Polymorphism-induced changes of interlayer electronic coupling at organic/inorganic interfaces
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ABSTRACT:  
The properties of a material depend on its structure, which for organic thin films often substantially differs from the bulk. A theoretical prediction of the most stable thin film structures through traditional first-principle modeling alone is unfeasible due to the combinatorial explosion in the number of polymorphs. Employing smart-data machine learning, we can now perform exhaustive structure searches for organic/inorganic interfaces requiring only a few hundred first-principles calculations. Here, we use this method to study the first two layers of benzoquinone on two different substrates, Ag(111) and graphene. Our results indicate that for the first layer, similar structures are favorable for both substrates. For the second layer, we find two distinct structures with significantly differing adsorption energies. Interestingly, graphene favors one class while Ag favors the other. To explain this behavior, we study the electronic properties of the substrates. This allows to explain the switch in stability, and its impact on the change in layer-to-layer charge transport.
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Organic thin films are materials of increasing interest, mainly by virtue of their application to the field of organic electronics. In comparison to inorganic alternatives, they present advantages such as flexibility and low cost. With a thickness ranging from less than a nanometer up to a few micrometers, organic thin films are commonly employed in the construction of Organic Field-Effect Transistors (OFET),\textsuperscript{1-2} Organic Light Emitting Diodes (OLED)\textsuperscript{3} and Organic Solar Cells.\textsuperscript{4} Of particular interest are films composed of molecules, which can form ordered films with relatively high charge-carrier mobilities.\textsuperscript{5-7} In fact, the properties of molecular materials, and especially their charge-carrier mobilities, depend drastically on the polymorph they assume, i.e. the relative arrangement of individual molecules in the thin film.\textsuperscript{8,9}

Which polymorph a thin film forms depends heavily on the fabrication conditions.\textsuperscript{10} However, also the nature of the substrate on which they grow has a decisive impact. Because the substrate interacts with molecules in the first layer, and because it changes the way molecules interact with each other (e.g., because they become charged), the second and subsequent layer can either assume the same structure as the first,\textsuperscript{11,12,13} assume a bulk structure,\textsuperscript{14} or form a completely different structure altogether.\textsuperscript{15} The decisive role of the substrate is highlighted by reports where even the same molecule forms different structures on different substrates.\textsuperscript{16,17,18}

In this work, we investigate the role of two prototypical substrates, Ag(111) and graphene, for the structure and the charge-carrier mobility of thin films of para-benzoquinone using a combination of machine learning and first-principles calculations. Both substrates are sensible electrode materials in organic electronics. At the same time, they show fundamentally different interactions
with organic molecules: Ag is a weakly reactive substrate, which readily undergoes charge-transfer reactions and can form weak covalent bonds with organic adsorbates.\textsuperscript{19–25,26} Conversely, graphene is mostly inert and mainly interacts through van der Waals interactions with planar organic adsorbates.\textsuperscript{27} Benzoquinone was chosen as model molecule due its small size (reducing the computational cost) while still exhibiting $\pi$-conjugation and functionalization with carbonyl groups. This renders its interactions qualitatively similar to those of technologically more relevant, larger analogues, like 5,12-pentacenequinone.\textsuperscript{26}

The first-principles prediction of thin film polymorphs (even as small as two layers) is far from trivial. To date, there exist a variety of algorithms to (i) predict the structures of single molecules adsorbing on a surface,\textsuperscript{28} (ii) single monolayers of molecules\textsuperscript{29,30}, and (iii) periodic bulk systems without substrate influence which employ stochastic approaches,\textsuperscript{31} various meta-heuristics,\textsuperscript{32} and numerous machine learning techniques\textsuperscript{33 34}.

Here, we present a first step towards bridging the gap between monolayer structures and the bulk polymorph by predicting the second adsorbate layer. Moreover, many macroscopic properties, such as the charge mobility within the thin film (perpendicular to the interface), are influenced by the geometry of each layer, so that a different arrangement of the second layer is meaningful even if the following layers are different.

