

This document is confidential and is proprietary to the American Chemical Society and its authors. Do not copy or disclose without written permission. If you have received this item in error, notify the sender and delete all copies.

### Odd-Even Effects in Charge Transport across n-Alkanethiolate-Based SAMs

Journal:	<i>Journal of the American Chemical Society</i>
Manuscript ID:	ja-2014-09436k.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Oct-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Baghbanzadeh, Mostafa; Harvard University, Dept. of Chemistry and Chemical Biology Simeone, Felice; Harvard University, Chemistry & Chemical Biology Bowers, Carleen; Harvard University, Chemistry & Chemical Biology Liao, Kung-Ching; Harvard University, Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology Thuo, Martin; Iowa State University, Materials Science & Engineering Baghbanzadeh, Mahdi; Shiraz University, Miller, Michael; University of Windsor, Chemistry and Biochemistry Carmichael, Tricia; University of Windsor, Chemistry and Biochemistry Whitesides, George; Harvard University, Chemistry & Chemical Biology

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Odd-Even Effects in Charge Transport across *n*-Alkanethiolate-Based SAMs**

Mostafa Baghbanzadeh,<sup>a</sup> Felice C. Simeone,<sup>a</sup> Carleen M. Bowers,<sup>a</sup> Kung-Ching Liao,<sup>a</sup> Martin Thuo,<sup>a</sup> Mahdi Baghbanzadeh,<sup>b</sup> Michael S. Miller,<sup>c</sup> Tricia Breen Carmichael,<sup>c</sup> and George M. Whitesides<sup>a,d\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Harvard University,

12 Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, United States

<sup>b</sup>Department of Statistics, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran

<sup>c</sup>Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Windsor, 401 Sunset Avenue,

Windsor, Ontario, Canada, N9B3P4

<sup>d</sup>Wyss Institute of Biologically Inspired Engineering, 60 Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, United States

\* *To whom correspondence may be addressed: gwhitesides@gmwhgroup.harvard.edu*

**ABSTRACT**

This paper compares rates of charge transport across self-assembled monolayers (SAMs) of  $n$ -alkanethiolates having odd and even numbers of carbon atoms ( $n_{odd}$  and  $n_{even}$ ) using junctions with the structure  $M^{TS}/SAM//Ga_2O_3/EGaIn$  ( $M = Au$  or  $Ag$ ). Measurements of current density,  $J(V)$ , across SAMs of  $n$ -alkanethiolates on  $Au^{TS}$  and  $Ag^{TS}$  demonstrated a statistically significant odd-even effect on  $Au^{TS}$ , but not on  $Ag^{TS}$ , that could be detected using this technique. Statistical analysis showed the values of tunneling current density across SAMs of  $n$ -alkanethiolates on  $Au^{TS}$  with  $n_{odd}$  and  $n_{even}$  belong to two separate sets, and while there is a significant difference between the values of injection current density,  $J_0$ , for these two series ( $\log|J_{0Au,even}| = 4.0 \pm 0.3$  and  $\log|J_{0Au,odd}| = 4.5 \pm 0.3$ ), the values of tunneling decay constant,  $\beta$ , for  $n_{odd}$  and  $n_{even}$  alkyl chains are indistinguishable ( $\beta_{Au,even} = 0.73 \pm 0.02 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ , and  $\beta_{Au,odd} = 0.74 \pm 0.02 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ ). A comparison of electrical characteristics across junctions of  $n$ -alkanethiolate SAMs on gold and silver electrodes yields indistinguishable values of  $\beta$  and  $J_0$ , and indicates that a change that substantially alters the tilt angle of the alkyl chain (and, therefore, the thickness of the SAM) has no influence on the injection current density across SAMs of  $n$ -alkanethiolates.

*Keywords:* Odd-even effect; tunneling; interface; self-assembled monolayer; EGaIn, molecular electronics, charge transport

## INTRODUCTION

Understanding charge tunneling through thin molecular films is important to understanding the movement of charge in organic insulators, and more broadly in nanoscience.<sup>1-7</sup> Using self-assembled monolayer (SAM)-based large-area junctions with the structure  $\text{Ag}^{\text{TS}}/\text{S}(\text{CH}_2)_n\text{T}/\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3/\text{EGaIn}$  (one type of so-called “EGaIn junction”),<sup>8,9</sup> we were able to study the influence of the changes in the structure of the SAM on the tunneling current density across it.<sup>10-14</sup> (Here  $\text{Ag}^{\text{TS}}$  is a template-stripped silver substrate;  $\text{S}(\text{CH}_2)_n$  is the *n*-alkanethiolate SAM covalently bonded to the  $\text{Ag}^{\text{TS}}$  substrate, T is the terminal functional group; and EGaIn is the liquid alloy of gallium and indium, covered with a thin, electrically conductive surface oxide—mostly  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$ —that forms spontaneously upon exposure to air.<sup>15,16</sup>) Those studies showed that alterations in the structure of the insulating organic layer,  $\text{S}(\text{CH}_2)_n\text{T}$ ,—for example, changing the anchoring group of the SAMs<sup>10</sup> or introducing polar organic groups either into the backbone of a polyethylene chain<sup>11</sup> or at the van der Waals  $\text{T}/\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  interface<sup>12-14</sup>—do not influence the rates of charge transport at a level that is statistically significant (less than a factor of three). In surprising contrast, we and others observed that the addition of one  $\text{CH}_2$  group to the alkyl chain—a change that, in essence, simply interchanges an exposed terminal methyl group for an ethyl group—appears to be sufficient to make a small but statistically significant difference in the electronic properties of the junction.<sup>17-20</sup> This phenomenon is one manifestation of the so-called odd-even effect,<sup>21</sup> and its origin is a continuing puzzle in understanding SAM-based tunneling junctions.

