



HAL
open science

The Critical Role of the Atmosphere in Dip-Coating Process

Elisa Bindini, Guillaume Naudin, Marco Faustini, David Grosso, Cédric Boissière

► **To cite this version:**

Elisa Bindini, Guillaume Naudin, Marco Faustini, David Grosso, Cédric Boissière. The Critical Role of the Atmosphere in Dip-Coating Process. *Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, 2017, 121 (27), pp.14572-14580. 10.1021/acs.jpcc.7b02530 . hal-01549056

HAL Id: hal-01549056

<https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-01549056v1>

Submitted on 28 Jun 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

The Critical Role of the Atmosphere in Dip-Coating Process

Elisa Bindini¹, Guillaume Naudin¹, Marco Faustini¹, David Grosso², and Cédric Boissière^{1}*

1. Laboratoire Chimie de la Matière Condensée de Paris, UMR UPMC-CNRS 7574, Université
Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris 6), 4 Place Jussieu 75252 Paris, France

2. IM2NP - Case 142 Avenue Escadrille Normandie Niemen 13397 Marseille (France)

ABSTRACT

Dip-coating is a common liquid deposition technique employed in research, but also for industrial production, to obtain polymer, hybrid and inorganic thin layers of controlled thickness. During liquid deposition, the substrate withdrawal speed allows in principle an easy tuning of deposited film thickness (first modeled by Landau and Levich). Yet, experimentally, unexplained thickness irreproducibility or strong fluctuations of the sol-gel films are often observed when coating large substrates, which is a critical issue for optical coatings such as anti-reflective/reflective coatings. In this study, we pointed out for the first time that uncontrolled solvent relative pressure gradients (coming from solvent evaporation) are responsible for these

1
2
3 thickness fluctuation issues. We investigated and quantified their impact for various solutions (of
4
5 sol-gel or polymer), and pointed out that the solvent evaporation rate is not constant but strongly
6
7 depends on the geometric configuration of the dip-coating experiment. From this understanding,
8
9 we demonstrated how an accurate tuning of processing atmosphere can provide a very good
10
11 control on layer thickness in the practical case of the deposition of anti-reflective water repellent
12
13 coating. In a second example, we used this phenomenon for developing a very easy synthesis
14
15 strategy leading to giant and controlled thickness gradient profiles.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. INTRODUCTION

Dip-coating from solution is a widely used method to deposit thin films on various substrates. With this liquid coating process, a homogeneous layer is easily spread on the substrate surface and the solvent evaporation leads to the formation of a solid film with a good control on structure and thickness¹⁻⁴. In principle, both organic and inorganic thin layers can be obtained by this method, and studied for many applications ranging from electronics⁵⁻⁸, optical coatings⁹, photocatalysis^{10,11}, and more¹²⁻¹⁴. Despite the wide use of sol-gel coatings both in industrial production and in research laboratories, the physical-chemical phenomena taking place during the dip-coating process are still not fully understood. The first definition of draining and dragging phenomena involved in dip-coating was published by Landau and Levich (LL) in 1942 for polymers¹⁵, who built up a theoretical model to describe the film formation mechanism and predicted the final thickness in certain conditions. We will refer to this regime, which follows the LL model, as "Draining regime". Since then, dip-coating processing has been used for depositing thin films from very different solutions which not always satisfy hypotheses of LL model. For example, whenever solvent evaporation is taking place, several critical parameters may change with time (like rheological properties and surface tension), due to the increase of concentration of non-evaporating components. The consequence of this is that a new low dragging speed deposition regime (so called Capillarity Regime - CR), not described by LL model, exists for this type of systems, as recently reported¹⁶ (Figure 1).

Solvent evaporation affects significantly the deposition process, its rate becoming a critical parameter that radically influences the deposited film thickness. The Capillarity Regime allows obtaining thick films with highly diluted solutions at ultralow withdrawal speeds and can be used when species to deposit cannot be dissolved or dispersed in high concentrations.

1
2
3 Moreover, in the CR, a solvent with high surface tension, such as water, can be used without
4
5 dewetting problems that are always encountered in the draining regime. For sol-gel solutions,
6
7 many progresses have been made to better understand the global dynamics related with dip-
8
9 coating deposition, in order to reach a better control on final film thickness and
10
11 structuration¹⁶⁻¹⁹. A global, semi-empirical model giving a satisfactory description of dip-
12
13 coating process, covering a broad withdrawal speed range (from 0.001 to 10 mm.s⁻¹) was
14
15 published by Faustini et al.¹⁶; it combines in a single equation both contributions of
16
17 Capillarity and Draining effects (Equation 1).
18
19

20
21 At high withdrawal speed, the amount of solvent evaporated at the liquid meniscus is
22
23 negligible, thus the film formation follows the LL model. At ultralow withdrawal speeds,
24
25 solvent evaporation takes place at the liquid meniscus, which is continuously fed through
26
27 capillary rise from the solution. In this case, no dragging is involved and the film thickness is
28
29 directly related to the evaporation rate E . At intermediate speeds, both contributions are
30
31 balanced. The speed range of this intermediate domain strongly depends on both solution
32
33 composition and processing conditions such as temperature. The equation 1 predicts the final
34
35 film thickness across the full span of withdrawal speeds, taking into account both the
36
37 capillarity and the draining regime behaviours:
38
39

$$40 \quad h_0 = k_i \left(\frac{E}{L} \frac{1}{u} + Du^{2/3} \right) \quad (1)$$

