Controlling Competing Feedback Mechanisms for Programmable Patterns *via* Nonlinear Laser Lithography

Özgün Yavuz¹, Abdullah bin Aamir¹, Ihor Pavlov², Sezin Galioğlu³, Ü. Seleme Nizam Bayrak¹, Petro Deminskyi⁴, Onur Tokel^{3,4}, Serim Ilday^{1,5}, and F. Ömer Ilday^{1,5}

¹ Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Information Technology, Ruhr-Universität Bochum,

Universitätsstraße 150, 44801 Bochum, Germany

² Department of Physics, Middle East Technical University, 06800 Ankara, Turkey

³ UNAM-National Nanotechnology Research Center & Institute of Materials Science and

Nanotechnology, Bilkent University, Ankara, 06800, Turkey

⁴ Department of Physics, Bilkent University, 06800 Ankara, Turkey

⁵ Faculty of Physics and Astronomy, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Universitätsstraße 150, 44801 Bochum, Germany

[†]Corresponding author: Oemer.Ilday@ruhr-uni-bochum.de

Controlling laser-induced pattern formation remains a long-standing challenge. A key advance was recognising the pivotal role of intrinsic feedback mechanisms in self-organisation, which enabled selfsimilar patterns with long-range order through nonlinear laser lithography. This concept was recently leveraged to surpass the diffraction limit. However, the demonstrated structures are relatively simple and material-specific, as they rely on a single assumed formation mechanism for each material. Here, we reveal the previously unknown coexistence of competing feedback mechanisms that drive distinct chemical and ablative processes, resulting in patterns with different symmetries. We show that one mechanism can be selectively activated, while completely suppressing the other, by tuning the laser parameters independently of the material. The competing mechanisms break surface symmetries in distinct lateral and vertical directions, and the selection can be dynamically inverted *in situ*, leading to rich surface chemistries and morphologies. We demonstrate the potential for applications through the maskless and ambient-air fabrication of complex composite patterns on diverse materials and substrates. These include seamlessly stitched superhydrophilic and superhydrophobic domains, structural colour, and a holographic temperature sensor. Combining programmable mechanism selection with recent demonstrations of sub-10 nm features could enable the maskless fabrication of composite structures that rival the capabilities of top-down nanofabrication techniques.

Pattern formation is historically the first¹ and the most studied²⁻⁵ self-organised process driven by a laser. However, the resulting structures suffered from poor long-range order until the advent of nonlinear laser lithography (NLL) in 2013⁶, which introduced deliberately exploiting intrinsic feedback mechanisms between the laser beam and the material's changes, based on an analogy to how self-amplitude modulation drives mode-locking of lasers. This conceptual advance has led to patterns with subnanometer Allan deviation⁶, and opened the door to 3D geometries^{3,7,8} and structures that surpass the diffraction limit^{4,9}. Here, we present a new conceptual advance where multiple competing feedback mechanisms are shown to coexist, with one mechanism being selectively chosen at the complete exclusion of the other, enabling programmable patterns with rich surface chemistries and morphologies.

One mechanism forms patterns by ablation of the surface¹⁰⁻¹⁴, which occurs only at points where the local intensity exceeds the ablation threshold due to the interference between the incident laser beam and the surface plasmon-polariton (SPP) waves excited by the beam. This results in stripe-like structures that are depressions below the surface, oriented perpendicular to the laser's polarisation^{6,10}. For the second mechanism, the structures look similar but grow outward from the surface by a chemical reaction, commonly oxidation, at the constructive interference points. The threshold intensity depends strongly on the cumulative number of incident pulses because the process is thermally activated. The stripes are parallel^{5,9} to the polarisation. Interestingly, ablation- and oxidation-type patterns have never been observed on the same surface but were regarded as unrelated phenomena that do not co-exist. This has led to speculation on the conditions where SPPs¹¹⁻¹³ or retarded potentials^{6,10} are independently responsible.

We begin by demonstrating that tightly feedback-driven NLL supports both mechanisms simultaneously, which compete, with the marginally stronger one completely excluding the other. Competitive exclusion, a well-known phenomenon in ecology¹⁵, describes how a stronger competitor eliminates a weaker one when vying for the same resources—in our case, the opportunity to reshape the surface profile that provides the feedback. We then show that the selected mechanism can be switched, inverting the symmetries of the resulting patterns, and altering their morphological and chemical compositions, simply by adjusting the laser parameters. Using large numbers of low-energy, high-repetition-rate pulses, we

form oxidation-based structures, NLL_{\parallel}, that grow out of the surface and are oriented parallel to the laser polarisation (Fig. 1a). In contrast, a small number of high-energy pulses create ablation-based structures, NLL_{\perp}, that grow into the surface and are oriented perpendicular to the polarisation (Fig. 1b). Both NLL_{\parallel} and NLL_{\perp} break lateral and transverse symmetries of the surface in distinct ways. We demonstrate both types on seven different materials, from metals to a semiconductor. Finally, we highlight potential technological applications of composite patterns with varying morphological and chemical structures, achieved through programmable switching of the pattern up to one hundred times. We conclude by suggesting that competing mechanisms are likely behind recent demonstrations of laser-driven structures and that programmable mechanism selection introduced here could be applicable to them.

The competing formation mechanisms

The patterns are formed by focussing an ultrafast laser beam on a surface, where every illuminated point infinitesimally scatters the laser light in proportion to its local height differences⁶ (Fig. 1c). Part of the scattered light propagates along the surface. As long as the focal spot is smaller than the propagation distance of the scattered light, all scatterers interfere fully coherently, thus collectively determining the total light intensity at a given point, which renders the feedback strongly non-local. The total intensity along the surface, $I_{total,n}$, is described by a 2D convolution integral (Fig. 1d),

$$I_{\text{total},n}(x,y) = \left| E_n(x,y) + \zeta \iint h_n(x',y') E_n(x',y') K(x-x',y-y') \mathrm{d}x' \mathrm{d}y' \right|^2, \tag{1}$$

where E_n is the electric field due to the n^{th} pulse impinging on the material surface, h_n is the surface height profile, *K* is the scattering kernel, and ζ is the scattering strength. The scattering occurs via two distinct processes: radiation remnants, including dipole radiation and SPP excitation. Both are included in the scattering kernel (see Supplementary Information). To visualise the kernel, we plot the light intensity scattered from a single defect (Fig. 1c(i)) in Fig. 1c(ii). The two scattering processes have different amplitudes and decay lengths, as seen from the cross-sections of the intensity distribution parallel (green curve) and perpendicular (blue curve) to polarisation (Fig. 1c(iii)). A vertically polarised incident laser beam has a long-range intensity modulation along the horizontal axis mainly due to dipole radiation. On the other hand, the vertical cross-section is led by SPP coupling, which has higher peak amplitudes but a shorter range. These minor differences, amplified exponentially by the non-local feedback, form the selection mechanism, as explained below.

Now, we drop the simplification of a single defect because the unprocessed surface is typically not pristine nor atomically flat. Instead, there are numerous random height variations, each acting as a scatterer, initially forming a random interference profile. At points of constructive interference, the surface will be modified by either oxidation (blue path in Fig. 1d) or ablation (green path in Fig. 1d), depending on which threshold is exceeded. Since the beam's power is highest at its centre, modification begins and spreads from there (Fig. 1e). Depending on the local intensity and the number of pulses per spot, the ablation or oxidation threshold may be reached, leading to NLL_{\perp} or NLL_{\parallel} , respectively. In either case, the local height changes by $\Delta h_n(x, y)$, increasing for oxidation and decreasing for ablation, and the surface profile is updated to $h_{n+1}(x, y)$. When the next pulse arrives, its intensity is scattered differently by the updated height profile, completing the feedback loop. Importantly, NLL_{\parallel} exhibits intrinsic negative feedback (blue feedback path in Fig. 1d). As the oxide grows thicker, it gets progressively harder for O₂ from ambient air to reach the activated material beneath, thus limiting further growth. This self-limiting effect ensures uniform heights and cross-sectional profiles across the pattern⁶. No such self-limiting counterpart exists for NLL_{\perp} , as ablation can continue indefinitely and ultimately destroy the pattern (Supplementary Fig. S8). Therefore, the number of pulses incident per spot must be limited.

The step-by-step formation of NLL_{\parallel} and NLL_{\perp} is illustrated in Fig. 1e via simulations. Normally, the simulations account for every surface point, but here we simplify the description by assuming that the first laser pulse scatters from a single point (Fig. 1c(i)), modifying the surface according to one of the mechanisms. The upper row of Fig. 1e corresponds to NLL_{\parallel} , which is formed gradually by thousands of high-repetition-rate, low-energy pulses. In contrast, NLL_{\perp} forms more abruptly through a small number of high-energy pulses. NLL_{\parallel} and NLL_{\perp} break the symmetries in two distinct ways: first, the stripe-like structures they form are mutually orthogonal, and second, they grow either out of or into the surface, thus

breaking the symmetry transverse to the surface. Importantly, either mechanism can only marginally outcompete the other. Ordinarily, the weaker mechanism would also modify the surface, albeit to a lesser extent, leading to inhomogeneous and distorted patterns. This is where the critical role of nonlocal feedback comes into play to achieve complete competitive exclusion: Once the smallest protostructures of the dominant mechanism form (at t_2 and onwards, Fig. 1e), they exponentially strengthen the chosen mechanism by altering $I_{\text{total},n}$, which sets the rate of change, Δh_n . This asymmetric growth results in pristine patterns that show no sign of the other mechanism, which is effectively hidden. Scanning electron microscope (SEM) images of fully formed NLL₁ and NLL₁ patterns on the same Ti sample are shown in Fig. 1e.

Given the exponential reinforcement by nonlocal feedback, one might expect that switching the mechanism, once chosen, is impossible. However, it can easily be achieved by momentarily turning off the pulses, moving the focal spot beyond the existing structures so they no longer provide nonlocal feedback, and then turning the pulses back on with the new parameters. This process inverts the symmetries, and any gaps between the two types of structures can be filled by scanning the beam over the surface. The symmetries can be inverted as many times as desired. As discussed in the next section, the transitions between NLL_{\parallel} and NLL_{\perp} requires only one or two periods of the structure.

Universality of the mechanism selection and symmetry inversions

The mechanism of competition, selection, and controllable symmetry inversions in NLL_{\parallel} and NLL_{\perp} are universal, *i.e.*, the dynamical steps discussed above and qualitative features are not material specific, provided physical processes are supported. Light scattering, which drives both NLL_{\parallel} and NLL_{\perp} , occurs *via* laser-induced radiation and SPP. The former applies universally to any solid surface, while the latter is supported by most non-dielectrics. Similarly, ultrafast ablation is possible in all materials, and oxidation occurs in many, though not all. While we focus on oxidation due to its reliance only on ambient air, the process can involve other chemical reactions, such as nitrate or carbide formation.

To demonstrate this universality, we created structures on various metals such as Ti, Co, Al, Ni, Nb, Cr, and a semiconductor, Si, despite their widely different absorptions, refractive indices, and heat diffusion rates. NLL_{\parallel} patterns on all these materials are shown in Fig. 2a. The strong and narrow reciprocal peaks shown in the lower row of Fig. 2a indicate high uniformity. NLL_{\perp} patterns on the same sample and their reciprocal peaks are also presented. We used 6×10^4 to 6×10^5 pulses per spot to form NLL_{\parallel} with pulse fluences ranging from 30 to 45 mJ/cm², depending on the material. In contrast, NLL_{\perp} required only 6 to 60 pulses at the higher fluences of 200 to 290 mJ/cm² (see Methods for the exact values). Notably, NLL_{\parallel} structures exhibit superior quality and periodicity, especially over large areas, due to their more gradual growth and self-limiting negative feedback. However, the abruptness of NLL_{\perp} is not inevitable. Future work may achieve more gradual ablation by employing bursts containing thousands of pulses¹⁶.

Next, we demonstrate for the first time that the chosen mechanism can be deliberately switched to the other over the same material surface. This transition is seamless, as shown in Fig. 2b. To confirm that NLL_{\parallel} structures grow out of the surface (Fig. 2b (i), (iii)) while NLL_{\perp} structures grow into the surface via ablation (Fig. 2b (ii), (iv)), we diced the processed samples and imaged their cross-sections using SEM. When the surface is a thin film on a substrate, ablation self-terminates when the thin film is fully removed, but for thicker films or bulk targets, limiting the number of pulses is essential.

Our theory predicts both the range of pulse parameters (Fig. 2c, for Co-films on a glass substrate) and the periodicities of the resulting structures (Fig. 2d, see the Supplementary Document for additional predictions). For NLL₁, the period corresponds to that of the SPP waves¹³. Predicting the NLL_{||} periods is more challenging, however, calculations that assume an effective index, n_{eff} , to account for the periodic metal and metal-oxide composition of the surface¹⁷ show good agreement with the experiments. The predicted values span a broad range due to uncertainties in the material properties.

Devices and applications

The universality of the mechanism competition, combined with the ability to switch between them at will,

offers far greater possibilities than relying on a single mechanism. These possibilities extend beyond controlling the symmetries; they include modifying the morphology (structures growing into or out of the surface) and the chemistry (the native material or its oxide) differently. Armed with the predictive power of our theoretical model, we showcase several technological applications. First, we present a functional holographic temperature sensor (Fig. 3a and 3b). Next, we demonstrate advanced control over surface wettability (Fig. 3c). Finally, we introduce programmable sequences of repeated symmetry inversions that tile complex surface patterns for structural colouring (Fig. 3d and 3e). These applications were designed to highlight versatility across diverse substrate materials: Kapton tape for the holographic temperature sensor, Si wafers for wettability control, and flexible glass for structural colouring.

The temperature sensor uses a hologram, created over a 100-nm-thick Co-coated Kapton tape (Fig. 3a). The sample was placed over a Peltier element to control its temperature electrically and illuminated with white light for detection. As the temperature increased from 27°C to 100°C, then decreased to 37°C, the periodicity of the structures changed due to the thermal expansion and contraction of the tape. This shift modulated the amount of red light detected (Fig. 3b).

For wettability control, we patterned Si wafers with NLL_1 , producing a superhydrophilic surface with a contact angle of 11.1° (Fig. 3c(i)). Coating the patterns with a 10-nm-thick C₄F₈ polymer rendered the surface superhydrophobic with a contact angle of 179.9° (Fig. 3c(ii)). Selective NLL processing then reverted the treated areas to superhydrophilic, now with a contact angle of 19.1°. The fabrication process is both simple and maskless. Time-lapse images of a water droplet bouncing over the superhydrophilic surface are shown in Fig. 3c(iii) (Supplementary Video 3). Although laser-based wettability control has been reported¹⁸, this is the first maskless demonstration to achieve transitions between superhydrophobic and superhydrophilic regions over just a few microns on the same surface (Fig. 3c(iv)). To showcase the capability, we demonstrate guided water flow along a predetermined path (Supplementary Video 4).

We demonstrate structural colouring by creating heptomino patterns with four different colours (Fig. 3d). The perceived colours arise entirely from the nanostructure; each tile diffracts a different wavelength range to a specific angle under a white light illumination. Inspired by the *Limenitis arthemis astyanax* butterfly, we replicated its image by structurally colouring a 4×4 cm² area on Co-coated flexible glass (Fig. 3e). The butterfly's colours were achieved using different laser polarisation states and formation mechanisms. Notably, when the flexible glass is bent to mimic flapping wings, the colours shift with the viewing angle, similar to the natural behaviour of the *Limenitis arthemis astyanax*.

Future possibilities include expanding the colour palette by varying the angle of polarised light, combining structural colouring with wettability and tribological control as demonstrated here and previously^{19,20}. Additionally, control of the structural periods can be tuned *in-situ* by changing the incidence angle of the laser beam (see Supplementary Figure S4), or the laser wavelength. All results reported here were achieved in ambient conditions, where oxygen is the most reactive species; however, alternative chemical reactions can be exploited under controlled atmospheres, in liquid solutions²¹, or using reactants from a plasma jet²².

Given the vast range of possible surface and substrate combinations, the robustness of the nanostructures against stretching and bending on flexible substrates or due to thermal expansion, and the high patterning speed (up to 7.2 mm²/s, limited by our setup), we believe the scope for potential applications extends far beyond those showcased here.

Conclusion

We have demonstrated the precise control of competing mechanisms in NLL, enabling the selective activation of one mechanism over another through laser parameters. This represents the first demonstration of controlled mechanism selection in laser-driven self-organisation. The excluded mechanism is suppressed by nonlocal feedback but can be reintroduced by tuning the laser parameters, offering a unique means of manipulating surface patterning by controlling feature size, orientation, or periodicity. While competitive exclusion ensures pristine structures, it complicates the discovery of other mechanisms if only a limited range of laser parameters is explored.

This new perspective prompted us to revisit recent findings on self-organised structures in

semiconductors and transparent dielectrics^{3,4,7-9,23,24}. Each demonstration reported distinct mechanisms, often in the same material^{3,7,8,23}, using widely varying laser parameters, such as nanosecond or femtosecond pulses (resulting in higher⁷ or lower²³ refractive indices both in Si) or different wavelengths^{7,8}. We conclude that multiple mechanisms likely coexisted but remained concealed due to competitive exclusion. This represents a pivotal opportunity²⁵ to combine the distinct mechanisms behind these recent results^{4,7,8,23} to enable the maskless, low-cost fabrication of feedback-driven programmable structures with the uniformity, complexity, and potentially sub-10 nm feature sizes⁴ to rival top-down nanofabrication techniques.

Methods

Experimental Setup

The experimental setup consists of a custom-built, laser-coupled transmission/reflection mode microscope paired with a galvo scanner for large-area laser processing. This setup enables simultaneous diffraction-limited optical imaging during laser-driven pattern formation. The microscope is based on a Nikon Eclipse Ti2 inverted microscope body, equipped with objectives of varying magnifications (Nikon CFI Plan Apo VC 60XC WI, CFI Plan Fluor 40X, CFI S Plan Fluor ELWD 20XC), and a motorised dual-axis translational stage (Standa 8MTF-200). Laser pulses are provided by a Spectra-Physics Spirit One 1040-8-SHG ultrafast laser. For larger-area processing, we used a dual-axis beam scanner (Scanlab, SCANcube 14). See Supplementary Information for further details.

Sample Preparation

A thermal evaporator and RF sputtering device were employed to coat various substrates with different materials. For the co-existence experiments, 150- μ m-thick microscope slides were used as the substrate (see Supplementary Table 2 for detailed processing parameters and sample thicknesses). Superhydrophobic samples were fabricated by coating a crystalline Si wafer with a 10-nm-thick CFx polymer after NLL_{\perp} processing. The temperature sensor was prepared by depositing a 110-nm-thick Co layer on Kapton tape via thermal evaporation. The butterfly pattern was drawn on a 110-nm-thick Co-coated Corning EAGLE XG Slim flexible glass.

Measurement Techniques

Images were acquired using mainly the transmission microscope setup, except when working with nontransparent samples. Videos of superhydrophobicity were captured with an iPhone X camera, while the temperature sensor videos were taken with a Nikon 5D Mark IV DSLR camera, using a stereo microscope.

Simulations

Simulations were conducted using self-developed MATLAB codes.

Figure Captions

Figure 1 Depiction of the regimes of laser-induced surface structure formation. The laser beam is shown in red. (a) The structure formation parallel to laser polarisation caused by oxidation driven by the laser (NLL_µ); (b) Structure formation perpendicular to the laser polarisation due to ablation (NLL_⊥). (c) Competition between NLL_∥ and NLL_⊥ during emergence. (i) The initial surface profile (h_1) , (ii) the total intensity distribution $(I_{total,n})$ caused by h_1 , (iii) vertical and horizontal cross-sections of $I_{total,n}$, with the green and blue lines showing the vertical and horizontal cross-sections, respectively. (d) Flowchart of the feedback-driven NLL process involving the surface profile, h_n , electric field profile, E_n , scattering kernel, K, and total intensity profile, $I_{total,n}$. (e) Numerical simulations of the formation of perpendicular and parallel structures depending on the pulse fluence. The scattered intensity induced by the present structures is shown with contours. The leftmost plot shows the initial surface. The top row shows the development of NLL_∥, with the times representing $t_1 = 97,000^{th}$, $t_2 = 98,000^{th}$, $t_3 = 99,000^{th}$, and $t_4 =$ 100,000th pulses, with a pulse fluence of 26.5 mJ/cm². The bottom row shows NLL_⊥, with the times representing $t_1 = 4^{th}$, $t_2 = 5^{th}$, $t_3 = 7^{th}$, and $t_4 = 8^{th}$ pulses, with a pulse fluence of 160 mJ/cm². The rightmost are the SEM images of NLL_∥ and NLL_⊥ on a Ti surface. The scale bars are 1 µm for simulations and 5 µm for SEM images.

Figure 2 (a) Demonstration of the universal mechanism selection. The top row shows optical images of NLL_{\parallel} with their respective reciprocal peaks. The third row shows optical images of NLL_{\perp} with their reciprocal peaks. All images were captured with a 60x objective, with the laser polarisation indicated in each row. Scale bars are 5 µm. (b) Cross-sectional images of NLL_{\parallel} and NLL_{\perp} on (i) and (ii) 400-nm-thick Ti, (iii) and (iv) and 100-nm-thick Co surfaces. (c) Parameter space of NLL formation as a function of pulse fluence and the number of pulses per spot. (d) Measured and calculated periods of the surface structures for each material and formation mechanism.

Figure 3 Prototype of a temperature sensor with 110-nm-thick Cobalt coated on Kapton tape. The sensor is illuminated with white light, and the red-colour channel of the recorded image is analysed. (a) The temperature was varied over time, causing the structure period to increase and decrease due to expansion and contraction of the tape. (b) The change in reflectivity for red colour is used to sense the temperature changes. (c) Superhydrophilic (i) and superhydrophobic (ii) functionalisation of crystalline silicon via NLL. (iii) Time-lapse images of a water droplet bouncing on a superhydrophobic surface. (iv) SEM image of adjacent superhydrophilic and superhydrophobic regions. (d) Structural colour created on 110-nm-thick cobalt film via NLL_{\parallel} and NLL_{\perp} using two mutually orthogonal polarisation directions and formed by enacting 100 preprogrammed transitions. The image was recorded under a white light

illumination. The NLL_{\parallel} patches were formed using 200,000 pulses/spot, each with a fluence of 42 mJ/cm². The NLL_{\perp} patches were created with 60 pulses per spot, each with 210 mJ/cm². (e) A structural-colour recreation of the wings of a *Limenitis arthemis astyanax* butterfly (inset) on a thin-film coated flexible glass, where the perceived colours change, similarly to the real butterfly's wings, when the glass is bent to mimic the wing flapping.

Video Captions

Supplementary Video 1 Simulation of switching on the same sample. Calculations are performed for a Co sample. Low pulse fluence at high repetition rate results in NLL_{\parallel} , and high pulse fluence at low repetition rate creates NLL_{\perp} .

Supplementary Video 2 Demonstration of the temperature sensor on a Co sample on Kapton tape by functionalisation with NLL.

Supplementary Video 3 Demonstration of superhydrophobic Si substrate after functionalisation with NLL.

Supplementary Video 4 Guided water flow along a predetermined superhydrophilic path surrounded by superhydrophobic regions on a silicon wafer, with the surface covered by a glass microscope slide. The fabrication process is both simple and maskless.

Acknowledgements

This work received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) projects NLL, PhD, UniLase, and DSA under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreements No. 617521, No. 853387, and No. 101055055, respectively) and TÜBİTAK (grant agreement No. 120F147).

Author contributions

Ö.Y., S.I., F.Ö.I, O.T., and I.P. designed the research and experiments. I.P. developed the idea and performed the initial experiments. Ö.Y. and A.A. performed the universality, temperature sensor, and tiling experiments. S.G. supplied the samples and obtained SEM images. P.D. designed and performed hydrophilicity experiments. Ö.Y. and Ü.S.N. developed the mathematical model and simulations. Ö.Y., S.I., and F.Ö.I. conceived of the theoretical framework.

Data availability

The data supporting the plots within this paper and other findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary text, methods, Figs. 1–9, Table 1–2, and references.

Bibliography

- Birnbaum, M. Semiconductor surface damage produced by ruby lasers. *Journal of Applied Physics* 36, 3688-3689 (1965).
- 2. Bonse, J. & Stephan G. Maxwell meets Marangoni—a review of theories on laser-induced periodic surface structures. *Laser & Photonics Reviews* 14, 2000215 (2020).
- 3. Chambonneau, M., *et al.* In-volume laser direct writing of silicon challenges and opportunities. *Laser & Photonics Reviews* **15**, 2100140 (2021).
- 4. Li, Z., *et al.* Super-stealth dicing of transparent solids with nanometric precision. *Nature Photonics* **18**, 799-808 (2024).
- 5. Han, F., Gu, S., Klimas, A., Zhao, N., Zhao Y., & Chen S.-C. Three-dimensional nanofabrication via ultrafast laser patterning and kinetically regulated material assembly. *Science* **378**, 1325-1331 (2022).
- 6. Öktem, B. *et al.* Nonlinear laser lithography for indefinitely large-area nanostructuring with femtosecond pulses. *Nature Photonics* **7**, 897-901 (2013).
- 7. Tokel, O. *et al.* In-chip microstructures and photonic devices fabricated by nonlinear laser lithography deep inside silicon. *Nature Photonics* **11**, 639-645 (2017).
- 8. Asgari Sabet, R., Ishraq, A., Saltik, A., Bütün, M. & Tokel, O. Laser nanofabrication inside silicon with spatial beam modulation and anisotropic seeding. *Nature Communications* **15**, 5786 (2024).
- 9. Ilday, F.Ö. Driven by feedback, unlimited by diffraction. Nature Photonics 18, 771-772 (2024).
- 10. Young, J.F., Sipe, J.E., Preston, J.S. & Van Driel, H.M. Laser-induced periodic surface damage and radiation remnants. *Applied Physics Letters* **41**, 261-264 (1982).
- 11. Sipe, J.E., Young J.F., Preston J.S. & Van Driel, H.M. Laser-induced periodic surface structure. I. theory. *Physical Review B* 27, 1141 (1983).
- 12. Guosheng, Z., Fauchet, P.M. & Siegman, A.E. Growth of spontaneous periodic surface structures on solids during laser illumination. *Physical Review B* 26, 5366 (1982).
- 13. Miyaji, G. & Miyazaki, K. Origin of periodicity in nanostructuring on thin film surfaces ablated with femtosecond laser pulses. *Optics Express* **16**, 16265-16271 (2008).
- Sakabe, S., Masaki H., Shigeki T., Shin N. & Kiminori O. Mechanism for self-formation of periodic grating structures on a metal surface by a femtosecond laser pulse. *Physical Review B* 79, 033409 (2009).
- 15. Hardin, G. The competitive exclusion principle. Science 131, 1292-1297 (1960).
- 16. Kerse, C. *et al.* Ablation-cooled material removal with ultrafast bursts of pulses. *Nature* **537**, 84-88 (2016).
- 17. Bonch-Bruevich, A.M., Libenson, M.N., Makin, V.S. & Trubaev, V.V. Surface electromagnetic waves in optics. *Optical Engineering* **31**, 718-730 (1992).
- Vorobyev, A.Y. & Guo, C. Multifunctional surfaces produced by femtosecond laser pulses. *Journal of Applied Physics* 117, 033103 (2015).

