


ChemComm

Accepted Manuscript



This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the RSC Publishing peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, which is prior to technical editing, formatting and proof reading. This free service from RSC Publishing allows authors to make their results available to the community, in citable form, before publication of the edited article. This *Accepted Manuscript* will be replaced by the edited and formatted *Advance Article* as soon as this is available.

To cite this manuscript please use its permanent Digital Object Identifier (DOI®), which is identical for all formats of publication.

More information about *Accepted Manuscripts* can be found in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics contained in the manuscript submitted by the author(s) which may alter content, and that the standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [ethical guidelines](#) that apply to the journal are still applicable. In no event shall the RSC be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these *Accepted Manuscript* manuscripts or any consequences arising from the use of any information contained in them.

COMMUNICATION

In-situ Observation of Electrolytic H₂ Evolution Adjacent to Gold Cathodes

Cite this: DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

Received 00th September 2013,
Accepted 00th September 2013Y. Liu^a and S. J. Dillon^a

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

www.rsc.org/

The early stages of gas evolution during electrolytic hydrogen production on Au electrodes are characterized by in-situ transmission electron microscopy. The results demonstrate that reaction product molecules initially dissolve into solution and then nucleate near, but not on, the electrodes. The gas subsequently wets the electrodes and its successive evolution is governed by triple phase boundary line motion.

As the cost of renewable energy sources approaches grid parity, the need for large-scale efficient energy storage and conversion becomes increasingly important. Electrolytic fuel production remains a leading candidate technology for accommodating excess load on the power grid. The resultant hydrogen may be used in fuel cells, generators, or transportation applications. The efficiency of the overall fuel cycle is sensitive to the overpotential associated with electrolysis. The current-overpotential relationship is sensitive to a number of parameters associated with the design and chemistry of the electrodes and electrolyte. Gas bubble nucleation, growth, and transport have long been recognized as important steps affecting the current-overpotential relationship. For example, they can block the electrode surface and inhibit the reaction, or promote mixing in the solution during detachment and enhance mass transport.¹

The nucleation and growth of electrolytically generated gas has been the subject of numerous studies, most of which employ electrochemistry, optical microscopy or scanning probe microscopy.^{2-4, 5-7} The details of the process depend on solution chemistry, electrode chemistry, surface roughness, the type of gas evolved. The growth and motion of the bubbles depends on hydrodynamics, capillarity, and intermolecular force balances.⁸ Generally, the reaction product molecules dissolve into solution until they supersaturate sufficiently to promote nucleation. The evolution of hydrogen gas from the supersaturated solution may be predicted based on classical nucleation theory. Dapkus and Sides² observed that nucleation occurs when the bulk concentration is ~4x the solubility limit. However, nucleation is localized to the electrode surface. Here the H₂ concentration may be 1- to 2-orders of

magnitude larger than the bulk solubility.^{2, 7} Classical nucleation theory in absence of any field effects would predict supersaturation 3-orders of magnitude in excess of solubility. The discrepancy has been rationalized based on the assumption that homogeneous nucleation occurs in the electrical double-layer.² Here the electric field may reduce the water-gas surface energy, which lowers the nucleation barrier energy. Whether nucleation occurs homogeneously or heterogeneously will depend on geometry and the relative interfacial energies. The work by Dapkus and Sides characterized the reaction on mercury drop electrodes.² A number of recent studies employing scanning probe microscopy find that gas nuclei wet highly oriented pyrolytic graphite electrodes with small contact angles.⁶ The system is ideal for scan probe microscopy and has relevance to carbonaceous catalyst supports. However, the interactions at these planar hydrophobic surfaces may differ significantly from those of metallic catalysts often employed for electrolysis.

Unfortunately, overall electrolytic gas evolution is still poorly understood as electrochemical techniques do not provide spatially resolved data, optical techniques do not probe sufficiently small length scales, and scan probe techniques lack temporal resolution and can not probe the bubble-electrode interface. This work seeks to characterize electrolytic gas production using in-situ environmental transmission electron microscopy (TEM). The approach allows for high spatial resolution, reasonable temporal resolution, and probing of the bubble-solid interface.⁹ In-situ TEM suffers from projection effects, confinement of liquids inherent to producing thin samples, and potential electron beam effects. While the former two effects cannot be mitigated, electron beam effects may be minimized such that they are negligible relative to an appropriately large external stimulus. For example, several researchers¹⁰ have noted that the electron beam current density may be reduced to the point where it generates no gas bubbles for extended periods of time. An external electric field may generate electrolytic gas at electrodes on relatively short time scales. This

work characterizes phenomenology associated with electrolytic gas nucleation and growth.





Fig. 1 (a) Schematic of the SiN_x grid utilized for assembling the in-situ environmental cell. (b) SEM image of the 50 nm SiN_x window patterned with gold electrodes, used in this study, imaged after testing.