In this work, we focused on three specific questions about the odd-even effect: i) Is there indeed—when examined using current technology—a systemic difference in the rate of charge transport across SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolates ( $\text{SC}_n$ ) with an odd number of carbons ( $n_{\text{odd}}$ ) and

1  
2  
3 SAMs with an even number of carbons ( $n_{\text{even}}$ )? (Much of the historical evidence for odd-even  
4 effects in charge transport has come from earlier and less accurate studies,<sup>17</sup> and from studies of  
5 phenomena such as wetting, which are of unknown relevance to quantum tunneling.<sup>21</sup>) ii) If there  
6 is an odd-even effect, then, mechanistically, how can such a small change in the structure of a  
7 SAM influence tunneling probabilities? iii) How does changing the substrate supporting the  
8 SAM from Au to Ag—a change that also changes the tilt angle of *n*-alkanethiolates as well as  
9 properties such as wetting and work function of electrode—influence tunneling current density  
10 across SAM-based large-area junctions?  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21


22           There are three plausible explanations for the observed odd-even effect in the rates of  
23 charge transport: i) Changes in the nature of the van der Waals interface between the SAM and  
24 the top electrode—changes that are presumed to be responsible for the odd-even effect in  
25 wetting<sup>21</sup>—might also influence the ability of the SAM and the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> to “wet” and conform to  
26 one another, or to condense a water film, or to adsorb adventitious contaminants at the interface.  
27 ii) Differences in rates of charge transport might reflect the differences in the orientation of the  
28 terminal group at the interface of the SAM with the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (e.g., CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub> vs. CH<sub>3</sub>, Figure S2),  
29 which might influence the strength of electronic coupling between the HOMOs of the *n*-alkyl  
30 groups and the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>. iii) There might be a systematic difference in the thickness of the SAM  
31 between odd and even *n*-alkanethiolates. (The tunneling path might have a through-space  
32 component and thus be sensitive to the thickness, independently of the length of the *n*-alkyl  
33 chain.) A fourth (in principle) possibility—differences in the electric dipole moment along the  
34 surface normal, which would be induced by the odd-even differences in the orientation of the  
35 terminal ethyl (–CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub>) group—seems unlikely to be important since the difference is  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 undoubtedly small, and introducing even large dipoles into the interface has little or no  
4  
5 effect.<sup>12,13</sup>  
6  
7

8 In our previous studies, although we were able to identify an odd-even effect in tunneling  
9  
10 current density,  $J$  (A/cm<sup>2</sup>) at  $\pm 0.5$  V (i.e., the results from SAMs with  $n_{\text{even}}$  and  $n_{\text{odd}}$  belonged to  
11  
12 separate data sets and demanded separate fits to eq. 1), we were not able—because the log-  
13  
14 standard deviation ( $\sigma_{\log}$ ) in those studies was large ( $\sigma_{\log} = 0.6$ -1.4) relative to those we now  
15  
16 generate ( $\sigma_{\log} = 0.3$ -0.6)—to determine the mechanism of the odd-even effect, or to establish  
17  
18 whether there was a statistically significant difference in the two parameters,  $\beta$ , and,  $J_0$ , of the  
19  
20 simplified Simmons equation (eq. 1).<sup>17</sup> In Eq. 1,  $J(V)$  is current density (current divided by the  
21  
22 geometrical contact area; A/cm<sup>2</sup>) at an applied voltage  $V$ .<sup>22,23</sup>  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

$$J(V) = J_0(V)e^{-\beta d} = J_0 10^{-\beta d/2.303} \quad (1)$$

28  
29  
30  
31 In this study, as in prior work, we have focused on trends in current densities as a  
32  
33 function of the number of methylene (-CH<sub>2</sub>-) units in SAMs of structure M(Au or  
34  
35 Ag)/SC<sub>n</sub>//Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>/EGaIn, rather than on absolute values of these measurements. We have  
36  
37 described previously details of the procedure we used.<sup>15</sup> Here we used so-called “flattened”  
38  
39 EGaIn tips,  $V = \pm 0.5$  V and template-stripped (TS) Ag and Au substrates (Figure 1).<sup>8,9,15</sup> The  
40  
41 fabrication of the conical tip—a process that stretches the EGaIn until it breaks—results in a  
42  
43 rough Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> surface. Using “selected”<sup>14</sup> or “flattened”<sup>15</sup> tips yield data with slightly narrower  
44  
45 distribution than tips with rougher surfaces. We do not know if flattening influences the  
46  
47 thickness of the oxide.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



**Figure 1.** Schematic structure of a  $\text{Au}^{\text{TS}}/\text{SAM}/\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3/\text{EGaIn}$  junction. Here,  $d$  represents the length of the tunneling barrier established by the alkyl chains in the SAM. Assuming a through-bond mechanism,  $d$  coincides with the length of the alkyl chain.  $J_0$  is defined as the current density across a hypothetical junction where  $d = 0$ .

1  
2  
3 Surfaces of Au and Ag have similar work functions ( $\Phi_{\text{Au}} = 4.9$  eV and  $\Phi_{\text{Ag}} = 4.4$  eV).<sup>24</sup>  
4  
5 The tilt angle of the backbone from the surface normal for *n*-alkanethiolate monolayers on  
6  
7 Au(111) ( $\sim 30^\circ$ ) is larger than that on Ag(111) ( $\sim 10^\circ$ ) (Figure S2).<sup>25</sup> Accordingly, comparing the  
8  
9 rate of charge transport across the *n*-alkanethiolate SAMs on Au and Ag substrates makes it  
10  
11 possible to separate the influence of several characteristics of a SAM—especially the tilt angle  
12  
13 (and thus the relative thickness of the SAM along the surface normal) of the SAM, and the SAM  
14  
15 packing density (21.7 Å<sup>2</sup>/molecule on Au and 19.1 Å<sup>2</sup>/molecule on Ag),<sup>26</sup> on rates of tunneling.  
16  
17 In particular, we hoped to answer two questions in this comparative study: i) Does the charge  
18  
19 move along the shortest distance between the two electrodes (a through-space path)? or ii) does  
20  
21 the charge follow the molecular orbitals along the backbone, regardless of the tilt of the *n*-alkyl  
22  
23 group (a through-bond path)?<sup>27,28</sup> Density of chains, tilt angle, and the properties of the interface  
24  
25 (T//Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, T = —CH<sub>3</sub>, —CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub>) are obviously convoluted, and no simple comparison of  
26  
27 SAMs on Au and Ag will distinguish them all unambiguously; our results do, nonetheless, both  
28  
29 allow some possibilities to be excluded, and help to frame questions for future study.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 We observed a statistically significant odd-even effect in the rates of tunneling across  
37  
38 SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolate on Au<sup>TS</sup>, where *n*-alkanethiolates with *n*<sub>odd</sub> gave higher current  
39  
40 densities ( $J(V)$ ) than did SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolate with *n*<sub>even</sub>. We show that the tunneling current  
41  
42 densities across SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolates with *n*<sub>odd</sub> and *n*<sub>even</sub> on Au<sup>TS</sup> fit in separate sets of data,  
43  
44 when analyzed using the simplified Simmons model (eq. 1); that is, analyzing the two series  
45  
46 separately led to more consistent interpretations of the results than analyzing them together. In  
47  
48 contrast, charge tunneling across SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolate on Ag<sup>TS</sup> does not show an odd-even  
49  
50 effect that we can detect in either  $\beta$  or  $J_0$ .  
51  
52  
53  
54

