Precursors to Molecular Slip on Smooth Hydrophobic Surfaces
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Experiments and simulations suggest that simple liquids can experience slip while flowing near a smooth, solid surface¹–⁴. Hydrophobic surfaces are expected to enhance slip at high shear rates due to a depleted density in the liquid near the solid⁵–⁷. Here we show how precursors to molecular slip can be observed in the complex response of a liquid to oscillatory shear. We measure both the change in frequency and bandwidth of a quartz crystal microbalance (QCM) during the growth of a single drop of water immersed in an ambient liquid. By varying the hydrophobicity of the surface using self-assembled monolayers, our results show little or no slip for water on all surfaces. More importantly, we observe excess transverse motion near hydrophobic surfaces due to weak binding in the corrugated surface potential, an essential “precursor” to slip. We also show how this effect can be easily missed in simulations with finite-ranged interaction potentials.

The conventional “no-slip” boundary condition for liquid flow near a solid wall assumes that the velocity is continuous. A more general boundary condition, first introduced by Navier in 1823, allows for a discontinuity in the tangential velocity, $\Delta v_t = b(\partial v_t/\partial n)$, where $n$ is the normal direction pointing into the liquid, and $b$ is the “slip length”. Although negligible on the macroscale, slip is especially important for nanoscale transport in confined⁸ and biological flows⁹, and for
technological processes involving nanofiltration[10], desalination[11], and energy harvesting[12]. Highly structured, superhydrophobic surfaces can lead to effective slip lengths greater than 1 µm due to residual gas bubbles trapped in surface features. However, on smooth surfaces, reported values of $b$ range from 0 to 100 nm or more, and are sensitive to issues such as nano-confinement[13–15] and surface contamination or roughness[16–20].

Two parameters are thought to determine slip in Newtonian liquids on molecularly smooth surfaces, yet there is little agreement between theory and experiments. First, surface hydrophobicity, often measured by the equilibrium contact angle in air, $\theta$, enhances slip through weak surface interactions. However, for water on hydrophobic surfaces, slip lengths reported in simulations[21, 22] are systematically lower than those reported in experiments[17, 23–26]. Second, a large shear rate at the liquid-solid interface will induce slip if the resulting shear stress is sufficiently strong[5, 7]. However, experiments often operate at shear rates of $\dot{\gamma} \leq 10^5$ s$^{-1}$, whereas simulations exceed $\dot{\gamma} = 10^9$ s$^{-1}$, making direct quantitative comparisons ambiguous.

Here we directly connect theory and experiments concerning molecular slip in water by systematically varying the surface hydrophobicity at large experimental shear rates. Our experiments show little or no slip ($|b| \leq 3$ nm) on all surfaces for $\theta_{a,wa} \leq 120$, where $\theta_{a,wa}$ is the advancing contact angle of a water drop in an ambient air environment. Before slip can occur on a surface, liquid molecules must, on average, experience some elastic displacement in local surface potential wells. We are able to measure these “precursors” to slip, and show that the amplitude of displacement increases with surface hydrophobicity. Thus, our measurements provide a direct connection between
Figure 1: (a) Diagram of the experimental setup. The QCM is immersed in a temperature-controlled bath of undecane as a water drop is slowly grown and imaged on the surface. (b-c) The QCM emits an evanescent shear wave which penetrates a characteristic distance $\delta \approx 200$ nm into the liquid. (d) The surface of the crystal is modified by oxygen plasma cleaning and/or coating with self-assembled monolayers which alters the hydrophobicity of the surface. (e) The liquid’s interaction with the surface adds inertia and damping to the crystal’s motion, which decreases the resonant frequency by $\Delta f$ and increases the bandwidth by $\Delta \Gamma$.

the nanometer-scale liquid dynamics and surface interactions; they allow us to predict when slip should occur at higher shear rates, and estimate the depletion length between the liquid and solid. Finally, we show how simulation techniques which are universally employed to simulate nanoscale flows, such as a cut-off radius for molecular interactions, can strongly influence interfacial slip for hydrophobic surfaces.

