Published in final edited form as:

Faraday Discuss. 2017 July 01; 199: 129–158. doi:10.1039/c6fd00256k.

Electrostatic interactions between ions near Thomas-Fermi substrates and the surface energy of ionic crystal at imperfect metals

V. Kaiser¹, J. Comtet¹, A. Niguès¹, A. Siria¹, B. Coasne², and L. Bocquet^{1,*}

¹Laboratoire de Physique Statistique, Ecole Normale Supérieure, UMR CNRS 8550, PSL Research University, 75005 Paris Cedex 05, France

²Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire de Physique, CNRS and Université Grenoble Alpes, UMR CNRS 5588, 38000 Grenoble, France

Abstract

The electrostatic interaction between two charged particles is strongly modified in the vicinity of a metal. This situation is usually accounted for by the celebrated image charges approach, which was further extended to account for the electronic screening properties of the metal at the level of the Thomas-Fermi description. In this paper we build upon the approach by [Kornyshev et al. *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.*, 78(3):1008–1019, 1980] and successive works to calculate the 1-body and 2-body electrostatic energy of ions near a metal in terms of the Thomas-Fermi screening length. We propose workable approximations suitable for molecular simulations of ionic systems close to metallic walls. Furthermore, we use this framework to calculate analytically the electrostatic contribution to the surface energy of a one dimensional crystal at a metallic wall and its dependence on the Thomas-Fermi screening length. These calculations provide a simple interpretation for the surface energy in terms of image charges, which allow for an estimate of interfacial properties in more complex situations of a disordered ionic liquid close to a metal surface. A counterintuitive outcome is that electronic screening, as characterized by a molecular Thomas-Fermi length ℓ_F , profoundly affects the wetting of ionic systems close to a metal, in line with the recent experimental observation of capillary freezing of ionic liquids in metallic confinement.

1 Introduction

Room-temperature ionic liquids (RTIL) [1] are a class of materials with broad promises for energy storage [2] and nanolubrication [3, 4]. Physically, they are solvent-less electrolytes which remain liquids at room temperatures as the size of the constituent species competes with the Coulomb interaction to prevent crystallization. Electrostatic interactions make such

*To whom correspondence should be addressed: lyderic.bocquet@ens.fr.

This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this *Accepted Manuscript* with the edited and formatted *Advance Article* as soon as it is available.

systems strongly correlated, even in the liquid phase [5], as highlighted by a number of specific properties exhibited by RTIL, such as layering [6, 7, 8, 9], crowding in the double layer [1], the recently observed phenomena of long-range electrostatic interactions in RTIL [10] or capillary freezing in confinement [11]. This points to the peculiar interfacial properties of RTIL, many aspects of which remain puzzling and defy theoretical understanding. Such specificities are however extremely interesting to be harnessed for various applications [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17].

In the present paper, our aim is to explore the impact of the substrate electronic properties on the interfacial properties of RTIL. This is in particular motivated by our recent experiments, highlighting a solidification of a RTIL in confinement. This is interpreted there in terms of capillary freezing at the nanoscale, which is found to strongly increase as the conductivity of the substrate increases [11]. These experiments point to an impact of the electronic properties of the substrate on the phase and interfacial properties of RTIL, which remains to be thoroughly rationalized.

Our goal is to set-up the microscopic foundations to explore, *e.g.* by means of molecular simulations, the interface between an ionic system and an imperfect metallic substrate. The latter is modelled at the level of the Thomas-Fermi (TF) theory for electronic screening, which allows us to interpolate continuously between insulators to ideal metals [18]. Modelling of TF interfaces has drawn attention in the context of metallic and semiconducting junctions [50, 48, 49] and electrochemistry, especially work functions involved in adsorption of charges and their configuration at surfaces [45]. In particular we build on the pioneering work by Kornyshev et al. [43, 19, 20, 21] who, in a series of papers, did set-up the framework to describe electrostatics near TF walls, and even the two-dimensional crystallisation of charges *along* the surface [46, 45]. Our objective is to obtain – here, at the level of the Laplace estimate for interfacial tensions [22] – an estimate of the electrostatic contribution to the interfacial energy of an ionic crystal at a TF substrate, which extends outward *perpendicular* to the surface.

We accordingly proceed in several steps: we first derive the analytical expressions for the 1-body and 2-body electrostatic interactions between two ions close to a TF substrate (section 2 of the paper); we also propose further manageable and versatile expressions for the interaction potential, in a form suitable for implementation in (future) molecular simulations; (ii) then using the proposed framework, we calculate the surface energy of 1D, 2D, and 3D ionic crystals close to a TF wall, as a function of the TF screening length (section 3 of the paper). Our theory predicts a lowering of the electrostatic energy of crystals due to the charge induced in the substrate, with better conductors leading to better charge screening and lower interfacial energy. We conclude by general perspectives and extensions of the proposed framework in the context of a number of recent experimental observations.

2 Electrostatics close to Thomas–Fermi surfaces

2.1 Thomas-Fermi screening and Green function

Thomas-Fermi screening—In electrostatics at the macroscale, any conductor is seen as an idealized metal which perfectly screens any external charge at infinitely short distances

[23]. An external charge close to the ideal metal interface induces a charge which is confined to the surface. The potential in the exterior of the metal can be expressed as a sum of the external-charge potential and the potential of an image charge of equal but opposite sign, mirrored by the surface. Unlike the surface charge, this image charge is purely a mathematical tool, as any real charge in an ideal metal is confined to the surface. The ideal metal limit has been treated in simulations by methods implementing the image charge method and its refinements in multiple fashions [24, 25, 26].

The perfect screening picture breaks down at the nanoscale as the screening charge cannot be localized due to fundamental principles of quantum mechanics [27]. Delocalisation of the screening charge then results in screening at a finite wavelength for any external charge perturbing the system. The simplest screening theory, due to Thomas and Fermi, takes into account the competition between the energy gain due to screening of the external charge and the energy cost of localising the screening charge, while neglecting further correlations due to the wave-like nature of (quasi-)electrons [18].

Electrostatics in vacuum or in an insulator next to the surface of Thomas–Fermi (TF) metal (located in the half plane $z < 0$) follows the Poisson equation of electrostatics, stated here as a Green function problem for a point charge at $z = a$,

$$\Delta\psi_I = -\frac{Q\delta(z-a)\delta(R)}{2\pi\delta\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{U}_0\delta\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{U}_I R}, \quad (1)$$

and the Thomas–Fermi equation

$$\Delta\psi_{II} - \kappa_{TF}^2 \psi_{II} = 0. \quad (2)$$

where the Thomas-Fermi wavevector $\kappa_{TF} = \ell_{TF}^{-1} = \sqrt{\delta\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{U}\delta\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{U}_{II} e^2 \mathcal{D}(E_F)}$ expresses the strength of the screening which increases with the density of states at the Fermi level $\mathcal{D}(E_F)$ (in the zero-temperature approximation). Increased $\mathcal{D}(E_F)$ permits the electron density to vary more with a lesser effect on the chemical potential of the local Fermi liquid, thus reducing the cost of localised screening, and reducing ℓ_{TF} .

Green function of a charge close to a TF substrate—The Green function of a charge Q at distance a from the surface is central to the derivation of the potential energies and the thermodynamic properties under investigation. The configuration is shown in Fig. 1. The Poisson equation (1), and the TF equation (2) govern the electrostatic potential outside, and inside the TF metal, respectively.

The Green function can be calculated using the Hankel transform method [28]. The latter is defined as $\psi(z, K) = \int dR R J_0(KR) \psi(z, R)$, where R is the radial component along the surface, and K the corresponding wavevector. Applying the Hankel transformation, the previous equations (1)–(2) for the Green function read

$$(\partial_{zz} - K^2) \psi_I = -\frac{Q \delta(z-a)}{2\pi \partial \tilde{U}_0 \partial \tilde{U}_I}, \quad (3)$$

$$(\partial_{zz} - \kappa_{TF}^2) \psi_{II} = 0 \quad \text{where} \quad \kappa_{TF}^2 = K^2 + \kappa_{TF}^2. \quad (4)$$

Boundary conditions at the surface are given by the continuity of the potential $\psi_I(z=0_+) = \psi_{II}(z=0_-)$ and the electric displacement field $\partial \tilde{U}_I / \partial z|_{z=0_+} - \partial \tilde{U}_{II} / \partial z|_{z=0_-} = 0$. Moreover, the potential vanishes at infinity in all directions. The resulting Green function reads (as shown in various ways in Refs. [50, 48, 43, 19, 20, 21]):

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_I^>(a|z>a, K) &= \frac{Q}{4\pi \partial \tilde{U}_0 \partial \tilde{U}_I K} \left[e^{+Ka} + \frac{\partial \tilde{U}_I K - \partial \tilde{U}_{II} \kappa_{TF}}{\partial \tilde{U}_I K + \partial \tilde{U}_{II} \kappa_{TF}} e^{-Ka} \right] e^{-Kz} \\ \psi_I^<(a|z<a, K) &= \frac{Q}{4\pi \partial \tilde{U}_0 \partial \tilde{U}_I K} \left[e^{+Kz} + \frac{\partial \tilde{U}_I K - \partial \tilde{U}_{II} \kappa_{TF}}{\partial \tilde{U}_I K + \partial \tilde{U}_{II} \kappa_{TF}} e^{-Kz} \right] e^{-Ka} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\psi_{II}(a|z, K) = \frac{Q e^{-Ka}}{4\pi \partial \tilde{U}_0 \partial \tilde{U}_I K} \frac{2 \partial \tilde{U}_I K}{\partial \tilde{U}_I K + \partial \tilde{U}_{II} \kappa_{TF}} e^{+\kappa_{TF} z}, \quad (6)$$

where the first term in the brackets corresponds to the potential of the point external charge, while the other one to the response of the TF surface. Within the Thomas-Fermi framework, the physical induced charge is proportional to the potential in the metal

$$\rho_{\text{ind}}(a|z, K) = -\partial \tilde{U}_0 \partial \tilde{U}_{II} \kappa_{TF}^2 \psi_{II}(a|z, K) = -\frac{\partial \tilde{U}_{II} \kappa_{TF}^2 Q e^{-Ka + \sqrt{K^2 + \kappa_{TF}^2} z}}{2\pi (\partial \tilde{U}_I K + \partial \tilde{U}_{II} \sqrt{K^2 + \kappa_{TF}^2})} \quad (7)$$

which replaces the induced surface charge in the perfect metal case due to finite screening length in the metal. In the Thomas-Fermi (TF) case, the induced charge is no longer confined to the surface but decays exponentially with the distance from it. As shown in Refs. [19, 20, 21], one remarkable property is that lateral extent of the screening cloud scales as $\partial \tilde{U}_I \ell_{TF} / \partial \tilde{U}_{II}$. It can therefore spread out significantly in cases of a large dielectric contrast between the insulator and the conductor $\partial \tilde{U}_I > \partial \tilde{U}_{II}$.

