

AD-A171 272

UNCLASSIFIED

DIGITAL SIMULATION OF THE MEASURED ELECTROCHEMICAL
RESPONSE OF REVERSIBLE... (U) MASSACHUSETTS INST OF TECH
CAMBRIDGE DEPT OF CHEMISTRY A J BARD ET AL. 22 AUG 86
IR-9-ONR N00014-85-K-0533 F/G 9/1

1/1

NL


END

DATA

FILED

10-86

END



XEROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

AD-A171 272

DTIC FILE COPY

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE | | READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM |
|--|-----------------------|---|
| 1. REPORT NUMBER ONR TR 9 | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Digital Simulation of the Measured Electrochemical Response of Reversible Redox Couples at Microelectrode Arrays: Consequences Arising from Closely Spaced Ultramicroelectrodes | | 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Interim Technical Report |
| 7. AUTHOR(s) A.J. Bard, J.A. Crayston, G.P. Kittlesen, T.V. Shea M.S. Wrighton | | 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER |
| 9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Chemistry Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, MA 02139 | | 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N0014-85-K-0553 |
| 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Office of Naval Research Department of the Navy, Arlington, VA 22217 | | 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR-051-579 |
| 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) | | 12. REPORT DATE August 22, 1986 |
| | | 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 57 |
| | | 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified |
| | | 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE |
| 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for Public release; reproduction is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government; distribution unlimited. | | |
| 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) Distribution of this document is unlimited | | |
| 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for Publication in <u>Analytical Chemistry</u> | | |
| 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) electrochemistry, microelectrodes, redox polymers | | |
| 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Attached | | |

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

(11) ~~14~~

DTIC
ELECTE
AUG 29 1986
S *af* D

B

DTIC
FILE COPY
1473

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Contract N00014-85-K-0553

Task No. NR-051-579

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 9

Digital Simulation of the Measured Electrochemical Response of
Reversible Redox Couples at Microelectrode Arrays: Consequences
Arising from Closely Spaced Ultramicroelectrodes

by

Allen J. Bard, Joseph A. Crayston, Gregg P. Kittlesen,
Teresa Varco Shea, and Mark S. Wrighton

Prepared for Publication

in

Analytical Chemistry

Department of Chemistry
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139

and

Department of Chemistry
University of Texas
Austin, TX 78712

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for
any purpose of the United States Government

This document has been approved for public release
and sale; its distribution is unlimited

Digital Simulation of the Measured Electrochemical
Response of Reversible Redox Couples at
Microelectrode Arrays: Consequences Arising from Closely
Spaced Ultramicroelectrodes

Allen J. Bard^{*2}, Joseph A. Crayston¹, Gregg P. Kittlesen¹,
Theresa Varco Shea², and Mark S. Wrighton^{1*}

1 Department of Chemistry
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

2 Department of Chemistry
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

*Authors to whom correspondence should be addressed

Submitted to Analytical Chemistry

January 1986

Revised April 1986

Digital Simulation of the Measured Electrochemical Response of Reversible Redox Couples at Microelectrode Arrays: Consequences Arising from Closely Spaced Ultramicroelectrodes. Bard, Crayston, Kittlesen, Shea, Wrighton

Brief

Ultramicroelectrode arrays can be used in RRDE-type experiments. Experimental and simulation results for collection efficiencies, shielding, and feedback and reported for arrays with μm band electrode spaced 0.2 - 1.2 μm apart.

Diffusion to arrays of closely spaced ($1.2\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ to $0.2\text{ }\mu\text{m}$) ultramicroelectrodes ($50\text{ }\mu\text{m} \times 2.3\text{ }\mu\text{m}$) was studied by digital simulation and experimentally by examining the redox behavior of $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$ in H_2O . Cylindrical diffusion of solution species resulted in quasi-steady-state currents at the microband electrodes. Generation-collection experiments, analogous to rotating ring-disk collection experiments, resulted in larger generator currents than those observed at a single microelectrode due to the back diffusion of products to the neighboring microelectrode. A collection efficiency of 93% was observed for the re-oxidation of $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{2+}$ generated at a central microelectrode $0.2\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ from two flanking collector microelectrodes. This experiment as well as generator-single collector electrode pairs was simulated at a two-dimensional rectangular expanding grid and yielded results in good agreement with the experiment. Predictions of the model that the collection efficiency principally depends on the gap size, rather than electrode width, were tested experimentally. The novel application of microelectrode arrays to the study of the follow-up reactions of electrogenerated intermediates is demonstrated.



✓

Account
NTM
FD
V
S
L
L
A
Dist
A-1

INTRODUCTION

The digital simulation of electrochemistry of ultramicroelectrode arrays is shown here to be successful in predicting the effect of variations in electrode geometry on the current response. Our results on the properties of arrays of closely-spaced microelectrodes represent the most complete study where theory can be tested with experiment.

Already, single ultramicroelectrodes have attracted a great deal of interest for analytical applications.¹ Apart from their obvious compactness, they exhibit: (1) enhanced diffusion to achieve steady-state or quasi-steady-state, diffusion-controlled currents; (2) low charging currents;² and (3) reduced solution resistance effects.³ The enhanced diffusion has led to the use in studies of charge transfer kinetics.^{4,5}

Recently it has been shown that it is possible to fabricate arrays of more than one ultramicroelectrode, each of which is individually addressable.⁶⁻¹⁰ Such arrays consist of microband electrodes, ca. 50 μm long and 2-3 μm wide, with an interelectrode spacing of the order of one to several μm .⁶⁻¹³ The photolithographic techniques used in the manufacturing process permit a very small spacing (1.2 μm) between electrodes. This makes them suited for use as charge flow control devices based on molecular materials,^{6-8,11-13} in which charge transport is usually very slow. Such devices may find applications as chemical sensors with built-in signal amplification.¹⁴ Previously described devices include those which mimic transistor⁶⁻⁸ and diode^{11,12} characteristics with a spacing of 1.2 μm . Recently, a transistor-like device consisting of a poly(3-methyl thiophene) film covering two microelectrodes has been exploited as a sensor for H_2 and O_2 .¹³

The close electrode spacing (1.2 μm) has a profound effect on the solution

amperometric response, as will be fully described in the experimental results section of this paper (Part II). Essentially, each microelectrode displays a sigmoidal current response in linear potential sweep voltammetry. This type of response arises from the enhanced mass transport due to non-linear diffusion.¹⁻³ Radial diffusion to the edges of microelectrodes contributes significantly to the overall diffusion and results in quasi-steady-state currents for moderate sweep rates with reversible redox couples. This diffusional flux affects various properties, but the most striking effect of an array of closely spaced electrodes where the diffusion layers overlap is that it becomes possible to detect the electrogenerated products at the adjacent electrodes. For example, the reduced form of a solution species generated at one microelectrode may be "collected" at adjacent microelectrodes which are held at a potential where oxidation can occur (as indicated by an anodic current). The situation is analogous to collection experiments using conventional rotating ring-disk electrodes (RRDE) of macroscopic dimension.¹⁵⁻¹⁶ Thus, one can define a collection efficiency representing the ratio of currents at the generator and collector electrodes. However, as opposed to RRDE experiments, where the current at the disk is unaffected by the ring, for closely spaced stationary electrodes products at the collector can diffuse back to the generator electrode and be electrolyzed there. Thus, an additional feedback current at the generator can be observed. Finally, the current at one electrode can affect that at its neighbor when both are at the same potential, because the diffusion layers overlap. This is analogous to shielding at the RRDE. For a deeper understanding of the effects of electrode width and interelectrode gap spacing on the collection efficiency, feedback and shielding, we used digital simulation techniques to model the microelectrode arrays. As described in Part I, this model predicts a collection efficiency which is in agreement with experiment.

Finally, we show how it is possible to apply such a digital simulation in the future to a more complex situation, namely a catalytic follow-up (or EC') reaction.¹⁷ represented by eqs. (1) and (2).



Catalytic currents have already been observed at a single ultramicroelectrode,^{18,19} but not at an array of several electrodes, each of which may be individually potentiostatted so that, in principle at least, all of the species in reactions (1) and (2) may be determined separately, provided that their electrode potentials are sufficiently different. Thus, the array of ultramicroelectrodes could function not merely as a rotating ring-disk electrode but also as a split ring-disk electrode,²⁰ capable of detecting up to seven intermediates.

