Atomistic Modeling of Carbon Nanostructures: Challenges and Opportunities

Kristof Bal Department of Chemistry, University of Antwerp Belgium

INTRODUCTION

ATOMISTIC SIMULATIONS

Plasma-based synthesis or modification of carbon nanostructures is a very complex process

ATOMISTIC SIMULATIONS



Neyts J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B 30, 030803 (2012)

ATOMISTIC SIMULATIONS

Plasma-based synthesis or modification of carbon nanostructures is a very complex process

We wish to known the atomic-level mechanisms!

Molecular dynamics (MD) simulations seem perfect

Explicit dynamics from equations of motion

Atomistic detail

Fully self-consistent system evolution

Truly exploratory

Direct simulation should be fairly straightforward

CNT growth: catalyst NP + C_xH_y precursors

Nanostructure etching: material + etchant species (ions, radicals)

THE TIME SCALE PROBLEM



But MD has a severe time scale limitation!

Many interesting processes occur at much longer time scales

e.g., CH₄ splitting on Ni

Average reaction time is $\sim 1 \ \mu s$ at 800 K...

...but MD will only get you to ns!

THE TIME SCALE PROBLEM



MD requires inter-impact times of $\sim ps \rightarrow pressures$ of ~ 100 atm! Many examples prove that is too fast

Ding et al., Chem. Phys. Lett. **393**, 309 (2004)

TOWARDS BETTER MODELS

$$p(x \rightarrow x') \sim \exp\left(\frac{\beta F_x(x'-x)}{2}\right)$$
 instead of $\mathbf{F} = m \cdot \mathbf{a}$

fbMC is a stochastic method

Atomic movements sampled from distribution

No "true" dynamics, but system evolution similar to MD

Average atomic displacement (~0.1 Å) larger than MD (~0.01 Å)

Easy to implement & very generic

Practical realisation:

Perform impacts with MD

Mimic inter-impact relaxation with fbMC



fbMC makes the simulation more physically sensible

Neyts et al. ACS Nano **4**, 6665 (2010)



One can even study nucleation from $C_x H_y$ feedstock

Khalilov et al. Nat. Commun. 6, 10306 (2015)



MD simulation Bad CNT Time scale: 40 ps



MD + fbMC Good CNT **Time scale: ???**

Page et al., Acc. Chem. Res. 43, 1375 (2010)

fbMC is still not good enough

No "real" dynamics and unclear time scale

We want rigorously correct methods with real time scales

Neyts et al., JACS 133, 17225 (2011)



Slow processes can be accelerated with the **hyperdynamics** method

A **bias potential** lowers the apparent barrier of a escape process → arbitrarily slow process become accessible

If transition states remain unbiased

Correct **relative dynamics** is preserved (k_1/k_2 = constant)

Time scales can be recovered!

THE CVHD METHOD



Unfortunately, implementing hyperdynamics requires a lot of *a priori* information \rightarrow functional form of ΔV ?

 We developed a method, collective variable-driven hyperdynamics (CVHD) that Can automatically generate ΔV on the fly Requires few system-specific details
One needs to know what type of reaction coordinate = the CV Bond breaking? Conformational change?

PYROLYIS & COMBUSTION



n-Dodecane pyrolysis and combustion is a great test system

Many reactions

We don't define any pathways, only bias bond breaking

PYROLYIS & COMBUSTION



On the fly bias

Temperature-dependent pyrolysis products Remarkable agreement with recent experiments @ 1000 K



PYROLYIS & COMBUSTION



Temperature-dependent oxidation pathways and products can also be captured

PYROLYIS & COMBUSTION



A posteriori validation through direct MD

	Pyrolysis	Combustion
Lowest temperature	1000 K	700 K
Longest simulated time	57 ms	39 s
Largest boost	6.3×10^{6}	1.3×10^9

CARBON NANOSTRUCTURES: H ETCHING



Graphite etching with H ions in a high-density fusion plasma CVHD between impact allows for arbitrary inter-impact times

CARBON NANOSTRUCTURES: GRAPHITE ETCHING



Experimentally relevant regimes in CVHD

CARBON NANOSTRUCTURES: GRAPHITE ETCHING



Experimentally relevant regimes in CVHD

→ different interaction mechanisms

CARBON NANOSTRUCTURES: GRAPHITE ETCHING



Experimentally relevant regimes in CVHD

- \rightarrow different interaction mechanisms
- → different surface evolution and etched species

CNT GROWTH



 $250 \ \mu s$ time scale

Application of CVHD to CNT growth works...

...but not always

- \rightarrow Many processes not included in CV
- \rightarrow We haven't identified all relevant processes yet

WRAPPING UP

CONCLUSIONS

In molecular simulations, accounting for long time scales is not only useful, **it is necessary**

Our method is **generically applicable** to any reactive system, if a suitable CV can be found

CVHD allows to better understand fundamental dynamic processes, e.g., in deposition of materials, **under realistic conditions**

We are always open to **collaborate**, in particular to combine simulations with experiments

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS







Erik Neyts pioneering simulations



Umedjon Khalilov CNT growth



Damien Aussems graphite etching

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION