Chemical Vapor Deposition of Ruthenium-based Layers by the

Single-Source Approach

Janine Jeschke,^a Stefan Möckel,^a Marcus Korb,^a Tobias Rüffer,^a Khaybar Assim,^a Marcel Melzer,^{b,c} Gordon Herwig,^d Colin Georgi,^{b,c} Stefan E. Schulz,^{b,c} and Heinrich Lang^{a,*}

a) Technische Universität Chemnitz, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Institute of Chemistry, Inorganic Chemistry, 09107 Chemnitz, Germany.

b) Fraunhofer Institute for Electronic Nano Systems (ENAS), Technologie-Campus 3, 09126 Chemnitz, Germany.

c) Technische Universität Chemnitz, Center for Microtechnologies, 09107 Chemnitz, Germany.

d) Technische Universität Chemnitz, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Institute of Physics, Chemical Physics, 09107 Chemnitz, Germany.

Supporting Information

Contents

Crystallographic Data	
Selected Bond Lengths and Angles	4
TG Studies	5
SEM Images of Layers A–G	6
EDX Spectra	9
XPS Data	10
Applied parameters for the peak deconvolution in XPS analyses	
XPS detail spectra	
XRPD	
¹ H and ¹³ C{ ¹ H} NMR Spectra of Ruthenium Complexes 4a-g	

Crystallographic Data



Figure S1. ORTEP diagram (30 % probability level) of the molecular structures of 4f (left) and 4g (right) with the atom numbering scheme. All hydrogen and disordered atoms have been omitted for clarity.

Selected Bond Lengths and Angles

	4 b	4c	4 e	4f	4g
Ru–O	2.1018(14)	2.1010(13)	2.100(2)	2.1046(17)	2.1099(15)
		2.1037(12)		2.0937(17)	2.1074(15)
Ru–C	1.873(2)	1.866(2)	1.892(3)	1.866(3)	1.877(2)
		1.873(2)		1.862(3)	1.869(2)
Ru–P	2.3906(5)	2.3856(5)	2.3844(8)	2.4063(7)	2.4102(6)
		2.3910(5)		2.4096(7)	2.3993(6)
C≡O	1.143(3)	1.144(2)	1.134(4)	1.140(3)	1.143(3)
		1.141(2)		1.141(3)	1.144(3)
С-О	1.230(3)	1.230(2)	1.221(4)	1.268(3)	1.224(3)
	1.291(3)	1.280(2)	1.294(4)	1.214(3)	1.267(3)
		1.231(2)		1.204(3)	1.220(3)
		1.290(2)		1.274(3)	1.269(3)
P–Ru–P	173.03(3)	173.041(18)	173.04(4)	176.23(3)	171.11(2)
P–Ru–C	92.93(7)	92.70(6)	92.44(9)	91.68(9)	93.57(7)
	92.05(7)	92.90(6)	92.60(9)	91.27(9)	93.86(7)
		92.87(6)		91.07(9)	92.58(7)
		91.48(6)		91.31(9)	92.82(7)
P-Ru-O	84.58(4)	90.20(4)	85.20(6)	91.99(5)	89.16(4)
	90.17(4)	84.70(4)	89.44(6)	84.46(5)	84.00(4)
		85.23(4)		85.23(5)	83.95(4)
		89.57(4)		92.55(5)	89.66(4)
C–Ru–C	88.83(13)	87.65(8)	87.13(19)	89.94(13)	87.34(9)
O–Ru–O	82.27(8)	83.55(5)	79.27(11)	80.24(7)	83.75(6)
C–Ru–O	175.90(7)	176.19(7)	175.53(10)	174.50(10)	176.28(8)
	94.50(8)	94.44(7)	96.84(12)	94.40(10)	94.64(8)
		176.70(7)		173.25(10)	177.09(8)
		94.51(7)		95.67(10)	94.40(8)
Ru–C–O	175.11(19)	173.12(18)	174.8(3)	178.0(3)	175.0(2)
		174.12(17)		177.2(3)	174.9(2)

Table S2. Selected bond distances (Å) and angles (°) for complexes **4b**,**c** and **4e**–**g**.

TG Studies



Figure S3. TG traces of **4e** at varying heating rates; gas flow $N_2 60 \text{ mL} \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$.

SEM Images





Layer B







Layer D



Layer E



Layer F







EDX Spectra



Figure S4. Representative EDX spectra obtained from layer E (Table 2) showing the characteristic pattern of ruthenium and the presence of phosphorus, silicon, oxygen and carbon.

XPS Data

Table S5. Applied parameters for the peak deconvolution in XPS analyses.

Peak	Ru 3d 5/2	Ru 3d 3/2	RuO ₂ 3d 5/2	RuO ₂ 3d 3/2	C 1s
Line shape	Gaussian-Lo	GL(25)			
Pos. [eV]	280.5-279.5	Ru 3d 5/2 + 4.2	282.0-280.6	$RuO_2 \ 3d \ 5/2 + 4.2$	285.5 - 284.5

XPS detail spectra



Binding Energy [eV]













XRPD



Figure S6. Representative diffractogram of layer E (Table 2) measured under grazing incidence. The diffractogram was recorded using Cu-K_{α 1} radiation ($\lambda = 1.5405$ Å) with a Ge(111) monochromator.

¹H and ¹³C{¹H} NMR Spectra of Ruthenium Complexes 4a–g in CDCl₃

 $Ru(CO)_2(P^nBu_3)_2(O_2CCH_3)_2$ (4a)



$Ru(CO)_2(P^nBu_3)_2(O_2CCH_2CH_3)_2$ (4b)





$Ru(CO)_2(P^nBu_3)_2(O_2CCH(CH_3)_2)_2$ (4c)





$Ru(CO)_2(P^nBu_3)_2(O_2CC(CH_3)_3)_2$ (4d)





$Ru(CO)_2(P^nBu_3)_2(O_2CCH_2OCH_3)_2$ (4e)





$Ru(CO)_2(P^nBu_3)_2(O_2CCF_3)_2$ (4f)



 $Ru(CO)_2(P^nBu_3)_2(O_2CCF_2CF_3)_2$ (**4g**)