- 19. Orazi, L. et al. Nonlinear laser lithography to control surface properties of stainless steel. College International pour la Recherche en Productique Annals 64, 193-196 (2015).
- 20. Gnilitskyi, I. *et al.* Nano patterning of AISI 316L stainless steel with nonlinear laser lithography: Sliding under dry and oil-lubricated conditions. *Tribology International* **99**, 67-76 (2016).
- 21. Manshina, A.A. *et al.* The second laser revolution in chemistry: Emerging laser technologies for precise fabrication of multifunctional nanomaterials and nanostructures. *Advanced Functional Materials* **34**, 2405457 (2024).
- 22. Morfill, G.E. & Ivlev, A.V. Complex plasmas: An interdisciplinary research field. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, **81**, 1353-1404 (2009).
- 23. Pavlov, I., et al. Femtosecond laser written waveguides deep inside silicon. Optics Letters 42, 3028-3031 (2017).
- 24. Hickstein, D.D., Carlson, D.R., Mundoor, H. et al. Self-organized nonlinear gratings for ultrafast nanophotonics. *Nature Photonics* **13**, 494-499 (2019).
- 25. Ilday, S. & Ilday, F.Ö. The universality of self-organisation: a path to an atom printer? in *Ultrafast Laser Nanostructuring: The Pursuit of Extreme Scales* (eds. Stoian, R., Bonse, J.) 173-207 (Springer International Publishing, 2024).





Figure 2





Controlling Competing Feedback Mechanisms for Programmable Patterns *via* Nonlinear Laser Lithography

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Özgün Yavuz¹, Abdullah bin Aamir¹, Ihor Pavlov², Sezin Galioğlu³, Ü. Seleme Nizam Bayrak¹, Petro Deminskyi⁴, Onur Tokel^{3,4}, Serim Ilday^{1,5}, and F. Ömer Ilday^{1,5}

¹ Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Information Technology, Ruhr Universität Bochum,

Universitätsstraße 150, 44801 Bochum, Germany

² Department of Physics, Middle East Technical University, 06800 Ankara, Turkey

³ UNAM-National Nanotechnology Research Center & Institute of Materials Science and Nanotechnology, Bilkent University, Ankara, 06800, Turkey

⁴ Department of Physics, Bilkent University, 06800 Ankara, Turkey

⁵ Faculty of Physics and Astronomy, Ruhr Universität Bochum, Universitätsstraße 150, 44801 Bochum, Germany

[†]Corresponding author: Oemer.Ilday@ruhr-uni-bochum.de

Table of Contents

1.	The full model of the pattern formation	4
2.	Calculating the periods of the NLL patterns	11
3.	Predictive power of the theoretical model of NLL	13
4.	The experimental setup	16
5.	Experimental demonstration of all primary transitions between the two types of NLL	17
6.	Cross-sectional analysis of the structures	19
8.	The self-limiting growth as a result of the negative feedback	21
9.	Demonstration of large-area patterning on flexible glass	23
10.	Fabrication and characterisation for wettability control	24
Bit	oliography	26

Table of Figures and Tables

Figure S1. Total intensity distribution with a vertically polarised laser beam from a single defect located at the centre of the
computation domain. (a) 2-D distribution of total intensity. (b) Horizontal (blue), and vertical (green) cross-sections of the intensity
distribution shown in (a)
Figure S2. The thresholds for oxidation (Iox) and ablation (Iab) processes are both described by error functions to avoid
discontinuities
Table S1. Optical constants of the processed materials. 11
Figure S4. Period estimation of the emerging NLL on a Ti surface. The green-framed images represent optical microscope images,
while the red-framed images correspond to simulation results. The scale bar represents 5 µm
Figure S5. Depiction of two different collision experiments. Simplified depictions of the two experiments are shown in (a)(i) and
(b)(i). The optical microscope images of the experimentally formed pattern are shown in (ii), and simulation results are shown in
(iii). All the scale bars are 5 μm
Figure S6. The experimental setup comprises a commercial femtosecond laser coupled to a computer-controlled 2-axis motorised
stage and a diffraction-limited optical microscope
Figure S7. The figure shows the possible transitions between NLL and NLL on cobalt for horizontal and vertical polarisations of
the laser beam. (a) NLL horizontal polarisation to vertical polarisation. (b) NLL vertical polarisation to horizontal polarisation. (c)
NLL vertical polarisation to horizontal polarisation. (d) NLL horizontal polarisation to vertical polarisation. (e) NLL horizontal
polarisation to NLL vertical polarisation. (f) NLL horizontal polarisation to NLL horizontal polarisation. (g) NLL vertical
polarisation to NLL vertical polarisation. (h) NLL vertical polarisation to NLL horizontal polarisation. (i) NLL vertical polarisation
to NLL horizontal polarisation. (j) NLL vertical polarisation to NLL vertical polarisation. (k) NLL horizontal polarisation to NLL
horizontal polarisation. (1) NLL horizontal polarisation to NLL vertical polarisation
Table S2. Laser and scanning parameters, and thin-film thicknesses for the experiments shown in Fig. 2a20
Figure S8. Demonstration of the effect of the negative feedback on oxidation. (a) Scanning the same Titanium surface 1, 2, and 5
times in NLL. (b) Scanning the same area 1, 2, and 5 times in NLL. See Methods for the detailed experimental conditions
Figure S9. Photo of the processed flexible glass. (a) Close-up photo of the processed area while the sample is flat. (b) Photo of the
sample being bent
Figure S10. The fabrication process for creating alternating superhydrophobic and superhydrophilic patterns using NLL24
Figure S11. Photograph of water droplets on a 54 mm-wide Si sample rendered superhydrophobic using NLL, showing uniform
surface coverage

1. The full model of the pattern formation

In this section, we provide a detailed explanation of the theoretical model summarised in **Fig. 1d**. We begin by describing the scattering of laser light from the surface, followed by the two alternative surface modification mechanisms: ablation and a thermochemical reaction (oxidation, in the present experiments).

When a laser pulse impinges on the sample surface, every infinitesimal point on the surface scatters the electromagnetic wave. The strength of this scattering depends on the local surface properties, particularly whether a given point is elevated or depressed relative to its immediate surroundings. For instance, a point that is merely nanometres taller or lower than its neighbouring points will scatter more effectively than a point that is of equal height to its surroundings. We refer to such points simply as "defects."

The total electric field, $\mathbf{E}_{tot}(\mathbf{r})$, can be written as the sum of the incident electric field, $\mathbf{E}_{inc}(\mathbf{r})$, and the scattered electric field. The total electric field on the sample surface is expressed as:

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{tot}}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{E}_{\text{inc}}(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{\alpha k^2}{\varepsilon_0} \int_{V} \overleftarrow{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \mathbf{E}_{\text{inc}}(\mathbf{r}') dV, \qquad (1)$$

where **r** is the observation point, **r**' is the position of the scattering point, α is the material polarisability, k is the wave vector, ε_0 is the permittivity of free space, and $\mathbf{\hat{G}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is the dyadic Green's tensor [1]. This tensor describes how the electric field scatters from an infinitesimal defect on the surface. Scattering occurs via two distinct processes: radiation remnants, which propagate perpendicular to the electric field oscillation direction and form lines parallel to the polarisation; and SPP excitation, which propagates along the polarisation direction and forms NLL lines perpendicular to the laser polarisation. Both effects are included in $\mathbf{\hat{G}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$.

Since the average height of the surface structures is significantly smaller than the wavelength of the laser, the three-dimensional volume integral can be reduced to a two-dimensional surface integral,

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{tot}}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{E}_{\text{inc}}(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{\alpha k^2}{\varepsilon_0} \int_{S} \overleftarrow{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \mathbf{E}_{\text{inc}}(\mathbf{r}') h(\mathbf{r}') \mathrm{d}S,$$
(2)

where $h(\vec{r}')$ is the surface height profile. $\overleftrightarrow{G}(\vec{r},0)$ for Cartesian coordinates $(i.e., \vec{r} = r \sin(\theta)\hat{a}_x + r \cos(\theta)\hat{a}_y)$ is given by:

$$\overrightarrow{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{r},0) = e^{-jkr} \begin{bmatrix} \cos^2\theta \frac{1}{r} + [3\sin^2\theta - 1](\frac{1}{k^2r^3} + \frac{j}{kr^2}) & -\sin\theta\cos\theta \frac{1}{r} + 3\sin\theta\cos\theta(\frac{1}{k^2r^3} + \frac{j}{kr^2}) \\ -\sin\theta\cos\theta \frac{1}{r} + 3\sin\theta\cos\theta(\frac{1}{k^2r^3} + \frac{j}{kr^2}) & \sin^2\theta \frac{1}{r} + [3\cos^2\theta - 1](\frac{1}{k^2r^3} + \frac{j}{kr^2}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

(3)

Next, all components of the scattered electric field, $\vec{E}_{scattered}(\vec{r})$, in Cartesian coordinates can be written as:

$$E(x, y)_{x}^{x} = \frac{\alpha k^{2}}{\varepsilon_{0}} \iint E_{\text{inc}, x}(x', y')h(x', y')e^{-jkr} \Big[(3\sin^{2}\theta - 1)(\frac{1}{k^{2}r^{3}} + \frac{j}{kr^{2}}) + \frac{\cos^{2}\theta}{r} \Big] dx'dy'$$
(4)

$$E(x,y)_x^y = \frac{\alpha k^2}{\varepsilon_0} \iint E_{\text{inc},x}(x',y')h(x',y')e^{-jkr} \Big[3\sin\theta\cos\theta(\frac{1}{k^2r^3} + \frac{j}{kr^2}) - \frac{\sin\theta\cos\theta}{r} \Big] dx'dy'$$
(5)

$$E(x,y)_{y}^{y} = \frac{\alpha k^{2}}{\varepsilon_{0}} \iint E_{\text{inc},y}(x',y')h(x',y')e^{-jkr} \Big[(3\cos^{2}\theta - 1)\Big(\frac{1}{k^{2}r^{3}} + \frac{j}{kr^{2}}\Big) + \frac{\sin^{2}\theta}{r} \Big] \mathrm{d}x'\mathrm{d}y' \tag{6}$$

$$E(x,y)_{y}^{x} = \frac{\alpha k^{2}}{\varepsilon_{0}} \iint E_{\text{inc},y}(x',y')h(x',y')e^{-jkr} \Big[3\sin\theta\cos\theta(\frac{1}{k^{2}r^{3}} + \frac{j}{kr^{2}}) - \frac{\sin\theta\cos\theta}{r} \Big] dx'dy', \tag{7}$$

where $E(x, y)_x^x$ is the electric field in the x-direction induced by an x-polarised laser beam, $E(x, y)_x^y$ is the electric field in the y-direction caused by an x-polarised laser beam. Here, $E_{\text{inc},x}$ and $E_{\text{inc},y}$ are the incident electric fields along the x and y directions, respectively. The angular variable is defined as $\theta = \arctan[(y - y')/(x - x')]$, and the radial distance is $r = \sqrt{(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2}$.

