# <sup>2</sup> Supplementary Information for

# In situ investigation of water on MXene Interfaces

<sup>4</sup> Wahid Zaman, Ray Matsumoto, Matthew W. Thompson, Yu-Hsuan Liu, Yousuf Bootwala, Marm B. Dixit, Ethan Crumlin, Marta

- 5 C. Hatzell, Peter T. Cummings and Kelsey B. Hatzell
- 6 Kelsey B. Hatzell.

1

- 7 E-mail: kelsey.hatzell@princeton.edu
- **8** This PDF file includes:
- 9 Figs. S1 to S12
- 10 Tables S1 to S8
- 11 SI References

12 Peak fitting. For peak fitting, CasaXPS software was used for data analysis. During spectra acquisition at 800eV, presence

<sup>13</sup> of Auger peaks was observed, which can be located by comparing 900eV spectra (Fig. S9). To eliminate the effect of Auger

peaks, a background subtraction was carried on (for C1s). The final peaks were corrected by using Tougaard background. For
 best fitting, a modified asymmetric Lorentzian lineshape (LF) was chosen for O1s and C1s peaks. The rest were fitted using

Gaussian Lorentzian (GL) lineshape. The XPS spectra was calibrated to TiC-T<sub>x</sub> component of C1s spectra at 282V. It should

<sup>17</sup> be noted that, the Fermi edges of the MXene samples were not sharp enough to locate the 0 eV. Therefore, an alternative

18 calibration approach was implemented by referencing to the TiC- $T_x$  peak. Binding energies and FWHM for the peaks are

<sup>19</sup> listed in Table S1-S3.

 $\mathbf{T}_{x}^{-}$  mole number calculation. Surface termination groups for MXene samples were determined by first calculating the global atomic percentage of all elements:

$$X_i = \frac{C_i}{\sum_{j=1}^m C_j}$$
$$C_i = \frac{I_i}{R_i}$$

<sup>22</sup> Where  $X_i$  = Atomic fraction of element i,  $C_i$  = intensity of element i and  $\sum_{j=1}^{m} C_j$  = Cumulative intensity of all elements,  $I_i$  = <sup>23</sup> integrated area of element i,  $R_i$  = Relative sensitivity factor (RSF) of element i.

 $T_x^-$  mole numbers were calculated by taking the areal fraction of each species (-O, -F, -OH, -H<sub>2</sub>O) from O1s and F1s spectra, multiplied by the global atomic percentage of the respective species. The amount of TiO<sub>2</sub> was calculated from Ti2P spectra and O-TiC from O1s was accounted from that accordingly.

Relative sensitivity factor. The relative sensitivity factors (RSFs) for beamline 9.3.2 were calculated using four correction 27 parameters (the flux of the beamline, the analyzer transmission function, the differential cross section, and the inelastic mean 28 free path). The flux was directly measured using a photodiode at the position of the sample and the analyzer transmission 29 function was deduced from the intensity of Au 4f spectra of a clean gold foil at a series of excitation energies using the same 30 data correction procedure, except for the inelastic mean free path, which was calculated with values calculated from optical 31 properties of the elements (1). The differential cross sections were obtained by assuming random orientation of grains and using 32 an angle between polarization vector and photoelectron direction of 20(2). The inelastic mean free path was calculated with the 33 predictive TPP-2M formula in an iterative manner: the material parameters entering the equation, i.e. the density, the number 34 of valence electrons, and the molar mass, were calculated from the sum formula, which was initially guessed and improved

of valence electrons, and the molar mass, were calculated from the sum formula, which was initially guessed and improved iteratively, based on the outcome of the composition analysis. The band gap (another parameter in the TPP-2M formula) was

assumed to be 0 eV. The density was calculated from the sum formula and the volume of the unit cell obtained from XRD.

<sup>38</sup> The effect of the volume changes on the relative sensitivity factors were negligible. Eight s- and p-orbital valence electrons of

<sup>39</sup> titanium are typically categorized as high-binding energy valence electrons and were not accounted for the calculation of the

40 inelastic mean free path (3). The product of the four correction factors were normalized to the resulting values of C 1s. The

<sup>41</sup> RSF values for all elements are shown in Table S8.

Region	Temperature	BE[eV]	FWHM	Fraction	Component	Reference
Ti 2p <sub>3/2</sub>	$25^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	455.07 (460.77)	1.7 (2)	0.19(0.09)	Ti <sup>+</sup>	(4)
$(2p_{1/2})$		456.06(461.76)	1.8(1.74)	0.2(0.1)	$Ti^{2+}$	(4)
. , .		457.35(463.05)	1.8(1.68)	0.13(0.067)	$Ti^{3+}$	(4)
		458.77 (464.47)	1.7(2.28)	$0.11 \ (0.055)$	$TiO_2$	(5)
		460 (465.70)	1.8(2.97)	0.03 (0.015)	$\mathrm{TiC}\text{-}\mathrm{T}_x$	(6)
Ti 2p <sub>3/2</sub>	$200^{\circ}C$	455(460.7)	1.7(2.15)	0.18(0.09)	Ti <sup>+</sup>	(4)
$(2p_{1/2})$		456.02(461.72)	1.8(1.78)	0.22(0.11)	$Ti^{2+}$	(4)
		457.24(462.94)	1.7(1.55)	0.11 (0.054)	$Ti^{3+}$	(4)
		458.53(464.23)	1.72(2.17)	0.12(0.058)	$TiO_2$	(5)
		460 (465.70)	1.8(2.93)	0.04(0.02)	$TiC-T_x$	(6)
O1s	$25^{\circ}C$	529.80	1.58	0.3	TiO <sub>2</sub>	(7)
		530.70	1.62	0.3	TiC-O	(8)
		531.95	1.62	0.18	TiC-OH	(7)
		533.08	1.58	0.088	$H_2O$	(7)
		534.84	1.58	0.12	$gp-H_2O$	(7)
O1s	$200^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	529.79	1.58	0.39	TiO <sub>2</sub>	(7)
		530.73	1.62	0.31	TiC-O	(8)
		531.94	1.62	0.17	TiC-OH	(7)
		533.08	1.58	0.044	$H_2O$	(7)
		534.78	1.58	0.087	$gp-H_2O$	(7)
C1s	$25^{\circ}C$	282	1.3	0.494	$\mathrm{TiC}\text{-}\mathrm{T}_x$	(8)
		284.52	2.04	0.505	$C-C/CH_x$	(9)
C1s	$200^{\circ}C$	281.98	1.31	0.47	$TiC-T_x$	(8)
		284.5	2.05	0.53	$C-C/CH_x$	(9)
F1s	$25^{\circ}C$	684.9	1.63	0.9	$\operatorname{TiC-(O,F)_x}$	(8)
		686.7	1.2	0.1	$AlF_x$	(10)
F1s	$200^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	684.9	1.72	0.87	$\operatorname{TiC-}(O,F)_x$	(8)
		686.82	1.54	0.13	$AlF_x$	(10)

Table S1. XPS peak fitting results of neat  $Ti_3C_2T_x$  at 100 mTorr vapor pressure

Region	Temperature	BE[eV]	FWHM	Fraction	Component	Reference
Ti 2p <sub>3/2</sub>	$25^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	455.05 (460.75)	1.7(2.5)	0.10(0.05)	$Ti^+$	(4)
$(2p_{1/2})$		455.80 (461.50)	1.81(1.44)	0.14(0.07)	$Ti^{2+}$	(4)
		457.15(462.85)	1.8(1.52)	0.12(0.059)	$Ti^{3+}$	(4)
		459(464.7)	1.66(2.38)	0.24(0.12)	$TiO_2$	(5)
		460 (465.70)	1.81(3.2)	0.063(0.031)	$\mathrm{TiC}\text{-}\mathrm{T}_x$	(6)
Ti 2p <sub>3/2</sub>	$200^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	455.15 (460.85)	1.7(2.42)	$0.11 \ (0.057)$	Ti <sup>+</sup>	(4)
$(2p_{1/2})$		455.75(461.45)	1.81(1.45)	0.12(0.06)	$Ti^{2+}$	(4)
		457.07 (462.77)	1.45(1.8)	0.13(0.066)	$Ti^{3+}$	(4)
		458.97 (464.67)	1.6(2.38)	0.25 (0.125)	$TiO_2$	(5)
		460 (465.70)	1.81(3.3)	0.05 (0.025)	$\mathrm{TiC}\text{-}\mathrm{T}_x$	(6)
O1s	$25^{\circ}C$	530.35	1.62	0.33	TiO <sub>2</sub>	(7)
		531.3	1.58	0.25	TiC-O	(8)
		532.50	1.58	0.165	TiC-OH	(7)
		533.50	1.62	0.15	$H_2O$	(7)
		534.98	1.62	0.1	$gp-H_2O$	(7)
O1s	$200^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	530.30	1.62	0.47	TiO <sub>2</sub>	(7)
		531.3	1.59	0.29	TiC-O	(8)
		532.50	1.58	0.144	TiC-OH	(7)
		533.45	1.59	0.04	$H_2O$	(7)
		534.9	1.58	0.055	$gp-H_2O$	(7)
C1s	$25^{\circ}C$	282	1.35	0.367	$\mathrm{TiC}\text{-}\mathrm{T}_x$	(8)
		285	2.16	0.63	$C-C/CH_x$	(9)
C1s	$200^{\circ}C$	282	1.38	0.373	$\mathrm{TiC}\text{-}\mathrm{T}_x$	(8)
		284.7	1.92	0.627	$C-C/CH_x$	(9)
F1s	$25^{\circ}C$	685.2	1.75	0.86	$\operatorname{TiC-(O,F)}_x$	(8)
		686.7	1.27	0.14	$AlF_x$	(10)
F1s	$200^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	685.1	1.6	0.92	$\operatorname{TiC-(O,F)}_x$	(8)
		687.5	1.2	0.08	$AlF_x$	(10)
Li1s	$25^{\circ}C$	56.03	2	1	$Li^+/LiF$	(11)
Li1s	$200^{\circ}C$	56.1	2	1	$Li^+/LiF$	(11)

Table S2. XPS peak fitting results of Li-Ti $_3$ C $_2$ T $_x$  at 100 mTorr vapor pressure

Region	Temperature	BE[eV]	FWHM	Fraction	Component	Reference
Ti 2p <sub>3/2</sub>	$25^{\circ}C$	455.15 (460.85)	1.7(2.42)	0.11(0.057)	Ti <sup>+</sup>	(4)
$(2p_{1/2})$		455.75 (461.45)	1.81(1.45)	0.12(0.06)	$Ti^{2+}$	(4)
. , .		457.07 (462.77)	1.45(1.8)	0.13(0.066)	Ti <sup>3+</sup>	(4)
		458.97 (464.67)	1.6(2.38)	0.25(0.125)	$TiO_2$	(5)
		460 (465.70)	1.81(3.3)	$0.05 \ (0.025)$	$TiC-T_x$	(6)
Ti 2p <sub>3/2</sub>	$200^{\circ}C$	455.12 (460.82)	1.7(2.5)	0.1(0.05)	Ti <sup>+</sup>	(4)
$(2p_{1/2})$		455.84 (461.54)	1.43(1.78)	0.11(0.055)	$Ti^{2+}$	(4)
. , .		457.02 (462.72)	1.78(1.68)	0.11(0.056)	Ti <sup>3+</sup>	(4)
		458.76 (464.46)	1.6(2.3)	0.28(0.14)	$TiO_2$	(5)
		460 (465.70)	1.81(3.02)	0.06(0.03)	$TiC-T_x$	(6)
O1s	$25^{\circ}C$	530.32	1.62	0.52	TiO <sub>2</sub>	(7)
		531.2	1.58	0.22	TiC-O	(8)
		532.40	1.61	0.098	TiC-OH	(7)
		533.30	1.6	0.072	$H_2O$	(7)
		534.8	1.58	0.097	$gp-H_2O$	(7)
O1s	$200^{\circ}C$	530.26	1.62	0.57	TiO <sub>2</sub>	(7)
		531.2	1.58	0.27	TiC-O	(8)
		532.40	1.58	0.066	TiC-OH	(7)
		533.3	1.62	0.026	$H_2O$	(7)
		534.91	1.58	0.067	$gp-H_2O$	(7)
C1s	$25^{\circ}C$	282	1.33	0.48	$\text{TiC-T}_x$	(8)
		284.95	2.3	0.52	$C-C/CH_x$	(9)
C1s	$200^{\circ}C$	282	1.39	0.41	$\operatorname{TiC-T}_x$	(8)
		284.84	1.94	0.59	$C-C/CH_x$	(9)
F1s	$25^{\circ}C$	684.8	1.9	0.93	$\operatorname{TiC-(O,F)}_{x}$	(8)
		686.9	1.46	0.07	$AlF_x$	(10)
F1s	$200^{\circ}C$	684.81	1.92	0.8	$\operatorname{TiC-}(O,F)_x$	(8)
		686.94	1.75	0.2	$\operatorname{AlF}_x$	(10)
K $2p_{3/2}$ ( $2p_{1/2}$ )	$25^{\circ}C$	293.22 (296.26)	1.33(1.22)	1	$K^+$	(12)
K 2p <sub>3/2</sub> (2p <sub>1/2</sub>	$200^{\circ}C$	293.2(296.24)	1.6(1.7)	1	K <sup>+</sup>	(12)

Table S3. XPS peak fitting results of K-Ti $_3$ C $_2$ T $_x$  at 100 mTorr vapor pressure

Sample	Temperature	1 mTorr	100 mTorr
$Ti_3C_2T_x$ $25^{\circ}C$		0.7	0.8
	$200^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	0.7	0.7
Li-Ti <sub>3</sub> C <sub>2</sub> T <sub><math>x</math></sub> 25°C		0.8	0.7
	$200^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	0.8	0.7
$ ext{K-Ti}_3 ext{C}_2 ext{T}_x$	$25^{\circ}C$	0.9	0.8
	$200^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	0.9	0.9

### Table S4. Mole number of -O group in MXene samples at 25°C and 200°C at 1 mTorr and 100 mTorr vapor pressure

# Table S5. Mole number of -OH group in MXene samples at 25°C and 200°C at 1 mtorr and 100 mTorr vapor pressure

Sample	Temperature	1 mTorr	100 mTorr
$Ti_3C_2T_x$ 25°C		0.6	0.5
	$200^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	0.5	0.5
$Li-Ti_3C_2T_x$	$25^{\circ}C$	0.6	0.6
	$200^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	0.5	0.5
$K-Ti_3C_2T_x$	$25^{\circ}C$	0.4	0.3
	$200^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	0.2	0.2

Table S6.  $R^2$  values for the regression analysis of areal fraction of adsorbed  $H_2O$ , -OH, -O and  $TiO_2$  in MXenes at 100 mTorr with increasing temperature

Sample	$H_2O$	-OH	-0	$TiO_2$
$Ti_3C_2T_x$	0.98	0.43	0.56	0.98
$\text{Li-Ti}_3\text{C}_2\text{T}_x$	0.94	0.87	0.99	0.97
$K-Ti_3C_2T_x$	0.92	0.99	0.34	0.99

#### Table S7. R<sup>2</sup> values for the regression analysis of areal fraction of water in MXenes at different vapor pressure

Sample	Temperature	$\mathbb{R}^2$
$Ti_3C_2T_x$	$25^{\circ}C$	0.98
	$200^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$	0.58
$\text{Li-Ti}_3\text{C}_2\text{T}_x$	$25^{\circ}C$	0.99
	$200^{\circ}C$	0.20
K-Ti <sub>3</sub> C <sub>2</sub> T <sub><math>x</math></sub>	$25^{\circ}C$	0.99
	$200^{\circ}C$	0.75

Table S8. Relative sensitivity factors (RSF) for all elements in XPS analysis, carried out using 800eV excitation energy

Element	RSF
Ti2p	3.7
O1s	1
C1s	1
F1s	0.39
Li1s	0.03
K2p	3.4



Fig. S1. O1s spectra of as-prepared samples in UHV at (a)  $25^\circ$ C and (b)  $200^\circ$ C



Fig. S2. O1s spectra at 100 mTorr, changes in (a)-O coverage and (b)-OH coverage with increasing temperature. The coverage in (a) and (b) was normalized with respect to the total fraction of -O, -OH,  $H_2O$  and  $TiO_2$ 



Fig. S3. Ti2p spectra at (a,d) UHV, (b,e) 1 mTorr and (c,f) 100 mTorr vapor pressure at 25°C and 200°C

8Wahid Zaman, Ray Matsumoto, Matthew W. Thompson, Yu-Hsuan Liu, Yousuf Bootwala, Marm B. Dixit, Ethan Crumlin, Marta C. Hatzell, Peter T. Cummings and Kelsey B. Hatzell



