E lectronic friction and liquid - ow -induced voltage in nanotubes

B N J. Persson^{1;2;3}, U. Tartaglino⁴, E. Tosatti^{3;4;5} and H. Ueba⁶

²K avli Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-4030, USA

³ International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP), P.O. Box 586, I-34014 Trieste, Italy

⁴ International School for Advanced Studies (SISSA), and INFM Democritos National Simulation Center, V ia Beirut 2,

I-34014 Trieste, Italy

⁵ Laboratoire de M ineralogie-Cristallographie de Paris, Universite' Pierre et Marie Curie, 4 place Jussieu, 75252 Paris Cedex,

France

⁶ Department of Electronics, Toyam a University, Gofuku, Toyama, 930-8555, Japan

A recent exciting experiment by G hosh et al [1] reported that the ow of an ion-containing liquid such as water through bundles of single-walled carbon nanotubes induces a voltage in the nanotubes that grows logarithm ically with the ow velocity v_0 . We propose an explanation for this observation. A ssum ing that the liquid molecules nearest the nanotube form a 2D solid-like monolayer pinned through the adsorbed ions to the nanotubes, the monolayer sliding will occur by elastic loading followed by local yield (stick-slip). The drifting adsorbed ions produce a voltage in the nanotube through electronic friction against free electrons inside the nanotube. Them ally excited jumps over force-biased barriers, well-known in stick-slip, can explain the logarithm ic voltage grow th with ow velocity. We estim ate the short circuit current and the internal resistance of the nanotube voltage generator.

PACS 72.80 R j 73.63 Fg

1. Introduction

In a recent, remarkable experiment [1], it was observed that the ow of an ion-rich liquid such as water through bundles of single-walled carbon nanotubes induces a voltage in the nanotube sample along the direction of the ow. Strikingly, the voltage grows logarithm ically with the liquid ow velocity over nearly six decades. The voltage m agnitude and sign depend sensitively on the ionic conductivity and on the polar nature of the liquid, suggesting that ions adsorbed, or located in the immediate vicinity of the carbon nanotubes must be involved in its generation. This work highlights the device potential for nanotubes as sensitive ow sensors; it also presents very interesting and intriguing questions about the underlying physics.

As an explanation for the observed e ect, G hosh et al [1] suggested that the dominant mechanism responsible for this highly nonlinear response to the ow could involve a direct forcing of the free electrons in the nanotubes by the uctuating C oulombic eld of the liquid owing past the nanotubes, through pulsating asymmetric ratchets. The model assumes adsorbed ions which nonetheless do not undergo any average physical drift, and needs to invoke ratchets for which there seem s to be no independent evidence. Earlier work [2] had suggested instead that molecular layers of liquid coating the nanotube physically slip along its surface, and excite a phonon wind which drags the free carriers in the tube. However, this model would yield an induced voltage linear in the uid ow velocity. Back in the 19th century, Helmholtz [3] had proposed an electrokinetic mechanism where a voltage induced by a liquid

ow ing past a solid substrate will appear as a stream ing potential involving the ions carried by uid ow in the di use (D ebye) layer at the interface, while the mobile charge carriers in the substrate play no role. This mechanism too would, for small ow velocities, predict a linear voltage increase with ow velocity. Our purpose here will be to propose an alternative model capable of explaining the observations { and of making prediction that could be checked by further work { based on ow -induced ion drift.

The experiments where performed on nanotube bundles (the nanotubes are not aligned). The nanotubes are are micrometer sized in length and nanometric in diameter. Fig. 1 shows the induced voltage as a function of the logarithm of the water (average) ow velocity v_0 . The solid line is a to the experimental data given by

$$U = U_{c} \ln \frac{v_{0}}{v_{c}}$$

where $U_c = 0.26 \text{ mV}$ and $v_c = 1.54 \text{ 10}^7 \text{ m} = \text{s}$.

¹ IFF, FZ-Julich, 52425 Julich, Germany



FIG.1. The voltage U as a function of the logarithm of the (average) uid velocity v_0 . The solid line is a tof the form $U = U_c \ln (v_0 = v_c)$. A dapted from [1].





FIG.2. Carbon nanotube in mersed in a owing liquid. We assume that the liquid molecules nearest the nanotube form a 2D solid-like monolayer, pinned to the nanotube by the adsorbed ions. As the liquid ows, the solid sliding motion along the nanotube is of a stick-slip nature: time intervals of elastic deform ation (loading phase) are followed by rapid local yield events. This will result in a force on the ions which increases logarithm ically with the uid ow velocity. The drifting adsorbed ions will produce a voltage in the nanotube through electronic friction against free electrons inside the nanotube. In the stationary state there is a net ow of ion satsorbing on the nanotube upstream, and a net ow of ion desorption downstream.

2. Ion stick-slip m odel

A lthough the reasoning is general, let us focus here on water as the uid, and start by assuming that ions dissolved in it become adsorbed on the carbon nanotube surfaces, see Fig. 2. We also postulate that the water molecules in the rst layer around a nanotube form an (incommensurate) solid-like monolayer. Recent simulations provided evidence for instances where that does occur [4]. This 2D solid-like water layer will experience a pinning potential on the nanotube, that is mediated through the adsorbed ions, and is in turn dragged or pulled forward by the external liquid water ow. The solid sliding motion along the nanotube occurs by stick-slip. Time intervals of elastic deformation (bading phase) are followed by rapid local yield events. During the loading phase the local stress in the 2D-solid near an ion will increase linear with time, until a critical stress $_{\rm c}$ is reached, when a local yield (rapid rearrangement process) takes place. We denote the elementary solid element where most of the rearrangement occur as the \stress block".

A linear (or nearly linear) relationship between driving force and the logarithm of the induced drift velocity has been observed form any system s exhibiting local stick-slip motion, e.g., charge density wave and ux line system s [5], as well as for atom ic force m icroscope tips moving in a substrate pinning potential [6]. These results are collectively understood through a standard picture involving them ally excited jumps over force-biased barriers [9]. This picture will apply for all system s which can be described as an e ective elastic solids pinned by defects, and driven by an external force. The basic picture consist of elastic loading, followed by rapid, local jumps over pinning barriers; in these jumps local regions (stress dom ains) of the elastic solid move forward. W hen them al activation of such a stick-slip process is taken into account, the average stress at yield increases logarithm ically with the velocity of the dragging uid.

A ssume that the (average) velocity v of the adsorbed 2D solid-like waterm on olayer depends linearly on the (average) uid ow velocity v, v = v₀, as expected for a New tonian liquid. During the loading phase the strain in a stress block will be of order u=L, where L is the linear size of a stress block and u the displacement u = vt. The local shear stress in the stress block will be of order Eu=L, where E is the elastic modulus of the 2D solid. We de ne the loading force F = La = Eau = ku, where a is the thickness of the 2D solid monolayer lm, and the elective spring constant is k = Ea. We could expect E to be similar to the elastic modulus of ice, i.e., of order 5 10^9 Pa and with a 0.3 nm we get k 1.5 N=m. A ssum ing the critical strain at yield to be of order 0.1 we get the critical displacement u_c 1 A and the elastic barrier = $ku_c^2=2$ 0.05 eV, i.e., in the same range of energy as a hydrogen bond.



FIG.3. Mechanical model representing the stick-slip (bading by elastic deformation followed by abrupt yield) of the 2D-solid in the vicinity of an ion [see Fig. 2 (a)]. The spring represent the elastic deformation of the 2D solid. When the spring force reaches a critical value (the static friction force) the block start to slip, reverting back to the pinned state when the spring force approximately vanishes.

The picture presented above is represented in F ig. 3, where the spring represents the elastic deform ation of the 2D solid. When the spring force reaches a critical value (the static friction force) the block starts to slip and will revert back to the pinned state when the spring force approximately vanishes. This fast slip event corresponds to a yield or rearrangement process of the 2D solid in the vicinity of the ion. In [8,7] we studied the relationship between the drive velocity v and the (average) spring force recessary in order to start the slip of the block), at temperatures T > 0 K them al excitation will allow the block to depin before the spring force has reached the critical value F_c . The rate of them al excitation over a barrier can be assumed to be of the standard form

where the prefactor 10^{10} s¹ and the elective depinning barrier ⁰ (0 < ⁰ <) depends on the local shear stress in the contact area. By considering the statistical distribution of the microscopic shear stress, the friction versus speed

can be calculated [8]. Three regimes are found, depending on the magnitude of the speed. We denote the parameter v:

$$v = \frac{F_c}{2k} e^2$$
(1)

