Published in final edited form as:

Phys Chem Chem Phys. 2017 March 01; 19(9): 6330–6333. doi:10.1039/c6cp07539h.

Simulated photoelectron intensities at the aqueous solution–air interface for flat and cylindrical (microjet) geometries

Giorgia Olivieri^a, Krista M. Parry^b, Cedric J. Powell^c, Douglas J. Tobias^b, and Matthew A. Brown^a

^aLaboratory for Surface Science and Technology, Department of Materials, ETH Zürich, Switzerland ^bDepartment of Chemistry, University of California, Irvine, California, USA ^cMaterials Measurement Science Division, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA

Abstract

Ion spatial distributions at the aqueous-air/vacuum interface are accessible by energy-dependent X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS). Here we quantify the difference between a flat surface and a cylindrical shaped microjet on the energy-dependent information depth of the XPS experiment and on the simulated photoelectron intensities using solutions of pure water and of 1 mol/L NaI as examples.

Photoelectron spectroscopy from liquid solutions dates to the pioneering laboratory-based work of Hans and Kai Siegbahn in the early nineteen-seventies.¹ The majority of current work in this field is now performed using synchrotron light sources^{2–4} that have the advantage of significantly higher brilliance than a laboratory anode tube and the ability to vary the X-ray energy. The latter permits depth-resolved experiments by exploiting the dependence of the information depth (ID) with kinetic energy of the photoelectron in solution⁵ and has been used extensively to interrogate the spatial distributions of electrolyte ions at aqueous-air/vacuum interfaces.^{6–13} These interfaces are routinely generated by deliquescing a salt crystal in an ambient pressure (several hundred Pa) of water vapour,^{6, 7, 11, 12} or by passing an electrolyte solution through a small capillary to create a free-flowing filament (a liquid microjet) in a vacuum of about 10^{–2} Pa.^{9, 10, 13} While it is generally assumed that these two experimental configurations give similar results, the liquid interfaces they create have two very different geometries: (assumed) flat in the case of a deliquesced sample (aqueous-air interface) and cylindrical when using the microjet (aqueous-vacuum interface). In this *Communication* we explore the effects of these different geometries on the energy-dependent ID of the XPS experiment and on the depth-resolved simulated photoelectron intensities of pure water and of 1 mol/L NaI (with a focus on the I[–]/Na⁺ ratio).

Correspondence to: Matthew A. Brown.

Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) available: Table ESI–1, Figs. ESI–1, ESI–2, ESI–3 and ESI–4, and details of the simulation of electron spectra for surface analysis (SESSA) and molecular dynamics (MD) simulations. See DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

The ID of a particular XPS experiment is determined in large part by the inelastic mean free path (IMFP) and the emission angle (α) of the photoelectrons with respect to the surface normal.^{14,15} ID calculations have only been made for photoelectron spectroscopy experiments that employ unpolarised X-rays;^{14,15} however, ion spatial distributions of aqueous electrolyte solutions have, to-date, only been measured using linearly polarized X-rays.^{6–13} Using the Simulation of Electron Spectra for Surface Analysis (SESSA) database developed by Werner *et al.*,^{16,17} we calculate the ID of an XPS experiment that employs linearly polarized light at a semi-infinite solution as a function of the percentage of the detected signal, P , when $\alpha=0^\circ$. Results for a solution of pure water are shown in Fig. 1a for photoelectron kinetic energies of 65 eV and 1500 eV (see ESI for details). The corresponding IDs for photoelectron kinetic energies between 65 eV and 1500 eV when $\alpha=0^\circ$ are shown in Fig. 1b (Table ESI-1, results for 1 mol/L NaI are available in the ESI) for our choice of $P = 95\%$. This energy range corresponds roughly to that typically available at soft X-ray synchrotron beamlines. For an experiment performed using a cylindrical microjet the average emission angle is not immediately clear and needs to be first calculated before the correct ID can be properly determined.

To model an XPS experiment that employs a liquid microjet, the cylindrical geometry is reconstructed by a series of planes that run tangent to the outer surface of the microjet (Fig. 2a). Only planes from quadrant 1 (Q1, with plane tilt angles $\theta = 0^\circ$ to 90°) contribute to the measured intensity¹⁸; photoelectrons from Q2 are blocked by Q1 (due to the short IMFPs of the detected photoelectrons), whereas Q3 and Q4 are shadowed by Q1 and Q2 from the incoming X-ray (due to the finite penetration depth of soft X-rays). The photoelectron emission angles (α) from each plane that contribute intensity in an experiment are a function of the polar acceptance angle of the analyser, ϕ . Figure 2b shows the accepted emission angles for $\theta = 0^\circ, 45^\circ$ and 80° when the analyser polar acceptance angle is $\phi = \pm 22^\circ$ (common to modern differentially-pumped hemispherical analysers¹⁹). For planes with tilt angles of $\theta = 0^\circ$ and 45° , the full angular acceptance of the analyser is realised, whereas for planes with higher tilt angles the angular acceptance of the analyser is cut by the surface (see Fig. 2b, $\theta = 80^\circ$) and the intensity reaching the analyser is decreased accordingly.

Using SESSA we simulate the O 1s photoelectron intensity from a semi-infinite solution of pure water as a function of plane tilt angle for photoelectron kinetic energies between 65 eV and 1500 eV (see ESI for details). The O 1s intensities predicted by SESSA are scaled by a geometric weighting factor, g , that accounts for the projection of each plane onto an axis perpendicular to the photoelectron detection axis.²⁰ In our model, this correction is $g = \cos \theta$. Figure 3a shows the results for a photoelectron kinetic energy of 65 eV when the analyser polar acceptance angle is $\phi = \pm 1^\circ$ (red circles). The decrease in O 1s intensity as the plane tilt angle is increased is well reproduced by the modified Chandrasekhar function, H (Fig. 3a).²²

$$H(\mu, \omega) = \frac{1 + \mu \sqrt{3}}{1 + \mu \sqrt{3(1-\omega)}} g \quad (1)$$

where $\mu = \cos \alpha$ and ω is the single-scattering albedo defined²² as the ratio of the IMFP to the sum of the IMFP and the transport mean free path ($\omega = 0.418$ at 65 eV for a solution of pure water).⁵

The average emission angle ($\langle \alpha \rangle$) for an XPS experiment performed with a cylindrical microjet is calculated from the weighted average of the corresponding intensities in Fig. 3a:

$$\langle \alpha \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (I_i \cos \theta_i) \theta_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n I_i \cos \theta_i}, \quad (2)$$

where $I_i \cos \theta_i$ is the weighted intensity reaching the detector from the i -th plane, θ_i (see Fig. ESI–2). Results for photoelectron kinetic energies between 65 eV and 1500 eV are shown in Fig. 3b. The average emission angle from a homogeneous cylindrical microjet of pure water is $\langle \alpha \rangle = 32.2^\circ$ at 65 eV, increasing slightly to $\langle \alpha \rangle = 32.6^\circ$ by 1500 eV. The latter approaches the upper limit of 32.7° (dashed-line in Fig. 3b) for a cylindrical geometry derived from the straight-line approximation²² where all elastic-scattering events are neglected. The polar acceptance angle (ϕ) of the analyser has no significant effect on the results up to $\phi = \pm 22^\circ$ (Fig 3c).²³ In addition, we find these results are independent of chemical composition: A homogeneous solution of 1 mol/L NaI yields virtually identical results to that of pure water (Fig. ESI–2).

The average emission angles in Fig. 3b are subsequently used to calculate the ID of an XPS experiment with cylindrical geometry. Continuing to use pure water as an example, we find that the ID at 65 eV decreases from 1.47 nm for a flat interface ($\alpha = 0^\circ$) to 1.36 nm in the cylindrical geometry ($\langle \alpha \rangle = 32.2^\circ$), and from 13.00 nm to 11.53 nm ($\langle \alpha \rangle = 32.6^\circ$) at 1500 eV. Overall, the effect of the cylindrical geometry of the liquid microjet is to increase the surface sensitivity of the experiment when compared to that of a flat surface.

Transitioning from a semi-infinite system to the interface region of a real solution adds complexity, as the solution is no longer homogeneous with depth. In electrolyte solutions, atomic populations in the vicinity of the aqueous-air/vacuum interface are typically depicted as density profiles determined by molecular dynamics (MD) simulations.²⁴ The profiles derived from MD simulations of an aqueous solution of 1 mol/L NaI are shown in Fig. 4, where zero depth is the position of the instantaneous interface (see ESI for details).²⁵ An enhancement of the ion population in the vicinity of the interface relative to the bulk is observed for both ions, while the water profile (oxygen density) shows clear layering near the interface. A detailed description of the driving forces behind these non-monotonic atom-density profiles is beyond the scope of the current work, but is discussed in detail in a recent review.²⁴ Here, using the MD density profiles of Fig. 4 and SESSA we predict the XPS intensities (I^-/Na^+ ratio) as a function of kinetic energy for a flat interface and for a cylindrical microjet. We note, however, that SESSA considers only atomic properties and each layer of the solution is modelled as being amorphous in structure. As such, any anisotropy that may be present in solution cannot be accounted for with SESSA.

The average emission angles ($\langle \alpha \rangle$) for the MD-derived density profiles of 1 mol/L NaI in the cylindrical geometry of a microjet are shown in Fig. 5a for kinetic energies between 65 eV

and 1500 eV. In contrast with the equivalent homogeneous solution (Fig. ESI-3) we find a non-negligible kinetic-energy dependence of the average emission angle that ranges from $\langle \alpha \rangle = 27.5^\circ$ at 65 eV to $\langle \alpha \rangle = 32.5^\circ$ at 1500 eV. The average emission angles of iodide (4d) and sodium (2p) deviate from one another because of their unique density profiles, behaviour that is not seen in homogeneous systems where each component has the same energy-dependence.

The I 4d/Na 2p intensity ratio for a cylindrical microjet of 1 mol/L NaI is calculated using SESSA as a function of the photoelectron kinetic energy at the average emission angle (open green markers of Fig. 5b).²⁶ In agreement with the generally accepted picture of aqueous iodide electrolyte solutions,⁶ we find preferential enhancement of iodide relative to sodium at lower kinetic energies (the I 4d/Na 2p ratio is 1.28 at 65 eV). As the kinetic energy is increased, the intensity ratio decreases, eventually reaching a stoichiometric value at ≈ 600 eV. At this energy the ID has increased to a value (5.71 nm, see Table ESI-1) where the corresponding experiment could no longer be considered interface sensitive (an XPS experiment at this energy would be largely considered as a measure of bulk stoichiometry).

The results for the cylindrical geometry of a microjet are compared with those predicted for the same MD atom density profiles at a flat interface, $\alpha = 0^\circ$ (closed red symbols, Fig. 5b). The slight increase in surface sensitivity of the XPS experiment with the cylindrical geometry of the microjet has a negligible effect on the I 4d/Na 2p ion ratio. The predicted ion ratios differ by at most 4% at 65 eV and are indistinguishable at kinetic energies above 200 eV. Given the limitations of reproducibility with XPS measurements at liquid interfaces, we predict these subtle differences in the intensity ratio could not be determined by experiment. Effectively, there is no difference between a flat interface and that of a cylindrical microjet from the perspective of an XPS experiment.

Conclusions

Using SESSA and atom-density profiles from MD simulations we determined the average emission angle for an XPS experiment performed from a cylindrical microjet. While the average emission angles are significant ($\approx 30^\circ$), the effect on the simulated ion intensity ratio (I 4d/Na 2p) for an aqueous solution of 1 mol/L NaI is negligible ($<4\%$) when compared with those of a flat interface where the average emission angle is taken to be 0° . We predict that such a small difference in ion intensity ratio could not be determined by experiment. We therefore conclude that XPS results from the two different sample configurations, assumed flat in the case of deliquesced salt crystals and cylindrical in the case of the microjet, are essentially the same and can be compared without having to worry about the influence of the microjet's curvature.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

G.O. is funded through at ETH Research Grant (no. ETH-20 13-2). The work at UC Irvine is supported in part by a grant from the National Science Foundation (no. CHE-0431312).