41
42 where k_i and D are constants characteristic of the solution, L is the width of the deposited
43
44 layer and u is the withdrawal speed.
45
46
47

48
49 This semi-empirical model describes satisfactorily the impact of withdrawal speed onto film
50
51 thickness assuming that the processing conditions do not change during coating. Often, when
52
53 relatively large surfaces have to be covered, one needs to use an adapted reservoir to prevent
54
55 the use of a large amount of solution. In such cases, conditions may not be identical all over
56
57 the substrate surface and thickness non uniformity is often noticed. The variation of
58
59
60

1
2
3 processing conditions is mainly related to the variation of the level of the solution with respect
4
5 to the reservoir top limit during withdrawal, which changes the evaporation conditions along
6
7 the substrate position due to vapor confinement. As an example, in Figure 2 is shown a glass
8
9 substrate coated with an anti-reflecting layer made by dip-coating process at constant
10
11 temperature and withdrawal speed in the conditions illustrated in Figure 2b. The transmission
12
13 spectra point out that, along the sample, the intensity of transmitted light changes, which
14
15 means that the anti-reflective layer thickness is not uniform from the top to the bottom of the
16
17 sample. By measuring the film thickness at several heights, we evidenced that the coating
18
19 layer becomes thinner with the distance of the solution level to the top edge increasing,
20
21 confirming that the geometry, dimensions and filling level of the reservoir used for dip-
22
23 coating do have a strong impact on the amount of material deposited, causing thus very
24
25 significant thickness non homogeneity. Other evidences of such an effect are reported in
26
27 Figure 3 where the variations of thickness with respect to the withdrawal rate are plotted for a
28
29 TiO_2 sol-gel solution prepared in similar conditions but with different reservoir geometries or
30
31 filling levels. Because the reservoir geometry and filling level mainly influence the local
32
33 vapor pressure governing the evaporation rate, we investigated the influence of solvent
34
35 relative vapor pressure in the atmosphere on the final thickness with respect to the withdrawal
36
37 speeds, which is a parameter usually not taken into account.
38
39
40
41
42

43 It is known that the relative solvent vapor pressure during film formation can impact the
44
45 material structure^{20,21} but until now, the effect of a solvent enriched atmosphere on the amount
46
47 of material deposited was never extensively investigated. The purpose of this work is having
48
49 an overview of the phenomenon and its mechanisms to be able to better handle and control
50
51 the dip-coating process from small to large production scale.
52
53

54 The solvent vapor pressure being the main factor responsible for the behavior shown in
55
56 Figure 3, several chemical systems were investigated to obtain dense TiO_2 or mesoporous
57
58

1
2
3 SiO₂ films from ethanol-based sol-gel solutions, porous SiO₂ films from water-based colloidal
4 solution, and PS-PEO copolymer films from THF solution. All solutions exhibit a similar
5 behavior, confirming the role of solvent relative vapor pressure in the atmosphere during dip-
6 coating. We carried out an experimental investigation which demonstrates the importance of
7 solvent relative vapor pressure not only in the ultra-low speeds regime, in which the
8 evaporation drives the film formation process, but also at speeds usually considered as pure
9 Landau-Levich regime, suggesting that the influence of capillarity regime can be relevant
10 until relatively high speeds, depending on the solvent used.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **2. EXPERIMENTAL SECTION**

23
24 **2.1 Materials.** Absolute ethanol and Tetrahydrofuran were purchased from Normapure, HCl
25 from Merck Millipore and TiCl₄, CTAB (hexadecyltrimethylammonium bromide) and TEOS
26 (tetraethylorthosilicate) were purchased from Aldrich and used without further purification.
27 PS-*b*-PEO (polystyrene-*b*-polyethyleneoxide Mn = 16400 Mn = 36400 Mw/Mn: 1.06) was
28 purchased from Polymer Source.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Ludox silica nanoparticles suspension, named HS40 was purchased from Aldrich. The
37 original stock of colloidal suspension was diluted 10 times with water.
38
39

40 **2.2 Solutions preparation.** The anti-reflective coatings were made of mesoporous
41 methylated SiO₂ by dip-coating at 0.3 mm s⁻¹ in dry air on sodalime glass. The solution
42 composition is 0.5/0.5/5/40/0.006/0.006 TEOS/MTEOS/H₂O/EtOH/HCl/F-127 for the
43 samples shown in Figure 6 (a-c) and 0.5/0.5/4/20/0.007/0.006 for the sample shown in Figure
44 6 (d). After the deposition, samples were cured at 450°C for 10 minutes. Both thickness
45 measurements and transmission spectra were measured by spectroscopic ellipsometry.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The TiO₂ solution was prepared with a molar ratio of 1:55:10 TiCl₄/EtOH/H₂O and used
54 fresh. The experimental investigation was performed using dense TiO₂ as a model system
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 since the film formation mechanisms are well known and titania thin films are widely
4 employed for many applications²²⁻²⁴. The final films obtained were cured at low temperature
5 (130 °C) to stabilize them keeping an amorphous structure, in order to avoid uncontrolled
6 crystallization followed by >50 nm surface roughness, not suited for ellipsometric analysis²⁵.
7
8 All TiO₂ films analyzed had a refractive index at 700 nm between 1.985 and 2.020.
9
10
11
12

