

Non-ergodic Intensity Correlation Functions for Blinking Nano Crystals

G. Margolin and E. Barkai

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, IN 46556.

(Dated: 30th August 2018)

We investigate the non-ergodic properties of blinking nano-crystals using a stochastic approach. We calculate the distribution functions of the time averaged intensity correlation function and show that these distributions are not delta peaked on the ensemble average correlation function values; instead they are W or U shaped. Beyond blinking nano-crystals our results describe non-ergodicity in systems stochastically modeled using the Lévy walk framework for anomalous diffusion, for example certain types of chaotic dynamics, currents in ion-channel, and single spin dynamics to name a few.

Statistics of fluorescence intensity signals from single molecules, atoms, and nanocrystals are in many cases analyzed using intensity correlation functions (e.g., [1, 2]). These correlation functions are used to investigate a wide range of dynamical behaviors, for example effects like anti-bunching and the stochastic dynamics of large molecules coupled to their environment ([3, 4] and Ref. therein). In standard theories it is assumed that the process of photon emission is stationary and ergodic. In contrast, measurements of intensity correlation functions obtained from single nano-crystals (NCs) exhibit a non-stationary and non-ergodic behavior [5, 6]; as such these systems exhibit a statistical behavior very different than other single emitting objects.

More specifically, the fluorescence emission of single colloidal NCs, e.g. CdSe quantum dots, exhibits interesting intermittency behavior [7]. A standard method to analyze such intensity signals is to define a threshold I_{th} and define two states: *on* if $I(t) > I_{th}$ and *off* otherwise. For capped NCs (e.g. CdSe(ZnS) core-shell NC) *on* and *off* times exhibit power law statistics [8, 9], their probability density function (PDF) behave like $\psi(\tau) \propto \tau^{-(1+\theta)}$ for large τ , and $\theta < 1$. For example in [6] 215 NCs were measured and the exponents $\theta_{on} = 0.58 \pm 0.17$ and $\theta_{off} = 0.48 \pm 0.15$ were found (note that within error of measurement $\theta_{on} = \theta_{off} = \theta$), further all NCs are reported to be statistically identical. Since $\theta < 1$ the average *on* and *off* times are infinite. The divergence of occupation times naturally leads to non-ergodicity in the blinking NCs [5, 6] (see also [10] for related discussion). Other measurements classify the intermittency based on time average correlation function or closely related power spectrum [5, 11, 12]. In this type of analysis of the experimental data there is no need to introduce a threshold value I_{th} .

From a single realization of intensity trajectory $I(t)$, recorded in a time interval $(0, T')$, we may construct the time averaged (TA) correlation function

$$C_{TA}(t', T') = \frac{\int_0^{T'} I(t+t')I(t)dt}{T}, \quad (1)$$

where we denoted $T = T' - t'$. On the other hand we may generate many intensity trajectories one at a time, and then average to obtain the ensemble average correlation function $\langle I(t)I(t+t') \rangle$. Single molecule experi-

ments investigate time average correlation functions. If the random process $I(t)$ is ergodic, the time average and the ensemble average correlation functions are identical in statistical sense, provided that the measurement time is long. Theories of correlation functions of single emitting objects are many times based on the assumption that the single molecule intensity trajectories are ergodic and hence for simplicity, theories concentrate on the calculation of the ensemble average correlation function. In this Letter we quantify the non-ergodic properties of the correlation functions of blinking NCs, using a stochastic approach. A related question of non-stationarity, or more specifically aging of the ensemble average correlation function, is a subject of intensive research in the literature [2, 13, 14, 15].