25 nm Au electrodes were patterned on commercial silicon supported amorphous silicon nitride (SiN_x) windows using photolithography. A 5 nm Cr adhesion layer ensured adhesion between the film and substrate. Patterned Cr/Au films were also evaporated onto the backside of the grids to serve as bonding pads for Au microwire leads that connected to the external circuit. A 100 nm SiO₂ spacer was patterned around the SiN_x windows using electron beam evaporation. Figure 1 shows the testing configuration of the biasing chip. Prior to the assembling the environmental cell, the SiN_x windows were made hydrophilic by plasma treatment. A droplet of 0.1 M H₂SO₄ solution was applied to the top surface of the biasing chip. A second blank SiN_x chip was placed on top enclosing the liquid electrolyte. The microscale electrochemical cell was sealed via three O-rings in an environmental cell described in detail elsewhere.¹¹ Due to the compliance of the SiN_x windows the sample thickness may vary with position, however for current experiments the thickness was ~300-500 nm. The samples were imaged at a beam current density < 1 A/m² in a JEOL 2010LaB₆ TEM. Below this value of current density, it is difficult to routinely obtain an accurate measurement in our system. However, beam induced gas production is negligible on the experimental timescales below 40 A/m² and no beam induced gas was observed in our system for over 30 min of exposure to the beam current density used for the experiments. Electrolysis was performed at voltages ranging from -1.6 V to -2 V_r.

At potentials up to -1.9 V, no electrolytic gas was observed on the time scale of 10 min. One potential challenge associated with in-situ TEM relates to the fact that small areas were probed in a single experiment and that the reaction of interest may be localized outside of the region observed if it is sufficiently sparse or infrequent. At -2 V, the nucleation and growth of electrolytic gas was observed at the cathode (See Fig. 2 and video S1). The current response may be seen in Fig. S1. The voltage for generating electrolytic gas in the environmental cell was larger than the -1.6 V threshold voltage for the bulk system which was obtained from ex-situ tests using the same chemistry. This is consistent with prior studies that cite a higher threshold voltage necessary to initiate electrolysis in an electrochemical microcell.⁵ The gas evolved should be primarily H₂ based on solution chemistry and the fact that water

vapour would be negligible in the bubble at the internal pressures associated with nanoscale bubbles. The video was captured at 3 frames per second. The formation and initial coarsening of a critical nuclei occur at a rate too rapid to capture with our detector.⁵ The projected area of the bubble observed in the first frame at 226 s is 9800 nm² and the uniform image intensity variation across the bubble suggests that it spans the entire thickness of the cell (Volume ~ 5 × 10⁶ nm³).

Fig. 2 Time-lapse TEM images depicting nucleation and growth of electrolytic gas at the gold electrode




The interesting feature of the bubble at the initial stage observed is that it is isolated from the electrode by a thin, 6-8 nm, layer of solution. The result suggests that the bubble nucleated homogeneously near the electrode interface (see Fig. S2). Such nucleation has been predicted to occur at electrodes that are poorly wetted by the gas phase. It is possible that nucleation occurred heterogeneously at the window away from the electrode interface. However, this still supports the idea that hydrogen molecules initially dissolve into solution and subsequently precipitate out, and that the nucleation may be favorable in the electrical double layer or regions with steep composition gradients. Given the temporal resolution it is difficult to distinguish the center of mass of the critical nuclei. The fact that the bubble subsequently wets the electrode, in a thermodynamically irreversible interaction, indicates that the bubble could not have initially formed on the electrode surface. The bubble is stable in this position for ~2 s prior to wetting the electrode. Nucleation occurred adjacent to a concave region of the gold surface, which is consistent with the generally held belief that bubbles preferentially nucleate at surface cavities, scratches, and fissures where the solubility is highest due to the Gibbs-Thomson effect.¹²

Figure 3a plots the projected area of the bubble as a function of time. The bubble area initially increases rapidly and decelerates to a linear growth rate that persists for ~20 s. Unlike results of prior studies characterizing individual micron scale bubbles¹², the early stage of bubble coarsening observed here does not correlate with a simple growth exponent that can be rationalized on the basis of a particular rate limiting mechanism.¹³ Assuming ideal gas behaviour, the pressure inside the bubble could be estimated following the Laplace-Young equation, $P = P_0 + \gamma\kappa$, where γ is the surface tension of the liquid-vapour interface, P is pressure, and κ is the mean curvature of the bubble. The large excess pressure