Our experiments consist of a QCM exposed to an unconfined liquid bath. The maximum
shear rate is \( \dot{\gamma} = 7.7 \times 10^5 \text{ s}^{-1} \), which is nearly an order of magnitude larger than other experimental techniques used to measure slip. QCMs have been previously used to measure liquid-solid boundary conditions\(^{27-32}\), and are known to be sensitive to temperature, elastic stress, and can be history dependent\(^{33}\). To achieve sub-nanometer resolution, we implemented a new, pseudo-differential method which compares the boundary condition between a wetting liquid (undecane), and a non-wetting liquid (water). Figure 1 shows our experimental setup. An AT-cut QCM operating at its fundamental frequency \( f_0 = 5 \text{ MHz} \) is immersed in a temperature-controlled bath of undecane. After a minimum of 1-2 hours of equilibration, a drop of water is slowly grown on the surface. Both liquids were degassed prior to the experiment in order to minimize the effects of surface nanobubbles\(^{34}\).

Upon immersion into a liquid with a no-slip boundary condition, the change in the resonant frequency and half-bandwidth of the QCM (\( \Delta f_{liq} \) and \( \Delta \Gamma_{liq} \) in Fig. 1, respectively) are given by\(^{33}\)

\[
\Delta f_{liq} = -\frac{f_0^{3/2}}{\pi Z_Q} \left( \pi \eta \rho \right)^{1/2},
\]

\[
\Delta \Gamma_{liq} = \frac{f_0^{3/2}}{\pi Z_Q} \left( \pi \eta \rho \right)^{1/2},
\]

where \( Z_Q \) is the acoustic impedance of quartz, \( \eta \) is the dynamic viscosity of the liquid, and \( \rho \) is the mass density of the liquid. The intuition for Eqn. 1 comes from the additional “carried mass” by the oscillator in the liquid. As shown in Fig. 1, the viscous penetration depth associated with the decay of the evanescent shear wave is \( \delta = \sqrt{\eta / \rho \pi f_0} \), and is typically a few hundred nanometers for low-viscosity liquids such as water. The additional carried mass per unit area of the QCM surface is product of the penetration depth and the liquid density, so that \( \delta \rho \propto \sqrt{\eta \rho} \). The shift in bandwidth
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in Eqn. 2 is proportional to the amount of energy dissipated per unit area in the liquid, which can be estimated by \( \eta (\partial v_t / \partial z)^{2}\delta \), where \( v_t \) is the liquid velocity tangent to the surface of the QCM. If we replace the derivative by the characteristic decay length, \( 1/\delta^2 \), then \( \Delta \Gamma_{\text{liq}} \propto \eta/\delta \propto \sqrt{\eta \rho} \).

The pseudo-differential technique requires matching the complex frequency response of the QCM to each liquid. This was done using the correct choice of liquids and experimental temperature. At \( 48^\circ \text{C} \), the growth of a water drop in undecane should result in \( \Delta f_{\text{drop}} = \Delta \Gamma_{\text{drop}} = 0 \) since \( \eta_w \rho_w = \eta_u \rho_u \), where the subscripts refer to water (w) and undecane (u) throughout. Thus, deviations from zero reveal information about the differences in the liquid-solid boundary condition for each the liquid. Figure 1a shows the shift in resonant frequency during the growth of water drops on various hydrophobic and hydrophilic surfaces used in our experiments (see Methods). It is important to note that the signal grows linearly with the contact area. If the signal was due to contact line effects, then the signal should scale with the perimeter of the drop (\( \sim \sqrt{A_{\text{drop}}} \)). The linear growth in the data suggests the entire contact area contributes to the signal. However, we can not rule out the existence of contact line effects that are too small to detect with our experimental technique.

To leading order, slip is expected to decouple mass from the surface, leading to a change in frequency but not bandwidth:

\[
\Delta f_{\text{slip}} = \frac{2 f_0^2 \rho}{Z_Q} b, \tag{3}
\]

\[
\Delta \Gamma_{\text{slip}} = \mathcal{O}(b^2/\delta^2), \tag{4}
\]

The slip length \( b \) can be interpreted as the distance below the surface where the velocity is continu-
ous (Fig. 2b). We are assuming here that the density and viscosity of the liquid near the surface are identical to the bulk, so that the slip is entirely due to a discontinuity in the velocity at the surface. However, this expression is valid for all one-parameter models of slip which extrapolate the linear velocity profile a distance \( b \) below the surface. If the liquid is slipping, then Eqn. 3 predicts

\[
\Delta f_{\text{drop}} = 2 \frac{A_{\text{drop}}}{A_{\text{active}}} \frac{f_0^2 \rho_w}{ZQ} \left( b_w - \frac{\rho_u}{\rho_w} b_u \right)
\]

upon the growth of a water drop with a contact area, \( A_{\text{drop}} \), and \( A_{\text{active}} = 37.1 \text{ mm}^2 \) is the measured active area of the QCM surface (see Methods).