We use a simple two state stochastic model, with which correlation functions and non-ergodicity of the NCs are investigated. The intensity $I(t)$ jumps between two states $I(t) = 1$ and $I(t) = 0$. At start of the measurement $t = 0$ the NC begins in state *on* $I(0) = 1$. A schematic realization of the intensity fluctuations is shown in Fig. 1. The process is characterized based on the sequence $\{\tau_1^{on}, \tau_2^{off}, \tau_3^{on}, \tau_4^{off}, \dots\}$ of *on* and *off* sojourn times or equivalently according to the dots on the time axis t_1, t_2, \dots , on which transitions from *on* to *off* or vice versa occur (See Fig. 1). The sojourn time τ_i is an *off* time if i is even, it is an *on* time if i is odd. The times τ_i are drawn at random from the PDF $\psi(\tau)$. These sojourn times are mutually independent, identically distributed random variables. We will consider the case $\psi(\tau) \propto \tau^{-(1+\theta)}$ where $0 < \theta < 1$. When $\theta > 1$, or when $\psi(\tau)$ is exponential, we find an ergodic behavior. Note that similar intermittency behavior describes a wide range of physical systems and models. In particular the model describes a Lévy walk, which is an important stochastic model for anomalous diffusion describing dynamics of systems mentioned in the abstract [2, 16, 17]. The power law behavior of the sojourn times of the NCs can be explained based on simple physical models. For example random energy trapping models and random walks models [18] can be used to model such behavior, though currently it is not clear yet what is the physical mechanism behind the observed power law behavior [2, 9, 11].

In Fig. 1, ten typical simulated correlation functions




Figure 1: (a) A schematic representation of intensity blinking, note that we redefine t_n to be equal to T . (b) Ten numerically generated realizations of the correlation function $C_{TA}(t', T')$ versus $r = t'/T'$, for $\theta = 0.8$. The correlation functions exhibit non-ergodic behavior and are random, for ergodic processes all the ten time averaged correlation functions would follow the same master curve, namely the ensemble average correlation function.

are plotted, the most striking feature of the figure is that the correlation functions are random. These correlation functions are similar to those obtained in the experiment [5]. Mathematically, the question of non-ergodicity may be formulated in the following way. Since the process $I(t)$ is random the time average correlation function $C_{TA}(t', T')$ is random. For ergodic processes, and in the long measurement time limit, the distribution of $C_{TA}(t', T')$ is delta peaked and centered around the ensemble average correlation function. For non-ergodic processes the goal is to obtain the non-trivial limiting distributions of $C_{TA}(t', T')$ which differ from the narrowly peaked delta functions found for ergodic processes. In what follows we will denote $P_{C_{TA}(t', T')}(x)$ to be the PDF of $C_{TA}(t', T')$.

To start our analysis we rewrite the time average correlation function as

$$C_{TA}(t', T') = \frac{\sum_{i \text{ odd}}^n \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} I(t+t') dt}{T}, \quad (2)$$

where we used the initial condition that $I(t) = 1$ at time $t = 0$. Hence $I(t) = 1$ in $t_{i-1} < t < t_i$ when i is odd, otherwise it is zero. The summation in Eq. (2) is over odd i 's, and $t_n = T$, namely $n-1$ in Eq. (2) is the random number of transitions in the interval $[0, T]$. From Eq. (2) we see that the time averaged correlation function is a sum of the random variables

$$\int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} I(t+t') dt = \begin{cases} \tau_i - t' + \mathcal{I}_i t' & i \text{ odd } t_i - t_{i-1} > t' \\ \mathcal{I}_i \tau_i & i \text{ odd } t_i - t_{i-1} < t' \\ 0 & i \text{ even} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_i = \begin{cases} \frac{\int_{t_i}^{t_i+t'} I(t) dt}{t'} & \text{if } t_i - t_{i-1} > t' \\ \frac{\int_{t_{i-1}+t'}^{t_i+t'} I(t) dt}{\tau_i} & \text{if } t_i - t_{i-1} < t'. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

The \mathcal{I}_i 's are time averages of the signal $I(t)$ over periods of length t' or $\tau_i = t_i - t_{i-1}$. Using Eqs. (2,3) we find an exact expression for the correlation functions in terms of $\{\tau_i\}$ and $\{\mathcal{I}_i\}$

$$TC_{TA}(t', T') = \sum_{i \text{ odd}}^n \tau_i - \sum_{\substack{i \text{ odd} \\ \tau_i < t'}}^n (1 - \mathcal{I}_i) \tau_i - t' \sum_{\substack{i \text{ odd} \\ \tau_i > t'}}^n (1 - \mathcal{I}_i). \quad (5)$$

The first term on the right hand side of this equation is T^+ the total time spent in state *on* in the time interval $[0, T]$, in the remaining two terms we have considered sojourn times τ_i larger or smaller than t' separately.