The full inversion of the Hankel transforms in terms of analytic functions is not analytically feasible. But they constitute a starting point for an approximation scheme. In the latter this allows us to express the single-body electrostatic energy in terms of simple integral expressions, and expand the two-body part in series in the Thomas-Fermi length ℓ_{TF} . This expansion also yields new physical insights into the structure of these potentials, for

example, that the Green function can be expressed in terms of an image multipole expansion akin to the image charge expression for the ideal metal.

A numerical inversion of the potential and the induced charge distribution is also feasible, but not very efficient for simulation purposes where it needs to be repeated many times for each time step. Below, we therefore propose approximated forms for the associated electrostatic energy, which can be handled numerically.

2.2 One-body interaction: a single charge close to a TF surface

We start by considering a single, isolated particle close to a flat surface. In the case of an ideal metal, the potential of a charge can be found from the image charge method [23], and the electrostatic energy $U_{\text{ideal}}^{(1)} = -Q^2 / [16\pi\delta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_1\delta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_0a]$ is half of what an equivalent pair of real charges would yield [23, 29].

The total electrostatic energy is half the scalar product of the charge density and the electrostatic potential, split between the induced charge (ρ_{ind} , $\psi_{\text{TF}} = \psi_{\text{II}}$, $z < 0$ support) and the external charge (ρ_{cr} , $\psi_{\text{cr}} = \psi_{\text{I}}$, $z > 0$ support) parts

$$U^{(1)}(a) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dz \int_0^{+\infty} 2\pi R dR \rho(a|z, R) \psi(a|z, R) \\ = \pi \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dz \int_0^{+\infty} dK K [\rho_{\text{ind}}(a|z, K) + \rho_{\text{cr}}(a|z, K)] \psi(a|z, K) \quad (8)$$

where we used the Plancherel theorem for the Hankel transform to equalize the direct and reciprocal space integrations. This expression can be used for TF metal and is equivalent to $\int_V \delta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}|\nabla\psi|^2/2$ because we treat the electrostatics of the system in the whole space and we have no explicit surface charges [23].

The resulting expressions for $U^{(1)}(a)$ is obtained in terms of an integral $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ext}}$ over the dimensionless variable $\lambda = Ka$

$$U^{(1)}(a) = - \frac{Q^2}{16\pi\delta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_0\delta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_1a} \left(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{\text{ext}} + \delta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_1\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ind}}\right), \quad \text{where} \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ext}} \left(\kappa_{\text{TF}}a, \delta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_1/\delta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_{\text{II}} \right) = \int_0^{+\infty} d\lambda \frac{4 \left(\delta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_1/\delta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_{\text{II}} \right) \lambda e^{-2\lambda}}{\sqrt{\lambda^2 + (\kappa_{\text{TF}}a)^2} + \left(\delta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_1/\delta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{J}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_{\text{II}} \right) \lambda} \quad (10)$$

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{ind}} \left(\kappa_{\text{TF}} a, \delta \dot{\text{I}} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{I}} / \delta \dot{\text{I}} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{II}} \right) = \int_0^{+\infty} d\lambda \frac{2(\kappa_{\text{TF}} a)^2 \lambda e^{-2\lambda}}{\left(\left(\delta \dot{\text{I}} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{I}} / \delta \dot{\text{I}} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{II}} \right) \lambda + \sqrt{\lambda^2 + (\kappa_{\text{TF}} a)^2} \right)^2 \sqrt{\lambda^2 + (\kappa_{\text{TF}} a)^2}}. \quad (11)$$

$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ext}}$ goes to unity for the insulating limit ($\kappa_{\text{TF}} = 0$, $\delta \dot{\text{I}} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{I}} = \delta \dot{\text{I}} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{II}}$) and vanishes for the ideal metal ($\kappa_{\text{TF}} \rightarrow \infty$). $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ind}}$ vanishes in both limits. The detailed derivation can be found in the Appendix A. The total energy reads accordingly $U^{(1)} = U_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} + U_{\text{ind}}^{(1)}$, separating the two induced and external contributions

$U_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} = - \frac{Q^2}{16\pi \delta \dot{\text{I}} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_0 \delta \dot{\text{I}} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{I}} a} (1 - \mathcal{J}_{\text{ext}})$ and $U_{\text{ind}}^{(1)} = - \frac{Q^2}{16\pi \delta \dot{\text{I}} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_0 a} \mathcal{J}_{\text{ind}}$. The integral expression $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ext}}$ has been first given in Refs. [50, 43], while we are not aware of $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ind}}$ being discussed in the literature. In Fig. 2 we show the integrals and their influence on the total one-body energy $U^{(1)}$. The energy is thus expressed in terms of a single-parameter integral with fast convergence due to the exponential decay of the integrands.

The reduction in energy of a charge close to the metal comes from the lowered electric field density, as the grounded surface only permits dipolar terms at long distances; the presence of the resulting electric field only in a half-space also explains why image charges contribute only half the energy when interacting with real charges. The one-body contribution $U^{(1)}(a)$ for TF metal thus interpolates between this value and the insulator limit.

At distances $a \gg \ell_{\text{TF}} = \kappa_{\text{TF}}^{-1}$, the TF potential energy approaches the ideal metal value $U_{\text{ext}}^{(1)}(\kappa_{\text{TF}} = \infty)$. But differences become apparent at shorter distances. Indeed the ideal metal energy diverges as a becomes small, due to the induced surface charge being localised laterally at distances comparable to a . But it is finite in the TF case, because the induced charge has always the extent of ℓ_{TF} , thus providing a natural ultra-violet cut-off for the energy. Moreover, there is an additional energy term $U_{\text{ind}}^{(1)}$ associated with the induced TF charge in the metal. This term vanishes in the ideal metal limit, as the charge is confined to the surface and occupies no volume. It also vanishes in the insulator limit, where no charge can be induced. This induced charge energy contributes the most for intermediate distances $a \sim \ell_{\text{TF}}$.

From a practical point of view, *e.g.* for simulation purposes, we propose a more tractable expression for the interaction energy, in terms of rational functions. Such a rational function was among approximations for $U_{\text{ext}}^{(1)}$ proposed in Ref. [44], which focused on the role of dielectric contrast. Here we fix $\delta \dot{\text{I}} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{I}} = \delta \dot{\text{I}} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{II}} = 1$ and approximate the integrals in Eqs. (10)-(11) to a higher degree of accuracy using a seven-parameter approximation of $U^{(1)}(a)$, reading

$$U^{(1)}(a) \simeq -\frac{Q^2}{16\pi\epsilon_0\epsilon_a} \left[1 - \frac{13.8879(\kappa_{\text{TF}}a)^3 + 37.4625(\kappa_{\text{TF}}a)^2 + 18.6940(\kappa_{\text{TF}}a) + 1}{27.8648(\kappa_{\text{TF}}a)^4 + 73.0987(\kappa_{\text{TF}}a)^3 + 70.3460(\kappa_{\text{TF}}a)^2 + 20.6754(\kappa_{\text{TF}}a) + 1} \right] \quad (12)$$

with maximal relative error less than 10^{-5} . We give details of the fitting procedure in the Appendix A.

2.3 Two-body interaction: two interacting charges close to the TF surface

The surface also mediates additional interactions between charges, as the induced charge on the surface also acts on other external charges. We split the electrostatic potential energy due to the two-body interaction into three parts

$$U^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = U_{\text{Coul}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) + U_{\text{ext}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) + U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2), \quad (13)$$

where the individual parts represent the following interactions:

- $U_{\text{Coul}}^{(2)} = Q_1 Q_2 / (4\pi\epsilon_0 \epsilon_a |\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|)$ is the direct Coulomb interaction between the two charges.
- $U_{\text{ext}}^{(2)}$ is the interaction of the charges with the charge induced in the TF boundary by the other charge. In the case of ideal metal this can be represented as half the Coulomb energy of each charge with the image charge of the other.
- $U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}$ is the electrostatic energy of a charge distribution induced by one charge (and located in the vicinity of the interface inside the TF conductor) within the potential of the other.

As in Eq. (8), the energy $U^{(2)}$ is a convolution of charge distribution with the potential. The terms $U_{\text{ext}}^{(2)}$ and $U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}$ are of the form $(1/2) \int (\psi^{(2)} \rho_{\text{ind}}^{(1)} + \psi^{(1)} \rho_{\text{ind}}^{(2)})$, comprising two contributions each. However, the two terms are equal, and we need to calculate only one of them, $\int \psi^{(2)} \rho_{\text{ind}}^{(1)}$. Altogether, the formal expressions for the two terms $U_{\text{ext}}^{(2)}$ and $U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}$ are obtained as:

$$U_{\text{ext}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{Q_1 Q_2}{4\pi\epsilon_0 \epsilon_a} \int_0^\infty dK J_0(K|\mathbf{r}_1^{(\parallel)} - \mathbf{r}_2^{(\parallel)}|) \frac{\delta\epsilon_{\text{I}} \tilde{U}_{\text{I}} K - \delta\epsilon_{\text{II}} \tilde{U}_{\text{II}} \sqrt{K^2 + \kappa_{\text{TF}}^2}}{\delta\epsilon_{\text{I}} \tilde{U}_{\text{I}} K + \delta\epsilon_{\text{II}} \tilde{U}_{\text{II}} \sqrt{K^2 + \kappa_{\text{TF}}^2}} e^{-K(z_1 + z_2)}, \quad (14)$$

where $\mathbf{r}^{(\parallel)}$ denotes projection of $\mathbf{r}$ parallel to the surface. And, using Eqs. (6) and (7), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) &= \frac{1}{2} \int d\mathbf{r} \rho_{\text{ind}}(\mathbf{r}_2|\mathbf{r}) \psi_{\text{II}}(\mathbf{r}_1|\mathbf{r}) \\
 \psi_{\text{II}}(\mathbf{r}_1|\mathbf{r}) &= \frac{Q}{2\pi\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_0} \int_0^\infty dK J_0(K|\mathbf{r}^{(\text{II})} - \mathbf{r}_1^{(\text{II})}|) \frac{K e^{+z_1\sqrt{K^2+\kappa_{\text{TF}}^2}} e^{-Kz}}{\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I K + \delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}} \sqrt{K^2+\kappa_{\text{TF}}^2}} \\
 \rho_{\text{ind}}(\mathbf{r}_2|\mathbf{r}) &= -\frac{\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}} \kappa_{\text{TF}}^2 Q}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty dK J_0(K|\mathbf{r}^{(\text{II})} - \mathbf{r}_2^{(\text{II})}|) \frac{K e^{+z_2\sqrt{K^2+\kappa_{\text{TF}}^2}} e^{-Kz}}{\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I K + \delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}} \sqrt{K^2+\kappa_{\text{TF}}^2}} \quad (15)
 \end{aligned}$$

Formally, these terms can be presented once again as inverse Hankel transforms, but we could not succeed in inverting the integrals analytically. To proceed further, we explore the far-field behavior by formally expanding the integrals in powers of the TF length, ℓ_{TF} , in an equivalent of a multipole expansion. This allows us to investigate the limit where ℓ_{TF} is finite, but small, corresponding to a good, but not ideal, metal.

In order to simplify notations, we consider in the following a pair of charges Q_1 and Q_2 at respective positions $\mathbf{r}_1 = [x_1, y_1, z_1] = [0, 0, a]$ and $\mathbf{r}_2 = [x_2, y_2, z_2] = [d, 0, b]$; see Figs. 1 and 3a for a sketch of this coordinate system used in deriving the two-charge energy terms.

“Image charge” contribution $U_{\text{ext}}^{(2)}$ —The integral in (14) closely resembles inverse transforms of functions of the type $K^M e^{-Kz}$, which can be resolved analytically. Thus, expanding the integrand in powers of ℓ_{TF} , the resulting expansion in real space is a multipole series centred at the image charge location $\mathbf{r}_1' = [0, 0, -a]$, with the distance between the image multipole and the charge being $r_{\text{im}} = \sqrt{d^2 + (a+z)^2}$. This yields immediately:

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_{\text{ext}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) &= \frac{Q_1 Q_2}{8\pi\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_0\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I} \left[-\frac{1}{r_{\text{im}}} + \frac{2\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I}{\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}} \kappa_{\text{TF}}} \frac{\cos\psi}{r_{\text{im}}^2} - \frac{2\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I^2}{(\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}} \kappa_{\text{TF}})^2} \frac{3\cos^2\psi - 1}{r_{\text{im}}^3} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \frac{3(2\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I^3 - \delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I \delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}}^2)}{(\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}} \kappa_{\text{TF}})^3} \frac{5\cos^3\psi - 3\cos\psi}{r_{\text{im}}^4} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\kappa_{\text{TF}}^4 r_{\text{im}}^5}\right) \right], \quad (16)
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\cos\psi = (a+b)/r_{\text{im}}$; see Appendix B for details. The series is convergent for $r_{\text{im}} > \ell_{\text{TF}}$, which we find by comparing it with the expansion of single body term $U_{\text{ext}}^{(1)}$. For practical implementation, a large margin $r_{\text{im}} > 2\ell_{\text{TF}}$ is suitable. Altogether, this means that the image charge is replaced by an image multipole series at long distances. We note that the multipole expansion constitutes an alternative derivation of the previously observed strong lateral dependence of the potential along the surface [43, 19], as evidenced by the dipolar term scaling as $\ell_{\text{TF}}\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I/\delta\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}}$.

“Induced charge” contribution $U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}$ —The integrals in Eq. (15) for the two-body potential energy of the induced charge distribution cannot be expanded by the same method as for $U_{\text{ext}}^{(2)}$, because $\kappa_{\text{TF}} = \sqrt{K^2 + \kappa_{\text{TF}}^2}$ appears in the exponential in the integral expressions

for the potential and induced charge, see Eq. (15): the term $e^{\kappa_{\text{TF}} z}$ has an essential singularity at $\ell_{\text{TF}} \rightarrow 0$ and as such does not allow for an expansion in ℓ_{TF} .

However one may remark that physically, any perturbing charge is screened at the Thomas–Fermi length $\ell_{\text{TF}} = 1/\kappa_{\text{TF}}$, and similarly, the external potential will decay exponentially away from the surface over a length ℓ_{TF} . The charge distribution can thus be approximated by projecting the charge along the z -axis onto a single plane, and placing this flat distribution at the surface. This approximation amounts to the assumption that the induced charge varies in a thin layer, and moreover in a slow and controlled fashion; it follows that it is valid at distances larger than TF length and its relative error scales as $\min(a, b)/\ell_{\text{TF}}$.

We approximate accordingly the induced charge as an infinitesimally thin layer

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\text{ind}}^{\text{app}}(z, R) &= \sigma_{\text{ind}}(R) \delta(z). \\ \sigma_{\text{ind}}(R) &= \beta \int_{-\infty}^0 dz \rho_{\text{ind}}(z, R) = -\beta \frac{\kappa_{\text{TF}}^2 Q}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^0 dz \int_0^\infty dK J_0(KR) \frac{\partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{II}} K e^{+\sqrt{K^2 + \kappa_{\text{TF}}^2} z} e^{-Ka}}{\partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{I}} K + \partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{II}} \sqrt{K^2 + \kappa_{\text{TF}}^2}} \\ &= -\beta \frac{Q}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty dK J_0(KR) \frac{\partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{II}} \kappa_{\text{TF}}^2 K e^{-Ka}}{(\partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{I}} K + \partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{II}} \sqrt{K^2 + \kappa_{\text{TF}}^2}) \sqrt{K^2 + \kappa_{\text{TF}}^2}}.\end{aligned}\quad (17)$$

Because the projection is not an exact procedure, we introduce a scaling factor, β which we will fix *a posteriori* by examining some exact limiting cases.

This form can now be subject to the expansion in the Thomas–Fermi length ℓ_{TF} resulting in

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{\text{ind}}(r_{\text{im}}, \psi) &= -\beta \frac{Q}{2\pi} \left[\frac{\cos \psi}{r_{\text{im}}^2} - \frac{\partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{I}} (3 \cos^2 \psi - 1)}{\partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{II}} \kappa_{\text{TF}}^3 r_{\text{im}}^3} + \frac{3(\partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{I}}^2 - \partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{II}}^2)(5 \cos^3 \psi - 3 \cos \psi)}{\partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{II}}^2 \kappa_{\text{TF}}^2 r_{\text{im}}^4} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\kappa_{\text{TF}}^3 r_{\text{im}}^5}\right) \right], \quad \text{for } r \text{ confined to the plane } (z=0).\end{aligned}\quad (18)$$

Along the same lines, in the thin layer approximation the potential writes

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{\text{II}}(a|R, z) &\simeq \kappa_{\text{TF}} \frac{Q}{2\pi \partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{II}} \partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{I}} \kappa_{\text{TF}}^2} \left[\frac{\cos \psi}{r_{\text{im}}^2} - \frac{\partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{I}} (3 \cos^2 \psi - 1)}{\partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{II}} \kappa_{\text{TF}}^3 r_{\text{im}}^3} + \frac{3(\partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{I}}^2 - \partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{II}}^2)(5 \cos^3 \psi - 3 \cos \psi)}{\partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{II}}^2 \kappa_{\text{TF}}^2 r_{\text{im}}^4} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\kappa_{\text{TF}}^3 r_{\text{im}}^5}\right) \right]\end{aligned}\quad (19)$$

This term scales with the dielectric contrast $\ell_{\text{TF}} \partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{I}} / \partial \Pi J \ddot{U}_{\text{II}}$, paralleling Eq. (16).