Notes and references

1. Siegbahn H, Siegbahn K. *Journal of Electron Spectroscopy and Related Phenomena*. 1973; 2:319–325.
2. Winter B, Faubel M. *Chem Rev*. 2006; 106:1176–1211. [PubMed: 16608177]
3. Brown MA, Faubel M, Winter B. *Annual Reports on the Progress of Chemistry, Section C*. 2009; 105:174–212.
4. Brown MA, Jordan I, Belouqui Redondo A, Kleibert A, Wörner HJ, van Bokhoven JA. *Surf Sci*. 2013; 610:1–6.
5. Olivieri G, Parry KM, Powell CJ, Tobias DJ, Brown MA. *J Chem Phys*. 2016; 144:154704. [PubMed: 27389231]
6. Ghosal S, Hemminger JC, Bluhm H, Mun BS, Hebenstreit ELD, Ketteler G, Ogletree DF, Requejo FG, Salmeron M. *Science*. 2005; 307:563–566. [PubMed: 15681380]
7. Krisch MJ, D'Auria R, Brown MA, Tobias DJ, Hemminger JC, Ammann M, Starr DE, Bluhm H. *J Phys Chem C*. 2007; 111:13497–13509.
8. Brown MA, D'Auria R, Kuo IFW, Krisch MJ, Starr DE, Bluhm H, Tobias DJ, Hemminger JC. *Phys Chem Chem Phys*. 2008; 10:4778–4784. [PubMed: 18688520]
9. Brown MA, Winter B, Faubel M, Hemminger JC. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*. 2009; 131:8354–8355. [PubMed: 19530722]
10. Ottosson N, Vacha R, Aziz EF, Pokapanich W, Eberhardt W, Svensson S, Ohrwall G, Jungwirth P, Bjorneholm O, Winter B. *J Chem Phys*. 2009; 131:124706. [PubMed: 19791911]
11. Cheng MH, Callahan KM, Margarella AM, Tobias DJ, Hemminger JC, Bluhm H, Krisch MJ. *J Phys Chem C*. 2012; 116:4545–4555.
12. Tissot H, Olivieri G, Gallet JJ, Bournel F, Silly MG, Sirotti F, Rochet F. *J Phys Chem C*. 2015; 119:9253–9259.
13. Brown MA, Lee MT, Kleibert A, Ammann M, Giorgi JB. *J Phys Chem C*. 2015; 119:4976–4982.
14. Powell CJ, Jablonski A. *Nucl Instrum Meth A*. 2009; 601:54–65.
15. Jablonski A, Powell CJ. *J Vac Sci Technol A*. 2009; 27:253.
16. Smekal W, Werner WSM, Powell CJ. *Surf Interface Anal*. 2005; 37:1059–1067.
17. Werner, WSM., Smekal, W., Powell, CJ. *Standard Reference Data Program Database 100*. Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology; Gaithersburg, Maryland: 2014. NIST Database for the Simulation of Electron Spectra for Surface Analysis, Version 2.0.
18. Tanuma S, Powell CJ, Penn DR. *Surf Interface Anal*. 1994; 21:165–176.
19. Suzuki YI, Nishizawa K, Kurahashi N, Suzuki T. *Phys Rev E*. 2014; 90:010302.
20. [Accessed June 23, 2016] http://www.specs.de/cms/front_content.php?idcat=269
21. Techane S, Baer DR, Castner DG. *Anal Chem*. 2011; 83:6704–6712. [PubMed: 21744862]
22. Werner WSM, Tilinin IS, Jablonski A. *Surf Interface Anal*. 1995; 23:823–832.
23. Larger ϕ are in principle possible with magnetic-bottle flight-tube analysers,²⁷ but in practice the small entrance aperture needed for ambient pressure and liquid jet type experiments limits ϕ to values much smaller than those achieved with commercial hemispherical analysers.²⁸ In addition, magnetic-bottle flight-tube analysers are operated at synchrotron radiation facilities typically only when the storage ring is operated in a single- or two-bunch mode. Depth-resolved energy-dependent XPS experiments have, to-date, only been done in multi-bunch mode, which make these analysers ill-suited for the type of experiment considered herein.
24. Tobias DJ, Stern AC, Baer MD, Levin Y, Mundy CJ. *Annu Rev Phys Chem*. 2013; 64:339–359. [PubMed: 23331311]
25. Willard AP, Chandler D. *J Phys Chem B*. 2010; 114:1954–1958. [PubMed: 20055377]

26. The SESSA intensities for I 4d and Na 2p are normalized by the corresponding energy-dependent photoionization cross-sections. In Fig. ESI-3 we show that the cross-sections employed herein yield stoichiometric ion ratios for a homogeneous solution of 1 mol/L NaI for all kinetic energies.
27. Tsuboi T, Xu EY, Bae YK, Gillen KT. Rev Scient Instr. 1988; 59:1357–1362.
28. Kothe A, Metje J, Wilke M, Moguilevski A, Engel N, Al-Obaidi R, Richter C, Golnak R, Kiyani Yu, Aziz EF. Rev Sci Instrum. 2013; 84:0231.

NIST Author Manuscript

NIST Author Manuscript

NIST Author Manuscript

Fig. 1.

(a) Information depth (ID) at 65 eV and 1500 eV of a semi-infinite solution of pure water as a function of the percentage of the detected signal when using linearly polarized light and $\alpha=0^\circ$. (b) IDs of liquid water for $P=95\%$ as a function of photoelectron kinetic energy when $\alpha=0^\circ$.

Fig. 2.

(a) Model of a cylindrical microjet used for photoelectron spectroscopy measurements of liquid solutions. The direction of liquid flow, incident X-ray and photoelectron (PE) detection axis are orthogonal. The cylindrical shape of the microjet is modelled using a series of planes that reconstruct the interfaces' curvature. The cylinder is divided into four quadrants (Q1–Q4) and only photoelectrons from Q1 reach the detector. (b) The photoelectron emission angles (α) that contribute to intensity depend on the plane tilt angle (in colour for $\theta = 0^\circ$, 45° and 80°) and the analyser polar acceptance angle (shown here for $\phi = \pm 22^\circ$). For planes with high tilt angles, the angular acceptance of the analyser is cut by the surface (e.g., $\theta = 80^\circ$).

Fig. 3.

(a) Simulated O 1s photoelectron intensities for a semi-infinite solution of pure water as a function of surface tilt angle (θ) at a kinetic energy (E_k) of 65 eV (open symbols). The polar acceptance angle of the analyser is $\phi = \pm 1^\circ$. The solid line is the modified Chandrasekhar function (Eq. 1) with $\omega = 0.418$. (b) Average photoelectron emission angle ($\langle \alpha \rangle$) from a cylindrical microjet as a function of kinetic energy when $\phi = \pm 1^\circ$. (c) Average photoelectron emission angle ($\langle \alpha \rangle$) from a cylindrical microjet as a function of polar acceptance angle of the analyser. Results are shown for kinetic energies of 65 eV (open red symbols) and 1500 eV (closed blue symbols).

Fig. 4.

Atomic density profiles determined from molecular dynamics (MD) simulations of 1 mol/L NaI. Black, oxygen (O) density (right axis); pink, sodium (Na) density (left axis); blue, (I) iodide density (left axis). The instantaneous interface is at $x = 0$ nm and marked by a dashed line. Negative x -values indicate depth into the solution.

Fig. 5.

(a) Average photoelectron emission angle ($\langle \alpha \rangle$) for a cylindrical microjet of 1 mol/L NaI (using the MD derived ion profiles of Fig. 4) as a function of kinetic energy. Results for the I 4d (open markers) and Na 2p (closed markers) orbitals are shown. The polar analyser acceptance angle is $\phi = \pm 1^\circ$. (b) SESSA calculated iodide-to-sodium ratio (I 4d/Na 2p) as a function of kinetic energy for a flat surface where $\alpha = 0^\circ$ (closed markers) and for a cylindrical microjet where $\alpha = \langle \alpha \rangle$.