Accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal

NISTNational Institute of Standards and Technology • U.S. Department of Commerce

Published in final edited form as:

J Phys Chem C Nanomater Interfaces. 2016 December 8; 120(48): 27478–27489. doi:10.1021/acs.jpcc. 6b10006.

Ultramicroelectrode Studies of Self-Terminated Nickel Electrodeposition and Nickel Hydroxide Formation upon Water Reduction

Nicole L. Ritzert* and Thomas P. Moffat*

Material Measurement Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 100 Bureau Drive, Gaithersburg, MD 20899, USA

Abstract

The interaction between electrodeposition of Ni and electrolyte breakdown, namely the hydrogen evolution reaction (HER) via H₃O⁺ and H₂O reduction, was investigated under well-defined mass transport conditions using ultramicroelectrodes (UME's) coupled with optical imaging, generation/collection scanning electrochemical microscopy (G/C-SECM), and preliminary microscale pH measurements. For 5 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl, pH 3.0, electrolytes, the voltammetric current at modest overpotentials, *i.e.*, between -0.6 V and -1.4 V vs. Ag/AgCl, was distributed between metal deposition and H_3O^+ reduction, with both reactions reaching mass transport limited current values. At more negative potentials, an unusual sharp current spike appeared upon the onset of H2O reduction that was accompanied by a transient increase in H2 production. The peak potential of the current spike was a function of both $[Ni(H_2O)_6]^{2+}$ concentration and pH. The sharp rise in current was ascribed to the onset of autocatalytic H₂O reduction, where electrochemically generated OH⁻ species induce heterogeneous nucleation of Ni(OH)_{2(ads)} islands, the perimeter of which is reportedly active for H₂O reduction. As the layer coalesces, further metal deposition is quenched while H₂O reduction continues albeit at a decreased rate as fewer of the most reactive sites, e.g., Ni/Ni(OH)₂ island edges, are available. At potentials below -1.5 V vs. Ag/AgCl, H₂O reduction is accelerated, leading to homogeneous precipitation of bulk $Ni(OH)_2 \cdot xH_2O$ within the nearly hemispherical diffusion layer of the UME.

TOC image

Supporting Information

^{*}Corresponding author information: nicole.ritzert@nist.gov, thomas.moffat@nist.gov.

CV of Au in NiCl₂-LiCl electrolyte. CV of Pt in NiCl₂-NaCl electrolyte. CV of Au in NiCl₂-Na₂SO₄ electrolyte. CV of Au in NiCl₂-Na₂Cl-H₃BO₃ electrolyte. Plot of *j* vs. $t^{-1/2}$ for current density immediately following current spike. Voltammetry of Au in NiCl₂-Na₂Cl electrolyte with potential poised at -1.20 V. CV of Au with varying radii in NiCl₂-Na₂Cl electrolyte. Videos of optical microscopy measurements in NiCl₂-Na₂Cl electrolytes. Voltammetry of Au in NiCl₂-Na₂Cl electrolytes corresponding to Videos S1 and S2. Processed images from Video S2. Chronoamperometry of Au in NiCl₂-Na₂Cl electrolytes. SEM and EDX images of electrodeposited Ni. Raman spectra of electrodeposited Ni. CV's of Au/Ni in in Na₂Cl electrolyte. Calibration of pH probes. This material is available free of charge *via* the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.



Introduction

For many electrodeposition reactions, nucleation and growth is accompanied by electrolyte breakdown that can affect properties such as microstructure, morphology, and chemical composition of the deposit. A prototypical example is the hydrogen evolution reaction (HER), arising from both H_3O^+ and H_2O reduction:

$$2H_3O^+ + 2e^- \rightarrow H_2 + 2H_2O$$
 (1)

 $2H_2O+2e^- \rightarrow H_2+2OH^-$ (2)

The HER occurs during electroplating of iron group elements, *e.g.*, Fe, Co, and Ni, and their alloys. The respective contributions of Equations 1 and 2 depend on the applied potential range. H_2 evolution decreases the overall current efficiency of electrodeposition, and the adsorbed H intermediate can be incorporated into the deposit. Under more demanding conditions, *i.e.*, at more negative potentials, the pH at the electrode-electrolyte interface increases, leading to formation of metal hydroxides that competes with metal deposition.^{1–11} Thus, to produce metallic films, buffers and complexing agents such as boric acid are commonly added to the electrolyte to mitigate the effects of pH changes.^{2,12–14}

The above side reactions have been used to deposit precise nanostructured features and to synthesize electrochemically metal oxides, hydroxides, oxyhydroxides, and their composites. An example of the former is fabrication of ultrathin films of Fe, Co, and Ni on Au through self-terminated metal growth¹⁵ where metal deposition ceases upon the onset of H₂O reduction. This behavior was attributed to the reaction of electrochemically generated OH⁻ (Equation 2) with divalent metal cations to form a hydroxide layer that quenches further metal deposition while supporting continued H₂O reduction. A similar scheme was used to create Ni nanoparticles and fully coalesced thin films on TiN substrates.^{16,17} Alternatively, media such as nitrate electrolytes that favor OH⁻ production have been used to make Ni(OH)₂ under well-controlled conditions.^{18–20} Ni(OH)₂ produced in this manner has been a popular constituent of batteries, electrocatalysts, and supercapacitors^{19–23} and is currently receiving renewed interest as a low-dimensional material.^{24–26} Of particular

relevance to the present study is the reported catalytic activity of metal/Ni(OH)₂ interfaces towards H_2O reduction.^{27–29}

Here, we took advantage of the unique properties of ultramicroelectrodes (UME's) to investigate further the interplay between metal deposition, the HER, and hydroxide formation with a focus on gaining further insight into the self-terminated electrodeposition of iron group metals in NiCl₂-NaCl electrolytes.¹⁵ UME's generate low currents, allowing for measurements of high current density while minimizing ohmic (iR) losses and electrochemical cell RC time constant delays that can distort the current response at macroscale (area of $\approx 1 \text{ cm}^2$) electrodes.^{30–33} High mass transport associated with the nearly hemispherical diffusional field of UME disks enables steady state conditions to be attained readily^{30–33} without distortions from forced hydrodynamics that can disturb evolving surface chemistry such as local H₂O structure or gel formation.^{34,35} This diffusional field is also more uniform than that associated with free convection at quiescent macroscale electrodes. The dimensions of UME's are amenable for studying nucleation mechanisms and growth morphology, ^{31–33,36–42} where the electrode size is commensurate with that of the growing crystals, as well as optical microscopy, where the entire UME area and its diffusion layer can be imaged,^{43–47} providing spatial-temporal insight into electrochemical phase transformations. Thus, we took advantage of the optical contrast between Au and Ni to follow the electrodeposition of Ni.

In the following studies with Au UME's, an unusual voltammetric current spike that can be correlated to self-termination of Ni deposition¹⁵ was observed near the onset of H₂O reduction in NiCl₂-NaCl electrolytes. Changes in electrolyte composition as well as generation/collection scanning electrochemical microscopy (G/C-SECM)^{48–50} were used to support the hypothesis that the current spike is due autocatalytic H₂ evolution that is associated with the nucleation and growth of a thin nickel hydroxide layer. At more negative potentials and extended H₂O electrolysis, homogeneous precipitation of a Ni(OH)₂·*x*H₂O gel occurred within the electrode diffusion layer, as shown by optical microscopy. Preliminary microscale pH measurements indicated a small pH shift associated with the current spike followed by a more extensive change at more negative potentials.

