N. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, 125,
317 13324. doi: 10.1021/ja0379363
- 318 (17) Lis, S.; Kimura, T.; Yoshida, Z. *J. Alloy Compd.* **2001**, 323-324, 125. doi:
319 10.1016/S0925-8388(01)00980-X
- 320 (18) Vuilleumier, J.-J.; Deschaux, M.; Marcantonatos, M. D. *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday T. 1* **1989**,
321 85, 2605. doi: 10.1039/F19898502605
- 322 (19) Parker, D. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2000**, 205, 109. doi: 10.1016/S0010-8545(00)00241-1
- 323 (20) Sabbatini, N.; Guardigli, M.; Lehn, J.-M. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1993**, 123, 201. doi:
324 10.1016/0010-8545(93)85056-A
- 325 (21) Choppin, G. R.; Peterman, D. R. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1998**, 174, 283. doi:
326 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0010-8545\(98\)00125-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0010-8545(98)00125-8)
- 327 (22) Lis, S.; Kimura, T.; Yoshida, Z.; But, S. *J. Alloy Compd.* **2004**, 380, 173. doi:
328 10.1016/j.jallcom.2004.03.026
- 329 (23) Lis, S. *J. Alloy Compd.* **2002**, 341, 45. doi: 10.1016/S0925-8388(02)00055-5
- 330 (24) Beeby, A.; Clarkson, I. M.; Dickins, R. S.; Faulkner, S.; Parker, D.; Royle L.; de Sousa,
331 A. S.; Williams, J. A. G.; Woods, M. *J. Chem. Soc. Perkin T. 2* **1999**, 3, 493. doi:
332 10.1039/A808692C
- 333 (25) Patroniak, V.; Baxter, P. N. W.; Lehn, J.-M.; Hnatejko, Z.; Kubicki, M. *Eur. J. Inorg.*

- 334 *Chem.* **2004**, 2379. doi: 10.1002/ejic.200300868
- 335 (26) Hebbink, G. A.; Reinhoudt, D. N.; van Veggel, F. C. J. M. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2001**,
336 4101. doi: 10.1002/1099-0690(200111)2001:21<4101::AID-EJOC4101>3.0.CO;2-9
- 337 (27) Steemers, Frank, J.; Verboom, W.; Reinhoudt, D. N.; van der Tol, E. B.; Verhoeven, J. W.
338 *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1995**, 117, 9408. doi: 10.1021/ja00142a004
- 339 (28) van Veggel, F. C. J. M.; Reinhoudt, D. N. *Chem.-Eur. J.* **1999**, 5, 90. doi:
340 10.1002/(SICI)1521-3765(19990104)5:1<90::AID-CHEM90>3.0.CO;2-8
- 341 (29) Richardson, F. S. *Chem. Rev.* **1982**, 82, 541. doi: 10.1021/cr00051a004
- 342 (30) Zhao, D.; Zhang, J.; Yue, D.; Lian, X.; Cui, Y.; Yang, Y.; Qian, G. *Chem. Commun.*
343 *(Camb.)* **2016**, 52, 8259. doi: 10.1039/c6cc02471h
- 344 (31) de Bettencourt-Dias, A.; Barber, P. S.; Viswanathan, S. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2014**, 273-
345 274, 165. doi: 10.1016/j.ccr.2014.04.010
- 346 (32) Yan, W.; Zhang, C.; Chen, S.; Han, L.; Zheng, H. *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces* **2017**, 9,
347 1629. doi: 10.1021/acsami.6b14563
- 348 (33) Sahoo, J.; Arunachalam, R.; Subramanian, P. S.; Suresh, E.; Valkonen, A.; Rissanen, K.;
349 Albrecht, M. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **2016**, 55, 9625. doi: 10.1002/anie.201604093
- 350 (34) Dong, Y.; Cai, J.; Fang, Q.; You, X.; Chi, Y. *Anal. Chem.* **2016**, 88, 1748. doi:
351 10.1021/acs.analchem.5b03974
- 352 (35) Vanek, J.; Lubal, P.; Hermann, P.; Anzenbacher, P., Jr. *J. Fluoresc.* **2013**, 23, 57. doi:
353 10.1007/s10895-012-1116-3
- 354 (36) Horrocks, W. D., Jr.; Sudnick, D. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1979**, 101, 334. doi:

- 355 10.1021/ja00496a010
- 356 (37) Horrocks, W. D., Jr.; Sudnick, D. R. *Accounts Chem. Res.* **1981**, 14, 384. doi:
- 357 10.1021/ar00072a004
- 358 (38) Cotton, S. A. Lanthanide and Actinide Chemistry, chapter 5 - *Electronic and Magnetic*
- 359 *Properties of the Lanthanides*, pages 61 - 87. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, West
- 360 Sussex, England UK, 2006.
- 361 (39) Penas, C.; Mascareñas, J. L.; Vázquez, M. E. *Chem. Sci.* **2016**, 7, 2674. doi:
- 362 10.1039/C5SC04501K
- 363 (40) Mathis, G. *Clin. Chem.* **1993**, 39, 1953. <http://clinchem.aaccjnls.org/content/39/9/1953>
- 364 (41) Soini, E. *Trends Anal. Chem.* **1990**, 9, 90. doi: 10.1016/0165-9936(90)87086-2
- 365 (42) DaCosta, M. V.; Doughan, S.; Han, Y.; Krull, U. J. *Anal. Chim. Acta* **2014**, 832, 1. doi:
- 366 10.1016/j.aca.2014.04.030
- 367 (43) Tu, D.; Zheng, W.; Liu, Y.; Zhu, H.; Chen, X. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2014**, 273-274, 13. doi:
- 368 10.1016/j.ccr.2013.11.017
- 369 (44) Liu, Q.; Feng, W.; Li, F. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2014**, 273-274, 100. doi:
- 370 10.1016/j.ccr.2014.01.004
- 371 (45) Surender, E. M.; Bradberry, S. J.; Bright, S. A.; McCoy, C. P.; Williams, D. C.;
- 372 Gunnlaugsson, T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2017**, 139, 381. doi: 10.1021/jacs.6b11077
- 373 (46) Hao, J.-N.; Yan, B. *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **2016**, 1603856. doi: 10.1002/adfm.201603856
- 374 (47) Jürgensen, A. *Can. J. Chem.* **2009**, 87, 601. doi: 10.1139/V09-023

- 375 (48) Credi A.; Prodi L. *Spectrochim. Acta A* **1998**, 54, 159. doi: 10.1016/S1386-
376 1425(97)00224-2
- 377 (49) Gullikson, E. (2010). Filter Transmission (X-ray transmission of a solid). *X-Ray*
378 *Interactions With Matter*. Retrieved 17, January 2017, 2017, from
379 http://henke.lbl.gov/optical_constants/filter2.html (http://henke.lbl.gov/optical_constants/)
- 380 (50) Kumala, S.; Hakanen, A.; Laine, E.; Haapakka, K. *J. Alloy Compd.* **1995**, 225, 279. doi:
381 10.1016/0925-8388(94)07141-1
- 382 (51) Heigl, F.; Jürgensen, A.; Zhou, X.-T.; Lam, S.; Murphy, M.; Ko, J. Y. P.; Sham, T. K.;
383 Rosenberg, R. A.; Gordon, R.; Brewe, D.; Regier, T.; Armelao, L. *Dynamic view on*
384 *nanstructures: a technique for time resolved optical luminescence using synchrotron*
385 *light pulses at SRC, APS, and CLS*. In J.-Y. Choi and S. Rah, editors, Synchrotron
386 Radiation Instrumentation: 9th International Conference on Synchrotron Radiation
387 Instrumentation, volume 879 of AIP Conference Proceedings, pages 1202 - 1205, **2007**.
- 388 (52) Heigl, F.; Jürgensen, A.; Zhou, X.-T.; Murphy, M.; Ko, J. Y. P.; Lam, S.; Sham, T. K.;
389 Regier, T.; Blyth, R. I. R.; Coulthard, I.; Zuin, L.; Hu, Y.-F.; Armelao, L.; Gordon, R.;
390 Brewe, D. *Time Resolved Studies of ZnO (Eu) Nanostructure Luminescence Using Short*
391 *Synchrotron Radiation Pulses*. In B. Hedman and P. Pianetta, editors, X-RAY
392 ABSORPTION FINE STRUCTURE - XAFS13: 13th International Conference, volume
393 882 of AIP Conference Proceedings, pages 864 - 866. **2007**.
- 394

395 Table 1: The aqueous solutions, their concentration and preparation method

<i>rare-earth (RE) ion</i>	<i>[RE³⁺] mol/L</i>	<i>Preparation Method</i>
Dy ³⁺	~0.9 ^a	1.9181 g DyCl ₃ ·6H ₂ O dissolved in 5.00 ml deionized H ₂ O
Sm ³⁺	0.913	1.8474 g SmCl ₃ ·6H ₂ O dissolved in 5.00 ml deionized H ₂ O
Tb ³⁺	0.913	0.7565 g TbCl ₃ ·6H ₂ O dissolved in 2.00 ml deionized H ₂ O
	0.480	1.8881 g TbCl ₃ ·6H ₂ O dissolved in 10.00 ml deionized H ₂ O
	0.240	1.00 ml of 0.480 M Tb ³⁺ solution diluted to 2.00 ml
	0.120	1.00 ml of 0.480 M Tb ³⁺ solution diluted to 4.00 ml
	0.0121	0.0227 g TbCl ₃ ·6H ₂ O and 2.6383 g (NH ₄) ₂ SO ₄ dissolved in 5.00 ml deionized H ₂ O ([SO ₄ ²⁻] = 3.99 M)

396 ^aThe nominal concentration is 0.917 M Dy³⁺. However, the solid sample contained an unknown
397 impurity, which did not dissolve. Thus, the actual [Dy³⁺] is less than 0.917 M.

398

Table 2: Luminescence Peaks and their Assignment

Tb³⁺		<i>solid TbCl₃·6H₂O</i>		<i>0.913 M TbCl₃ solution</i>		
No.	Position (nm)	Height (counts) [Rel. Height]	Position (nm)	Height (counts) [Rel. Height]	Assignment	
1	484	87953 [42.6]	482	1998 [53.0]	⁵ D ₄ → ⁷ F ₆	
2	539	206074 [100]	537	3769 [100]	⁵ D ₄ → ⁷ F ₅	
3	580	47115 [22.9]	578	1211 [32.1]	⁵ D ₄ → ⁷ F ₄	
4	614	26487 [12.9]	613	591 [15.7]	⁵ D ₄ → ⁷ F ₃	
5	642	3811 [1.85]	638	40 [1.06]	⁵ D ₄ → ⁷ F ₂	
6	665	3879 [1.88]	665	65 [1.72]	⁵ D ₄ → ⁷ F ₁	
Dy³⁺		<i>solid DyCl₃·6H₂O</i>		<i>~0.9 M DyCl₃ solution</i>		
No.	Position (nm)	Height (counts) [Rel. Height]	Position (nm)	Height (counts) [Rel. Height]	Assignment	
1	475	5301 [85.1]	474	138 [100]	⁴ F _{9/2} → ⁶ H _{15/2}	
2	568	6232 [100]	567	96 [69.6]	⁴ F _{9/2} → ⁶ H _{13/2}	
3	655	297 [4.77]			⁴ F _{9/2} → ⁶ H _{11/2}	
4	746	282 [4.53]			⁴ F _{9/2} → ⁶ H _{9/2}	
Sm³⁺		<i>solid SmCl₃·6H₂O</i>		<i>0.913 M SmCl₃ solution</i>		

No.	Position (nm)	Height (counts)		Position (nm)	Height (counts)		Assignment
			[Rel. Height]			[Rel. Height]	
1	557	91	[20.4]				$^4\text{G}_{5/2} \rightarrow ^6\text{H}_{9/2}$
2	593	447	[100]				$^4\text{G}_{5/2} \rightarrow ^6\text{H}_{7/2}$
3	639	316	[70.7]				$^4\text{G}_{5/2} \rightarrow ^6\text{H}_{5/2}$
4	697	63	[14.1]				$^4\text{G}_{5/2} \rightarrow ^6\text{H}_{3/2}$