Combining these two contributions provides an expansion in powers of $1/\kappa_{\text{TF}}$. Focusing here on the lowest order term, proportional to $1/\kappa_{\text{TF}}$, the corresponding “dipolar” term of the convolution of σ_{ind} and ψ_{II} reads in the coordinate system introduced above:

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}(a, b, d) &\simeq -\frac{\beta Q_1 Q_2}{8\pi \partial \dot{\text{I}}\text{I}\ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{II}} \partial \dot{\text{I}}\text{I}\ddot{\text{U}}_0 \kappa_{\text{TF}}} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty dR \int_0^{2\pi} d\chi \frac{Ra}{(a^2 + R^2)^{3/2}} \frac{b}{(b^2 + d^2 + R^2 - 2Rd \cos \chi)^{3/2}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\kappa_{\text{TF}}^2}\right) \\
 &= -\frac{\beta Q_1 Q_2 ab}{8\pi \partial \dot{\text{I}}\text{I}\ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{II}} \partial \dot{\text{I}}\text{I}\ddot{\text{U}}_0 \kappa_{\text{TF}}} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty dR \frac{4R \mathcal{E}\left(\frac{4dR}{b^2 + (d+R)^2}\right)}{(a^2 + R^2)^{3/2} (b^2 + (d-R)^2)(b^2 + (d+R)^2)^{1/2}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\kappa_{\text{TF}}^2}\right)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{20}$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is the *complete elliptic integral*. This integral is not expressible in a closed form, but converges fast due to its d^{-5} asymptotics.

Interestingly, for the specific case of $d \rightarrow 0$ and $a = b$ (same axis), the expansion for $U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}$ converges to a finite value which can be obtained readily as

$$U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}(a, b=a, d=0) = -\frac{\beta Q^2}{16\pi \partial \dot{\text{I}}\text{I}\ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{II}} \partial \dot{\text{I}}\text{I}\ddot{\text{U}}_0 a} \left[\frac{1}{\kappa_{\text{TF}} a} - \frac{2 \partial \dot{\text{I}}\text{I}\ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{I}}}{\partial \dot{\text{I}}\text{I}\ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{II}}} \frac{1}{(\kappa_{\text{TF}} a)^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\kappa_{\text{TF}}^3}\right) \right]. \tag{21}$$

This corresponds to two coinciding charges and this should match the corresponding series for the self-energy term $U_{\text{ind}}^{(1)}$ in Eq. (9), which is shown to behave as

$$U_{\text{ind}}^{(1)}(a) = -\frac{Q^2}{16\pi \partial \dot{\text{I}}\text{I}\ddot{\text{U}}_0 a} \left[\frac{1}{2\kappa_{\text{TF}} a} - \frac{\partial \dot{\text{I}}\text{I}\ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{I}}}{\partial \dot{\text{I}}\text{I}\ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{II}}} \frac{1}{(\kappa_{\text{TF}} a)^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\kappa_{\text{TF}}^3}\right) \right]. \tag{22}$$

So the comparison between the two expressions confirms the thin layer expansion as a valid approach, and allows fixing the scaling factor β to a value $\beta = \partial \dot{\text{I}}\text{I}\ddot{\text{U}}_{\text{II}}/2$.

Altogether, and to the lowest order in κ_{TF}^{-1} (“dipolar contribution”), we accordingly obtain the expression:

$$U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}(a, b, d) \simeq -\frac{Q_1 Q_2}{16\pi \partial \dot{\text{I}}\text{I}\ddot{\text{U}}_0 \kappa_{\text{TF}}} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty dR \frac{4Rab \mathcal{E}\left(\frac{4dR}{b^2 + (d+R)^2}\right)}{(a^2 + R^2)^{3/2} (b^2 + (d-R)^2)(b^2 + (d+R)^2)^{1/2}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\kappa_{\text{TF}}^2}\right).
 \tag{23}$$

This leading term decays as b^{-2} perpendicular, and as d^{-3} parallel to the surface (see Fig. 3); the subsequent corrections are of higher order in the charge distance. Better apparent from the expression (14), $U_{\text{TF}}(a, b, d)$ is a function of $a + b$ and d only. It can be again well approximated by rational functions of these variables, thus allowing for a more efficient evaluation in molecular simulations. This expression is provided in the Appendix B.

We finally mention that higher orders terms in $1/\kappa_{\text{TF}}^2, \dots$ can be obtained by combining corresponding terms in Eqs. (18) and (19). We however leave this technical but straightforward calculations for future work.

Summary: total electrostatic interaction—The expression for the total electrostatic interaction potential, expressed formally in Eq. (13), can be obtained as the sum of the Coulombic interaction, $U_{\text{Coul}}^{(2)} = Q_1 Q_2 / (4\pi\epsilon_0 |\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|)$, and two contributions resulting from image and induced charges, $U_{\text{ext}}^{(2)}$ and $U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}$. Analytical expressions for these interaction energies can be obtained in the limit of small TF length, ℓ_{TF} (or large κ_{TF}) in terms of a multipole-like expansion. The corresponding expressions are obtained in Eqs. (16) and (23). It is provided at the lowest (dipolar) order in $1/\kappa_{\text{TF}}$ for $U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}$. Higher order terms can be obtained by going up in the expansion. They constitute practical expressions which can be used to calculate the many-body electrostatic energy of multiple charges in interaction, when located in the vicinity of a TF metal.

Altogether, the electrostatic interaction potential is plotted in Fig. 4 for various distances and TF lengths.

3 The one dimensional ionic crystal and the role of electronic screening on interfacial energy

The previous calculations do show that the interaction of charges in the vicinity of a TF substrate can be formally complex and non-trivial. In this section, we use the previous framework on a simplified one dimensional crystal system. This allows to gain many physical insights into the behavior of the TF screening and will provide explicit expressions for the electrostatic contribution to the crystal-substrate surface tension, as a function of the electronic structure of the walls.

We consider a one-dimensional electroneutral crystal of $N/2$ cations and $N/2$ anions with a TF boundary. The inter-ion lattice spacing is denoted as a and the crystal charge distribution reads

$$\rho_{\text{cr}}^{(N)}(z, R) = \sum_{n=0}^N (-1)^n \frac{Q \delta(z - (n\alpha + h)) \delta(R)}{2\pi R}. \quad (24)$$

Here h is the shift of the first layer close to the wall; in the following we will mostly focus on the case $h = a/2$.

From a technical point of view, calculating energies of such long-range interacting crystals requires precise definition of the convergence of the sums involved [30]. One of the key observations is that boundary conditions need to be imposed even for an infinite system [31], resulting in surface energy terms for pairs of boundaries that cannot be disentangled to single boundary values. We analyze carefully the meaning of these surface terms, and use this framework to discuss surface energy and disjoining pressure [32].

3.1 Surface tension of a ionic crystal close to an insulating surface

The electrostatic energy of a crystal with finite thickness N , immersed in a dielectric with relative permittivity ϵ can be calculated as

$$U(\ell_{\text{TF}} \rightarrow \infty; N) = \frac{Q^2}{4\pi\epsilon\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{(-1)^{n-m}}{n-m} = \frac{Q^2}{16\pi\epsilon\alpha} \left[-4N \ln 2 + 2 - \frac{1}{N} + \mathcal{O}(N^{-3}) \right], \quad (25)$$

where we recall that α is the inter-ion lattice spacing. The sum is conditionally convergent, but we calculate the asymptotics by fixing the physical order of summation given by adding pairs of positive and negative charges. The potential energy per particle converges to the Madelung constant $\mathcal{E}_{\text{Mad}} = -Q^2 \ln 2 / 4\pi\epsilon\alpha$ for $N \rightarrow \infty$.

The surface energy for a crystal-insulating wall interface is then identified as

$$\gamma_{\text{ins}} = \gamma(\ell_{\text{TF}} \rightarrow \infty) = \frac{Q^2}{8\pi\epsilon\alpha} \quad (26)$$

and for large film thickness, $D = Na$, this value is approached with a long range $1/D$ correction as

$$W(\ell_{\text{TF}} \rightarrow \infty; D \gg \alpha) = \gamma_{\text{ins}} - \frac{Q^2}{16\pi\epsilon D} + \dots \quad (27)$$

Several remarks are in order. First, the finite thickness correction to the surface energy (corresponding to a insulator-crystal-insulator interface) is shown to vanish as the inverse thickness D^{-1} and is therefore of considerable long range, longer than van der Waals interactions which decay as D^{-2} . Furthermore the electrostatic nature of the interaction leads to typical surface energies of the order of $Q^2/16\pi\epsilon D$ (normalizing by an elementary area α^2). For $\alpha = 3 \text{ \AA}$, a typical inter-ion spacing in ionic liquids, this yields very values of the surface energy, of order 2 J/m^2 , comparable with the adhesion energy of two metals [32]. This is also much higher than the typical surface energy of a free ionic liquid interface, which is of the order of 50 mJ/m^2 [33].

3.2 Surface tension of an ionic crystal close to a perfect metal surface

We now consider the situation of an ionic crystal with finite thickness sandwiched between a perfect metal surface on one side and a dielectric semi-infinite medium on the other. The potential energy of each charge in the crystal gains an additional term, expressed as an interaction with image charges, although with half the energy of interaction with a real charge [23, 29].

The energy can be summed to yield

$$U(\ell_{\text{TF}} \rightarrow 0; N) = \frac{Q^2}{4\pi \delta \ddot{\text{I}} \text{I} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_1 \delta \ddot{\text{I}} \text{I} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_{0\alpha}} \left[\sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{(-1)^{n-m}}{n-m} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^N \frac{(-1)^{n+m-1}}{n+m-1} \right] = \frac{Q^2}{16\pi \delta \ddot{\text{I}} \text{I} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_1 \delta \ddot{\text{I}} \text{I} \text{J} \ddot{\text{U}}_{0\alpha}} \left[-4N \ln 2 + 1 - \right]$$

Subtracting the Madelung contribution, $N \times \mathcal{E}_{\text{Mad}}$, one obtains the surface energy for a crystal-metal wall interface as

$$\gamma_{\text{metal}} = \gamma(\ell_{\text{TF}} \rightarrow 0, N \gg 1) = \frac{Q^2}{16\pi\dot{\Pi}\dot{\mathbf{L}}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{I}}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{J}}\dot{\Pi}\dot{\mathbf{L}}\ddot{\mathbf{U}}_{0\alpha}} \quad (29)$$

Again this value for the energy is reached asymptotically – in this metal-crystal-dielectric geometry – with a long range correction scaling like the inverse film thickness

$$W(\ell_{\text{TF}} \rightarrow 0, D) = \gamma_{\text{metal}} - \frac{Q^2}{64\pi\delta\dot{\Pi}\ddot{\mathbf{J}}_0\ddot{\mathbf{J}}_1\ddot{\mathbf{J}}_0D} + \dots \quad (30)$$

(again with $D = Na$ the film thickness).