associated with the curvature of the bubble produces a chemical potential difference between the gas in the bubble and the solution equilibrated with a flat surface. The reduction in the rate of bubble growth and the rate of decreasing chemical potential correlates with the impingement of the triple lines at asperities on the Au surface. We hypothesize that the decrease in bubble coarsening at this point is associated with the barrier imposed by forming non-equilibrium dihedral angles and introducing excess curvature into the bubble in the process. Prior computational studies also indicate that triple line pinning inhibits bubble motion.¹⁴ The growth rate subsequently accelerates until the bubble detaches from the electrode. Instead, we hypothesize that movement of the electrode-solution-gas triple phase boundary across asperities on the rough electrode surface thermodynamically limits coarsening of nanoscale bubbles. Figures 3b and c plot the dihedral angles between the electrode and the solution-gas interfaces (see Fig. S3 for details). The bubble initially coarsens rapidly as it wets the concave portion of the surface. The dihedral angles also vary rapidly, which is commonly associated with the stick-slip nature of their motion.^{3, 15} The growth slows when both triple lines reach a critical point that requires the bubble to envelope convex surface asperities. The bubble continues to coarsen slowly, taking on non-equilibrium dihedral angles, which also vary slowly. At ~250 s, the bubble expands rapidly normal to the electrode surface, destabilizing one of the triple lines and allowing it to wet along the surface. The bubble ultimately dewets the electrode and flows rapidly away. The process of bubble transport has been treated elsewhere with broader statistics and has similarly been associated with wetting instabilities.¹⁶ Prior work has also found that surface significantly affects bubble motion.¹⁷ By 900 s almost the entire window region (250 x250 μm) is covered by evolved gas.

Fig. 3 (a) Time-dependent evolution of the projected area of the bubble, (b) calculated chemical potential difference between H_2 in the bubble and in solution, (c) the dihedral angles associated with the lower triple line, and (d) the dihedral angles associated with the upper triple line.



Conclusions

This work characterized the evolution of electrolytically generated H_2 using in-situ TEM. The results demonstrate the fact that gas initially dissolves into solution and subsequently nucleates near Au electrodes, but not directly on their surface. The bubbles eventually wet the surface and their growth kinetics are strongly influenced by the surface roughness, which impacts the local dihedral angle and capillarity. Dewetting appears to be driven by a wetting instability.

Acknowledgments

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 1254406

Notes and references

^a Department of Materials Science and Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1304 W. Green St., Urbana, IL 61801.

†Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) available: Fig. S1-S3 and Video S1. See DOI: 10.1039/c000000x/

1. L. Janssen, *Electrochimica acta*, 1989, **34**, 161-169; R. Alkire and P. Y. Lu, *Journal of the Electrochemical Society*, 1979, **126**, 2118-2124.
2. K. V. Dapkus and P. J. Sides, *Journal of colloid and interface science*, 1986, **111**, 133-151.
3. S. Lubetkin, *Electrochimica acta*, 2002, **48**, 357-375.
4. C. A. Sequeira, D. M. Santos, B. Šljukić and L. Amaral, *Brazilian Journal of Physics*, 2013, 1-10; H. Vogt, *Electrochimica acta*, 1984, **29**, 167-173.
5. V. B. Svetovoy, R. G. Sanders and M. C. Elwenspoek, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, 2013, **25**, 184002.
6. L. Zhang, Y. Zhang, X. Zhang, Z. Li, G. Shen, M. Ye, C. Fan, H. Fang and J. Hu, *Langmuir*, 2006, **22**, 8109-8113.
7. S. Shibata, *Bulletin of the Chemical Society of Japan*, 1963, **36**, 53-57.
8. H. Vogt, *Electrochimica Acta*, 1978, **23**, 203-205; K. Stephan and H. Vogt, *Electrochim. Acta*, 1979, **24**, 11-18; S. A. Guelcher, Y. E. Solomentsev, P. J. Sides and J. L. Anderson, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 1998, **145**, 1848-1855.
9. N. de Jonge and F. M. Ross, *Nature Nanotechnology*, 2011, **6**, 695-704; E. R. White, M. Mecklenburg, S. B. Singer, S. Aloni and B. C. Regan, *Applied Physics Express*, 2011, **4**, 055201.
10. K. W. Noh, Y. Liu, L. Sun and S. J. Dillon, *Ultramicroscopy*, 2012, **116**, 34-38; T. J. Woehl, K. L. Jungjohann, J. E. Evans, I. Arslan, W. D. Ristenpart and N. D. Browning, *Ultramicroscopy*, 2012; Y. Liu, K. Tai and S. J. Dillon, *Chemistry of Materials*, 2013.
11. Y. Liu, X. Chen, K. W. Noh and S. J. Dillon, *Nanotechnology*, 2012, **23**.
12. J. Glas and J. Westwater, *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, 1964, **7**, 1427-1443.
13. S. D. Lubetkin, *Chemical Society Reviews*, 1995, **24**, 243-250.
14. J. H. Weijss and D. Lohse, *Physical Review Letters*, 2013, **110**, 054501; Y. Liu and X. Zhang, *The Journal of chemical physics*, 2013, **138**, 014706.
15. D. E. Westerheide and J. Westwater, *AIChE Journal*, 1961, **7**, 357-362.
16. F. A. N. Kabanov B. N., in *Zh. Fiz. Khim.*, 1933.

17. E. Dussan, *J. Fluid Mech*, 1985, **151**; E. Dussan V and R. T.-P. Chow, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 1983, **137**, 1-29.