EXPERIMENTAL

Ultramicroelectrode arrays. In the arrays of eight Au microelectrodes, each was 50 μm long, 2.3 μm wide, 0.1 μm thick and spaced 1.3 μm apart. Complete details of the fabrication of arrays on p-Si/SiO₂/Si₃N₄ substrates are given in earlier reports.^{6-8,11-13} The arrays of two Au microelectrodes were designed with the aim of reducing the width and spacing dimensions for the particular application of decreasing the amount of polymer necessary to make the type of diode described in previous work.^{11,12} The fabricated microelectrodes were 50 μm long, 1.2 μm wide, 0.1 μm thick and interspaced by 0.9 μm . These geometries approach the practical limits imposed by the GCA Mann 4800 Wafer Stepper and positive photoresist. The M.I.T.

Microelectronics Laboratory Wafer Stepper has successfully patterned $0.6\ \mu\text{m}$ lines and spaces in MacDermid Ultramac PR-914 positive photoresist.

Prior to use, the electrode surfaces were cleaned by an R. F. O_2 plasma etch to remove residual photoresist, followed by cycling the potential at each electrode between $-1.6\ \text{V}$ and $-2.0\ \text{V}$ vs. SCE in $0.1\ \text{M}$ aqueous K_2HPO_4 , ca. 5 cycles at $200\ \text{mV/s}$ to evolve H_2 . Other conventional and more stringent chemical and electrochemical cleaning led to electrode damage. Pt was deposited on each electrode from $2\ \text{mM}$ K_2PtCl_4 in $0.1\ \text{M}$ aqueous K_2HPO_4 . At each electrode, $0.2\ \mu\text{C}$ was passed. The resulting platinized electrodes of an eight-wire array were $2.5\ \mu\text{m}$ wide and interspersed by $1.0\ \mu\text{m}$. The dimensions were determined by scanning electron microscopy using a Cambridge Mark 2A Stereoscan with a resolution of $20\ \text{nm}$, after first coating the array with ca. $200\ \text{\AA}$ of Au to minimize problems from surface charging. The platinized electrodes of a two-wire array were $1.5\ \mu\text{m}$ wide and interspaced by $0.8\ \mu\text{m}$. The interelectrode spacing was significantly reduced by depositing more Pt from solution. Upon passing a total charge of $2.5\ \mu\text{C}$ at each of two adjacent electrodes of an eight wire array, the electrodes were $3.1\ \mu\text{m}$ wide and separated by $0.3\ \mu\text{m}$. Another strategy was to platinize the electrode lightly by passing $0.2\ \mu\text{C}$, and then to platinize the neighboring electrode more heavily by passing $4.0\ \mu\text{C}$. The heavily platinized electrode was $4.1\ \mu\text{m}$ wide and separated from the lightly platinized one by $0.3\ \mu\text{m}$. Two-wire arrays were similarly lightly/heavily platinized by passing $0.2\ \mu\text{C}$ and $1.75\text{--}2.0\ \mu\text{C}$, respectively.

Platinization of the Au electrodes was desirable in the Ru^{3+} generation-collection experiments for reasons of: (1) greater lifetime of the quasi-steady-state current for Ru^{3+} reduction -- presumably adsorption of impurities with time led to a decreased current and a "flattening" of the sigmoidal $i\text{--}V$ curve, and (2) providing a means of reducing the

interelectrode spacing. However, the quinone experiments were conducted at the unplatinized Au electrodes so that there was less interference from direct O_2 reduction at the electrode. The Au electrodes were cleaned (as described above) prior to each measurement to obtain reproducible currents.

Gold electrodes were deliberately removed by electrochemically cycling between 0.0 V and +1.8 V vs. SCE in 0.1 M KCl solution until the current at 1.8 V decayed to zero. Alternatively, the electrode was potentiostatted at +1.8 V vs. SCE. This removed both the ca. 0.1 μm thick Au electrode and the ca. 60 Å layer of Cr, so that zero current was observed in response to 5 mM $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6\text{Cl}_3$. This lift off procedure was also attempted in a 0.1 M NaCN solution and cycling between 0.0 V and +0.5 V. However, preliminary optical microscopic and electrochemical examination suggested that the Au layer was removed, but the Cr layer was not affected.

Chemicals. Triply distilled H_2O (EM Science) was used for all solutions with various supporting electrolytes: KCl, LiCl, LiClO_4 and LiNO_3 were used as received. $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6\text{Cl}_3$ (Strem) was also used as received. 2,5-Dichloro-3,6-bis-[2-(dimethylpropylamino)ethyl]-benzoquinone was prepared²¹ by similar methods to those previously published for naphthoquinone derivatives.^{22,23}

Electrochemical Equipment. Electrochemical plating of Pt onto the Au microelectrodes was accomplished using a Princeton Applied Research Model 173 Potentiostat/Galvanostat, Model 179 Digital Coulometer, and Model 175 Universal Programmer. The remaining electrochemical experiments were performed using a Pine Model RDE4 bipotentiostat and recorded on a Kipp and Zonen BD91 XYt recorder. All potentials were controlled relative to an aqueous saturated calomel electrode (SCE). Electrochemical measurements were carried under N_2 or Ar at 22° C, unless otherwise stated.

Digital Simulations. All computations were carried out on the UT-CDC

6000 Dual Cyber Computer (Control Data Corp.)

PART I. Simulation of Patterned Array Electrodes for Electrochemistry.

The Model and Tests of the Model. Digital simulation of a single microband electrode and arrays of electrodes generally followed previous practice.^{24,25} To simulate the ultramicroelectrode array, a two-dimensional space grid was set up, Figure 1A where the two electrodes A and B, the generator and collector, were separated by a gap. Because of the small height to width ratio, 23 to 1, of the experimental arrays, the top of the electrode was assumed to lie in the plane of the substrate, i.e., the height of the electrode in the J-direction was taken to be zero. The width of the electrodes in the N-direction, as well as the gap width, was varied by varying the number of boxes corresponding to the electrodes and the interelectrode spacing. In addition, the axis of symmetry through electrode A permitted the simulation of one half of the three electrode array as well as the single band electrode and reduced the amount of computer time and storage space needed. Figure 1B shows the grid configuration adopted for the simulation of generator-single collector pairs.

To further conserve computation time and extend the simulated times to correspond to the rather long experimental times required to attain quasi-steady-state behavior, an exponentially expanding space grid²⁶⁻²⁸ was added in the J-direction, perpendicular to the electrode surface, and in the N-direction, extending out from the electrode surface, parallel to the substrate (Figure 1). However, the solution boxes above the electrodes and gap in the N-direction were represented by a uniform space grid and were treated in the usual way.^{24,25} Details of the mathematical treatment of the digital simulation are given in the appendix.

The validity of the model was demonstrated by applying the simulation

to a single band electrode. In the test case, we consider a potential step to electrode A while electrode B was missing, i.e., the grid begins expanding at the edge of electrode A in the N-direction and the solution contained only species Ox. We assumed total mass transport-controlled conditions, with the concentration of Ox at the electrode surface going instantaneously to zero and the mass transport solely by diffusion. A typical simulated current-time (i-t) response compared to the numerical solution for a potential step at a microband electrode recently reported by Tallman et al.,²⁹ is shown in Figure 2. The i-t response can be described in terms of three time domains that are dependent upon the magnitude of the dimensionless parameter $\theta = 4Dt/W^2$ [eq. (A15)] where D is the diffusion coefficient, t is the time and W is the electrode width. At very short times, $\theta < 3 \times 10^{-5}$ (corresponding to ca. 65 ns when $W \sim 1 \mu\text{m}$), the flux to the electrode surface is approximated by semi-infinite linear diffusion and the current decays as a function of $t^{-1/2}$ (Cottrell conditions) shown by the dashed line in Figure 2. This time regime was not observed in the digital simulation where the earliest simulation times correspond to real times of the order of microseconds.

In the limit of long times, $\theta < \text{ca. } 30$, the current approaches that expected for a hemicylinder and decays as $(\ln t)^{-1}$ (Figure 2, curve b).²⁹ For the time domain of $0.01 \leq \theta \leq 1$, the current can be approximated by eq. (A17), (Figure 2, curve a).²⁹ Over the range of θ from 0.01 to 10000 simulated currents agreed with Coen, Cope and Tallman's²⁹ numerical solution for a microband electrode within 3%, demonstrating the validity of the simulation model for a microband electrode over 6 orders of magnitude of θ thus providing confidence that the digital simulation could be applied to microelectrode arrays and determination of collection efficiencies, feedback, and shielding effects.