We use an extended version of the SAMPLE approach, which is specifically designed for inorganic/organic interfaces.\textsuperscript{29} When applying the SAMPLE approach, one starts with finding the adsorption sites that a single molecule could adopt on a surface. These structures act as building blocks. As a second step, a wide variety of polymorphs – ranging in the millions – are built by assembling all possible combinations of these building blocks in a variety of unit cells. A small subset of these polymorphs is then evaluated with DFT calculations, and the resulting energies are
used to train an energy model utilizing Bayesian linear regression. The trained energy model can then predict the energies of all remaining polymorphs with the same level of accuracy as the underlying electronic structure calculations. To predict the second layer, we employ the SAMPLE approach a second time, now taking the energetically most favorable first adlayer as a new substrate. A more detailed explanation of the procedure is given in ref 15.

![Figure 1](image.png)

Figure 1. Geometry of the first layer of benzoquinone on (a) Ag(111) and (b) graphene. The unit cell for benzoquinone on Ag(111) is shown in green, in both plots. The unit cell for benzoquinone on graphene is shown in solid fuchsia. The dashed fuchsia lines in (b) indicate an equivalent, twice as large unit cell (the (1, 1, -1, 1) transform), which fits the Ag unit cell (green) almost perfectly.

Before we discuss the bilayer geometries, it is useful to briefly look at the structure that the first layer of benzoquinone forms. Figure 1a shows the energetically best geometry on Ag(111), as already obtained in an earlier work. In this configuration, the unit cell contains two molecules, placed on a top site and on a bridge site of the metal surface. The molecules adsorb at a height of
about 2.6 Å, and are slightly bent, with the oxygen closer to the metal substrate than the carbon backbone. Also, the two molecules in the unit cell present a different conformation: the top-site molecule is more intensely bent than the bridge-site molecule.

For comparison, here we also predict the energetics of a monolayer benzoquinone on graphene. Figure 1b shows the energetically best structure (details about the prediction process and the comprehensive ranking are given in the Supporting Information). The molecules adsorb at around 3.3 Å and are almost perfectly flat. We find that the unit cell is virtually identical to the monolayer on Ag(111), except that on graphene the two molecules are indistinguishable as they occupy the same adsorption site. This fortuitous equivalence, which can be traced back to the similar registry of Ag and graphene, massively facilitates the evaluations of the effects of the substrate beyond the first layer.

To study the second molecular layer, we invoke two assumptions. For the sake of argument, we assume that the first layer keeps its geometry when additional material is deposited. We note that, in practice, this is not always the case, as in some systems the first layer re-orientates to form a more tightly packed layer. However, predicting such re-orientations is beyond the scope of the present work. As second assumption, we place all additional molecules into the second layer, i.e., we do not allow a third layer to form. This approach corresponds to the assumption that a Frank-Van Der Merwe growth mechanism is at play, in which the molecules complete each layer, before they form the next one. In essence, this allows us to use the SAMPLE approach employing the monolayer geometry of benzoquinone (plus metal/graphene) as effective substrate unit cell, without any further extensive modifications. In order to obtain accurate energies, after the ranking of the polymorphs candidates by SAMPLE we perform full geometry optimizations (see Method section) for the 10 best structures. During these optimizations, the energies still change notably (see
Supporting Information), as the molecules in the second layer assume more favorable orientations towards the first layer.

The five energetically best bilayer structures on Ag are shown in Figure 2a. In passing, we note that the measure for ranking is not the energy per molecule, but the energy per area, as required by ab-initio thermodynamics.\textsuperscript{35} The full prediction data for both systems, including a comparison between predicted and calculated energies, can be found in the Supporting Information. In the energetically most favorable structure, the benzoquinone molecules in the first and the second layer partly overlap with each other, with the (negatively charged) oxygen of one molecule always aligned with the center (i.e., the least negative region) of the ring of the molecules in the other layer. We refer to this alignment, that is shown in Figure 2a in red, as molecule-on-molecule (MoM) hereafter. The second-best geometry is already 50 meV/nm\textsuperscript{2} worse in energy (which is quite substantial for polymorphs). As shown in orange in Figure 2a, in this geometry the molecules in the second layer are located above “gaps” of the first layer. Only the carbonyl-groups of the first and the second layer are on top of each other, with oppositely directed dipoles presumably leading to electrostatic attraction. To distinguish this alignment from the others, we refer to it as molecule-on-gap (MoG) hereafter. The energetically next-higher lying structures are combinations of MoM and MoG, variations thereof, and structures with lower coverages.
Figure 2. Adsorption energy and graphical representation of the five best configurations of the bilayer of benzoquinone on Ag(111) and graphene. The bars corresponding to Molecule-on-Gap and Molecule-on-Molecule (for explanation see main text) are colored in orange and red, respectively. In the geometry representations Ag and graphene are omitted, the first layer of adsorbates is colored in black, and the second layer is colored according to the adsorption positions (i.e. similar positions have the same color).