3.3 Surface tension of a ionic crystal close to a TF surface

Beyond these limiting situations, we now consider the more complex case of ionic crystals at the interface with a TF wall.

The expression of the energy is a charge-potential convolution, of the same form as for the one-body energy, Eq. (8). We will use the ideal metal limit as a reference for the energy, as it greatly simplifies the calculations. Following the same procedures as in the previous section, the Hankel transform of the resulting “excess” potential of the n -th charge is

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\psi_I(n\alpha+h|z, K) &= \psi_I(z, K) - \psi_I^{\text{metal}}(z, K) = \frac{Q}{4\pi\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_0\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I K} \frac{2\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I K}{\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}\kappa_{\text{TF}}+\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I K}} e^{-K(n\alpha+h)} e^{-Kz} \\ \delta\psi_{\text{II}}(n\alpha+h|z, K) &= \psi_{\text{II}}(z, K) - \psi_{\text{II}}^{\text{metal}}(z, K) = \frac{Q}{4\pi\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_0\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I K} \frac{2\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I K}{\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}\kappa_{\text{TF}}+\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I K}} e^{-K(n\alpha+h)} e^{+\kappa_{\text{TF}} z}.\end{aligned}$$

(31)

Being the difference to the metal case, the bulk Madelung term cancels out and this allows us to calculate directly the surface energy, $\gamma(\ell_{\text{TF}}, N)$. A straightforward calculation shows that the latter can then be written as the sum of three terms:

$$\gamma(\ell_{\text{TF}}, N) = \gamma(\ell_{\text{TF}}=0, N) + \gamma_{\text{ext}}(\ell_{\text{TF}}, N) + \gamma_{\text{ind}}(\ell_{\text{TF}}, N). \quad (32)$$

The “external charge” contribution $\gamma_{\text{ext}}(\ell_{\text{TF}}, N)$ involves a double sum evaluating N contributions to the potential at N point charge positions. This yields a geometric sum, which can be brought under the integral to give

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{\text{ext}}(\ell_{\text{TF}}, N) &= \frac{Q^2}{8\pi\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_0\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I} \int_0^{+\infty} dK \frac{2\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I K}{\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}\kappa_{\text{TF}}+\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I K}} e^{-2Kh} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} (-e^{-Ka})^{n+m} \\ &= \frac{Q^2}{16\pi\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_0\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I a} \int_0^{+\infty} d\lambda \frac{4(\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I/\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}})\lambda}{(\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I/\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}})\lambda + \sqrt{\lambda^2 + (\kappa_{\text{TF}} a)^2}} \frac{e^{-2\lambda(h/a)} (1 + (-1)^N e^{-N\lambda})^2}{(1 + e^{-\lambda})^2}.\end{aligned}$$

(33)

On the other hand, the energy shift due to the induced charge can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{\text{ind}}(\ell_{\text{TF}}, N) &= -\pi\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_0\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}\kappa_{\text{TF}}} \int_{-\infty}^0 dz \int_0^{+\infty} dK \left[\sum_{n=0}^N \delta\psi_{\text{II}}(n\alpha+h|z, K) \right]^2 K \\ &= \frac{Q^2}{16\pi\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_0 a} \int_0^{+\infty} d\lambda \frac{2\lambda(\kappa_{\text{TF}} a)^2}{\sqrt{\lambda^2 + (\kappa_{\text{TF}} a)^2} \left[\frac{\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I}{\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{\text{II}}} \lambda + \sqrt{\lambda^2 + (\kappa_{\text{TF}} a)^2} \right]^2} \frac{e^{-2\lambda(h/a)} (1 + (-1)^N e^{-N\lambda})^2}{(1 + e^{-\lambda})^2}.\end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where we recast the integral into a dimensionless form.

The surface tension $\gamma^{\text{TF}}(\ell_{\text{TF}})$ is obtained as the limit of this surface energy when $N = \infty$ and it takes the expression:

$$\gamma^{\text{TF}}(\ell_{\text{TF}}) = \frac{Q^2}{16\pi\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_I\partial\text{IIJ}\ddot{U}_{0\alpha}} \mathcal{F}(\alpha/\ell_{\text{TF}}) \quad (35)$$

where $\mathcal{F}(a/\ell_F) = [1 + \mathcal{G}_{\text{ext}}(\ell_F, \infty) - \mathcal{G}_{\text{ind}}(\ell_F, \infty)]$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{ext}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{ind}}$ are the integrals in Eqs. (33) and (34), respectively, taken here in their $N = \infty$ limit.

We plot in Fig. 5b the dependence of the surface energy as a function of number of layers N for various TF lengths ℓ_F . In Fig. 5c, we then plot the dependence of $\gamma^{\text{TF}}(\ell_F)$ as a function of the TF length ℓ_F . This plot highlights that the TF interpolates smoothly between the insulating and ideal metal cases, as the TF length is varied between infinity and zero.

It is also interesting to extract the dependence of the electrostatic energy as a function of the number of layers N , *i.e.* the crystal thickness $D = Na$. Such an expansion can be derived from the evaluation of a dipolar Ewald sum equivalent to Eq. (28), yielding

$$U(\ell_{\text{TF}}; D) = N \times \mathcal{E}_{\text{Mad}} + W(D) \quad (36)$$

where the interfacial energy $W(D)$ of the TF metal–crystal–dielectric sandwich now writes

$$W(D) = \gamma^{\text{TF}}(\ell_{\text{TF}}) - \frac{Q^2}{256\pi\delta\epsilon\epsilon_0\ell_F} - \frac{7Q^2\ell_{\text{TF}}}{128\pi\delta\epsilon\epsilon_0\ell_F D^2} + \mathcal{O}(D^{-3}), \quad (37)$$

As for the perfect metal and insulating cases, the first correction to the surface tension scales as a long-range $1/D$ term. But an interesting remark is that the thick film expansion for the crystal-TF metal interface reveals also the emergence of a term proportional to D^{-2} which is absent in both ideal metal and pure insulator cases. This term is akin to an attractive van der Waals potential, both in structure and in origin, as it follows from the interaction of charges with their image dipoles. It can be written in terms of a Hamaker constant for the TF metal-crystal-dielectric system, and takes the expression:

$$A_{\text{TF-C-D}} = \frac{21\ell_{\text{TF}}Q^2}{32\delta\epsilon\epsilon_0\ell_F\alpha_{\parallel}^2}, \quad (38)$$

where TF-C-D stands for the TF metal-crystal-dielectric sandwich; we assumed that the lateral surface area corresponding to the one-dimensional crystal is $\alpha_{\parallel}^2$, the lateral size of the elementary cell. This yields $A_{\text{TF}} \approx 5 \times 10^{-18}$ J for typical values $\alpha_{\parallel} = 2$ Å and $\ell_F = 1$ Å. So not only the TF Hamaker contribution is long-ranged, but it is of unusually high magnitude with this interfacial configuration.

3.4 Comparison to the direct numerical summation

As a final check for the previous approach, we compare in this section the exact result for the metal-crystal surface tension, in Eq. (35), to the direct numerical summation of one body and two body interactions on a 1D crystalline structure, which are calculated using the TF formalism above. As described above, we consider accordingly a one-dimensional

electroneutral crystal of $N/2$ cations and $N/2$ anions (with position z_n , $n = 1, \dots, N$) at the interface with a TF metal wall.

The total energy is calculated by the direct summation of one-body and two-body interactions between ions.

$$U(N) = \sum_i U^{(1)}(z_i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} U^{(2)}(z_i, z_j) \quad (39)$$

where the expressions for $U^{(1)}$ and $U^{(2)}$ are given previously. Note that previously, we limited ourselves to first order (in $1/\kappa_{\text{TF}}$) expression for $U^{(2)}$. This implies that, in order to be consistent, we only keep terms up to the dipolar order (linear in κ_{TF}^{-1}) in both expressions of $U_{\text{ext}}^{(2)}$ and $U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}$ in Eqs. (16)-(23). The surface tension is deduced from the expression

$$\gamma^{\text{TF}} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} [U(N) - N \times \mathcal{E}_{\text{Mad}}] \quad (40)$$

In Fig. 6, we compare the exact result in Eq. (35) to the direct numerical summation using the one body and two body interactions calculated over the ion structure. Note that the

surface tension is made dimensionless according to $\gamma^{\text{TF}} = \frac{Q^2}{16\pi\delta\ddot{H}\ddot{J}\ddot{U}_{0\alpha}} \times \tilde{\gamma}^{\text{TF}}$. As expected, both results are shown to match for $\kappa_{\text{TF}}a \gg 1$. Typically a 10 % agreement is found for $\kappa_{\text{TF}}a > 1.3$. This comparison therefore validates the previous framework developed for the calculation of TF interactions.