Note that the microband electrode (in common with the cylindrical or hemicylindrical electrode) does not attain a true steady-state current; spherical and embedded disk electrodes do. However, at sufficiently long θ -values ($\theta \geq 100$), the rate of decay of current is small; we call this the "quasi-steady-state" region. Feedback from the collector electrode tends to decrease even more the rate of decay, and the onset of natural convection can produce steady-state currents. For electrodes with $W \approx 1 \mu\text{m}$, the quasi-steady-state region is attained after about 0.1 s. The quoted quasi-steady-state efficiencies here correspond to $\log \theta \sim 3.3$, or experimental times of the order of $t \approx 3.5 \text{ s}$. In this region the normalized currents change less than 5% for a ten-fold change in θ .

Simulation of an Array and Dependence of Collection Efficiency on Electrode Geometry. One half of the array is shown in Figure 1A and results that apply to a central generator electrode and a pair of flanking collector electrodes will be discussed first. Because of the large width to height ratio, 23 to 1, the electrodes were considered to be in the plane of the substrate, so the height in the J direction was zero. At electrode A the reduction reaction $\text{Ox} + e^- \rightarrow \text{Red}$ occurs, as described in the previous section. However, now a potential is applied to electrode B such that the Red produced at electrode A is re-oxidized, $\text{Red} \rightarrow \text{Ox} + e^-$. This type of experiment is similar to that at a rotating ring-disk electrode^{15,16} with the exception that now diffusion, not convection, is the primary means of mass transport. The geometric considerations necessary to maximize the amount of Red reaching electrode B will be discussed in the remainder of this paper.

To determine the effect of changing a geometric parameter, such as the gap or electrode width, the collection efficiency was studied. The collection efficiency, ϕ_{ss} , is the ratio of the quasi-steady-state current

for Ox produced at the collector electrode, B, divided by the current for reduction of Ox at the generator electrode, A; see eq. (3).

$$\phi_{ss} = (Z_B/Z_A)_{ss} \quad (3)$$

Simulated collection efficiencies for a generator and a pair of flanking collector electrodes of equal width ($W_G = W_C = 1-4 \mu m$) are shown by the circles in Figure. 3. These are plotted in terms of the convenient dimensionless parameter $\theta_{GAP} = 4 Dt/W_{GAP}^2$, where W_{GAP} is the gap width. The simulated points could be fit by the empirical equation

$$\phi_{ss} = 0.095 + 0.33 \log \theta_{GAP} - 0.035 (\log \theta_{GAP})^2 \quad (4)$$

The experimental results shown in Figure 3 will be discussed in Part II. The results in Figure 3 and eq. (4) indicate that, as intuitively expected, the collection efficiency is maximized as the gap width is decreased.

Another consideration in the construction of interdigitized ultramicroelectrode arrays concerns the width of the generator (W_G) and collector (W_C) electrodes, since the quasi-steady-state current (eqs. (A16) and (A17)) is a function of the width. To maximize the current, a large width is desirable. However, a large width provides a greater lateral surface area from which the species Red can escape into the bulk. Therefore, a compromise between larger, more easily measured currents and minimizing loss due to diffusion out into the bulk must be made. However, for the electrode widths shown in Table I, where $W_G = W_C$ was varied from 1 to $3.3 \mu m$ with a $1 \mu m$ gap width, the collection efficiency ϕ_{ss} is the same within the error of the simulation (3%). While there is no discernable difference in ϕ_{ss} when the ratio of generator and collector is unity, when the ratio is not unity,

the collection efficiency is found to depend on the collector electrode width. In Figure 4, ϕ_{ss} is plotted as a function of collector width for a generator electrode with two flanking collector electrodes, where the generator electrode width, the interelectrode gap and θ are held constant. The squares are experimental points, discussed in Part II. As expected, the collection efficiency increased as the collector electrode width increased from 0.5 to 6 μm with $W_G = 1 \mu\text{m}$ and $W_{\text{GAP}} = 1 \mu\text{m}$. The increase in ϕ_{ss} is largest for $W_C \sim W_G$ and becomes less important for $W_C \geq 4 \mu\text{m}$. Thus, both the gap size and the ratio of the collector and generator electrode widths must be considered in the design of microelectrode arrays. One gains efficiency by minimizing the gap width while the ratio of the collector to generator widths should be greater than unity to maximize collection.

The digital simulation model could also be used to model a pair of microband electrodes (generator and single collector) of interest in experiments described in Part II. The simulation grid used is shown in Figure 18 and the mathematical details are discussed in the Appendix. Simulated results of the collection efficiency, ϕ_{ss} , as a function of the interelectrode gap width, W_{GAP} , are given in Figure 5. The collection efficiency can be approximated by eq. (5) (with a coefficient of correlation of 0.997).

$$\phi = 0.039 + 0.18 \log \theta_{\text{GAP}} - 0.0030 (\log \theta_{\text{GAP}})^2 \quad (5)$$

Eq. (5) is useful for estimation of the observed experimental collection efficiencies for gaps of 0.5 to 23 μm . As expected, the ϕ_{ss} -values for a pair of electrodes is smaller than those for flanking collectors (compare Figures 3 and 5).

The Effect of Shielding and Feedback. When the array of ultramicroelectrodes was operated in the generator-collector electrode mode,

the current response mimicked the steady state behavior observed at the RRDE as previously demonstrated. As noted, the primary means of mass transport was by diffusion, which is responsible for the closely related shielding and feedback effects.

For the RRDE, the shielding experiment involves reducing the amount of Ox which reaches the ring, where the ring reaction is $Ox + e^- \rightarrow Red$, by applying a potential to the disk (e.g., $E_D = E_R$) to cause the same reduction reaction to occur. In the corresponding experiment with the array, the adjacent electrodes were held at the same potential, $E_G = E_C$, where E_G and E_C are the potentials of the generator and collector electrodes, respectively. As the electrolysis proceeds, the diffusion layers overlap, shielding each electrode. This shielding effect reduced the quasi-steady-state current at three electrodes in the array when compared to the sum of the currents expected at 3 independent electrodes. We define this reduction in current as the shielding factor, S_F , given by eq. (6) for equal sized electrodes.

$$S_F = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^q Z_i}{qZ} \quad (6)$$

where Z_i is the current at each of the q electrodes in the array and Z is the current observed for a single electrode, with all other electrodes at open circuit. The shielding factor is a measure of the degree of overlap of the diffusion layers and approaches zero in the absence of shielding (e.g., for electrodes widely spaced apart). The simulation results for the quasi-steady-state currents at three electrode arrays are given in Table II. The shielding effect is more pronounced on the inner (generator) electrode than on the flanking (collector) electrodes, because the inner electrode is blocked from non-linear diffusion paths from both sides while the outer electrodes are only blocked from one side.

A phenomenon related to shielding but not possible at the RRDE is feedback. When the reduced species reaches the collector electrode, it is re-oxidized to Ox that can diffuse back to the generator electrode. Thus, the collector electrodes act as a source and increase the flux of Ox to the generator. The effect of feedback was observed in the increased magnitude of the quasi-steady - state generator currents (see Table II). In generator-collector experiments where the reactions were all reversible, the generator currents were increased by the feedback factor, F_B , given in eq. (7).

$$F_B = 1 - (Z_{G,0}/Z_{G,C}) \quad (7)$$

where $Z_{G,0}$ is the steady state current without feedback and $Z_{G,C}$ is the steady state generator current with feedback. Typical effects of feedback with three electrode arrays are given in Table II. It should be noted that at the same $\log \theta = 4.3$, the collection efficiencies are the same with and without feedback, although the magnitude of the generator and collector currents are smaller without feedback.

In summary, the predictions of the digital simulation are that the collection efficiency: (1) is strongly dependent on gap size and to a lesser extent on the collector electrode width; (2) using eq. (4) for a three electrode array or eq. (5) for a two electrode pair, the collection efficiency can be calculated for a known diffusion constant, time and interelectrode gap (i.e., θ_{Gap}); (3) shielding and feedback are shown to be important at electrodes of these dimensions; (4) agreement between the simulation predictions and experiment are within 10% and agreement between the simulation and theory is better than 3% for a single microelectrode.