We also find the MoM and the MoG geometry as energetically favorable structures on graphene. However, in salient contrast to the situation on Ag, here the MoG structure is energetically more beneficial than MoM by 20 meV/nm². Only two structures are found that are energetically even better than MoG and MoM. Both of these structures are noticeably more complex than MoG and MoM, featuring five adsorbates per unit cell and several adsorption positions similar to MoM and MoG. For the sake of conciseness and clarity, we will focus the following discussion on the MoM
an the MoG structures only. A brief discussion of structures 1 and 2 can be found in the Supporting Information.

Since the charge-carrier mobility of a crystal depends on the wave-function overlap,\(^8,^{36,37}\) already a visual inspection of the MoM and MoG geometries lets us expect that this property will be very different for the two geometries. The fact that the ordering of the two polymorphs reverses only depending on the substrate, therefore, deserves further scrutiny.

When considering only the second layer, MoM and MoG are virtually identical, exhibiting the same unit cell vectors and very similar geometries. Rather, their main difference is a translation relative to the first benzoquinone layer. Thus, we expect the switch in the energetic ordering to be caused by a variation in the interlayer interactions between the first and the second layer.

To verify this assumption, we investigate the energies of the building blocks on the two substrates. For each building block, the molecule in the second layer interacts with the substrate but is not in close proximity to any other second layer molecule. Thus, their stability exclusively depends on interlayer interactions.

![Figure 3. Adsorption energies of all building blocks of the second layer of benzoquinone on Ag(111) graphene. For both substrates, we show the energy for the adsorption on substrate + the first benzoquinone layers versus the energy for the adsorption on the benzoquinone layer alone, but in the same geometry. The energies are given relative to the value of the most stable geometries.](image-url)
In Figure 3, we plot the adsorption energies of each building block for both systems, highlighting the ones that constitute MoM and MoG in red and orange, respectively. The building blocks of MoM and MoG have a somewhat different geometry for the two substrates, as they are found independently on each system. They will only converge to analogous structures after being assembled in full second layers and allowed to relax. Consequently, a direct comparison between their adsorption energies on the two substrates is not sensible. A more insightful result can be obtained by altering both substrates, keeping the adsorption geometries fixed, and observing the response of the building blocks to this perturbation. Therefore, we also show the adsorption energies for the same geometries on hypothetical free-standing benzoquinone layers, obtained by removing our substrates from the calculations.

We find that in the case of Ag(111), the adsorption energies for the MoM and MoG building blocks are very similar. When removing the Ag substrate, the MoM building block becomes energetically destabilized with respect to the MoG geometry. This indicates a stronger influence of the substrate on the MoM structure compared to MoG. For the case of graphene, the destabilization of MoM is much less pronounced, i.e. a graphene substrate does not notably affect the energetic ordering. We can, thus, conclude that the Ag substrate massively changes the way the first and the second layer interact with each other. Specifically, we find that Ag substrate significantly stabilizes the MoM geometry, explaining why the MoM geometry is favored on Ag, but not on graphene.
We now need to ask what the underlying mechanism is that stabilizes the MoM geometries. We can trace the effect back to the charge rearrangements resulting from the contact between the substrate and a molecular layer. To illustrate this, we calculated the adsorption-induced charge rearrangements $\Delta \rho$, defined as

$$\Delta \rho = \rho_{\text{system}} - \rho_{\text{sub}} - \rho_{\text{monolayer}}$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 1}$$

where $\rho_{\text{system}}$, $\rho_{\text{sub}}$ and $\rho_{\text{monolayer}}$ are the charge densities of the combined system, of the substrate and of the isolated benzoquinone monolayer respectively. We further calculate the net charge transfer via

$$Q_{\text{bond}}(z) = \int_0^z \Delta \rho (z') dz'$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 2}$$

for the benzoquinone monolayers on Ag and on graphene.

