Hybrid Self-Assembly during Evaporation Enables Drop-on-Demand Thin Film Devices
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ABSTRACT: We propose and demonstrate a hybrid self-assembly process as the mechanism for producing strikingly uniform deposits from evaporating drops composed of cosolvents. This assembly process leverages both particle–fluid interactions to carry the particles to the drop surface and particle–interface interactions to assemble the particles into a uniform film. We anchor our results in a cosolvent evaporation model that agrees with our experimental observations. We further employ the process to produce thin film devices such as flexible broadband neutral density filters and semitransparent mirrors. Our observations suggest that this assembly process is free of particle–substrate interactions, which indicates that the results should be transferable across a multitude of material/substrate systems.
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As a drop of liquid evaporates on a solid surface, the particles within form a deposit. Due to the myriad of physical and chemical processes involved during evaporation, the structure of this deposit can vary greatly, ranging from simple ring formations like those seen in coffee drops,1 to more complex morphologies such as fractal patterns.2,3 Of these possible outcomes, a strikingly uniform deposit may be formed by mixing together two cosolvents.4,5 Although common wherever there are solvent mixtures (e.g., most kitchens, dining rooms, or pubs), these deposits also show great potential for industrial applications, as they may provide simpler, faster, and less costly ways to manufacture thin film devices compared to conventional methods.6–9 By appropriately tuning design parameters, co-solvent-based deposits could also be used to produce conformal monolayer coatings on three-dimensional surfaces or extremely fine hole patterns. Here we ascribe the uniform deposits associated with cosolvents to a hybrid self-assembly process. The cosolvent drop segregates during evaporation, resulting in an elevated concentration of higher vapor pressure solvent at the drop surface.10 Consequently, the particles, miscible only in the higher vapor pressure solvent, are carried toward the drop surface. Once at the drop surface, the particles self-assemble due to attractive particle–interface interactions.11,12 Real-time observations during evaporation reveal the mechanisms of this self-assembly process. The observed drop profile kinetics agree well with our evaporation model for cosolvent drops. We also show that film uniformity depends on an optimal initial particle concentration, below which results in voids and above which exhibits a coffee ring formation. Moreover, this technique is used to produce thin film devices such as flexible broadband neutral density filters and semitransparent mirrors. This hybrid self-assembly approach requires no particle–substrate interactions, is scalable, robust, and transferable. In essence, this work reveals the mechanism for co-solvent-based uniform deposits and demonstrates applications for drop-based fabrication of thin film devices.

This paper describes a process that is applicable to any cosolvent system where the dispersed particles (or nonvolatile material, in general) are miscible only in the solvent with a higher vapor pressure. However, the scope of this study is focused specifically on a system composed of an ethanol/water cosolvent mixture, which has been well-studied10,13–15 and thiol-capped Ga–In nanoparticles (see Figure 1a), a recently characterized class of nanoparticles.16,17 The process is transferable to any substrate on which there is contact line pinning throughout evaporation; however, for this study we focus our results on polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) substrates. We found substantially varying deposit outcomes with other control groups (see Supporting Information Figures S1 and S2). Single-solvent (ethanol only) drops exhibited various particle size-dependent structures, including distributed clumps for large particles (268 ± 51 nm), highly pronounced coffee rings for medium particles (110 ± 22 nm), or less pronounced
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outer coffee rings with interior fractal-like deposits for small particles (84 ± 18 nm). We note that fractal patterns were observed at the contact line for single-drops containing all particle sizes (see Figure S1). With the inclusion of a lower vapor pressure solvent (water in this case), the resulting deposit structures became strikingly uniform, ranging from thick, in the cases where the contact line becomes depinned early during the evaporation process (see Figure S2), to extremely thin, when the contact line remains pinned throughout evaporation. This study focuses on the latter case.

The direction of the Marangoni flow can be deduced by considering the influence of gradients in temperature, ethanol concentration, and nanoparticle concentration on surface tension gradients. A detailed discussion and relevant calculations are included in Section 1 of the Supporting Information; however, we include a brief overview here. The Marangoni flow may be either thermally driven or concentration driven, where the dominant case dictates the direction of the internal droplet flow. The mismatch in thermal conductivities between the substrate and the liquid indicates a Marangoni flow from the top of the drop to the bottom along the liquid−air interface and from the contact line toward the center of the drop along the liquid−solid interface (opposite of what is depicted in Figure 1) and a corresponding thermal Marangoni number, $Ma_T = 5.18 \times 10^3$. On the other hand, given the higher evaporation rate of ethanol compared to water, it is expected that there will be an elevated concentration of ethanol at the contact line where the flux is the highest. Because ethanol also has a lower surface tension, this results in a concentration driven surface tension gradient opposing the thermally driven gradient and a flow opposing the one brought about by thermal gradients (in the same direction as that depicted in Figure 1). The magnitude of the concentration driven Marangoni number associated with the gradients in ethanol concentration is $Ma_C = 1.53 \times 10^7$, which is 4 orders of magnitude larger than $Ma_T$ and therefore dominates the direction of the flow. Moreover, the influence of the nanoparticles can further contribute to this flow in two
ways. First, the areas of the drop surface that are densely packed with nanoparticles (initially at the contact line) will exhibit a lower surface tension compared to areas that are particle free (see Figure S3), resulting in a surface flow from the edge of the drop to its center along the liquid−air interface. Second, the nanoparticles can be viewed effectively as surface contaminants, which can further reduce \( M_{RT} \) by as much as 2 orders of magnitude,\(^{19}\) thus increasing the relative dominance of the concentration driven flow.

The monolayer growth at the drop surface continues throughout the evaporation process until the higher vapor pressure solvent has completely evaporated and all of the particles have reached the interface (Figure 1c). During the final stages of the evaporation process, the contact line of the evaporating fluid depins, allowing for the assembled sheet of nanoparticles to collapse onto the substrate (Figure 1d). These observations suggest a process qualitatively different from previously reported methods for producing uniform films from evaporating drops, which solely employ interparticle capillary interactions,\(^{20}\) particle−interface interactions,\(^{21}\) or fluid−particle interactions.\(^{19,22}\) Instead, this assembly process appears to be a hybrid case wherein particle−fluid interactions carry the particles to the boundary, followed by particle−interface interactions that assemble the particles into a sheet at the surface of the drop. Moreover, we observed sheet fracturing (see S1, 0:27−0:35) in drops with low particle loading and sheet buckling (see S2, 1:18−1:53) in drops with high particle loading, similar to that seen in evaporating drops containing latex particles.\(^ {23}\) This observed mechanical behavior of the sheet (i.e., fracturing of sheets in tension associated with drops with low particle loading and buckling of sheets in compression

Figure 2. Evaporation process. (a) Profile images of sessile drops with various particle concentrations at different times (beginning, middle, end) during the evaporation process. Vertical dashed lines are used to highlight that the drops remain pinned (i.e., constant contact radius) throughout this process. Concentrations are given in grams/liter (g/L). Scale bars are 150 μm in length. (b−e) Kinetics of drop geometry during evaporation, including (b) contact angle, (c) volume, (d) dimensionless contact angle plotted with respect to time normalized by drop size and initial contact angle, and (e) dimensionless volume with respect to time normalized by drop size and initial contact angle. Vertically oriented dashed lines mark the total evaporation time for each experiment. The theory curves were generated based on observed initial conditions for the 0 g/L drop experiment (see Section 2 of SI). For reference, the particles for the deposits in this figure had a mean size of 268 nm with a standard deviation of 51 nm (see Experimental Section and Figure S4).
Experimental Section and Figure S4). When the drop is in contact with a substrate, the evaporation process can be modeled as quasi-steady state, where liquid vapor equilibrium applies (see Sections 2.1–2.3 of SI for a more detailed discussion on how the evaporation process is modeled). In contrast to previous studies on evaporating drops of ethanol with contact angles that are less than 45°,25 which is applicable to our system. After accounting for differences in drop size and shape, the dynamics appear to behave in accordance with that predicted from our mixture evaporation theory, indicating that particle concentration has little effect on the evolution of the drop profile during evaporation throughout a majority of the drop lifetime. Moreover, the low model errors (<5%) in the normalized total evaporation time for low particle concentrations (<15.0 g L⁻¹ or <2.38 × 10¹⁴ particles L⁻¹) also indicate a good model fit toward the end of the evaporation process. However, there is a relatively large discrepancy (≈17% model error) for the high particle concentration (15.0 g L⁻¹ or 2.38 × 10¹⁴ particles L⁻¹ or 0.24 vol %). This indicates that the model is valid over a reasonable range of concentrations (≤10.7 g L⁻¹ or ≤1.70 × 10¹⁴ particles L⁻¹ or ≤0.17 vol %), but should be augmented to account for the effects of the particles at high concentrations (≥15.0 g L⁻¹ or ≥2.38 × 10¹⁴ particles L⁻¹ or ≥0.24 vol %).

Figure 3. Tuning particle concentration eliminates coffee ring. (a) Optical micrographs (left) of deposits left behind (scale bars are 150 μm in length) with corresponding detail confocal intensity micrographs (right) of the deposit edge (scale bars are 10 μm in length). (b) Corresponding profiles at edge of deposits. Solid lines represent average profile. Lighter shaded regions represent one standard deviation (n = 5) above and below the average profile. For reference, the particles for the deposits in this figure had a mean size of 268 nm with a standard deviation of 51 nm (See Experimental Section and Figure S4).

Figure 3 shows profile images of cosolvent sessile drops with various particle concentrations throughout the evaporation process. As evident from Figure 3, the evaporation dynamics initially favor that of pure ethanol despite the fact that the initial concentration of water is much larger (initial mole fractions of water and ethanol within the drop are x_w ≈ 0.87 and x_e ≈ 0.13, respectively), which supports the previous experimental observation that the drop rapidly segregates during evaporation into an outer ethanol shell and a water enriched core.10 The evaporation process can be modeled as quasi-steady state, where liquid vapor equilibrium applies (see Sections 2.1–2.3 of SI for a more detailed discussion on how the evaporation process is modeled). In contrast to previous studies on evaporating drops of ethanol–water mixtures,10 our model accounts for the azeotropic effect (see Section 2.4 of SI). As seen in Figure S5, the vapor mole fraction of ethanol just above the drop surface, y_v, is significantly larger than the liquid mole fraction of ethanol within the drop (e.g., initially for this study x_e ≈ 0.13 and y_e ≈ 0.49). To maintain this condition, an excess of ethanol must be present at the interface. Moreover, the larger evaporation rate of ethanol during this process (see Figure S6b) amplifies the transport of the ethanol to the surface. Because it is known that the thiol-capped nanoparticles form stable colloidal suspensions in ethanol,16,17 and are also hydrophobic24 (see also Figure S3), they migrate to the drop surface via the evaporating ethanol due to fluid–particle interactions, completing the first part of the assembly process. Once at the interface between the water enriched core and the ethanol shell, it is expected that the nanoparticles assemble due to particle–interface interactions,11,12 thereby concluding the second phase of the hybrid self-assembly process.

We also examine the effects of particle concentration on the evaporation process (note that nanoparticle concentrations here are reported per volume of total solution). Figure 3 shows that the drops remained pinned throughout most of the evaporation process, regardless of particle loading (see also Figure S7). Moreover, Figure 2b shows similar initial contact angles among all concentrations, indicating that the wetting behavior is dominated by the interaction between the solvent mixture and the substrate. Normalizing the data from Figure 2b,c to account for differences in drop size and shape (see Section 2.5 of SI for normalization description) enables comparisons between our cosolvent evaporation model and drops of various particle loadings. These normalization results are shown in Figure 2d,e. Note that this normalization is applicable for evaporating drops with contact angles that are less than 45°, which is applicable to our system. After accounting for differences in drop size and shape, the dynamics appear to behave in accordance with that predicted from our mixture evaporation theory, indicating that particle concentration has little effect on the evolution of the drop profile during evaporation throughout a majority of the drop lifetime.
Figure 3 summarizes the influence of initial particle concentration on the final morphology of the deposit. Deposits with high initial concentrations (15.0 g·L⁻¹ or 2.38 × 10¹⁴ particles·L⁻¹) exhibit a dense accumulation of particles at the boundary (i.e., a large coffee ring), with a uniform deposit at the interior of the drop. Note the presence of cracks in the coffee ring of the high concentration deposit, indicative of high particle loading in dry colloidal deposits. As evident from Figure 3, reducing the initial concentration results in thinner thickness of the uniform interior of the deposit as well as a size decrease of the coffee ring, with a complete elimination corresponding to concentrations <8.8 g·L⁻¹ (1.40 × 10¹⁴ particles·L⁻¹). Small voids in the deposit at the smallest initial concentration (7.3 g·L⁻¹ or 1.16 × 10¹⁴ particles·L⁻¹) suggest that the optimal initial concentration that will result in a uniform monolayer deposit lies between 7.3 and 8.8 g·L⁻¹. This range can be transformed to the number of particles in a drop (n) under the spherical cap approximation (see Section 2.1 of SI for validation of this approximation) via 

