Electronic Supplementary Information for:

RSC Advances, doi:10.1039/c3ra23304a

Tantalum-oxide catalysed chemical vapour deposition of single- and multi-walled carbon nanotubes

Bernhard C. Bayer^{1,*}, Carla Castellarin-Cudia^{2,3}, Raoul Blume⁴, Stephen A. Steiner III⁵, Caterina Ducati⁶, Daping Chu¹, Andrea Goldoni³, Axel Knop-Gericke⁷, Robert Schlögl⁷, Cinzia Cepek², John Robertson¹, Stephan Hofmann¹

¹Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB3 0FA, UK
²Istituto Officina dei Materiali-CNR, Laboratorio TASC, I-34149 Trieste, Italy
³Sincrotrone Trieste SCpA, I-34149 Trieste, Italy
⁴Helmholtz-Zentrum Berlin für Materialien und Energie, D-12489 Berlin, Germany
⁵Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
⁶Department of Materials Science and Metallurgy, University of Cambridge, CB2 3QZ, UK
⁷Fritz-Haber-Institut der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, D-14195 Berlin-Dahlem, Germany

^{*} Corresponding Author: bcb25@cam.ac.uk, Tel.: +44/(0)1223/748291, Fax: +44/(0)1223/748348

Experimental Methods (full)

1. Sample preparation and atmospheric pressure nanotube growth

P-type doped Si(1 0 0) wafers covered with 200 nm thermally grown SiO₂ (Si/SiO₂(200 nm), Si-Mat, Germany) and n-doped Si(1 0 0) samples with ~2 nm native oxide (Si(1 0 0), Compart Technology, UK) were cleaved by hand to samples of approximately 5 mm x 5 mm.

Alumina (Al₂O₃) was deposited onto some Si/SiO₂(200 nm) samples in a rfmagnetron sputter deposition system (CCR, Germany) from a stoichiometric Al₂O₃ target (99.995%, PI-KEM, UK). Base pressure of the system was ~5x10⁻⁶ mbar, the sputtering gas used was Ar (99.9995%, BOC GASES, UK) at 30 sccm (leading to ~2.5x10⁻⁴ mbar during deposition), an applied power of 120W and an applied DC-bias of ~300 V. The thickness of the Al₂O₃ films was determined by spectroscopic ellipsometry (Woollam, USA) to (10±3) nm.

Tantalum (Ta) was sputter deposited onto Si/SiO₂(200 nm), Si/SiO₂(200 nm) Al₂O₃ 10 nm and Si(1 0 0) samples as well as onto perforated SiO_x TEM membranes (200 μ m window, 50 nm oxide thickness, SPI supplies, USA) in a custom built DC-magnetron sputtering system from a metallic Ta target (99.95%, PI-KEM, UK). The base pressure of the system was ~8x10⁻⁶ mbar, the sputtering gas used was Ar (99.9995%, BOC GASES, UK) at 25 sccm (leading to ~2x10⁻³ mbar during deposition), an applied power of 30W and an applied bias of ~300 V. Samples were then left to oxidise in ambient air for a minimum of 24 h.

Ta-oxide films of nominal thicknesses of 0.1 nm, 0.2 nm, 0.5 nm, 0.7 nm, 1.0 nm, 2.0 nm and 5.0 nm were thus prepared (measured by spectroscopic ellipsometry (Woollam, USA) with an estimated uncertainty in film thickness of $\pm 30\%$).

Chemical Vapour Deposition (CVD) of Carbon Nanotubes (CNTs) was conducted at atmospheric pressure in a custom-built 2 inch diameter quartz tube furnace (i.e. hotwall system, Carbolite, UK) after transferring the pre-prepared samples in air to the furnace. Prior to the growth of CNTs the process gases Ar (99.9995%, BOC GASES, UK), H₂ (99.9995%, BOC GASES, UK) and CH₄ (99.9995%, BOC GASES, UK) or C₂H₂ (99.6%, Air Products, UK) were flushed for several minutes at room temperature through the system. Then the system was heated to the desired temperature at 20°C/min in an Ar flow of ~1000 sccm. In the CH₄ recipe, H₂ was then flushed for 10 min (200 sccm), followed by 15 min of 500 sccm CH₄ plus H₂ of 100 sccm. In the C_2H_2 recipe, after reaching growth temperature, Ar was flushed for 5 min (4000 sccm). Then H₂ (500 sccm) plus Ar (200 sccm) were introduced for 3 min pretreatment, after which 10 sccm C₂H₂ were added for 30 min to the H₂/Ar mixture. After growth, the system was flushed with 4000 sccm Ar for 5 min, then the heater turned off and the system left to cool in an Ar flow of ~400 sccm. The system was reopened and samples were taken out when the system had cooled down to $\sim 30^{\circ}$ C. Temperatures tested included 650°C, 750°C, 850°C, 900°C and 950°C. The system was cleaned by heating it in air to 950°C after each run to remove carbon deposits in the tube.

The morphology of the samples was studied using a Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM, FEI Philips XL30 sFEG) in plan view with electron acceleration voltages of 1 to 5 kV. Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM, Tecnai F20, 200 kV acceleration voltage) was employed for samples either directly grown on the perforated SiO_x TEM membranes or after scratching tubes from the wafers onto standard Cu TEM grids. Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM) measurements were done on a Veeco Dimension in tapping mode. Raman spectroscopy of nanotubes without transfer from substrates was done with a Renishaw Ramascope-1000 Raman spectrometer (633 nm).

2. X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) details

The *in-situ* and *ex-situ* XPS experiments shown in Figures 3 and 5, have been performed in normal emission geometry using a conventional Mg X-ray lab source (hv = 1253.6 eV) and a 120° spherical sector electron energy analyser, with an overall energy resolution of 1.2 eV (VG Escalab MKII). All the measurements and all sample treatments have been done in high vacuum condition at a base pressure of $\sim 10^{-9}$ mbar (up to $\sim 2x10^{-8}$ mbar during sample annealing at 850°C). The photoelectron binding energy has been referenced by fixing the Si2p XPS binding energy (BE) at 99.6eV and the spectra have been normalized to the incident photon flux. The data was analysed by performing a non-linear mean square fit following the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm. We have used a Shirley background, and we have reproduced the photoemission intensity by using Doniach-Sunjic.

The *in-situ* XPS experiments during H₂ and hydrocarbon exposure, shown in Figure 4, were performed at the ISISS beamline of the FHI/MPG located at the BESSY II synchrotron facility in Berlin, Germany. The high pressure XPS setup consists of a reaction cell attached to a set of differentially pumped electrostatic lenses and a differentially pumped analyzer (Phoibos 150, SPECS GmbH), as described elsewhere.^{S1} The spectra were collected in normal emission in vacuum and gas with a probe size of ~ 100 μ m x 1 mm. The samples were heated from the back using an external IR-laser (cw, 808 nm). The temperature was controlled via a K-type

thermocouple in direct contact with the sample surface. Gases were introduced in the reaction cell using calibrated mass flow controllers (Bronkhorst).

Contamination was excluded by survey spectra of the samples at the beginning of each experiment. The Ta4f photoelectron spectra were taken at a photon energy of 330eV with a spectral resolution of 0.3 eV. The kinetic energy of the electrons correspond to an electron mean free path of ≈ 8 Å. The total XPS information depth is ≈ 2 nm, that is, 95% of all detected electrons originate from 3λ .^{S2} For XPS analysis, the photoelectron binding energy (BE) is referenced to the Fermi edge, and the spectra are normalized to the incident photon flux. Background correction was performed by using a Shirley background.^{S3} The spectra were fitted following the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm to minimize the χ^2 . Peak shapes were modeled by using asymmetric Doniach-Sunjic functions convoluted with Gaussian profiles.^{S4} The accuracy of the fitted peak positions is ≈ 0.05 eV.

Note that due to the higher resolution and different charge correction methodology for the synchrotron-based XPS, the obtained binding energies between Figures 3 & 5 (lab-source-based XPS) and Figure 4 (synchrotron-based XPS) vary slightly.

CNT growth on Al₂O₃



Supplementary Figure 1: SEM image showing the typical sparse and short nanotube growth from Ta-oxide on Al_2O_3 supports (Ta-oxide 0.5 nm film on Al_2O_3 , CH₄-based CVD at 950°C).

Supplementary References

- ^{S1} H. Bluhm, M. Hävecker, A. Knop-Gericke, M. Kiskinova, R. Schlögl and M. Salmeron, *MRS Bull.* 2007, **32**, 1022.
- ^{S2} M. P. Seah, *Surf. Interface Anal.*, 1986, **9**, 85.
- ^{S3} D. A. Shirley, *Phys. Rev. B* 1972, **5**, 4709.
- ^{S4} S. Doniach and M. Sunjic, J. Phys. C 1970, **3**, 285.