In a wide interm ediate range of speeds, where $1 < < v = v < < e^2$, we get

$$F = \frac{F_c}{4} \ln \frac{v}{v}$$
(2)

In the extrem e low velocity $\lim it$, where v=v << 1, we have

$$F = \frac{kv}{k}e$$

For very high velocity instead, $v=v >> \exp(2)$, we have on the other hand

$$F = \frac{F_c}{2} \quad 1 \quad \frac{v}{2 \quad v} e^2$$

We now assume that the force F will also act on the ion which is at the same time embedded in the 2D solid monolayer and adsorbed on the nanotube. This force will result in a slow average drift motion of the ion along the water aw direction. Since F is very small, linear response should apply. The adsorbed ion drift velocity is thus

$$v_a = F$$
 (3)

where the mobility depends on the lateral ion di usion barriers. Combining (2) and (3) gives

$$v_a = v_a^c \ln \frac{v_0}{v_c} ; \qquad (4a)$$

where $v_c = v = and$

$$v_a^c = \frac{F_c}{4} :$$
 (4b)

If we write $F_c = ku_c$, where u_c is the displacement necessary in order induce the yield, we get from (1)

$$v_c = v = = \frac{u_c}{2} e^2$$
 (5)

Note that (5) can be written as

$$2 = \ln \frac{u_c}{2 v_c}$$
(6)

which shows that is very insensitive to the exact value of , u_c and . If we assume = 0:1, u_c 1 A and 10^{10} s⁻¹ we get with (from Fig. 1) $v_c = 1:54 - 10^{-7}$ m =s, 0:2 eV which is very plausible.

3. Flow induced current and voltage: electrical properties

A ssume that there is a 2D concentration n_e of conduction electrons in the carbon nanotube. We shall use here a sem i-classical picture for the motion of the electrons. Under the ion-originated external forces the conduction electrons drift with the velocity v_e , so that the electric current in a nanotube will be $I = 2 \text{ rn}_e ev_e$, where r is the radius of the nanotube. The equation of motion for the drift velocity is given by

$$m_{e} \underline{v}_{e} = m_{e} \frac{1}{v_{e}} m_{a} (v_{e} - v_{a}) \frac{n_{a}}{n_{e}} + eE$$
 (7)

where is a D rude relaxation time, an electronic friction $\cos c$ eient, n_a the concentration of adsorbed ions, E the electric eld in the 2D nanotube, and v_a is the drift velocity of the adsorbed ions. In deriving (7) we assumed

that the frictional drag from the moving adsorbates to be distributed uniform by over all the conduction electrons in the nanotube. The electronic friction coe cient can be related to the adsorbate-induced increase in the nanotube resistivity. [9] Thus, when $v_a = 0$ (no uid ow) we get in steady state

$$v_e = \frac{e E = m_e}{1 + (m_a = m_e) (n_a = n_e)}$$

so that the current

$$I = \frac{2 m_{e}e^{2} E = m_{e}}{1 + (m_{a} = m_{e})(n_{a} = n_{e})}$$

Thus, U = RI, where the resistivity

$$R = R_0 \quad 1 + \frac{m_a}{m_e} \frac{n_a}{n_e} = R_0 (1 +)$$

where R_0 is the nanotube resistivity in the absence of adsorbates:

$$R_0 = Lm_e = (2 m_e e^2)$$

We consider now the full equation (7) in two dimensions in the second equation (7) in two dimensions E = 0 so that in the stationary case (1) takes the form

$$0 = m_{e} - v_{e} m_{a} (v_{e} v_{a}) \frac{n_{a}}{n_{e}}$$

so that

$$v_{e} = \frac{(m_{a} = m_{e})(n_{a} = n_{e})}{1 + (n_{a} = n_{e})(m_{a} = m_{e})}$$

and thus

$$I = \frac{2 \text{ m}_{a} (\text{m}_{a} = \text{m}_{e}) \text{ ev}_{a}}{1 + 2 \text{ m}_{e} \text{ev}_{a}} = \frac{1}{1 + 2 \text{ m}_{e} \text{ev}_{a}}$$
(8)

