

Collective nuclear excitation dynamics in mono-modal x-ray waveguides

Leon M. Lohse,^{1,2,*} Petar Andrejić,³ Sven Velten,² Malte Vassholz,¹ Charlotte Neuhaus,¹ Ankita Negi,² Anjali Panchwane,² Ilya Sergeev,² Adriana Pálffy,⁴ Tim Salditt,¹ and Ralf Röhlsberger^{5,6,7,2}

¹*Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, 37077 Göttingen, Germany*

²*Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, 22607 Hamburg, Germany*

³*Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, 91058 Erlangen, Germany*

⁴*Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, 97074 Würzburg, Germany*

⁵*Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena, 07743 Jena, Germany*

⁶*Helmholtz-Institut Jena, 07743 Jena, Germany*

⁷*GSI Helmholtzzentrum für Schwerionenforschung GmbH, 64291 Darmstadt, Germany*

(Dated: March 12, 2024)

Ensembles of identical atoms exhibit peculiar collective properties in their interaction with radiation depending on geometry and environment where they are embedded in. A remarkably clean and versatile platform to study collective effects in resonant light scattering are Mössbauer nuclei placed in planar x-ray waveguides. Here we conceive and demonstrate experimentally distinct temporal emission characteristics in these systems, ranging from a tunable accelerated exponential decay all the way to a pronounced oscillatory emission pattern, depending on the waveguide geometry and mode of excitation. The observed temporal and spatial emission characteristics of the collectively excited nuclear state in the waveguide – the nuclear exciton – are well reproduced by a unified theoretical model. Our findings pave the way for applications ranging from fundamental studies of cooperative emission at hard x-ray frequencies up to new methods of narrowband x-ray control via the engineering of collective radiation patterns.

Ensembles of excited identical two-level atoms exhibit a collective dynamics during their spontaneous decay that is fundamentally different from that of the constituent individual atoms [1]. Collective effects such as directed emission [2, 3], collective frequency shifts, superradiant decay [4], and collective oscillations emerge already in the regime of weak excitation from as little as a single photon [5]. They have been observed over a large range of platforms, from one-dimensional chains of atoms coupled to optical waveguides [6–10] to Mössbauer nuclei driven by hard x-rays [11–17]. In spatially extended ensembles, the geometry and spatial distribution distinctively affects the dynamics [18, 19].

A well-suited platform to observe and harness collective effects are ensembles of Mössbauer isotopes in solid state systems, where nuclear transitions resonant to hard x-ray frequencies have extremely narrow linewidths [20], making exceptionally clean quantum-optical systems [21, 22]. X-ray pulses produced by synchrotron or x-ray free electron laser light sources are several orders of magnitude shorter than the natural life time of the excited states. Thus, excitation and decay can be considered as separate processes and the collective excitation of the nuclear ensemble, the “nuclear exciton” [11, 12], evolves freely after impulsive excitation.

The temporal evolution of the nuclear exciton distinctively depends on the geometrical shape of the nuclear ensemble and its environment. In a thick slab or foil illuminated in normal incidence, it radiates so-called dynamical beats (DB) in forward direction [13, 23] – also known as nuclear forward scattering (NFS). On the other hand, as a thin film embedded in an x-ray waveguide (WG) and excited in grazing-incidence (GI) illumination

it decays exponentially and emits into the direction of specular reflection – which we call reflection geometry – with superradiant speedup and a shifted resonance frequency compared to the single atom [15]. Combining multiple such films in stacked WGs, the exciton has even been observed to oscillate between them [16]. Both scattering geometries have been studied extensively, yet their “overlap”, bounded WGs, still remain elusive.

In this Letter, we investigate the dynamical evolution of the nuclear exciton of an ultrathin layer of ⁵⁷Fe embedded in an x-ray WG. We present two experiments, in which we excite the sample either in front-coupling (FC) geometry [Fig. 1(a)] [24] or in GI geometry [Fig. 1(b)] [25] and observe the photons that have been emitted into resonant modes of the WG leaving its back end. Depending on the mode of excitation, the exciton either exhibits the same dynamical beats as in NFS [Fig. 1(a) right] or decays exponentially with superradiant speedup [Fig. 1(b) right]. The back (and front) boundaries of the WG break spatial translational symmetry and demand an interpretation different from models established so far [26–28] for the reflection geometry. Our observations can be well modelled by applying a recently introduced approach based on a real-space Green’s function formalism [29]. We obtain a one-dimensional equation of motion that governs both geometries in terms of a few palpable coefficients, which can be solved analytically. It provides a natural and quantitative interpretation of the nuclear exciton dynamics in both geometries in a unified *waveguide* picture (including the spatial propagation).

Hard x-rays are an extreme regime for waveguiding. In the energy regime above 10 keV, refractive indices of matter are written as $n = 1 - \delta + i\beta$, where $\delta, \beta < 10^{-5}$.




FIG. 1. A short excitation pulse (blue) couples into a planar WG and creates a nuclear exciton in the ^{57}Fe layer (red) that radiatively decays (green). (a) FC excitation creates an exciton that emits pronounced temporal beatings. (b) GI excitation of a *long* WG: the exciton decays exponentially. Superradiant speedup and shifted resonance, compared to the natural exponential decay with rate γ (dotted green line), depend on the incidence angle θ_{in} .

X-ray waveguiding manifests when lighter core materials are surrounded by denser cladding materials. Because of the small contrasts in n , x-ray WGs are weakly guiding (modes typically extend over a few 100 wavelengths in the transversal direction) and cause significant photoelectric absorption in the dense cladding. Consequently, the Purcell enhancement is negligible and coupling to guided – or more generally resonant – modes is small [30]. However, dense cladding strongly attenuates everything but the lowest few resonant modes [31], so that fields generated by emitters in the WG can be asymptotically approximated by only their resonant components [30].

We have prepared two planar x-ray WGs, both containing a few-atomic-layers-thin iron film, to 95% enriched in ^{57}Fe , in the center of its guiding layer (see Supplemental Material [32]). The ^{57}Fe does not develop long-range magnetic order in this thin film and hence exhibits essentially a single resonance line. The experiments were performed at the dynamics beamline P01 at PETRA III (DESY, Hamburg). The samples were illuminated by 100 ps-long synchrotron pulses at a repetition period of 192 ns, creating nuclear excitons. The photons leaving the WG at its back end were detected with a stack of avalanche photo diodes (APDs). By temporal gating, the (delayed) temporal emissions of the nuclear exciton are detected independently from the (prompt) synchrotron pulse.