## 55 BACKGROUND

56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**Odd-Even Effects in Tunneling across SAMs.** The odd-even effect in SAMs has been observed (and reviewed<sup>21</sup>) in a number of properties, including wetting by liquids,<sup>29-32</sup> molecular packing,<sup>33</sup> and electronic,<sup>19</sup> frictional,<sup>34</sup> and electrochemical behaviors.<sup>35</sup> Odd-even effects have been studied in the surface treatment of dielectric materials for pentacene-based field-effect transistors,<sup>36</sup> and in the rate of charge transport across carbon-chain-based molecular devices.<sup>20</sup> Odd-even alternation in rectification of tunneling current density has also been reported.<sup>18</sup> Using EGaIn-based top electrodes in molecular junctions, we have studied odd-even effects in charge transport across *n*-alkanethiolate SAMs on Ag<sup>TS</sup> substrates.<sup>17,11</sup> Using statistical tools, we showed that the data for current densities for SAMs with  $n_{\text{even}}$  and  $n_{\text{odd}}$  belong to separate data sets.<sup>37</sup>

27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Theory of Charge Tunneling across SAMs.** SAMs of alkanes are considered to be good electrical insulators for current transport at low bias (we use  $\pm 0.5$  V), and charge transport takes place by hole tunneling.<sup>38,39</sup> When such molecules are placed between two electrodes, the charge transport has usually been interpreted (in the absence of a more detailed model) in terms of a rectangular barrier using Eq. 1.<sup>22</sup> The injection current density at an applied voltage  $V$ ,  $J_0(V)$ , gives, ideally, the current flowing across a hypothetical junction in which the SAM has zero ( $d = 0$ ) thickness, but the characteristic of the interfaces between the SAM and the electrodes remain the same as those when there is a SAM. The tunneling decay constant  $\beta$  ( $\text{\AA}^{-1}$ ) contains, according to the Simmons model, information about the shape of the tunneling barrier, which, in principle, is determined by the molecular/electronic structure of the backbone in the SAM. The width of the barrier across which charges move is  $d$  ( $\text{\AA}$ ), and is usually assumed to be determined by the molecular structure, not the shortest path between the two electrodes, but this assumption is not based either on solid empirical or theoretical grounds.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION


We collected  $J(V)$  using “flattened” conical tips. The procedures for formation and use of these flattened tips are described in detail elsewhere.<sup>15</sup> (See the Supporting Information for details of experimental design.)

**Charge Transport across  $n$ -Alkanethiolates on Ag<sup>TS</sup> and Au<sup>TS</sup> Substrates.** Values of  $J$  are approximately log-normally distributed (Figures S3 and S4; Supporting Information). For each SAM, we could fit, by nonlinear least-squares fitting,<sup>37</sup> Gaussian curves to the distributions of  $\log|J|$ . Figures S3 and S4 show the histograms for the values of  $\log|J|$  ( $J$ , Acm<sup>-2</sup>) for SAMs of  $n$ -alkanethiolates on Ag<sup>TS</sup> and Au<sup>TS</sup>. Table S1 summarizes the values of  $\log|J|$  at  $V = +0.5$  V for SAMs of  $n$ -alkanethiolates (SC<sub>*n*</sub>) on Ag<sup>TS</sup> and Au<sup>TS</sup> with both odd and/or even numbers of carbons ( $n_{odd}$  and  $n_{even}$ ). Table 1 summarizes the values for injection current density,  $\log|J_0|$ , and tunneling decay coefficient,  $\beta$ , for the  $n$ -alkanethiolates with  $n_{even}$  and  $n_{odd}$  on both Ag and Au substrates. Figure 2 shows plots of linear regression of  $\log|J|$  versus molecular length (number of carbons) for SAMs of  $n$ -alkanethiolate on Ag (Figure 2a) and Au (Figure 2b) with  $n_{even}$  and  $n_{odd}$ . Figure S5 shows plots of  $\log|J|$ , at  $V = +0.5$  V, versus  $d$ (Å) for different lengths of  $n$ -alkanethiolates on both Ag<sup>TS</sup> and Au<sup>TS</sup> substrates. We calculated the molecular length from the sulfur atom to the distal hydrogen atom of the final methyl group in contact with Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (Figure 1). Despite the potential for differences in the structural order for SAMs with short ( $n < 9$ ) and long chains ( $n > 9$ ),<sup>40</sup> we do not detect these differences in the current density or the yields of working junctions. The values of  $J_0$  and  $\beta$  for SAMs of alkanethiolate on Ag<sup>TS</sup> with  $n_{even}$  are in agreement with our report using flattened Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>/EGaIn conical tips.<sup>15</sup> The  $\beta$  value (0.74 Å<sup>-1</sup>) for  $n$ -alkanethiolates with  $n_{even}$  on Au<sup>TS</sup> is in good agreement with reported values of  $\beta$  (0.6-1 Å<sup>-1</sup>) across a wide range of measurement techniques.<sup>2</sup>

**Table 1.** Values for injection current density,  $\log|J_0|$ , and tunneling decay coefficient,  $\beta$ , for the *n*-alkanethiolates with  $n_{\text{even}}$  and  $n_{\text{odd}}$  on both  $\text{Ag}^{\text{TS}}$  and  $\text{Au}^{\text{TS}}$  substrate.

<b>M<sup>a</sup>/odd or even</b>	<b>Length (Å)<sup>b</sup></b>		<b>Length (n<sub>C</sub>)<sup>c</sup></b>	
	$\log J_0 $	$\beta$ (Å <sup>-1</sup> )	$\log J_0 $	$\beta$ (n <sub>C</sub> <sup>-1</sup> )
$\text{Ag}^{\text{TS}}/\text{even}$	3.7±0.3	0.73±0.02	3.4±0.3	0.93±0.02
$\text{Ag}^{\text{TS}}/\text{odd}$	3.6±0.3	0.71±0.02	3.3±0.3	0.91±0.02
$\text{Au}^{\text{TS}}/\text{even}$	4.0±0.3	0.73±0.02	3.6±0.3	0.93±0.02
$\text{Au}^{\text{TS}}/\text{odd}$	4.5±0.3	0.74±0.02	4.1±0.3	0.94±0.02

<sup>a</sup>The metal substrate. <sup>b</sup>Molecular length from the sulfur atom to the distal hydrogen atom of the final methyl group in contact with  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  (Figure 1). <sup>c</sup>Length based on the number of carbons of  $\text{SC}_n$ .



**Figure 2.**  $\log|J|$  at  $V = +0.5V$  versus number of carbons for SAMs of  $n$ -alkanethiolates ( $SC_n$ ) on a) Ag<sup>TS</sup> and b) Au<sup>TS</sup>. Solid line (for  $n$ -alkanethiolate SAMs with  $n_{even}$ ) and dashed line (for  $n$ -alkanethiolate SAMs with  $n_{odd}$ ) represent the linear regression analyses which gives  $\beta/2.303$  (slopes) and  $\log|J_0|$  (intercepts at  $d = 0$ ). Error bars represent the standard deviation for the  $\log|J|$  values ( $0.1 \geq \sigma_{\log} \geq 0.6$ ).