13
14 The thickness values were obtained by using a regular beam (3 mm) that allows averaging
15 the thickness fluctuation (typically 7%) due to stick and slip phenomena in the capillarity
16 regime.
17
18
19

20
21 The mesoporous SiO₂ solution was prepared using tetraethyl orthosilicate (TEOS) as
22 inorganic precursor and hexadecyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB) as template
23 surfactant. TEOS and CTAB are added to EtOH and in the end is added aqueous acidic
24 solution (pH=2 by HCl addition), the molar ratio used is 1/0.14/40/5
25 TEOS/CTAB/EtOH/H₂O. The solution is stirred at room temperature for 72 h before use.
26
27
28
29

30
31 The PS-b-PEO polymer solution was prepared in a concentration of 3.33 g/L using THF as
32 solvent.
33
34
35

36 **2.3 Processing.** Dip-coating was performed using an ACEDip equipment (from SolGelWay,
37 Paris, France) in an atmosphere of dry air (RH< 5%, flux 2.5 L/min) for the TiO₂ experiments
38 with different levels of solution in the reservoir and injecting EtOH-saturated air for tests at
39 different vapor pressures, as previously explained. Air was bubbled into EtOH at 50 °C to be
40 saturated with the solvent vapors and then passed through EtOH at 25 °C before entering in
41 the dip-coater chamber. In this way, the excess of EtOH vapors recondenses from hot air in
42 the solvent at 25 °C, avoiding the condensation in the wires and inside the dip-coater, which
43 would cause strong irreproducibility. Then the EtOH enriched air is mixed with dry air, in
44 proportions managed by a mass flow controller, and injected in the dip-coater. A total air flux
45 of 2.5 L/min is maintained during the deposition process, otherwise, especially for slow
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 withdrawal speeds, the ethanol relative vapor pressure in the atmosphere changes too fast,
4
5 leading to irreproducible results, since the chamber is not a hermetically close system but
6
7 communicates with the external environment. For the other systems tested no flux of air was
8
9 used during the dip-coating.
10

11 The temperature in the chamber was 40 °C for the solution of SiO₂ nanoparticles in water
12
13 and for the polymeric solution, 26 °C in the other experiments.
14

15
16 Films were prepared on silicon substrates (1x7 cm) cleaned with acetone and, after the
17
18 coating, they were cured at 130 °C for 1 hour, except the polymeric and the colloidal ones,
19
20 which have not been thermally treated. The SiO₂ films reported in figure 7 have been
21
22 stabilized at 130°C for one night and then cured at 450°C for 10 minutes.
23

24
25 **2.4 Characterization.** The refractive index and the thickness of final films were measured,
26
27 after the stabilizing thermal treatment, by spectroscopic ellipsometry performed on a UV-IR
28
29 (193-1690 nm) variable angle spectroscopic ellipsometer (VASE) M2000DI from Woollam at
30
31 an incidence angle of 70°, and the data analysis was performed with the CompleteEASE
32
33 software.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

43
44 In many industrial applications, for which it is important to control the thickness of the thin
45
46 layer deposited, dip-coating is often the chosen method to perform a liquid deposition on a
47
48 substrate²⁶. In a simple approach, one can notice that filling the container at various levels or
49
50 using different containers could lead to very different thicknesses of the final film obtained, as
51
52 evidenced qualitatively in Figure 3. As expected from the reference model¹⁶, films thickness
53
54 decreases when withdrawal speed rises until it reaches a minimum after which it starts to
55
56 increase again, following the Landau-Levich model.
57

58
59
60

1
2
3 Yet, the curve of film thickness versus withdrawal speed shifts between different
4 experiments, meaning that, for the same experimental conditions and the same speed, we
5 obtain films with different thicknesses.
6
7

8
9 As evidenced from Figure 3, the gap in thickness is huge in the ultralow speeds regime and
10 is progressively reduced with increasing speeds. The factor which is responsible for this
11 behavior is likely to be the partial vapor pressure of the solvent in the atmosphere originating
12 from the solution evaporating from the reservoir and from the deposited layer.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **3.1 Influence of solvent relative vapor pressure in the atmosphere**