399

Draft

400 Table 3: The Intensity vs. $[\text{Tb}^{3+}]$ correlation and the lowest detectable concentration

No.	Best Fit: $\text{Peak Height} = A (1 - 10^{-B \times [\text{Tb}^{3+}]} - C)$	$[\text{Tb}^{3+}]$ for $\text{Peak Height} = 0$
1	$A = 2790, B = 1.25, C = 0.21$	0.082
2	$A = 5192, B = 1.13, C = 0.18$	0.078
3	$A = 1670, B = 1.18, C = 0.19$	0.079
4	$A = 839, B = 1.24, C = 0.22$	0.088
Average:	$B = 1.20 \pm 0.05, C = 0.20 \pm 0.02$	0.082 ± 0.004

401 **Note:** $A = k I_0(\lambda_{\text{ex}}) \Phi_L$, $B = \epsilon_L(\lambda_{\text{ex}}) b$, and $C = I_c$. See text and equations (1) and (2) for details.

402 **List of Figures:**

403 **Fig. 1.** Setup of the experimental apparatus at the DCM beamline of CSRF.

404 **Fig. 2.** The extraction of the XEOL signal of the solute from the measured XEOL spectrum,
405 illustrated for the data of a 0.480 M TbCl_3 solution:

406 a) top: the as collected data of a single scan

407 centre: the data of a single scan after despiking

408 bottom: the data of a single scan after background removal and I_0 normalization.

409 b) top: the averaged data of four scans (black) and the spectrum resulting from a least-
410 squares fit (grey) on the 200 – 450 nm region using two XEOL spectra of water.

411 centre: the two XEOL spectra of water used for the least-squares fit.

412 bottom: The XEOL spectrum of the solute after subtraction of the contribution from
413 the window and the water, the least-squares fit result.

414 c) bottom: the XEOL spectrum of the solute

415 top: the XEOL spectrum of the solute after normalization with respect to the
416 transmission of the 3 μm Mylar window (grey).

417 **Fig. 3.** The XEOL spectrum of TbCl_3 in the solid state (a) and as a 0.913 M aqueous solution (b).

418 For the latter, the spectrum prior to the subtraction of the window contribution is also
419 shown (grey).

420 **Fig. 4.** The energy level diagram for the observed luminescent f-f transitions of Tb^{3+} and the
421 radiationless de-excitation via O-H vibrations.

422 **Fig. 5.** The XEOL spectrum of DyCl_3 in the solid state (a) and as a ~ 0.9 M aqueous solution (b).

423 For the latter, the spectrum prior to the subtraction of the window contribution is also

shown (grey).

Fig. 6. The XEOL spectrum of SmCl_3 in the solid state (a) and as a 0.913 M aqueous solution (b).

For the latter, the spectrum prior to the subtraction of the window contribution is also shown (grey).

Fig. 7. The effect of ion concentration on the XEOL spectrum of $\text{Tb}^{3+}(\text{aq})$:

a) XEOL spectra of aqueous solutions with varying Tb^{3+} concentration showing the decrease in signal intensity.

b) The luminescence intensity (peak height) as a function of $[\text{Tb}^{3+}]$ for each of the four most intense peaks in the XEOL spectrum. The curves represent the best fits of the form $\text{Peak Height} = A (1 - 10^{-B[\text{Tb}^{3+}]})$ (dotted grey) and $\text{Peak Height} = A (1 - 10^{-B[\text{Tb}^{3+}]} - C)$ (solid black), where $A = k I_0(\lambda_{\text{ex}}) \Phi_L$, $B = \varepsilon_L(\lambda_{\text{ex}}) b$, and $C = I_c$. See text and equations (1) and (2) for details.

Fig. 8. The XEOL spectrum of an aqueous solution containing 0.0121 M TbCl_3 and 3.99 M $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$. The spectrum prior to the subtraction of the window contribution is shown in grey.

441 Fig. 1.

442

443

444 Fig. 2.

445

446

Fig. 3.

448

449

450 Fig. 4.

451

452

453 Fig. 5.

454

455

456 Fig. 6.

457

458

Fig. 7.

462 **Fig. 8.**

463

464

465 **Graphical Abstract**

466