1  
2  
3 For SAMs on Au<sup>TS</sup>, junctions comprising SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolates with *n*<sub>odd</sub>  
4 consistently showed higher values of current densities than their analogs with *n*<sub>even</sub> (Figures 2b  
5 and 3). Based on a careful statistical analysis, we concluded, with 95% probability, that there is a  
6 significant difference between two regression lines (Figure 2b). We determined that the  
7 difference in the values of the intercepts ( $\log|J_0|$ ) of the two lines is statistically significant, but  
8 the slopes ( $\beta$ ) are indistinguishable (for details of statistical analysis; see Supporting  
9 Information). We did not, however, observe any significant difference in the trends of  $\log|J|$  (i.e.,  
10 odd-even alternation) for SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolates with *n*<sub>even</sub> or *n*<sub>odd</sub> on Ag<sup>TS</sup> (Figure 2a).  
11 Statistical analysis, similar to that carried out for SAMs on Au<sup>TS</sup>, for SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolates  
12 with *n*<sub>even</sub> or *n*<sub>odd</sub> on Ag<sup>TS</sup> showed that the two lines are indistinguishable and values of the  
13 injection current density,  $\log|J_0|$ , and of tunneling decay coefficient,  $\beta$ , for the *n*-alkanethiolates  
14 with *n*<sub>even</sub> were indistinguishable from  $\log|J_0|$ , and  $\beta$  for *n*-alkanethiolates with *n*<sub>odd</sub>.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30


31 For SAMs on Au<sup>TS</sup>, values of  $\log|J|$  of most of the *n*-alkanethiolate SAMs with *n*<sub>even</sub> (SC<sub>*n*</sub>)  
32 were within 0.1 of the values of  $\log|J|$  of their next homolog with *n*<sub>odd</sub> (SC<sub>*n*+1</sub>) (Figure 3a). Figure  
33 3b shows that the  $\Delta\log|J|$  ( $\Delta\log|J| = \log|J_{\text{observed}}| - \log|J_{\text{fitted}}|$ ) for SAMs with *n*<sub>odd</sub> are constantly  $\leq 0$   
34 while  $\Delta\log|J|$  for SAMs with *n*<sub>even</sub> are constantly  $\geq 0$ .  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 To examine the statistical difference between the tunneling current density values,  $\log|J|$ ,  
42 of SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolates on Au<sup>TS</sup> we calculated the 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the  
43 whole set of  $\log|J|$  values (for details see SI). Error bars in Figure 3 show the 95% CI for the  
44  $\log|J|$  values on Au<sup>TS</sup> substrate (i.e., the smaller the overlap of bars, or the larger the gap between  
45 bars, the stronger the evidence for a true difference).<sup>41</sup> Figure 3b shows an interesting  
46 phenomenon; that is, although the odd-even alternation can be observed for the whole series of  
47 SC<sub>*n*</sub> (*n* = 5-18), it is only statistically significant for  $10 \leq n \leq 14$ . We rationalize this difference as a  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 reflection of the conclusion—drawn largely from spectroscopic studies<sup>42</sup>—that SAMs with  
4 longer SAMs ( $n \geq 10$ ) are crystalline and well ordered, while those with  $9 \geq n$  are disordered,  
5 probably because of weak interactions between the shorter alkyl chains. The SAMs with long  
6 chain— $n \geq 15$ —may be less ordered and have chains with gauche configurations (similar  
7 observations have been reported for some other types of odd-even effect<sup>18,43</sup>). Our data are  
8 consistent with suggestions that the magnitude of odd-even effect depends on the degree of order  
9 of the SAM.  
10  
11

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 One of the factors that, potentially, can influence the quality of the SAM is the incubation  
21 time (i.e., the time that metal substrate stayed in a solution of the thiols (1 mM in toluene)). To  
22 examine the effect of incubation time, we prepared SAMs of SC<sub>10</sub> and SC<sub>11</sub> on both Ag<sup>TS</sup> and  
23 Au<sup>TS</sup> substrates with incubations of 3 h, 1 day, 2 day, and 7 day. The rate of charge tunneling for  
24 SAMs formed over 3 h is not distinguishable from the 7-day sample (Table S2).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 **Comparison between Au and Ag.** To examine the influence of geometry of SAMs on tunneling  
33 transport, we compared  $J(V)$  of  $n$ -alkanethiolates on Au<sup>TS</sup> and Ag<sup>TS</sup>. Figure 4 shows plots of  
34  $\log|J|$  at  $V = +0.5$  versus molecular length (in number of carbons) for  $n$ -alkanethiolate SAMs with  
35  $n_{\text{even}}$  and  $n_{\text{odd}}$  on both Au<sup>TS</sup> and Ag<sup>TS</sup>. Statistical analysis, similar to that which we have carried  
36 out for the odd-even effect, showed that SAMs with  $n_{\text{even}}$  on both Au<sup>TS</sup> and Ag<sup>TS</sup> result in  
37 indistinguishable values of  $\log|J_0|$  and  $\beta$  (Table 1, Figure 4a). When, however, we compared the  
38 tunneling current density between SAMs with  $n_{\text{odd}}$  on Ag<sup>TS</sup> and Au<sup>TS</sup>, we observed a significant  
39 difference in values of  $\log|J_0|$ , while the values of  $\beta$  were indistinguishable (Table 1, Figure 4b).  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 These comparisons lead to two important conclusions:  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



**Figure 3.** Odd-even effect in charge transport across *n*-alkanethiolates on Au<sup>TS</sup>. a) Plot of  $\log|J|$  at  $V = +0.5V$  versus number of carbons for SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolates on Au<sup>TS</sup> ( $SC_n$ ,  $n=5-18$ ). The solid line represents the linear regression analysis to *all* the data. Error bars represent 95% CI for the  $\log|J|$  values. b) Difference ( $\Delta\log|J|$ ) between the observed current density ( $\log|J_{\text{observed}}|$ ) and the calculated current density ( $\log|J_{\text{fitted}}|$ ) based on the regression line ( $\Delta\log|J| = \log|J_{\text{observed}}| - \log|J_{\text{fitted}}|$ ). Error bars represent standard deviation (light dotted) and 95% CI (solid) for the  $\log|J|$  values.