Part II. Experimental Results and Discussion

Electrochemical Characterization of Microelectrode Arrays. Each Au electrode of an array was individually addressable. Generally, a small amount of Pt ($0.2 \mu\text{C}$, corresponding to a coverage of $0.86 \mu\text{mol}/\text{cm}^2$) was electrochemically deposited onto each microelectrode to yield a consistently fresh electroactive surface prior to electrochemical experimentation. Figure 6 shows linear potential sweep cyclic voltammograms for the reduction of $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$ at each microelectrode of an eight electrode array. The solution was not stirred during the measurement. That there was no cathodic current peak is a consequence of the narrow width of the microelectrode. At a larger electrode at the same sweep rate, a cathodic current peak would be observed due to the depletion of $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$ near the electrode surface. On the return scan an anodic current peak would also be observed due to the oxidation of $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{2+}$ generated in the negative sweep. At the microelectrode radial diffusion to the edges of the microelectrode was significant and combined with diffusion normal to the microelectrode surface to deliver the redox species to the microelectrode at a rate approximately equal to the electrolysis rate. Hence, a steady-state current was observed at slow sweep rates and low redox reagent concentrations. As shown in Part I, it was not necessary for non-diffusional hydrodynamic flow to be invoked. The quasi-steady-state cathodic currents in Figure 6 are all nearly identical, demonstrating the success of the encapsulation and Pt deposition techniques used in the array fabrication. The magnitude of the current can be calculated from eq. (8)²⁹ for the mass transport limited current at a micro-band electrode.

$$i = nFDCl[5.553/\ln \theta - 6.791/(\ln \theta)^2], \quad \theta = 4Dt/W^2 \quad (8)$$

where l is the length of the electrode, W is the width of the electrode, and

t is the characteristic time. Typically θ was about 215 for our electrodes, so that for the experiment in Figure 6, eq. (8) predicts a current of 13.7 nA compared to ca. 19 nA observed. At a θ of 215, the simulation and theory are in very good agreement. The normalized current function, Z , see eq. (A16), for the experiment in Figure 6 is 1.11 compared with 0.80 calculated by eq. (8) and 0.78 calculated by the simulation.

The results of a generation-collection experiment analogous to a rotating ring-disk electrode collection experiment are given in Figure 7. The potentials of two adjacent microelectrodes were independently controlled by a bipotentiostat. Again, forced convection was not necessary in order to observe quasi-steady-state currents. In the experiment summarized by Figure 7, the potential of one electrode, the generator electrode, was swept in a negative direction linearly in time through the formal potential of $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+/2+}$. Simultaneously, the potential of the adjacent electrode, the collector electrode, was held fixed at a value such that the $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{2+}$ generated was oxidized to $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$. A larger steady-state current (42% greater) was observed at the generator electrode than when no collector electrode was used. This is the manifestation of feedback associated with closely spaced electrodes discussed in Part I. The point is that the collector electrode was an additional source of $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$ to the generator electrode. 51% of the generated $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{2+}$ was collected at one adjacent microelectrode, Figure 6(a). Collection efficiencies were typically 51-60% between adjacent lightly platinized microelectrodes with a 1.0 μm separation between nearest edges. The significant finding is that more than 50% of the generated $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{2+}$ can be collected on only one side of the generator electrode. The collection efficiency was the same when the electrode on the other side of the generator was used as a collector. In other words, there is a symmetry of the system in the sense that any pair of adjacent

electrodes in a generation-collection experiment will give rise to the same collection efficiency.

Now we examine the first situation investigated in the digital simulation. For two collector electrodes, one on either side of a centrally positioned generator electrode, the collection efficiency was dramatically increased to 79%, Figure 7(b). Here, the limiting current observed at the generator electrode was 88% greater than when no collector electrodes were used, $F_g = 0.47$, demonstrating significant consequence from feedback. Simulation results predict $F_g = 0.44$ for this electrode geometry at $\log \theta = 3.1$. By connecting seven microelectrodes as collector electrodes the collection efficiency only increased to 86%, Figure 7(c). Clearly, inclusion of those electrodes lying farther away from the central generator electrode did little to increase the collection efficiency beyond 79%. This result is consistent with Part I as shown in Fig. 4.

By using a central electrode of the eight as the generator, there were three possible symmetrically disposed collector electrode pairs that could be used to test the predicted dependence of efficiencies on gap size displayed in Figure 3. Figure 8 shows the results from one such set of experiments and Table III summarizes several such determinations. The experimental results and the simulation are in quite good agreement (Fig. 3), at the same θ -value with the experimental values consistently slightly lower (ca. 7-10%) than the simulated ones. A possible reason for the discrepancy between the simulation and experiment is that the model does not take into account the effect of intervening nonpotentiostatted electrodes. Thus, when using electrode no. 4 as a generator and electrodes nos. 2 and 6 as collectors, the presence of electrodes nos. 3 and 5 may contribute in some way to the observed collection efficiency. To test this, experiments were carried out to measure collection efficiencies before and after

electrochemical removal of the intervening electrodes (see Experimental). The collection efficiency in an experiment with generator electrode no. 4 and collector electrodes nos. 2 and 6 increased from 49% to 57% after removal of electrodes nos. 3 and 5. This suggested that intervening electrodes act to diminish currents.

The dependence of collection efficiency on the distance between the generator and only one collector electrode is presented in Table IV and Figures 5 and 9. A collection efficiency of 58% between adjacent electrodes was observed. Upon using electrode no. 4 as the collector and electrode no. 1 as the generator, the collection efficiency dropped by less than a factor of two to 34%. For the no. 1/no. 4 generator-collector pair the electrodes were separated by 8.3 μm between adjacent edges. The generator electrode current amplitude for this pair and all pairs at greater separation was identical to the current amplitude observed with no collector electrode, indicating that there was negligible feedback for the large separations. For the greatest separation, the no. 1/no. 8 pairing, the collection efficiency was 20%. These results agree well with the symmetrical generator-collector experiments and the simulated results in that the collection efficiency falls off slowly with distance.

The collection efficiency vs. gap size (separation between generator and collector) was further investigated using two-electrode arrays. The smaller interelectrode spacing of the two-electrode arrays, 0.8 μm , compared to 1.0 μm for the eight-electrode arrays, resulted in a larger collection efficiency for the reduction and reoxidation of $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$: 68% compared to 58%. There are two possible geometric factors at work here which can be considered to affect collection efficiency, i.e., collector electrode area and interelectrode spacing. The improved collection efficiency was caused

by the smaller spacing, since results above show that collector area is not a big factor in collector efficiency, Figure 7(b) vs. Figure 7(c). Moreover, the electrodes of the two-wire arrays had smaller areas than did the electrodes of the eight-wire arrays that gave the 58% collector efficiency, Figure 9. It appears that collector area does not have as great an effect on the collection efficiency as the interelectrode spacing, as predicted in Part I.

Effect of Increased Platinization of Microelectrodes on the Collection Efficiencies. The strong dependence of collection efficiency on gap size (generator separation from one collector) was further investigated by electrochemically depositing relatively large amounts of Pt onto the electrodes to close the gap between adjacent microelectrodes by a significant amount. Two different strategies were employed to minimize the interelectrode spacing. Either large amounts of Pt were deposited on each electrode or one electrode was lightly platinized and the other heavily platinized. Large Pt deposits generally resulted in rough edges along the electrodes. Projections of Pt along the rough edge occasionally led to shorted electrode pairs. The light/heavy deposition strategy preserves one straight edge. Clearly, Pt deposition reduces the gap size, but it also increases the height and width of the electrodes.

Large amounts of Pt were deposited on six of eight electrodes in an array by reduction of PtCl_4^{2-} in $0.1 \text{ M K}_2\text{HPO}_4$. Amounts of Pt deposited and resulting dimensions of the electrodes (determined by scanning electron microscopy) are detailed in Table V. Figure 10 displays the large increase in limiting currents and collection efficiency as the gap between adjacent electrodes is decreased to $0.2 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$. At a $1.0 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ separation between lightly platinized electrodes, a collection efficiency of 53% was obtained. For heavily platinized microelectrodes with a spacing of $0.2 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$, a collection

efficiency of 83% was observed.


In another experiment, one electrode was lightly platinized by passing 0.2 μC and the adjacent electrode was heavily platinized by passing 4.0 μC . The heavily platinized electrode was 4.1 μm wide and separated from the lightly platinized electrode by 0.3 μm . The heavily platinized electrodes displayed large nonfaradaic currents and significant cathodic currents for the reduction of H_2O . The lightly platinized electrode situated next to the heavily platinized electrode showed a slight voltammetric cathodic current peak for the reduction of 2 mM $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$. The heavily platinized electrode may impair radial diffusion to the adjacent lightly platinized electrode. A collection efficiency of 80% was obtained when the lightly platinized electrode was connected as the generator electrode and the heavily platinized electrode is connected as the collector electrode. By connecting a lightly platinized electrode as the generator electrode between two heavily platinized collector electrodes, a maximum of 93% collection efficiency was observed. This high collection efficiency was a consequence of the small separation (Figure 3).