There is a substantial transfer of electrons from Ag to the first molecular layer. This can be seen in Figure 4 when investigating the net charge transfer. For Ag, half an electron is transferred from below the substrate surface (indicated with a dashed line) to above it. Conversely, graphene is practically inert, and the electron transfer is negligible. Furthermore, by conducting a Molecular-
Orbital Projected Density of States analysis, we find that the LUMO of the benzoquinone layer gets filled in the case of Ag, reaching an occupation of 1.25 electrons, while in the case of graphene it remains substantially empty at occupation 0.05 electrons.

Figure 5. a) Variation of the total energy (without van der Waals interactions) and LUMO-LUMO overlap for different shifts along the main molecular axis of a benzoquinone dimer. The shifts corresponding to the MoM and MoG structures are indicated with vertical lines. b) Energy plotted as a function of extra charge for the two highlighted points. Here, in addition to the values of charge used in (a), we see the effect of charges in the 2-3 e\textsuperscript{-} range. In this range, additional charge occupies the antibonding combination of molecular orbitals, and the dependency of total energy on overlap is reversed.
This difference directly impacts the interaction with the second molecular layer. One might assume that the electrostatic interaction resulting from the charge transfer to the first layer on Ag(111) is the main factor governing the preferability of MoM compared to MoG. However, this is only true to a small extent. Rather, the additional electron in the first layer directly benefits geometries with a large LUMO-LUMO overlap. To demonstrate this, we use a simple dimer model composed of two stacked benzoquinone molecules. The two molecules are arranged at a distance of 3 Å along the z direction, which is a reasonable approximation of the interlayer distances for our systems. They are then shifted with respect to one another along the long molecular axis. The shifting starts from a position of congruence in x-y coordinates, and includes positions corresponding to both the MoM and MoG offsets. For each position, the electronic energy of the system (i.e. the total energy without van der Waals contributions) is evaluated together with the overlap between the LUMOs of the two molecules (Figure 5a).

It has been observed that, in analogous cases, one can find an inverse correlation between stability and HOMO-HOMO overlap, as a consequence of Pauli repulsion. In our case, though, we are interested in the response of the system to the introduction of additional electronic charge, and therefore we focus on the overlap between LUMOs. For the neutral system (shown in purple), there is no correlation between the LUMO-LUMO overlap and the energy. This also wouldn’t be expected, since the orbitals are completely empty. Rather, the energy of the system decreases systematically as the molecules are shifted away from each other. This can be attributed to a reduction in Pauli-Pushback, as the wave-functions no longer overlap.

The situation changes notably when additional charge is introduced. As can be seen, particularly for larger charges, the energy profile now shows an inverse correlation with the LUMO-LUMO overlap, i.e. situations with a large overlap are energetically more favorable than those with a small
overlap. The MoM geometry has a significantly larger overlap than the MoG geometry (although both are local maxima) and is therefore notably stabilized (up to two electrons, see below). This is in accordance with what we have observed in the behavior of the building blocks in Figure 3. This behavior can be readily rationalized based valence-bond theory: When two identical molecules come into contact, their LUMOs (originally at the same energy) will hybridize and form a bonding and an antibonding linear combination. The splitting depends on the orbital overlap, i.e. the bonding combination is more strongly bonding the larger the overlap is. If the system is neutral, this has no effect on the total energy. However, when electrons are introduced, they will first occupy the bonding linear combination. As long as there are less than two additional electrons per dimer, only the bonding one will be occupied, resulting in a net energy gain that is larger the larger the overlap is. Conversely, when more than two electrons are introduced, the effect reverses.

This provides a simple and solid explanation of why the two arrangements present a different stability, and why this difference varies when the silver substrate transfers charge into the first layer. In addition it provides an important hint towards its consequences: it is known that charge carrier mobility, within the model of the hopping regime, is fundamentally influenced by the overlap between the origin and destination orbitals. Generally, substrates that undergo significant charge transfer with the first layer will facilitate the formation of polymorphs that have a large LUMO-LUMO overlap. Because the LUMO-LUMO overlap is a relevant ingredient for the electron mobilities of the compound, it stands to reason that these polymorphs generally display superior properties. In our case, we can estimate the rate of interlayer charge transfer for the two systems by calculating the electronic coupling between LUMO orbitals with the Projection-
Operator Diabatization method.\textsuperscript{40,41} The details of the Electronic Coupling calculation can be found in the Supporting Information, and results are shown in Table 1.