1  
2  
3 i) They indicate that replacing Au/SR with Ag/SR (for SAMs with  $n_{even}$ )—a change that  
4 substantially alters the tilt angle of the alkyl chain (and, therefore, the thickness of the SAM)<sup>29</sup>—  
5 had no influence (to the precision that we can measure) on the injection current density across  
6 these SAMs (Figure 4a).  
7

8  
9  
10  
11  
12 ii) The odd-even effect in charge tunneling across the SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolates is related  
13 to the orientation of the terminal methyl group. This study showed that SAMs of *n*-  
14 alkanethiolates with  $n_{even}$  on Au<sup>TS</sup> behave, in EGaIn junctions, similarly to the SAMs with  $n_{even}$   
15 and  $n_{odd}$  on Ag<sup>TS</sup>, and that only SAMs with  $n_{odd}$  on Au<sup>TS</sup> conduct differently (Figure 4 and Table  
16  
17 1). The significant structural difference between SAMs with  $n_{odd}$  on Au<sup>TS</sup> with the other SAMs  
18 studied in this comparison is the orientation of terminal ethyl group: for SAMs with  $n_{even}$  on  
19 Au<sup>TS</sup>, and SAMs with  $n_{even}$  and  $n_{odd}$  on Ag<sup>TS</sup>, the surface consists predominantly of methyl  
20 groups. Based on high-resolution electron energy loss spectroscopy (HREELS) studies,<sup>43</sup> the  
21 terminal CH<sub>2</sub>-CH<sub>3</sub> moiety of the SAMs with  $n_{odd}$  on Au<sup>TS</sup> is tilted away from the surface normal,  
22 producing a surface that is composed of a mixture of methyl and methylene groups (that is, an  
23 “ethyl” rather than “methyl” surface<sup>29</sup>) (Figure S2). The same behavior was reported in wetting  
24 properties of SAMs on Ag and Au; SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolate on Ag showed no<sup>29</sup> or slight<sup>44</sup> odd-  
25 even effect; the effect was more distinguishable on Au.<sup>45</sup>  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 An alternative hypothesis that might rationalize the fact that no odd-even effect is observed  
45 on Ag<sup>TS</sup> could be that there are differences in the order of the SAMs on these substrates, with  
46 SAMs on Ag<sup>TS</sup> being more disordered than SAMs on Au<sup>TS</sup>. Differences in these SAMs are due  
47 primarily to differences in the tilt angle of the monolayers, and to the resulting differences in the  
48 density of molecules per unit area. Since the template-stripped metal substrates have similar  
49 values of surface roughness, we do not expect significant differences in the degree of order  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




1  
2  
3 between SAMs on Ag<sup>TS</sup> and Au<sup>TS</sup> due to surface roughness. Moreover, the narrow distribution of  
4 data, high yields in non-shorting junctions, and good reproducibility<sup>46</sup> on Ag<sup>TS</sup> substrates provide  
5 empirical evidence that there is no difference between the order of the SAMs on Ag<sup>TS</sup> and Au<sup>TS</sup>.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 CONCLUSION

11  
12 **The Odd-Even Effect in Charge Transport by Tunneling Is Real.** Our statistical  
13 analysis for SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolates on Au<sup>TS</sup> showed i) the values of tunneling current density  
14 across SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolates with  $n_{odd}$  and  $n_{even}$  belong to two separate data sets, and ii)  
15 while there is a significant difference between the values of  $J_0$  for these two series, the values of  
16  $\beta$  for  $n_{odd}$  and  $n_{even}$  alkyl chains were indistinguishable. We conclude that there is an odd-even  
17 effect in tunneling transport across SAMs on Au<sup>TS</sup>; an odd-even effect, however, was *not*  
18 observable (at the precision that we could measure) for the series on Ag<sup>TS</sup>.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 **The Geometry of the *n*-Alkyl Chain Determines the Odd-Even Effect.** The contrast of  
30 junction measurements between SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolates on gold (where we observed an odd-  
31 even effect) and on silver (where we did not observe a significant trend) indicates that the odd-  
32 even effect in tunneling transport corresponds to the composition (“methyl” vs. “ethyl”) of the  
33 surface of the SAM (Figure S2).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 **The Tunneling Path Is “along Single Molecule” rather than “across Multiple**  
41 **Molecules”.** Our results demonstrate that although a SAM on gold is thinner than one on silver,  
42 the values of  $J_0$  and  $\beta$  for SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolates with  $n_{even}$  on Au<sup>TS</sup> and Ag<sup>TS</sup> are statistically  
43 indistinguishable (Figure 4a). We suggest—based on this observation—that charge carriers  
44 travel through the backbone of the alkyl chain in the SAM, rather than across the shortest (and  
45 thus across multiple molecules of *n*-alkanethiolate) distance between the two electrodes.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



**Figure 4.**  $\log|J|$  at  $V = +0.5V$  versus number of carbons for SAMs of  $n$ -alkanethiolates a) with an even number of carbons on Au<sup>TS</sup> and Ag<sup>TS</sup> and b) with an odd number of carbons on Au<sup>TS</sup> and Ag<sup>TS</sup>. Solid line (for  $n$ -alkanethiolate SAMs on Ag<sup>TS</sup>) and dashed line (for  $n$ -alkanethiolate SAMs Au<sup>TS</sup>) represent the linear regression analyses which give  $\beta/2.303$  (slopes) and  $\log|J_0|$  (intercepts at  $d = 0$ ). Error bars represent the standard deviation for the  $\log|J|$  values.

1  
2  
3       **The SAM//Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> Interface Is Responsible for the Odd-Even Effect on Au<sup>TS</sup>.** Since  
4  
5 the value of  $J_0$  reflects the characteristics of the interfaces between the SAM and the electrodes,  
6  
7 rather than the shape of the most insulating part of the tunneling barrier, significant differences in  
8  
9 values of injection current densities,  $J_0$ , and indistinguishable values of tunneling decay,  $\beta$ , for  
10  
11 SAMs of *n*-alkanethiolates with  $n_{odd}$  and  $n_{even}$  imply that the odd-even effect is influenced by  
12  
13 some property of the interfaces (e.g., Au/S or SAM//Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>). We suggest that a determining  
14  
15 contribution of the SAM//Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> interface to odd-even effects is more plausible than one for the  
16  
17 Au/S interface for two reasons: i) Our previous studies,<sup>10,47</sup> and the current study (Figure 4a),  
18  
19 showed that changing the bottom interface does not significantly influence the tunneling current  
20  
21 densities. ii) Results of this study indicate that changing the terminal group from CH<sub>3</sub> to CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub>  
22  
23 correlates with a change in the injection current density (Figures 2b and 4b).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29       **The Origin of the Odd-Even Effect Is not Completely Defined by Currently**  
30  
31 **Available Data.** While we were able to identify the odd-even effect with respect to  $J$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $J_0$ ,  
32  
33 between *n*-alkanethiols with  $n_{odd}$  and  $n_{even}$ , we cannot pinpoint the origin of the observed odd-  
34  
35 even effect on Au<sup>TS</sup>. We can, however, identify and assess four possibilities (although—based on  
36  
37 our current and previous studies—some possibilities are less plausible than others).  
38  
39