\[ n = 2cR^2(1 + \cos(\theta_0))^2(2 + \cos(\theta_0))/2d^3\rho \sin^3(\theta_0) \]

where c is the initial mass concentration of particles, R is the areal contact radius of the deposit, \( \theta_0 \) is the contact angle of the drop at the onset of evaporation, d is the particle size, and \( \rho \) is the mass density of the particle. Substituting in appropriate values for these experiments: 7.3 g·L⁻¹ < c < 8.8 g·L⁻¹, R ≈ 1.2 mm, \( \theta_0 \approx 25° \), \( \rho = 6250 \text{ kg·m}^{-3} \), and d = 268 nm (the particle size used for the study in Figure 3), results in an optimal number of particles in a drop to be between 7.1×10⁷ and 8.5×10⁷.

Figure 4. Application to thin film optics. (a−b) Qualitative examples demonstrating use of deposits as thin film devices. (a) Filters, where the deposit reduces the amount of light transmitted through (left) a close-up image of Einstein and (right) a close-up image of a Purdue “P”. (b) Mirrors, where the deposit reflects light incident on (left) an image of an array of Einsteins and (right) an image of an array of Purdue “Ps”. Deposits are approximately 2 mm in diameter. (c) Representative SEM image of deposit morphology for the 84 ± 18 nm samples used in panels a and b (scale bar is 500 nm in length). (d−g) Spectrophotometry data for samples of various particle size including (d) absorbance, (e) transmittance, (f) reflectance, and (g) specular reflectance normalized by total reflectance.
assemble by particle diffusion is found to be smaller than the time scale for the particles to reach the drop surface due to evaporation (see Section 3 of the SI), indicating that the likely arrangement of the particles at the surface is hexagonal packing. Therefore, the theoretically estimated number of particles per drop to produce uniform monolayer deposits is $n_{\text{optimal}} = 7.3 \times 10^9$ (corresponding to an optimal concentration of $c_{\text{optimal}} = 7.5 \text{ g L}^{-1}$), which indeed falls within our observed range. This demonstrates a process for determining appropriate particle concentrations for uniform monolayer deposits in cosolvent formulations.

On the other hand, these results also indicate that exceeding the appropriate concentration range will result in the formation of a coffee ring at the contact line and an increase in thickness over the uniform interior of the deposit, which is expected due to the nature of monolayer growth during evaporation. Once a monolayer is achieved during evaporation, any particles remaining within the drop will begin to form multilayer structures as they move to the surface and collide with particles within the formed monolayer. The likelihood for collisions is largest at the edge of the drop because this is where the radial velocity is highest, resulting in the presence of coffee ring deposits for $c > c_{\text{optimal}}$ as shown in Figure 3. Note the appearance of gray spots in the optical micrographs of Figure 3a for $c > c_{\text{optimal}}$. These gray spots in the optical microscope images of the deposits are a result of differences in light scattering, indicating differences in local film thickness (lower local thicknesses in the gray areas). We suspect that this is a result of multiple layers being formed throughout areas of surface while the first layer is still being formed in others.

Experiments were conducted to demonstrate application of this self-assembly process to the fabrication of high performance drop-on-demand thin film optical devices, summarized in Figure 4. Figure 4a,b qualitatively highlights drop-deposited devices such as filters and mirrors. The representative scanning electron micrograph in Figure 4c reveals that these deposits are uniform and densely packed throughout. Figure 4d–g shows the measured optical results for self-assembled deposits of various nanoparticle size. The larger particles will produce thicker samples, resulting in an increased absorbance, as seen in Figure 4d. This gives rise to the reverse effect for the transmittance (see Figure 4e). The absorbance and transmittance spectra also flatten with increased particle size. This may be due to the increased size heterogeneity with respect to particle size (see Figure S4), allowing for cancellation of resonance peaks associated with different sized particles within the sample. Most notable of this effect is the flat transmission response (13% ± 2%) associated with the largest particle ($d = 268 \text{ nm}$) monolayer deposits over the entire sample range (300–820 nm), which demonstrates an application of these deposits as a broadband neutral density filter. As shown in Figure 4f,g, the samples are also inherently reflective given their metallic composition. The decrease in particle size gives rise to smoother deposits. As the deposits become smoother, their total and specular reflectances increase, resulting in the trend we see here. Regarding application, as shown in Figure 4g, the high specular reflectance response (>80%) associated with the small particle ($d = 84 \text{ nm}$) deposits shows promise for use as a mirror, especially for wavelengths in the visible–near-infrared range. These results are remarkable considering the flexing and stretching experienced by the samples during optical measurement preparation (see Experimental Section).

Our experiments have revealed that uniform deposits from evaporating cosolvent drops are created by a hybrid of two self-assembly mechanisms: (1) fluid–particle interactions, where the nanoparticles are carried to the drop surface by the higher vapor pressure solvent, followed by (2) particle–interface interactions once the particles reach the interface of the phase-segregated drop. As observed, this assembly process occurs at the surface of the drop, indicating independence of this mechanism with respect to substrate. The cosolvent evaporation model we have developed accurately describes the drop profile kinetics and could be used for future design of cosolvent-based functional inks. The agreement of the size and shape normalized data and model show scalability of this process. Our results also show a simple means for designing particle concentrations to produce uniform monolayers. Moreover, we demonstrate the application of cosolvent formulation to high performance drop-on-demand thin film devices such as mirrors and broadband neutral density filters. Given these results, it is likely that high throughput drop deposition methods (e.g., roll-to-roll inkjet printing) will receive more attention as a viable means to fabricate thin film devices in the future.

### EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

#### Preparation of EGaInNP Dispersions.

EGaInNP dispersions were prepared by an ultrasonication method similar to previous works. All samples were prepared in 3 dram bottles (Kimble Chase). Before ultrasonication the vials were thoroughly washed with Liquinox detergent (Alconox), followed by a rinse with distilled water, followed by a rinse with ethanol to remove surface impurities. Once clean, a nominal mass of 1 g of eutectic Gallium–Indium alloy (EGaIn) (Sigma-Aldrich) was added to the vial via syringe. Masses were measured using a Ohaus Pioneer balance with 0.1 mg resolution. This was followed by the addition of 120 μL (Labnet BioPette, 1000 μL size) of 100 mM solution of 3-mercaptop-N-nonylpropionamide (1ATC9, Sigma-Aldrich). An additional 3880 μL of pure ethanol was added to achieve a final thiol concentration of 3 mM and final liquid volume of 4 mL. Once the sample was prepared, the liquid metal was dispersed into the solvent using a Qsonica Q700 probe ultrasonicator fitted with a 1/16 in microtip. The vial with EGaIn and solvent was contained in a water bath to prevent overheating and evaporation of the sample. The sample was sonicated for 1 h at an amplitude of 30%. After sonication, samples were either further processed via centrifugation or placed in a −35 °C freezer for later processing.

Differential centrifugation was used to separate particles of various sizes. The process is as follows. Sonicated samples were distributed evenly into 1.5 mL polypropylene centrifuge tubes, lightly bath-sonicated (Branson 1800) in isopropyl alcohol (Macron Fine Chemicals) for approximately 20 s, and placed in a refrigerator at approximately 10 °C for several minutes to allow the samples to reach below the melting point of the bulk alloy. The samples were then rinsed of any free thiol by centrifugation (ReySpin RS-200). Namely, the samples were spun at 10,000 rotations per minute (RPM) (5529 relative centrifugal force (RCF)) for 10 min. The resulting aliquots were discarded and the pellets were resuspended via light sonication in ethanol. This process was repeated three times to ensure there was no unbound thiol in the samples. Next, the resuspended pellets were spun at 2,000 rpm (220.5 RCF) for 10 min. The aliquots from this step were poured into centrifuge tubes to obtain smaller particles, whereas the pellets were resuspended via light sonication in fresh ethanol. This process was repeated three times. This procedure was further applied to the aliquots to obtain particles at 4,000, 6,000, and 8,000 rpm (384, 1990, and 3537.5, RCF, respectively) in series. Samples from each differential centrifugation condition were drop deposited on clean Si for scanning electron microscope (SEM)-based particles sizing (see Figure S4). Ethanol/water mixtures were made by adding a known volume (Lagnett BioPette, 20 μL) of ethanol to a pellet of dried...
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Movie S1, showing the hybrid self-assembly process (MOV)

Movie S2, showing the shell buckling for drops with high concentrations of nanoparticles (MP4)
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