Fig. S4. C1s spectra at (a,d) UHV, (b,e) 1 mTorr and (c,f) 100 mTorr vapor pressure at  $25^\circ$ C and  $200^\circ$ C



Fig. S5. Li1s spectra at (a) UHV, (b) 1 mTorr and (c) 100 mTorr vapor pressure at 25°C and 200°C



Fig. S6. K2p spectra at (a) UHV, (b) 1 mTorr and (c) 100 mTorr vapor pressure at  $25^{\circ}C$  and  $200^{\circ}C$ 



Fig. S7. O1s spectra at (a,b) UHV and (c,d) 1 mTorr vapor pressure at  $25^\circ C$  and  $200^\circ C$ 



Fig. S8. F1s spectra at (a,d) UHV, (b,e) 1 mTorr and (c,f) 100 mTorr vapor pressure at  $25^{\circ}C$  and  $200^{\circ}C$ 



Fig. S9. Full spectra of (a) Li-Ti $_3C_2T_x$  and (b) K-Ti $_3C_2T_x$  at 800eV and 900eV showing appearance of Auger peaks



Fig. S10. Ti:C ratio of the MXenes at different conditions



Fig. S11. Chemical Potential as a function of Pressure in a system of bulk SPC/E water



Fig. S12. Number density profiles for (a)  $Ti_3C_2T_x$ , (b) Li- $Ti_3C_2T_x$  and (c) K- $Ti_3C_2T_x$ . . Surface position at 0.0 nm corresponds to the maximum z-coordinate of the MXene sheet.

### 42 References

- S Tanuma, CJ Powell, DR Penn, Calculations of electron inelastic mean free paths. IX. Data for 41 elemental solids over the 50 eV to 30 keV range. Surf. Interface Analysis 43, 689–713 (2011).
- 45 2. JJ Yeh, I Lindau, Atomic subshell photoionization cross sections and asymeetry parameters: 1≤Z≤103. At. Data Nucl.
  46 Data Tables 32, 1–155 (1985).
- 47 3. NIST Standard Reference Database 71, URL: https://www.nist.gov/srd/nist-standard-reference-database-71. (2021).
- 4. V Schier, J Halbritter, K Karlsruhe, ARXPS-analysis of sputtered TiC, SiC and Tio.sSio.sC layers. J. Anal. Chem.,
  49 227–232 (1993).
- 5. F Santerre, MA El Khakani, M Chaker, JP Dodelet, Properties of TiC thin films grown by pulsed laser deposition. Appl.
  Surf. Sci. 148, 24–33 (1999).
- 6. T Sultana, et al., XPS analysis of laser transmission micro-joint between poly (vinylidene fluoride) and titanium. Appl.
  Surf. Sci. 255, 2569–2573 (2008).
- 54 7. S Yamamoto, et al., In situ x-ray photoelectron spectroscopy studies of water on metals and oxides at ambient conditions.
  55 J. Phys. Condens. Matter 20 (2008).
- 8. J Halim, et al., X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy of select multi-layered transition metal carbides (MXenes). Appl. Surf.
  Sci. 362, 406–417 (2016).
- 9. PM Jayaweera, EL Quah, H Idriss, Photoreaction of ethanol on TiO2(110) single-crystal surface. J. Phys. Chem. C 111, 1764–1769 (2007).

## 1WadittsZaman, Ray Matsumoto, Matthew W. Thompson, Yu-Hsuan Liu, Yousuf Bootwala, Marm B. Dixit, Ethan Crumlin, Marta C. Hatzell, Peter T. Cummings and Kelsey B. Hatzell

- 10. Knst, D Grman, R Hauert, E Holländer, Fluorine-Induced corrosion of aluminium microchip bond pads: An XPS and
  AES analysis. Surf. Interface Analysis 21, 691–696 (1994).
- 11. M Ghidiu, et al., Ion-Exchange and Cation Solvation Reactions in Ti3C2 MXene. Chem. Mater. 28, 3507–3514 (2016).
- A Caballero, JP Espinós, A Fernández, L Soriano, AR González-Elipe, Adsorption and oxidation of K deposited on
  graphite. Surf. Sci. 364, 253-265 (1996).