We conclude with two remarks. First, the agreement can be in principle improved by expanding the two-body interaction term further in powers of κ_{TF}^{-1} . We leave this development for future work. Second the results can be easily extended to higher dimensions. We have used the previous framework with approximated forms for the one-body and two body interactions to calculate the energy in 2D and 3D semi-infinite system, from which we extract the surface energy according to Eq.(40). In Fig. 6, we show the numerical estimate of the surface tension in 2D and 3D as a function of the TF screening parameter, κ_{TF} . According to the theoretical framework (and in line with the 1D results), we expect that the results are valid for sufficiently large TF screening parameter, $\kappa_{\text{TF}}a \gg 1$ with a the lattice spacing. Independently, the calculations can also be performed for an insulating substrate, *i.e.* $\kappa_{\text{TF}} = 0$. An interesting result is that whatever the dimension, we find the surface tensions for the perfect metal and insulating cases obey $\tilde{\gamma}_{\text{ins}} = 2\tilde{\gamma}_{\text{id. met}}$. Here $\tilde{\gamma}_{\text{ins}} = 2\tilde{\gamma}_{\text{id. met}} \simeq 0.46$, for 2D square lattice, and $\tilde{\gamma}_{\text{ins}} = 2\tilde{\gamma}_{\text{id. met}} \simeq 0.26$, for the 3D cubic lattice. This result calls for further analytical investigations. Finally, another interesting result highlighted in Fig. 6-(b) is that the surface tensions for the 2D and 3D cases follow the same general scaling form versus κ_{TF} as the 1D case, up to a simple rescaling: $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{2\text{D},3\text{D}}(\kappa_{\text{TF}}a) \simeq \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{1\text{D}}(\mathcal{C}_{2\text{D},3\text{D}} \times \kappa_{\text{TF}}a)$, with $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{1\text{D}}$ given in Eq. (35) and the rescaling constants are provided in Fig. 6. This result highlights the fact that although simplified, the

1D geometry captures the physics involved in more complex interaction behavior with larger dimensions. We leave more detailed calculations of surface tensions for an more exhaustive study involving finite-temperature calculations using molecular simulations.

4 Towards the wetting properties of ionic liquids and crystals on metals

In this section we build on the previous results to discuss physically the relative wetting of ionic liquids versus ionic crystals on metallic substrates.

This is motivated by our recent experimental results [11], which point to the capillary freezing of ionic liquids in confinement. These experiments highlight the impact of the metallicity of the confining substrate to facilitate solidification in a confined geometry. Capillary freezing can be interpreted in terms of the shift of the freezing transition induced by surface wetting: while the stable phase in the bulk is the ionic liquid, surface terms may become predominant in confinement, favoring the thermodynamically less favored phase, here the crystal. This mechanism is summarized by the so-called Gibbs-Thomson relationship accounting for freezing in confinement [11].

At the core of this experimental result, the key question is to understand the relative wettability of the crystal phase of the ionic system versus its liquid phase. Our results above provide some key information on the wetting behavior of the crystal phase. However, calculating analytically the surface tension for the ionic liquid at a metal surface remains a tremendous task. Still, the high correlation existing in an ionic liquid would suggest that the interfacial energy should behave in a quite similar way to that of the crystal.

In the following, we discuss a simple framework allowing to predict the scaling behavior for the surface wettability of ionic systems on a metal, by getting inspiration from the previous results for the crystal.

4.1 Approximated scaling of surface energies of crystals and liquids

Our approach is based on the following observation for the energetics of the ionic crystal: the transition between metal and insulator follows a remarkably similar function for the single-body potential energy $U^{(1)}$ in Eqs. (9–11) and for the surface tension γ^{TF} of the 1D crystal in Eqs. (33–34). This result is not incidental and can actually be read directly from the detailed definitions of these terms in terms of their integral expressions which are remarkably similar – compare Eqs. (9–11) with Eqs. (33–34). Graphically, this is also evidenced by comparing Figs. 5c. and 2a.

Combined with the re-scaling of 2D and 3D surface tensions to match them with the 1D crystal function in Fig. 6, this allows us to propose that the surface tension follows a general scaling form

$$\gamma_{\text{cr}}^{\text{TF}} - \gamma_{\text{cr}}^{\text{ins}} \simeq \rho_{\text{cr}} \times \alpha \times U^{(1)}(\ell_{\text{TF}}, \alpha) \quad (41)$$

where $\gamma_{\text{cr}}^{\text{ins}}$ is the surface tension with the insulating wall, here considered as reference.

But beyond the mathematical coincidence, the physical meaning behind this simple approximated form is simple and transparent. It shows that the dominant part of the surface energy originates in the interaction of ions in the vicinity of the walls with their image charges – via $U^{(1)}$. These contributing charges are typically at a molecular distance a from the surface – as evidenced by Eq. (41) –; their interaction energy scales accordingly with their number $N_{\text{cr}} \sim a \times \rho_{\text{cr}}$. The contribution of the layers beyond a molecular distance a is screened out due to the compensation of near charges due to electroneutrality. This simple result is quite remarkable in the sense that it captures the main behavior for a complex interface between a dense and strongly interacting phase and an imperfect metal.

We note that this approximation of the surface tension curves corresponds to a situation where all the individual surface-mediated interactions decay in a common way with the strength of the screening. The pre-factor is then given mainly by the geometry of the charge configurations. The independence on the geometry of the transition from an insulator to a metal thus requires that the two-body interactions are either sufficiently isotropic or weak (compared to one-body terms). Equivalently, we expect this assumption to fail if the effect of surface leads to a great anisotropy. As the strongest lateral interaction scales as

$\epsilon_F \delta \Pi J \ddot{U}_I / (\delta \Pi J \ddot{U}_{II} a^3)$, see Eq. (16), this approximation is expected to breakdown in the situations of a large dielectric contrast $\delta \Pi J \ddot{U}_I \gg \delta \Pi J \ddot{U}_{II}$. This regime was examined in detail and shown to exhibit a range of unique behaviour in Refs. [43, 19].

Coming back to the wetting of the ionic system, one may then remark that being physically simple, the previous scaling argument can be extended to any configuration of charges, and notably for the surface energy of an *ionic liquid phase* close to a TF metal. Following the above qualitative argument, the surface energy in excess to the insulating case is expected to scale as

$$\gamma_{\text{liq}}^{\text{TF}} - \gamma_{\text{liq}}^{\text{ins}} \simeq \rho_{\text{liq}} \times a \times U^{(1)}(\ell_{\text{TF}}, a). \quad (42)$$

where the density of the liquid ρ_{liq} replaces the crystal one. The physical meaning is the same as above: it states that the main behavior for the liquid-wall interaction stems from the interaction of ions in the liquid phase located in a molecular volume of extension a close to the metal. As for the crystal phase, the size of this volume is fixed by electroneutrality which leads to a cut-off of interaction beyond a molecular length a . Being a dense phase, the characteristic length a is expected to be typically of the order of the molecular size of the ions. This range is thus expected of the same order of magnitude as the crystal lattice spacing $a \simeq a$. We can take the same value of $a \simeq a$ for both the liquid and crystal (chosen here as the crystal lattice spacing in the crystal), since this choice does not make a strong difference in the functional dependence of $U^{(1)}$.

We emphasize that this expression is only approximate, but that this approximation is expected to capture the main contributions for the surface energy, as validated by the exact bench-marking calculations above for the crystal-metal interface. We discuss below the implications of this result for the wetting properties of ionic systems on metallic surfaces.

4.2 Discussion: Relative wetting of ionic crystal and liquid phases on a metal

The previous results suggest that an increased 'metallicity' of the metals does reduce the interfacial energy, thus stabilizing dense ionic phases close to metallic substrates. Furthermore the decrease in surface energy is expected to be higher for the denser crystal phase than its disordered liquid counterpart ($\rho_{\text{cr}} > \rho_{\text{liq}}$). This is highlighted by the comparison of Eqs.(41) and (42). The difference becomes more significant with decreasing ℓ_{F} (increasing κ_{TF}), and the metallicity of the substrate thus promotes the wetting of the metal by the crystal phase, hereby yielding ionic liquid crystallisation in confinement. This prediction, while based on a simple mechanism, is in agreement with the experimental results obtained in Ref. [11].

Going beyond would require to perform full molecular simulations to study the relative wetting of the two phases at a metal surface. This will be the objective of a future and dedicated study using molecular simulations, based on the TF interaction potentials derived above.

5 Conclusions and perspectives

Our results above constitute a thorough exploration of the energetics of charged systems in contact with Thomas-Fermi metal substrates, building on and extending the previous theoretical work. We focus not only on the potential outside of the metal, but also on the energy associated with inducing the TF charge distribution in the surface, absent from previous work on the subject. We put emphasis on deriving the results in a form applicable in molecular simulations. Our analysis of the two-body potential energy reveals a hitherto unknown structure involving a multipole expansion, which provides a physical intuition into the far-field structure of the potential. It complements the previous models of the "image charge on a line" approach of Ref. [50] and the "sandwich" of a dielectric and a perfect metal layer [43], while being simpler than the former and more precise than the latter. The expansions open the way for simulations of conducting surfaces that is cheaper than full DFT, yet more versatile than simulation methods for ideal (insulating or perfect metal) surfaces. While the presented results involve a single conducting and a single metallic wall, the approximation procedures can be repeated for combinations of conducting walls.

Then we have made use of this framework to obtain approximate expressions for the surface tension of ionic systems at a metal wall, both for its ordered crystal phase, and its disordered liquid phase. This is based on an analysis of the crystal-metal interface, for which analytical results can be obtained with simple physical interpretation in terms of the interaction of ions with their image charges at the interface. It suggests an extension to the interface between an ionic liquid and the metal substrates. This study indicates that wall metallicity favors the denser crystal phase, and this effect is promoted for better metals. Altogether it is particularly interesting, and quite counter-intuitive, that the electronic screening in the metal, as characterized by a molecular length ℓ_{F} , profoundly affects the interfacial energy of a crystal.