We now illustrate the rich behaviors of the PDF $P_{C_{TA}(t', T')}(x)$ using numerical simulations, and later we consider the problem analytically. We generate random realization of the process using $\psi(\tau) = \theta \tau^{-1-\theta}$ for $\tau > 1$ and show two cases: $\theta = 0.3$ in Fig. 2 and $\theta = 0.8$ in Fig. 3. In both figures we vary $r \equiv t'/T'$. The diamonds are numerical results which agree very well with the theoretical curves, without any fitting. First consider the case $r = 0$ in Figs. 2,3. For $\theta = 0.3$ and $r = 0$ we see from Fig. 2 that the PDF $P_{C_{TA}(t', T')}(z)$ has a *U* shape. This is a strong non-ergodic behavior, since the PDF does not peak on the ensemble averaged value of the correlation function which is $1/2$ for this case. On the other hand, when $\theta = 0.8$ the PDF $P_{C_{TA}(t', T')}(z)$ has a *W* shape, a weak non ergodic behavior. To understand the origin of this type of transition note that as $\theta \rightarrow 0$ we expect the process to be in an *on* state or an *off* state for the whole duration of the measurement, hence in that case the PDF of the correlation function will peak on $C_{TA}(t', T') = 1$ and $C_{TA}(t', T') = 0$ (i.e *U* shape behavior). On the other hand when $\theta \rightarrow 1$ we expect a more ergodic behavior, since for $\theta = 1$ the mean *on* and *off* periods are finite, this manifests itself in a peak of the distribution function of $C_{TA}(t', T')$ on the ensemble average value of $1/2$ and a *W* shape PDF emerges. Note that for $\theta < 1$ there is still statistical weight for trajectories which are *on* or *off* for periods which are of the order of the measurement time T' , hence the distribution of $C_{TA}(0, T')$ attains its maximum on $C_{TA}(0, T') = 1$ and $C_{TA}(0, T') = 0$. For $r > 0$ we observe in both figures a non-symmetrical shape of the PDF of the correlation function, which will be explained later.

We first consider the non-ergodic properties of the correlation function for the case $t' = 0$. It is useful to define

$$\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]} = \int_a^b I(t) dt / (b - a), \quad (6)$$

the time average intensity between time a and time $b > a$. Using Eq. (5) and for $t' = 0$ the time averaged correlation




Figure 2: The PDF of $C_{TA}(t', T')$ for $\theta = 0.3$ and different values of $r = t'/T'$. The diamonds are numerical simulations and the curves are analytical expression obtained for: (a) $r = 0$, Eq. (8) solid curve, (b) $r = 0.01, 0.1$, Eq. (12) dashed curve, and (c) for $r = 0.5, 0.9, 0.99$, Eq. (15) solid curve. In the ergodic phase the PDF of $C_{TA}(t', T')$ would be peaked around the ensemble average correlation function, which for $r = 0$ falls on $1/2$ and for $t' \rightarrow \infty$ is on $1/4$ (for any $r \neq 0$). We see that any measurement is highly unlikely to yield the ensemble average when $\theta = 0.3$.

function is identical to the time average intensity

$$C_{TA}(0, T) = \mathcal{I}_{[0, T]} = \frac{T^+}{T}. \quad (7)$$

The random correlation function $C_{TA}(0, T)$ has a known asymptotic behavior in the limit $T \rightarrow \infty$, found originally by Lamperti [19] (see also [13]), this PDF is denoted with $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_{C_{TA}(0, T)}(x) = l_\theta(x)$, and

$$l_\theta(x) = \frac{\sin \pi \theta}{\pi} \frac{x^{\theta-1} (1-x)^{\theta-1}}{x^{2\theta} + (1-x)^{2\theta} + 2x^\theta (1-x)^\theta \cos \pi \theta}, \quad (8)$$

for $0 \leq x \leq 1$. The transition between the U shape behavior and the W shape behavior happens at $\theta_c = 0.5946\dots$. The Lamperti PDF is shown in Figs. 2 and 3 for the case $r = 0$, together with the numerical results.

