

“Hot” Surface Activation of Molecular Complexes: Insight from Modeling Studies**

Ettore Fois, Gloria Tabacchi, Davide Barreca, Alberto Gasparotto, and
Eugenio Tondello*



Angewandte
Chemie

Published in: "Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 2010, 49: 1944–1948" doi:10.1002/anie.200907312
Which should be cited to refer this work.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/anie.200907312>

“Hot” Surfaces Activation of Molecular Complexes: Insight from Modelling Studies **

Ettore Fois^a, Gloria Tabacchi^{a}, Davide Barreca^b, Alberto Gasparotto^c and Eugenio Tondello^c*

[*] ^aProf. Dr. Ettore Fois, Dr. Gloria Tabacchi*

Dep. of Science and High Technology, Insubria University and INSTM, Via Valleggio 9; I-22100 Como (Italy)

Fax: (+) 39 031 2386630

E-mail: gloria.tabacchi@uninsubria.it

Homepage: <https://yourmoleculardreams.wordpress.com/>

^bDr. Davide Barreca

CNR-ISTM and INSTM, Dep. of Chemistry, Padova University, Via Marzolo 1; I-35131 Padova (Italy)

^cDr. Alberto Gasparotto, Prof. Dr. Eugenio Tondello

Dep. of Chemistry, Padova University and INSTM, Via Marzolo 1; I-35131 Padova (Italy)

[**] MIUR-PRIN-2007 project “Microscopic features of chemical reactivity”, CNR-INSTM PROMO and CARIPARO Foundation within the project “Multi-layer optical devices based on inorganic and hybrid materials by innovative synthetic strategies” assisted financially the work.

The activation of gas phase molecules on hot solid surfaces, a major issue for both fundamental research and technological applications, plays a key role in the fabrication of advanced materials supported on suitable substrates.^[1] The interest relates to the increasing requirement of attaining a deeper insight into the first molecular activation stages, a critical step in the bottom-up nucleation of functional nanostructures with specific size-structure relationships. While molecular activation is in general influenced by the surface chemical composition, in the harsh conditions typical of hot substrates the surface-molecule energy transfer becomes crucial. As a consequence, physisorption competes with desorption, a diverse reactivity emerges and novel activation mechanisms may be triggered, leading to products not attainable under mild conditions. Atomistic-level details of gas phase molecules-hot surfaces encounters are not easily available,^[2] due to both the fast kinetics associated with high temperatures and the difficulties of performing experimental *in-situ* analysis on a molecular scale. In this context, first principles modelling studies^[3-5] are of significant relevance in the design and tailoring of specific molecular routes to functional nanosystems, such as Chemical Vapor Deposition (CVD) processes, where surface temperature is a decisive factor. Herein, we report on how the multifaceted dynamical behavior of a CVD precursor on a hot substrate, captured by simulation, disclosed a novel general activation channel for high temperature surface processes: the fast rolling motion of vibrationally excited molecules. This surface mobility regime, never reported up to date, combines fast lateral transport of an adsorbent with excitation of its internal modes, thus suggesting that energetic collision of rolling species is actually one of the ways through which molecules are activated and react at a hot surface.

Observations were collected in a computer experiment where a Cu(II) complex [Cu(hfa)₂·TMEDA]^[6] (see Figure 1, left), was put in contact with a hot model surface (750 K). [Cu(hfa)₂·TMEDA] is a successful CVD precursor^[7] for the deposition of Si-supported Cu_xO (*x* = 1, 2) nanostructures for H₂ production and gas sensing applications.^[8] On purely empirical grounds,

the complex is considered a good CVD precursor thanks to its favourable mass transport properties and, in particular, to its sublimation without side decomposition. Yet, the conversion of $[\text{Cu}(\text{hfa})_2 \cdot \text{TMEDA}]$ into Cu_xO systems evidences a temperature-dependent ligand elimination through molecular activation on the hot substrate, whose exact mechanism is up to date unknown. The solid-state Cu_xO nucleation occurs when $[\text{Cu}(\text{hfa})_2 \cdot \text{TMEDA}]$ (sublimated at ~ 343 K in a cold-wall CVD reactor) under $\text{O}_2/\text{H}_2\text{O}$ -based atmosphere interacts with oxidized Si(100) heated substrates (523-823 K). Both the system structure/composition (CuO vs. Cu_2O) and spatial organization (from continuous films to anisotropic *quasi*-1D nanowires) can be finely tuned through controlled variations of both reaction atmosphere and surface temperature.^[8a,d]