Figure 2c shows the differential slip length from Eqn. 5 as a function of the advancing contact angle for a water drop in air, \( \theta_w^a \) (Table 1). The data can also be interpreted as the absolute slip length of water on the various surfaces if we assume \( b_u = 0 \). Naively, this is a reasonable assumption since undecane wets (\( \theta_u^a = 0 \)) all surfaces used in the experiment. We can conclude that the slip length on all surfaces is zero, or nearly zero, since it would be unreasonably fortuitous if both water and undecane had large, yet identical slip lengths on all surfaces. These results are consistent with recent simulations of water on a variety of surfaces indicating that slip only occurs for very hydrophobic interactions where \( \theta_e \geq 140^\circ \). The dashed line in Fig. 2c represents a theoretical prediction for water, \( b_w = 0.5(1 + \cos(\theta_w^a))^{-2} \) nm. The negative slip lengths consistently observed on SiO\(_2\) surfaces may be related to the formation of solid-like water layers, which is enhanced by hydroxylation through oxygen-plasma cleaning (Extended Data Fig. 1).

Figure 2c shows no obvious trend in the data for increased hydrophobicity. Conversely, Fig. 3b shows an increase in \( \Delta \Gamma \) as the water drop displaces the undecane, an effect which is larger
Figure 2: (a) $\Delta f$ scales linearly with the contact area of the drop for all experimental surfaces. Blue points are on SiO$_2$ surfaces, red points are on gold and gold-SAM surfaces. Only every 5th point is shown for clarity. (b) The slip length $b$ is defined by extrapolating the linear velocity profile at the surface. The dashed lines in (a) represent $b_w = \pm 2$ nm, assuming $b_u = 0$. (c) Differential slip length between water and undecane from Eqn. 5 versus advancing contact angle of the water (Table I). The dashed line is a theoretical prediction, as described in the text. Symbol shapes correspond to different surface chemistries as indicated in the legend in (c), and symbol fills indicate different experiments for a given surface.
for hydrophobic surfaces. The increase in dissipation is roughly linear in the contact area, and is not due to energy loss in the form of capillary waves, for example. We have verified this by reversing the role of the liquids in the experiment, i.e. growing an undecane drop on the surface in a water bath. In this case the bandwidth decreases by the same magnitude (Extended Data Fig. 2). An increase in $\Delta \Gamma$, with no corresponding change in $\Delta f$, is not easily explained. According to equations [1] and [2], variations in the liquid density or viscosity near the surface would affect the resonant frequency of the QCM.

Nevertheless, an isolated change in $\Delta \Gamma$ can be explained by additional elastic deformation between the first layer of liquid molecules and the SAM surface. For hydrophilic surfaces, the first layer of liquid is sufficiently bound to the SAM layer so that it moves synchronously with the QCM, and the amplitude of liquid motion is identical to the amplitude of solid motion. However, as the surface hydrophobicity increases, the near-surface molecules will experience excess deformation in their local potential minima, leading to a larger amplitude of motion in the liquid compared to the solid. Such deformation must occur prior on the onset of slip. Thus, upon the growth of a water drop, to leading order we expect (see Methods)

$$\Delta \Gamma_{\text{drop}} = 2 \frac{A_{\text{drop}}}{A_{\text{active}}} \left( \frac{D_w - D_u}{D_s} \right) \Delta \Gamma_{\text{iq}},$$

where $D_w$ ($D_u$) is the amplitude of motion of the water (undecane) at the surface, and $D_s$ is the amplitude of the solid, as shown in Fig. 3b. Figure 3b shows the fractional increase in amplitude as a function of the advancing contact angle of the water drop in undecane, $\theta_{wu}$. For the QCM voltages and liquids used in our experiment, the crystal amplitude $D_s \approx 3.3$ nm (see Methods), so the data in Fig. 3b suggest the excess amplitude in the liquid is of order 0.1 Å which is necessarily
smaller than the typical lattice spacing for SAMs, given by $\sigma_{ss} \approx 5 \, \text{Å}^{37}$.

The elastic deformation between the liquid and the solid surface can not be provided by the SAM monolayer since the typical modulus of a SAM is $\sim 20 \, \text{GPa}^{38}$, which is orders of magnitude too large to produce the observed effect. Thus, the deformation must be occurring at the liquid-SAM boundary. We can estimate the potential, $V_l$, experienced by a liquid molecule as the sum of all molecular pair-wise interactions across the interface. Near the surface, $V_l$ will have transverse, periodic variations due to the underlying lattice structure. The peak-to-peak amplitude of the variations, $V_{pp}$, will decay exponentially with surface separation$^2$. If the liquid is dragged along by the motion of the surface, then the force provided by the transverse gradient in the potential must be sufficient to balance the shear stress in the liquid. This idea is illustrated in Fig. 4a for a simple one-dimensional model.

Locally, the potential is parabolic near a minimum, so the maximum stress provided by the transverse gradient is $(\hat{t} \cdot \nabla V_l)/\sigma_{ss}^2 \approx k^2 V_{pp} (D_l - D_s)/2\sigma_{ss}^2$, where $\hat{t}$ is a unit tangent vector to the surface, $k = 2\pi/\sigma_{ss}$, and the subscript $l$ refers to the liquid phase. For the damped shear wave in the liquid, the maximum shear stress at the surface$^{33}$ is $D_l (2\pi f_0)^{3/2} (\eta \rho)^{1/2}$. Equating the two stresses gives

$$\frac{D_l}{D_s} \approx 1 + \frac{\sigma_{ss}^4}{V_{pp}^2} \left( \frac{2\eta \rho f_0^3}{\pi} \right)^{1/2},$$

where the approximation is valid when $D_l/D_s - 1 \ll 1$. Thus, for weak-binding substrates, the liquid will be, on average, further away from the surface, so $V_{pp}$ is smaller, leading to a larger compliance and an increase in the measured dissipation.
Figure 3: (a) $\Delta \Gamma$ scales linearly with the drop contact area. Blue points are on SiO$_2$ surfaces, red points are on gold and gold-SAM surfaces. Only every 5th point is shown for clarity. (b) Schematic showing a larger amplitude of motion in the liquid in comparison to the solid surface. (c) Difference in motional amplitude between the water and undecane at the solid surface, normalized by the amplitude of the solid, versus the advancing contact angle of the water drop in undecane. Symbol shapes correspond to different surface chemistries as indicated in the legend in (b), and symbol fills indicate different experiments for a given surface.
Figure 4: (a) One-dimensional model showing a liquid molecule moving in the transverse potential during left and right oscillatory motion of the surface. The excess amplitude of the liquid is $D_l - D_s$. (b) Illustration of an fcc lattice of dimensions $w \times w \times w/2$ and a liquid molecule at a center-to-center distance $z$ above the top surface molecular plane. (c) Local peak-to-peak variation in potential, $V_{pp}$, normalized by the interaction energy, versus $z$. The local potential depends on the size of the lattice, as well as the cut-off radius $r_0$ used for the pair potential. Unless specified, $r_0 = \infty$. 
In order to better understand how $V_{pp}$ depends on the distance from the surface, we compute the net potential from finite slabs of an fcc lattice of atoms with lattice constant $\sigma_{ss} = 5$ Å and dimension $w \times w \times w/2$, as shown in Fig. 4b. The liquid-solid interaction is modeled using a standard 12-6 Lennard-Jones pair potential, $V(r) = 4\epsilon((\sigma_{ls}/r)^{12} - (\sigma_{ls}/r)^6) + K_1r + K_2$, where $r$ is the center-to-center separation and $\sigma_{ls} = 3.37$ Å is the length scale of the interaction between the liquid and the solid. The constants $K_1$ and $K_2$ are adjusted to satisfy $V(r_0) = 0$ and $V'(r_0) = 0$, where $r_0$ is the cut-off radius, set to infinity where noted. The total potential is found from summing over the particles in the lattice. Figure 4c shows the sensitivity of $V_{pp}$ to the finite size of the system and range of the potential. Here, $V_{pp}$ is defined as the minimum potential barrier in any transverse direction along the surface. For $w \to \infty$, $V_{pp}$ exponentially decays away from the surface. For small slabs, the potential inverts ($V_{pp} \to 0$) before saturating. The largest effect is seen when the potential is cut off at $r_0 = 0.84$ nm.

Fig. 3c shows that $(D_w - D_u)/D_s \approx 0.01$ for the most hydrophobic surfaces in our experiments. Assuming for simplicity that $D_u = D_s$ since $\theta^a_u = 0$ for all surfaces, Eqn. 6 predicts that $V_{pp} \approx 3.9 \times 10^{-26}$ J for the water-solid interaction. For $\theta^a_w \sim 120^\circ$, we can estimate a liquid-solid interaction energy $\epsilon \approx 5 \times 10^{-22}$ J. Thus $V_{pp}/\epsilon \approx 8 \times 10^{-5}$, corresponding to a surface separation $z \approx 0.8$ nm in Fig. 4c. The corresponding depletion length would be $z - \sigma_{ls} = 4.6$ Å which is in excellent agreement with recent x-ray reflectivity measurements of depletion layers for SAM-water interfaces.

We expect slip to occur by increasing the hydrophobicity (decrease $V_{pp}$), or by increasing the
shear stress (increase $\dot{\gamma}$). The maximum gradient in the potential occurs at 1/4 the lattice spacing from the local minimum, as shown in Fig. 4a. This corresponds to $(D_l - D_s)/D_s = \sigma_{ss}/4D_s \approx 0.37$. Thus, increasing the shear rate by a factor of 40 would exceed the maximum tangential force provided by the surface, and result in slip. This would correspond to $\dot{\gamma} \approx 3.1 \times 10^7 \text{ s}^{-1}$, which is a factor of 10 less than the smallest shear rates in molecular dynamics simulations where slip is often reported.

Although our results are consistent with most molecular dynamics simulations, there have been several experimental studies that report slip lengths of order $b \geq 10 - 100 \text{ nm}$ for water on hydrophobic surfaces. All of the hydrodynamic surfaces used in these studies are composed of smooth glass coated with a silane-based SAM, as opposed to the gold-thiol based surfaces reported here. Nevertheless, the contact angles are similar and one may expect similar slip behavior. However, there are other important differences. The previous experimental studies do not report degassing the water prior to use, which has been suggested as a source for the enhanced slip due to the presence of adsorbed gas or nanobubbles. In addition, improvements in experimental sensitivity for tracer-based methods have systematically reported smaller slip lengths on silanized surfaces, and are consistent with $b = 0 \text{ nm}$. Perhaps most importantly, experimental techniques such as surface force apparatus or atomic force microscopy confine the liquid to nanoscale dimensions, which can dramatically enhance measurements of slip and alter the liquid viscosity. Our QCM method utilizes an open, semi-infinite liquid, where the substrate itself detects the shear stress.
In summary, we have demonstrated that precursors to slip can be observed for hydrophobic surfaces at large experimental shear rates, a result which connects numerous studies that are necessarily separated by orders of magnitude in dynamical time scales. Simple models of surface molecules show that the transverse potential variations experienced by the liquid are strongly influenced by the finite range of the simulation domain and the interaction potential. Although the range of the potential has been considered for static quantities such as the equilibrium contact angle, we have shown here that it is equally important for the interfacial dynamics. We expect the synthesis between theory and experiment presented here will impact multiple fields of research involving nanoscale liquid dynamics near material and biological interfaces. As applications necessitate even smaller length scales for flows, confinement effects become more important, as well as increased shear rates, both of which remain open questions for ongoing research efforts.

Methods

QCM properties The experiments utilized a Stanford Research Systems QCM200 + QCM25 system which is designed for liquid immersion. The quartz wafers were obtained from Inficon and were 330 \( \mu \text{m} \) thick and 2.54 cm in diameter. The exposed electrode material of the crystal was typically gold, although for some experiments they were purchased with an outer layer of SiO\(_2\) with thickness 100 nm. The active area, \( A_{\text{active}} = 37.1 \text{ mm}^2 \), of the quartz crystal was measured by placing microliter droplets at various distances from the center of the electrode and observing the response. An approximately Gaussian sensitivity profile was found with a standard deviation of 2.5 mm.
Table 1: Receding ($r$) and advancing ($a$) contact angles ($\pm 2^\circ$) for water ($w$) and undecane ($u$) on experimental surfaces in air. The designation (pc) indicates oxygen plasma cleaned, and $\theta_{wu}$ indicates a water drop immersed in an undecane bath.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>surface</th>
<th>$\theta^r_w$</th>
<th>$\theta^a_w$</th>
<th>$\theta^a_u$</th>
<th>$\theta^a_{wu}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SiO$_2$</td>
<td>13°</td>
<td>21°</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>38°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiO$_2$ (pc)</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>67°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au</td>
<td>70°</td>
<td>95°</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>120°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au (pc)</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>45°</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>115°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au-S(CH$<em>2$)$</em>{11}$CH$_3$</td>
<td>72°</td>
<td>90°</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>156°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au-S(CH$<em>2$)$</em>{11}$OH</td>
<td>11°</td>
<td>50°</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>100°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au-S(CH$_2$)$_2$(CF$_2$)$_7$CF$_3$</td>
<td>99°</td>
<td>115°</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>148°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The roughness of the bare QCMs were measured using atomic force microscopy before and after the addition of SAMs. Figure S3 shows a typical image of the surface, and the Fourier transform of the surface height fluctuations. The average RMS value for surface roughness was 1.67 nm, and the lateral length scale for this variation was >100 nm. These length scales result in a negligible contribution to the frequency and bandwidth due to roughness and are not expected to affect slip either. In liquids, QCM’s emit a very small percentage of their power in the form of longitudinal waves due to gradients in the shear amplitude along the surface. We avoided resonant conditions for emitted longitudinal waves by placing a tilted baffle between the mirror and the chamber window.

The amplitude of the crystal oscillation, 3.3 nm, was calculated using a 0.5 Volt amplitude across the QCM electrodes from the QCM200 controller. Thus, the shear rate in the water was \( \dot{\gamma} = D_w (\rho_w/\eta_w)^{1/2} (2\pi f_0)^{3/2} = 7.7 \times 10^5 \text{ s}^{-1} \). Although this shear rate is larger than encountered in most experiments, low-viscosity liquids such as water are expected to remain Newtonian (i.e. constant viscosity) in this regime.

**Liquid properties** Undecane (> 99% purity) was obtained from TCI America and filtered before each use. De-ionized water was obtained from a Millipore Sigma filtration system. Both liquids were de-gassed using a vacuum pump and flask overnight prior to experiments. A Stanford Research Systems PTC10 temperature controller maintained the undecane bath temperature at 48 ± 0.01°C. Prior to the growth of a water drop on the crystal, water was initially added into the corner of the experimental cell to equilibrate with the undecane due to the finite solubility of water in undecane (1.5 \( \times \) 10\(^{-3} \) mole fraction). This was especially necessary for SiO\(_2\) surfaces.
which displayed reversible, solid-layer adsorption upon the addition of water to the system (Ex-
tended Data Fig. 2). The contact area of the drop with the solid surface, $A_{\text{drop}}$, was measured by
imaging from above. For drops with $\theta_{\text{wu}} > 90^\circ$, $A_{\text{drop}}$ was corrected due to the refraction of
the light through the water-undecane surface.

The surface tensions of the water/air, undecane/air, and water/undecane interfaces at 48°C
were taken as $\gamma_{\text{wa}} = 68.0 \text{ mN/m}$\textsuperscript{46}, $\gamma_{\text{ua}} = 22.0 \text{ mN/m}$\textsuperscript{47}, and $\gamma_{\text{wu}} = 50.0 \text{ mN/m}$\textsuperscript{48}. The values for
the density and viscosities of water and undecane at 48°C were measured: $\rho_w = 989 \text{ kg/m}^3$, $\eta_w =$
$5.6 \times 10^{-4} \text{ Pa.s}$, $\rho_u = 720 \text{ kg/m}^3$, and $\eta_u = 7.8 \times 10^{-4} \text{ Pa.s}$.

**Surface preparation** All SAMs were obtained from Sigma Aldrich. The surface of the QCM
was initially cleaned by sonication in a Neutrad solution, then rinsed with ethanol and de-ionized
water. The QCM was then plasma cleaned using a custom oxygen plasma oven for 30 s to remove
all organic contaminants. For surfaces such as bare gold, this aggressive cleaning procedure was
necessary to obtain reproducible results. For SAM surfaces, the QCM was then immersed in
an ethanol solution containing the SAM molecules, and left for 24-48 hours. Prior to use in an
experiment, the QCM was removed from the solution, rinsed in ethanol, them immediately placed
in the QCM25 crystal holder and immersed into the bath of undecane in order to minimize ambient
contamination.