The gap between two-electrode arrays was similarly narrowed. For example, one electrode can be plated with 0.2 μC of Pt from PtCl_4^{2-} in solution, and the other electrode can be plated with 1.75-2.0 μC of Pt. The resulting widths were 1.5 μm and 2.2 μm , respectively, separated by 0.3-0.4 μm , which was very similar to that in the analogous electrodes of an eight electrode array. An 80% collection efficiency for the re-oxidation of $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{2+}$ was observed, identical to that observed at the eight-electrode array. This experiment confirmed the suggestion that interelectrode spacing is the dominant factor controlling collection efficiencies, and not collector widths, since the widths in the two-electrode arrays are different than in the eight-electrode arrays.


Shielding Effects at Microelectrode Arrays. To demonstrate shielding in the sense developed in Part I, various combinations of the eight electrodes were driven together as the working electrode in a conventional three-electrode linear potential sweep voltammetry configuration for the reduction of 5 mM $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6\text{Cl}_3$ in 0.1 M LiNO_3 . The basic finding was that quasi-steady-state cathodic current amplitudes were not directly proportional to the combined areas of the closely spaced electrodes. Figure 11 presents the results of linear potential sweep voltammetry at one, two adjacent, four adjacent, and all eight electrodes. Two adjacent electrodes displayed 61% of the limiting cathodic current expected by simply doubling the current observed at a single electrode. Driving more adjacent electrodes incrementally decreased the percentage of observed current relative to that expected by simply multiplying the current at a single electrode by the number of electrodes driven together. Driving all eight electrodes together resulted in a limiting cathodic current which was only 28% of eight times the limiting current at a single electrode. Figure 12 demonstrates the effects of driving a group of electrodes spread out across the array in contrast to driving the same number of adjacent electrodes. The current at two adjacent electrodes was 61% of two times the current at a single microelectrode ($S_F=0.39$). By driving electrodes no. 1 and no. 8, separated by 23 μm between nearest edges across the microelectrode array, 89% of two times the current at a single electrode was observed ($S_F=0.11$). At three adjacent electrodes, 46% of three times the current at a single electrode was observed in good agreement with the simulated result at $\log \theta = 4.3$ of $S_F = 0.56$. By spreading out the three electrodes across the array, the limiting cathodic current observed increased to 64% of three times the current at a single electrode. The importance of radial diffusion of redox species to the electrodes is clear. By driving the closely spaced

electrodes together, the effective radial diffusion to the combined electrode area was reduced.

Collection Efficiency of the Intermediate in an EC' reaction. So far we have described experiments investigating the generation and collection of a stable redox reagent $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{2+}$. Now we describe preliminary results for an intermediate that is unstable in the presence of dissolved O_2 and follows the EC' mechanism in eq. (1) and (2). The type of reaction that we have chosen for study is the reduction ($2\text{e}^-/2\text{H}^+$) of the water soluble benzoquinone (Q) to QH_2 , which undergoes a rapid follow-up reaction with dissolved O_2 , eqs. (9) and (10).



Q = 2,5-Dichloro-3,6-bis-[2-(dimethylpropylamino)ethyl]-benzoquinone



The rate constant, k , was estimated from rotating disk data for immobilized quinone, Q, on a W electrode to be $\geq 0.65 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$.²⁰ We now describe experiments aimed at a direct measurement of this rate constant from the electrochemistry of Q at an ultramicroelectrode array. Figure 13(a) shows the generation and collection of QH_2 at adjacent electrodes

after the aqueous Q solution (5 mM, pH 7.2 tris-buffered) was thoroughly deoxygenated by purging with N_2 . The generator electrode was swept from 0.0 to -0.8 V to reduce Q ($E^\circ = -0.34$ V vs. SCE)²¹ and the collector was held at 0.0 V, a potential sufficiently positive to re-oxidize the generated QH_2 . The collection efficiency of 57% was close to that observed at the same two electrodes with Ru^{3+} (58%). This indicated that no follow-up reaction of QH_2 occurred in the absence of O_2 . For a single electrode with the collector turned off (not shown), the observed generator current was used to estimate a diffusion coefficient based on the observed currents for Ru^{3+} reduction (diffusion coefficient for Ru^{3+} taken as $0.71 \times 10^{-5} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, ref. 30) and assuming that the reaction remained a simple $2e^-/2H^+$ reduction at Au, as it was at W electrodes.^{21,22} We know that the current is proportional to the number of electrons and the diffusion coefficients from eq. (8). Thus, we calculated a diffusion coefficient, $D_Q = 0.35 \times 10^{-5} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, for Q.

Figure 13 also shows the changes that occur when the same solution was purged with air (Figure 13(b)) and pure O_2 (Figure 13(c)). We observed: (1) the generator current was increased as expected for the catalytic regeneration of Q (eq. (10)); (2) the magnitude of the collection current was decreased, indicating the consumption of the intermediate QH_2 as it diffuses to the collector electrode. The increase in the generator current (obtained by subtracting the diffusion limited current in the absence of O_2 from the total current) can be used to calculate a value for the rate constant for the reaction of QH_2 with O_2 by substituting in the following expression for the catalytic current, i_{cat} , eq. (11).

$$i_{cat} = nFA D_Q C_Q (k C_{O_2} / D_{O_2})^{1/2} \quad (11)$$

This equation was derived in a similar fashion to that given in reference 18

for pseudo-first order reaction of Q. Taking the concentration of O_2 in air-saturated aqueous solution as 0.24 mM ,³¹ using the value of D_Q calculated earlier and taking D_{O_2} ³⁰ to be $2.6 \times 10^{-5} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, we obtained a rate constant of $7(+5) \times 10^6 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$, which was an average value taken from several experiments at different Q and O_2 concentrations. (The error stems from the error in measuring the current and the approximation involved in calculating the area of the entire surface of the electrode, including contributions from the walls of the electrode.) This value compares with the lower limit of $0.65 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ calculated previously for similar surfaced-confined quinones. As a check that the pseudo-first order conditions necessary to apply equation (8), i.e., diffusive flux of $O_2 \gg$ flux required to sustain reaction with QH_2 are operating, one can derive eq. (12).¹⁸

$$(D_{O_2} C_{O_2} / W) [5.553 / \ln - 6.791 / (\ln)^2] \gg D_Q C_Q (k C_{O_2} / D_{O_2})^{1/2} \quad (12)$$

This condition was amply satisfied in the case of purging the solution with pure O_2 . There was direct evidence for an excess of O_2 , since a "tail" was seen at the most negative part of the sweep for the direct reduction of O_2 at the Au surface.

Turning our attention once again to the collection currents shown in Figure 13 we see that the current for QH_2 reoxidation was approximately halved in the presence of $1.2 \text{ mM } O_2$. While a quantitative description of this must await a full digital simulation, the decrease in collection current may be qualitatively explained on the basis of transit time arguments similar to those used in the rotating ring-disk experiment.³² From a random walk model the distance, x , traveled by the diffusing quinone in time t is $x^2 \approx (2 D_Q t)$. Hence, the transit time to cross the $1.2 \text{ } \mu\text{m}$ interelectrode spacing was 1 ms , which was the same order as the half-life

of the quinone in the pseudo-first order reaction with 1.2 mM O_2 ($t_{1/2} (kC_{O_2}) = 2$ ms).

In the recent literature on the electrocatalytic reduction of O_2 by both soluble^{33,34} and insoluble³¹ catalysts, there has been disagreement concerning the relative importance of the contributions from heterogeneous reactions of supposed soluble catalysts. Shigehara and Anson³¹ have pointed out that the ratio of the catalytic currents from the adsorbed and dissolved catalysts is given by eq. (13).

$$i_{ads}/i_{sol} = k^{1/2} \Gamma_{cat} / (O_{O_2}^{1/2} C_{cat}^{1/2}) \quad (13)$$

where Γ_{cat} is the surface excess of the adsorbed catalyst. Even with submonolayer coverage (barely detectable by rotating disk techniques), say 10^{-11} mol cm^{-2} , and a rate constant of $k = 4 \times 10^{10}$ $M^{-1}s^{-1}$, the adsorbed catalyst would have a comparable turnover rate to the dissolved catalyst present in mM concentration. In the context of the quinone experiment described in this paper, the absence of such complications was ensured by cleaning the electrodes prior to each measurement. Furthermore, the collection currents for the dissolved QH_2 species were decreased in accordance with the half-life calculated assuming a solution reaction with O_2 .

CONCLUSIONS

Steady-state currents are observed for linear potential sweep voltammetry of solution redox species at microelectrodes. The significant contribution of radial diffusion of redox species to and from the microelectrode obviates the need for forced hydrodynamics otherwise necessary to obtain steady current behavior. Moreover, the collection efficiencies attainable at microelectrode arrays are significantly larger

than those usually obtained at RRDEs. The observation that the limiting current for the redox reaction of a solution species at two closely spaced microelectrodes is significantly less than the sum of the current observed at each microelectrode separately, provides evidence for shielding and the importance of radial diffusion.

From the digital simulation of microelectrode arrays and the use of these arrays as RRDE-type probes, we can draw several conclusions. One of the key factors allowing these systems to work is the small gap size. As the interelectrode spacing is reduced by Pt deposition, larger collection efficiencies are obtained in generation-collection experiments. In this paper, we report efficiencies of ca. 80% for gap sizes of ca. 0.2 μm . Although it may be possible to reduce the gap further, the gain in efficiency will probably not be sufficient to justify the efforts. In addition, with smaller and smaller gaps, migration may become important. The effect of migration may be useful for the study of intermediates.

The digital simulations reported here are useful for simulating current-time behavior for single microband electrodes as well as for predicting the collection efficiency of RRDE-type experiments at arrays. In future work, we hope to simulate in detail the experiments of homogeneous follow-up reactions briefly outlined in this paper.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank the following agencies for support of this research: National Science Foundation (CHE8304666), the Office of Naval Research, and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. We also thank Diane K. Smith for the sample of the quinone compound and Dr. S. W. Feldberg for his assistance and comments on the digital simulations.

REFERENCES

1. Wightman, R. M. *Anal. Chem.* 1981, 53, 1125A and references therein.
2. Bond, A.M.; Fleischmann, M.; Robinson, J. J. *Electroanal. Chem.* 1984, 168, 299.
3. Bond, A.M.; Fleischmann, M.; Robinson, J. J. *Electroanal. Chem.* 1984, 172, 11.
4. Bindra, P.; Brown, A.P.; Fleischmann, M.; Pletcher, D. J. *Electroanal. Chem.* 1975, 58, 31.
5. Mallouk, T.E.; Cammarata, V.C.; Crayston, J.A.; Wrighton, M.S. *J. Phys. Chem.*, submitted.
6. White, H.S.; Kittlesen, G.P.; Wrighton, M.S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1984, 106, 5375.
7. Kittlesen, G.P.; White, H.S.; Wrighton, M.S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1984, 106, 7389.
8. Paul, E.W.; Ricco, A.J.; Wrighton, M.S. *J. Phys. Chem.* 1985, 89, 1441.
9. Thormann, W.; van den Bech, P.; Bond, A. M. *Anal. Chem.*, 1985, 57, 2764.
10. Chidsey, C.E.; Feldman, B. J.; Lundgren, C.; Murray, R. W. *Anal. Chem.* 1986, 58, 601.
11. Kittlesen, G.P.; White, H.S.; Wrighton, M. S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1985, 107, 7373.
12. Kittlesen, G.P.; Wrighton, M.S. *J. Mol. Electronics*, in press.
13. Thackeray, J.W.; White, H.S.; Wrighton, M.S. *J. Phys. Chem.* 1985, 89, 5133.
14. Wrighton, M.S. *Comments Inorg. Chem.*, in press.
15. Albery, W.J.; Hitchman, M. L. In "Ring-Disk Electrodes," Clarendon

Press: Oxford, 1971.

16. Bruckenstein, S.; Miller, B. *Acc. Chem. Res.* 1977, 10, 54.
17. Bard, A. J.; Faulkner, L.R. In "Electrochemical Methods," John Wiley: New York, 1980; p. 429.
18. Fleischmann, M.; Lassere, F.; Robinson, J.; Swan, D. J. *Electroanal. Chem.* 1984, 177, 97.
19. Dayton, M.A.; Ewing, A.G.; Wightman, R.M. *Anal. Chem.* 1980, 52, 2392.
20. Miller, B; Visco, R.E. *J. Electrochem. Soc.* 1968, 115, 251.
21. Smith, D.K.; Calabrese, G.S.; Wrighton, M.S., unpublished results.
22. Calabrese, G.S.; Buchanan, R.M.; Wrighton, M.S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1982, 104, 5786.
23. Calabrese, G.S.; Buchanan, R. M.; Wrighton, M.S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1983, 105, 5594.
24. Feldberg, W.S. In "Electroanalytical Chemistry," Bard, A.J., Ed.,; Marcel Dekker: New York, 1979, vol. 3.
25. Maloy, J.T. In "Laboratory Techniques in Electroanalytical Chemistry," Kissinger, P.T., Ed., Marcel Dekker: New York, 1984.
26. Feldberg, W.S. *J. Electroanal. Chem.* 1981, 127, 1.
27. Reller, H.; Kirowa-Eisner, E.; Gileadi, E. *J. Electroanal. Chem.* 1984, 161, 247.
28. Joslin, T.; Pletcher, D. J. *Electroanal. Chem.* 1974, 49, 171.
29. Coen, S.; Cope, D. K.; Tallman, D. E. *J. Electroanal. Chem.*, submitted for publication.
30. Kovach, P.M.; Caudill, W.L.; Peters, D.G.; Wightman, R.M. *J. Electroanal. Chem.* 1982, 185, 285.
31. Shigehara, K.; Anson, F.C. *J. Phys. Chem.* 1982, 86, 2775.
32. Bruckenstein, S.B.; Feldman, G.A. *J. Electroanal. Chem.* 1965, 9,

395.

33. Kobayashi, N.; Fujihara, M.; Osa, T.; Kuwana, T. *Bull. Chem. Soc. Japan* 1980, 53, 2195.
34. Forshey, P.A.; Kuwana, T. *Inorg. Chem.* 1983, 22, 699.
35. Oldham, K. B. *J. Electroanal. Chem.* 1981, 122, 1

Table I Comparison of collection efficiencies for various electrode sizes

| Electrode width (a) μm | ϕ (b) |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| 1.0 | 0.85 |
| 1.7 | 0.87 |
| 2.0 | 0.87 |
| 3.3 | 0.88 |

(a) For $W_G = W_C$; $W_{\text{GAP}} = 1 \mu\text{m}$

(b) ϕ calculated at $\log \theta_{\text{GAP}} = 4.3$ corresponding to $D = 7.1 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$,
 $t = 7 \text{ sec}$.

Table A1 Grid parameters for the digital simulation

J-direction (perpendicular to the electrodes)

N-direction (parallel to the electrodes)

| Limits | Element Width | Inner Boundary | Outer Boundary | Concentration |
|---------------------|--|--|---|---|
| (a) | | | | |
| All J | $\Delta y(J) = \Delta y \exp[\beta(J-1)]$ | $y'(J) = \frac{\Delta y \exp[\beta(J-1)]-1}{\exp[\beta]-1}$ | $y''(J) = \frac{\Delta y \exp[\beta J]-1}{\exp[\beta]-1}$ | $\bar{y}(J) = \frac{\Delta y \exp[\beta(J-\frac{1}{2})]-1}{\exp[\beta]-1}$ |
| (b) | | | | |
| $N1 \leq N \leq N4$ | $\Delta x(N) = \Delta x$ | $x'(N) = (N-1)\Delta x$ | $x''(N) = N\Delta x$ | $\bar{x}(N) = (N-\frac{1}{2})\Delta x$ |
| $N > N4$ (b,c) | $\Delta x(N) = \Delta x \exp[\beta(N-N4-1)]$ | $x'(N) = \frac{\Delta x \exp[\beta(N-N4-1)]-1}{\exp[\beta]-1}$ | $x''(N) = \frac{\Delta x \exp[\beta(N-N4)]-1}{\exp[\beta]-1}$ | $\bar{x}(N) = \frac{\Delta x \exp[\beta(N-N4-\frac{1}{2})]-1}{\exp[\beta]-1}$ |

(a) $\Delta x = \Delta y$ in all cases

(b) N4 is the last uniform element corresponding to the electrode edge.

(c) For the grid in Figure 1B, these equations were further modified to account for the expanding grid to the left of the generator electrode, $N < N1$, where N1 is the first uniform element of the electrode surface.

Table A2 Summary of simulation diffusion constants

| Limits (a) | Inner Boundary | Outer Boundary |
|-----------------|---|---|
| $J \geq 2$ | $D'(J) = \frac{D_M}{\exp[2\beta(J-5/4)]}$ | $D''(J) = \frac{D_M}{\exp[2\beta(J-3/4)]}$ |
| $J = 1$ | $D'(1) = D_M \frac{\exp[\beta] - 1}{\exp[\beta/2] - 1}$ | $D''(1) = \frac{D_M}{\exp[2\beta(J-3/4)]}$ |
| $N < N4(b,c)$ | D_M | D_M |
| $N > N4+1(b,c)$ | $D'(N) = \frac{D_M}{\exp[2\beta(N-N4-5/4)]}$ | $D''(N) = \frac{D_M}{\exp[2\beta(N-N4-3/4)]}$ |
| $N = N4+1(b,c)$ | D_M | $D''(N) = \frac{D_M}{\exp[2\beta(N-N4-3/4)]}$ |

(a) In all cases $\Delta x = \Delta y$.