First, we have prepared a layer system optimized for FC excitation, consisting of a 0.6 nm-thin layer of ^{57}Fe , embedded in a planar x-ray WG with 20 nm B_4C core, and symmetric 30 nm-thick Mo cladding as sketched in Fig. 2(a). The layer structure was deposited onto a 1 mm-thick Ge wafer and capped with a second Ge wafer after




FIG. 2. Layer design and experimental data for FC excitation. (a) Transversal mode profiles $u_m(z)$ of the 2 guided modes supported by the WG. (b) Experimentally observed emissions as a function of delay t for different WG lengths L (colored points). The intensities are normalized and vertically shifted. The dashed lines show simulations of NFS through ^{57}Fe -foils, using parameters (including foil thickness L_{foil}) that were estimated from the experimental data. (c) Extracted foil thickness and resonant optical depth L_{foil}/Λ_{res} for different L (colors indicate 2 independent measurements).

deposition as detailed in Ref. [33]. The synchrotron beam was focussed with two elliptical mirrors in Kirkpatrick-Baez geometry to a spot of about $7 \mu\text{m}$ diameter into the WG entrance at the focal position. The Ge wafers were used to absorb the tails of the focus to reduce background signal, but they do not affect the resonant mode structure due to the thick cladding [34]. The wafer sandwich was cut to triangular shape, allowing us to change the effective WG length L by translating it along y transversal to the beam (see Supplemental Material [32]). The WG length was calibrated by measuring the absorption in the wafer as a function of y -translation. Figure 2(b) shows the temporal evolution of the emitted x-rays for several WG lengths up to 2 mm (limited by off-resonant absorption). The emissions clearly exhibit dynamical beats resembling those known from NFS through a single line resonant absorber *foil*. The dashed lines show simulations of NFS through a thick foil of enriched ^{57}Fe including slight inhomogeneous hyperfine-splitting in the order of 6 natural linewidths, in a 4-parameter model (see Supplemental Material [32]), which accurately describes the data. The optimal parameters were found using a maximum-likelihood estimation assuming Poisson statistics. The

magnitude of hyperfine splitting is expected from similar amorphous thin films [15, 35]. The extracted optical depth and effective foil thickness [Fig. 2(c)] is strictly proportional to the WG length L .




FIG. 3. Off-resonant intensity of the GI sample, illuminated at an incidence angle of θ_{in} and recorded 3 m downstream of the sample with a pixel detector. Vertical cuts correspond to observed far-field patterns. The 4 resonant modes, which are supported by the layer structure, are clearly visible in the region between the primary beam ($\theta_{\text{in}} + \theta_{\text{out}} = 0$) and the specularly reflected beam ($\theta_{\text{out}} = \theta_{\text{in}}$). The modes are well separated in θ_{in} .

For the second experiment, we have prepared a layer system optimized for GI excitation [Fig. 1(b)], having a 40 nm-thick B_4C core and, in contrast to the FC experiment, a top Mo cladding layer of only 8 nm to allow incident light to evanescently couple into the WG. We used a 10 mm long Si wafer as substrate, so that the WG is significantly longer than the attenuation length of the resonant modes and thus has effectively infinite extent. The back end of the sample was broken off post deposition to provide a clean exit face. The sample was placed onto an eulerian cradle allowing to tune the incidence angle θ_{in} . Figure 3 shows the off-resonant far-field intensity distribution, detected 3 m downstream of the sample by a time-insensitive pixel detector as a function of θ_{in} . We then aligned the APDs with the WG exit [$\theta_{\text{out}} \approx 0^\circ$, see Fig. 1(b)] and collected the emitted photons for several values of θ_{in} in the vicinity of the third resonance $\theta_3 = 0.203^\circ$. We selected the 3rd mode for practical reasons, because the divergence of the incident beam was 0.002° , which is wider than the resonance of the 1st mode. Figure 4(a) shows the emitted intensity as a function of time for three different θ_{in} . The intensity exhibits an initial superradiant decay and a slow-down for longer delays, which is caused by a residual small hyperfine splitting of the nuclear levels. The initial decay is plotted in panel (b), showing a decay rate of 30γ at θ_3 , which gradually diminishes as θ_{in} moves away from resonance. The red curve shows a simulation in reflection geometry [32] that considers divergence of the incoming beam and hyperfine splitting of the transitions

(red). The hyperfine parameters for the simulation were extracted from measurements at $\theta_{\text{in}} = 0.5^\circ$, far from the WG modes, and are consistent with the FC experiment [32].




FIG. 4. Experimentally measured emissions of the nuclear exciton in GI excitation. (a) Decay pattern for 3 angles in the vicinity of the 3rd resonant mode and initial exponential decay (black dashed line). (b) Initial decay rate as a function of angle detuning: extracted from the experimental data (black diamonds); calculated with the simple model (6) (purple dashed line); simulation including small hyperfine splitting of the transition energies as well as the angular divergence of the experiment (red line).

To qualitatively model the experimental observations, we employ the theory developed in Ref. [29] (see Supplemental Material [32]) based on macroscopic quantum electrodynamics, which describes the atom-light interaction using the classical electromagnetic Green’s function. Here, we neglect the nearly degenerate sublevels of the ground ($I_g = 1/2$) and excited ($I_e = 3/2$) state of ^{57}Fe ($\hbar\omega_0 = 14.4$ keV, $\hbar\gamma = 4.7$ neV, M1-transition) and describe the nuclear state by a single nuclear transition operator for each atom $\hat{\sigma}_{ge}^i = |g\rangle\langle e|$. The excitation pulses have very small pulse areas so that the nuclear populations are close to the ground state ($\langle\langle\hat{\sigma}_{ee}^i\rangle\rangle \approx 0$) and the response is linear. The expectation values of the transition operators $\sigma_{ge}^i := \langle\langle\hat{\sigma}_{ge}^i\rangle\rangle$ evolve, in the rotating frame of the nuclear transition frequency ω_0 , according to [6]

$$-i\omega\sigma_{ge}^i(\omega) = -\frac{\gamma}{2}\sigma_{ge}^i(\omega) + i\Omega(\mathbf{r}_i, \omega) + i\sum_{j\neq i}g_{ij}(\omega)\sigma_{ge}^j(\omega), \quad (1)$$

where $\Omega(\mathbf{r}, t) = \mathbf{m}^* \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{r}, t)/\hbar$ is the propagating excitation pulse expressed as a Rabi frequency and \mathbf{m} the magnetic dipole moment. The total single-atom spontaneous decay rate γ includes self-interaction and is approximately equal to its value in a homogeneous environment (negligible Purcell factor). Note that \mathbf{B}_{in} is the *free* incident magnetic field and “scattering” from the nuclei is fully accounted for by the coupling coefficients g_{ij} . The

coupling is mediated by the WG environment via

$$g_{ij}(\omega) = \frac{\mu_0 k_0^2}{\hbar} \mathbf{m}^* \cdot \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{G}}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, \omega_0 + \omega) \cdot \mathbf{m}, \quad (2)$$

where μ_0 is the vacuum permeability and $\overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{G}}_{\mathbf{m}}$ the Green's function for the magnetic field in the WG (see Supplemental Material [32]).