Since a full quantitative description of surface plasmon polariton (SPP) excitation requires integration over all angles near the defect, it is quite complex. For our purposes, we simplify this by introducing a coupling constant, κ , which represents the coupling between the near-field electric field and the SPP. As SPP waves decay exponentially with distance from the source [2], the resulting equations become:

$$E(x,y)_x^x = \frac{\alpha k^2}{\varepsilon_0} \iint E_{0x}(x',y')h(x',y')e^{-jkr} \left[\kappa(3\sin^2\theta - 1)e^{-\beta r} + \frac{\cos^2\theta}{r}\right] \mathrm{d}x'\mathrm{d}y' \tag{8}$$

$$E(x, y)_x^y = \frac{\alpha k^2}{\varepsilon_0} \iint E_{0x}(x', y') h(x', y') e^{-jkr} \Big(3\kappa \sin\theta \cos\theta e^{-\beta r} - \frac{\sin\theta \cos\theta}{r} \Big) dx' dy'$$
(9)

$$E(x,y)_{y}^{y} = \frac{\alpha k^{2}}{\varepsilon_{0}} \iint E_{0y}(x',y')h(x',y')e^{-jkr} \left[\kappa(3\cos^{2}\theta-1)e^{-\beta r} + \frac{\sin^{2}\theta}{r}\right] \mathrm{d}x'\mathrm{d}y'$$
(10)

$$E(x,y)_{y}^{x} = \frac{\alpha k^{2}}{\varepsilon_{0}} \iint E_{0y}(x',y')h(x',y')e^{-jkr} \Big(3\kappa\sin\theta\cos\theta e^{-\beta r} - \frac{\sin\theta\cos\theta}{r}\Big)dx'dy', \tag{11}$$

where $(2\beta)^{-1}$ is the SPP decay constant, leading to NLL₁. The terms that exclude κ correspond to the dipolelike (for linearly polarised laser light) radiation responsible for NLL₁.

Finally, the total intensity on the material surface is given by:

$$I_{\text{tot}}(x,y) = |E(x,y)_x^x \hat{a}_x + E(x,y)_y^x \hat{a}_x + E(x,y)_x^y \hat{a}_y + E(x,y)_y^y \hat{a}_y|^2,$$
(12)

where \hat{a}_x and \hat{a}_y are unit vectors along the x and y directions, respectively.

The scattering kernel of the main text, *K*, is a reduction of Eqn. (8) - (11) to scalar form. For instance, the incident electric field vector for a *x*-polarised laser beam will be $\mathbf{E}_{inc}(x, y) = E_{inc,x}(x, y)\hat{a}_x$. All the components including $E_{inc,y}(x, y)$ as a multiplicative term, namely Eqns. (10), (11), vanish. Eqn. (9) remains complex only and does not contribute to interference in Eqn. (12) but contributes a bias to the overall interference pattern. Therefore, the total intensity can be written as:

$$I_{\text{tot}}(x,y) = \left| E_{\text{inc},x}(x,y) + \frac{\alpha k^2}{\varepsilon_0} \iint E_{\text{inc},x}(x',y')h(x',y')K(x-x',y-y')dx'dy' \right|^2,$$
(13)

with a kernel, K, of:

$$K(x - x', y - y') = e^{-jkr} \left[\kappa (3\cos^2\theta - 1)e^{-\beta r} + \frac{\sin^2\theta}{r} \right].$$
 (14)

We calculate the total intensity distribution by considering contributions from every infinitesimal point along the surface, where each point acts as an individual scatterer with strength proportional to its local height profile, as expressed in equation (2). However, visualising this distribution directly can be challenging.

To aid interpretation, the main text describes the intensity distribution produced by a single defect. Here, we provide additional detail. The defect is assumed to be located at the centre of the computational domain, and the laser beam is assumed to have a vertically polarised electric field (aligned along the *y*-axis). Figure 1c in the main text is reproduced on a larger scale in Fig. S1a. Corresponding vertical and horizontal crosssections of the intensity pattern are shown in Fig. S1b, where the green trace represents the vertical crosssection, and the blue trace corresponds to the horizontal cross-section.

A single defect is modelled by setting $h(x, y) = \delta(x, y)$, where $\delta(x, y)$ is the Dirac delta function. The nearfield component of the SPP creates a short-range intensity modulation perpendicular to the polarisation axis (green curve). This behaviour is expected, as SPP excitation decays rapidly —within a few micrometres for high-loss metals such as Ti (SSP decay length of 4.6 µm), Cr, and W. In contrast, SPPs can propagate several tens of micrometres in low-loss metals, such as Au, Ag, and Cu.

The resulting intensity distribution reveals two key features:

- (i) A high-intensity, short-range modulation perpendicular to the laser polarisation, which corresponds to NLL₁.
- (ii) A lower-intensity, long-range modulation parallel to laser polarisation, which corresponds to NLL_{||}.
- Figure S1. Total intensity distribution with a vertically polarised laser beam from a single defect located at the centre



of the computation domain. (a) 2-D distribution of total intensity. (b) Horizontal (blue), and vertical (green) crosssections of the intensity distribution shown in (a).

Before proceeding to describe the modelling of surface modifications via ablation and thermochemical reactions, it is important to highlight a key point. There is *no fundamental reason* why the SPP field must exclusively drive ablation (*i.e.*, NLL_{\perp}) while dipole radiation drives the thermochemical reaction (*i.e.*, NLL $_{\parallel}$). This distinction arises from a *practical consequence*: for all the materials examined in this study, the SPP field produces higher but narrower intensity peaks that surpass the ablation threshold before reaching the threshold for the chemical reaction. Conversely, the broader intensity distribution associated with dipole radiation crosses the chemical reaction threshold before exceeding the ablation threshold. If the thresholds were reversed, the SPP field would drive NLL_{\parallel}, and dipole radiation would drive NLL_{\perp}.

We now describe the modelling of surface modifications through ablation and thermochemical reactions. Once again, we emphasise that oxidation is the reaction observed in our experiments only because they were conducted in ambient atmosphere using materials that readily oxidise. Fundamentally, however, the reaction could be any kinetically favourable process occurring in a suitable environment.

To calculate the volume of oxidised and ablated material under the laser beam's influence, we use the following expressions:

$$dV_{ox}(x,y) = dA \int f_{ox}(x,y,z)dz,$$
(13)

$$dV_{ab}(x,y) = dA \int f_{ab}(x,y,z)dz,$$
(14)

where $dV_{ox}(x, y)$ and $dV_{ab}(x, y)$ are the activated volume elements, $f_{ox}(x, y, z)$ and $f_{ab}(x, y, z)$ are the activation

probability functions for oxidation and ablation, respectively. Both processes are modelled by assuming effective thresholds below which no reaction occurs and above which the reaction proceeds. The oxidation threshold is calculated as the energy required to convert the surface material from the solid phase at room temperature to the activated state (near melting but below evaporation). For Co atoms, we use the following material properties: the specific heat capacity, $c_{sp} = 0.42$ J/gK, fusion heat, $H_f = 16.19$ kJ/mol, melting temperature, $T_m = 1768$ K, boiling temperature, $T_b = 3200$ K, density, $\rho = 8.9$ g/cm³, atomic mass, M = 58.93 amu, skin depth, $z_s = 29$ nm, and pulse duration, $\tau_p = 300$ fs. Similar calculations have been made for all other materials used in this study. The ablation threshold is calculated assuming that if the vaporisation energy is exceeded, the material will be ablated and removed from the material surface. For Co, the heat of vaporisation is $H_v = 376.5$ kJ/mol. With these coefficients and assumptions, the oxidation and ablation thresholds are calculated as $I_{ox} = 110$ GW/cm², and $I_{ab} = 600$ GW/cm², respectively.

We acknowledge that these threshold calculations are simplified approximations of highly complex processes. Nevertheless, they align well with experimental observations. During simulations, we evaluate both thresholds at each surface point after every pulse to determine which process (if any) is activated.

Since real threshold processes are not discontinuous, directly imposing sharp thresholds causes numerical complications. To address this, we introduce smoothened threshold functions using differentiable sigmoid-like functions such as:

$$f_{\rm ox}(x,y) = \frac{1 + \operatorname{erf}\{s_{\rm ox}[I_{\rm tot}(x,y) - I_{\rm ox}]\}}{2},\tag{15}$$

where $erf\{\cdot\}$ is the error function, and s_{ox} is the smoothening factor. The expression for ablation follows a similar form and is omitted here for brevity. Both activation probability functions are plotted in **Fig. S2**. The incident pulse intensity at depth *z* within the material is given by:

$$I_{\text{tot}}(x, y, z) = I_{\text{surf,tot}}(x, y)e^{-z/z_{\text{s}}},$$
(16)

where $I_{\text{surf.tot}}(x, y)$ is the intensity distribution, and z_s is the skin depth of the material.

Finally, the corresponding volume elements for oxidation and ablation are expressed as follows:

$$dV_{ox}(x, y) = dA z_s c_{ox} \left(erf\{s_{ox}[I_{tot}(x, y) - I_{ox}]\} + 1 \right) / 2,$$
(19)

$$dV_{ab}(x, y) = dA z_s c_{ab} \left(erf\{s_{ab}[I_{tot}(x, y) - I_{ab}]\} + 1 \right) / 2$$
(20)

where c_{ox} and c_{ab} are proportionality factors setting the rates of oxidation and ablation processes, respectively.

To calculate the change in surface height per laser pulse due to oxidation, we must account for both the

number of activated surface atoms and the availability of O₂ molecules in the immediate vicinity.

When a laser pulse arrives, the number of, *e.g.*, Co atoms activated by that pulse within the volume, $dV_{ox}(x, y)$, is given by, $N_{Co,ox} = dV_{ox}(x, y)\rho N_A/M_{Co}$, where M_{Co} is the molar mass of cobalt, ρ is its mass density, N_A is Avogadro's number.

The number of available oxygen molecules for the reaction is given by $N_{O_2}(x, y) = c_{O_2} e^{-h_n(x,y)/h_c}$, where $h_n(x, y)$ (if positive) is the oxide layer thickness after the *n*th pulse and h_c is the critical height that characterises oxygen diffusion into the cobalt oxide layer.



Figure S2. The thresholds for oxidation (I_{ox}) and ablation (I_{ab}) processes are both described by error functions to avoid discontinuities.

Following each pulse, the corresponding change in the oxide layer is given by, $\Delta h_{\text{ox},n}(x, y) = r_{\text{ox}}N_{\text{CoO}}$, where r_{ox} is the oxidation rate and N_{CoO} is the number of newly formed oxide molecules. The latter is determined by the limiting factor in the reaction,

$$N_{\rm CoO} = \begin{cases} N_{\rm Co,ox} & \text{if } N_{\rm Co,ox} < N_{\rm O_2}, \\ N_{\rm O_2} & \text{if } N_{\rm O_2} < N_{\rm Co,ox}. \end{cases}$$
(21)

This self-limiting nature of the oxidation process introduces a form of negative feedback in nonlinear laser lithography (NLL), which naturally saturates the growth of surface structures.

The height change due to the ablation process can be calculated in a similar manner. The activated volume element, $dV_{ab}(x, y)$, is determined similarly, using the parameters I_{ab} , s_{ab} , and c_{ab} . However, unlike oxidation, the ablated material is simply ejected without involving any additional reactants. The corresponding height change is given by $\Delta h_{ab,n}(x, y) = dV_{ab}(x, y)/dA = -r_{ab}N_{Co,ab}$, which is always a negative function, except when zero. Here, r_{ab} is the ablation rate and $N_{Co,ab}$ is the number of surface molecules activated for ablation.

Combining both mechanisms, the net height change after the n^{th} pulse is given by

$$\Delta h_n(x, y) = \Delta h_{\text{ox}, n}(x, y) + \Delta h_{\text{ab}, n}(x, y).$$
⁽²²⁾

Before proceeding with the calculations for the $(n + 1)^{st}$ pulse, the height profile is updated as,

$$h_{n+1}(x, y) = h_n(x, y) + \Delta h_n(x, y).$$
(23)

The simulation code runs over the entire cycle, with the position of the focal spot moved according to the scanning speed. It is important to note that the beam motion is much slower than the pulse repetition rate and the associated physical processes.

2. Calculating the periods of the NLL patterns

The structure period is determined by the period of the scattering event and the interference over the material surface. If the structures are formed due to retarded electromagnetic waves, the waves propagate mostly in ambient air. The electric field component concentrated along a very narrow region at the interface. The period of the structures can be crudely approximated by λ_0/n_{eff} , where λ_0 is the laser wavelength in free space and n_{eff} is the effective refractive index of the interface. n_{eff} depends on the refractive index of ambient air, metal (or semiconductor), the corresponding oxide material, and the amount (thickness) of the oxide. Therefore we assumed $n_{\text{eff}} = an_{\text{air}} + bn_{\text{material}} + cn_{\text{oxide}}$. Since retarded electromagnetic waves travel dominantly through ambient air, a = 0.75, b = c = 0.125, in most cases. In the case of Ni, we assumed $a_{\text{Ni}} = 0.9$, $b_{\text{Ni}} = 0.02$, $c_{\text{Ni}} = 0.08$, and for Nb, we assumed $a_{\text{Nb}} = 0.6$, $b_{\text{Nb}} = 0.04$, $c_{\text{Nb}} = 0.36$. If the formation is due to SPP coupling to the material, the structure period is given by $\lambda = \kappa 2\pi/\text{Re}\{k_{\text{SPP}}\}$, where κ is a scaling constant, taken as 0.75 here, $k_{\text{SPP}} = k_0 \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{metal}} \varepsilon_{\text{air}}/(\varepsilon_{\text{metal}} + \varepsilon_{\text{air}})}$, with $k_0 = 2\pi/\lambda_0$, and $\varepsilon_{\text{metal,air}}$ the relative permittivities of the metal and air, respectively.

Material	ε _r (real permittivity)	ε _i (imaginary permittivity)	Bulk/Thin film	Reference	Material	$\varepsilon_{\rm f}$ (real permittivity)	n (refractive index)	Bulk/Thin film	Reference
Со	-24.33	32.7	Bulk	[3]	CoO	4.6656	2.16	Bulk	[4]
Nb	-25.35	16.95	Bulk	[5]	Nb ₂ O ₅	5.0176	2.24	Thin film	[6]
Ni	-26.5	29.6	Bulk	[3]	NiO	3.24	1.8	Bulk	[7]
Cr	-0.52	25.04	Thin film	[3]	Cr ₂ O ₃	3.61	1.9	Thin film	[8]
Al	-97.44	27.81	Bulk	[9]	Al ₂ O ₃	3.0625	1.75	Bulk	[10]
Ti	-4.2	27.43	Bulk	[3]	TiO ₂	6.1504	2.48	Bulk	[11]
Si	N/A (see text)	N/A (see text)	Bulk	[12]	SiO ₂	2.1025	1.45	Bulk	[13]

 Table S1. Optical constants of the processed materials.

A special case is silicon. Because it is a semiconductor, it must be excited to reveal its metallic property and to support SPP waves and its refractive index scales with the strength of the excitation. Given the laser pulses are femtoseconds-long, there are several mechanisms, such as multi-photon absorption, free carrier absorption, and Auger recombination. These processes are complicated, and we used the empirical observations to estimate the period in Si [13] instead of a direct calculation like we did for the other materials. **Fig. 3b** illustrates the estimation of the structure period and the measured structure period. The sample tilt causes an experimental uncertainty in the setup with respect to the incidence angle of the beam, which is expressed by the error bar, corresponding to a 0.5-degree uncertainty for the tilt over the sample.

Since the refractive indices and permittivities vary wildly in the literature, it is not possible to estimate the structure period precisely. Therefore, we assumed a 30% uncertainty on the refractive indices of the metal and metal-oxides. We used the permittivities (refractive indices) given in **Table S1**. Despite these uncertainties, the estimated periods agree reasonably well with the experimental measurements of the period structures over all the materials considered in this study.

3. Predictive power of the theoretical model of NLL

The theoretical model demonstrates its ability to predict a broad range of phenomena observed experimentally. While the NLL process is generally intuitive, as we will showcase below, there are instances where predicting the resulting pattern is challenging. In these cases, the numerical solution of the model reliably predicts the experimental results. In this section, we present several examples that highlight the extensive predictions we have made over the years, all of which have been experimentally verified.



Figure S3. Simulation result of surface scanned with two sets of parameters while the laser polarisation kept the same. At the upper part $I_0 = 0.1$ TW/cm², $f_R = 1$ MHz, which supports oxidation; at the lower part $I_0 = 1.76$ TW/cm², $f_R = 500$ Hz, which supports ablation.