The second limiting case (open circuit) correspond to $v_e = 0$ so that, from (7), U = LE is given by

$$U = \frac{Lm_a}{e} \frac{n_a}{n_e} v_a = R_0 2 \ m_e e v_a \tag{9}$$

We expect > 1 so that for the short circuit case the current I $2 \text{ m}_{e}ev_{a}$ is nearly equal to the current expected if the nanotube conduction electrons drift with the same velocity as the adsorbed ions.

We note that R given above represents the internal resistance of the nanotube bundle as an EMF generator. The measured resistivity $_0$ of the nanotube bundles in the norm all atmosphere is $_0 = 0.02\,$ m so that the resistance R_0 = $_0L$ =A where the length L = 1 mm and the cross section area A = $0.4\,$ mm 2 . Thus R_0 = 50 $\,$. If the electron ow velocity v is measured in m=s and if the electron concentration $n_e = 2\,$ $10^{27}\,$ m $^3\,$ we get the electron current in Am pere,

$$I = A n_e e v_e$$
 100 v_e ;

and the induced voltage in mV,

$$U = R_0 I = 5 \quad 10^6 v_e :$$
 (10)

The lowest ow velocity for which a ow induced voltage was measured was $2 \ 10^7 \text{ m} = \text{s}$ and in that case the induced voltage was about 0.2 mV. Now, this is basically the value one would obtain if the drift velocity of the electrons in the nanotubes equaled the (average) liquid ow velocity and if the resistivity R for the liquid-immersed nanotube bundles were the same as that of the bundles in the atm osphere. Thus with $v_e = 2 \ 10^7 \text{ m} = \text{s} \text{ Eq.}$ (10) gives

$$U = 1 m V$$
:

This is only ve times higher than the measured voltage indicating (if as we expect R is similar to R_0) that the electron drift velocity in the nanotubes, in the limiting case of the lowest possible uid ow velocity where the induced voltage can be observed, is of order the average uid ow velocity. At higher uid ow velocity drag is less perfect, and this is no longer the case, since the voltage increases logarithm ically with the uid ow velocity. At the highest studied uid ow velocity ψ 10² m =s the electron drift velocity would be roughly a factor of 10⁵ lower than the average uid ow velocity.

4. Consequences of the model

Because in our stick-slip model the logarithmic voltage increase with ow velocity is due to thermally activated jump of the ions, biased by the force arising from the drift motion of the solid monolayer, we can anticipate rst of all a strong temperature dependence. This is apparent in Eq. (4) above, where the strongest temperature dependence is derived from the thermal Boltzm ann factor which occurs in the microscopic expression for the mobility, that should thus increase exponentially with temperature. In addition there is also a linear temperature prefactor 1 = T, but this is in most cases negligible compared to the Boltzm ann factor. There may also be a temperature dependence arising from a temperature dependence of the concentration of adsorbed ions. In any case, a strong temperature dependence of the induced voltage is predicted by our model and should provide a rst possibility of experimental test.

A second aspect, which strongly distinguishes our model from uctuating ratchets, is the ow-induced concentration of ions from upstream to downstream. In the free uid, every ion is neutralized by some counter-ion of opposite charge. When an ion, say positive, adheres upstream to the nanotube surface, it will get to a large extent neutralized by the image electron charge in the nanotube. The corresponding negative counter-ion in the uid is no longer neutralized. Being made redundant by the positive ion adsorption, it must go somewhere else. When on the other hand, after having drifted along a nanotube the positive ion leaves the nanotube surface some distance downstream, it will lose its neutralizing image electron, and must at that point again recuperate a counter-ion. This suggests that the ow-induced drag of positive adsorbed ions will be accompanied by the simultaneous ow of image electron inside the nanotube, and by a drift of negative counter-ions inside the uid, that will migrate from upstream, where they are redundant, to downstream, where they are needed. In that case we have two negative currents, one electronic inside the nanotube and one ionic, due to the negative counterions, against only one ionic positive current, that of the adsorbed ions. The end result is a net negative current, as observed.