Under these conditions, the exposed substrate surface is formed by a hydroxylated silica layer.^[1b,9] On this basis, the surface model used in this work consists of a ~ 1 nm thick slab of amorphous silica, with a concentration of 2.8 surface silanols (Si-OH) *per* nm^2 (see Figure 1, right and Experimental Section). A $[\text{Cu}(\text{hfa})_2 \cdot \text{TMEDA}]$ molecule has been positioned on top of such a surface. The system temperature was set to 750 K, and the time evolution was followed by First Principles Molecular Dynamics (FPMD) for a total of ~ 30 ps. The target molecule remained close to the substrate during the whole simulation, *i.e.*, with its closest contact with the surface atoms always within 2-3 Å (see Figure 2, left). Nevertheless, the complex cannot be considered as firmly physisorbed, since the time evolution of the x and y components of the Cu coordinates (Figure 2, right) indicates a remarkable mobility on top of the surface.

Three regimes were identified along the $[\text{Cu}(\text{hfa})_2 \cdot \text{TMEDA}]$ -hot surface simulation. In the first part of the trajectory (0 - 4 ps interval, region **a**), the complex diffuses over the surface through a series of small back-and-forth bumps, rocking meanwhile. In such a slow “bump-and-rock” diffusion regime, favourable longer-lasting molecule-surface contacts may be established. Indeed, a low-mobility behaviour is observed subsequently (4 - 20 ps interval, region **b**), where the motion is confined to a $\sim 1 \times 1$ Å² area (evidenced in green in Figure 2, right). A closer inspection of this

trajectory segment allows one to identify two sub-regions, **b'** and **b''** in the inset of Figure 2, where the complex is localized in two small areas ($\sim 0.25 \text{ \AA}^2$ each). This regime can be hence associated with two physisorption events, separated by a short site-to-site diffusion phase. Finally (20 - 30 ps interval, region **c**), a fast “roll-and-go” diffusion of the complex over the substrate takes place. In this high-mobility regime (see Figure 3, and movies in Supporting Information), the $[\text{Cu}(\text{hfa})_2 \cdot \text{TMEDA}]$ ligands change their position and orientation relative to the surface by rotating around an imaginary axis passing through the complex centre (Cu atom). Moreover, although a pseudo-octahedral geometry around Cu is basically maintained, the molecule instantaneously undergoes severe conformational distortions while its motion remains confined to a layer close and almost parallel to the surface. The $[\text{Cu}(\text{hfa})_2 \cdot \text{TMEDA}]$ behaviour, far more complex than that of a rolling hard sphere, is therefore the first observed manifestation of a novel temperature induced surface transport mechanism.

The Mean Square Displacement $msd(t) = \langle [\mathbf{r}(t) - \mathbf{r}(0)]^2 \rangle$ calculated for the Cu atom along the trajectory (Figure 4) illustrates the differences in the aforementioned three regimes. In region **a**, a diffusive motion is detected, as indicated by the linear behaviour of $msd(t)$ vs. t .^[10] The diffusion coefficient of the complex on top of the hot surface is estimated to be $\sim 0.4 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for such a regime. In region **b**, $msd(t)$ shows two plateaus that can be associated with the two physisorption events **b'** and **b''**. Finally, in region **c**, characterized by a high complex mobility, $msd(t)$ shows a rapid increase. Correspondingly, a large diffusion coefficient, $\sim 3 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, has been estimated. It is worth pointing out that the fast mobility phase follows a labile physisorption event, thus highlighting the relevance of hot surface-molecule energy transfer in this context. Such a behaviour is in line with the fact that kT ($\sim 1.5 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$) is an appreciable fraction of the calculated complex physisorption energy ($5.0 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$).

Besides disclosing such a rich and multi-faceted dynamics, the simulation reveals that interaction with the hot surface strongly perturbs the $[\text{Cu}(\text{hfa})_2 \cdot \text{TMEDA}]$ internal degrees of freedom, as

clearly emerges from the time behaviour of the Cu-ligands (Cu–L) bond distances (Figure 5). All Cu–L distances show pronounced oscillations;^[11] the largest effects are detected for the weakest contact in the gas phase molecule,^[7] Cu–O1, which elongates up to ~4 Å. In the physisorption regime **b**, Cu–L bonds distortion correlates with separation from the surface, *e.g.* O1*, which is closer to the surface than O1, shows larger bond oscillations (Table 1). Therefore the complex loses its C_2 symmetry as a consequence of interactions with the hot surface, and the extent of symmetry breaking is more pronounced than for a 0 K surface (see Table 1). After ~13 ps the oscillation amplitudes of all the Cu–L bonds undergo a non-negligible increase, which becomes remarkable in region **c**. This trend, where the Cu–O2 distances transiently become even longer than the Cu–O1 ones, evidences the large structural distortions experienced by the molecule in the fast diffusion regime and points out to a general excitation of the molecular internal modes. Inter-ligands interactions, relevant for activation, are promoted as well. In particular, close contacts between TMEDA CH₃ protons and hfa O1 atoms (down to 1.73 Å) (Figure 5e) suggest a possible decomposition path of the complex by detachment of the hfa ligand through O1 protonation by the TMEDA H atoms.^[12] These interactions are emphasized in the rolling diffusion phase.

In summary, the early activation stages of a molecular complex on a substrate at high temperature (750 K) have been unravelled by an FPMD simulation. The hot surface induces significant bond oscillations and inter-ligand interactions on the molecule, which alternates physisorption with low or high molecular mobility. In the spanned simulation time (~30 ps) a novel phenomenon emerged: the fast “roll-and-go” diffusion. Such a regime greatly enhances the vibrational excitation of the molecule, increases the probability of highly energetic intermolecular collisions on top of the substrate, and configures itself as a general activation route, which may be operative in a broad variety of processes at hot-surfaces.

Experimental Section

The behaviour of [Cu(hfa)₂·TMEDA] on a model hydroxylated silica surface^[13] was simulated within Density Functional Theory (DFT) using periodic boundary conditions and plane waves (PW) basis sets. The surface was modelled by periodically repeating a ~1 nm thick slab of stoichiometry Si₃₆O₇₂·8H₂O (with water dissociatively chemisorbed) and dimensions of 1.69×1.69 nm². The simulation system, consisting of 185 atoms, was built by placing a [Cu(hfa)₂·TMEDA] molecule on the model surface in a 1.69×1.69×3.6 nm³ simulation box. FPMD^[14] simulations were performed on this system with the CPMD code (www.cpmd.org). Ultra-soft pseudopotentials^[15a] were adopted for Cu, F, O, N, C, H atoms, while a norm conserving pseudopotential was adopted for Si.^[15b,c] PW cut-off values were 30 and 240 Ry for the orbital expansion and electronic density, respectively. The Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof spin density functional (multiplicity=2)^[16] was adopted. Benchmark calculations for this level of theory can be found elsewhere.^[7] A time step of 0.121 fs was used for the trajectory integration. The inertia parameter for the electronic coefficients was 500 au. After 5 ps equilibration, data were collected along a ~30 ps production run in the canonical ensemble using a target temperature of 750 K and Nose-Hoover thermostats.^[17] Geometry optimization was performed on the lowest energy configuration sampled in the trajectory. The complex binding energy was calculated by subtracting from the energy of such an optimized configuration the sum of the energies of the optimized substrate slab and that of the isolated complex calculated in the same simulation box. Optimizations were performed by using a quasi-Newton algorithm^[14b] and a convergence criterion of 10⁻⁴ au as maximum force per atom. The calculated surface-[Cu(hfa)₂·TMEDA] binding energy was 5.0 kcal mol⁻¹.

REFERENCES

- [1] a) G. A. Somorjai, J. Y. Park, *Surf. Sci.* **2009**, *603*, 1293; b) P. C. Thüne, J. W. Niemantsverdriet, *Surf. Sci.* **2009**, *603*, 1756; c) A. Fujishima, X. Zhang, D. A. Tryk, *Surf. Sci. Rep.* **2008**, *63*, 515; d) G. Eranna, B. C. Joshi, D. P. Runthala, R. P. Gupta, *Crit. Rev. Solid State Mater. Sci.* **2004**, *29*, 111; e) G. A. Somorjai, J. Y. Park, *Angew. Chem.* **2008**, *120*, 9352; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2008**, *47*, 9212.
- [2] A. Kulkarni, B. C. Gates, *Angew. Chem.* **2009**, *121*, 9877; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2009**, *48*, 9697.
- [3] a) A. S. Barnard, *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **2009**, *4*, 332; b) B. Han, J. Wu, C. Zhou, B. Chen, R. Gordon, X. Lei, D. A. Roberts, H. Cheng, *Angew. Chem.* **2010**, *122*, 152; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2010**, *49*, 148.
- [4] a) C. Cavallotti, V. Gupta, C. Sieber, K. F. Jensen, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2003**, *5*, 2818; b) Y. S. Won, Y. S. Kim, T. J. Anderson, L. McElwee-White, *Chem. Mater.* **2008**, *20*, 7246.
- [5] a) T. Tanaka, T. Nakajima, K. Yamashita, *Thin Solid Films* **2002**, *409*, 51; b) E. Machado, M. Kaczmariski, B. Braida, P. Ordejón, D. Garg, J. Norman, H. Cheng, *J. Mol. Model.* **2007**, *13*, 861.
- [6] S. Delgado, A. Muñoz, M. E. Medina, C. J. Pastor, *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **2006**, *359*, 109.
- [7] a) G. Bandoli, D. Barreca, A. Gasparotto, R. Seraglia, E. Tondello, A. Devi, R. A. Fischer, E. Fois, A. Gamba, G. Tabacchi, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2009**, *11*, 5998; b) A. Gasparotto, D. Barreca, A. Devi, R. A. Fischer, E. Fois, A. Gamba, C. Maccato, R. Seraglia, G. Tabacchi, E. Tondello, *ECS Trans.* **2009**, *25*, 549.
- [8] a) D. Barreca, A. Gasparotto, C. Maccato, E. Tondello, O. I. Lebedev, G. Van Tendeloo, *Cryst. Growth Des.* **2009**, *9*, 2470; b) D. Barreca, P. Fornasiero, A. Gasparotto, V. Gombac, C. Maccato, T. Montini, E. Tondello, *ChemSusChem* **2009**, *2*, 230; c) D. Barreca, E. Comini, A.

- Gasparotto, C. Maccato, C. Sada, G. Sberveglieri, E. Tondello, *Sens. Actuators, B* **2009**, *141*, 270; d) A. Gasparotto, D. Barreca, P. Fornasiero, V. Gombac, O. I. Lebedev, C. Maccato, T. Montini, E. Tondello, G. Van Tendeloo, E. Comini, G. Sberveglieri, *ECS Trans.* **2009**, *25*, 1169.
- [9] a) L. T. Zhuravlev, *Colloids Surf. A* **2000**, *173*, 1; b) L. Colombi Ciacchi, D. J. Cole, M. C. Payne, P. Gumbsch, *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2008**, *112*, 12077.
- [10] A. Rahman, *Phys. Rev. A*, **1964**, *2*, 405.
- [11] The Cu–O and Cu–N stretching frequencies in the complex are below 600 cm^{-1} , see Ref. [7a], while at 750 K, $kT/hc=500\text{ cm}^{-1}$.
- [12] D. R. Armstrong, L. Balloch, W. Clegg, S. H. Dale, P. García-Álvarez, E. Hevia, L. M. Hogg, A. R. Kennedy, R. E. Mulvey, C. T. O'Hara, *Angew. Chem.* **2009**, *121*, 8831; *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2009**, *48*, 8675.
- [13] G. Tabacchi, E. Gianotti, E. Fois, G. Martra, L. Marchese, S. Coluccia, A. Gamba, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, **2007**, *111*, 4946.
- [14] a) R. Car, M. Parrinello, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1985**, *55*, 2471. b) D. Marx, J. Hutter, *Ab initio Molecular Dynamics*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, **2009**.
- [15] a) D. Vanderbilt, *Phys. Rev. B* **1990**, *41*, 7892; b) D. R. Hamman, M. Schlüter, C. Chiang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1979**, *43*, 1494; c) L. Kleinman, D. M. Bylander, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1982**, *48*, 1425.
- [16] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1996**, *77*, 3865.
- [17] S. Nose, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1984**, *87*, 511.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Left: ball-and-stick representation of the $[\text{Cu}(\text{hfa})_2 \cdot \text{TMEDA}]$ (hfa = 1,1,1,5,5,5-hexafluoro-2,4-pentanedionate, TMEDA = *N,N,N',N'* - tetramethylethylenediamine) complex. Atoms labelling as in Ref. [7]. The isolated molecule (C_2 symmetry) has a Jahn-Teller distorted octahedral CuO_4N_2 geometry and a dipole moment of 9.4 D.^[7] Right: representation of the minimum energy structure of $[\text{Cu}(\text{hfa})_2 \cdot \text{TMEDA}]$ on top of a hydroxylated silica layer. Atoms color codes: Cu, yellow; C, gray; N, blue; O, red; F, green; Si, black; H, white.

Figure 2. Left: selected distances r vs. time between $[\text{Cu}(\text{hfa})_2 \cdot \text{TMEDA}]$ and hydroxylated silica surface atoms. Black, red and green lines correspond to the shortest distances of Cu, TMEDA H and hfa F atoms from the closest surface atom, respectively. The **a**, **b** and **c** labels refer to the different regimes described in the text. Right: projection on the xy plane, parallel to the substrate surface, of the ~ 30 ps trajectory of Cu (black line). The red arrows indicate the time direction of the trajectory. A low-mobility region (regime **b**) of the trajectory is highlighted by a green shadow and magnified in the inset.

Figure 3. Snapshots taken from the last part of the trajectory (region **c**) highlighting the roll-and-go diffusion of $[\text{Cu}(\text{hfa})_2 \cdot \text{TMEDA}]$ on hydroxylated silica. From **a**) to **d**), pictures are separated by 2.4 ps. Atom color codes as in Figure 1.

Figure 4. Mean Square Displacement calculated for the $[\text{Cu}(\text{hfa})_2 \cdot \text{TMEDA}]$ central atom (Cu) on top of the hot hydroxylated silica surface (black dotted line). $\text{msd}(t)$ sections showing linear behaviour vs. time have been interpolated using a least square fitting to $\text{msd}(t) = A + Qt$. In the linear segments in **a** and **c** (blue dashed lines), the values of $Q/6$ provide an estimation of the

diffusion coefficient in these regions. The vertical dot-dashed lines mark the borderlines between the **a**, **b** and **c** regimes.

Figure 5. Time evolution of Cu–ligand distances (panels a), b), c), d)) and shortest TMEDA H–hfa O1 distance (panel e)) $r(t)$ along the simulation. The **a**, **b** and **c** labels refer to the different regimes described in the text.

Table

Table 1. Minimum (R_{\min}), maximum (R_{\max}) and average ($\langle R_{\text{Cu}} \rangle$) distances between Cu and ligand-atoms; average distances of the O1, O1*, O2, O2*, N, N* atoms from the closest surface oxygen atom ($\langle D_{\text{surf}} \rangle$). Distances in Å. Data from the trajectory part corresponding to complex physisorption (stage **b**, 4 - 20 ps) at 750 K. For the averaged parameters, the standard deviations are reported. R_{Cu} and D_{surf} values refer to an optimized (0 K) complex-surface structure. The guess configuration for geometry optimization was taken from the stage **b** of the trajectory.

Atom	R_{\min}	R_{\max}	$\langle R_{\text{Cu}} \rangle$	R_{Cu}	$\langle D_{\text{surf}} \rangle$	D_{surf}
O1	1.882	2.963	2.41±0.17	2.375	5.62±0.79	5.534
O1*	1.858	3.565	2.43±0.20	2.419	4.81±0.63	3.898
O2	1.748	2.518	2.03±0.07	2.012	4.85±0.63	4.772
O2*	1.817	2.452	2.02±0.07	2.007	7.40±0.43	6.513
N	1.933	2.445	2.12±0.07	2.096	5.86±0.41	5.800
N*	1.922	2.914	2.14±0.10	2.113	4.71±0.29	4.700

Entry for the Table of Contents

Rock-and-roll over hot floors: The first activation stages of a Cu complex on top of a heated surface (750 K) are investigated by theoretical modelling. Two different types of mobility regimes intercalated by labile physisorption, *i.e.* a slow “bump-and-rock” diffusion over the surface and a fast “roll-and-go” motion accompanied by significant temperature-induced bonds oscillations, have been evidenced and described, enabling a deeper insight into “hot” surface molecular activation processes.

To be cited as: *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **49**, 1944-1948 (2010).
Link to version of record: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/anie.200907312>

Keywords: Chemical Vapor Deposition • Density Functional calculations • High-temperature chemistry • Molecular dynamics • Surface chemistry




Figure 1.




Figure 2.




Figure 3.





Figure 4.

*Figure 5.*




Image for Table of Contents