(b) $N4$ corresponds to the last element of the electrode surface.

(c) For the grid in Fig. 1B, the equations were modified to account for the grid expanding to the left of electrode A, i.e., for $N < N1$.

Table 11 Simulation of Effects of Feedback and Shielding^a

| Gap Width μm | Electrode Width μm | Normalized Currents | | | | | | | | | Shielding Factor | Feedback Factor |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|-------------|------------------|-------|-------------|-----------|-------|-----------|------------------|-----------------|
| | | With Feedback | | | Without Feedback | | | Shielding | | | | |
| Generator | Collector | Z_G | Z_C | ϕ_{ss} | $Z_{G,0}$ | Z_C | ϕ_{ss} | Z_G | Z_C | Z_{tot} | | |
| 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.09 | 0.87 | 0.80 | 0.50 | 0.40 | 0.80 | 0.22 | 0.42 | 0.64 | 0.54 | |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.14 | 0.97 | 0.85 | 0.50 | 0.43 | 0.85 | 0.18 | 0.50 | 0.68 | 0.56 | |
| 1.0 | 6.0 | 1.20 | 1.13 | 0.94 | 0.50 | 0.47 | 0.94 | 0.07 | 0.83 | 0.90 | 0.58 | |
| 2.7 | 1.0 | 0.88 | 0.67 | 0.77 | 0.50 | 0.39 | 0.77 | | | | 0.43 | |
| 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.37 | 1.21 | 0.88 | 0.50 | 0.44 | 0.88 | | | | 0.64 | |

Z_G are normalized generator and collector electrode currents, respectively, ϕ_{ss} is the quasi-steady-state collection efficiency (eq. 3); the shielding and feedback factors are defined in eqs. (6) and (7), respectively. For a single generator and two flanking collector electrodes.

Table III Distance Dependence of Observed Collection Efficiency Using One Generator Electrode and Two Symmetrically Disposed Collector Electrodes ^a

| Generator Electrode Current (nA) | | Collector Electrodes Current (nA) | | Separation ^b (μm) | Collection Efficiency (%) |
|-------------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|------|--|---------------------------------|
| #4 | 36.8 | #3,5 | 30.4 | 1.0 | 83 |
| #4 | 25.6 | #2,6 | 17.2 | 4.7 | 67 |
| #4 | 22.8 | #1,7 | 12.8 | 8.3 | 56 |

a Mean values determined from several different lightly platinized microelectrode arrays. Errors: separation (SEM photographs) $\pm 0.1 \mu\text{m}$; collection efficiencies $\pm 3\%$.

b Separation between generator and collector nearest edges.

Table IV Distance Dependence of Observed Collection Efficiency for a Generator-Single Collector Electrode Pair.

| Generator Electrode Current (nA) | | Collector Electrode Current (nA) | | Separation ^a (μm) | Collection ^b Efficiency (%) |
|----------------------------------|------|----------------------------------|------|------------------------------|--|
| #1 | 32.0 | #2 | 24.0 | 1.0 | 58 |
| #1 | 24.0 | #3 | 10.0 | 4.7 | 42 |
| #1 | 22.0 | #4 | 7.5 | 8.3 | 34 |
| #1 | 21.5 | #5 | 6.0 | 11.9 | 28 |
| #1 | 21.0 | #6 | 5.0 | 15.5 | 24 |
| #1 | 20.5 | #7 | 4.5 | 19.1 | 22 |
| #1 | 20.5 | #8 | 4.0 | 22.7 | 20 |

a Separation between nearest edges of a single generator and a single collector electrode ($\pm 0.1 \mu\text{m}$).

b The standard deviation in absolute collection efficiency from array to array is $\pm 4\%$. However, each array shows a smooth decrease in collection efficiency as the collector electrode is farther from the generator electrode.

Table V Observed Collection Efficiencies at Heavily-platinized Arrays.

| Electrode | Charged Passed during $\text{Pt}^{2+} \rightarrow \text{Pt}^0$ (μC) | Width of Electrode (μm) | Gap Size (μm) | Collection Efficiency (%) |
|-----------|--|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| #1 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 1.3 | 40 |
| #2 | 0.0 | 2.2 | | |
| #3 | 0.25 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 53 |
| #4 | 0.25 | 2.4 | | |
| #5 | 1.25 | 3.0 | 0.7 | 66 |
| #6 | 1.25 | 2.7 | | |
| #7 | 2.00 | 3.3 | 0.2 | 83 |
| #8 | 2.00 | 3.0 | | |

Appendix: Digital Simulation Model

The digital simulation methods follow those used previously in electrochemical problems combining the uniform^{24,25} and exponentially expanding space grids,^{26,28} Figure 1A and B. The distance in the N-direction across the electrode surface, NELE, and the interelectrode gap, NGAP, is divided by a uniform space grid while in the J-direction, perpendicular to the substrate and beyond the outer electrode edge in the parallel, N-direction, the grid expands exponentially. Each part of the problem will be treated separately beginning with the expanding portions of the simulation. The mathematical treatment generally applies to simulations of a single band and to arrays of band electrodes.

The development of the equations describing the expanding grid elements follows that in Ref. 26. The width of the expanding box, $\Delta y(J)$ is given by eq. (A1) which reduces to the uniform grid size

$$\Delta y(J) = \Delta y \exp [\beta (J-1)] \quad (A1)$$

when $\beta=0$. β is the exponential grid factor and $\beta=0.5$ ²⁶ for all expanding portions of the grid. The outer boundary of the box is at $y''(J)$, eq. (A2), while the inner boundary is at $y'(J)$, eq. (A3).

$$y''(J) = \Delta y(\exp[\beta J] - 1)/(\exp[\beta] - 1) \quad (A2)$$

$$y'(J) = \Delta y(\exp[\beta(J-1)] - 1)/(\exp[\beta] - 1) \quad (A3)$$

The concentration within each expanded volume element is taken at the position given in eq. (A4). In the limit as $\beta \rightarrow 0$, eqs. (A2) - (A4) reduce to

$$\bar{y}(J) = \Delta y (\exp[\beta(J-1/2)] - 1) / (\exp[\beta] - 1) \quad (A4)$$

those for a uniform grid where the concentration is taken at the midpoint of each box. A summary of the grid parameters is presented in Table A1.

The finite difference form of Fick's second law, eq. (A5), in two

$$\partial C / \partial t = D [(\partial^2 C / \partial x^2) + (\partial^2 C / \partial y^2)] \quad (A5)$$

dimensions is given by eq. (A6) and can be used to calculate the

$$\frac{C(x,y,t+\Delta t) - C(x,y,t)}{\Delta t} = D \left[\frac{(C(x+\Delta x,y,t) - C(x,y,t)) / \Delta \bar{x}^2 - (C(x,y,t) - C(x-\Delta x,y,t)) / \Delta \bar{x}^2}{\Delta \bar{x}^2} + \frac{(C(x,y+\Delta y,t) - C(x,y,t)) / \Delta \bar{y}^2 - (C(x,y,t) - C(x,y-\Delta y,t)) / \Delta \bar{y}^2}{\Delta \bar{y}^2} \right] \quad (A6)$$

change in concentration due to diffusion in a uniform space grid where $\Delta x = \Delta y$ for all N and J. The diffusion coefficient, D, the time increment, Δt , and the space increment, Δx , can be gathered into dimensionless simulation diffusion constant, D_m , eq. (A7)

$$D_m = D \Delta t / \Delta x^2 = D \Delta t / \Delta y^2 \leq 0.25 \quad (A7)$$

For our simulations, we assume that $D_{ox} = D_{red}$ and a value of $D_m = 0.24$ is used throughout.

The flux, f , in each of the volume elements is calculated by substituting the values of $\Delta x(N)$, $\Delta y(J)$, $\bar{x}(N)$, and $\bar{y}(J)$ from Table A1 into eq. (A6) which results in eq. (A8).