Experimental Methods

Chemicals were used as received.^a Nickel chloride hexahydrate (NiCl₂·6H₂O, ReagentPlus grade), agar (ash 2.5 % to 4.5 %), lithium chloride (LiCl, 99. 2% ACS reagent), and sulfuric acid (H₂SO₄, 99.999 %) were from Sigma-Aldrich, (St. Louis, MO). Alfa Aesar (Ward Hill, MA) was the source of cobalt chloride hexahydrate (CoCl₂·6H₂O, 99.9 %), potassium nitrate (KNO₃, 99.0 % min), nickel sulfate hexahydrate (NiSO₄·6H₂O, 99.99 %), sodium sulfate (Na₂SO₄, 99. 0 % min), and sodium hexachloroiridate (III) hydrate (Na₃IrCl₆·xH₂O, 31.5 % min. Ir). Hydroxymethylferrocene (FcMeOH, 99 %) was from Strem Chemicals (Newbury Point, MA). Mallinckrodt (Paris, KY) supplied sodium chloride (NaCl, ACS grade) and boric acid (H₃BO₃, ACS grade). Goodfellow Corporation (Oakdale, PA) supplied

^aCommercial materials and equipment are identified in this paper to specify adequately the experimental procedure. In no case does such identification imply recommendation or endorsement by the National Institute of Standards and Technology nor does it necessarily imply that the product is the best available for the purpose.

J Phys Chem C Nanomater Interfaces. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2017 December 08.

tempered microwires (99.99 %) for fabricating UME's. Water (18.3 Ω·cm) from an EASYpure UV system (Barnstead-Thermolyne, Dubuque, IA) was used to clean glassware and prepare solutions. All glassware and electrochemical cells were soaked overnight in 3 mol/L HNO₃ and then rinsed with copious amounts of water before use. The pH value of electrolyte solutions was 3.0, unless otherwise noted, and was measured using an Oakton Instruments (Vernon Hills, IL) Model pH11 meter. Au UME's with radius, a, of 6.25 µm were from CH Instruments (Austin, TX), and those with $a = 12.5 \,\mu\text{m}$ were from CH Instruments or homemade.⁵¹ Homemade Au UME's were fabricated by sealing Au wire of diameter, ϕ , 25 µm in flint glass (*i.e.*, low melting) capillaries in an air/H₂ flame. Pt UME's were made by sealing Pt wire with $\phi = 15 \,\mu\text{m}$ or 25 μm in soda-lime capillaries using resistive heating in a pipette puller (Narische Scientific, Tokyo, Japan). Back contact was made with Ag epoxy or eutectic containing a mass fraction of $\approx 25/75$ Ga/In. After exposing the metal disk with sandpaper of successively finer grit, UME's were polished with $1.0 \,\mu m$, 0.3 µm, and then 0.05 µm alumina on polishing cloth. For generation/collection-scanning electrochemical microscopy (G/C-SECM), UME's were sharpened using sandpaper and then polished with alumina. UME's were characterized in 1 mmol/L FcMeOH + 0.1 mol/LKNO3. In order to define the probe dimensions, experimental approach curves, *i.e.*, plots of tip probe current vs. tip-surface separation, at a glass slide were compared to theory for negative feedback current⁵² in order to determine the distance of shortest approach between the tip and substrate, d_0 , and $R_G (= r_g/a)$, where r_g is the radius of the glass sheath. R_G ranged from 5 to 10, and d_0 ranged from 1 µm to 2 µm.

Electrochemical measurements were performed at room temperature using a model 920D CH Instruments scanning electrochemical microscope system. At least three repetitions were performed for all measurements. Intervals are reported at the 95 % confidence level. Except for optical microscopy measurements, a grounded aluminum Faraday cage on a marble table was used to minimize electronic and vibration disturbances. A graphite rod (spectroscopic grade, Union Carbide, New York, NY) or Ir wire auxiliary electrode was used for all measurements except in SECM, where a Pt wire was used. The reference was an Ag/AgCl/1 mol/L KCl electrode, which was separated from working and auxiliary electrodes by a salt bridge containing 30 g/L agar + 0.2 mol/L KNO₃. No effect from trace NO₃⁻ in the main electrolyte was detected, as results using paper frits were similar to those with salt bridges. Unless noted otherwise, all potentials are reported as ± 0.02 V with respect to the Ag/AgCl reference electrode (+0.22 V vs. SHE).⁵³ For cyclic voltammetry and chronoamperometry, electrochemical cells were glass vials of volume 20 mL with plastic lids. Electrodes were introduced through holes cut into the lids. Solutions were deaerated using N_2 (zero grade, 99.998 %, Roberts Oxygen, Rockville, MD) for at least 20 min prior to each measurement with a blanket of gas always over the solution. Before each measurement, Au UME's were polished with alumina and then cycled at a sweep rate of 200 mV/s in 0.1 mol/L H_2SO_4 between the oxygen (OER) and hydrogen (HER) evolution reactions, viz., between +1.50 V and -0.35 V, respectively. Deposited metal films were removed by immersing the UME's in 3 mol/L HNO₃ for at least 10 min before mechanical polishing.

A PTFE cell of volume 2 mL was used for G/C-SECM measurements. An Au generator UME was used as the moveable tip probe, and a Pt collector UME was used as the stationary substrate electrode. In order to minimize the amount of dissolved O_2 , the cell was wrapped

with paraffin film containing a hole large enough to accommodate the tip probe. A Pasteur pipette was used to deaerate the electrolyte for at least 30 min and then blanket the solution with N₂. To align the UME disks before running each G/C-SECM measurement, positive feedback current was maximized using the HER at Au and the hydrogen oxidation reaction (HOR) at Pt in 0.1 mol/L NaCl. Positioning error was $\pm 1 \mu$ m. After measurements in 0.1 mol/L NaCl, the solution was replaced with 5.0 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl while maintaining a constant tip-substrate surface separation, *i.e.*, tip height, *d*.

An Epiphot 300 Metallurgy Inverted Microscope (Nikon, Tokyo, Japan) was used to examine electrodeposited films. For *ex situ* measurements, the potential was swept or stepped to the desired value in 5 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl and then poised for a given time before the UME was removed from solution and rinsed with water. Optical images were obtained using a Polaroid (Minnetonka, MN) model i733 digital camera or a VS8904G smartphone (LG Electronics, Seoul, South Korea) digital camera operating Android 4.4.2 software attached to the side viewing port. For *in situ* measurements, UME's were imaged under potential control using a three-electrode cell arrangement. Electrodes were suspended in about 0.25 mL of 5 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl on a fused silica plate ($\phi = 76$ mm, thickness of 0.5 mm, Valley Design East, Shirley, MA) on top of the microscope stage. UME's were viewed through the bottom of the plate and solution. Images were recorded using a Model OCS-5.0 OptixCam Summit Series CMOS Camera (Microscope Store, L.L.C., Roanoke, VA) with OCView (version 7.3.1.8) and then processed using ImageJ (version 1.49).⁵⁴

Results and Discussion

Cyclic voltammetry in 5 mmol/L Ni²⁺ electrolytes

The cyclic voltammetry (CV) of Au UME's in 5.0 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl was examined at three reversal potential limits (Figure 1), where the dominant precursor species is $[Ni(H_2O)_6]^{2+}_{(aq)}$,^{55,56} although a fraction (<10 %) of the nickelous species in 0.1 mol/L NaCl, pH 3.0, may be $[Ni(H_2O)_5Cl]^-_{(aq)}$.⁵⁶ For simplicity, the discussion will refer to all dissolved nickelous species as Ni²⁺. Upon sweeping negative in the Ni²⁺-free electrolyte (Figure 1, dashed gray line), H₃O⁺ reduction, reaching mass transport limited current near -1.0 V, was followed by the onset of H₂O reduction near -1.5 V, as given in Equations 1 and 2, respectively. The half-wave potential of H₃O⁺ reduction was -0.83 V, far negative of the formal potential of H₃O⁺/H₂ at -0.40 V vs. Ag/AgCl (-0.18 V vs. SHE)⁵⁷ at pH 3.0, reflecting the poor kinetics of this reaction at Au. In the Ni²⁺ electrolyte (Figure 1, solid gray curve), the increase in the current density, *f*_{total}, at -1.20 V is due to Ni²⁺ reduction, proceeding with concurrent H₃O⁺ reduction. Ni deposition begins near -0.6 V, corresponding to a small nucleation overpotential relative to the calculated potential of the Ni^{2+/0} couple in 5 mmol/L Ni^{2+ at} -0.55 V vs. Ag/AgCl (-0.33 V vs. SHE).⁵⁸ The diffusion coefficients, *D*, of H₃O⁺ and Ni²⁺ were determined from the steady-state current density, *f*:

$$j = 4nFDc\pi^{-1}a^{-1} \quad (3)$$

Page 6

derived from the steady-state current for a disk UME,⁵⁷ where the number of electron equivalents, *n*, is 1 for H₃O⁺ and 2 for Ni²⁺, *F* is Faraday's constant (96 485 C/mol), and *c* is concentration. The value of j_{Ni} was calculated by subtracting j_H in the supporting electrolyte (Figure 1, dashed gray line) from j_{iotal} in the Ni²⁺ electrolyte (Figure 1, solid gray line) at -1.20 V. Values of D_H and D_{Ni} were $(9.5 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-5}$ cm²/s and $(6.7 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-6}$ cm²/s, respectively, corresponding well to literature values of 9.3×10^{-5} cm²/s and 6.6×10^{-6} cm²/s,⁵⁹ demonstrating that H₃O⁺ and Ni²⁺ reduction are well-defined in this potential region. In the reverse sweep, the anodic wave at -0.15 V corresponds to stripping of the Ni film and any incorporated H. The ratio of j_{Ni}/j_{total} at -1.20 V yielded (41 ± 1) % for the current efficiency of Ni²⁺ reduction whereas the current efficiency was (18 ± 6) % when comparing the charge in the anodic stripping peak to the background-subtracted charge in the deposition wave. Indeed, the Ni^{2+/0} ion transfer reaction is irreversible,⁵⁸ suggesting that only part of the Ni film was removed in the reverse sweep.

When the negative voltammetric limit was extended to -1.45 V (Figure 1, red line), a sharp cathodic spike appeared at an average value of -1.40 V although, in this case, the value was -1.42 V (*vide infra*). The absence of a corresponding feature in the reverse sweep suggests that this feature was due to an (electro)chemically irreversible process. The rapid increase in current density is suggestive of a 2D heterogeneous nucleation and growth process in which growing deposited islands give rise to an increased electrochemically active surface area followed by a decay in current during coalescence.^{32,36,60} Furthermore, for 10 replicate measurements at pH 3.0, the potential of the peak appeared anywhere between -1.44 V and -1.38 V, indicating that this process is highly sensitive to the electrode surface and possibly reflects the stochastic nature of nucleation. The peak was more pronounced, *i.e.*, the peak current density was higher and the current rise occurred within 2 mV, at electrodes that had been pretreated electrochemically by cycling through Au oxide formation when compared to those cleaned with only mechanical polishing.

Reduction of both Ni^{2+} and H_3O^+ was under mass transport conditions at -1.40 V, precluding them as the source of a nucleation-induced current spike whereas the spike occurs just after the onset of H₂O reduction. A reasonable hypothesis is that the OHgenerated at the electrode surface via H₂O reduction reacts with the inward diffusing Ni²⁺ to form a thin nickel hydroxide layer, which will be referred to as Ni(OH)_{2(ads)} for simplicity. The solubility product constant, K_{sp} , for homogenous precipitation of Ni(OH)₂, $\approx 10^{-16}$ mol^3/L^3 , 61-64 is exceeded at 5 mmol/L Ni²⁺, and the electrode surface may further stabilize a heterogeneous thin Ni(OH)2 layer. Recent work on H2 evolution in alkaline media reveals that composite Ni/Ni(OH)2 surfaces are more catalytic than bare Ni towards water reduction.²⁸ Thus, the interaction between Ni²⁺ and electrochemically generated OH⁻ may lead to autocatalytic water reduction and further Ni(OH)2(ads) formation at the boundary between Ni(OH)_{2(ads)} nuclei and Ni. Accordingly, the H₂O reduction activity rises sharply with Ni(OH)_{2(ads)} island nucleation and perimeter expansion followed by a decay in current as the film coalesces and the number of Ni/Ni(OH)2(ads) active sites decreases. Substitution of LiCl for the NaCl supporting electrolyte did not enhance the H2O reduction kinetics (Figure S1), in contrast to recent studies of water reduction at Pt/Ni(OH)₂ electrodes.²⁷

Coincident with potentials where the current spike occurs, Ni deposition is quenched in previous electrochemical quartz crystal microbalance (EQCM) measurements at macroscale (area of $\approx 1 \text{ cm}^2$) electrodes in 5.0 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl, pH 3.0.¹⁵ However, in contrast to UME measurements, only a small wave was evident, possibly due to the more uniform diffusion field and higher flux of material at UME's. The lower potential of the wave not only marked the onset of quenching of the Ni deposition reaction but also an

increase in EQCM dissipative losses that was ascribed to increased hydrogen bonding between the nickel hydroxide layer and the electrolyte. At the terminus of the voltammetric wave, metal deposition was blocked by a fully formed hydroxide layer while H_2O reduction was sustained below -1.5 V.

At a more negative potential limit of -1.55 V (Figure 1, black line), another smaller, broader peak occurred negative of the current spike. More peaks were revealed at slower potential sweep rates (inset of Figure 1), indicating a secondary process such as hydrolysis (*vide infra*). Results for Ni deposition on Pt UME's (Figure S2) produced a similar current spike and subsequent waves, indicating that these processes are insensitive to the underlying substrate electrode. The half-wave potential of H₃O⁺ shifted negative by about 0.6 V in the reverse sweep, confirming that Ni dominates the observed electrochemical behavior.

In order to understand better the role of the supporting electrolyte, Ni deposition was examined in 5.0 mmol/L NiSO₄ + 0.05 mol/L Na₂SO₄ (Figure S3). A current spike appeared at -1.46 V, indicating that anions in the supporting electrolyte are not central to the phenomenon. In some cases, a second wave was observed at more negative potentials, reflecting the variability in electrode preparation (vide supra). The higher current on the diffusion limited plateau in the supporting electrolyte relative to that in the chloride electrolyte, may be due to dissociation of bisulfate anions, $pK_a=1.99$,⁶⁵ in the H₃O⁺depleted diffusion layer. In addition to sulfate, borate is a common additive in Ni plating baths used to stabilize deposition by preventing formation of nickel hydroxide species.^{12–14} Voltammetry performed in 5.0 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.05 mol/L NaCl + 0.05 mol/L H₃BO₃, pH 3.0 (Figure S4) revealed a current peak at -1.51 V, negative of the spike in NiCl₂-NaCl media and further past the onset of H₂O reduction. Thus, nucleation of Ni(OH)_{2(ads)} appears to be delayed in the NiCl₂-NaCl-H₃BO₃ electrolyte. Production of metallic Ni films in borate media has traditionally been attributed to buffering action, but no significant change in the transport-limited H_3O^+ reduction current is evident. Alternatively, borate adsorption or even polyborate formation on the surface may hinder or block Ni(OH)_{2(ads)} formation^{6,66} although investigation of this hypothesis lies beyond the objectives of the present work.

The peak shape of the spike was similar for sweep rates from 5 mV/s to 50 mV/s in the NiCl₂-NaCl electrolyte (inset of Figure 1) in that the peak current density was reached within 2 mV of its onset. However, no systematic change in the peak potential with sweep rate was detected, likely due to the dispersion associated with surface preparation (*vide supra*). For sweep rates of 10 mV/s and 20 mV/s (Figure S5), the relationship between the post-peak decaying current density and $t^{-1/2}$ was linear when t was less than 1 s, possibly reflecting the decrease in the number of Ni/Ni(OH)₂ sites. However, it should be noted that such time-dependent analysis is an approximation, as steady state conditions are often achieved within ≈ 100 ms at UME's.⁵⁷ The charge in the current spike, calculated by

integrating the current between the foot of the spike and the inflection point before the second feature, was $(8.7 \pm 2.1) \text{ mC/cm}^2$, $(8.8 \pm 1.3) \text{ mC/cm}^2$, $(4.7 \pm 0.7) \text{ mC/cm}^2$, and $(2.7 \pm 0.5) \text{ mC/cm}^2$ at sweep rates of 5 mV/s, 10 mV/s, 20 mV/s, and 50 mV/s, respectively, decreasing with increasing sweep rate. The charge was two orders of magnitude larger than the 0.1 mC/cm² observed in the corresponding feature at macroelectrodes, likely reflecting the more uniform mass transport and higher mixing rate of reactants to and from the UME's.^{37,67,68} The relationship between the peak current density and sweep rate is nonlinear, and the charge is over ten times larger than 0.2 mC/cm², the surface coverage expected for a monolayer of Ni(OH)₂, based on n = 2 for the Ni and 1.06×10^{-9} mol/cm² for $3Ni(OH)_2 \cdot 2H_2O.^{69}$ Thus, this feature is not due to reduction of a simple adsorbed species such as Ni(OH)₂.

Examination of the stripping wave in Figure 1 revealed how H₂O reduction affected the deposited Ni metal film. Compared with results using a reversal potential limit of -1.20 V, the stripping peak shifted positive for both potential negative limits of -1.45 V and -1.55 V, and the integrated charge was smaller, suggesting that H₂O reduction is associated with formation of a passivating layer. Voltammetry collected using a more negative potential limit would be expected to yield a larger stripping wave as more Ni would be deposited. However, formation of a passivating nickel hydroxide layer could lead to less subsequent Ni metal deposition as well as inhibition of its dissolution during the reverse sweep. Ni²⁺ reduction seemed to occur during the reverse sweep, as the current density at -1.20 V is similar in both sweep directions, but it is unclear if metal deposition occurred. Further analysis of the stripping peak is beyond the scope of this discussion.

Variation of the size and shape of the UME enhanced the magnitude of the current spike. Poising the potential of the UME for 3 min at -1.20 V before continuing to sweep negative (Figure S6) resulted in a rough overgrowth of Ni beyond the Au disk, with a increasing by \approx 3 µm based on the ratio of j_{total} before and after the potential hold. The spike still occurred upon continuing the negative scan, demonstrating that the spike is not due to growth instability such as a sudden increase in electrode area. In this case, the peak current density increased by a factor of five, perhaps due to roughening of the overgrowth. Simply increasing the electrode area is unlikely the cause of the larger peak current density because performing the experiment with freshly prepared $a = 6.25 \,\mu\text{m}$ UME's produced a larger spike current density as well. In Figure S7, the current response at Au UME's with a = 6.25 μ m was compared with that at 12.5 μ m UME's in 5.0 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl, pH 2.8. At -1.20 V, the current density at the 6.25 µm UME's was nearly twice that of the a =12.5 µm UME's, as expected, since steady state current density at a disk UME is inversely proportional to a (Equation 3). The integrated peak charge of (9.2 ± 3.1) mC/cm² at the 6.25 μ m UME's also doubled when compared to (3.8 ± 1.9) mC/cm² at the 12.5 μ m UME's, demonstrating that the spike does not scale in proportion with electrode area, as would be expected for reduction of a simple adsorbed species such as Ni(OH)₂ (vide supra). Enhanced deposition due to higher Ni²⁺ flux at the electrode edge will lead to the development of a convex edge shape, and at longer times, the electrode will evolve toward a hemispherical shape. This shape evolution will occur more rapidly at the smaller UME's, leading to improved uniformity of the current distribution compared to that at a disk.

Optical microscopy in 5 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl

The surface and surrounding diffusion layer of Au UME's were monitored during Ni electrodeposition using optical microscopy. Videos compiled from sequences of still images and their corresponding voltammograms (Figure S8) and descriptions are given in the Supporting Information, with highlights from each sequence in Figure 2. Darkfield imaging, where scattered light provides contrast,⁷⁰ revealed additional features, viz., formation of a gray gel, obscured in the brightfield. As the potential was swept to -1.20 V (Videos S1, S2; Figures 2a, 2b), smooth, bright Ni films deposited, as expected. No definitive optical changes such as bulk precipitation and H_2 bubbles were evident at potentials of about -1.40V, corresponding to the cathodic spike. In addition, the smooth current response in the voltammetry contrasts with the noisy current associated with Cr(OH)3(s) precipitation in Cr³⁺ electrolytes⁷¹ and the sharp decrease in the current upon generation of H₂ bubbles.⁷² However, image processing by taking the difference between the image at -1.25 V and images collected between -1.26 V and -1.50 V in Video S2 suggests that the spike is accompanied by a subtle optical change near -1.37 V (Figure S9). The increase in brightness at the electrode edge during diffusion limited reduction of Ni²⁺ (Video S2; Figure 2b) reflects enhanced electrodeposition due to higher Ni²⁺ flux.^{32,73} At potentials negative of the spike near -1.40 V (Videos S1, S2; Figures 2a, 2b), the electrode surface gradually appeared more granular. Homogeneous precipitation of bulk Ni(OH)_aCl_{2-a}·xH₂O, which will be referred to as $Ni(OH)_2 \cdot xH_2O$, and the resulting change in optical density could perturb the light path from the electrode surface; indeed, at extended times at -1.50 V to -1.60 V, a circular, light gray gel formed, with a larger diameter at higher overpotentials (Video S2; Figure 2b). The gel subsequently dissipated over time under open circuit conditions (Video S3; Figure 2c). The distance between the edge of the gel and the Au disk was tens of micrometers, corresponding well to the expected thickness of the nearly hemispherical diffusion layer at UME's.⁵⁷

The evolution of the UME surface was also examined during potential steps, *i.e.*, chronoamperometry. A more detailed analysis of current transients in Ni²⁺ electrolytes is given in the Supporting Information (Figure S10). In Video S4 and Figure 2d, stepping to -1.42 V revealed little change in the reflectivity of the Au electrode at short times, consistent with self-terminated growth of ultrathin Ni films.¹⁵ After 20 s, the reflectivity decreased slightly although the color of the underlying Au electrode was still apparent. This change is likely due to formation of a Ni(OH)₂·*x*H₂O gel which dissipates over time under open circuit conditions, similar to Video S3 and Figure 2c. In a related experiment, after depositing Ni at -1.20 V for 60 s, the potential was stepped to -1.55 V (Video S5; Figure 2e), resulting in rapid coverage of the electrode surface with a gel that densified with time. After 83 s, H₂ gas evolution disrupted the gel, and part of the Ni layer was removed, exposing the underlying Au electrode, similar to the peeling of Au thin films during the HER at high overpotentials.⁷⁴ Similarly, in some voltammetric studies, H₂ bubbles were observed at extended times while poising the potential below -1.5 V.

Some of the modified electrodes were removed from solution, rinsed with water, and compared with bare Au (Figure 3a). Note that these films can be altered upon removal from the deposition electrolyte. Smooth, bright Ni films were deposited at -1.10 V (Figure 3b), as

expected. At potentials near the spike (Figures 3c, 3d), the Ni film had metallic rings at the UME edge as a result of the enhanced deposition rate at the perimeter of the electrode, as seen in Video S2. The Ni film exhibited a variety of morphologies when H₂O reduction takes place. Gray rings with a larger diameter than the UME usually formed on the glass sheath that surrounds the electrode (Figure 3e, 3g, 3h). Similarly, rings were observed during precipitation of Prussian blue species caused by Co dissolution from an SECM tip, where the rings defined the edge of the diffusion layer.⁷⁵ In the present work, the rings are likely remnants of the Ni(OH)₂·*x*H₂O gel. Some of them were iridescent, congruent with the color changes reported for Ni(OH)₂ precipitation at macroelectrodes.^{7,18} The metallic parts in the ring and the exposed underlying Au could be part of the damaged Ni film lifted away from the Au surface during the HER (Figure 2e). Differences in the appearance at similar potentials in Figures 3e and 3f were likely due to variations in electrode preparation and precise potential of the spike (*vide supra*). During the potential step to -1.50 V (Figure 3g), the apparently bare Au disk is consistent with self-terminated deposition of an ultrathin Ni film.

Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDX) (Figure S11) on a sample swept to -1.55 V confirmed that the ring contains Ni. Raman spectra (Figure S12; Table S1) were collected at various regions of a similarly treated sample. For reference, spectra from a Ni layer grown at -1.20 V are also shown. Comparison to literature⁷⁶ shows that peaks at 451 cm⁻¹, 1388 cm⁻¹, 1434 cm⁻¹, 1604 cm⁻¹, and 3639 cm⁻¹ are congruent with Ni(OH)₂ on the metallic parts, gray ring, and apparently bare Au.

Effect of Ni²⁺ concentration and pH

The concentration of Ni²⁺, c_{Ni}, was varied from 1 mmol/L to 25 mmol/L (Figure 4a), and the pH of the supporting electrolyte was varied from 2.6 to 4.5 (Figure 4b), where the main nickelous species is $[Ni(H_2O)_6]^{2+}_{(aq)}$. 55,56,62,63 The lower and upper pH values were chosen to avoid generation of H₂ bubbles and precipitation of Ni(OH)₂·xH₂O in the bulk electrolyte, respectively. The current efficiency at -1.20 V increased from (41 ± 1) % to (81 ± 2) % as the Ni²⁺ concentration was increased from 5.0 mmol/L to 25.0 mmol/L. Likewise, for 5 mmol/L Ni²⁺, the metal deposition efficiency increased from (17 ± 7) % at pH 2.8 to (96 \pm 0.3) % at pH 4.5. The contribution from the HER decreases in both cases as c_{Ni} and pH increase. The current spike at 1 mmol/L Ni²⁺ was broader than that in more concentrated solutions, suggesting that the sharpness of the peak is limited by flux of Ni²⁺. Here, few, disperse Ni(OH)_{2(abs)} islands form before bulk H₂O reduction takes place, similar to the reported low efficiency of Ni(OH)₂ deposition at low Ni(NO₃)₂ concentrations.¹⁸ The magnitude of the current spike decreases as c_{Ni} and pH increase, suggesting that the hydroxide layer coalesces at a much faster rate with a higher flux of reactants. The positive shift in potential with increasing c_{Ni} , as expected from thermodynamics of Ni(OH)₂ formation. The slopes of the average peak current potential vs. $\log_{10}(c_{\text{Ni}})$ and the peak potential vs. pH were +230 mV/log c_{Ni} and +110 mV/pH unit, respectively, indicating a complicated mechanism for Ni(OH)2 formation. The positive slope in the latter case suggests that OH⁻ participates as a reactant. Regardless of a detailed mechanism, these results show that the process giving rise to the spike clearly depends on both Ni²⁺ and pH.

HER at Au/Ni in supporting electrolyte

Figure 5 shows the voltammetric behavior of Au/Ni in 0.1 mol/L NaCl in the absence of Ni²⁺ along with the results in NiCl₂-NaCl electrolyte from Figure 1, comparing the kinetics of H₂O reduction at Ni electrodeposited at different potentials. Full voltammograms are given in Figure S13 along with the detailed deposition experimental procedure. The current spike was absent in all cases, confirming that this feature depends on the presence of Ni²⁺. At a deposition potential of -1.20 V (Figure 5, red curve) to form Au/Ni, the onset of H₂O reduction occurred near -1.35 V, 0.15 V positive of that at Au. This potential was similar to that of the current spike, indicating that the spike begins just after the onset of H_2O reduction at an Au/Ni film. Indeed, the foot of the current spike in Figure 1 exhibited a smooth rise from the diffusion limited plateau of H_3O^+ and Ni^{2+} reduction before the sharp acceleration in current. The first and fifth cycles nearly overlap, demonstrating that any oxidation of Ni during transfer of the UME from the Ni²⁺ electrolyte does not exert a large effect on H₂O reduction kinetics. For films deposited at -1.47 V and -1.55 V (Figure 5, gray and blue curves), the onset of H_2O reduction shifted positive to about -1.2 V during the first cycle, indicating that this surface is more active for H₂O reduction than Au or Au/Ni, perhaps due to formation of a catalytic Ni/Ni(OH)₂ film.²⁷⁻²⁹ However, by the third cycle, the potential shifted negative to -1.35 V, possibly due to deactivation or delamination of the active species.

Collection of H₂ using SECM

G/C-SECM was used to detect H₂ produced during Ni electrodeposition with a focus on contributions associated with the current spike (Figure 6). Although more sensitive measurements can be made with smaller electrode separations, preliminary measurements showed that the flux of Ni²⁺ to the Au was hindered when the separation was less than ≈ 10 µm, resulting in more limited Ni deposition. The Pt collector UME was poised at 0.00 V to oxidize any H₂ while the potential of the Au generator UME was swept negative. Current collection efficiency, defined as the ratio j_{Pt}/j_{Au} , where j_{Pt} and j_{Au} are the current densities at the Pt collector and Au generator electrodes, respectively, is given over the potential range of -0.5 V to -1.5 V in Figure 6b. The more positive potential onset of -0.4 V for H₃O⁺ reduction (Figure 6a) compared to that in Figure 1 could be due to trace Pt contamination from dissolution of the auxiliary electrode.⁷⁷ The current collection efficiency for H₃O⁺ reduction was (54 ± 8) % at -1.20 V in the supporting electrolyte. A similar value of 55 % was obtained for FcMeOH in a similar configuration, indicating that little of the H intermediate in the former experiment is absorbed by the Au substrate. When the supporting electrolyte was replaced with 5.0 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl, a broad feature appeared between -0.55 V and -0.85 V, attributed to catalyzed H₃O⁺ reduction at a Pt-contaminated surface.⁷⁷ Similar to deposition at Pt UME's (Figure S2), the inflection at -0.85 V suggests that H₃O⁺ reduction was inhibited following the onset of Ni deposition. The downward slope in the current plateau from -1.10 V to -1.40 V may be due to complicated mass transport in the gap, where H₃O⁺ exhibits positive feedback and the Ni²⁺ flux is constrained by cylindrical diffusion. Here, the lower collector current compared to that in the supporting electrolyte may be attributed to incorporation of the H intermediate in the growing deposit. An estimate of the concentration of H incorporated in Ni deposited at -1.20 V can be derived by partitioning the partial current for diffusion limited H_3O^+ reduction (Figure 1) by

the ratio of the SECM collector currents in Figure 6a. Such analysis yields a deposit stoichiometry close to Ni₃H for films grown on an unobstructed UME.

The current spike was clearly observed at -1.40 V, followed by smaller, broader waves, consistent with the UME experiments in Figure 1. A corresponding spike and waves appeared at the Pt collector, confirming that these features involve the HER. Comparison of the magnitude of the peak heights between Au and Pt in Figure 6c shows that the peak current collection efficiency was nearly 50%, consistent with the current spike being ascribed to HER. As H_3O^+ is transport limited at this potential, H_2O reduction was the source of H_2 . Compared with the mass transport-limited region from -1.10 V to -1.40 V (Figure 6b), the nominal current collection efficiency increased sharply by 18 % upon the current spike, returning to the original value of 38 % before Ni deposition, consistent with the termination of the Ni deposition reaction and negligible further H incorporation into the deposit.

The charge in the current spike at Au was $(5.2 \pm 1.1) \text{ mC/cm}^2$, agreeing well with the value from Figure 1. This value was calculated by integrating from the foot of the spike to the inflection point before the second wave, using the same potential range for the Au and Pt current responses. The charge collection efficiency, (79 ± 7) %, was determined by dividing the charge at Pt by that at Au. Expanding the integration limits from the foot of the spike to the inflection point following the last wave in order to include the entire post-spike feature, the charge collection efficiency was (104 ± 12) %. At potentials negative of the current spike, a Ni(OH)₂·*x*H₂O gel could constrain H₂ diffusion away from the gap between the two electrodes and thus form a local thin layer cell.

Local potentiometric pH measurements

In preliminary measurements, the pH change in the diffusion layer during Ni deposition was examined (Figure 7). The Pt collector electrode in the SECM arrangement was modified using thin iridium oxide films to make potentiometric sensor probes. Details for fabrication of the pH probes and their calibration curves (Figure S14) are in the Supporting Information. The pH value at the potentiometric probe was calculated from measured potential values using the slope, (73 ± 2) mV/pH unit, of the calibration curves. The probe potential shifted by about -10 mV (less than one pH unit) at the onset of diffusion limited H₃O⁺ reduction on Au in NaCl as well as during Ni deposition in NiCl₂-NaCl electrolyte, indicating that negligible hydrolysis^{62–64} of Ni²⁺ occurs in this potential range:

$$[\text{Ni}(\text{H}_2\text{O})_6]^{2+} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow [\text{Ni}(\text{H}_2\text{O})_5 (\text{OH})]^+ + \text{H}_3\text{O}^+$$
(4)

A sharp change of -20 mV appeared nearly coincident with the generator current spike at -1.27 V. However, as the generator potential was swept more negative, the increase in the rate of H₂O reduction leads to a continuous rise in the pH of at least seven orders of magnitude such that the pH of the diffusion layer exceeds 10 by -1.50 V, thus providing ample driving force for forming Ni(OH)₂·*x*H₂O. Similar pH shifts were reported using a

micrometer sized grid electrode attached to a glass pH electrode.⁶ Based on the K_{sp} of Ni(OH)₂ (*vide supra*), saturation occurs above pH 8 in 5 mmol/L Ni²⁺.

Cyclic voltammetry of 5 mmol/L CoCl₂+ 0.1 mol/L NaCl

The generality of the UME observations was investigated with Co electrodeposition (Figure 8) because self-terminated metal deposition was reported for all iron group metals,¹⁵ and cobalt hydroxide precipitation reportedly hindered Co deposition in other studies.⁷⁸ As the potential is swept negative, a small wave occurred at -0.78 V, corresponding to (3.5 ± 0.4) mC/cm², that is attributed to underpotential deposition (upd) of Co. The Co layer inhibits H_3O^+ reduction relative to Au. Between -0.9 V and -1.1 V, the current associated with bulk Co^{2+} and H_3O^+ reduction increased to transport limited values. D_{Co} was $(7.3 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-6}$ cm^2/s , comparable with a literature value of $7.3 \times 10^{-6} cm^2/s$.⁵⁹ The current efficiency determined using the steady state current density at -1.20 V was (43 ± 3) %, and the integrated voltammetric current efficiency determined by comparing the reduction charge with that of the stripping peak was (56 ± 8) %. H₂O reduction is evident near -1.4 V with a small current feature at -1.45 V (inset of Figure 8) that corresponds to potentials where selftermination of metal deposition was observed in EQCM measurements.¹⁵ No clear current spike was observed, suggesting that Co/Co(OH)_{2(ads)} is less effective in catalyzing H₂O reduction than Ni/Ni(OH)2(ads), consistent with results comparing Co(OH)2(ads) and Ni(OH)_{2(ads)} islands on Pt.²⁹ These results are also consistent with the conclusion that main current spike in Ni²⁺ electrolytes is not due to simple hydrolysis (Equation 4) since the pK_a values, $\approx 10^{62}$ of Co(OH)₂ and Ni(OH)₂ are similar. On the reverse sweep, Co deposition was reactivated by -1.2 V, followed by a Co stripping wave at -0.21 V that was much larger than that for Ni stripping (Figure 1). In contrast to a Ni(OH)_{2(ads)} layer, Co(OH)_{2(ads)} provided little inhibition to reactivation of the deposition reaction at more positive potentials and as well as to subsequent Co dissolution at more positive potentials, in good agreement with the EQCM study¹⁵ and results of others.⁷⁹

Conclusions

The well-defined mass transport conditions associated with UME's provided several new insights into the electrodeposition of Ni on Au in NiCl₂-NaCl electrolytes. Voltammetry revealed an unusual sharp current spike coincident with the onset of H₂O reduction and self-termination of Ni electrodeposition, and analysis of SECM measurements indicated that the spike is associated with H₂ evolution. These observations combined with recent reports of catalyzed H₂O reduction at composite metal/Ni(OH)₂ electrodes suggests that the spike was due to autocatalytic H₂ production associated with Ni(OH)_{2(ads)} nucleation and growth on the Ni surface. Here, OH⁻ generated *via* H₂O reduction reacted with Ni²⁺ to form a thin heterogeneous Ni(OH)_{2(ads)} layer. In a separate phenomenon, as the rate of H₂O reduction increased at higher overpotentials, the pH increased such that the *K*_{sp} of Ni(OH)₂ was exceeded and precipitation of a Ni(OH)₂·*x*H₂O gel occurred in the diffusion layer surrounding the UME. Regarding Ni deposition during concurrent H₃O⁺ reduction, H may be incorporated in the growing Ni metal film although other measurements would be needed to support this hypothesis. Studies are underway to couple voltammetry with *in situ* spectroscopy and to model quantitatively processes involved in both self-termination of the

metal deposition reaction as well as the subsequent homogenous precipitation in the diffusion layer.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

N.L.R. acknowledges the National Institute of Standards and Technology-National Research Council research associateship program for a postdoctoral fellowship, Maureen Williams for performing SEM and EDX measurements, Carlos Beauchamp for assistance with the Summit camera, and the Center for Nanoscale Science and Technology for use of the Raman microscope.

References

- Dahms H, Croll IM. Anomalous Codeposition of Iron-Nickel Alloys. J Electrochem Soc. 1965; 112:771–775.
- 2. Harris LB. Change in pH near the Cathode during the Electrodeposition of a Bivalent Metal. Analysis. J Electrochem Soc. 1973; 120:1034–1040.
- Gómez E, Muller C, Proud WG, Vallés E. Electrodeposition of Nickel on Vitreous Carbon: Influence of Potential on Deposit Morphology. J Appl Electrochem. 1992; 22:872–876.
- Vallés E, Pollina R, Gómez E. Relation between the Presence of Inhibitors and Deposit Morphology in Nickel Deposition. J Appl Electrochem. 1993; 23:508–515.
- Deligianni H, Romankiw LT. *In situ* Surface pH Measurement during Electrolysis using a Rotating pH Electrode. IBM J Res Develop. 1993; 37:85–95.
- Proud WG, Muller C. Electrodeposition of Nickel on Vitreous Carbon: Impedance Studies. Electrochim Acta. 1993; 38:405–413.
- Cui CQ, Lee JY. Effects of Oxygen Reduction on Nickel Deposition from Unbuffered Aqueous Solutions. I. Deposition Process and Deposit Structure. J Electrochem Soc. 1994; 141:2030–2035.
- 9. Muñoz AG, Salinas DR, Bessone JB. First Stages of Ni Deposition onto Vitreous Carbon from Sulfate Solutions. Thin Solid Films. 2003; 429:119–128.
- Ori aková R, Turo ová A, Kladeková D, Gálová M, Smith RM. Recent Developments in the Electrodeposition of Nickel and Some Nickel-Based Alloys. J Appl Electrochem. 2006; 36:957– 972.
- Song SQ, Liu Z, Ortega CM, Wu WS, Sun L. Electrochemical Study of Ni Deposition on Carbon Microfiber. Electrochim Acta. 2013; 94:252–258.
- Zech N, Landolt D. The Influence of Boric Acid and Sulfate Ions on the Hydrogen Formation in Ni-Fe Plating Electrolytes. Electrochim Acta. 2000; 45:3461–3471.
- Motoyama M, Fukunaka Y, Sakka T, Ogata YH. Effect of Surface pH on Electrodeposited Ni Films. J Electrochem Soc. 2006; 153:C502–C508.
- 14. Vasquez-Arenas J, Altamirano-Garcia L, Pritzer M, Luna-Sánchez R, Cabrera-Sierra R. Experimental and Modeling Study of Nickel Electrodeposition Including H⁺ and Water Reduction and Homogeneous Reactions. J Electrochem Soc. 2011; 158:D33–D41.
- Wang R, Bertocci U, Tan H, Bendersky LA, Moffat TP. Self-Terminated Electrodeposition of Ni, Co, and Fe Ultrathin Films. J Phys Chem C. 2016; 120:16228–16237.
- Vanpaemel J, van der Veen MH, De Gendt S, Vereecken PM. Enhanced Nucleation of Ni Nanoparticles on TiN through H₃BO₃ Mediated Limited Growth. Electrochim Acta. 2013; 109:411–418.

- Vanpaemel J, Sugiura M, Cuypers D, van der Veen MH, De Gendt S, Vereecken PM. Electrochemical Deposition of Subnanometer Ni Films on TiN. Langmuir. 2014; 30:2047–2053. [PubMed: 24520857]
- Streinz CC, Hartman AP, Motupally S, Weidner JW. Effect of Current and Nickel Nitrate Concentration on the Deposition of Nickel Hydroxide Films. J Electrochem Soc. 1995; 142:1084– 1089.
- Doyle RL, Godwin IJ, Brandon MP, Lyons MEG. Redox and Electrochemical Water Splitting Catalytic Properties of Hydrated Metal Oxide Modified Electrodes. Phys Chem Chem Phys. 2013; 15:13737–13783. [PubMed: 23652494]
- Hall DS, Lockwood DJ, Bock C, MacDougall BR. Nickel Hydroxides and Related Materials: A Review of Their Structures, Synthesis, and Properties. Proc R Soc A. 2015; 471:20140792. [PubMed: 25663812]
- 21. Dionigi F, Strasser P. NiFe-Based (Oxy)hydroxide Catalysts for Oxygen Evolution Reaction in Non-Acidic Electrolytes. Adv Energy Mater. 2016:1600621.
- 22. Beck F, Rüetshci P. Rechargeable Batteries with Aqueous Electrolytes. Electrochim Acta. 2000; 45:2467–2482.
- Diaz-Morales O, Ledezama I, Koper MTM, Calle-Vallejo F. Guidelines for the Rational Design of Ni-Based Double Hydroxide Electrocatalysts for the Oxygen Evolution Reaction. ACS Catal. 2015; 5:5380–5387.
- Wang H, Casalongue HS, Liang Y, Dai H. Ni(OH)₂ Nanoplatelets Grown on Graphene as Advanced Electrochemical Pseudocapacitor Materials. J Am Chem Soc. 2010; 132:7472–7477. [PubMed: 20443559]
- Zhu Y, Cao C, Tao S, Chu W, Wu Z, Li Y. Ultrathin Nickel Hydroxide and Oxide Nanosheets: Synthesis, Characterizations and Excellent Supercapacitor Performances. Scientific Reports. 2012; 4:5787.
- 26. E SP, Liu D, Lazenby RA, Sloan J, Vidotti M, Unwin PR, Macpherson JV. Electrodeposition of Nickel Hydroxide Nanoparticles on Carbon Nanotube Electrodes: Correlation of Particle Crystallography with Electrocatalytic Properties. J Phys Chem C. 2016; 120:16059–16068.
- Subbaraman R, Tripkovic D, Strmcnik D, Chang K-C, Uchimura M, Paulikas AP, Stamenkovic V, Markovic N. Enhancing Hydrogen Evolution Activity in Water Splitting by Tailoring Li⁺-Ni(OH)₂-Pt Interfaces. Science. 2011; 334:1256–1260. [PubMed: 22144621]
- Danilovic N, Subbaraman R, Strmcnik D, Chang KC, Paulikas AP, Stamenkovic VR, Markovic NM. Enhancing the Alkaline Hydrogen Evolution Reaction Activity through the Bifunctionality of Ni(OH)₂/Metal Catalysts. Angew Chem Int Ed. 2012; 51:12495–12498.
- Subbaraman R, Tripkovic D, Chang K-C, Strmcnik D, Paulikas AP, Hirunsit P, Chan M, Greeley J, Stamenkovic V, Markovic NM. Trends in Activity for the Water Electrolyzer on 3d M(Ni, Co, Fe, Mn) Hydr(oxy)oxide Catalysts. Nat Mater. 2012; 11:550–557. [PubMed: 22561903]
- 30. Wightman RM. Microvoltammetric Electrodes. Anal Chem. 1981; 53:1125A-1134A.
- 31. Pons S, Fleishmann M. The Behavior of Microelectrodes. Anal Chem. 1987; 59:1391A-1399A.
- Pletcher, D. Studies of Metal Deposition and Dissolution using Microelectrodes. In: Montenegro, MI.Quierós, MA., Daschbach, JL., editors. Microelectrodes: Theory and Applications. Kluwer Academic; Netherlands: 1991. p. 463-475.
- Heinze J. Ultramicroelectrodes in Electrochemistry. Agnew Chem Int Ed Engl. 1993; 32:1268– 1288.
- Gibbs-Davis JM, Kruk JJ, Konek CT, Scheidt KA, Geiger FM. Jammed Acid-Base Reactions at Interfaces. J Am Chem Soc. 2008; 130:15444–15447. [PubMed: 19006409]
- 35. Lis D, Backus EHG, Hungar J, Parekh SH, Bonn M. Liquid Flow along a Solid Surface Reversibly Alters Interfacial Chemistry. Science. 2014; 344:1138–1142. [PubMed: 24904160]
- Scharifker B, Hills G. Electrochemical Kinetics at Microscopically Small Electrodes. J Electroanal Chem. 1981; 130:81–97.
- 37. John R, Wallace GG. The Use of Microelectrodes to Probe the Electropolymerization Mechanism of Heterocyclic Conducting Polymers. J Electroanal Chem. 1991; 306:157–167.
- Bade K, Tsakova V, Schultze JW. Nucleation, Growth, and Branching of Polyaniline from Microelectrode Experiments. Electrochim Acta. 1992; 37:2255–2261.