We now consider an analytical approach for the case $t' \ll T$. The behavior of $P_{C_{TA}(t', T)}(x)$ for $t' \neq 0$ is non-trivial, because the \mathcal{I}_i 's in Eq. (5) depend statistically on the random variables τ_i . To treat the problem we use a non-ergodic mean field approximation. We noticed already that \mathcal{I}_i defined in Eq. (4) are short time averages of the intensity, hence using mean field theory approach we replace the \mathcal{I}_i in Eq. (5) with the *time* average intensity $\mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}$, *specific for a given realization*. Replacing \mathcal{I}_i with the *ensemble* average intensity is not appropriate. Hence within mean field

$$TC_{TA}(t', T') = \mathcal{I}_{[0, T]} T - (1 - \mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}) (t' N^+ + \sum_{\substack{i \text{ odd} \\ \tau_i < t'}}^n \tau_i) \quad (9)$$

where N^+ is number of odd (i.e. *on*) intervals satisfying $\tau_i > t'$ and $i \leq n$.

We now investigate the distribution of $C_{TA}(t', T')$ using the approximation Eq. (9), leaving certain details of our derivation to a longer publication. First we replace N^+ with its scaling form. Let $P(\tau > t') = \int_{t'}^{\infty} \psi(\tau) d\tau$ be the probability of τ being larger than t' , we have $N^+ \simeq KP(\tau > t')T^+ / \int_0^{T^+} \tau \psi(\tau) d\tau$, where K is a constant of order 1, and $T^+ / \int_0^{T^+} \tau \psi(\tau) d\tau$ is total number of jumps in time interval T^+ . A more refined treatment yields

$$N^+ \simeq \frac{\sin \pi \theta}{\pi \theta} \left[\left(\frac{T^+}{t'} \right)^\theta - 1 \right], \quad (10)$$

which is valid for $T^+/t' > 1$. Similar scaling arguments are used for the sum in Eq. (9) which lead to

$$\sum_{\substack{i \text{ odd}, \tau_i < t'}}^n \tau_i \simeq (T^+)^\theta (t')^{1-\theta}, \quad (11)$$

an approximation which is valid for $t' < T^+$. For $t' > T^+$, $N^+ = 0$ and $\sum_{i \text{ odd}, \tau_i < t'}^n \tau_i = T^+$. In summary and after some rearrangements we obtain

$$C_{TA}(t', T') \simeq \begin{cases} \mathcal{I}_{[0, T]} \left\{ 1 - (1 - \mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}) \left[\left(\frac{r}{(1-r)\mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}} \right)^{1-\theta} \left(\frac{\sin \pi \theta}{\pi \theta} + 1 \right) - \frac{\sin \pi \theta}{\pi \theta} \frac{r}{(1-r)\mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}} \right] \right\} & t' < T^+ \\ \mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}^2 & t' > T^+ \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Eq. (12) yields the correlation function, however unlike standard ergodic theories the correlation function here is a random function since it depends on $\mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}$. The distribution of $C_{TA}(t', T')$ is now easy to find using the chain

rule, and Eqs. (7, 8, 12). In Figs. 2, 3 we plot the PDF of $C_{TA}(t', T')$ (dashed curves) together with numerical simulations (diamonds) and find excellent agreement between theory and simulation, for the cases where our ap-




Figure 3: Same as Fig. 2 however now $\theta = 0.8$. If compared with the case $\theta = 0.3$, the distribution function exhibits a weaker non-ergodic behavior, namely for $r = 0$ the distribution function peaks on the ensemble average value of $1/2$.

proximations are expected to hold $r < 1/2$. We observe that unlike the $r = 0$ case the PDF of the correlation function exhibit a non-symmetrical shape. To understand this note that trajectories with short but finite total time in state *on* ($T^+ \ll T$) will have finite correlation

functions when $t' = 0$. However when t' is increased the corresponding correlation functions will typically decay very fast to zero. On the other hand, correlation functions of trajectories with $T^+ \sim T$ don't change much when t' is increased (as long as $t' \ll T^+$). This leads to the gradual nonuniform shift to the left, and “absorption” into $C_{TA}(t', T') = 0$, of the Lamperti distribution shape, and hence to non-symmetrical shape of the PDFs of correlation function, in general, whenever $r \neq 0$.