This outcome diers from that of models such as that by K um are tal, where no physical drift of ions is involved. If, as we suggest, ionic transport is involved, then there will not generally be a spatially uniform steady state. To be sure, there could be a non-uniform steady state where the ion concentration (of both signs) is slightly higher downstream than upstream. Depending on geometrical conditions, ow velocity etc, the ions might or might not have the time to di use backwards upstream, against the ow, so as to establish such a steady state equilibrium. That suggests the possibility to look in principle at that ion concentration gradient as the possible signature of an ion drift mechanism, although it is at the moment unclear whether such a gradient could in fact be measured.

A third consequence of our model is the presence of characteristic stick slip noise, that should be readily observable by frequency analysis of the induced voltage. Straightforward as this seems, it might constitute the most direct and simplest test of the model proposed.

5. Sum m ary and conclusions

We propose that the logarithm ic voltage observed in nanotubes bundles upon immersion in a owing liquid with ions dissolved, could have the same thermal barrier jump origin as that observed for frictional stick-slip processes between solids. Once ions adsorb on the nanotubes, they should be dragged not just by owing individual liquid molecules, but by some kind of solid layer of molecules which surrounds the nanotube, and which is rigid enough to support the stick-slip. Each drifting adsorbed ion can in turn drag along electrons inside the nanotube, through the very same electronic frictional force which enables a xed adsorbed ion to cause electrical resistance inside the nanotube.

By assuming this mechanism to be at work we obtained very simple formula for the nanotube generator electrical properties. Expressions for the internal resistance, short circuit current and open circuit voltage obtained in this manner seem entirely reasonable. Moreover the latter quantities increase logarithm ically with the ow velocity, as is seen experimentally.

Various tests can be considered for our mechanism. First, the logarithm ic voltage increase should be strongly temperature dependent. Secondly, the physical dragging of adsorbed ions should cause the ion concentrations in the

uid to become non-uniform, and in particular to become higher downstream. Third, a characteristic stick-slip noise

spectrum should arise on top of the DC ow-induced voltage. It is hoped that these prelim inary simple predictions will stimulate further experimental work on this intriguing elect.

A cknow ledgm ents W e are much indebted to Professors N. Kum ar and A K. Sood for introducing us to their new e ect, for making unpublished information available to us, and for illum inating discussions. W ork at SISSA was sponsored through INFM PRA NANORUB, through M IUR COFIN 2003 as well as FIRB RBAU01LX 5H and FIRB RBAU017S8R, and by Regione Friuli Venezia Giulia. One of us (BNJP) is grateful to the International Centre for Theoretical Physics, where this work was initiated, for hospitality. BNJP also thank the EC for a \Smart Q uasicrystals" grant under the EC Program \Prom oting C om petitive and Sustainable G row th". This research was supported by the N ational Science Foundation under G rant No. PHY 99-07949.

- [1] S.Ghosh, A.K. Sood and N.Kum ar, Science 299, 1042 (2003).
- [2] P.K raland M. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 131 (2001).
- [3] H L F . van Helm holtz, Ann. Physik. 7 (no. 3), 337 (1879).
- [4] M.Odelius, M.Bernasconiand M.Parrinello, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 2855 (1997); R.Zangiand A E.Mark, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 025502 (2003).
- [5] see, e.g., P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 9, 309 (1962); G.M ihaly and L.M ihaly, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52, 149 (1984).
- [6] E.G necco, R.Bennewitz, T.G yalog, Ch.Loppacher, M.Bammerlin, E.Meyer and H.-J.Gunterodt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 1172 (2000); E.Riedo et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 084502 (2003).
- [7] B N J. Persson, O. A Bohr, F. Mancosu, V. Peveri, V N. Sam oilov and IM. Sievebaek, W ear 254, 835 (2003).
- [8] B N J. Persson, Phys. Rev. B 51, 13568 (1995); B N J. Persson, Phys. Rev. B 61, 5949 (2000).
- [9] B N J. Persson and A J. Volokitin, Surf. Sci. 310, 314 (1994); B N J. Persson, J. Chem. Phys. 98, 1659 (1993); B N J. Persson, Sliding Friction: Physical Principles and Applications (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000);