20 To investigate this hypothesis, we performed a first set of dip-coating with an ethanol-based
21 TiO₂ sol-gel solution. The dip-coated atmosphere was progressively enriched with ethanol
22 employing the gas injection system described in SI 6. Briefly, dry air was bubbled into hot
23 ethanol at 50 °C to be saturated with the solvent vapors and then passed through cold ethanol
24 at 25°C before entering in the dip-coater chamber. After the passage in ethanol at ambient
25 temperature, the solvent-saturated air was mixed with dry air in different proportions,
26 regulated by mass flow controllers, and injected within the dip-coater.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 From the ratio between dry air and EtOH-enriched air, we infer the ethanol relative pressure
38 injected into dip-coating chamber. The relative vapor pressure values reported in Figure 4 are
39 values related to the air injected in the chamber, they are not the effective ethanol vapor
40 pressure values of the atmosphere within the chamber. Probably full saturation in EtOH
41 (100%) is never reached, because the system is not perfectly sealed and exchanges air with
42 the outside. All the experiments were performed with a reservoir filled up with solution up to
43 the top. Plotting the thickness versus withdrawal speed by equation 1, we can clearly see a
44 shift of the point of minimum thickness towards lower withdrawal speed values with
45 increasing solvent vapor pressure, as shown in Figure 4, going from a minimum thickness of
46 62 nm in dry air until 29 nm when injecting EtOH-saturated air. From the plots in Figure 4 we
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

notice a linear correlation between minimum thickness and solvent partial vapor pressure increase.

As expected, the influence of higher vapor pressure atmosphere is stronger in the capillarity regime where the thickness of the deposited layer is directly proportional to the evaporation rate E ¹⁶:

$$h_0 = \frac{c_i M_i}{\alpha_i \rho_i} \frac{E}{L u} = k_i \frac{E}{L u} \quad (2)$$

Equation 2 gives the expression of final film thickness h_0 obtained in pure capillary regime versus withdrawal speed u . A more detailed description of the material proportion constant k_i for the capillary regime includes the solution inorganic concentration c_i , the molar weight M_i and the density ρ_i of the stabilized material. α_i is the volume fraction of the inorganic material deposited in the final film and L is the width of the deposited layer, which doesn't change during the dip-coating process. For most solutions, k_i is constant and the plot of h_0/k_i versus $1/u$ plot gives a straight line with a slope corresponding to the solution depositing rate E/L , that is, the final thickness is proportional to the evaporation rate E . The evaporation process of a solution could be a complex phenomenon to discuss and is influenced by several parameters. In the most simple case for which no convection is involved, the evaporation rate E of a solvent can be described following the Hertz-Knudsen equation (3)^{27,28}:

$$E = A \alpha (KT)^{-1/2} (P_{(T)}^* - P_{amb}) \quad (3)$$

where A is the evaporation surface area and T is temperature, α is the sticking coefficient of a gas molecule onto the surface and K is a constant including the molecular mass, the Boltzmann constant and a numeric prefactor. Both α and K are determined by solvent characteristics. The Equation 3 shows that E depends on the difference between the solvent

1
2
3 saturation vapor pressure P^* at the temperature of the solution and its relative vapor pressure
4
5 in the gas phase P_{amb} .
6

7 Including E in Equation 2 we obtain:
8

$$9 \quad h_0 = \Gamma AT^{-1/2} (P_{(T)}^* - P_{amb}) \frac{1}{u} \quad (4)$$

10
11
12
13
14 Where Γ gathers all the constant factors previously described. By increasing the solvent
15
16 relative vapor pressure in the atmosphere P_{amb} , the evaporation rate E is reduced and, as is
17
18 evident from equation 4, the thickness of the deposited layer h_0 will be smaller. The surface of
19
20 the interface A which, in our case, is the surface of the liquid meniscus at the contact with the
21
22 substrate, is also playing a role in the kinetics of evaporation. As a direct consequence, every
23
24 parameter which can lead to a different shape of the meniscus as the reservoir geometry, the
25
26 contact angle between the substrate and the solution, the distance of the sample from the
27
28 reservoir's edge, will also influence the evaporation rate and, consequently, the film thickness.
29
30

31
32 Theoretically, in the draining regime, the relative vapor pressure doesn't affect the final
33
34 thickness of the film obtained, as described by LL model (Equation 5):
35

$$36 \quad h_0 = k_i Du^{2/3} \quad (5)$$

37
38
39 In this regime, the system reaches quickly the equilibrium thickness, meaning that the
40
41 variations in viscosity and surface tension, caused by the presence of solvent vapors in the
42
43 atmosphere, are small and that the evaporation process is slower than the time needed for the
44
45 layer deposition.
46

47
48 In the intermediate speed range where both regimes have a contribution, we can expect
49
50 differences in the final thickness due to the influence of the capillarity regime. The effect of
51
52 higher ethanol relative vapor pressure in the atmosphere can easily explain the behavior
53
54 observed in real experimental conditions, as reported in Figure 3.
55
56
57

3.2 Effect of meniscus position

However, to be reproducible, not every height of the solution inside the reservoir is equivalent: when the liquid meniscus is above the container, the evaporation speed is controlled by the relative solvent vapor pressure within the dip-coater.

As soon as the meniscus is positioned within the solution's container, the relative solvent vapor pressure increases following a gradient from the external edge towards the inside. In this situation we observe experimentally thinner films. In Figure 5 is plotted the thickness of a film deposited a constant speed by dip-coating, versus the position of the liquid level within the container Δz . The final film thickness h is normalized on h_0 which is the thickness of a film deposited in the same conditions but with a completely full container (Level 0). Values of h/h_0 underline that a small variation in the solution height inside the reservoir leads to huge differences in the amount of material deposited, up to a decrease of 80-90% in capillarity regime.

It is evident that there is always a gap in the amount of material deposited on the substrate; one has to highlight that, this effect is visible even in Landau Levich regime, and can be very strong when a highly volatile solvent, such as THF, is used. This is exemplified with the polymeric system polystyrene-block-poly(ethylene oxide) in Figure 5, that reveals a thickness variation of 70-75% even at withdrawal speed $5 \text{ mm}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ that is usually considered in "pure" Landau Levich regime. So, in this case, even for a high withdrawal speed, the evaporation process is faster than the liquid layer deposition. Below a given Δz value, lowering further the liquid level does not bring any additional thickness variation. We assume this is due to the fact that within the solution reservoir, the atmosphere is nearly saturated, thus that evaporation speed is minimum. In such an experimental situation, the P_{amb} parameter of equation (4) is not a constant anymore but becomes a function describing the local evolution of the relative solvent pressure above the solution meniscus (which is directly related to the solvent relative

1
2
3 pressure gradient appearing with solution level lowering). How steep the initial thickness
4
5 decreases (in other words, how high P_{amb} value increases) with solution lowering depends
6
7 experimentally on the solvent volatility, on the withdrawal speed, and on the reservoir
8
9 dimensions and shape. It can be determined experimentally in figure 5 by assuming that h/h_0
10
11 is proportional to $P_{amb}(\Delta z)/P_{amb}(0)$.
12
13

14 The shape of meniscus is another important parameter that can play a role in the thickness
15
16 differences observed at different positions of the film. We verified that the meniscus shape
17
18 changes noticeably only in the first 0.1 cm (data reported in SI), that is when the meniscus
19
20 passes from outside the reservoir to within. We can observe thickness variations during the
21
22 first 2-3 cm on the film (Fig. 5), meaning that the solvent vapor pressure variation is mainly
23
24 responsible for the described behavior.
25
26

27 The observed phenomenon can be indeed a real problem when coating large substrates. In
28
29 fact, if the volume of the immersed substrate is significant with respect to the volume of the
30
31 container, dragging will cause an important variation in the liquid level and, as a consequence,
32
33 a difference in thickness between the top and the bottom of the sample. A direct consequence
34
35 is that the shape and volume of the container does affect the film thickness profile in the
36
37 capillarity regime (an example is given in SI 5).
38
39

40 When applied to the real case of an anti-reflecting layer, for which thickness variation
41
42 strongly impacts the transmittance of a window, we verified that the samples coated with the
43
44 same solution but starting from a different position of the meniscus (at the reservoir's top edge
45
46 level, and some cm inside the reservoir) shows smaller difference in thickness and
47
48 transmission along the specimen, as evident in Figure 6. One can of course minimize this
49
50 effect by using high withdrawal speeds. Nevertheless, industrial production favors water-
51
52 based solution which imposes low speed or high temperature deposition conditions, both
53
54 entailing significant solvent evaporation contributions.
55
56
57

1
2
3 From Figure 5, we can infer that, to gain reproducibility, it is better to keep the liquid level
4 some cm lower, to be on the plateau of vapor pressure profile. In such a case, obtaining the
5 targeted thickness (about 80 nm for this antireflective coating deposited on sodalime glass)
6 implies to readapt the concentration of the solution (see Figure 6). Moreover, it is better to use
7 a large reservoir with respect to the volume of the substrate, in this way the dragging will
8 impact less the level of the solution within the container than in the case of a smaller
9 reservoir. Of course, the use of big reservoirs means that huge a volume of solution has to be
10 prepared, which is often not possible or too expensive. An efficient technical solution to this
11 problem called “bi-phasic dip-coating” method was recently reported.²⁹ Its principle consists
12 in using a reservoir as large as needed with a small amount of coating solution deposited at
13 the top of a large volume of non-miscible and denser liquid, which is an efficient remedy to
14 the issue investigated here.

30 **3.3 Towards controlled gradients**

31
32 Indeed, the variation of the solvent relative vapor pressure in the atmosphere during the dip-
33 coating process may cause huge thickness gradient on the deposited films. We investigated
34 this phenomenon and proposed some solutions to compensate it when the thickness
35 uniformity of the layer is required. Nevertheless, considering that in some processing
36 conditions the thickness decrease can be as important as 90%, it would be very interesting to
37 exploit this effect to fabricate graded films with a controlled thickness profile. The huge
38 potential of thin films exhibiting functionality gradients obtained from films thickness
39 gradient is well illustrated in the work of Faustini *et al.*³⁰ In this study, thickness gradient
40 were produced employing the dip-coating technique with increasing withdrawal speeds.
41 However, with this procedure, the maximum thickness obtained is about two times the value
42 of initial thickness. By contrast, partial vapor pressure gradient can promote much larger
43 relative thickness variations. Moreover, exploiting the effect described in this work to produce
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 controlled thickness gradient allows preparing graded films at a constant withdrawal speed, in
4
5 a very simple process which doesn't require elaborate dip-coating equipment.
6

7
8 As it's highlighted in equation 4, the factor which has to be controlled is the relative solvent
9
10 vapor pressure in the atmosphere P_{amb} . If one target is building a linear film thickness profile,
11
12 we are facing the fact that a linear evolution of Δz caused by the substrate dragging induces at
13
14 the solvent/air interface a $P_{amb}(\Delta z)$ which has not a linear evolution inside the container.
15
16 Hence, ideally one should find a way to promote a linear solvent relative pressure within the
17
18 reservoir. This can be done by using a reservoir with inside walls distance widening from the
19
20 bottom to the top. Although this approach is reliable, it is not very convenient, because a new
21
22 container should be designed for every different solution composition and every temperature
23
24 to obtain a chosen graded profile. In a more practical way, another simpler method consists in
25
26 playing on the ratio between the substrate volume and the solution volume V_{sample}/V_l . The
27
28 goal is to maintain the total solution lowering Δz (promoted by substrate dragging) within the
29
30 range in which the surrounding atmosphere is far from saturation (the first centimeter of Δz in
31
32 figure 5 experiments for example). In this Δz range, the diffusion profile of P_{amb} can be
33
34 considered as a reasonable linear approximation. This could lead to the preparation of graded
35
36 layers exhibiting large thickness gradient along the specimen.
37
38

39
40 We tested this method (*cf.* Figure 7) by varying the solvent to substrate volume ratio in
41
42 order to vary the solution total lowering Δz . For a small volume ratio of 0.21, resulting in a
43
44 small Δz , the deposited layer has a thickness gradient which is perfectly linear but of moderate
45
46 amplitude. A too high volume ratio of 0.43 does not allow getting a linear thickness gradient.
47
48 With an intermediate volume ratio of 0.32 however, one obtains a regular thickness gradient
49
50 decreasing from 74 nm to 16 nm.
51
52

53
54 Thus, controlled thickness gradients can be obtained with a very simple constant speed dip-
55
56 coating process by knowing and compensating the solvent vapor pressure variations around
57
58

1
2
3 the meniscus. Remarkably, the thickness variation observed here (4.6 fold between smaller
4 and larger thicknesses) is larger than that previously obtained by using accelerating dip-
5 coating process (2.5 folds).²⁵
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 **4. CONCLUSIONS**

14
15 We presented an experimental investigation of the impact of the variation of solvent relative
16 pressure that takes place during dip-coating processing. This study highlighted that solvent
17 relative pressure is responsible for the difficulties often met in literature for fitting
18 experimental film thickness with Landau-Levich equation. A more accurate description of
19 dip-coating deposition processing must take into account the evaporation speed of the solvent
20 which varies a lot as a function of the solvent, the geometry of the solution reservoir, and the
21 lowering of the solution level within this reservoir. We demonstrated that a good knowledge
22 of these parameters allows for the controlled deposition of film thickness gradients of large
23 amplitude.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **ASSOCIATED CONTENT**

40 41 **Supporting Information.**

42 The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at
43 DOI:
44

45 Experimental points obtained for all the studied systems, effect of the shape and size of the
46 container and of the difference in liquid meniscus shape, scheme of the apparatus used in dip-
47 coating experiments with controlled relative solvent vapor pressure.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 56 **AUTHOR INFORMATIONS**

57
58 16
59
60

1
2
3 **Corresponding author**
4

5 *E-mail: cedric.boissiere@upmc.fr
6
7

8
9 **Notes**
10

11
12 The authors declare no competing financial interest
13
14
15

16
17
18 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**
19

20 We acknowledge the financial support from the DIM CNano Region Ile-de-France.
21
22
23

24
25
26 **ABBREVIATIONS**
27

28 LL Landau-Levich; CR Capillarity Regime
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 **REFERENCES**
39

- 40 1. Brinker, C. J., Hurd, A. J., Schunk, P. R., Frye, G. C. & Ashley, C. S. Review of Sol-Gel
41 Thin Film Formation. *J Non-Cryst Solids* **1992**, *147*, 424–436.
42
43 2. Brinker, C. J., Frye, G. C., Hurd, A. J. & Ashley, C. S. Fundamentals of Sol-Gel Dip
44 Coating. *Thin Solid Films* **1991**, *201*, 97–108.
45
46 3. Brinker, C. J., Lu, Y., Sellinger, A. & Fan, H. Evaporation-Induced Self-Assembly:
47 Nanostructures Made Easy. *Adv. Mater.* **1999**, *11*, 579–585.
48
49 4. Scriven, L. E. Physics and Applications of Dip-Coating and Spin Coating. in *Symposium H*
50 - *Better Ceramics Through Chemistry III* **1988**, *121*, 717-730.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