One can see that the Molecule-on-Molecule exhibits superior electronic coupling for all the systems we consider. For the single molecular dimer from Figure 5 the difference is very large, and for molecular bilayers MoM retains a reasonably large margin over MoG.

\textit{Table 1. Electronic couplings for MoM and MoG structures}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electronic Coupling (eV)</th>
<th>Molecule-on-Molecule</th>
<th>Molecule-on-Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Dimer</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilayer on Graphene</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilayer on Ag(111)</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that the influence of the choice of the substrate is crucial for the performance of any device, and exemplifies that, even when we can examine the fortuitous case in which two different substrates would seem to induce the same geometry to the first layer, the influence beyond the first layer can be enough to drastically alter the properties of the system.

In conclusion, we have studied the structure of the first two layers of benzoquinone on two different substrates. Employing first-principle calculations in combination with smart-data machine learning, we have found that for the first layer, similar structures are favorable for both substrates. For the second layer, two structures are very favorable for both systems, but their ranking is swapped for the two substrates. This difference in ranking is a consequence of the difference in LUMO-LUMO overlap for the two different structures in the second layer. Hereby, the MoM structure has a large overlap compared to the MoG structure. Without induced charge, the MoG is energetically more favorable compared to MoM. When charge is induced into the first molecular layer (as is the case for Ag) MoM becomes energetically stabilized due to the LUMO-LUMO overlap.
overlap. This points to the fact that the two different structures induced by the two substrates would exhibit different vertical charge carrier mobilities.

**Computational Methods**

All calculations were performed using the FHI-aims package, with the PBE exchange-correlation functional and TS$_{surf}$ correction for long-range dispersion interactions. All geometry optimization were conducted with the BFGS algorithm, converging the forces on each atom to a threshold of 0.01 eV/Å. For the Ag system, the first 6 layers of metal were kept fixed and the top 2 layers were allowed to relax. Graphene atoms were kept fixed.

For the Ag system, default tight basis sets were used for all chemical elements except Ag, for which a mixed-quality numerical basis set (see ref. 26 for details) was employed. The calculations were conducted with the repeated slab approach, using a dipole correction, and setting a unit cell height of 80 Å. For finding all single-molecule local adsorption geometries on the surface, a three-step procedure was followed. First, a single molecule was relaxed at an arbitrary position on top of the substrate unit cell (consisting of a molecular monolayer on Ag(111), see Figure 1a). Secondly, we used a Gaussian Process Regression tool equivalent to the BOSS approach to find all stationary points in the PES along three dimensions (translations along X and Y, rotation of the molecule around the axis perpendicular to the surface). Finally, all the geometries corresponding to these points were relaxed keeping all substrate atoms (metal and first molecular layer) fixed. At this stage of the work, all calculations were executed on a 2x2 substrate cell, integrating in k-space on a grid of 3x3 points per primitive lattice direction and 1 k-point in the Z direction. Given the high computational cost of running geometry optimizations with these systems, the search for local adsorption geometries was conducted on a gas-phase monolayer substrate, in which Ag atoms were
removed. The adsorption energy of the adsorption geometries was evaluated reintroducing the metal atoms for a single-point calculation. The SAMPLE approach uses these adsorption geometries as building blocks to assemble different configurations, placing them in all possible ways on a set of different unit cells (details in the Supporting Information). Among all configurations, a set of 250 was selected with experimental design employing the D-optimality criterion\textsuperscript{47} on intermolecular interactions. Of these, 200 were used as training set, while the remaining 50 were used as test set. In addition, 961 gas-phase calculations, in which all substrate atoms were removed, were used to calculate priors for all intra-layer interaction energies. At this stage of the work, given the necessity to work with a wide variety of unit cells, the k-space integration was conducted on automatically generated generalized Monkhorst-Pack grids.\textsuperscript{48} After training in the conditions described beforehand, SAMPLE predicts the adsorption energies of the test set with a root mean square error (RMSE) of 7 meV. Leave-one-out cross validation\textsuperscript{49} (LOOCV) was also applied on the training set and gave a RMSE of 10 meV.

For the graphene system, the procedure is identical to the Ag case, unless specified otherwise. Default tight basis sets were used for all chemical elements. The lattice constant of graphene was converged to 2.46 Å, and a unit cell height of 85.2 Å was set. When searching for local adsorption geometries for the first benzoquinone layer, a 5 x 5 substrate cell was used, and the k-space integration was conducted on a grid of 6 x 6 points per primitive lattice direction and 1 k-point in the Z direction. For the SAMPLE prediction, 100 calculations were used, 60 as training set and 40 as test set, together with 1000 gasphase calculations, resulting in an RMSE of 5 meV on the test set and a LOOCV-RMSE of 7 meV.

When searching for local adsorption geometries for the second benzoquinone layer, the structure shown in Figure 1b was set as primitive substrate unit cell. A 2 x 2 substrate cell was used, and the
k-space integration was conducted on a grid of 6 x 6 points. For the SAMPLE prediction, 250 calculations were used, 200 as training set and 50 as test set, together with 997 gasphase calculations, resulting in an RMSE of 14 meV on the test set and a LOOCV-RMSE of 23 meV. The calculation of electronic coupling terms was performed with the Projection-Operator Diabatization method POD2L.\textsuperscript{40,41} For these calculations, FHI-Aims default light basis sets were used in place of the tight basis sets, as the former were found to be more numerically stable under the required block-diagonalization scheme.

**Supporting Information**

Graphical representation of all local adsorption geometries, details about the SAMPLE prediction inclusive of geometry optimizations, further discussion of the best configurations for the second layer of benzoquinone on graphene, details on the calculation of electronic coupling terms.
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Local adsorption geometries
As reported in the main text, the following procedure was applied to find local adsorption geometries: first, a single molecule was relaxed at an arbitrary position on top of the substrate unit cell; secondly, the BOSS approach\(^3\) was employed to find all stationary points in the PES along three dimensions (translations along X and Y, rotation of the molecule around the axis perpendicular to the surface); finally, all the geometries corresponding to these points were relaxed keeping all substrate atoms fixed. If two or more optimizations lead to the same position, the redundant ones are eliminated. All Local Adsorption Geometries for the 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) layer of benzoquinone on graphene reported below in Figures S1 and S2, together with the relative adsorption energies.

**Figure S1.** Local adsorption geometries for the 1\(^{st}\) layer of benzoquinone on graphene
Figure S2. Local adsorption geometries for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} layer of benzoquinone on graphene.
In the case of benzoquinone on Ag(111), local adsorption geometries for the second layer were found on a gasphase benzoquinone substrate, and the resulting geometries were then recalculated on the full metal substrate. All local adsorption geometries on the gasphase benzoquinone substrate are reported in Figure S3, while the variations in energy and ordering that result from the reintroduction of Ag (as depicted in Figure 3 of the main text) are indicated in Table S1.
Figure S3. Local adsorption geometries for the second layer of benzoquinone on Ag(111), as found on a gasphase monolayer of benzoquinone.
Table S1. Adsorption energies of all local adsorption geometries of the 2nd layer of benzoquinone on graphene and original ranking and adsorption energy on the simplified gasphase-monolayer substrate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Adsorption Geometry</th>
<th>Adsorption Energy (meV)</th>
<th>Original Ranking on Gasphase Substrate</th>
<th>Original Adsorption Energy on Gasphase Substrate (meV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-483</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-478</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-477</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-476</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-473</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-472</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-468</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-464</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-464</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-463</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-462</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-459</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-455</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-448</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-436</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-430</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-404</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-397</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-379</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-373</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-373</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-333</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-271</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generating configurations with SAMPLE