Finally, we turn to the case $T \ll t'$. Since t' is large we use a decoupling approximation and write Eq. (1) as

$$C_{TA}(t', T') \simeq \mathcal{I}_{[0, T]} \mathcal{I}_{[t', T']}. \quad (13)$$

We distinguish between two types of trajectories, those in which no transition event occurs in the time interval $[T, T']$ and all other trajectories. Let $P_0(a, b)$ be the probability of making no transition between time a and time b , also called the persistence probability [13],

$$P_0(a, b) \sim \frac{\sin \pi \theta}{\pi} \int_0^{a/b} x^{\theta-1} (1-x)^{-\theta} dx \quad (14)$$

in the scaling limit. Using the Lamperti distribution for $\mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}$, and probabilistic arguments with details left to the Appendix, we find the PDF of $C_{TA}(t', T')$

$$P_{C_{TA}(t', T')}(z) \simeq [1 - P_0(T, T')] \left\{ [1 - P_0(t', T')] \int_z^1 \frac{l_\theta(x)}{x} dx + \frac{P_0(t', T')}{2} [l_\theta(z) + \delta(z)] \right\} + P_0(T, T') \left[z l_\theta(z) + \frac{\delta(z)}{2} \right]. \quad (15)$$

Note that to derive Eq. (15) we used the fact that $\mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{[t', T']}$ are correlated. In Figs. 2,3 we plot these PDFs of $C_{TA}(t', T')$ (solid curves) together with numerical simulations (diamonds) and find good agreement between theory and simulation, for the cases where these approximations are expected to hold, $r > 1/2$. In the limit $t'/T' \rightarrow 1$ Eq. (15) simplifies to

$$P_{C_{TA}(t', T')}(z) \sim [l_\theta(z) + \delta(z)]/2, \quad (16)$$

a result which is easily understood if one realizes that in this limit $\mathcal{I}_{[t', T']}$ in Eq. (13) is either 0 or 1 with probabilities $1/2$, and that the PDF of $\mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}$ is Lamperti's PDF Eq. (8).

To summarize, our work classifies the nonergodic properties of photoemission intensity signal from NCs, and more generally Lévy walks, and yields an analytical tool

for the investigation of the nonergodic correlation functions.

This work was supported by National Science Foundation award CHE-0344930.

Appendix A: DERIVATION OF EQ.(15)

To calculate the PDF of $C_{TA}(t', T')$ in Eq.(13) we use two steps: (i) calculate the PDF of $\mathcal{I}_{[t', T']}$ which statistically depends on $\mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}$ and then (ii) using the distribution of $\mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}$, which is the Lamperti's PDF Eq.(8), calculate the PDF of $C_{TA}(t', T')$.

Using the persistence probability, we approximate the conditional PDF of $\mathcal{I}_{[t', T']}$ for a given $\mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}$ in the case $T \ll t'$ by

$$f_{\mathcal{I}_{[t', T]}}(z | \mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}) \simeq [1 - P_0(T, T')] Q_{\mathcal{I}_{[t', T]}}(z) + P_0(T, T') [\mathcal{I}_{[0, T]} \delta(z-1) + (1 - \mathcal{I}_{[0, T]}) \delta(z)], \quad (A1)$$

where $Q_{\mathcal{I}_{[t', T]}}(z)$ is the PDF of $\mathcal{I}_{[t', T]}$ conditioned that at least one transition occurs in $[T, T']$. In Eq. (A1) we

introduced the correlation between $\mathcal{I}_{[t',T']}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{[0,T]}$ through the dependence of the right hand side of the equation on $\mathcal{I}_{[0,T]}$. We assumed that in the case of no transitions in the time interval $[T, T']$, the probability of the interval $[t', T']$ to be all the time either *on* or *off* (the only possible choices) is linearly proportional to the value of $\mathcal{I}_{[0,T]}$.

The persistence probability controls also the behavior of

$$Q_{\mathcal{I}_{[t',T]}}(z) \simeq [1 - P_0(t', T')] \Theta(0 < z < 1) + P_0(t', T') \frac{\delta(z) + \delta(z - 1)}{2}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Briefly, we assumed that if a transition occurs in the interval $[t', T']$ the distribution of $\mathcal{I}_{[t',T]}$ is uniform [i.e., $\Theta(0 < z < 1) = 1$ if the condition in the parenthesis is correct]. This is a crude approximation which is, however, reasonable for our purposes (however when θ approaches 1, this approximation does not work). The delta functions in Eq.(A2) arise from two types of trajectories: If no transition occurs either $\mathcal{I}_{[t',T]} = 1$ (state *on*) or $\mathcal{I}_{[t',T]} = 0$ (state *off*) with equal probability.

Based on Eq.(13), the PDF of $C_{TA}(t', T')$ is

$$P_{C_{TA}(t', T')}(z) \approx \int_0^1 \ell_\theta(x) f_{\mathcal{I}_{[t',T]}}\left(\frac{z}{x} \middle| x\right) \frac{dx}{x}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where we use the observation that $\mathcal{I}_{[0,T]}$ is distributed according to Lamperti distribution Eq.(8). Finally, from Eqs. (A1,A2,A3) we obtain Eq.(15).

-
- [1] R. Verberk, and M. Orrit, *J. Chem. Phys.* **119** 2214 (2003).
 - [2] G. Margolin, E. Barkai, *J. Chem. Phys.* accepted. And cond-mat/0403090 (2004).
 - [3] L. Mandel, and E. Wolf, *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics* Cambridge University Press 1995, New York.
 - [4] E. Barkai, Y. Jung, and R. Silbey *Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **55** 457 (2004).
 - [5] G. Messin, J. P. Hermier, E. Giacobino, P. Desbiolles and M. Dahan, *Optics Letters* **26** 1891 (2001).
 - [6] X. Brokmann, J. P. Hermier, G. Messin, P. Desbiolles, J.-P. Bouchaud, and M. Dahan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** 120601 (2003).
 - [7] M. Nirmal, B. O. Dabbousi, M. G. Bawendi, J. J. Macklin, J. K. Trautman, T. D. Harris, L. E. Brus *Nature* **383** 802 (1996).
 - [8] M. Kuno, D. P. Fromm, H. F. Hamann, A. Gallagher and D. J. Nesbitt, *J. Chem. Phys.* **112** 3117 (2000).
 - [9] K. T. Shimizu, R. G. Neuhauser, C. A. Leatherdale, S. A. Empedocles, W. K. Woo and M. G. Bawendi, *Phys. Rev. B* **63** 205316 (2001).
 - [10] J. P. Bouchaud, *J. Phys. I France* **2** 1705 (1992).
 - [11] R. Verberk, A. M. Oijen, and M. Orrit, *Phys. Rev. B* **66** 233202 (2002).
 - [12] M. Pelton, D. G. Grier and P. Guyot-Sionnest, *arXiv:cond-mat/0404589*.
 - [13] C. Godrèche and J. M. Luck, *J. Stat. Phys.* **104** 489 (2001).
 - [14] A. Baldassarri, J. P. Bouchaud, I. Dornic, and C. Godrèche *Phys. Rev. E* **59** R20 (1999).
 - [15] G. Aquino, L. Palatella and P. Grigolini, *arXiv:cond-mat/0406138*.
 - [16] Y. Jung, E. Barkai, and R. Silbey, *Chem. Phys.* **284**, 181 (2002).
 - [17] J. Klafter, M. F. Shlesinger, and G. Zumofen, *Phys. Today* **49** 33 (1996).
 - [18] A charge carrier ejected from the NC into the matrix may turn the NC *off* and if it executes an unbiased random walk, under certain conditions the *off* and *on* times statistics will follow $\psi(\tau) \propto \tau^{-3/2}$, i.e., $\theta = 1/2$ [2].
 - [19] J. Lamperti, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **88** 380 (1958).