These results call for further extensions in various directions. First, as discussed above, it is now required to assess this scenario using molecular simulations and perform a complete

study of the wetting of ionic systems at (imperfect) metals. Beyond the relative wettability of the ionic crystal versus the ionic liquid, it would be also interesting to consider the wetting of *thick films* of crystal on the metal surface. As we have shown above, asymptotic expansions for the 1D crystal case show that the thickness dependence of the interfacial energy of a metal-crystal-dielectric sandwich behaves as

$$W(D) = \gamma^{\text{TF}}(\ell_{\text{TF}}) - \frac{A_{\text{el}}}{D} - \frac{A_{\text{TF-C-D}}}{D^2} + \dots \quad (43)$$

with A_{el} a pure electrostatic constant, and $A_{\text{TF-C-D}}$ is a Hamaker-like constant for the TF metal – crystal – dielectric sandwich, whose expression is given in Eq. (38) and depends linearly in the TF length ℓ_{TF} (for small ℓ_{TF}). This suggests long-range electrostatic interactions within the films (here calculated in the metal-crystal-dielectric geometry). However this behavior needs to be confirmed in molecular simulations in a more pertinent configuration, involving a metal-crystal-liquid sandwich, at finite temperature. To some extent, these results echo long-range electrostatic interactions observed recently [10], a relation between confinement and correlations yet to be assessed in detail.

Taking a broader perspective, we conclude by several remarks about several experimental situations, involving solid-electrolyte interfaces, where the electronic properties of the confining system could play a role [35, 15, 36, 37, 38]. Recent experimental work highlighted much faster hydrodynamic water flows inside single (semi-metallic) carbon nanotubes as compared to (insulating) boron-nitride nanotubes [35]. This puzzling result points to the fact that the understanding of the interfacial interactions of charged and polarized molecules as well as the ionic adsorption at metallic versus insulating surfaces is of primer interest in the context of nanofluidic transport [40, 41]. Altogether, that electronic properties may affect hydrodynamics remains an open question. Using the simplified TF model for the electronic properties of the substrates, as developed in the present framework, could provide first hints into the microscopic phenomena at stake.

We finally quote that the present results could be generalized to alternative experimental situations. Indeed our results apply for any boundary between Laplace and Helmholtz equations. Accordingly the Thomas-Fermi framework discussed here also applies to electrolyte solutions with a differential salt concentration, as evidenced by electrode adsorption being one of the original contexts for this model [47, 45]. From a practical point of view, the TF model is formally equivalent to the Debye-Hückel model for weak electrolytes [34], where a metallic wall is equivalent to a salt solution with a corresponding Debye screening parameter, now defined in terms of the salt concentration. The subtle impact of the TF screening on the charge interactions obtained here suggests that similar effects could occur whenever charges are in the presence of an electrolyte with a differential salt concentration. In particular, this raises a number of questions about ionic interactions in the presence of salinity gradients, which would be interesting to explore more specifically. Moreover, the theory can be extended to the interface between a Debye-Hückel electrolyte and a Thomas-Fermi metal [51]. Such situations are in particular relevant to a number of

recent experimental observations associated with (diffusio-)osmosis and osmotic power generation under salinity gradients [42].

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgements

We thank B. Rotenberg and E. Charlaix for many fruitful discussions. J.C., A.N. and A.S. acknowledge funding from the European Union's H2020 Framework Programme / ERC Starting Grant agreement number 637748 - NanoSOFT. L.B. acknowledges support from the European Union's FP7 Framework Programme / ERC Advanced Grant Micromegas. Authors acknowledge funding from ANR project BlueEnergy.

References

- [1]. Fedorov MV, Kornyshev AA. Ionic liquids at electrified interfaces. *Chemical Reviews*. 2014; 114:2978–3036. [PubMed: 24588221]
- [2]. Uesugi E, Goto H, Eguchi R, Fujiwara A, Kubozono Y. Electric double-layer capacitance between an ionic liquid and few-layer graphene. *Scientific reports*. 2013; 3:1595. [PubMed: 23549208]
- [3]. Palacio M, Bhushan B. A review of ionic liquids for green molecular lubrication in nanotechnology. *Tribology Letters*. 2010; 40(2):247–268.
- [4]. Dold C, Amann T, Kailer A. Influence of electric potentials on friction of sliding contacts lubricated by an ionic liquid. *Phys Chem Chem Phys*. 2015; 17(16):10339–10342. [PubMed: 25805119]
- [5]. Rotenberg B, Salanne M. Structural Transitions at Ionic Liquids Interfaces. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*. 2015; 6(24):4978–4985. [PubMed: 26722704]
- [6]. Bovio S, Podesta A, Lenardi C, Milani P. Evidence of extended solidlike layering in [Bmim][NTf2] ionic liquid thin films at room-temperature. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B*. 2009; 113(19):6600–6603.
- [7]. Bou-Malham I, Bureau L. Nanoconfined ionic liquids: effect of surface charges on flow and molecular layering. *Soft Matter*. 2010; 6(17):4062–4065.
- [8]. Yokota Y, Harada T, Fukui KI. Direct observation of layered structures at ionic liquid/solid interfaces by using frequency-modulation atomic force microscopy. *Chemical communications*. 2010; 46(45):8627–8629. [PubMed: 20938557]
- [9]. Smith AM, Lovelock KRJ, Gosvami NN, Welton T, Perkin S. Quantized friction across ionic liquid thin films. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*. 2013; 15(37):15317–15320. [PubMed: 23942943]
- [10]. Gebbie MA, Smith AM, Dobbs HA, Lee AA, Warr GG, Banquy X, Valtiner M, Rutland MW, Israelachvili JN, Perkin S, Atkin R. Long range electrostatic forces in ionic liquids. *Chem Comm*. 2017; 53:1214–1224. [PubMed: 28000809]
- [11]. Comtet, Jean, Niguès, Antoine, Kaiser, Vojt ch, Bocquet, Lyderic, Siria, Alessandro. Nanoscale capillary freezing of ionic liquids confined between metallic interfaces and the role of electronic screening. *arXiv:1611.08448 [cond-mat]*. 2016
- [12]. Bovio S, Podestà A, Milani P, Ballone P, Del Pòpolo MG. Nanometric ionic-liquid films on silica: a joint experimental and computational study. *Journal of physics. Condensed matter*. 2009; 21(42):424118. [PubMed: 21715853]
- [13]. Merlet, Céline, Rotenberg, Benjamin, Madden, Paul A., Taberna, Pierre-Louis, Simon, Patrice, Gogotsi, Yury, Salanne, Mathieu. On the molecular origin of supercapacitance in nanoporous carbon electrodes. *Nature Materials*. 2012; 11(4):306–310. [PubMed: 22388172]
- [14]. Kondrat S, Kornyshev A. Charging dynamics and optimization of nanoporous supercapacitors. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*. 2013; 117(24):12399–12406.

- [15]. Kondrat S, Wu P, Qiao R, Kornyshev A. Accelerating charging dynamics in subnanometre pores. *Nature Materials*. 2014; 13:387–393. [PubMed: 24651430]
- [16]. Rochester, Christopher C., Lee, Alpha A., Pruessner, Gunnar, Kornyshev, Alexei A. Interionic interactions in conducting nanoconfinement. *ChemPhysChem*. 2013; 14(18):4121–4125. [PubMed: 24311321]
- [17]. Lee, Alpha A., Kondrat, Svyatoslav, Kornyshev, Alexei A. Single-File charge storage in conducting nanopores. *Physical Review Letters*. 2014; 113(4):048701. [PubMed: 25105658]
- [18]. Mahan, Gerald D. *Many-Particle Physics*. Springer Science & Business Media; 2000.
- [19]. Vorotyntsev M, Kornyshev AA. Electrostatic interaction on a Metal/Insulator interface. *Zh Eksp Teor Fiz*. 1980; 78(3):1008–1019.
- [20]. Kornyshev AA, Vorotyntsev MA. Nonlocal electrostatic approach to the double layer and adsorption at the electrode-electrolyte interface. *Surface Science*. 1980; 101(1–3):23–48.
- [21]. Kornyshev AA, Schmickler W, Vorotyntsev MA. Nonlocal electrostatic approach to the problem of a double layer at a metal-electrolyte interface. *Physical Review B*. 1982; 25(8):5244–5256.
- [22]. Rowlinson, JS., Widom, B. *Molecular Theory of Capillarity*. Oxford University Press; Oxford: 1989.
- [23]. Jackson, John David. *Classical Electrodynamics*. 3 edition. Wiley; New York: 1998.
- [24]. Siepmann, J Ilja, Sprik, Michiel. Influence of surface topology and electrostatic potential on water/electrode systems. *The Journal of chemical physics*. 1995; 102(1):511–524.
- [25]. Tyagi, Sandeep, Arnold, Axel, Holm, Christian. Electrostatic layer correction with image charges: A linear scaling method to treat slab 2D+h systems with dielectric interfaces. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*. 2008; 129(20):204102. [PubMed: 19045847]
- [26]. Gingrich, Todd R., Wilson, Mark. On the ewald summation of gaussian charges for the simulation of metallic surfaces. *Chemical Physics Letters*. 2010; 500(1–3):178–183.
- [27]. Lang ND, Kohn W. Theory of metal surfaces: Induced surface charge and image potential. *Physical Review B*. 1973; 7(8):3541–3550.
- [28]. Olver Frank, WJ., Lozier, Daniel W., Boisvert, Ronald F., Clark, Charles W. *NIST Handbook of Mathematical Functions*. Cambridge University Press; 2010.
- [29]. Bezerra M, de Melo e Souza R, Kort-Kamp WJM, Farina C. Subtleties in obtaining the electrostatic energy of continuous distributions. *European Journal of Physics*. 2014; 35(6): 065021.
- [30]. Ewald PP. Die Berechnung optischer und elektrostatischer Gitterpotentiale. *Annalen der Physik*. 1921; 369(3):253–287.
- [31]. de Leeuw, Simon W., Perram, John W., Smith, Edgar R. Simulation of electrostatic systems in periodic boundary conditions. I. lattice sums and dielectric constants. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*. 1980; 373(1752):27–56.
- [32]. Israelachvili, Jacob N. *Intermolecular and Surface Forces*. Third Edition. Academic Press; Burlington, MA: 2011.
- [33]. Tariq, Mohammad, Freire, Mara G., Saramago, Benilde, Coutinho, João AP., Canongia Lopes, José N., Rebelo, Luís Paulo N. Surface tension of ionic liquids and ionic liquid solutions. *Chemical Society Reviews*. 2012; 2:829–868.
- [34]. Bocquet L, Charlaix E. Nanofluidics, from bulk to interfaces. *Chemical Society Reviews*. 2010; 39(3):1073–1095. [PubMed: 20179826]
- [35]. Secchi E, Marbach S, Niguès A, Stein D, Siria A, Bocquet L. Massive radius-dependent flow slippage in single carbon nanotubes. *Nature*. 2016; 537(7619):210–213. [PubMed: 27604947]
- [36]. Köfinger, Jürgen, Hummer, Gerhard, Dellago, Christoph. Single-file water in nanopores. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*. 2011; 13(34):15403. [PubMed: 21779552]
- [37]. Algara-Siller G, Lehtinen O, Wang FC, Nair RR, Kaiser U, Wu HA, Geim AK, Grigorieva IV. Square ice in graphene nanocapillaries. *Nature*. 2015; 519(7544):443–445. [PubMed: 25810206]
- [38]. Agrawal, Kumar Varoon, Shimizu, Steven, Drahushuk, Lee W., Kilcoyne, Daniel, Strano, Michael S. Observation of extreme phase transition temperatures of water confined inside isolated carbon nanotubes. *Nature Nanotechnology*. 2016 advance online publication.