We convert (1) into a one-dimensional *macroscopic* equation. To that end, we assume homogeneously distributed nuclei in a single thin layer, insert the analytic expression for the Green's function, and assume interaction via a *single* resonant mode. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\sigma}_{ge}(x, t) &= -\frac{\gamma}{2}\sigma_{ge}(x, t) + i\Omega(x, t) \\ &- \frac{\zeta_m \gamma}{4\Lambda_{\text{res}}} \int_{-L}^0 dx' e^{ik_0 \nu_m |x-x'|} \sigma_{ge}(x', t - |x-x'| \nu_m / c). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here, Λ_{res} (47 nm for ^{57}Fe) is the on-resonance attenuation length; ν_m is the complex effective refractive index of the mode, and ζ_m the dimensionless coupling-coefficient of the WG mode. The latter effectively rescales Λ_{res} and is given by $\zeta_m = du_m(z_0)^2$, where d and z_0 are thickness and position of the ^{57}Fe -layer, respectively and $u_m(z)$ is the complex transversal mode profile, described in Ref. [30], which is bi-normalized to $\int [u_m(z)]^2 dz = 1$. The field produced by the exciton is obtained from the oscillating magnetization, $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{m} \rho \sigma_{ge} \exp(-i\omega_0 t) + \text{h.c.}$. Note that (3) not only describes planar WGs (after integrating out y) as discussed here, but also 1d channel WGs, and furthermore homogeneous slabs (foils) with translational symmetry in y - z [36], with different values for ν_m ($= n$ for slab) and ζ_m ($= 1$ for slab).

Equation (1) is often treated as an eigenvalue problem, decomposing σ_{ge} into radiative eigenmodes [6, 18, 19]. Instead, we employ a *forward-scattering approximation* (FSA) that allows us to solve (3) analytically for the two experimental settings sketched in Fig. 1. The rapidly oscillating phase factor in (3) strongly suppresses the back-scattered field [29]. Hence, we change the upper limit of integration in (3) to x .

In the FC geometry [Fig. 1(a)], the only surviving component of the excitation pulse is the fundamental guided mode, so that $\Omega(x, t) = \Omega_0 \exp(ik_0 \nu_m x) \Pi(t_{\text{ret}})$, with some slowly varying envelope $\Pi(t)$ where $t_{\text{ret}} = t - k_0 \nu_m x / c$. Note that the excitation pulse decays with x , as $\text{Im}\{\nu_m\} > 0$. For finite L , (3) becomes a Volterra integral equation due to the FSA and hence has *no* radiative eigenmodes. Its exact analytical solution for the given $\Omega(x, t)$ is

$$\sigma_{ge}(x, t) = iA e^{ik_0 \nu_m x - \gamma t_{\text{ret}}/2} J_0 \left[\sqrt{\gamma t_{\text{ret}} x \zeta_m \Lambda_{\text{res}}^{-1}} \right], \quad (4)$$

for $t_{\text{ret}} \geq 0$, where J_0 is a Bessel function of the first kind and $A = \Omega_0 \int \Pi(t) dt$ the pulse area. This is the well

known solution for NFS [23] with Λ_{res} rescaled by ζ_m . The exciton emits directionally and purely into the WG mode (see Supplemental Material [32]). The emission undergoes the dynamical beats, well known from coherent pulse propagation through resonant media [13, 37] – and clearly observed in our experiment. From the experimental data, we obtain an estimate for the coupling coefficient $|\zeta_m| = L_{\text{foil}}/L \approx 0.029$, slightly smaller than the theoretical value (from design parameters) of 0.038.

In the GI geometry [Fig. 1(b)], the incidence angle θ_{in} fixes the in-plane wavevector to $k_{\text{in}} = k_0 \cos \theta_{\text{in}}$. The excitation pulse can be written as $\Omega(x, t) = \Omega_0 \exp(ik_{\text{in}} x) \Pi(t_{\text{ret}})$, with here $t_{\text{ret}} = t - k_{\text{in}} x / \omega_0$. Assuming that L is significantly larger than the off-resonance attenuation length of the mode, $\Lambda_m = (2k_0 \text{Im}\{\nu_m\})^{-1}$, (typically a few 100 μm) we can extend the lower boundary of integration in (3) to $-\infty$. This eliminates the boundary effect in the forward direction. The linear spatial phase in $\Omega(x, t)$ corresponds to a radiative eigenmode of the exciton, so that the exciton evolves harmonically with shifted frequency and enhanced decay. We obtain (see Supplemental Material [32])

$$\sigma_{ge}(x, t) = iA \exp \left[ik_0 x \cos \theta_{\text{in}} - \left(\frac{\gamma}{2} - i\eta \right) t_{\text{ret}} \right], \quad (5)$$

$$\eta(\theta_{\text{in}}) = \frac{\zeta_m \Lambda_m}{\Lambda_{\text{res}}} \frac{1}{2\Lambda_m q\theta - i\frac{\gamma}{2}}, \quad (6)$$

with $q\theta = k_0 \cos \theta_{\text{in}} - k_0 \text{Re}\{\nu_m\} \approx -k_0(\theta_{\text{in}} - \theta_m) \sin \theta_m$ and pulse area A as previously defined. The mode angle is defined via $\cos \theta_m = \text{Re}\{\nu_m\}$. The exciton decays superradiantly with peak speedup of $1 + \zeta_m \Lambda_m / \Lambda_{\text{res}}$ depending on ratio between off- and on-resonant attenuation lengths, as well as the mode coupling coefficient ζ_m . Note that $\Lambda_m / \Lambda_{\text{res}} = \rho \Lambda_m \sigma_{\text{res}}$ (σ_{res} : resonant cross section, ρ : number density of nuclei) gives the number of nuclei within the off-resonant absorption length (compare Ref. [22]), clearly demonstrating the collective superradiant nature of the speedup, contrasting earlier interpretations based on an increase of the photon density of states [14]. Figure 4(b) shows the speedup from calculations with (6) using the design parameters as well as from the experimental data. This simple mono-modal model already explains the observed peak speedup. It does not fully account for the increased angular resonance width, which can be attributed to the residual hyperfine splitting and angular divergence observed in the experiment [32]. Thus, we see that (3) qualitatively reproduces both experiments.

In summary, we have investigated the evolution of nuclear excitons in x-ray WGs for two different modes of excitation. In the FC geometry, we have observed dynamical beats emitted by WGs with a 20 nm-thick guiding core and varying lengths from about 0.1 mm to 2 mm into the fundamental WG mode. In the GI geometry, we have observed exponential decay into the resonantly excited WG mode with tuneable superradiant speedup. Our the-

ory consistently describes the observations of both experiments in a one-dimensional waveguide picture. When a single mode dominates, the equation of motion is formally identical to that of a homogeneous slab with length (foil thickness) rescaled by a nucleus-mode coupling constant ζ_m . Depending on the *off-resonant* optical thickness of the WG, two regimes are realized. For optically thin WGs, the sharp jump in nuclear density at the WG entrance gives rise to dynamical beats. The grazing incidence geometry allows to study optically thick WGs, where off-resonant absorption suppresses the boundary effect and the exciton evolves harmonically with resonant dispersion relation.

Going beyond the single-mode WGs discussed here will enable to observe a wider range of phenomena. The front coupling geometry in particular can support multiple guiding modes, which can be used to implement effective two-beam control techniques for the x-ray frequency regime, and opens the door for a vast possibility of new methods of narrowband x-ray control via the engineering of collective radiation patterns with extreme transversal coherence. Exploiting interference between two resonant modes in a longitudinally microstructured layer, a phenomenon similar to selective sub-radiance is predicted [29]. Even a gravitational sensor has been proposed that uses similar WG structures and the nuclear resonance of scandium [38]. Thus, Mössbauer nuclei in x-ray WGs are a viable platform to study the collective interaction of localized two-level systems with photons propagating in a one-dimensional WG, realizing the low-saturation regime with a very high number of emitters, and allowing to control the temporal evolution of the collective decay via the excitation and coupling geometry.