- 1
2
3 5. Takahashi, Y., Okada, S., Bel Hadj Tahar, R., Nakano, K., Ban, T. & Ohya, Y. Dip-
4
5 Coating of ITO Films. *J. Non-Cryst. Solids* **1997**, *218*, 129–134.
- 6
7 6. Jang, J., Nam, S., Im, K., Hur, J., Cha, S. N., Kim, J., Son, H. B., Suh, H., Loth, M. A.,
8
9 Anthony, J. E. *et al.* Highly Crystalline Soluble Acene Crystal Arrays for Organic
10
11 Transistors: Mechanism of Crystal Growth During Dip-Coating. *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **2012**,
12
13 *22*, 1005–1014.
- 14
15 7. Mirri, F., Ma, A. W. K., Hsu, T. T., Behabtu, N., Eichmann, S., Young, C. C.,
16
17 Tsentelovich, D. E. & Pasquali, M. High-Performance Carbon Nanotube Transparent
18
19 Conductive Films by Scalable Dip-Coating. *ACS Nano* **2012**, *6*, 9737–9744.
- 20
21 8. Valle, G. G., Hammer, P., Pulcinelli, S. H. & Santilli, C. V. Transparent and Conductive
22
23 ZnO:Al Thin Films Prepared by Sol-Gel Dip-Coating. *J. Eur. Ceram. Soc.* **2004**, *24*, 1009–
24
25 1013.
- 26
27 9. Cathro, K., Constable, D. & Solaga, T. Silica Low-Reflection Coatings for Collector
28
29 Covers, by a Dip-Coating Process. *Sol. Energy* **1984**, *32*, 573–579.
- 30
31 10. Sonawane, R. ., Hegde, S. . & Dongare, M. . Preparation of Titanium(IV) Oxide Thin
32
33 Film Photocatalyst by Sol-Gel Dip-Coating. *Mater. Chem. Phys.* **2003**, *77*, 744–750.
- 34
35 11. Sonawane, R. ., Kale, B. . & Dongare, M. . Preparation and Photo-Catalytic Activity
36
37 of Fe/TiO₂ Thin Films Prepared by Sol-Gel Dip-Coating. *Mater. Chem. Phys.* **2004**, *85*,
38
39 52–57.
- 40
41 12. Lindqvist, K. & Lidén, E. Preparation of Alumina Membranes by Tape Casting and
42
43 Dip-Coating. *J. Eur. Ceram. Soc.* **1997**, *17*, 359–366.
- 44
45 13. Ge, C., Xie, C. & Cai, S. Preparation and Gas-Sensing Properties of Ce-Doped ZnO
46
47 Thin-Film Sensors by Dip-Coating. *Mater. Sci. Eng. B* **2007**, *137*, 53–58.
- 48
49 14. Shieh, J., Feng, H. M., Hon, M. H. & Juang, H. Y. WO₃ and W/Ti/O Thin-Film Gas
50
51 Sensors Prepared by Sol-Gel Dip-Coating. *Sens. Actuators B Chem.* **2002**, *86*, 75–80.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 15. Landau, L. & Levich, B. Dragging of a Liquid by a Moving Plate. *Acta Physicochim. Urss* **1942**, *17*, 42–54.
4
5
6
7 16. Faustini, M., Louis, B., Albouy, P. A., Kuemmel, M. & Grosso, D. Preparation of
8 Sol–Gel Films by Dip-Coating in Extreme Conditions. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2010**, *114*, 7637–
9 7645.
10
11
12
13 17. Kuznetsov, A. V. & Xiong, M. Effect of Evaporation on Thin Film Deposition in Dip
14 Coating Process. *Int Commun Heat Mass Transf.* **2002**, *29*, 35–44.
15
16
17
18 18. Lee, C. H., Lu, Y. F. & Shen, A. Q. Evaporation Induced Self Assembly and Rheology
19 Change During Sol-Gel Coating. *Phys Fluids* **2006**, *18*, 052105-052105-11.
20
21
22
23 19. Grosso, D. How to Exploit the Full Potential of the Dip-Coating Process to Better
24 Control Film Formation. *J Mater Chem* **2011**, *21*, 17033–17038.
25
26
27 20. Sanchez, C., Boissiere, C., Grosso, D., Laberty, C. & Nicole, L. Design, Synthesis,
28 and Properties of Inorganic and Hybrid Thin Films Having Periodically Organized
29 Nanoporosity. *Chem.Mater.* **2008**, *20*, 682–737.
30
31
32
33 21. Soler-Illia, G. J. A. A., Angelome, P. C., Fuertes, M. C., Grosso, D. & Boissiere, C.
34 Critical Aspects in the Production of Periodically Ordered Mesoporous Titania Thin Films.
35 *Nanoscale* **2012**, *4*, 2549–2566.
36
37
38
39 22. O’Regan, B. & Gratzel, M. A Low-Cost, High-Efficiency Solar Cell Based on Dye-
40 Sensitized Colloidal TiO₂ Films. *Nature* **1991**, *353*, 737–40.
41
42
43
44 23. Sakatani, Y. *et al.* Optimised Photocatalytic Activity of Grid-Like Mesoporous TiO₂
45 Films: Effect of Crystallinity, Pore Size Distribution, and Pore Accessibility. *J Mater Chem*
46 **2006**, *16* (1), 77–82.
47
48
49
50 24. Bosca, F., Edwardsa, D., Kellera, N., Kellera, V. & Ayral, A. Mesoporous TiO₂-based
51 Photocatalysts for UV and Visible Light Gas-Phase Toluene Degradation. *Thin Solid Films*
52 **2006**, *495* (1-2), 272–279.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 25. Louis, B., Krins, N., Faustini, M. & Grosso, D. Understanding Crystallization of
4 Anatase into Binary SiO₂ / TiO₂ Sol–Gel Optical Thin Films: An in Situ Thermal
5 Ellipsometry Analysis. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2011**, *115*, 3115–3122.
6
7
8
9
10 26. John Biteau, Christy Ford, Arnaud Glacet. Method of Dip-Coating a Lens,
11 US20130022739 A1 **2013**
12
13
14 27. Hertz, H. On the Evaporation of Liquids, Especially Mercury. In Vacuo. *Ann Phys*
15 *Chem* **1882**, *17*, 177–198.
16
17
18 28. Knudsen, M. Die maximale Verdampfungsgeschwindigkeit des Quecksilbers. *Ann.*
19 *Phys.* **1915**, *352*, 697–708.
20
21
22
23 29. Ceratti, D. R., Louis, B., Paquez, X., Faustini, M. & Grosso, D. A New Dip Coating
24 Method to Obtain Large-Surface Coatings with a Minimum of Solution. *Adv. Mater.* **2015**,
25 *27*, 4958–4962.
26
27
28
29 30. Faustini, M. *et al.* Engineering Functionality Gradients by Dip Coating Process in
30 Acceleration Mode. *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces* **2014**, *6*, 17102–17110.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57