**Derivation of Eqn. 6** We can model the QCM as a one-dimensional, driven, damped harmonic
oscillator whose dynamics are described by the following equation:

$$
\frac{d^2 x}{dt^2} + \gamma \frac{dx}{dt} + \omega_0^2 x = \frac{F}{m} \sin(\omega t),
$$

(8)
where $x$ is the position of the oscillator, $m$ is the mass, $\gamma$ is the damping rate, $\omega_0$ is the natural angular frequency, and $F$ and $\omega$ are the amplitude and angular frequency of forcing, respectively. We assume that $\gamma \ll \omega_0$ because the QCM has a high quality factor. In this regime, the half-bandwidth at the resonant frequency is given by $\Delta \Gamma = \sqrt{3} \gamma / 2$, and the amplitude of motion at the resonant frequency is given by $D = F / (m \gamma \omega_0)$. The total energy dissipated per oscillation cycle is:

$$\Delta E = \int_0^T \gamma m \left( \frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 dt = D^2 \pi m \gamma \omega_0 = 2 \pi m \omega_0 D^2 \Delta \Gamma / \sqrt{3},$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)$$

where $T = 2 \pi / \omega_0$ is the period. Thus the dissipated energy is proportional to the bandwidth and the square of the amplitude of motion. For a QCM immersed in undecane, this implies $\Delta E \propto \Delta \Gamma_{\text{liq}} D_u^2$. The growth of the drop will be a small correction to this dissipation, so that to leading order this can be written as $(\Delta \Gamma_{\text{liq}} + \Delta \Gamma_{\text{drop}}) D_u^2$. This can also be written as the sum of the dissipation from the contact areas with undecane and water

$$(\Delta \Gamma_{\text{liq}} + \Delta \Gamma_{\text{drop}}) D_u^2 = \Delta \Gamma_{\text{liq}} D_u^2 \frac{A_{\text{active}} - A_{\text{drop}}}{A_{\text{active}}} + \Delta \Gamma_{\text{liq}} D_w^2 \frac{A_{\text{drop}}}{A_{\text{active}}}. \hspace{1cm} (10)$$

We note that $\Delta \Gamma_{\text{liq}}$ from Eqn. 2 is the same for both liquids at 48°C. Since the change in amplitude is small, $(D_w - D_s) / D_s \ll 1$ and $(D_u - D_s) / D_s \ll 1$, to leading order Eqn. 10 reduces to Eqn. 6.
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Extended Data Figure 1: Time dependence of the frequency after the addition of water to the undecane bath for QCMs with SiO$_2$, plasma-cleaned SiO$_2$, and plasma-cleaned gold surfaces. For all surfaces there was no appreciable change in $\Gamma$. For the SiO$_2$ surfaces, the frequency displayed an exponential relaxation, which we attribute to the adsorption of water molecules at the surface, and thus extra mass carried by the QCM. The effect is larger for plasma-cleaned surfaces, consistent with previous experiments$^{36}$. Assuming bulk values for the density of water, maximum change in frequency after several hours corresponded to 6 nm for SiO$_2$, and 14 nm for the plasma-cleaned SiO$_2$. The effect was completely reversible by allowing the water to evaporate from the undecane bath.
Extended Data Figure 2: Red up triangles: change in bandwidth during the growth of two separate water drops in an undecane bath on a dodecanethiol-SAM surface (Au-S(CH$_2$)$_{11}$CH$_3$). The advancing contact angle of the drop is $\theta_{\text{w/u}}^a = 156^\circ$. The same data is shown in Fig. 3a. Olive down triangles: change in bandwidth during the growth of two separate undecane drops in a water bath. The change in bandwidth reverses sign due to the larger dissipation occurring at the water-solid interface. The advancing contact angle of the drop is $\theta_{\text{u/w}}^a = 55^\circ$. Gaps in the olive data are due to stick-slip motion of the drop contact line, leading to jumps in the contact area of the drop.
Extended Data Figure 3: (a) AFM image of a typical Au-S(CH$_2$)$_{11}$CH$_3$ SAM surface. The image is dimensions are 4 µm × 4 µm. Maximum and minimum heights are indicated by the color bar. The average RMS amplitude of surface height fluctuations is 1.67 nm. (b) Fourier amplitude vs. wavelength, averaged over horizontal and vertical directions for the surface shown in (a). Most of the variation in height occurs over wavelengths longer than 100 nm, meaning that the surface is locally flat on the molecular scale. (c) Typical line trace showing surface height fluctuations.