Supporting information: Structural Control over Bimetallic Core-Shell Nanorods for Surface Enhanced Raman Spectroscopy

Jessi E.S. van der Hoeven^{1,2,|,*}, Tian-Song Deng^{1,3,|,*}, Wiebke Albrecht¹, Liselotte A. Olthof^{1,2}, Marijn A. van Huis¹, Petra E. de Jongh², and Alfons van Blaaderen^{1,*}

¹Soft Condensed Matter, Debye Institute for Nanomaterials Science, Utrecht University, Princetonplein 5, 3584 CC Utrecht, The Netherlands

²Inorganic Chemistry and Catalysis, Debye Institute for Nanomaterials Science, Utrecht University, Universiteitsweg 99, 3584 CG Utrecht, The Netherlands

³Current address: School of Electronics and Information Engineering, Hangzhou Dianzi

University, Hangzhou, 310018, China

Contributed equally to this work

*To whom correspondence should be addressed.

E-mail: j.e.s.vanderhoeven @uu.nl; dengts @pku.edu.cn; a.vanblaaderen @uu.nl

Supplementary Figures



Figure S1: Thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) measurements on Au@SiO₂ NRs before and after the HCl-washing. a) TGA curves displaying the sample weight of untreated and 0.10 M HCl in EtOH washed Au@SiO₂ NRs as a function of the heating temperature. b) Mass spectrometry (MS) results corresponding to the TGA curves in a) showing the combustion products H₂O and CO₂ of CTAB as a function of the heating temperature. Both the TGA and MS results show that most of the CTAB was removed after HCl washing. The measurements were done with Au@SiO₂ NRs with $L_{Au} = 95 \pm 8$ nm, $D_{Au} = 26 \pm 2$ nm ($\lambda_{LSPR} = 795$ nm) and a ~18 nm thick mesoporous silica shell. The TGA-MS measurements were carried out in air.



Figure S2: Quantification of the porosity of the silica shell using nitrogen physisorption. a) Isotherm linear plot showing the adsorption (closed symbols) and desorption isotherm (open symbols). The hysteresis between the adsorption and desorption isotherm at 0.9 to 1.0 relative pressure indicates the presence of mesopores. b) Pore size distribution showing the pore volume for different pore diameters. The broad peak from 20 to 60 nm is due to the pores between the nanorods. The peak at a pore diameter of 2.5 nm is caused by the mesopores in the silica shell, as is shown more clearly in panel c). The BET surface area was $235 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$.



Figure S3: Extinction spectra of $Au@SiO_2$ NRs etched in the absence of CTAB. The optical spectra after 0, 10 and 25 min of etching correspond to the $Au@SiO_2$ NRs in the TEM images in Figure 1d of the main text. Upon etching the LSPR peak position changed from 950 (red), to 811 (orange), to 684 nm (blue).



Figure S4: The silica shell thickness of Au@Ag@SiO₂ NRs decreases upon Ag-shell growth. The plot shows the distributions in silica shell thickness for Au@Ag@SiO₂ NRs with a thin ($X_{Ag} = 0.18$) and thick ($X_{Ag} = 0.63$) Ag-shell, which have an average silica shell thickness of 18.8 and 16.7 nm, respectively.



Figure S5: Direct Ag overgrowth on non-etched Au@SiO₂ NRs. EDX map of Au@Ag@SiO₂ NRs, where the Ag overgrowth was performed on non-etched Au@SiO₂ NRs after CTAB removal. The synthesis was performed on a 400 mL scale. $X_{Ag} = 0.24$, sample weight = 26 mg, metal loading = 85 wt%, $L = 107 \pm 9.7$ nm, $D = 35 \pm 2.9$ nm, $V = 9.1 \pm 1.9 \times 10^4$ nm³.



Figure S6: Excess Ag overgrowth on Au cores leads to cracking of the surrounding silica shells. The red arrows indicate the places cracks in the silica shell due to the expansion of bimetallic core. For the particles with the cracked shell the Ag shell had a 5 times larger volume than the Au core and was 3.5 times larger than the original Au rod before etching.