The first demonstration is central to the present study: the ability to create both types of NLL structures on the same surface and to switch between them. While similar calculations have been performed for all the materials considered in this study, for this example, we use the parameters for Ti: oxidation threshold $I_{ox} = 0.184$ TW/cm², ablation threshold $I_{ox} = 0.902$ TW/cm², surface plasmon decay length $\beta = 4.61$ µm, surface plasmon coupling coefficient $\kappa = 10^5$, oxidation rate $r_{ox} = 10^{-3}$, ablation rate $r_{ab} = 5 \times 10^{-16}$, wave number $k = 2\pi/\Lambda$ with $\Lambda = 870$ nm, critical thickness for oxidation $h_c = 15$ nm, and $\alpha k^2/\epsilon_0 = 5 \times 10^{12}$. In the simulations, we raster-scan the laser beam starting from the top-left corner of the field of view, initially using the laser parameters corresponding to NLL_{||}. In the middle of the simulation, we momentarily stop the pulses and change the laser parameters to correspond to NLL_⊥, while keeping the laser polarisation the same. **Figure S3** demonstrates the simulation results. We begin the raster scan at coordinates x = 30 µm and y = 0µm with the following laser parameters: peak intensity $I_0 = 0.1$ TW/cm², laser repetition rate $f_R = 1$ MHz. We stopped at coordinates x = 15 µm, y = 0 µm, then we moved to x = 0 µm, y = 0 µm and scanned backwards this time, with $I_0 = 1.76 \text{ TW/cm}^2$, $f_R = 500 \text{ Hz}$. The laser spot size is set to $w = 8 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ in diameter, and the scanning speed is set to $v = 125 \text{ }\mu\text{m/s}$ for both cases. These values correspond to $N_{\text{ox}} = 6.4 \times 10^3$ and $N_{\text{ab}} = 32 \text{ pulses per spot for NLL}_{\parallel}$ and NLL_ \perp , respectively.

The second demonstration is a more advanced calculation: the prediction of period change in structure formation as a function of the incidence angle of the laser beam [14]. The relationship between the laser structure period and the incidence angle is given by

$$\Lambda = \frac{\Lambda_0}{1 \pm \sin \theta},\tag{24}$$

where Λ is the resulting period, Λ_0 is the nominal period, and θ is the incidence angle with respect to the surface normal. **Figure S4** shows the comparison of the theoretical, experimental and simulation results for a Ti surface. The black straight line is the period estimated by Eqn. (24). The red data points are the measured period from the experimental data and the green ones are from the simulation results. Several samples from both the simulation and experiments are shown beneath the plot. The green and red frames surrounding the patterns indicate the experimental and theoretical results, respectively. The simulations predict the change of the period with a high degree of accuracy.



Figure S4. Period estimation of the emerging NLL on a Ti surface. The green-framed images represent optical microscope images, while the red-framed images correspond to simulation results. The scale bar represents $5 \mu m$.

The third, and perhaps most striking, demonstration of the predictive capability of the theoretical model involves a highly counterintuitive case. Despite our years of experience with these patterns, we were unable to predict the experimental outcome *a priori*, whereas the theoretical model predicts it perfectly. The NLL_{II} structures form stripe-like structures parallel to the laser polarisation. With great control over the structure's period, quality, and orientation, the following question naturally arises: What happens if we translate the laser beam over a preconditioned surface with structures oriented perpendicularly to the laser polarisation? We refer to these as *collision experiments* because the outcome heavily depends on how the new pattern interacts with the pre-existing one. The nonlocal feedback from the old pattern competes with the feedback from the new pattern in the overlap region. The results of these collision experiments can be either hexagonal or square patterns, since the two lattice vectors are of equal length. Figure S5 shows a description of the experiments, particularly the specific order of the events, the optical microscope images of the resulting structures, and the simulation predictions. When the horizontally oriented pre-existing structures are reprocessed by a vertically polarised laser beam, the result is a square pattern. The alternative scenario results in a hexagonal pattern, even though the applied laser fields are exactly the same in both cases, differing only in the order of their application. The striking difference in the order of events is perfectly predicted by the simulations.



Figure S5. Depiction of two different *collision experiments*. Simplified depictions of the two experiments are shown in (a)(i) and (b)(i). The optical microscope images of the experimentally formed pattern are shown in (ii), and simulation results are shown in (iii). All the scale bars are 5 μ m.

4. The experimental setup

The laser source was a commercial unit (Spectra Physics, Spirit One 1040-8) operating at 1 μ m wavelength with a pulse duration of 300 fs. At a repetition rate of 1 MHz, the maximum pulse energy that we used was 1 μ J. The repetition rate of the laser is electronically reducible from 1 MHz down nearly arbitrarily down to a single pulse operation. The laser beam was coupled to a home-built bright-field optical microscope in both transmission and reflection modes with diffraction-limited resolution (**Fig. S6**). The illumination was from white or blue LEDs, operating at 450 nm in the latter case. The transmission mode of the microscope offered superior resolution and contrast, but this mode was useable only with sufficiently transparent samples. Glass substrates with thin (few 100 nm) metal films were transparent enough, but bulk samples or Si wafers required the reflection mode. In either imaging mode, the pattern formation can be observed in real time.

In nearly all of the experiments, the beam was kept stationary, and the sample was translated via 2D motorised translation stages (Thorlabs, MLS203 series). Only in experiments requiring faster processing to cover large areas, a 2D galvo scanner (Scanlab, ScanCube series) was temporarily integrated (not shown in **Fig. S6**) but the insertion of the scanner blocks the imaging pathway and was not preferred for prolonged use.



Figure S6. The experimental setup comprises a commercial femtosecond laser coupled to a computer-controlled 2-axis motorised stage and a diffraction-limited optical microscope.

5. Experimental demonstration of all primary transitions between the two types of NLL

NLL results in structures in the form of parallel stripes when using linearly polarised laser light. As discussed before, the stripes created by NLL_{\parallel} and NLL_{\perp} are orthogonal to each other. Furthermore, any area covered by either pattern type has two distinct edges, one where the stripes are parallel and another where they are perpendicular to the edge or boundary. The possibilities increase, in principle, to infinity, if we allow the use of arbitrarily polarisation angles when creating the two regions. We ignore them here and consider only the distinct cases where the laser polarisation is linear and oriented along one direction (say, along the *x*-axis) or orthogonal to it (along the *y*-axis). Even then, there are 12 distinct ways in which NLL_{\parallel} can transition into NLL_{\perp} or *vice versa*. We have systematically demonstrated all such transitions in **Fig. S7**.

The NLL_{\parallel} experiments are performed with $N = 2 \times 10^5$, and pulse fluence of 42 mJ/cm². The NLL_{\perp} experiments are performed with N = 60, and pulse fluence of 210 mJ/cm². The experiments contain an 8 μ m-12 μ m overlap region while going from one process to the other only for illustration purposes. While moving from oxidation type to ablation type, the transition region can act as a nucleation site because of the induced irregularities causing some structures to chip away; these irregularities heal themselves further into the ablation region where the chipping behaviour is not observed, and structures are uniform. This effect does not occur from the ablation type to the oxidation type due to the non-destructive naure of the oxidation type NLL process. However, ablated structures can leave debris fields in their vicinity, hamper the coherence of new NLL structures forming nearby. The oxidation-type NLL structures heal as they move away from the debris field, gaining coherence. Also, note that the structure orientation for ablation-assisted structures is perpendicular to the laser polarisation.



Figure S7. The figure shows the possible transitions between NLL_{\parallel} and NLL_{\perp} on cobalt for horizontal and vertical polarisations of the laser beam. (a) NLL_{\parallel} horizontal polarisation to vertical polarisation. (b) NLL_{\parallel} vertical polarisation to horizontal polarisation. (c) NLL_{\perp} vertical polarisation to horizontal polarisation. (d) NLL_{\perp} horizontal polarisation to vertical polarisation. (e) NLL_{\parallel} horizontal polarisation to NLL_{\perp} vertical polarisation. (f) NLL_{\parallel} horizontal polarisation to NLL_{\perp} horizontal polarisation. (g) NLL_{\parallel} vertical polarisation to NLL_{\perp} vertical polarisation. (h) NLL_{\parallel} vertical polarisation to NLL_{\perp} horizontal polarisation. (j) NLL_{\parallel} vertical polarisation. (j) NLL_{\perp} vertical polarisation to NLL_{\perp} horizontal polarisation. (j) NLL_{\perp} vertical polarisation to NLL_{\parallel} horizontal polarisation. (j) NLL_{\perp} vertical polarisation to NLL_{\parallel} horizontal polarisation. (j) NLL_{\perp} vertical polarisation to NLL_{\parallel} horizontal polarisation. (k) NLL_{\perp} horizontal polarisation to NLL_{\parallel} horizontal polarisation. (l) NLL_{\parallel} horizontal polarisation to NLL_{\parallel} vertical polarisation. (k) NLL_{\perp} horizontal polarisation to NLL_{\parallel} horizontal polarisation. (l) NLL_{\parallel} horizontal polarisation to NLL_{\parallel} vertical polarisation.

6. Cross-sectional analysis of the structures

The claim of NLL_{\parallel} growing oxide structures that rise above the level of the unmodified surface, while NLL_{\perp} ablating, thus creating depressions into the material is addressed by cross-section scanning electron microscope (SEM, FEI Nova NanoSEM) images shown in **Fig. 2b**. For experiments, we used thin-film coatings of 400-nm Ti and 110-nm Co deposited on a glass slide via thermal sputtering. Then, we patterned parts of the same sample with both NLL_{\parallel} and NLL_{\perp}. Then, we cut the sample with a precision saw, bisecting the patterns, which were then imaged *via* SEM. The unprocessed surface heights are precisely determined from the unprocessed parts on the surface (outside the field of view). These are shown via the dashed lines. These measurements prove that NLL_{\parallel} structures grow taller than the unmodified surface, and NLL_{\perp} structures are depressions lower than the nominal surface. As discussed elsewhere, the lack of self-limiting negative feedback for the ablation case makes it more challenging to obtain highly uniform structures via NLL_{\perp}.