SAMPLE produces a wide variety of configuration by producing a set of unit cells, and trying all combinations of Local Adsorption Geometries and their symmetric equivalents that can be fit in each cell.\textsuperscript{4} When executing this step of the SAMPLE approach, one must decide which cells to build, and how many molecules to try and fit in them. By using a big maximum cell size and a high maximum number of molecules, one would allow for the prediction of a larger number of configurations. This would of course allow for the possibility of finding new structures, but it must be noticed that the number of resulting configurations gets out of hand very rapidly, so one should always limit these parameters in order to obtain a reasonable amount of structures. Moreover, one should modulate the maximum number of molecules to the size of the unit cell, to avoid producing a large number of mostly useless configurations with very low coverages. In addition to this, one must establish the distance threshold under which molecules are considered to be colliding, and the configuration containing them is discarded. This is defined for each possible combinations of chemical elements, and must be chosen so that no configurations involving strongly repulsive interactions is produced. The values of all these parameters, for the different systems on which SAMPLE was applied, are reported in table S2, together with the number of unit cells and configurations that were produced.
Table S2. Parameters for the construction of configurations by SAMPLE and resulting numbers of cells and configurations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd Layer Benzoquinone on Ag(111)</th>
<th>1st Layer Benzoquinone on Graphene</th>
<th>2nd Layer Benzoquinone on Graphene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cell Areas (n. of primitive unit cells)</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>5 - 66</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of molecules</td>
<td>Area 1: 1 - 3</td>
<td>Area 5 – 32: 1 – 3</td>
<td>Area 1: 1 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area 2: 3 - 5</td>
<td>Area 32 - 66: 3</td>
<td>Area 2: 1 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area 3: 3 - 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area 3: 2 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area 4: 2 - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area 5: 3 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area 6: 4 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Threshholds (Angstrom)</td>
<td>HH: 1.500</td>
<td>HH: 1.337</td>
<td>HH: 1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OH: 1.500</td>
<td>OH: 1.441</td>
<td>OH: 1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OO: 2.200</td>
<td>OO: 2.127</td>
<td>OO: 2.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH: 2.000</td>
<td>CH: 2.000</td>
<td>CH: 2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO: 2.400</td>
<td>CO: 2.400</td>
<td>CO: 2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC: 3.000</td>
<td>CC: 3.000</td>
<td>CC: 3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of generated cells</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of generated configurations</td>
<td>83,044</td>
<td>26,512,059</td>
<td>349,483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rankings of all configurations

SAMPLE gives access to a prediction of the adsorption energies of all configurations. This allows to rank the configurations from the most stable to the least stable. In Figure S4 the rankings for all three SAMPLE runs are shown.
Figure S4. Ranking of all configurations for all three systems. For the 1st layer of graphene, given the extremely large number of configurations, only a subset is shown. This is obtained by taking the best 1000 configurations and filtering out any duplicates. The same duplicate removal procedure has also been applied to the top 1000 configurations of the other two systems, and this explains why the total number of plotted configurations is slightly smaller than the total number of constructed configurations reported in Table 2S.

Geometry optimization of the best configurations

Once SAMPLE has allowed us to select the most stable configurations according to its energy model, the DFT for the 10 best configurations of each structures have been calculated. In addition, geometry optimizations are run allowing the newly formed layer of adsorbates to relax. Subsequently, also the first layer and – in the case of Ag(111) - the top layers of substrate are allowed to relax. This is necessary in the case of second-layer prediction, as the corrugated adsorption surface of the first layer combined with the generally weaker adsorption energies make it easier for the adsorbates to rearrange compared to their single-molecule adsorption geometry. A summary of these optimizations for the second layer of benzoquinone on Ag(111) is shown in Figure S5.

One can notice a very good agreement between the SAMPLE prediction and the single-point DFT calculations. On the other hand, the relaxation of the second layer of adsorbates produces big changes in energy, that fortunately do not change the ordering of the structures, except for structures 3 and 4. Structures 5-6 are very similar, and are
fundamentally variations of structure 1 with some defects. On a positive note, one can notice that the re-relaxation of the 1st layer produces a fairly small and uniform variation in energy, showing that the second layer of adsorbates does not influence the first layer strongly.

A summary of optimization results for graphene is given in figure S6. For this system, while the agreement between SAMPLE predictions and DFT data remains good, the geometry optimizations produce intense and irregular changes in energies, that result in several switches in ordering going from the prediction results to the
Figure S6. Energies from predictions, single-point DFT calculations, and DFT geometry optimizations of the 10 best configurations of the 2nd layer of benzoquinone on graphical and graphical representation of all 10 configurations

post-optimization results. The relaxation of the first layer also produces stronger perturbations compared to Ag(111), as a consequence of the weaker interaction between substrate and 1st layer. In particular, we can see a set of structures with a very elongated unit cell arriving to the top 5 positions of the ranking. Of these, structures 1 to 3 are fundamentally equivalent, so 2 and 3 are discarded. Structures 5, 6 and 8 are also basically identical to the single-cell configuration 7 and are therefore discarded. This gives us the top-5 ranking shown in Figure 2.
Discussion of complex second-layer configurations of benzoquinone on graphene

As shown in Figure 2 and Figure S9, the 2nd layer of benzoquinone on graphene presented a few configurations more stable than Molecule on Molecule and Molecule on Gap, namely configurations 1 and 2 in Figure 2. While we have focused our discussion on more simple configurations, MoM and MoG, it is useful to discuss the properties of these more complex configurations. In particular, it should be understood what makes them so favourable, and why they appear for graphene and not for Ag(111).