Figure S7: High resolution bright field TEM images of Au@Ag@SiO₂ NRs. a) HRTEM image and b) corresponding zoom-in of the Au@Ag@SiO₂ NR with $d_{lattice}^{Au} = d_{lattice}^{Ag} = 0.205$ nm, corresponding to {200} lattice planes.



Figure S8: Overview of Au@Pd@SiO₂ NRs with $X_{Pd} = 0.03-0.39$ a) HAADF-STEM images of Au@Pd@SiO₂ NRs grown with 0.083-3.3 mM NaPdCl₄, yielding NRs with $X_{Pd} = 0.03-0.39$. b) Plot of the X_{Pd} versus the NaPdCl₄ concentration used in the metal overgrowth.





Figure S9: Comparison between the experimental and FDTD calculated spectra of Au@Pd@SiO₂ NRs with a thin and thick Pd shell a) Experimental spectra for 0.083 mM (red, L = 60.5 nm, D = 19.7 nm) and 0.83 mM (blue, L = 78.6 nm, D = 19.4 nm) Na₂PdCl₄. The extinction of the Au@Pd@SiO₂ NRs spectra was normalized with respect to the extinction spectrum of the Au core NRs (black, L = 58.5 nm, D =17.7 nm). The spectrum of the Au@Pd@SiO₂ NRs grown with 0.83 mM Na₂PdCl₄ has an offset of -0.2 (along the y-axis) for better comparison. (b) FDTD calculated spectra with a Pd volume fraction of p = 0.1 (red) and p = 0.4 (blue) match the the experimental spectra in a) best. Hence, the experimentally obtained Au@Pd@SiO₂ NRs have a discontinuous Pd shell.



Figure S10: The plasmonic properties of Au@Pd@SiO₂ NRs change upon thermal treatment indicating a change in Pd shell morphology. Black: extinction spectra of the as prepared Au@Pd@SiO₂. Corresponding TEM images of this sample are shown in Figure 3f. Blue: extinction spectrum of the Au@Pd@SiO₂ NR after thermal treatment in H₂ at 300 °C. Corresponding TEM images of this sample are shown in Figure 3g. Thermal treatment led to a blue shift of the LSPR from 899 nm to 840 nm, indicating a transition from a discontinuous to a continuous Pd shell



Figure S11: TEM investigation of the pore structure before and after Pt overgrowth. a) TEM image of mesoporous silica coated AuNR as prepared, and b) after Pt overgrowth. A line scan was performed along the red (a) and green (b) line. The grey values as a function of distance are plotted in panel c. The periodicity in grey values before and after overgrowth is similar indicating that no large changes in the mesopore structure occurred upon Pt overgrowth



Figure S12: High resolution bright field TEM images of Au@Pt@SiO₂ NRs. a) HRTEM image and b) corresponding zoom-in of the Au@Pt@SiO₂ NR with $d_{lattice}^{Au} = 0.237$ nm and $d_{lattice}^{Pt} = 0.22$ nm, corresponding to the (111) lattice planes.



Figure S13: Verifying the accessibility of silica coated AuNRs after CTAB removal from the mesopores using pyridine SERS. Raman spectra of pyridine (10 mM in H_2O) with Au@SiO₂ NRs (green) and without (black). The spectra were recorded using a 50× air objective and a 633 nm laser operating at a laser power of 1.3 mW. A measurement time of 1 s was used



Figure S14: Reproducible SERS measurements of crystal violet (CV) in the presence of bimetallic Au@Ag@SiO₂ and Au@Pd@SiO₂ NRs, and monometallic Au@SiO₂ NRs measured at 10 different positions in each capillary. The CV concentration was 1.0 μ M in a 3:1 EtOH:H₂O mixture containing a constant metal concentration of [Au] = 0.5 mM. As the Au core sizes are similar ($V_{core} = 1.2 \cdot 2.4 \times 10^4$) the particle density is comparable in the different samples. The resulting spectra of Au@Ag@SiO₂ NRs with $X_{Ag} = 0.42$ (a) and 0.20 (b), Au@SiO₂ NRs with $X_{Au} = 1.0$ (c) and Au@Pd@SiO₂ NRs with $X_{Pd} = 0.21$ (d) and 0.32 (e) are shown in orange, red, black, blue and turquoise, respectively.

Supplementary Tables

Table S1: Dimensions of the Au@Ag@SiO₂ NRs. For the overgrowth 0.300 mL etched AuNRs@meso-SiO₂ (L = 61.7 nm, D = 18.2 nm, LSPR = 748 nm, Ext= 2.2) in H₂O were used. The full set of reaction conditions used in the synthesis of the Au@Ag@SiO₂ NRs are presented in Table 2. The size parameters are based on TEM analysis of 100 particles per sample.

X_{Ag}	AgNO ₃ (mM)	Length (nm)	Diameter (nm)	AR
0	0	$61.7 {\pm} 9.7$	18.2 ± 2.2	$3.4{\pm}0.5$
0.18	0.05	$64.5 {\pm} 9.8$	$19.7 {\pm} 2.1$	$3.3{\pm}0.5$
0.35	0.08	$64.3 {\pm} 9.9$	$22.2{\pm}2.7$	$2.9{\pm}0.4$
0.41	0.13	$68.4{\pm}11$	22.7 ± 2.4	$3.0{\pm}0.5$
0.50	0.17	$72.9{\pm}11$	$23.9{\pm}2.5$	$3.0{\pm}0.4$
0.57	0.22	75.5 ± 11	25.3 ± 3.2	$3.0{\pm}0.4$
0.57	0.27	$75.6{\pm}11$	25.3 ± 3.2	$3.0{\pm}0.3$
0.61	0.30	$76.7 {\pm} 10$	$26.6 {\pm} 2.8$	$2.9{\pm}0.4$
0.63	0.33	75.7 ± 10	27.4 ± 3.5	2.8 ± 0.4

Table S2: Ag overgrowth: reaction conditions used for the Au@Ag@SiO₂ NRs presented in Figure 2 in the main text. For the overgrowth 0.300 mL etched AuNRs@meso-SiO₂ (length (L) = 61.7 nm; diameter (D) = 18.2 nm, $\lambda_{LSPR} = 748$ nm, Ext= 2.2) in H₂O were used. Reaction time = 20 min. AgNO₃/Ascorbic acid (added) and AgNO₃/Ascorbic acid (final) refer to the amount and concentration of the AgNO₃/Ascorbic acid solution added to the reaction mixture, and the final AgNO₃/Ascorbic acid concentration in the reaction mixture, respectively.

X_{Ag}	$AgNO_3$ (added)	Ascorbic acid (added)	$AgNO_3$ (final)	Ascorbic acid (final)
0.18	0.015 mL 1.0 mM	$0.015~\mathrm{mL}~4.0~\mathrm{mM}$	$0.045 \mathrm{~mM}$	$0.18 \mathrm{~mM}$
0.35	0.030 mL 1.0 mM	$0.030~\mathrm{mL}~4.0~\mathrm{mM}$	$0.083 \mathrm{~mM}$	$0.33 \mathrm{~mM}$
0.41	0.023 mL 2.0 mM	$0.023~\mathrm{mL}~8.0~\mathrm{mM}$	$0.13 \mathrm{~mM}$	$0.53 \mathrm{~mM}$
0.50	0.030 mL 2.0 mM	$0.030 {\rm ~mL} {\rm ~8.0 ~mM}$	$0.17 \mathrm{~mM}$	$0.67 \mathrm{~mM}$
0.57	0.019 mL 4.0 mM	$0.019~\mathrm{mL}$ 16 mM	0.22 mM	$0.90 \mathrm{~mM}$
0.57	0.023 mL 4.0 mM	$0.023~\mathrm{mL}$ 16 mM	$0.27 \mathrm{~mM}$	$1.1 \mathrm{~mM}$
0.61	0.026 mL 4.0 mM	$0.026~\mathrm{mL}~16~\mathrm{mM}$	$0.30 \mathrm{~mM}$	1.2 mM
0.63	0.030 mL 4.0 mM	$0.030~\mathrm{mL}$ 16 mM	$0.33 \mathrm{~mM}$	$1.3 \mathrm{~mM}$

Table S3: Pd overgrowth: reaction conditions used for the Au@Pd@SiO₂ NRs presented in Figure 3 in the main text. For the overgrowth 0.300 mL etched AuNRs@meso-SiO₂ (L=60.8 nm, D=19.5 nm, $\lambda_{LSPR}=746$ nm, Ext= 2.2) in H₂O were used. Reaction time = 20 min. Na₂PdCl₄/Ascorbic acid (added) and Na₂PdCl₄/Ascorbic acid (final) refer to the amount and concentration of the Na₂PdCl₄/Ascorbic acid solution added to the reaction mixture, and the final Na₂PdCl₄/Ascorbic acid concentration in the reaction mixture, respectively.

X_{Pd}	Na_2PdCl_4 (added)	Ascorbic acid (added)	Na_2PdCl_4 (final)	Ascorbic Acid (final)
0.03	0.030 mL 1.0 mM	$0.030 { m ~mL} 4.0 { m ~mM}$	$0.083 \mathrm{~mM}$	$0.33 \mathrm{~mM}$
0.14	$0.030 {\rm ~mL} {\rm ~2.0 ~mM}$	$0.030 { m ~mL} { m 8.0 ~mM}$	$0.17 \mathrm{~mM}$	$0.67 \mathrm{~mM}$
0.34	$0.030 {\rm ~mL} {\rm ~5.0 ~mM}$	$0.030~\mathrm{mL}~20~\mathrm{mM}$	$0.42 \mathrm{~mM}$	$1.7 \mathrm{~mM}$
0.39	$0.030~\mathrm{mL}~10~\mathrm{mM}$	$0.030~\mathrm{mL}$ 40 mM	$0.83 \mathrm{~mM}$	$3.3 \mathrm{~mM}$

Table S4: Pt overgrowth: reaction conditions used for the Au@Pt@SiO₂ NRs presented in Figure 4 in the main text. For the overgrowth 0.300 mL etched AuNRs@meso-SiO₂ (L= 61.7 nm, D= 18.2 nm, $\lambda_{LSPR}= 748 \text{ nm}$, Ext= 2.2) in H₂O were used. The reaction mixture was left overnight. K₂PtCl₄/Ascorbic acid (added) and K₂PtCl₄/Ascorbic acid (final) refer to the amount and concentration of the K₂PtCl₄/Ascorbic acid solution added to the reaction mixture, and the final K₂PtCl₄/Ascorbic acid concentration in the reaction mixture, respectively.

K_2PtCl_4 (added)	Ascorbic acid (added)	K_2 PtCl ₄ (final)	Ascorbic acid (final)
$0.030 {\rm ~mL} \ 1.0 {\rm ~mM}$	$0.030 {\rm ~mL} {\rm ~4.0} {\rm ~mM}$	$0.083 \mathrm{~mM}$	$0.33 \mathrm{~mM}$
$0.030~\mathrm{mL}~10~\mathrm{mM}$	$0.030~\mathrm{mL}~40~\mathrm{mM}$	$0.83 \mathrm{~mM}$	$3.3 \mathrm{~mM}$
$0.030~\mathrm{mL}$ 50 mM	$0.030~\mathrm{mL}~200~\mathrm{mM}$	$4.2 \mathrm{~mM}$	$17 \mathrm{~mM}$
$0.030~\mathrm{mL}$ 100 mM	$0.030~\mathrm{mL}~400~\mathrm{mM}$	$8.3 \mathrm{~mM}$	$33 \mathrm{~mM}$

Table S5: Estimated yield in Ag overgrowth. Based on the metal concentrations used in the metal overgrowth, the theoretical composition (X_{Ag} calculated) was estimated and compared to the measured composition (X_{Ag} measured). The yield is the measured composition divided by the calculated composition times 100 %. The gold concentration in the 0.3 mL dispersion used in the metal overgrowth step was estimated to be 0.18 mM. This estimate is based on the following assumptions: i) in the AuNR synthesis: [HAuCl₄] = 0.5 mM, ii) in the AuNR synthesis: [Au⁰] = 0.33 mM (which is based on the fact that only 2/3 of the HAuCl₄ is reduced as [ascorbic acid] = 0.33 x [Au¹⁺], and 1 ascorbic acid molecule can reduce 2 Au¹⁺ ions to Au⁰), iii) in the metal overgrowth: [Au⁰] = 0.18 mM, as the Au concentration used in the metal overgrowth is 0.55 times the Au concentration used during the AuNR synthesis.