7. Experimental parameters for the simultaneous demonstration of both mechanisms

The parameters for the experiments in **Fig. 2a** are given in **Table S2**. The oxidation and ablation type formation experiments were performed at a laser repetition rate of 1 MHz and 2 kHz, respectively. In all experiments, the sample was raster-scanned with a scan step of 1 μ m, and the focussed spot size was 6 μ m (1/*e*² width). While the pulse fluence required to form NLL_{||} patterns varies between 35 to 42 mJ/cm², creating NLL_⊥ patterns requires between 210 to 350 kJ/m². Similarly, in NLL_⊥ patterns, the pulses per spot range from 6 to 60, while NLL_{||} we used between 6×10⁴ to 6×10⁵ pulses. The only outlier is Si, where fewer pulses were sufficient. This may be related to the laser wavelength being at the edge of the band gap of Si.

	NLL				NLL_{\perp}				
Material	Scanning speed (µm/s)	Number of pulses per spot	Pulse fluence (mJ/cm ²)	Peak intensity (TW/cm²)	Scanning speed (µm/s)	Number of pulses per spot	Pulse fluence (kJ/m ²)	Peak intensity (TW/cm ²)	Sample thickness (nm)
Cobalt	30	200,000	42.4	0.159	200	60	212	0.797	110
Niobium	20	300,000	42.4	0.159	200	60	212	0.797	120
Nickel	10	600,000	35.3	0.133	250	48	283	1.064	230
Chromium	30	200,000	42.4	0.159	200	60	212	0.797	177
Aluminum	10	600,000	42.4	0.159	200	60	248	0.932	200
Titanium	20	300,000	39.6	0.148	250	12	340	2.127	135
Silicon	10	300	707	1.326	250	12	707	2.216	200

Table S2. Laser and scanning parameters, and thin-film thicknesses for the experiments shown in Fig. 2a.

8. The self-limiting growth as a result of the negative feedback

There are two drawbacks for the NLL_{\perp} process compared to NLL_{\parallel} . The first is the relatively abrupt formation process via a small number of laser pulses. This results in large height changes per pulse, so the feedback between the evolving surface profile and the redistribution of the light intensity for each pulse occurs in fewer and large steps. This can be avoided by ablation via bursts containing thousands of pulses.

In the case of oxidation, in addition to non-local positive feedback, negative feedback causes saturation of the structure's growth after it reaches a certain height (Fig. 1c). This feedback is based on self-limitation of oxygen access to the growing structures proportional to its height. Practically, it makes the process immune to multiple scans and removes the lower limit for the scanning speed. The SEM images of oxidation-based parallel surface structures formed on the Ti surface are presented in Fig. S8a, where the laser beam was scanned over the same area multiple times. There is no recognisable difference between structures in terms of their quality. In contrast, when the formation is governed by ablation, it does not have inherent negative feedback to halt the structure formation. Each pulse impinging on the surface ablates more material and destroys the surface structures. The absence of negative feedback in ablation-based structure formation makes the process prone to multiple scans. Even after the second scan, the quality of the structure decreases significantly and is ruined after the five scans (Fig. S8b). The absence of natural negative feedback of ablation requires additional precautions to regulate the quality of the structure. We observed that the optimal number of pulses per spot is 4-10 for the Ti sample. The scanning speed in Fig. S8b was 1.5 m/s, with a spot size of ~10 μ m at a repetition rate of 1-MHz and 350 mW of average power. It corresponds to ~6 pulses per spot with 3 kJ/m² pulse fluence.



Figure S8. Demonstration of the effect of the negative feedback on oxidation. (a) Scanning the same Titanium surface 1, 2, and 5 times in NLL_{\parallel} . (b) Scanning the same area 1, 2, and 5 times in NLL_{\perp} . See Methods for the detailed experimental conditions.

9. Demonstration of large-area patterning on flexible glass

In order to demonstrate the large-area processing on flexible materials, we coated a flexible glass (Coresix Willow Glass) with 100-nm-thick titanium. We processed the coated flexible glass using a galvo-scanner. **Fig. S9** shows the processed area on a bent flexible glass. As the photo shows, the structures can be bent without destroying the pattern. The bending has been repeated many times with no noticeable adverse effects. Several of the samples have been produced several years ago and have been stored at room temperature and in ambient air. All samples maintain the patterned structures, and they can still be bent without any degradation. As discussed in the next section, the processing speed was limited to 7.2 mm²/s by the beam translation speed of the galvo scanner. Polygon scanners allow up to a thousand times faster scanning speeds. There is no clear impediment in terms of the NLL process itself to scaling the speeds up to the maximum values allowed by these advanced scanners.



Figure S9. Photo of the processed flexible glass. (a) Close-up photo of the processed area while the sample is flat. (b) Photo of the sample being bent.

10. Fabrication and characterisation for wettability control

The wettability control was achieved through either a single-step or a three-step fabrication process (**Fig. S10**). Although we focussed on Si (100) wafers for their technological significance, the process is entirely applicable to the other materials for which we demonstrated NLL.

The first step is to process the surface with NNL_{\perp}. We used a galvo scanner to be able to quickly cover areas as large as 5.0×5.0 cm². The scanning speed was 600 mm/s and the spot size was 12 µm (half-width at $1/e^2$ intensity threshold), corresponding to a processing speed of 7.2 mm²/s. We note that the speed is limited by the galvo scanner, and not the NLL process.



Figure S10. The fabrication process for creating alternating superhydrophobic and superhydrophilic patterns using NLL.

By patterning the surface, we rendered it superhydrophilic with a contact angle of 11.1° . If only a superhydrophilic surface is required (as **Fig. 3c(iii)** or **Fig. S11**) or the native wettability of the unprocessed surface is acceptable, this single step is sufficient — the unprocessed parts of the surface retain their native wettability characteristics (contact angle is ~70° for Si and ~55° for glass).

For more complex patterns featuring alternating superhydrophilic and superhydrophilic regions, two additional steps are followed. The second step is to coat the surface with a layer of octafluorocyclobutane (C_4F_8) using an inductively coupled plasma system. The thickness of these films was determined using a variable angle spectroscopic ellipsometer (V-VASE, J.A. Woollam Co. Inc., Lincoln, NE) coupled with a rotating analyser and xenon light source.

Film thickness strongly influenced the superhydrophobicity, as quantified by contact angles measured after depositing 4- μ L water droplets using a static contact angle measurement setup (DataPhysics, OCA 25). For films thinner than 6 nm, the contact angle remained ~70° (similar to untreated Si). At a thickness of 6 nm, the contact angle increased to 150.1°, and for thicknesses between 20 nm and 40 nm, the contact angle reached 179.9°, before decreasing slightly to 170.2° at 50 nm.

The third and final step is to convert selected parts of the fully C_4F_8 -covered and superhydrophobic surface back to superhydrophilic by maskless processing with NLL one more time. This resulted in reduced superhydrophilicity compared to the first step, but still achieving a low contact angle of 19.1°.



Figure S11. Photograph of water droplets on a 54 mm-wide Si sample rendered superhydrophobic using NLL, showing uniform surface coverage.

Bibliography

- 1. Novotny, L. & Hecht, B. Principles of nano-optics. (Cambridge University Press, 2019).
- 2. Sipe, J. E., Driel, H. M. & Young, J. F. Surface electrodynamics: Radiation Fields, surface polaritons, and radiation remnants. *Canadian Journal of Physics* **63**, 104–113 (1985).
- 3. Johnson, P. B., & Christy, R. W. Optical constants of transition metals: Ti, v, cr, mn, fe, co, ni, and pd. *Physical Review B* **9**, 5056 (1974).
- 4. Gallant, D., Pezolet, M., & Simard, S. Optical and physical properties of cobalt oxide films electrogenerated in bicarbonate aqueous media. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **110**, 6871-6880 (2006).
- 5. Golovashkin, A. I., Leksina, I. E., Motulevich, G. P., & Shubin, A. A. Optical properties of niobium. *Soviet Physics, JETP* **29**, 27-34 (1969).
- 6. Gao, L., Lemarchand, F., & Lequime, M. Exploitation of multiple incidences spectrometric measurements for thin film reverse engineering. *Optics Express* **20**, 15734-15751 (2012).
- 7. Mahmoud, S. A., Shereen, A., & Mou'ad, A. T. Structural and optical dispersion characterisation of sprayed nickel oxide thin films. *Journal of Modern Physics* **2**, 2011.
- 8. Julkarnain, M., Hossain, J., Sharif, K. S., & Khan, K. A. Optical properties of thermally evaporated Cr2O3 thin films. *Canadian Journal on Chemical Engineering & Technology* **3**, 81-85 (2012).
- 9. Rakić, A. D. Algorithm for the determination of intrinsic optical constants of metal films: application to aluminum. *Applied Optics* **34**, 4755-4767 (1995).
- Querry, M. R. *Optical constants*. (US Army Armament, Munitions & Chemical Command, Chemical Research & Development Center, 1985).
- 11. DeVore, J. R. Refractive indices of rutile and sphalerite. *Journal of the Optical Society of America* **41**, 416-419 (1951).
- Danilov, P. A. *et al.* Silicon as a virtual plasmonic material: Acquisition of its transient optical constants and the ultrafast surface plasmon-polariton excitation. *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics* 120, 946-959 (2015).
- 13. Malitson, I. H. Interspecimen comparison of the refractive index of fused silica. *Journal of the Optical Society of America* **55**, 1205-1209 (1965).
- Sipe, J. E., Young, J. F., Preston, J. S., & Van Driel, H. M. Laser-induced periodic surface structure. I. Theory. *Physical Review B* 27(2), 1141 (1983).