Warm thanks go to Mike Kanbach for preparing the WG assemblies, to Olaf Leupold for his support and fruitful discussions during the first beamtime, and to Dieter Lott and Helmholtz-Zentrum Hereon for providing and supporting the reflectometer to calibrate the thin film samples. We acknowledge DESY (Hamburg, Germany), a member of the Helmholtz Association HGF, for the provision of experimental facilities. Beamtime was allocated for proposals I-20211677; I-20221193. We acknowledge partial funding by Max Planck School of Photonics; Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) (432680300 SFB 1456/C03, 429529648 TRR 306/C04, 390858490 EXC 2147). A. Pálffy acknowledges support from the DFG in the framework of the Heisenberg Program. LML, MV, TS, and RR are part of the Max Planck School of Photonics.

* llohse@uni-goettingen.de

[1] R. H. Dicke, Coherence in spontaneous radiation processes, *Physical Review* **93**, 99 (1954).

- [2] M. O. Scully, E. S. Fry, C. H. R. Ooi, and K. Wódkiewicz, Directed spontaneous emission from an extended ensemble of n atoms: Timing is everything, *Physical Review Letters* **96**, 010501 (2006).
- [3] J. H. Eberly, Emission of one photon in an electric dipole transition of one among N atoms, *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics* **39**, S599 (2006).
- [4] M. O. Scully, Collective lamb shift in single photon dicke superradiance, *Physical Review Letters* **102**, 143601 (2009).
- [5] M. O. Scully and A. A. Svidzinsky, The super of super-radiance, *Science* **325**, 1510 (2009).
- [6] A. Asenjo-Garcia, J. D. Hood, D. E. Chang, and H. J. Kimble, Atom-light interactions in quasi-one-dimensional nanostructures: A green's-function perspective, *Physical Review A* **95**, 033818 (2017).
- [7] J. Kumlin, K. Kleinbeck, N. Stiesdal, H. Busche, S. Hofferberth, and H. P. Büchler, Nonexponential decay of a collective excitation in an atomic ensemble coupled to a one-dimensional waveguide, *Physical Review A* **102**, 063703 (2020).
- [8] R. Pennetta, M. Blaha, A. Johnson, D. Lechner, P. Schneeweiss, J. Volz, and A. Rauschenbeutel, Collective radiative dynamics of an ensemble of cold atoms coupled to an optical waveguide, *Physical Review Letters* **128**, 073601 (2022).
- [9] S. Cardenas-Lopez, P. Solano, L. A. Orozco, and A. Asenjo-Garcia, Optical precursors in waveguide quantum electrodynamics, *Physical Review Research* **5**, 013133 (2023).
- [10] D. Su, Y. Jiang, S. Cardenas-Lopez, A. Asenjo-Garcia, P. Solano, L. A. Orozco, and Y. Zhao, Dynamical beats of short pulses in waveguide qed (2023), arXiv:2304.09277 [quant-ph].
- [11] J. P. Hannon and G. T. Trammell, Coherent γ -ray optics, *Hyperfine Interactions* **123/124**, 127 (1999).
- [12] G. V. Smirnov, General properties of nuclear resonant scattering, *Hyperfine Interactions* **123/124**, 31 (1999).
- [13] U. van Bürck, Coherent pulse propagation through resonant media, *Hyperfine Interactions* **123/124**, 483 (1999).
- [14] R. Röhlberger, K. Schlage, T. Klein, and O. Leupold, Accelerating the spontaneous emission of x rays from atoms in a cavity, *Physical Review Letters* **95**, 10.1103/physrevlett.95.097601 (2005).
- [15] R. Röhlberger, K. Schlage, B. Sahoo, S. Couet, and R. Ruffer, Collective lamb shift in single-photon superradiance, *Science* **328**, 1248 (2010).
- [16] J. Haber, X. Kong, C. Strohm, S. Willing, J. Gollwitzer, L. Bocklage, R. Ruffer, A. Pálffy, and R. Röhlberger, Rabi oscillations of x-ray radiation between two nuclear ensembles, *Nature Photonics* **11**, 720 (2017).
- [17] A. I. Chumakov, A. Q. R. Baron, I. Sergueev, C. Strohm, O. Leupold, Y. Shvyd'ko, G. V. Smirnov, R. Ruffer, Y. Inubushi, M. Yabashi, K. Tono, T. Kudo, and T. Ishikawa, Superradiance of an ensemble of nuclei excited by a free electron laser, *Nature Physics* **14**, 261 (2017).
- [18] A. A. Svidzinsky, J.-T. Chang, and M. O. Scully, Cooperative spontaneous emission of n atoms: Many-body eigenstates, the effect of virtual lamb shift processes, and analogy with radiation of N classical oscillators, *Physical Review A* **81**, 053821 (2010).
- [19] J. T. Manassah, Cooperative radiation from atoms in different geometries: decay rate and frequency shift, *Ad-*