$AgNO_3$ (added)	Au (added)	X_{Ag} calculated	X_{Ag} measured	Yield $(\%)$
$0.015 \ \mu mol$	$0.054 \ \mu mol$	0.22	0.18	83
$0.030~\mu mol$	$0.054 \ \mu mol$	0.36	0.35	98
$0.045 \ \mu mol$	$0.054 \ \mu mol$	0.45	0.41	90
$0.060 \ \mu mol$	$0.054 \ \mu mol$	0.53	0.50	95
$0.075 \ \mu mol$	$0.054 \ \mu mol$	0.58	0.57	98
$0.090~\mu { m mol}$	$0.054 \ \mu mol$	0.63	0.57	91
$0.0105 \ \mu mol$	$0.054 \ \mu mol$	0.66	0.61	92
$0.012 \ \mu mol$	$0.054 \ \mu mol$	0.68	0.63	91

Table S6: Estimated yield in Pd overgrowth. Based on the metal concentrations used in the metal overgrowth, the theoretical composition (X_{Pd} calculated) was estimated and compared to the measured composition (X_{Pd} measured). The yield is the measured composition divided by the calculated composition times 100 %. The gold concentration in the 0.3 mL dispersion used in the metal overgrowth step was estimated to be 0.18 mM.

Na_2PdCl_4 (added)	Au (added)	X_{Pd} (calculated)	X_{Pd} (measured)	Yield (%)
$0.030 \ \mu mol$	$0.054 \ \mu mol$	0.36	0.03	8
$0.060 \ \mu mol$	$0.054 \ \mu mol$	0.53	0.14	27
$0.15~\mu { m mol}$	$0.054 \ \mu mol$	0.74	0.34	46
$0.30 \ \mu mol$	$0.054 \ \mu mol$	0.85	0.39	46

Table S7: Sample details Au@Ag@SiO₂, Au@SiO₂ and Au@Pd@SiO₂ NRs used for the SERS measurements as presented in Figure 6 in the main text. The composition of the particles was determined via ICP and the particle dimensions via TEM. The values are an average of 50-100 size measurements per particle batch. The composition was determined using ICP. The error in the given compositions is $\leq 3\%$.

Composition	Length (nm)	Diameter (nm)	Aspect ratio	Particle volume (10^4 nm^3)	Au core volume (10^4 nm^3)
$X_{Au} = 1.0$	$67 {\pm} 6.3$	$19{\pm}2.2$	$3.5 {\pm} 0.5$	$1.8{\pm}0.5$	$1.8{\pm}0.4$
$X_{Ag} = 0.20$	$73 {\pm} 6.8$	26 ± 3.1	$2.8 {\pm} 0.4$	$3.5{\pm}0.9$	$2.5{\pm}0.5$
$X_{Ag} = 0.42$	$75 {\pm} 6.3$	$30{\pm}3.0$	$2.5 {\pm} 0.3$	$4.6 {\pm} 0.9$	$2.5 {\pm} 0.5$
$X_{Pd} = 0.21$	$65 {\pm} 6.4$	$19{\pm}1.8$	$3.5 {\pm} 0.5$	$1.6{\pm}0.4$	$1.2{\pm}0.3$
$X_{Pd} = 0.32$	72 ± 7.7	$24{\pm}3.2$	$3.5 {\pm} 0.4$	$2.9{\pm}0.9$	$2.0{\pm}0.6$

Table S8: Maximum local field E_{max} computed with FDTD around Au@SiO₂, Au@Ag@SiO₂ and Au@Pd@SiO₂ NRs in the xz direction, where the z-axis is directed along the length of the NR.

Composition	E_{xz}^{max}
$X_{Ag} = 0.42$	3396
$X_{Ag} = 0.20$	198
$X_{Au} = 1.0$	12
$X_{Pd} = 0.21$	14
$X_{Pd} = 0.32$	22