40       (i)     *Differences in the Orientation of the Terminal (T) Group at the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> Interface*  
41  
42 (*e.g.*, CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub> vs. CH<sub>3</sub>). A larger exposure of terminal CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub> group at the surface of the *n*-  
43  
44 alkanethiolate SAMs with  $n_{odd}$  results in larger van der Waals interactions (by changing the  
45  
46 polarizability of surface and increasing the area of contact) between the monolayer and the  
47  
48 EGaIn tip, and may consequently give rise to a difference in  $J(V)$  (similar to differences observed  
49  
50 in wetting of SAMs on Au<sup>21</sup>). If the orientation of terminal CH<sub>2</sub>–CH<sub>3</sub> bonds is responsible for  
51  
52 both the odd-even effect in charge transport, and the odd-even effect in wetting, then increasing  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the van der Waals interactions as a result of different surface polarization is a possible origin of  
4  
5 the former. (These changes in van der Waals interactions *could* influence the contact resistance  
6  
7 at the SAM//Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> interface; however, we did not observe this influence in the distribution of  
8  
9 current density (Figures S3 and S4)). This hypothesis—that the odd-even effect in charge  
10  
11 tunneling across SAMs terminating in ethyl and methyl groups reflects polarizability and van der  
12  
13 Waals interactions—is not easily reconciled with the fact that introducing groups such as  
14  
15 halogens or aromatics into this interface does *not* produce large differences in  $J_0$  in our  
16  
17 experiments.<sup>12,13</sup> (Cahen and others have reported much larger differences with specific terminal  
18  
19 halogen substituents when using a mercury top electrode.<sup>48</sup>)  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 Larger exposure of terminal CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub> groups at the surface of the SAMs with  $n_{odd}$  on  
26  
27 Au<sup>TS</sup> might also result in direct interaction between the EGaIn electrode and the CH<sub>2</sub> groups,  
28  
29 which are adjacent to the terminal CH<sub>3</sub> groups. This direct interaction would reduce the length of  
30  
31 the molecule between both electrodes effectively by one C-C bond (excluding the top CH<sub>3</sub>). This  
32  
33 hypothesis would also explain why this effect is not observed on the Ag substrate where the  
34  
35 surface consists predominantly of methyl groups, and the tilt is too little to expose CH<sub>2</sub> group to  
36  
37 the molecule-EGaIn interface. We do not know if there is a van der Waals contact between the  
38  
39 CH<sub>2</sub> of the terminal ethyl group and the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, and, thus, cannot accept or reject this hypothesis.  
40  
41  
42

43 (ii) *Systematic Alternations in Energy of the Frontier Orbital Energies (i.e.*  
44  
45 *HOMO/LUMO Levels) of Odd and Even n-Alkanethiolates.* Difference in the orientation of the  
46  
47 terminal group at the SAM interface between the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub> vs. CH<sub>3</sub>, Figure S2) might  
48  
49 influence the strength of electronic coupling between the HOMOs of the *n*-alkyl groups and the  
50  
51 Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>. This hypothesis seems less plausible when we consider the fact that the HOMO in these  
52  
53 SAMs is concentrated at the Au-S interface, with little amplitude at the SAM/Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> interface.<sup>49</sup>  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 We do not, however, have a sound theoretical understanding of the CH<sub>3</sub> (or CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub>)/Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>  
4 interface.  
5  
6

7  
8 (iii) *Systematic Differences in the Thickness of the SAM between Odd and Even n-*  
9 *Alkanethiolates.* Naively, it seemed that SAMs on gold with  $n_{odd}$  might be thinner than SAMs  
10 with  $n_{even}$ . Our calculation of thicknesses of odd and even SAMs suggests that there is no  
11 significant (<0.5 Å) systematic alternation in the thickness between  $n_{odd}$  and  $n_{even}$ . Figure S6b (in  
12 the SI) shows an essentially monotonic increase in the thickness for  $n$ -alkanethiolate monolayers  
13 with a tilt angle of 30° on Au<sup>TS</sup>. These calculations suggest that an odd-even variation in  
14 thickness is not the cause of the odd-even alternation in  $J(V)$  (Figure S7). In addition, by  
15 comparing the rate of tunneling across SAMs of  $n$ -alkanethiolates on Au and Ag, we have shown  
16 empirically that charge transport is insensitive to the thickness of the SAMs (as measured along  
17 the perpendicular to the mean plane of the surface of the metal.). The value of  $\beta$  for SAMs of  $n$ -  
18 alkanethiolates on Au<sup>TS</sup> and Ag<sup>TS</sup> is indistinguishable; this observation indicates that tunneling  
19 current densities are insensitive to the difference in thickness. We conclude that there is no  
20 evidence to support a contribution of the thickness of the SAM to the existence of the odd-even  
21 effect.  
22  
23

24 (iv) *Difference in the Dipole along the Surface Normal, which might Correlate with*  
25 *Odd-Even Differences in the Orientation of the Terminal CH<sub>3</sub> Group (Figure S2).* Different  
26 orientations of the terminal methyl group in  $n_{odd}$  and  $n_{even}$  could cause an odd-even alternation in  
27 the dipole along the surface normal,<sup>50</sup> which might contribute to an odd-even effect through an  
28 influence on the work function of the surface.<sup>19,50</sup> Although we have no direct evidence to prove  
29 or exclude this hypothesis, our previous studies<sup>12,13</sup> showed that introducing even a group with a  
30 large dipole moment at the SAM//Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> interface does not change the tunneling barrier enough  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 to influence the rate of charge transport; thus, we think this very small difference in dipole along  
4 surface normal seems unlikely to be important. To be proved or excluded, this hypothesis,  
5  
6 however, needs more investigation (e.g., using a *series* of odd and even SAMs having terminal  
7  
8 polar groups such as CF<sub>3</sub> or OCH<sub>3</sub> that introduce a dipole at the interface but do not change the  
9  
10 topography of the SAM).  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 **If There Is an Observable Odd-Even Effect for *n*-Alkanes, Why Was There no**  
16  
17 **Detectable Difference in much Larger Changes in Terminal Groups for SAMs?** This paper  
18  
19 confirms that there is an odd-even effect for *n*-alkanethiolates, but that it is small (a factor of ~3  
20  
21 when appropriately compared, or  $\Delta \log J_0 \sim 0.5$ ), and only reliably detectable given the  
22  
23 availability of a substantial number of structurally related compounds, with measurements taken  
24  
25 carefully, and in parallel. Previous papers have shown that a range of groups with quite different  
26  
27 polarities, degrees of saturation, composition, and polarizability have a surprisingly small  
28  
29 influence on tunneling current densities.<sup>13</sup> These two sets of observations seem at odds.  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 The problem in comparing these data is that they are not, strictly speaking, comparable.  
35  
36 Most of our studies of terminal groups *did* show variability, but the variation (which might have  
37  
38 been a factor of 10 across of series of groups) was not designed to detect differences as small as  
39  
40 those characterizing the odd-even effect, and would require comparing groups known to have  
41  
42 different sizes and shapes. In those studies, we compared the current densities of compounds  
43  
44 having polar terminal groups (R) with those of hypothetical *n*-alkanethiolates of the same length.  
45  
46 If those comparisons demonstrate that the difference in  $\log |J|$  ( $\Delta \log |J| = \log |J_{\text{polar}}| - \log |J_{\text{CH}_3}|$ )  
47  
48 was  $\leq 0.5$ , or less than a factor of three in  $|J|$ , we considered the compound with polar terminal  
49  
50 group and *n*-alkanethiol to be indistinguishable. In the current study, however, we did not  
51  
52 compare two single data points, but studied a series of compounds (S(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>n</sub>H, n = 5-18) and  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 analyzed the results based on eq. 1. Although the  $\Delta\log|J|$  for each adjacent pair of  $n$ -  
4  
5 alkanethiolate was  $\leq 0.4$  (Figure 3b), analyzing the two series separately led to more consistent  
6  
7 interpretations of the results than did analyzing them together ( $n_{\text{even}}$  and  $n_{\text{odd}}$  produce two  
8  
9 statistically distinguishable sets of data).  
10  
11