- vances in Optics and Photonics **4**, 108 (2012).
- [20] R. Röhlsberger, *Nuclear Condensed Matter Physics with Synchrotron Radiation* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005).
- [21] R. Röhlsberger and J. Evers, Quantum optical phenomena in nuclear resonant scattering, in *Modern Mössbauer Spectroscopy*, Topics in Applied Physics, edited by Y. Yoshida and G. Langouche (Springer Singapore, 2021) pp. 105–171.
- [22] B. W. Adams, Nuclear γ -ray superradiance, *Journal of Modern Optics* **56**, 1974 (2009).
- [23] G. V. Smirnov, U. van Bürck, J. Arthur, G. S. Brown, A. I. Chumakov, A. Q. R. Baron, W. Petry, and S. L. Ruby, Currents and fields reveal the propagation of nuclear polaritons through a resonant target, *Physical Review A* **76**, 043811 (2007).
- [24] C. Fuhse, A. Jarre, C. Ollinger, J. Seeger, T. Salditt, and R. Tucoulou, Front-coupling of a prefocused x-ray beam into a monomodal planar waveguide, *Applied Physics Letters* **85**, 1907 (2004).
- [25] Y. P. Feng, S. K. Sinha, H. W. Deckman, J. B. Hastings, and D. P. Siddons, X-ray flux enhancement in thin-film waveguides using resonant beam couplers, *Physical Review Letters* **71**, 537 (1993).
- [26] K. P. Heeg and J. Evers, X-ray quantum optics with mössbauer nuclei embedded in thin-film cavities, *Physical Review A* **88**, 10.1103/physreva.88.043828 (2013).
- [27] D. Lentrodt, K. P. Heeg, C. H. Keitel, and J. Evers, Ab initio quantum models for thin-film x-ray cavity QED, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 023396 (2020).
- [28] D. Lentrodt, O. Diekmann, C. H. Keitel, S. Rotter, and J. Evers, Certifying multimode light-matter interaction in lossy resonators, *Physical Review Letters* **130**, 263602 (2023).
- [29] P. Andrejić, L. M. Lohse, and A. Pálffy, Waveguide QED with Mössbauer nuclei, arXiv:2305.11647 (2023), arXiv:2305.11647 [quant-ph].
- [30] L. M. Lohse and P. Andrejić, Nano-optical theory of planar x-ray waveguides, *Optics Express* **32**, 9518 (2024).
- [31] M. Osterhoff and T. Salditt, Coherence filtering of x-ray waveguides: analytical and numerical approach, *New Journal of Physics* **13**, 103026 (2011).
- [32] See Supplemental Material at URL-will-be-inserted-by-publisher for more information on the theoretical model, sample design, experimental setup, and data analysis.
- [33] S. P. Krüger, H. Neubauer, M. Bartels, S. Kalbfleisch, K. Giewekemeyer, P. J. Wilbrandt, M. Sprung, and T. Salditt, Sub-10nm beam confinement by x-ray waveguides: design, fabrication and characterization of optical properties, *Journal of Synchrotron Radiation* **19**, 227 (2012).
- [34] T. Salditt, S. P. Krüger, C. Fuhse, and C. Bähz, High-transmission planar x-ray waveguides, *Physical Review Letters* **100**, 184801 (2008).
- [35] B. Sahoo, K. Schlage, J. Major, U. von Hörsten, W. Keune, H. Wende, R. Röhlsberger, A. Ghoshray, B. Bandyopadhyay, and C. Mazumdar, Preparation and characterization of ultrathin stainless steel films, in *AIP Conference Proceedings* (AIP, 2011).
- [36] R. Friedberg and J. T. Manassah, Eigenfunctions and eigenvalues in superradiance with x-y translational symmetry, *Physics Letters A* **372**, 2787 (2008).
- [37] Y. Kagan, A. M. Afanas'ev, and V. G. Kohn, On excitation of isomeric nuclear states in a crystal by synchrotron radiation, *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics* **12**, 615 (1979).
- [38] S.-Y. Lee, S. Ahrens, and W.-T. Liao, Gravitationally sensitive structured x-ray optics using nuclear resonances, arXiv:2305.00613 (2023), arXiv:2305.00613 [physics.optics].

Supplemental Material to: Collective nuclear excitation dynamics in mono-modal x-ray waveguides

Leon M. Lohse,^{1,2,*} Petar Andrejić,³ Sven Velten,² Malte Vassholz,¹ Charlotte Neuhaus,¹ Ankita Negi,² Anjali Panchwane,² Ilya Sergeev,² Adriana Pálffy,⁴ Tim Salditt,¹ and Ralf Röhlsberger^{5,6,7,2}

¹*Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, 37077 Göttingen, Germany*

²*Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, 22607 Hamburg, Germany*

³*Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, 91058 Erlangen, Germany*

⁴*Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, 97074 Würzburg, Germany*

⁵*Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena, 07743 Jena, Germany*

⁶*Helmholtz-Institut Jena, 07743 Jena, Germany*

⁷*GSI Helmholtzzentrum für Schwerionenforschung GmbH, 64291 Darmstadt, Germany*

I. THEORY

A. Detailed derivation of the equation of motion

We derive the equations of motion from the main manuscript using the approach detailed in Ref. [S1]. It is based on the Gruner-Welsch quantization of the macroscopic Maxwell's equations [S2], which expresses the electromagnetic field in terms of the *classical* dyadic Green's function of the medium. We use an asymptotic expansion of the Green's function in terms of its resonant (guided and leaky) and non-resonant modes, derived in Ref. [S3], to obtain tractable, yet quantitative, analytical expressions for the coupling terms. Refer to the references given in the introductions of Refs. [S1, S3] for an extensive list of related works.

The 14.4 keV resonance of the ⁵⁷Fe nucleus corresponds to a magnetic dipole (M1) transition between one of the ground and excited states with nuclear spins $I_g = 1/2$ and $I_e = 3/2$, respectively. For the purpose of this letter, we neglect the $2I + 1$ sublevels and consider only a single ground $|g\rangle$ and a single excited state $|e\rangle$, with a magnetic transition dipole moment that is aligned with the polarization of the excitation pulse. The full picture is discussed in Ref. [S1]. We write the nuclear transition operator, in the rotating frame of the nuclear transition frequency, as $\hat{\sigma}_{ge} := |g\rangle\langle e|$, so that the magnetic dipole moment operator is

$$\hat{\mathbf{M}}_i = \mathbf{m} (\hat{\sigma}_{ge}^i e^{-i\omega_0 t} + \hat{\sigma}_{eg}^i e^{i\omega_0 t}), \quad (\text{S1})$$

with magnetic dipole moment \mathbf{m} and transition energy $\hbar\omega_0$. The diagonal operators for the excited and ground states are written accordingly. Similarly, we separate the magnetic field operators into components with positive and negative frequencies, such that

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}}(t) = \hat{\mathbf{B}}^+(t)e^{-i\omega_0 t} + \hat{\mathbf{B}}^-(t)e^{i\omega_0 t}. \quad (\text{S2})$$

The nuclear transition operators then fulfill [S1]

$$\frac{d}{dt} \hat{\sigma}_{ge}^i(t) = -\frac{\gamma}{2} \hat{\sigma}_{ge}^i(t) - [\hat{\sigma}_{ee}^i(t) - \hat{\sigma}_{gg}^i(t)] \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbf{m}^* \cdot \hat{\mathbf{B}}^+(\mathbf{r}_i, t), \quad (\text{S3})$$

under the rotating wave approximation. Since the pulse areas of the synchrotron pulses are tiny, even under extreme focussing, the excited state populations will be very small and negligible in (S3). We make the approximation $[\hat{\sigma}_{ee}^i(t) - \hat{\sigma}_{gg}^i(t)] \approx -1$. Taking the expectation values on both sides yields

$$\dot{\sigma}_{ge}^i(t) = -\frac{\gamma}{2} \sigma_{ge}^i(t) + \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbf{m}^* \cdot \mathbf{B}^+(\mathbf{r}_i, t). \quad (\text{S4})$$

* lohse@uni-goettingen.de

The field consists of the incoming field and the field emitted by the nuclei, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}_{\text{in}} + \mathbf{B}_{\text{nuc}}$. The nuclei emit the field [S1]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{B}_{\text{nuc}}^+(\mathbf{r}, \omega) &= \mu_0 \left(\frac{\omega + \omega_0}{c} \right)^2 \sum_i \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\mathbf{G}}_{\text{m}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_i, \omega + \omega_0) \cdot \mathbf{M}_i^+(\omega) \\ &= \mu_0 \left(\frac{\omega + \omega_0}{c} \right)^2 \sum_i \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\mathbf{G}}_{\text{m}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_i, \omega + \omega_0) \cdot \mathbf{m} \sigma_{ge}^i(\omega),\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S5})$$

where

$$\left\{ \epsilon(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \times \frac{1}{\epsilon(\mathbf{r})} \nabla \times -[n(\mathbf{r})\omega/c]^2 \right\} \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\mathbf{G}}_{\text{m}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \epsilon(\mathbf{r}) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\mathbf{1}} \quad (\text{S6})$$

defines the magnetic Green's function. Here ϵ is the relative electric permeability and n the refractive index of the layer system, excluding the nuclear interaction. Inserting (S5) into the Fourier transform of (S4), we obtain

$$-i\omega \sigma_{ge}^i(\omega) = -\frac{\gamma}{2} \sigma_{ge}^i(\omega) + i\Omega(\mathbf{r}_i, \omega) + i \sum_{j \neq i} g_{ij}(\omega + \omega_0) \sigma_{ge}^j(\omega), \quad (\text{S7})$$

where $\Omega(\mathbf{r}, \omega) = \mathbf{m}^* \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\text{in}}^+(\vec{r}, \omega)/\hbar$ is the time-dependent Rabi frequency produced by our propagating excitation pulse and coupling between the nuclei is mediated by

$$g_{ij}(\omega) = \frac{\mu_0 \omega^2}{\hbar c^2} \mathbf{m}^* \cdot \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\mathbf{G}}_{\text{m}}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, \omega) \cdot \mathbf{m}. \quad (\text{S8})$$

The waveguide contains a large number of nuclei that are homogeneously distributed in an amorphous thin layer at height $z = z_0$. Let d denote the layer thickness and ρ the nuclear number density within the layer. Going to continuous variables and integrating out the transversal dimensions y and z , we obtain

$$-i\omega \sigma_{ge}(x, \omega) = -\frac{\gamma}{2} \sigma_{ge}(x, \omega) + i\Omega(x, z_0, \omega) + i\rho d \text{ p.v.} \int g(x - x', \omega + \omega_0) \sigma_{ge}(x', \omega) dx', \quad (\text{S9})$$

with

$$g(x - x', \omega) = \frac{\mu_0 \omega^2}{\hbar c^2} \mathbf{m}^* \cdot \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\mathbf{G}}_{\text{m},2\text{d}}(x - x', z_0, z_0, \omega) \cdot \mathbf{m}. \quad (\text{S10})$$

where $\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\mathbf{G}}_{\text{m},2\text{d}}$ is the Green's function corresponding to a line source extended along y (see Ref. [S3] for a detailed discussion). For x-ray waveguides, it is approximately transversal and can be expanded into its resonant and non-resonant modes, giving

$$\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\mathbf{G}}_{\text{m},2\text{d}}(x - x', z, z', \omega) \approx \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\mathbf{1}}_{\perp} \frac{i}{\omega/c} \sum_m \frac{u_m(z) u_m(z')}{2\nu_m} e^{i\omega|x-x'|\nu_m/c} + \text{non-resonant}, \quad (\text{S11})$$

where ν_m are the (complex) effective refractive indices of the corresponding resonant modes (in short: mode indices), $\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\mathbf{1}}_{\perp} = \hat{\mathbf{y}} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{y}} + \hat{\mathbf{z}} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{z}}$ the transversal unit tensor, and $u_m(z)$ are transversal mode profiles as defined in Ref. [S3]. They are bi-normalized according to

$$\int \frac{[u_m(z)]^2}{\epsilon(z)} dz = 1. \quad (\text{S12})$$

The expansion (S11) in particular uses the fact that transverse magnetic and transverse electric modes are approximately degenerate in the hard x-ray regime due to the small refractive index contrasts, so that the polarization-dependence simplifies to the transversal unit tensor.

We make the crucial approximation to neglect the non-resonant modes, since they are strongly attenuated, and obtain

$$-i\omega \sigma_{ge}(x, \omega) = -\frac{\gamma}{2} \sigma_{ge}(x, \omega) + i\Omega(x, \omega) - \frac{\mu_0 |\mathbf{m}|^2 \rho}{2\hbar} \frac{\omega + \omega_0}{c} \sum_m \zeta_m \int_{-L}^0 dx' e^{i(\omega + \omega_0)|x-x'|\nu_m/c} \sigma_{ge}(x', \omega). \quad (\text{S13})$$

Since $\omega \ll \omega_0$, we neglect the frequency detuning in the prefactor. Fourier-transforming (S13) finally yields

$$\dot{\sigma}_{ge}(x, t) = -\frac{\gamma}{2}\sigma_{ge}(x, t) + i\Omega(x, t) - \frac{\gamma}{4\Lambda_{\text{res}}} \sum_m \zeta_m \int_{-L}^0 dx' e^{ik_0\nu_m|x-x'|} \sigma_{ge}(x', t - |x-x'|\nu_m/c), \quad (\text{S14})$$

where $k_0 = \omega_0/c$ and

$$\frac{1}{\Lambda_{\text{res}}} = \rho \frac{k_0\mu_0|\mathbf{m}|^2}{\hbar} \frac{2}{\gamma} \equiv \rho\sigma_{\text{res}} \quad (\text{S15})$$

is the reciprocal on-resonance attenuation length.

Making the forward-scattering approximation and assuming that only a single mode contributes gives

$$\dot{\sigma}_{ge}(x, t) = -\frac{\gamma}{2}\sigma_{ge}(x, t) + i\Omega(x, t) - \frac{\gamma\zeta_m}{4\Lambda_{\text{res}}} \int_{-L}^x dx' e^{ik_0\nu_m(x-x')} \sigma_{ge}\left(x', t - \nu_m \frac{x-x'}{c}\right). \quad (\text{S16})$$

B. Frequency shift and superradiant speedup

The grazing incidence geometry permits an analytical solution of (S16), which we briefly discuss here. The incidence angle θ_{in} fixes the in-plane wavenumber to $k_{\text{in}} = k_0 \cos \theta_{\text{in}}$. The excitation pulse can be written as $\Omega(x, t) = \Omega_0 \exp(ik_{\text{in}}x)\Pi(t_{\text{ret}})$, with $t_{\text{ret}} = t - k_{\text{in}}x/\omega_0$. Note that such an excitation pulse is made possible by the GI geometry, where the incident plane wave is propagating in air/vacuum and therefore not attenuated. Other geometries will unavoidably introduce an off-resonant attenuation due to material absorption.

Taking the Fourier transform gives

$$\Omega(x, \omega) = \Omega_0 e^{i\tilde{k}_{\text{in}}x} \Pi(\omega), \quad (\text{S17})$$

with $\tilde{k}_{\text{in}} = (\omega + \omega_0)/c \cdot \cos \theta_{\text{in}}$ Fourier-transforming (S16) and inserting (S17), we obtain

$$-i(\omega + i\gamma/2)\sigma_{ge}(x, \omega) + \frac{\gamma\zeta_m}{4\Lambda_{\text{res}}} \int_{-L}^x dx' e^{i\tilde{k}_m(x-x')} \sigma_{ge}(x', \omega) = i\Omega_0 \Pi(\omega) e^{i\tilde{k}_{\text{in}}x}, \quad (\text{S18})$$

with $\tilde{k}_m = \nu_m(\omega + \omega_0)/c$.

The key to solve (S18) is that, for $L \rightarrow \infty$, the right-hand side is an eigenfunction of the integral operator on the left-hand side. One readily obtains

$$\sigma_{ge}(x, \omega) = \frac{-\Omega_0 \Pi(\omega)}{\omega + i\gamma/2 - \tilde{\eta}(\omega)} \exp\left(i\tilde{k}_{\text{in}}x\right) \quad (\text{S19})$$

where

$$\tilde{\eta}(\omega) = \frac{\zeta_m \gamma}{4\Lambda_{\text{res}}} \frac{1}{(\omega_0 + \omega)/c} \frac{-1}{\nu_m - \cos \theta_{\text{in}}} \quad (\text{S20})$$

is the frequency shift. Since $\omega \ll \omega_0$, we can neglect the frequency-dependency, setting $\eta := \tilde{\eta}(\omega = 0)$. We write

$$\eta = \frac{\gamma}{2} \frac{\zeta_m \Lambda_m}{\Lambda_{\text{res}}} \frac{1}{2\Lambda_m q_\theta - i} \quad (\text{S21})$$

with $q_\theta = k_0(\cos \theta_{\text{in}} - \text{Re}\{\nu_m\})$. Fourier-transforming the solution gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{ge}(x, t) &= \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} e^{-i\omega t} \sigma(x, \omega) \\ &= i\Omega_0 \Pi(\delta - i\gamma/2) \Theta(t_{\text{ret}}) \exp[ik_{\text{in}}x - (\gamma/2 - i\eta)t_{\text{ret}}]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S22})$$

Finally, we approximate $\Omega_0 \Pi(\eta - i\gamma/2) \approx A$ to be the pulse area, taking into account that the frequency detuning is small compared to the bandwidth of the excitation pulse.

C. The emitted field

To compute the field emitted by the nuclei, we use (S5) and apply the same assumptions as before, in particular the asymptotic expansion of the Green's function. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}_{\text{nuc}}^+(x, z, \omega) &= \mu_0 \rho d \left(\frac{\omega + \omega_0}{c} \right)^2 \int \overset{\leftrightarrow}{G}_{\text{m},2\text{d}}(x - x', z, z_0, \omega + \omega_0) \cdot \mathbf{m} \sigma_{ge}(x', \omega) dx' \\ &\approx ik\mu_0 \rho d \frac{u_m(z)u_m(z_0)}{2\nu_m} \mathbf{m} \int_{-L}^0 e^{i\bar{k}_m|x-x'|} \sigma_{ge}(x', \omega) dx'. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S23})$$

The constant factor can be brought into a more expressive form, so that

$$\mathbf{B}_{\text{nuc}}^+(x, z, \omega) = -\mathbf{B}_0^+ \zeta_m \frac{u_m(z)}{u_m(z_0)} \frac{\gamma\tau}{4\Lambda_{\text{res}}} \frac{1}{iA} \int_{-L}^0 e^{i\bar{k}_m|x-x'|} \sigma_{ge}(x', \omega) dx', \quad (\text{S24})$$

where $\tau = \Pi(\omega = 0)$ is the length of the excitation pulse and the field amplitude is $\mathbf{B}_0^+ = \mathbf{m}\Omega_0\hbar/|\mathbf{m}|^2$. To compute the field inside the sample, we can again employ the forward scattering approximation or integrate (S24) numerically. In the experiment, we measure the far-field pattern of the field at the back end of the waveguide ($x = 0$).

The integral can be readily evaluated analytically for the two cases discussed in the letter. For the FC geometry we obtain

$$\mathbf{B}_{\text{nuc}}^+(0, z, t) = -\mathbf{B}_0^+ \frac{u_m(z)}{u_m(z_0)} \frac{\gamma\tau}{4} \left[\frac{\zeta_m L}{\Lambda_{\text{res}}} \exp(ik_0\nu_m L) \right] \exp(-\gamma t_{\text{ret}}/2) \frac{2J_1\left(\sqrt{\gamma t_{\text{ret}}\zeta_m L/\Lambda_{\text{res}}}\right)}{\sqrt{\gamma t_{\text{ret}}\zeta_m L/\Lambda_{\text{res}}}}. \quad (\text{S25})$$

For the GI geometry, we obtain

$$\mathbf{B}_{\text{nuc}}^+(0, z, t) = -\mathbf{B}_0^+ \frac{u_m(z)}{u_m(z_0)} \frac{\gamma\tau}{4} \left[\frac{2\zeta_m\Lambda_m}{\Lambda_{\text{res}}} \frac{-i}{2q_\theta\Lambda_m - i} \right] \exp[-(\gamma/2 - i\eta)t_{\text{ret}}], \quad (\text{S26})$$

retaining the frequency shift and superradiant decay. Here, the overall intensity decreases when the θ_{in} is detuned from the mode resonance due to the wavelength mismatch.

II. SAMPLES AND EXPERIMENT

A. Layer design

The waveguides were designed using the xwglib software described in Ref. [S3]. The materials were chosen for minimal mode absorption while being suitable for sputter deposition. The cladding thickness was set to 30 nm, which is thick enough to fully contain the resonant modes (effectively infinite) but still relatively thin to minimize roughness build-up. Table S1 lists the model parameters computed for the two final layer designs, assuming perfectly sharp interfaces.

m	$\zeta_m (10^{-2})$	$1 - \text{Re}\{\nu_m\}$	$\text{Im}\{\nu_m\}$	Λ_m (mm)
FC				
1	3.8	3.8×10^{-6}	2.8×10^{-8}	0.25
2	0	6.8×10^{-6}	6.8×10^{-8}	0.11
GI				
1	2.1	2.9×10^{-6}	1.3×10^{-8}	0.51
2	0	3.9×10^{-6}	2.2×10^{-8}	0.31
3	2.3	5.9×10^{-6}	7.5×10^{-8}	0.09
4	0	8.2×10^{-6}	1.6×10^{-7}	0.04

TABLE S1. Model parameters for the resonant modes m of the two waveguide designs: coupling coefficient ζ_m , effective mode index ν_m , and (off-resonance) mode attenuation length Λ_m for the supported resonant modes.

B. Sample preparation

The two samples were fabricated by magnetron sputter deposition, using an argon plasma at a pressure of 5×10^{-3} mbar at a target-to-substrate distance of about 7 cm with sputtering guns from the A300-XP series (AJA International, Massachusetts, USA). The residual base pressure prior to deposition was typically less than 4×10^{-7} mbar. Molybdenum and the ^{57}Fe -isotope-enriched iron (97 % enrichment) were deposited using targets with diameter 3.81 cm at 12 W DC, and B_4C using a target with diameter 5.08 cm at 53 W RF power. The deposition rates were calibrated based on x-ray reflectivity measurements.

To block the overilluminating part of the x-ray focus in the FC experiment, we bonded a second 1 mm-thick germanium wafer on top of the layer structure, as detailed in Ref. [S4]. Figure S1(a,b) show photographs of the final FC sample after bonding and cutting it to shape. To verify the layer structure of the FC sample, we acquired high-resolution cross-sectional SEM images. To that end, the layer structure was exposed with a Helios G4 focussed ion beam system (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Massachusetts, USA). The SEM images were acquired with an eLiNE system (Raith GmbH, Germany). Panels (c) and (d) show such images at different magnification. At highest magnification, the individual films are clearly distinguishable.




FIG. S1. The FC waveguide assembly: (a) top view, showing the sample along the y -direction to change the propagation length L of the x-rays in the WG; (b) Front-view; (c) the two wafers were bonded with an InSn alloy, visible as a horizontal stripe at medium magnification; (d) high-resolution view of the layer structure.

C. Experimental setup

Figure S2 shows the setups of the two experiments performed at P01. The undulator radiation is monochromatized to about 1 meV by a high-resolution monochromator (HRM). In the front-coupling experiment, the beam was focussed by two mirrors in Kirkpatrick Baez geometry to about $7 \mu\text{m}$ in focus diameter. A pair of slits was used to cut off the outer tails of the focus that were not blocked by the 2 mm thick waveguide assembly. A stack of avalanche photo diodes (APDs), mounted on a translation stage, approximately 1 m downstream of the waveguide was used to detect the photons exiting the waveguide. In the grazing incidence experiment, the beam was mildly focussed by a beryllium compound refractive lens (CRL) down to about $100 \mu\text{m}$ diameter. The CRL stack was placed immediately after the monochromator to maximize the focal distance and minimize angular divergence of the beam, which was about 0.002° . The beam was cut in vertical direction to about $20 \mu\text{m}$ using a slit placed immediately in front of the sample. The angular acceptance of the APDs was adjusted with a pair of slits mounted in front of the APDs. In both experiments, a time-insensitive pixel detector, a LAMBDA 750k (X-Spectrum GmbH, Hamburg, Germany) with $55 \mu\text{m}$ pixel size, was placed about 3 m downstream of the sample to measure the off-resonant (prompt) photons exiting the waveguide.

III. DATA ANALYSIS

The theory presented in the Letter captures the central features of the exciton dynamics and illustrates the qualitative behaviour. To obtain analytical solutions, we neglected the energetic sublevels of the nuclei, which will be




FIG. S2. Experimental setups at the high resolution dynamics beamline P01 for realization of the front-coupling and the grazing-incidence geometries. Only the relevant components are sketched. In both experiments, a time-insensitive pixel detector was mounted 3 m downstream of the WG (not shown). The APDs were moved out of the beam to acquire images with the pixel detector.

slightly perturbed in the presence of hyperfine interactions. The theory can be readily extended to include the full hyperfine structure of the nuclei and then solved numerically [S1].

However, our theory shows that the *time-dependence* of the emitted fields is formally equivalent to that known from established experimental geometries. In FC geometry, if only a single guided mode contributes, the time-dependence resembles NFS through a foil with rescaled thickness. In GI geometry, the time-dependence is the same for the emission into the mode and into the direction of specular reflection. This allows us to use available and tested software for simulation and data analysis of nuclear resonant scattering to model the experimentally observed temporal emissions. We emphasize that only the time-dependence is equivalent, whereas the spatial emission structure is clearly different.

We used the Nexus [S5] library to implement the forward model $f(t, \vec{p})$ and inferred the model parameters \vec{p} by numerically finding the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE), given the data and assuming Poisson statistics. The iron film in the samples is too thin to develop magnetic order so that we can neglect magnetic hyperfine splitting. However, variations in the electric field at the positions of the nuclei may cause inhomogeneous line broadening, and an electric field gradient couples with the non-vanishing quadrupole moment of the excited state and may cause a splitting into two lines. Since the thin iron layer is likely amorphous, there is no overall directional dependence and we can take the isotropic average. Table S2 lists the extracted parameters based on these assumptions.

To extract the initial speedup of the emissions in GI geometry, we assumed a simple exponential decay $f(t, \vec{p}) = p_0 \exp(-p_1 \gamma t)$ and inferred the optimal parameters by numerically computing the MLE based on the data in the time interval $13 \text{ ns} \leq t \leq 30 \text{ ns}$.

Parameter	FC	GI
Broadening FWHM (γ)	6(2)	4
Quad. splitting (γ)	6(1)	7

TABLE S2. Hyperfine parameters inferred from the experimental data, assuming normally distributed broadening and quadrupole splitting of the transition lines. For FC, the parameters were extracted from each WG length independently. The number in parentheses gives the standard deviation. For GI, the parameters were extracted from a single measurement in reflection geometry at $\theta_{\text{in}} = \theta_{\text{out}} = 0.5^\circ$.

IV. FULL SIMULATION OF SPEEDUP

To explain the values of the speedup in the GI geometry, we simulated the emission from the layer system as a function of time in reflection geometry, $\theta_{\text{out}} = \theta_{\text{in}}$. To that end, we exploit that the time-dependence is the same for the emissions out of the back end of the WG as well as for the field that evanescently couples through the top cladding and is emitted into the direction of specular reflection. We used Nexus [S5] to simulate the time-dependent field in GI geometry with specular emission, assuming an infinitely extended layer system. Note, however, that the angular dependence is different between the two geometries, so that the simulated intensity scale is meaningless. The results, without hyperfine splitting, with hyperfine splitting (extracted from independent data as detailed above), and including a uniform angular divergence of 2.1 mdeg (FWHM), are presented in Fig. S3(a). The angular divergence is assumed to be uniformly distributed and incoherently summed.

From these simulated curves, we extracted the initial decay rate, using the same procedure as for the experimental data. The results are shown and discussed in Fig. S3(b). The simulation without hyperfine splitting, on the one hand, accurately matches the simple single-mode model. The full simulation including hyperfine splitting and divergence, on the other hand, explains the experimental data (see main text). We conclude that the deviation from the simple model is indeed mainly caused by residual hyperfine splitting and beam divergence.




FIG. S3. Simulated emission in reflection geometry ($\theta_{\text{in}} = \theta_{\text{out}}$). Without hyperfine splitting (blue), the simulation is in perfect agreement (up to global scaling) with the predictions of the simple theory. The additional beating due to the hyperfine interactions (green) results in increased (apparent) speedup. Close to resonance, this effect is partially reversed by the angular divergence of 2.1 mdeg FWHM (orange), which is assumed to be uniform and incoherent.

-
- [S1] P. Andrejić, L. M. Lohse, and A. Pálffy, Waveguide QED with Mössbauer nuclei, arXiv:2305.11647 (2023), arXiv:2305.11647 [quant-ph].
- [S2] T. Gruner and D.-G. Welsch, Green-function approach to the radiation-field quantization for homogeneous and inhomogeneous kramers-kronig dielectrics, Physical Review A **53**, 1818 (1996).
- [S3] L. M. Lohse and P. Andrejić, Nano-optical theory of planar x-ray waveguides, Optics Express **32**, 9518 (2024).
- [S4] S. P. Krüger, H. Neubauer, M. Bartels, S. Kalbfleisch, K. Giewekemeyer, P. J. Wilbrandt, M. Sprung, and T. Salditt, Sub-10nm beam confinement by x-ray waveguides: design, fabrication and characterization of optical properties, Journal of Synchrotron Radiation **19**, 227 (2012).
- [S5] L. Bocklage, Nexus - nuclear elastic x-ray scattering universal software (2023).