First, it should be noticed that these structures share a fundamental feature: they are all constituted of a 5x1 unit cell, in which 4 molecules are aligned like MoM and MoG while the 5th molecule is rotated by 90°. The 4 aligned molecules are placed on the first molecular layer in positions similar to those of MoM and MoG, but each molecule is in a slightly shifted position, with respect to the first layer, compared to the previous one. The pattern is identical for configurations 1 and 2, the only difference being a small difference in alignment with respect to the first molecular layer. Consequently, we will now focus on configuration 1 to explain the cause of its stability, and the results will also apply to configuration 2.
Figure S7. Comparison of monolayer formation energies for configuration 1 from figure 9S, a perfect layer of benzoquinone (see main text) and the MoG and MoM configurations (a); superposition of MoG (b) and configuration 1 (b) to the perfect layer.

To gain insight about the stability of configuration 1, we focus on intralayer interactions. To do this, we consider the energy of the configuration 1 layer in gasphase. The monolayer formation energy of this geometry is plotted in figure 10S-a. As terms of comparison, we have the monolayer formation energies of the MoM and MoG configurations, as well as the monolayer formation energy of a benzoquinone perfect layer. With perfect layer we indicate the geometry assumed by a benzoquinone sheet with the same geometry as MoG after a geometry optimization in which the unit cell vectors are allowed to relax. As a consequence, it is the geometry with the best intralayer interactions. We can see in figure 10S-a that the intralayer interaction energy of MoG and MoM are extremely similar, with MoG being around 5 meV more stable. This is well predictable, given that the two configurations are almost identical, except for their different alignment on the first layer, and for a slight tilting
that MoM molecules adopt to fit on top of the first layer molecules. Configuration 1, on the other hand, is 15 meV more stable than MoG, and represents a middle point between MoM-MoG and the perfect layer. By looking at figure 10Sb and c, we can see that while the periodicity of MoG (which is the same as the periodicity of MoM and of the first molecular layer) is incommensurate to the periodicity of the perfect layer, in the case of Configuration 1 the 4 aligned molecules are almost perfectly congruent to the molecules of the perfect layer. In conclusion, we see that the arrangement of the 5 molecules of configuration 1 allows very favorable interlayer interactions, using the elongated 5x1 cell to create stripes of 4 molecules aligned with a very favorable angle that is different from that of the first molecular layer. It is a configuration that performs better than MoG and MoM because of its intralayer interactions and not because of a different mechanism of interactions with the previous layer.

To understand why this configuration emerges in the case of graphene and not in the case of Ag(111), we must again notice how its cell is an elongated 5x1 cell, in which 5 molecules can be arranged in a row, so that 4 of them align at a very favorable angle, while the 5th molecule closes the gap and allows the structure to fit on the lattice of the first layer. If we now look at the unit cell of the Ag(111) first layer in Figure 1, we can see that it includes two molecules. Therefore, in order replicate the 5-molecules pattern of configuration 1, SAMPLE would need to assemble cells made of 5 primitive unit cells (10 molecules). As indicated in Table S2, this was not the case in our study, because working with cells of such dimensions on Ag(111) would pose an extremely high computational cost.

**Calculation of electronic coupling terms**

The electronic coupling terms presented in Table 1 have been obtained with the methodology described in ref 5. For the molecular dimer, we calculated the coupling between the LUMOs of the two molecules.

For the bilayer on graphene, we calculated the coupling between the LUMOs of the two isolated monolayers at the gamma point.

For the bilayer on Ag(111), a unit cell of each layer contains two molecules. As a consequence, for each layer the molecular LUMOs combine to form two orbitals, LUMO and LUMO+1 of the isolated monolayer, which are
almost perfectly degenerate in energy. We calculated the interlayer couplings between all 4 possible combinations of orbitals (LUMO-LUMO, LUMO-LUMO+1, LUMO+1-LUMO, LUMO+1-LUMO+1), summed the 4 values and divided by 2 to avoid double counting.
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