- [39]. Onsager L, Samaras. The surface tension of Debye-Hückel electrolytes. *Journal of Chemical Physics*. 1934; 2:528–536.
- [40]. Tocci G, Joly L, Michaelides A. Friction of Water on Graphene and Hexagonal Boron Nitride from Ab Initio Methods: Very Different Slippage Despite Very Similar Interface Structures. *Nano Letters*. 2014; 14:6872–6877. [PubMed: 25394228]
- [41]. Grosjean B, Péan C, Siria A, Bocquet L, Vuilleumier R, Bocquet M-L. Chemisorption of Hydroxide on 2D Materials From DFT Calculations: Graphene Versus Hexagonal Boron Nitride. *Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*. 2016; 7:4695–4700. [PubMed: 27809540]
- [42]. Siria A, Poncharal P, Bianco A-L, Fulcrand R, Blase X, Purcell S, Bocquet L. Giant osmotic energy conversion measured in a single transmembrane boron-nitride nanotube. *Nature*. 2013; 494:455–458. [PubMed: 23446417]
- [43]. Kornyshev AA, Rubinshtein AI, Vorotyntsev MA. Image potential near a dielectric/plasma like medium interface. *Phys.Stat.Sol.(b)*. 1977; 84(7619):125–132.
- [44]. Kornyshev AA, Vorotyntsev MA. Analytic expression for the potential of a test charge in a dielectric bounded by solid state plasma. *J Phys C: Solid State Phys*. 1978; 11:L691–694.
- [45]. Kornyshev AA, Schmickler W. On the coverage dependence of the partial charge transfer coefficient. *J Electroanal Chem*. 1986; 202:1–21.
- [46]. Vorotyntsev MA, Ivanov SN. Statistical Mechanics of an Ionic Ensemble Adsorbed at the Metal–Dielectric Interface. *Sov Phys JETP*. 1985; 61:1028–1032.
- [47]. Vorotyntsev MA. Attraction Constant of the Ionic Adsorption Isotherm at an Uniform Metal–Electrolyte Solution Interface. *Soviet Electrochemistry*. 1985; 21:257–259.
- [48]. Inkson JC. Many-body effect at metal-semiconductor junctions. II. The self energy and band structure distortion. *J Phys C: Solid State Phys*. 1973; 6:1350–1362.
- [49]. Heinrichs J. Response of metal surfaces to static and moving point charges and to polarizable charge distributions. *Phys Rev B*. 1973; 8(4):1346–1364.
- [50]. Newns DM. Fermi–Thomas Response of a Metal Surface to an External Point Charge. *J Chem Phys*. 1969; 10:1613–1629.
- [51]. Vorotyntsev MA, Kornyshev AA, Rubinshtein AI. Electrostatic interaction of ions in solution at the surface of an electrode: penetration of the ion field into the electrode. *Soviet Physics: Doklady*. 1979; 24:848–850.

Figure 1.
Sketch of two charges close to a Thomas-Fermi metal.

Figure 2.

(a) Dependence of integrals $\mathcal{Q}$ on the dimensionless distance to surface $a/\ell_{\text{TF}} = \kappa_{\text{TF}}a$; TF metal behaves like a metal at long distances and like an insulator at short distances. The integrals represent the relative magnitude with regards to $U^{(1)}$ at the ideal metal limit $\ell_{\text{TF}} = 0$. $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ext}}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ind}}$ are associated with the external charge and the charge induced in the metal, respectively. Note the sign inversion for clarity. (b) The single-body electrostatic energy $U^{(1)} = U_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} + U_{\text{ind}}^{(1)}$ as a function of distance a for fixed $\ell_{\text{TF}} = 1 \text{ \AA}$. The finite screening length ℓ_{TF} assures that $U^{(1)}$ has a finite value at the surface, unlike in the divergence in case of an ideal metal U_{ideal} . For all quantities shown, we impose no dielectric contrast ($\epsilon_{\text{I}} = \epsilon_{\text{II}} = 1$).

Figure 3.

(a) The coordinate system used in the main text to derive $U^{(2)}$. (b-g) Electrostatic two-body energy terms $U_{\text{ext}}^{(2)}$ (panels b,d,f) and $U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}$ (panels c,e,g) due to the presence of TF metal, with examples given for $\ell_{\text{TF}} = 0.5$ Å (a,b), $\ell_{\text{TF}} = 1$ Å (c,d), and $\ell_{\text{TF}} = 2$ Å (e,g). The charges are placed at $[0, 0, a = 1 \text{ Å}]$ and $[d, 0, b]$, respectively. Only absolute value is plotted, and both terms are of the opposite sign to the direct Coulomb interaction, i.e. positive for $q_1 = -q_2 = e$. At long distances, U_{ext} converges to the image charge picture of the ideal metal limit, while $U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}$ decays as b^{-2} perpendicular, and as d^{-3} parallel to the surface with a shape that

represents the lateral extent of the induced charge. The dashed white line corresponds to $b = 2\ell_F$, giving an estimate of convergence of the series for $U_{\text{ext}}^{(2)}$ and $U_{\text{ind}}^{(2)}$, as the series represent a long-range limit.

Figure 4.

The total electrostatic energy of two-charge configurations at $[0, 0, a = 1 \text{ Å}]$ and $[d, 0, b]$ for $\ell_{TF} = 0$ (a), $\ell_{TF} = 0.5 \text{ Å}$ (b), $\ell_{TF} = 2 \text{ Å}$ (c), and $\ell_{TF} = \infty$ (d). The long-range dipolar character from the ideal metal case is preserved for small TF lengths, while the absolute values shift. This is representative of the perturbation approach we take. The dashed white line corresponds to $b = 2\ell_{TF}$, giving an estimate of convergence of the series.

Figure 5.

The surface energy of a one-dimensional crystal close to the TF interface, as a function of its thickness N . (a) Schematic representation of the one-dimensional crystal and its limits. A crystal close to a metallic interface has a substantially lower energy than close to an insulator, and TF theory interpolates between the two. (b) The surface energy γ as a function of crystal thickness N , for various TF lengths ℓ_{TF} . The surface energy is adimensionalized by $Q^2/(16\pi\epsilon\epsilon_1\alpha)$. The dashed and dash-dotted line show the ideal metal limit ($\ell_{\text{TF}} = 0$), and the insulator limit ($\ell_{\text{TF}} \rightarrow \infty$), respectively. (c) Dependence of the surface energy ($N = \infty$) versus the TF length.

Figure 6.

Comparison of the 1D metal-crystal surface tension, from Eq. (35) (solid line), versus the direct summation of one body and two body interactions, from Eq. (40) (dashed blue line). As discussed in the text, the latter are calculated to first, dipolar, order in κ_{TF}^{-1} . A 10% agreement is found for $\kappa_{TF} \alpha > 1.3$. The surface tension is made dimensionless as

$\tilde{\gamma}^{TF} = \gamma^{TF} / [Q^2 / 16\pi \delta \tilde{U}_1 \delta \tilde{U}_0 \alpha]$. The horizontal dashed lines are the 1D limits for insulating walls ($\tilde{\gamma}_{ins} = 2$, top) and perfect metals ($\tilde{\gamma}_{id.met} = 1$, bottom). Two- and three-dimensional crystals (dotted lines) can be rescaled to closely follow the 1D energy function $\tilde{\gamma}$, as shown in (b). The rescaling parameters are $\tilde{\gamma}_{ins} = 2\tilde{\gamma}_{id.met} \approx 0.46$, $C \approx 0.39$ for 2D square lattice, and $\tilde{\gamma}_{ins} = 2\tilde{\gamma}_{id.met} \approx 0.26$, $C \approx 0.26$ for 3D cubic lattice.