Figure 1: Scheme of capillarity and draining regimes which dominate the dip-coating process respectively at slow and fast withdrawal speeds. Capillarity regime can be very useful in case of aqueous solutions because it avoids dewetting problems; moreover it enables us to deposit thick films from highly diluted solutions.




Figure 2: a) Glass substrate coated with a single anti-reflective layer, various positions on the sample for which transmission and layer thickness have been measured are reported b) Dip-coating conditions: the liquid level inside the container decreases during the process because of the substrate dragging. Withdrawal speed used: 0.3 mm s^{-1} , c) Transmission spectra taken at different distances from the top edge of the coating layer d) Thickness profile of the sample.




Figure 3: Scheme of the dip-coating method and plot of the thickness versus withdrawal speed (log-log scale) when the dip-coating is performed with different reservoirs (curves A,B and C) or same reservoir but different level of liquid (curves C1, C2, C3) for a TiO_2 solution in EtOH. The reported graphs are the fits obtained from experimental data points following the equation 1. The data points were acquired at 0.5 cm from the top of the film.




Figure 4: Plot of the thickness versus withdrawal speed (log-log scale) for different solvent vapor pressures injected in the dip-coater chamber (experimental points are given in SII, the data points were acquired at 0.5 cm from the top of the film.). Dashed lines are the theoretical trends, which are not possible to verify because dewetting from substrate surface occurs at speeds smaller than 0.1 mm s⁻¹ for high values of EtOH vapor pressure. To have a clear image we report here just the fitted curves, the experimental points are presented in the supplementary information. On the right are shown evolutions of the minimal thickness h_{\min} , the critical withdrawal speed u_c (at which h_{\min} is obtained), and the solution deposition rate E/L (from Equation 1) with solvent vapor pressure injected into the dip-coater chamber.




Figure 5: Evolution of h/h_0 with the difference in liquid level Δz for different speeds, for: **a)** ethanol-based sol-gel SiO₂ solution **b)** water-based colloidal SiO₂ solution, **c)** THF-based PS-PEO block copolymer solution. The h/h_0 is the ratio between the thickness of a film dip-coated with a liquid level within the reservoir lowered by 1, 2, 3 cm and a sample dip-coated at the same speed but with the liquid level reaching the top edge of the container. Complete thickness versus withdrawal speed data are provided in SI 2 to 4.




Figure 6: Dip-coating of an anti-reflective layer on a sodalime glass dip-coated at 0.3 mm s^{-1} . (left) film thickness profile obtained at different positions of the substrate, (right) UV-Vis Transmission spectra at similar positions of the substrates. The films are obtained by dip-coating a mesoporous silica sol-gel solution (TEOS/MTEOS 0.5:0.5), compositions are given in Experimental section. From **a)** to **c)** are shown that lowering the liquid level within the container leads to more uniform films deposition, but the layer becomes too thin to have good anti-reflective properties with the original solution. **d)** By readapting the solution concentration and dip-coating with the meniscus inside the reservoir, we obtain quasi-homogeneous film thickness and good anti-reflective properties along the whole sample.




Figure 7: Plot of the thickness of graded mesoporous SiO₂ films for different volume ratio between the sample and the solution. The ethanol-based solution was dip-coated at withdrawal speed 0.1 mm s⁻¹. Black lines are given as guide for the eyes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

TOC graphic:

