

Ostwald Ripening on Nanoscale

V. M. Burlakov

*Department of materials, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3PH, UK
and
Institute for Spectroscopy Russian Academy of Sciences, Troitsk, Moscow Region, 142190,
Russia*

Abstract

Applicability of classical Lifshitz-Slyozov theory of Ostwald ripening is analyzed and found limited by relatively large cluster sizes due to restrictions imposed by theoretical assumptions. An assumption about the steady state ripening regime poses an upper limit, while another, implicit assumption of continuous description poses a cluster size-dependent lower limit on the supersaturation level. These two limits mismatch for the clusters under certain size in the nanometer scale making the theory inapplicable. We present a more generic, molecular theory of Ostwald ripening, which reproduces classical Lifshitz-Slyozov and Wagner theories in appropriate extreme cases. This theory has a wider applicability than classical theories, especially at lower supersaturation levels, and is more suitable for nanoscale systems.

PACS Numbers: 05.70.-a, 64.60.My, 81.30.-t

1. Introduction

The competitive growth of new-phase clusters, named Ostwald ripening (OR) [1], is a phenomenon often observed at late stages of many first order phase transformations, and playing important role in precipitation hardening of alloys [2-4], stability of emulsions [5-6], formation and stability of surface structures [7-10], and synthesis of nanoparticles [11]. During OR small clusters of atoms/molecules dissolve and transfer their mass to bigger clusters. Classical mean-field theory of OR by Lifshitz-Slyozov-Wagner (SLW) was

developed for a dilute system of clusters suggesting that their volume fraction is negligibly low [12-17]. The main predictions of this theory are confirmed in numerical [11, 18-22] and experimental [8-10, 23-27] investigations of the systems satisfying the theoretical assumptions. There are, however, many experimental studies reporting the coarsening rate and the cluster size distribution significantly different from those predicted by Lifshitz-Slyozov [12, 13] or Wagner [14] theories. This is explained by the deviation of the experimental conditions from those assumed theoretically, in particular, by finite volume fraction of the new-phase clusters (see Ref 26 and references therein). Further theoretical developments of OR were therefore focused on describing the more realistic systems taking into account finite volume fraction of the clusters [18, 28-29].

Both the classical LSW theory and its further improvements are based on solving diffusion equation in the vicinity of clusters implicitly assuming that molecular concentration is high enough to be a smooth function of spatial coordinates at least on the scale of the cluster radius. For small cluster sizes (~ 10 nm) this assumption can be violated, as the required molecular concentration appears to be unrealistically high. This paper presents an alternative, molecular mean field approach to describing structure coarsening on nanoscale. To illustrate peculiarities of this new approach we first briefly outline the classical descriptions of OR.

2. Classical theories of Ostwald Ripening

Classical mean-field theory of Ostwald ripening is derived for a system of spherical clusters of condensed phase, which are infinitely far from each other, and immersed in a vapor/solution with low enough supersaturation such that no further cluster formation (nucleation) takes place. Here we present a concise and simplified derivation of classical results, paying particular attention to the conditions under which they are applicable. For convenience we refer to the condensed phase clusters as ‘molecular clusters’ (or just

‘clusters’), and the inter-cluster space is referred to as vapor though it can be represented by atomic/molecular species dissolved in a condensed phase too.

Consider the total diffusion flux $C(R+r)$ of molecules toward (or outward from) an isolated molecular cluster of radius R , which according to the Gauss’ theorem, does not depend on the radial distance r from the cluster surface

$$\frac{d}{dr}[C(R+r)] = \frac{d}{dr}\left[4\pi \cdot (R+r)^2 \cdot D \frac{dn(r)}{dr}\right] = 0 \quad (1)$$

where D is molecular diffusion coefficient and $n(r)$ is the vapor concentration. The generic solution to Eq. (1) has the form

$$n(R+r) = -\frac{C(R)}{4\pi D \cdot (R+r)} + n_\infty \quad (2)$$

with n_∞ being the vapor concentration infinitely far from the cluster. The boundary conditions for Eqs (1) and (2) are defined by molecular flux density across the cluster-vapor interface,

$$D \frac{dn(R+r)}{dr} \Big|_{r=0} = \frac{C(R)}{4\pi R^2} = I_{in} - I_{out} \quad (3)$$

and by the vapor concentration at the cluster surface

$$n(R) = -\frac{C(R)}{4\pi D \cdot R} + n_\infty. \quad (4)$$

The incoming flux I_{in} is taken as positive, thereby defining the sign in front of the derivative in Eq. (3), whereas the net molecular flux density $I_{in} - I_{out}$ is described by the Wagner anatz

$$I_{in} - I_{out} = k \cdot (n(R) - n_{GT}(R)) \quad (5)$$

in terms of the constant interface reaction rate k and equilibrium vapor concentration $n_{GT}(R)$ at the cluster surface. Eqs (3)-(5) define two simultaneous equations for $C(R)$ and $n(R)$, for which the solution $C(R)$ is

$$C(R) = 4\pi R^2 \cdot D \cdot \frac{k \cdot (n_\infty - n_{GT}(R))}{D + k \cdot R}. \quad (6)$$

If we associate the volume v_m with each molecule in a cluster, then the time evolution of the cluster radius is given by

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \frac{v_m \cdot C(R)}{4\pi R^2} = v_m \cdot D \cdot \frac{k \cdot (n_\infty - n_{GT}(R))}{D + k \cdot R}, \quad (7)$$

which is the main equation of the classical theories. It contains two unknowns,

n_∞ and $n_{GT}(R)$. The parameter n_∞ represents the mean field, which mediates molecular exchange between different clusters. An equilibrium molecular concentration $n_{GT}(R)$ at the cluster surface is obtained from the Gibbs-Thomson relation, as described in the next subsection.

2.1 Gibbs-Thomson relation

The Gibbs-Thomson relation forms the basis for all classical theories of OR, and is derived assuming that the molecular cluster of radius R is in equilibrium with the surrounding molecular vapor. According to this assumption, the chemical potentials of the molecules in the cluster μ_{cl} and of those in the vapor μ_{vap} are equivalent. Using explicit expressions for these chemical potentials

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{cl} &= -e_{coh} + \gamma \cdot v_m \frac{dS}{dV} = -e_{coh} + \frac{2\gamma \cdot v_m}{R} \\ \mu_{vap} &= -k_B T \ln \left(\frac{N_0}{n} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

one finds a Gibbs-Thomson relation between equilibrium vapor concentration $n_{GT}(R)$ and the cluster radius R

$$n_{GT}(R) = N_0 \cdot e^{-\frac{e_{coh}}{k_B T}} \cdot e^{\frac{2\gamma \cdot v_m}{R \cdot k_B T}} = n(\infty) \cdot e^{\frac{2\gamma \cdot v_m}{R \cdot k_B T}} \quad (9)$$

where e_{coh} is the cohesive energy per molecule, γ is the energy per unit area of the cluster surfaces, N_0 is a constant defining some reference concentration (such as the concentration of all available sites for the molecule in a vapor), k_B is the Boltzmann constant, and T is the temperature, and finally, the factor $n(\infty)$ in Eq. (9) represents the equilibrium vapor concentration above the flat surface of condensed phase. The Gibbs-Thomson relation states that the concentration of molecular vapor is exponentially higher around smaller molecular clusters.

2.2 Lifshitz-Slyozov-Wagner theory

Classical LSW theory of Ostwald ripening is based on the mean-field approximation, in which the coupling between different clusters is established through average concentration of the vapor n_∞ . The value of n_∞ is defined assuming a steady-state cluster evolution, at which at any moment in time a sum of all absorbed molecular fluxes is equal to that of all emitted molecular fluxes

$$\sum_i \left(4\pi R_i^2 \cdot D \cdot \frac{k \cdot (n_\infty - n_{GT}(R_i))}{D + k \cdot R_i} \right) = 0. \quad (10)$$

Assuming further that the exponential function in Eq. (9) can be approximated as

$$n_{GT}(R) \approx n(\infty) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{2\gamma \cdot v_m}{R \cdot k_B T} \right) \quad (11)$$

one can obtain an analytical solution to Eq. (7) for the following two extreme cases.

2.2.1 Lifshitz-Slyozov theory

The main assumption in the LS theory is that the cluster and the surrounding vapor are in mutual equilibrium. This means that molecular exchange across the cluster-vapor interface occurs more quickly than the molecular diffusion in the vapor $k \cdot R \gg D$, i.e. the ripening process is diffusion-controlled. The Gibbs-Thomson relation in the form of Eq. (11) then

gives the vapour concentration at the cluster surfaces. Substituting n_∞ and $n_{GT}(R)$ from Eqs (10) and (11), respectively, into Eq (7) one obtains

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \frac{D}{R} \cdot \frac{2\gamma \cdot v_m^2 \cdot n(\infty)}{k_B T} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\langle R \rangle} - \frac{1}{R} \right) \quad (12)$$

where the simbol $\langle \rangle$ means an average over the cluster size distribution. Eq. (12) is the main equation of the LS theory. According to this equation the cluster evolution possesses a self-similar regime [30] characterized by asymptotic ($t \rightarrow \infty$) time dependence of average cluster radius $\langle R(t) \rangle \propto t^{1/3}$ and by the scaling invariant cluster size distribution function presented in References 12 and 13.

2.2.2 Wagner theory

The opposite extreme case to the LS theory, $k \cdot R \ll D$, was proposed by Wagner [14] who suggested that the ripening process is controlled by molecular attachment-detachment reactions at cluster surfaces. Eq. (7) then takes the form

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \frac{2k \cdot \gamma \cdot v_m^2 \cdot n(\infty)}{k_B T} \cdot \left(\frac{\langle R \rangle}{\langle R^2 \rangle} - \frac{1}{R} \right). \quad (13)$$

This equation is also scale-invariant, indicating a self-similar regime of OR, which is characterized by asymptotic time dependence of average cluster radius in the form $\langle R(t) \rangle \propto t^{1/2}$. The characteristic cluster size distribution in this case is significantly different from that in the LS theory [14].

2.3 LSW approximations expressed in molecular terms

To understand the meaning of Lifshitz-Slyozov and Wagner extreme cases in molecular terms, let us consider Eq. (5) in more detail. The incoming flux I_{in} in this equation can be rewritten as

$$I_{in} = \frac{1}{2} n(R) \cdot \overline{V}_r \cdot \kappa \quad (14)$$

where \overline{V}_r is an average molecular velocity in the radial direction, and κ is the probability for a molecule touching the cluster surface to join this cluster. For simplicity we take $\kappa = 1$, though we may also consider this in more general terms. Comparing Eqs (5) and (14) we find that

$$k = \frac{1}{2} \overline{V}_r. \quad (15)$$

Taking into account the definitions $\overline{V}_r \approx \overline{V}_x = \overline{V}_y = \overline{V}_z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \overline{V}$ and $D = \frac{1}{3} \overline{V} \cdot \lambda$ we find that

$$D = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} k \lambda. \quad (16)$$

Using this the applicability conditions for the LS and Wagner extreme cases are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} k \cdot R \gg D &\Rightarrow \lambda \ll R, \text{ Lifshitz-Slyozov's case} \\ k \cdot R \ll D &\Rightarrow \lambda \gg R, \text{ Wagner's case} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

It is worth pointing out that similar conditions can also be obtained for solid-liquid and solid-solid phase transformations, if the diffusion coefficient and average molecular velocity are expressed in terms of the hopping attempt frequency and average hopping distance.

However, the actual condition required for applicability of Wagner theory is in fact even stronger than that given by Eq. (17). According to Eq. (6) taken in Wagner's limit, a cluster emits as many molecules per unit time as it would have emitted in equilibrium, while the flux absorbed by the cluster is due only to the mean field n_∞ . This suggests that all emitted molecules immediately contribute to the mean field, and no single molecule returns back to the cluster of origin. This is possible only if the emitted molecules travel ballistically from the cluster of origin to other clusters, i.e. the molecular mean free path is

much greater than the characteristic inter-cluster distance Λ . This means that the actual requirement for the Wagner case reads $\lambda \gg \Lambda$, which is rather unlikely in physical systems of practical interest.

A stronger condition exists also for the applicability of Lifshitz-Slyozov theory, and it concerns the vapor concentration around the clusters. For the concentration gradient in Eq. (1) to be a well-defined function, the concentration must be a smooth function on the scale of λ around the cluster, suggesting the following requirement

$$n_{GT}(R) \sim n(\infty) \gg \frac{1}{R^2 \lambda}. \quad (18)$$

For OR in a solid state system containing the clusters with the characteristic radius $R=3$ nm, and for the molecular mean free path $\lambda \approx 0.5$ nm, an applicability of LS theory according to Eq. (18) requires unrealistically high vapour concentration, significantly exceeding $0.2 \cdot 10^{21} \text{ cm}^{-3}$. As it is shown in Section 4, the LS theory in such a case can be applied only to much bigger clusters.

There is also a higher limit for molecular concentration in the vapour applicable to both LS and Wagner cases, as the vapour concentration should not affect the molecular mean free path, which is implicitly assumed to be a constant in the LSW theory.

Corresponding condition reads [31]

$$n(\infty) \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} \sigma \lambda} \quad (19)$$

where σ is a cross section for molecular collisions. The applicability conditions we obtain for classical theories can then be summarized as

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \ll R \text{ and } \frac{1}{R^2 \lambda} \ll n(\infty) \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} \sigma \lambda}, & \text{ Lifshitz-Slyozov's case} \\ \lambda \gg \Lambda \text{ and } n(\infty) \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} \sigma \lambda}, & \text{ Wagner's case} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

These conditions indicate that existing theories cannot describe OR in a system with molecular mean free path in the range $\Lambda > \lambda > R$. Furthermore, there is also no ripening theory applicable for $\lambda \ll R$ and low supersaturation values $n_\infty \leq 1/(R^2\lambda)$ or, in other words, for small-scale systems such as nanosystems. These regimes of ripening may well take place in precipitation hardening alloys and in the gas-phase production of nanoparticulate powders [32-36], and are more suitable to be described within the molecular theory of OR [37], some details of which are reproduced in the next section.

3 Molecular theory of Ostwald Ripening

The basis for this methodology is the application of kinetic gas theory to a conservative system of spherical molecular clusters surrounded by vapor using the approximations of classical LSW theory: a) the total cluster volume is negligible compared to the whole system volume (zero volume fraction), and b) the vapor concentration is low enough to have the probability of nucleation negligibly low, and c) the process can be considered as a steady state one, i.e. molecular fluxes around particular cluster instantaneously adjust to the size distribution of all clusters. Quantitative analysis of this latter approximation is given below in this section.

Under these approximations a cluster of radius R emits from every unit area of its surface a molecular flux $I_{out}(R)$ and absorbs a flux density $I_{in}(R)$ over the same surface. For simplicity we maintain the assumption that clusters absorb every molecule touching their surfaces, i.e. $\kappa = 1$, although the approach could (again) be formulated in more general terms. The key point in the molecular theory of OR is that it takes into account that the molecules emitted from the clusters at a past moment in time, t_1 , have a certain probability $p(R, t - t_1)$ to return to the cluster of origin at a subsequent moment in time, t ,

due to collisions with other molecules. With this in mind, the net flux $I_{\text{out}}(R)$ emitted by a cluster may be written as

$$I_{\text{out}}(R(t)) = K(R(t)) - \int_{-\infty}^t K(R(t_1)) \cdot p(R(t_1), t - t_1) dt_1, \quad (21)$$

where $K(R)$ is the molecular emission rate per unit surface area. The time variables are explicitly shown in Eq. (21), as they pertain to the different time moments defined above.

The emission rate $K(R)$ depends on the cluster radius in accordance with the Gibbs-Thomson relation. As a cluster in equilibrium with the surrounding vapor emits as many molecules as it absorbs, $K(R)$ can be expressed as

$$K(R) = \frac{1}{2} n_{GT}(R) \cdot \bar{V}_r = k \cdot n(\infty) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{2\gamma \cdot v_m}{R \cdot k_B T} \right), \quad (22)$$

where we took into account Eqs (11) and (15). Hence, Eq. (22) can be considered as a definition for $K(R)$.

By analogy with classical LSW theory we consider a steady state process of OR. In molecular terms this means that each molecule emitted by a cluster if returns back find this cluster unchanged. In other words the cluster should not noticeably change its size while the emitted molecule travels the distance L large compared to the cluster radius R .

Formally this statement reads

$$4\pi R^2 (K(R) - k \cdot n(\infty)) \cdot t_D \ll \frac{4\pi}{3v_m} R^3, \quad (23)$$

where on the left is the net number of molecules emitted by the cluster during the time

$t_D = L^2 / (6D)$, and on the right is the total number of molecules in the cluster. For

obtaining an order of magnitude estimate we approximated the absorbed molecular flux in

Eq. (23) by replacing the unknown $n(R)$ in Eqs (14)-(15) with $n(\infty)$. Then using the

definitions of D and $K(R)$ from Eqs (16) and (22), respectively, the condition given by Eq. (23) can be expressed as

$$n(\infty) \cdot \frac{\gamma \cdot v_m L^2}{k_B T} \ll \frac{2\lambda R^2}{\sqrt{3}v_m} \rightarrow n(\infty) \ll \frac{\lambda R^2 k_B T}{\gamma \cdot v_m^2 L^2}, \quad (24)$$

or together with Eq (19) it finally gives the requirement for the steady state regime of OR

$$n_{GT}(R) \sim n(\infty) \ll \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\sigma\lambda}, \frac{\lambda R^2 k_B T}{\gamma \cdot v_m^2 L^2} \right\}. \quad (25)$$

Fulfilling this requirement allows simplifying the integral in Eq. (21) by taking out the factor $K(R)$

$$I_{out}(R(t)) \approx K(R(t)) - K(R(t)) \cdot \int_{-\infty}^t p(R(t_1), t - t_1) dt_1 = K(R(t)) \cdot (1 - P(R)) \quad (26)$$

where $P(R)$ is the total probability for an emitted molecule to return to the cluster of origin. This probability depends on the parameters determining the regime of mass transport, such as the molecular mean free path λ , cluster radius R , and average inter-cluster distance Λ . Assuming λ to be constant (e.g. set by a buffer gas density), we may now analyze OR in different regimes of molecular transport.

3.1 Rarefied gas regime of mass transport $\lambda \gg R$

As $L \approx \lambda \gg R$ in this case, the requirement for a steady state regime of OR given by Eq. (24) is automatically fulfilled and one can use an approximation equivalent to that of the Wagner theory. According to it the OR process is controlled by molecular attachment-detachment, and the vapor concentration obeying also the restriction given by Eq. (19) can be considered homogeneous throughout the inter-cluster space, so that all clusters are subjected to the same density of the incoming molecular flux $I_{in}(R) = I_\rho$. The value of I_ρ can be determined using conservation of the total cluster volume, namely

$$\int_{R_{\min}}^{R_{\max}} 4\pi R^2 I_{out}(R) f(R, t) dR = \int_{R_{\min}}^{R_{\max}} 4\pi R^2 I_{out}(R) f(R, t) dR = I_{\rho} \int_{R_{\min}}^{R_{\max}} 4\pi R^2 f(R, t) dR, \quad (27)$$

$$\int_{R_{\min}}^{R_{\max}} f(R, t) dR = N_C(t)$$

where the function $f(R, t)$ describes the instantaneous cluster radius distribution, $N_C(t)$ is the total number of clusters, and $R_{\min} \approx 0$ and R_{\max} are the minimum and the maximum cluster radii, respectively. Then the volume balance for a single cluster of radius R implies that

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = v_m \left(\frac{\int_0^{R_{\max}} x^2 I_{out}(x) f(x, t) dx}{\int_0^{R_{\max}} x^2 f(x, t) dx} - I_{out}(R) \right). \quad (28)$$

Eqs (28) and (26) are the main equations of the molecular theory of OR in the regime described by Wagner approximation. To estimate the probability $P(R, \lambda)$ in Eq. (26) we recall that any emitted molecule can return to the cluster of origin after 1, 2, ... m collisions with other molecules, suggesting that $P(R, \lambda) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P_k(R, \lambda)$. In a simplified situation the emitted molecules travel away from the cluster along the radius, and single-collision return probability $P_1(R, \lambda)$ can be represented as [38]

$$P_1(R, \lambda) = \int_0^{\infty} T(x, \lambda) \cdot \left(\int_x^{\infty} T(x_1, \lambda) dx_1 \right) \cdot G(x) dx \quad (29)$$

where $T(x, \lambda) = \lambda^{-1} \exp(-x/\lambda)$ is the probability density, the integral of which from “0” to “ x ” defines the probability for a molecule to have a collision after traveling the distance x ; $G(x)$ is a geometric factor defining the probability for a molecule colliding at a distance x from the cluster to scatter along the directions crossing the cluster surface. The geometric factor $G(x)$ can be estimated assuming isotropic scattering and taking into account the cluster cross section $G(x) \approx 0.5 [R/(R+x)]^2$. Using this estimate one obtains from Eq. (29) $P_1(R, \lambda) \approx 0.5 \cdot R/\lambda$, the result just slightly overestimating single-collision return

probability. A rigorous calculation taking into account isotropic emission of molecules from the cluster surface and the cluster sphericity gives

$$P_1(R, \lambda) \approx 0.35 \cdot R / \lambda. \quad (30)$$

We show that for low enough values of R/λ the total return probability $P(R, \lambda)$ can be approximated by the single-collision return probability given by Eq. (30). The two-collision return probability $P_2(R, \lambda)$ can be estimated by direct calculation within the same approximations as those used in estimating $P_1(R, \lambda)$

$$P_2(R, \lambda) \approx \int_0^\infty dx \int_0^\infty dx_1 \int_{-1}^1 dt \cdot [T(x, \lambda) T(x_1, \lambda) G(L)] \approx 5 \cdot (R / \lambda)^2, \quad (31)$$

$$L = \sqrt{x^2 + x_1^2 - 2xx_1t}, \quad t = \cos(\varphi)$$

where x , x_1 and L are the distances a molecule travels from the cluster to the first collision point, between the first and the second collision points after scattering at an angle φ with respect to the original direction of motion, and from the second collision point back to the cluster of origin, respectively. Similarly one can obtain an estimate for the three-collision return probability

$$P_3(R, \lambda) \approx 0.5 \cdot (R / \lambda)^2. \quad (32)$$

To estimate higher order multi-collision return probabilities we recall that the mean square displacement of the emitted molecule after m collisions is $\langle x^2 \rangle = \lambda^2 \cdot m$. Using this,

$P_m(R, \lambda)$ can be estimated as

$$P_m(R, \lambda) \approx \frac{R^2}{\left(\sqrt{\langle x^2 \rangle} + R\right)^2} \cdot \exp\left(-\sqrt{\langle x^2 \rangle} / \lambda\right) \approx \frac{R^2}{\lambda^2} \cdot \frac{\exp(-\sqrt{m})}{m}. \quad (33)$$

Equations (31), (32) and (33) facilitate the estimation of the total contribution of all multi-collision return probabilities, and demonstrate that the result does not exceed $6 \cdot (R / \lambda)^2$.

This suggests that for low enough values of R/λ the total contribution of all multi-collision return probabilities can be neglected in comparison with the single-collision one

$$P_1(R, \lambda) \approx 0.35 \cdot R / \lambda .$$

The equation for the time evolution of cluster radii can then be derived by replacing the return probability in Eq. (26) with the single-collision return probability given by Eq. (30) and substituting the result into Eq. (28). It takes the form

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \frac{2\gamma kn(\infty)v_m^2}{k_B T} \left(\frac{\langle R \rangle}{\langle R^2 \rangle} - \frac{1}{R} \right) + \frac{0.35 kn(\infty)v_m}{\lambda} \left(R - \frac{\langle R^3 \rangle}{\langle R^2 \rangle} \right) \quad (34)$$

Right-hand side of this equation contains two major terms: the first is proportional to the surface energy γ and is identical to that in Eq. (13) describing the Wagner theory. This term is due to the thermodynamic mechanism of ripening driving the system toward minimization of the interface area between the condensed and the vapor phases. The second term in the right hand side of Eq. (34) does not depend on any surface energy, and can be considered as purely kinetic mechanism of ripening. One can estimate the cluster size for which the kinetic mechanism becomes comparable with the thermodynamic one. Consider ripening in a hypothetical system of nanoclusters at temperature $k_B T \sim 0.1$ eV and at atmospheric pressure ($\lambda \sim 100$ nm). We estimate relative contributions of the

thermodynamic and kinetic mechanisms, e.g. the coefficients $\frac{2\gamma \cdot v_m}{Rk_B T}$ and $\frac{0.35R}{\lambda}$, taking typical values for the surface energy $\gamma \sim 1$ J/m² and molecular volume $v_m \approx (0.3 \text{ nm})^3$.

Substituting these data we find that both mechanisms are comparable for clusters with radius ~ 40 nm, e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2\gamma \cdot v_m}{Rk_B T} &\approx 0.14 \\ \frac{0.35R}{\lambda} &\approx 0.135 \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

For bigger clusters the role of the kinetic mechanism increases, while that of the thermodynamic one decreases, suggesting that early and later stages of coarsening may be controlled by two entirely different mechanisms. The OR process driven solely by the kinetic mechanism is described in Ref. 38.

3.2 Regime of molecular transport with $\lambda \ll R$

In the limit $\lambda \ll R$ the molecules emitted from the cluster and scattered outward it after the first collision still have a very high probability of returning to the original cluster due to subsequent collisions. This makes the collision-based calculation of the return probability difficult, as the multiple-collision terms cannot be neglected. We show that in this case one can calculate the escape probability $1 - P(R, \lambda)$ using an electrostatic analogy [38].

Consider a stationary point source S emitting molecules with constant rate W and located at a distance ξ from the sphere A of radius R , which absorbs the molecules and not reemit them. The probability of molecule emitted from S traveling to infinity can be associated with the ratio W_{inf} / W , where W_{inf} is a steady state molecular flux crossing the surface of infinitely large encompassing sphere. As the steady-state concentration $N(r)$ obeys Laplace's equation $\Delta N(r) = 0$, one can use an electrostatic analogy to calculate the molecular flux W_{inf} , by replacing $N(r)$ with the electrostatic potential, the molecular flux with the electric field flux, and the molecule generation/absorption rate with positive/negative electric charge. For illustration purposes we assume that the sphere A absorbs every molecule touching its surface, so that molecular concentration $N(r=R)$ (electrostatic potential) at its surface is "0". Then the source S and the sphere A can be replaced with a point charge $q=W$ and an earthed metallic sphere of radius R , respectively. The flux W_{int} can then be calculated using Gauss' theorem $W_{int} \propto (q + Q)$, where Q is the charge induced on the earthed sphere by the point charge q . The value of Q is known to be

$Q = -q \frac{R}{R + \xi}$ suggesting that the escape probability for molecules emitted from S is equal to $\frac{\xi}{R + \xi}$.

If we now associate the sphere A with the molecular cluster, and the source S with the point at which a molecule emitted from this cluster has its first collision, then the overall escape probability can be determined as

$$1 - P(R, \lambda) \simeq \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_0^\infty \frac{\xi \cdot \exp(-\xi/\lambda)}{R + \xi} d\xi = \frac{\lambda}{R} \cdot \int_0^\infty \frac{x \cdot \exp(-x)}{1 + \lambda x/R} dx = \alpha \frac{\lambda}{R} \cdot \Phi(\lambda/R). \quad (36)$$

where α is a constant that takes into account molecular collisions in a thin Knudsen layer around the cluster, and is of the order of ‘1’. The exact value of α can be obtained by comparing the molecular theory results with those of the Lifshitz-Slyozov theory, as illustrated in the next section. By direct calculation it can be shown that the value of $\Phi(\lambda/R)$ varies by no more than 1 % of its asymptotic value $\Phi(\lambda/R \simeq 0) = 1$ at all $\lambda/R \leq 0.005$ allowing one to use an approximation for the return probability

$$P(R, \lambda) \simeq 1 - \alpha \frac{\lambda}{R}.$$

Substituting this into Eq. (26) and then into Eq.(28) and taking into account Eq. (22) one obtains the equation describing the cluster size evolution

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \alpha k n(\infty) v_m \lambda \left[\left(\frac{\langle R \rangle}{\langle R^2 \rangle} - \frac{1}{R} \right) + \frac{2\gamma v_m}{k_B T} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\langle R^2 \rangle} - \frac{1}{R^2} \right) \right]. \quad (37)$$

Similar to Eq. (34) this equation also contains two main terms in its right-hand side. The first term is clearly dominant, as $\frac{2\gamma v_m}{R k_B T} \ll 1$ by definition, and does not contain the surface energy γ . Hence it can be interpreted as accounting for the kinetic mechanism of OR. The functional form of this term is identical to that in Wagner’s theory suggesting that this theory would describe interface-controlled OR in the limit $\lambda/R \ll 1$ too. However, the

coarsening rate in this case $F_W^{Kin} = kn(\infty)v_m\lambda$ differs from that in the classical Wagner

theory $F_W^{Class} = \frac{2k \cdot \gamma \cdot v_m^2 \cdot n(\infty)}{k_B T}$ by the factor $\frac{2\gamma v_m}{\lambda k_B T}$, which is a ratio of the capillary length

to molecular mean free path, and can either be larger or smaller than 1. This difference could be responsible for the deviation of experimentally observed coarsening rates from theoretical predictions.

3.3 Relation of the molecular theory to the classical theories of Ostwald ripening

To understand the relation between molecular theory and classical Lifshitz-Slyozov and Wagner theories it is worth analyzing the structure of Eqs (12) and (13). Molecular flux from the cluster in the former equation is proportional to $(R^{-1})^2$, where the factor R^{-1} is due to the cluster dimensionality and comes from the Gibbs-Thomson relation given by Eq. (11). An extra factor R^{-1} comes from the dimensionality of the molecular transport. Interestingly, the dimensionality of the molecular transport is not at all reflected in Wagner's theory, as the molecular flux from the cluster in Eq. (13) is simply proportional to R^{-1} . This fact can be understood if we recall that molecular exchange between the clusters in this theory is due to ballistic transport, which is not influenced by any property of the inter-cluster space such as dimensionality.

In contrast to the Wagner theory, the molecular theory depends on the dimensionality of the molecular transport through the return probability $P(R, \lambda)$, which is taken into account in both Eq. (34) and Eq. (37). The first equation is reduced to the main equation of Wagner theory Eq. (13) in the limit $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. It can be shown that an equation similar to Eq. (34) can be obtained by Taylor's expansion of the main equation of the classical theory Eq. (7) up to the term linear in kR . In the opposite extreme case ($\lambda \rightarrow 0$) the molecular theory is represented by Eq. (37), which is entirely new and cannot be obtained from Eq. (7).

The molecular approach can be extended onto the case of diffusion-controlled OR to establish its relation to the Lifshitz-Slyozov theory. To do this we analyze molecular fluxes in the equation of cluster size evolution

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = v_m \cdot (I_{in} - I_{out}). \quad (38)$$

The net flux I_{out} is again calculated taking into account molecular return probability as shown by Eqs (26) and (36). The main difference from the case described in the previous subsection is that now the incoming molecular fluxes to clusters are determined by diffusion of particles from infinity, which means that the mean field is now represented by the vapor concentration n_∞ rather than by the flux I_ρ . To describe the diffusive incoming fluxes we need boundary conditions at the cluster surfaces for the fraction of vapor concentration n_{mf} related to the mean field, i.e. to the contribution of all other clusters. According to our assumption about molecular absorption by clusters $\kappa = 1$, this boundary condition is '0'. Now we can rewrite Eq. (38) as

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = v_m \cdot \left(D \frac{dn_{mf}(R+r)}{dr} - I_{out} \right) \quad (39)$$

where $n_{mf}(R+r)$ is the fraction of concentration, which is equal to '0' at the cluster surface ($r = 0$), and is equal to n_∞ far away from the clusters. Solving the diffusion problem with these boundary conditions for an isolated cluster we obtain in the place of Eq. (39)

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = v_m \cdot \left(\frac{n_\infty D}{R} - I_{out} \right) \quad (40)$$

Substituting Eq. (36) into Eq. (26) we have for the outgoing flux

$$I_{out} = K(R(t)) \cdot (1 - P(R)) = k \cdot n(\infty) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{2\gamma \cdot v_m}{R \cdot k_B T} \right) \frac{\alpha \lambda}{R}, \quad (41)$$

which can then be substituted into Eq. (40) to obtain

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \frac{v_m n_\infty D}{R} - v_m k \cdot n(\infty) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{2\gamma \cdot v_m}{R \cdot k_B T}\right) \frac{\alpha \lambda}{R} = \frac{D v_m}{R} \left(n_\infty - \frac{\alpha \sqrt{3}}{2} n(\infty)\right) - \frac{\alpha 2\gamma \cdot v_m^2}{R \cdot k_B T} \frac{\lambda k n(\infty)}{R} \quad (42)$$

Assuming again the steady state regime we can exclude the value of n_∞ and obtain the equation

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \frac{2\gamma \cdot v_m^2}{k_B T} \frac{\alpha \lambda k n(\infty)}{R} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\langle R \rangle} - \frac{1}{R}\right). \quad (43)$$

This is equivalent to the main equation of classical LS theory if we choose $\alpha = 2/\sqrt{3}$ to ensure the relation between k and D given by Eq. (16). Thus we find that the molecular theory includes classical Lifshitz-Slyozov and Wagner theories as the particular extreme cases. Using this fact and comparing the applicability conditions for both the LS and molecular theory in terms of vapour concentration given by Eqs (20) and (25), respectively, it seems possible to understand the implicit requirement imposed by the steady-state regime in the classical LS theory of OR.

4 Applicability range for the classical LSW and molecular theories of OR

Here we show that the assumption about the steady state ripening regime together with the continuous description implicitly poses significant restrictions on characteristic cluster size in a system treated within the LSW theory. As shown in the previous section, the molecular approach reproduces both the LS and Wagner theories in the appropriate extreme cases. The molecular theory is formulated under the condition expressed by Eq. (24) suggesting that the same condition should be in force when this theory is applied to the LS or Wagner case. Combining the condition given by Eq. (24) with those for the LSW theory (Eq. (20)) we can now rewrite the applicability conditions for all the theories

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda \ll R \text{ and } \frac{1}{R^2 \lambda} \ll n(\infty) &\ll \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} \sigma \lambda}, \frac{\lambda R^2 k_B T}{\gamma \cdot v_m^2 L^2} \right\}, & \text{LS \& MT} \\
\lambda \gg \Lambda \text{ and } n(\infty) &\ll \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} \sigma \lambda} \right\}, & \text{Wagner \& MT} \\
\lambda \ll R \text{ and } n(\infty) &\ll \min \left\{ \frac{1}{R^2 \lambda}, \frac{\lambda R^2 k_B T}{\gamma \cdot v_m^2 L^2} \right\}, & \text{MT} \\
\Lambda \gg \lambda \gg R \text{ and } n(\infty) &\ll \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} \sigma \lambda}, \frac{\lambda R^2 k_B T}{\gamma \cdot v_m^2 L^2} \right\}, & \text{MT}
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Taking reasonable values for the parameters $\sqrt{2} \sigma = 0.1 \text{ nm}^2$, $k_B T = 0.1 \text{ eV}$,

$\gamma = 1 \text{ J/Mol} \approx 1 \text{ eV/nm}^2$, $v_m = 0.03 \text{ nm}^3$, and assuming for definiteness that $L \approx 10R \gg R$

we can rewrite the first line of this condition as

$$\frac{1}{R^2 \lambda} \ll n(\infty) \ll \frac{0.01 \lambda}{\text{nm}^4}. \tag{45}$$

This double inequality suggests a much stronger inequality between the left and right sides,

e.g. such as

$$\frac{10}{R^2 \lambda} \ll \frac{0.01 \lambda}{\text{nm}^4} \rightarrow R \gg \frac{30 \cdot \text{nm}^2}{\lambda}. \tag{46}$$

If $\lambda \approx 0.5 \text{ nm}$, which is a characteristic hopping distance for metal atoms diffusion in solids, then the LS approach can be applied only if the system is composed of clusters with characteristic radius $R \gg 60 \text{ nm}$. If $\lambda \approx 1 \text{ nm}$, which is typical for a liquid or emulsion, then the cluster radii should be $R \gg 30 \text{ nm}$ for being treated within the LS theory.

All the conditions summarized in Eq. (44) are illustrated in Fig. 1 in the parameter space $\{n(\infty), \lambda\}$ for two values of cluster radius: a) $R=3 \text{ nm}$, and b) $R=100 \text{ nm}$. As can be




Figure 1. Applicability areas (shaded) of the molecular theory of OR (1 – 4) and those of the Wagner (3) and Lifshitz-Slyozov theories in the parameter space $\{n(\infty), \lambda\}$ as defined by Eq. (44) for a system of clusters with characteristic radius a) 3 nm, and b) 100 nm, and for the parameter values $\sqrt{2}\sigma = 0.1 \text{ nm}^2$, $k_B T = 0.1 \text{ eV}$, $\gamma = 1 \text{ J/Mol} \approx 1 \text{ eV/nm}^2$, $v_m = 0.03 \text{ nm}^3$. Arrows indicate the value of cluster radius R and that of hypothetical inter-cluster distance Λ . Inclined solid and dot-dashed lines and the vertical dotted line corresponding to the R -value surround the applicability area for LS theory, as indicated by area 4 in b). There is no such area in a) suggesting that LS theory cannot be applied to such small clusters at given parameter values.

seen from the figure, the molecular theory is applicable to both cluster sizes in almost the whole range of λ values (areas 1-4) and in a wide range of vapour concentrations $n(\infty)$.

The applicability area of LS theory (area 4) is rather narrow for 100 nm clusters and totally disappears for 3 nm clusters. This happens because the requirement of the steady state ripening regime suggests an upper limit, while continuous description poses a cluster size-dependent lower limit on the vapour concentration. For small enough cluster sizes, such as $R=3$ nm, these two limits mismatch. The applicability area for Wagner theory (area 3) is also very narrow and does not depend on the cluster size. This comparison of the applicability ranges for the LSW and molecular theories of OR shown in Fig. 1 indicates

that deviations from the classical LSW theory can be observed even if the experimental system fulfils explicit theoretical assumptions about the cluster volume fraction and low supersaturation level, and that such deviations are more likely to occur for the systems composed of nanometer sized clusters.

5 Conclusions

We have analyzed the applicability of classical theories of Ostwald ripening and expressed corresponding criteria in terms of the molecular mean free path in a vapor phase λ , average inter-cluster separation Λ , characteristic cluster radius R , and the vapour supersaturation $n(\infty)$. It is shown that Lifshitz-Slyozov theory of diffusion controlled ripening is applicable at $\lambda \ll R$ and for relatively large clusters, while the Wagner theory of interface controlled ripening is restricted by ballistic transport of molecules, and can be applied to any cluster sizes. The presented molecular theory of Ostwald ripening describes the process in a much broader range of molecular transport regimes and supersaturation levels reproducing the classical results in appropriate extreme cases. This theory is more suitable for nanoscale clusters than the classical Lifshitz-Slyozov-Wagner theory.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Professor D. G. Pettifor for useful and stimulating discussions, and for opportunity to use Materials Modelling Laboratory facilities. Financial support from the EPSRC within the project 'Supramolecular self-assembly of 1-10 nm templates for biofunctional surfaces, quantum information processing and nanoelectronics' (EP/D048761/1) is gratefully acknowledged.

References

1. W. Z. Ostwald, *Phys. Chem.* **37**, 385 (1901).
2. P. W. Voorhees, *Ann. Rev. Mater. Sci.* **22**, 197 (1992).
3. D. A. Porter, K. E. Easterling, *Phase transformations in metals and alloys*. 2nd Edition, New York: Chapman and Hall, (1992).
4. A. Baldan, *J. Materials Sci.* **37**, 2171 (2002); *ibid* **37**, 2379 (2002).
5. T. Tadros, P. Izquierdo, J. Esquena, C. Solans, *Adv. in Coll. And Interf. Sci.* **108-109**, 303 (2004).
6. P. Taylor, *Adv. Colloid. Interf. Sci.* **106**, 261 (2003).
7. S. A. Kukushkin, A. V. Osipov, *Progress in Surf. Sci.* **51**, 1 (1996).
8. M. Zinke-Allmang, L. C. Feldman, M. H. Grabow, *Surf. Sci. Rep.* **16**, 377 (1992).
9. W. N. Bartelt, C. R. Theis, M. Tromp, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 11741 (1996).
10. Goldfarb, G. A. D. Briggs, *Recent Res. Devel. in Mat. Sci.* **1**, 189 (1998).
11. N. V. Mantzaris, *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, **60**, 4749 (2005).
12. M. Lifshitz, V. V. Slyozov, *Zh. Eksp. Theor. Fiz.* **35**, 479 (1958) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* **8**, 331 (1959)].
13. M. Lifshitz, V. V. Slezov., *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **19**, 35 (1961).
14. C. Z. Wagner, *Electrochem.* **65**, 581 (1961).
15. B. K. Chakraverty, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **28**, 2401 (1967).
16. C. V. Thomson, *Acta Metall.* **36**, 2929 (1988).
17. J. A. Marqusee, *J. Chem. Phys.* **81**, 976 (1984).
18. N. Akaiwa, P. W. Voorhees, *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 3860 (1994).
19. M. K. Chen, P. W. Voorhees, *Mod. Simul. Mater. Sci. Eng.* **1**, 591 (1993).
20. M. Strobel, S. Reiss, K.-H. Heinig, *Nucl. Inst. Meth. Phys. Res. B* **20**, 216 (1996).
21. J. A. Warren, B. T. Murray, *Mod. Simul. Mater. Sci. Eng.* **4**, 215 (1996).

22. M. Shwind, J. Agren, *Acta Mater.* **49**, 3821 (2001).
23. M. Hanbücken, M. Futamoto, J. A. Venables, *Surf. Sci.* **147**, 433 (1984).
24. R. F. Shannon, C. R. Harkless, S. E. Nagler, *Phys. Rev. B* **38**, 9327 (1988).
25. S. Arrott, B. Heintich, S. T. Purcell, in *Kinetics of Ordering and Growth on Surfaces*, edited by M. G. Lagally (Plenum Press, New York, 1990).
26. J. Alkemper, V. A. Snyder, N. Akaiwa, P. W. Voorhees, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2725 (1999).
27. W. K. Kim, K. Char, C. K. Kim, *J. Polym. Phys. B* **38**, 3042 (2000).
28. D. Fan, S. P. Chen, L.-Q. Chen, P. W. Voorhees, *Acta Materialia* **50**, 1895 (2002).
29. K. G. Wang, M. E. Glicksman, K. Rajan, *Comput. Mat. Sci.* **34**, 235 (2005).
30. W. W. Mullins, *J. Appl. Phys.* **59**, 1341 (1986).
31. J. H. Ferziger, H. G. Kaper, *Mathematical Theory of Transport Processes in Gases*, (Morth-Holland Pub. Co. 1972).
32. F. Qia, T. A. Egerton, I. L. Cooper, *J. Eur. Ceramic Soc.* **26**, 37 (2006).
33. G. P. Dransfield, K. A. Fothergill, T. A. Egerton. In *Euro Ceramics (Vol. 1)*, ed. G. Dewith, R. A. Terpstra, R. M. Metsalaar. Elsevier Applied Science Publishers, London, **1989**, pp. 275-279.
34. K. Deller, M. Ettlinger, S. Fisher, R. Weinland, *Eur. Cosmet.* **57**, 391 (1991).
35. J. F. Edd, U.S. Patent 4 022 872 (to Alcoa); S. R. Blackburn, T. A. Egerton, A. G. Jones, *Br. Ceram. Proc.* **47**, 87 (1991).
36. P. Fauchais, E. Boudrin, J. F. Caudert, R. McPherson. In *Topics in Current Chemistry (Vol. 107)*, ed. S. Venprek and M. Venoguplan. Springer, Berlin, **1983**, pp. 59-183.
37. V. M. Burlakov, *J. Comput. Theor. Nanosci.* (2007), in press.
38. V. M. Burlakov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 155703 (2006).