

## Supporting Text

### Global and target analysis procedures

In global analysis, a model consisting of independent exponential decays is fitted to the data  $\psi(\lambda, t)$

$$\psi(\lambda, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_{comp}} c_i(t) DADS_i(\lambda)$$

where  $n_{comp}$  is the number of components,  $c_i(t)$  corresponds to the convolution of the  $i$ -th exponential decay with the instrument response function (IRF), and  $DADS_i(\lambda)$  is the  $i$ -th decay-associated difference spectrum (DADS).

The four DADS estimated from pump-probe data of GFPuv in H<sub>2</sub>O are shown in Fig. 6. The estimated lifetimes are 2.2 ps (black), 11 ps (red), 400 ps (green), and 3 ns (blue). The DADS with lifetimes of 2.2 and 11 ps both represent the transition  $A^* \rightarrow I^*$  and their shapes are practically identical. The absence of spectral differences between the 2.2 and 11 ps components indicates that the biexponentiality in the excited state of GFP is intrinsic, and does not correspond to an evolution from one molecular species to another. The emission from  $I^*$  (whose difference spectrum resembles the blue DADS) decays in 3 ns. It rises biexponentially from  $A^*$ , as is evident from the black and red DADS above 510 nm. Finally, the green DADS, which decays in 400 ps, will later be shown to represent the inverse of the I difference spectrum.

In target analysis (1) a compartmental scheme is used to describe the concentrations of the compartments (states). Transitions to and from compartments are described by microscopic rate constants. The model that is fitted to the data now reads

$$\psi(\lambda, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_{comp}} c_i(t) SADS_i(\lambda)$$

where  $c_i(t)$  now corresponds to the concentration of the  $i$ -th compartment.  $SADS_i(\lambda)$  is the  $i$ -th species-associated difference spectrum. The concentrations of all compartments are collated in a vector

$$c(t) = [c_1(t) \quad c_2(t) \quad c_3(t) \quad c_4(t) \quad c_5(t) \quad c_6(t)]^T = [A_1^*(t) \quad A_2^*(t) \quad I^*(t) \quad I_1^{FC}(t) \quad I_1(t) \quad I_2(t)]^T$$

which obeys the differential equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} c(t) = Kc(t) + j(t)$$

where the transfer matrix  $K$  contains off-diagonal elements  $k_{pq}$ , representing the microscopic rate constant from compartment  $q$  to compartment  $p$ . The diagonal elements contain the total decay rates of each compartment. The input to the compartments is



### Raw multi-pulse transient absorption data

To illustrate that our kinetic modeling is adequate and show the correspondence between the results of the target analysis procedure and the actual measured spectra, raw data at selected points in time are shown below.

Fig. 8A shows raw pump-dump-probe spectra of GFP in H<sub>2</sub>O at times shortly after the dump at 20 ps. It can be observed that after the dump pulse, the spectra in the region around 480-490 nm shift to the blue on a picosecond timescale (inset, *upper*). At the same time, the stimulated emission feature from 505 to 520 nm shifts to the blue as well, along with an increase of the stimulated emission signal (inset, *lower*). These signals are dump-induced and can be only explained by assuming a spectrodynamic process in the ground state species I. In particular, these signals are consistent with a dynamic blue shift of the I species, which absorbs in the region 480-520 nm, on the picosecond timescale. The apparent increase of stimulated emission in the 500 to 530-nm region follows from a decrease of induced absorption of I in that region. Hence our introduction of two distinct species of I, namely I<sub>1</sub> and I<sub>2</sub> in our kinetic modeling, of which I<sub>2</sub> is formed from I<sub>1</sub> on the picosecond timescale and is blue-shifted with respect to it.

Fig. 8B shows the corresponding spectra for GFP dissolved in D<sub>2</sub>O. The evolution of the pump-dump probe spectra after the dump is similar to that in H<sub>2</sub>O, with a progressive blue shift of the induced absorption around 490 nm and a blue shift and apparent increase of the stimulated emission around 510 nm. However, the dynamic blue shift proceeds slower in GFP in D<sub>2</sub>O compared with H<sub>2</sub>O: The spectra in H<sub>2</sub>O taken at 20 and 35 ps (i.e. 10 and 15 ps after the dump) are almost overlapping, whereas in the spectra in D<sub>2</sub>O taken at 110 and 125 ps (i.e. 10 and 25 ps after the dump), the blue shifting is still proceeding. Thus, the dynamic blue shift of I<sub>1</sub> to I<sub>2</sub> is subject to a kinetic isotope effect. The target analysis procedure estimated a time constant of 3 ps for the blue shift in H<sub>2</sub>O, whereas a time constant of 7 ps was found for D<sub>2</sub>O, leading to a kinetic isotope effect of about 2 (see table 1).

Fig. 7 shows pump-probe and pump-dump-probe spectra of GFP dissolved in D<sub>2</sub>O on a longer time scale. Fig. 7 is the equivalent of Fig. 4, and the spectra correspond to the kinetic traces shown in Fig. 3 D - F. At a delay of 5 ps after the dump pulse (which was set at 100 ps, Fig 7A), the dumped spectrum looks very similar to that observed in H<sub>2</sub>O shortly after the dump pulse (Fig 4A), indicating that a fraction of I\* has been dumped to produce the anionic ground state species I. However, the differences with GFP in H<sub>2</sub>O become clear at longer time delays: the absorption features of I persist up to 4 ns, whereas the absorption and emission features of I\* have decayed away at 4-ns delay. The dumped and undumped spectrum at a delay of 4 ns look very similar to each other and show a main absorption band near 490 nm, which can be attributed to I, and a small residual stimulated emission feature due to a small fraction of remaining I\*. These observations demonstrate that in GFP in D<sub>2</sub>O, the decay of I is significantly slower than in H<sub>2</sub>O, consistent with the kinetic traces shown in Fig. 3 E and F. The target analysis indicated a lifetime of 5 ns of I<sub>2</sub> for GFP dissolved in D<sub>2</sub>O. Thus, the evolution from I<sub>2</sub> to A is subject to a large kinetic isotope effect of a factor of 12, as indicated in Table 1.

1. van Stokkum, I. H. M., Larsen, D. S. & van Grondelle, R. (2004) *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **1657**, 82-104.
2. Chagnenet-Barret, P., Choma, C., Gooding, E., DeGrado, W. & Hochstrasser, R. M. (2000) *J. Phys. Chem. B* **104**, 9322-9329.
3. Fleming, G. R. & Cho, M. (1996) *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **47**, 109-134.
4. Kennis, J. T. M., Larsen, D. S., Ohta, K., Facciotti, M. T., Glaeser, R. M. & Fleming, G. R. (2002) *J. Phys. Chem. B* **106**, 6067-6080.