12  
13 The surprise in these studies was thus that substituting, for example, a terminal methyl  
14  
15 group for an amide, or a terminal cyclohexyl group with a phenyl, produced a change in current  
16  
17 density ( $J(V)$ ) of approximately a factor of 4.0 ( $\Delta\log|J(0.5V)| = 0.6$ ),<sup>12</sup> and that this change was  
18  
19 smaller than we had—perhaps naively— expected, while substituting a terminal methyl for a  
20  
21 terminal ethyl produced a change of a factor of 2.5 ( $\Delta\log|J(0.5V)| = 0.4$ ), which was larger than  
22  
23 we had expected. The precision of the former studies was, however, substantially less than the  
24  
25 latter, and the studies of polar and aromatic groups, as they were designed, would not have been  
26  
27 able to detect the subtle differences characterizing the odd/even effect. Differences in size,  
28  
29 composition, and other factors restricted our ability to make meaningful comparisons of current  
30  
31 densities with  $\Delta\log|J(0.5V)| \leq 0.6$ .  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 So, what is the origin of the odd-even effect? Although this paper cannot answer the  
38  
39 question unambiguously, it has eliminated a number of possibilities (differences in the thickness  
40  
41 of the SAM, certain differences in the HOMOs for the SAMs), and leaves a focus on the  
42  
43 contribution of the non-covalent interface between the SAM and the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  film on the EGaIn  
44  
45 electrode. This interface has been characterized empirically by studies such as those described in  
46  
47 this paper, but have not yet been included in relevant theoretical calculations. In particular, the  
48  
49 height of the barrier to tunneling is probably high in the region where there is only physical  
50  
51 contact (relative to the rest of the SAM), but the width of this region is small. Understanding the  
52  
53 mechanism of charge transport across this interface, and its contribution to overall tunneling  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 currents, remains an unresolved problem with this junction (and, in fact, with all junctions  
4  
5 involving SAMs as insulating layers between two conducting electrodes).  
6  
7

## 8 9 ASSOCIATED CONTENT

10  
11  
12 **Supporting Information.** The experimental procedures, synthesis characterization of the  
13 alkanethiols, histograms of  $J(V)$  data, and statistical analysis details. This material is available  
14  
15 free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.  
16  
17

## 18 19 AUTHOR INFORMATION

### 20 21 Corresponding Author

22  
23 \*E-mail: [gwhitesides@gmwgroup.harvard.edu](mailto:gwhitesides@gmwgroup.harvard.edu)  
24  
25

### 26 27 Notes

28  
29 The authors declare no competing financial interest.  
30  
31

## 32 33 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

34  
35 The work at Harvard University was supported by a subcontract from Northwestern University  
36  
37 from the United States Department of Energy (DOE, DE-SC0000989). The DOE grant from  
38  
39 Northwestern also supported the salary for M.B., C.M.B, and K.-C.L. Aspects of this work  
40  
41 (SAM preparation and characterization) was supported by the US Department of Energy,  
42  
43 Division of Materials Sciences, under Award No. DE-FG02-00ER45852.  
44  
45  
46  
47

## 48 49 REFERENCES

- 50  
51 (1) Bergfield, J. P.; Ratner, M. A. *Phys. Status Solidi B* **2013**, *250*, 2249.  
52  
53 (2) McCreery, R. L.; Bergren, A. J. *Adv. Mater.* **2009**, *21*, 4303.  
54  
55 (3) Salomon, A.; Cahen, D.; Lindsay, S.; Tomfohr, J.; Engelkes, V. B.; Frisbie, C. D.  
56  
57 *Adv. Mater.* **2003**, *15*, 1881.  
58  
59  
60