$f =$

$$D \Delta t / \Delta y(J) \left[[C(N,J+1) - C(N,J)] / [\bar{y}(J+1) - \bar{y}(J)] - [C(N,J) - C(N,J-1)] / [\bar{y}(J) - \bar{y}(J-1)] \right] +$$

$$D \Delta t / \Delta x(N) \left[[C(N+1,J) - C(N,J)] / [\bar{x}(N+1) - \bar{x}(N)] - [C(N,J) - C(N-1,J)] / [\bar{x}(N) - \bar{x}(N-1)] \right]$$

$$\bar{x}(N-1), \text{ for } N, J \geq 2]] \quad (A8)$$

The flux equation, eq. (A8) can be simplified by redefining the dimensionless diffusion constant taking into account the modified boundaries so that now the simulation diffusion coefficients are a function of distance. At the outer boundary, $y''(J)$, of the expanded elements, $D''(J)$ is given by eq. (A9), while eq. (A10) is the expression for the diffusion constant

$$D''(J) = D_M / \exp[2B(J-3/4)] \quad (A9)$$

at the inner boundary.

$$D'(J) = D_M / \exp[2B(J-5/4)], J \geq 2 \quad (A10)$$

A summary of the diffusion constants is presented in Table A2.

To calculate the current, the flux at the electrode surface must be calculated. The electrode width, W , is divided by the number of boxes corresponding to the electrode, $NELE$, such that eq. (A11) holds.

$$\Delta x = \Delta y = W/NELE \quad (A11)$$

During a simulation time iteration, K , the flux in each of the $NELE$ boxes representing the electrode is calculated and the individual fluxes, $f_K(N)$, are then summed to yield the total flux, f_K . The average flux in the box N at the electrode is given by eq. (A12).

$$f_K(N) = D'(1)(C(N,1) - C(N,0)) \quad (A12)$$

Since eq. (A12) is the average flux during the time increment, K , the flux at $t=K\Delta t$ is given by the average of the fluxes, $f_K(N) + f_{K+1}(N)$ and the total dimensionless flux, F_K , is calculated by eq. (A13)

$$F_K = \sum_{N=1}^{NELE} (f_K(N) + f_{K+1}(N)) / (2 \cdot D_m) \quad (A13)$$

The total flux, F_K , is related to the corresponding dimensionless current, $Z(K)$, by eq. (A14)

$$F_K = i/nFDC1 = Z(K) \quad (A14)$$

$Z(K)$ can be expressed for various time domains which depend on the dimensionless parameter θ defined in eq. (A15)

$$\theta = 4Dt/W^2 = 4 D_m K / (NELE)^2 \quad (A15)$$

In eq. (A15) D is the real diffusion coefficient (cm^2/s), t is the real time in (s), W is the electrode width (cm), while D_m , K , and $NELE$ are the corresponding dimensionless simulation parameters. As shown by Tallman et al.,²⁹ in the limit of long times, $\log \theta > \text{ca. } 2.5$, the total dimensionless flux is given by eq. (A16)

$$Z(K) = i/nFDC1 = 5.553/\ln\theta - 6.791/(\ln\theta)^2 \quad (A16)$$

For short times, i.e., $\log \theta < \text{ca. } 1.0$, the flux can be calculated by eq. (A17) (see Figure 2)^{29,35}

$$Z(K) = i/nFDC1 = 2/(\pi\theta)^{1/2} + 1 \quad (A17)$$

where eq. (A16) derives from the long time expression for the current at a hemicylinder³⁰ and eq. (A17) follows from eq. (40) in Ref. 35.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1 (A) The two dimensional space grid used for the simulation of the three microelectrode array. The grid begins expanding after element N4, the last uniform element in the N-direction. The grid expands also from the substrate in the J-direction. The axis of symmetry through electrode A permits the simulation of one half of the array. (B) The space grid used for the simulation of 2-electrode pairs. To the right of N4 and in the J-direction, the grid is the same as A. However, to the left of N1, the grid also expands exponentially.

Figure 2 The normalized current, $1/nFDCI$ vs. $\log(4Dt/W^2)$. The solid line is the theoretical curve calculated in Ref. 29. The dashed curve (---) is the theoretical Cottrell behavior. Curve (a) was calculated by eq. (A17) and curve (b) by eq. (A16). The circles are simulated results.

Figure 3 The collection efficiency, ϕ_{ss} , as a function of the interelectrode gap for a single generator, and a pair of flanking collector electrodes ($W_G=W_C=1 \mu m$). Squares are experimental points (part II). The circles are simulation results at the same value of $\log \theta = 4$ as the experimental points. Triangles are theoretical values calculated by eq. (4).

Figure 4 Collection efficiency, ϕ_{ss} , vs. the collector electrode width. The simulated collector widths were varied from 0.5 to 6 μm (circles) while the experimental widths were varied from 1 to 3.5 μm (squares) for the single generator, double collector electrode configuration. $W_G=1 \mu m$, $W_{GAP}=1 \mu m$, $\log \theta = 4$.

- Figure 5 Collection efficiency, ϕ_{ss} , as a function of gap width for the generator—single collector pair. Simulated results (circles) correspond to gap widths of 1 to 15.5 μm while experimental results (squares) are for gaps of 0.5 to 22.7 μm . Theoretical results (triangles) were calculated by eq. (5) for $D=7.1 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$, $t=3.5 \text{ s}$, $W_G=1 \mu\text{m}$.
- Figure 6 Cyclic voltammetry, 50 mV/s, of an array of eight microelectrodes in a 0.1 mM LiCl solution containing 5 mM $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6^{3+}$.
- Figure 7 Generation/collection experiment in 5 mM $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6\text{Cl}_3$ in 0.1 M aq. LiNO_3 as a function of the number of collector electrodes. Microelectrode no. 4 was the generator electrode in each case. The potential of the generator electrode was swept between +0.4 and -0.7 V vs. SCE at 10 mV/s while the potential of the collector electrodes was held at +0.1 V vs. SCE. Collector electrodes: (a) single adjacent electrode no. 5; (b) microelectrodes no. 3 and no. 5; (c) electrodes nos. 1-3 and nos. 5-8.
- Figure 8 Generation/collection experiment in 5 mM $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6\text{Cl}_3$ in 0.1 M aq. NaNO_3 using a central generator microelectrode no. 4 and symmetrical pairs of collector electrodes. (L-R: nos. 3,5; nos. 2,6; nos. 1,7).
- Figure 9 Generation/collection experiment in 5 mM $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6\text{Cl}_3$ in 0.1 M aq. KCl as a function of distance between collector and generator electrode. Electrodes nos. 2, 4, and 8 were used as collector electrodes.
- Figure 10 Generation/collection cyclic voltammetry at a series of heavily platinized electrodes of 5 mM $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6\text{Cl}_3$ in 0.1 M aq. NaNO_3 . Electrode geometries are presented in Table II. Dashed curves - collectors at open circuit.
- Figure 11 Slow scan rate cyclic voltammetry in 5 mM $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6\text{Cl}_3$ in 0.1 M aq. LiNO_3 at one, two adjacent, four adjacent, and eight adjacent electrodes.
- Figure 12 Slow scan rate cyclic voltammetry in 5 mM $\text{Ru}(\text{NH}_3)_6\text{Cl}_3$ in 0.1 M aq. LiNO_3 at adjacent vs. interspaced electrodes.
- Figure 13 Generation/collection curves at Au electrodes for the reduction of 5 mM

Fig. 1A




Fig. 18




Fig. 2




Fig. 3





Fig. 4






Fig. 5

Fig. 6




Fig. 7




Fig. 8




Fig. 9




Fig. 10




Fig. 11




Fig. 12





Fig. 13



TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, GEN

| | <u>No. Copies</u> | | <u>No. Copies</u> |
|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Office of Naval Research Attn: Code 413 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217 | 2 | Dr. David Young Code 334 NORDA NSTL, Mississippi 39529 | 1 |
| Dr. Bernard Douda Naval Weapons Support Center Code 5042 Crane, Indiana 47522 | 1 | Naval Weapons Center Attn: Dr. Ron Atkins Chemistry Division China Lake, California 93555 | 1 |
| Commander, Naval Air Systems Command Attn: Code 310C (H. Rosenwasser) Washington, D.C. 20360 | 1 | Scientific Advisor Commandant of the Marine Corps Code RD-1 Washington, D.C. 20380 | 1 |
| Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory Attn: Dr. R. W. Drisko Port Hueneme, California 93401 | 1 | U.S. Army Research Office Attn: CRD-AA-IP P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709 | 1 |
| Defense Technical Information Center Building 5, Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314 | 12 | Mr. John Boyle Materials Branch Naval Ship Engineering Center Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112 | 1 |
| DTNSRDC Attn: Dr. G. Bosmajian Applied Chemistry Division Annapolis, Maryland 21401 | 1 | Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Dr. S. Yamamoto Marine Sciences Division San Diego, California 91232 | 1 |
| Dr. William Tolles Superintendent Chemistry Division, Code 6100 Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D.C. 20375 | 1 | | |