- 1  
2  
3 (4) Wang, W. Y.; Lee, T.; Reed, M. A. *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **2005**, *68*, 523.  
4  
5 (5) Vilan, A.; Yaffe, O.; Biller, A.; Salomon, A.; Kahn, A.; Cahen, D. *Adv. Mater.*  
6  
7 **2010**, *22*, 140.  
8  
9 (6) McCreery, R. L. *Chem. Mater.* **2004**, *16*, 4477.  
10  
11 (7) Coskun, A.; Spruell, J. M.; Barin, G.; Dichtel, W. R.; Flood, A. H.; Botros, Y. Y.;  
12 Stoddart, J. F. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2012**, *41*, 4827.  
13  
14 (8) Chiechi, R. C.; Weiss, E. A.; Dickey, M. D.; Whitesides, G. M. *Angew. Chem.*  
15 *Int. Ed.* **2008**, *47*, 142.  
16  
17 (9) Dickey, M. D.; Chiechi, R. C.; Larsen, R. J.; Weiss, E. A.; Weitz, D. A.;  
18 Whitesides, G. M. *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **2008**, *18*, 1097.  
19  
20 (10) Liao, K.-C.; Yoon, H. J.; Bowers, C. M.; Simeone, F. C.; Whitesides, G. M.  
21 *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2014**, *53*, 3889.  
22  
23 (11) Thuo, M. M.; Reus, W. F.; Simeone, F. C.; Kim, C.; Schulz, M. D.; Yoon, H. J.;  
24 Whitesides, G. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 10876.  
25  
26 (12) Yoon, H. J.; Shapiro, N. D.; Park, K. M.; Thuo, M. M.; Soh, S.; Whitesides, G.  
27 M. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2012**, *51*, 4658.  
28  
29 (13) Yoon, H. J.; Bowers, C. M.; Baghbanzadeh, M.; Whitesides, G. M. *J. Am. Chem.*  
30 *Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 16.  
31  
32 (14) Bowers, C. M.; Liao, K.-C.; Yoon, H. J.; Rappoport, D.; Baghbanzadeh, M.;  
33 Simeone, F. C.; Whitesides, G. M. *Nano Lett.* **2014**, *14*, 3521.  
34  
35 (15) Simeone, F. C.; Yoon, H. J.; Thuo, M. M.; Barber, J. R.; Smith, B. J.; Whitesides,  
36 G. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 18131.  
37  
38 (16) Barber, J. R.; Yoon, H. J.; Bowers, C. M.; Thuo, M. M.; Breiten, B.; Gooding, D.  
39 M.; Whitesides, G. M. *Chem. Mater.* **2014**, *26*, 3938.  
40  
41 (17) Thuo, M. M.; Reus, W. F.; Nijhuis, C. A.; Barber, J. R.; Kim, C.; Schulz, M. D.;  
42 Whitesides, G. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 2962.  
43  
44 (18) Nerngchamnon, N.; Yuan, L.; Qi, D. C.; Li, J.; Thompson, D.; Nijhuis, C. A.  
45 *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **2013**, *8*, 113.  
46  
47 (19) Tao, Y. T.; Wu, K. Y.; Huang, K. H.; Perng, T. P. *Org. Electron.* **2011**, *12*, 602.  
48  
49 (20) Qiu, M.; Liew, K. M. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2012**, *116*, 11709.  
50  
51 (21) Tao, F.; Bernasek, S. L. *Chem. Rev.* **2007**, *107*, 1408.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 (22) Simmons, J. G. *J. Appl. Phys.* **1963**, *34*, 1793.  
4  
5 (23) Simmons, J. G. *J. Appl. Phys.* **1963**, *34*, 2581.  
6  
7 (24) de Boer, B.; Hadipour, A.; Mandoc, M. M.; van Woudenberg, T.; Blom, P. W.  
8  
9 *M. Adv. Mater.* **2005**, *17*, 621.  
10 (25) Love, J. C.; Estroff, L. A.; Kriebel, J. K.; Nuzzo, R. G.; Whitesides, G. M. *Chem.*  
11 *Rev.* **2005**, *105*, 1103.  
12 (26) Dubois, L. H.; Nuzzo, R. G. *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **1992**, *43*, 437.  
13 (27) Slowinski, K.; Chamberlain, R. V.; Miller, C. J.; Majda, M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*  
14 **1997**, *119*, 11910.  
15 (28) Foti, G.; Sanchez-Portal, D.; Arnau, A.; Frederiksen, T. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2013**,  
16 *117*, 14272.  
17 (29) Laibinis, P. E.; Whitesides, G. M.; Allara, D. L.; Tao, Y. T.; Parikh, A. N.;  
18 Nuzzo, R. G. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1991**, *113*, 7152.  
19 (30) Srivastava, P.; Chapman, W. G.; Laibinis, P. E. *Langmuir* **2005**, *21*, 12171.  
20 (31) Tao, Y. T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, *115*, 4350.  
21 (32) Colorado, R.; Lee, T. R. *J. Phys. Org. Chem.* **2000**, *13*, 796.  
22 (33) Cyganik, P.; Szelagowska-Kunstman, K.; Terfort, A.; Zharnikov, M. *J. Phys.*  
23 *Chem. C* **2008**, *112*, 15466.  
24 (34) Ramin, L.; Jabbarzadeh, A. *Langmuir* **2012**, *28*, 4102.  
25 (35) Aguilar-Sanchez, R.; Su, G. J.; Homberger, M.; Simon, U.; Wandlowski, T. H. *J.*  
26 *Phys. Chem. C* **2007**, *111*, 17409.  
27 (36) Stoliar, P.; Kshirsagar, R.; Massi, M.; Annibale, P.; Albonetti, C.; de Leeuw, D.  
28 M.; Biscarini, F. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 6477.  
29 (37) Reus, W. F.; Nijhuis, C. A.; Barber, J. R.; Thuo, M. M.; Tricard, S.; Whitesides,  
30 G. M. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2012**, *116*, 6714.  
31 (38) Paddonrow, M. N.; Shephard, M. J.; Jordan, K. D. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1993**, *97*, 1743.  
32 (39) Lin, L. L.; Jiang, J.; Luo, Y. *Physica E* **2013**, *47*, 167.  
33 (40) Nurbawono, A.; Liu, S.; Nijhuis, C. A.; Zhang, C. Unpublished work 2014.  
34 (41) Cumming, G.; Fidler, F.; Vaux, D. L. *J. Cell Biol.* **2007**, *177*, 7.  
35 (42) Porter, M. D.; Bright, T. B.; Allara, D. L.; Chidsey, C. E. D. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*  
36 **1987**, *109*, 3559.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 (43) Kato, H. S.; Noh, J.; Hara, M.; Kawai, M. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2002**, *106*, 9655.  
4  
5 (44) Walczak, M. M.; Chung, C. K.; Stole, S. M.; Widrig, C. A.; Porter, M. D. *J. Am.*  
6  
7 *Chem. Soc.* **1991**, *113*, 2370.  
8  
9 (45) Lee, S.; Puck, A.; Graupe, M.; Colorado, R.; Shon, Y.-S.; Lee, T. R.; Perry, S. S.  
10 *Langmuir* **2001**, *17*, 7364.  
11  
12 (46) Yuan, L.; Jiang, L.; Thompson, D.; Nijhuis, C. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*,  
13  
14 6554.  
15  
16 (47) Bowers, C. M.; Liao, K.-C.; Žaba, T.; Breiten, B.; Baghbanzadeh, M.; Rappoport,  
17  
18 D.; Krzykawska, A.; Aspuru-Guzik, A.; Cyganik, P.; Whitesides, G. M. Unpublished work 2014.  
19  
20 (48) Haj-Yahia, A.-E.; Yaffe, O.; Bendikov, T.; Cohen, H.; Feldman, Y.; Vilan, A.;  
21  
22 Cahen, D. *Adv. Mater.* **2013**, *25*, 702.  
23  
24 (49) Mirjani, F.; Thijssen, J. M.; Whitesides, G. M.; Ratner, M.A. Submitted for  
25  
26 publication 2014.  
27  
28 (50) Alloway, D. M.; Hofmann, M.; Smith, D. L.; Gruhn, N. E.; Graham, A. L.;  
29  
30 Colorado, R.; Wysocki, V. H.; Lee, T. R.; Lee, P. A.; Armstrong, N. R. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2003**,  
31  
32 *107*, 11690.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Table of content graphic.





93x123mm (300 x 300 DPI)