- Chen S, Kucernak A. Electrodeposition on Nanometer-Sized Carbon Electrodes. J Phys Chem B. 2003; 107:8390–8402.
- Petrovi Ž, Metikoš-Hukovi M, Gruba Z, Omanovi S. The Nucleation of Ni on Carbon Microelectrodes and Its Electrocatalytic Activity in Hydrogen Evolution. Thin Solid Films. 2006; 513:193–200.
- Eguiluz KIB, Avaca LA, Barin CS. Estudo da Electrocristalizção de Ni e Ni-P sobre Ultramicroelectrodes de Platina. Quim Nova. 2008; 5:1150–1155.
- 42. Velmurugan J, Noël J-M, Nogala W, Mirkin MV. Nucleation and Growth of Metal on Nanoelectrodes. Chem Sci. 2012; 3:3307–3314.
- 43. Schilardi PL, Marchiano SL, Salvarezza RC, Hernandez Creus A, Arvia AJ. Kinetics and Growth Modes of Quasi-2d Silver Branched Electrodeposits Produced in the Presence of a Supporting Electrolyte. J Electroanal Chem. 1997; 431:81–98.
- Mauzeroll J, Hueske EA, Bard AJ. Scanning Electrochemical Microscopy. 48. Hg/Pt Hemispherical Ultramicroelectrodes: Fabrication and Characterization. Anal Chem. 2003; 75:3880–3889. [PubMed: 14572057]
- 45. Hammadi Z, Astier J-P, Morin R, Veesler S. Protein Crystallization Induced by a Localized Voltage. Cryst Growth Des. 2007; 7:1472–1475.
- 46. Birkin PR, Nestoridi M, Pletcher D. Studies of the Anodic Dissolution of Aluminum Alloys Containing Tin and Gallium using Imaging with a High-Speed Camera. Electrochim Acta. 2009; 54:6668–6673.
- Jebaraj AJJ, Scherson DA. Microparticle Electrodes and Single Particle Microbatteries: Electrochemical and in Situ MicroRaman Spectroscopic Studies. Acc Chem Res. 2012; 46:1192– 1205.
- Bard AJ, Fan F-RF, Kwak J, Lev O. Scanning Electrochemical Microscopy. Introduction and Principles. Anal Chem. 1989; 61:132–138.
- 49. Zhou F, Unwin PR, Bard AJ. Scanning Electrochemical Microscopy. 16. Study of Second-Order Homogeneous Chemical Reactions via the Feedback and Generation/Collection Modes. J Phys Chem. 1992; 96:4917–4924.
- Sánchez-Sánchez CM, Rodríguez-López J, Bard AJ. Scanning Electrochemical Microscopy. 60. Quantitative Calibration of the SECM Substrate Generation/Tip Collection Mode and Its Use for the Study of the Oxygen Reduction Mechanism. Anal Chem. 2008; 80:3254–3260. [PubMed: 18355084]
- Bard, AJ., Fan, F-R., Mirkin, MV. Electroanalytical Chemistry: A Series of Advances. Vol. 18. Marcel Dekker; New York: 1994. Scanning Electrochemical Microscopy; p. 243-373.
- Mirkin, MV., Wang, Y. Theory. In: Bard, AJ., Mirkin, MV., editors. Scanning Electrochemical Microscopy. 2nd. CRC Press; Boca Raton, FL: 2012. p. 75-125.
- Bertocci, U., Wagman, DD. Copper, Silver, Gold. In: Bard, AJ.Parsons, R., Jordan, J., editors. Standard Potentials in Aqueous Solution. Marcel Dekker; New York: 1985. p. 287-320.
- 54. Rasband, WS., Image, J. http://imagej.nih.gov/ij/(accessed June 6, 2016
- Deltombe, E., de Zoubov, N., Pourbaix, M. Atlas of Electrochemical Equilibria in Aqueous Solutions. 2nd. National Association of Corrosion Engineers; Houston, TX: 1974. Nickel; p. 330-342.
- Ji J, Cooper WC. Nickel Speciation in Aqueous Chloride Solutions. Electrochim Acta. 1996; 41:1549–1560.
- Bard, AJ., Faulkner, LR. Electrochemical Methods: Fundamentals and Applications. 2nd. Wiley; New York: 2001.
- Ariva, AJ., Posadas, D. Nickel, Palladium, Platinum. In: Bard, AJ.Parsons, R., Jordan, J., editors. Standard Potentials in Aqueous Solution. Marcel Dekker; New York: 1985. p. 321-365.
- 59. Vanysek, P. Ionic Conductivity and Diffusion at Infinite Dilution. In: Haynes, WM., editor. CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics. 97th. CRC Press/Taylor and Francis; Boca Raton, FL: 2017. Internet Version
- Harrison, JA., Thirsk, HR. Electroanalytical Chemistry: A Series of Advances. Vol. 5. Marcel Dekker; New York: 1971. Fundamentals of Metal Deposition; p. 67-148.

- Auinger M, Katsounaros I, Meier JC, Klemm SO, Beidermann RU, Topalov AA, Rohwerder M, Mayrhofer KJJ. Near-surface Ion Distribution and Buffer Effects during Electrochemical Reactions. Phys Chem Chem Phys. 2011; 13:16384–16394. [PubMed: 21837326]
- 62. Baes, CF., Mesmer, RE. Hydrolysis of Cations. John Wiley; New York: 1976.
- 63. Burgess, J. Metal Ions in Solution. Ellis Horwood; Chichester, Sussex, England: 1978.
- 64. Grégoire B, Ruby C, Carteret C. Hydrolysis of Mixed Ni²⁺-Fe³⁺ and Mg²⁺-Fe³⁺ Solutions and Mechanism of Formation of Layered Double Hydroxides. Dalton Trans. 2013; 42:15687–15698. [PubMed: 24048362]
- 65. Harris, DC. Quantitative Chemical Analysis. 5th. W. H. Freeman; New York: 1999.
- 66. Stevenson KJ, Hatchett DW, White HS. Electrochemical Deposition of Polyborate Monolayers at Ag(111) Electrodes. Langmuir. 1997; 13:6824–6828.
- Dayton MA, Ewing AG, Wightman RM. Response of Microvoltammetic Electrodes to Homogeneous Catalytic and Slow Heterogeneous Charge-Transfer Reactions. Anal Chem. 1980; 52:2392–2396.
- Dayton MA, Brown JC, Stutts KJ, Wightman RM. Faradaic Electrochemistry at Microvoltammetric Electrodes. Anal Chem. 1980; 52:946–950.
- 69. Desilvestro J, Corrigan DA, Weaver MJ. Characterization of Redox States of Nickel Hydroxide Film Electrodes by *In Situ* Surface Raman Spectroscopy. J Electrochem Soc. 1988:885–892.
- Chambers, W., Fellers, TJ., Davidson, MW. Darkfield Illumination. http://www.microscopyu.com/ articles/stereomicroscopy/stereodarkfield.html (accessed July 14, 2016)
- Howarth JN, Pletcher D. The Electrodeposition of Chromium from Chromium (III) Solutions-A Study using Microelectrodes. J Appl Electrochem. 1988; 18:644–652.
- Luo L, White HS. Electrogeneration of Single Nanobubbles at Sub-50-nm-Radius Platinum Nanodisk Electrodes. Langmuir. 2013; 29:11169–11175. [PubMed: 23957440]
- Lupo C, Stumpp M, Schlettwein D. Diffusion-controlled Electrochemical Growth of Porous Zinc Oxide on Microstructured Electrode Band Arrays. J Appl Electrochem. 2015; 45:105–113.
- Kim J, Yoon SH. Failure Mechanism of a Gold Microelectrode in Bioelectronics applications. J Nanomater. 2015:1–7.
- 75. Sauter S, Wittstock G. Local Deposition and Characterization of K₂Co[Fe(CN)₆] and K₂Ni[Fe(CN)₆] by Scanning Electrochemical Microscopy. J Solid State Electrochem. 2001; 5:205–211.
- 76. Hall DS, Lockwood DJ, Poirier S, Bock C, MacDougall BR. Raman and Infrared Spectroscopy of α and β Phases of Thin Nickel Hydroxide Films Electrochemically Formed on Nickel. J Phys Chem A. 2012; 116:6771–6784. And references therein. [PubMed: 22642317]
- Solla-Gullón J, Aldaz A, Clavilier J. Ultra-Low Platinum Coverage at Gold Electrodes and Its Effect on the Hydrogen Evolution Reaction in Acidic Solutions. Electrochim Acta. 2013; 87:669– 675.
- 78. Mech K, Zabinski P, Kowalik R. Co-Reduction of Electrochemically Active $[Co(H_2O)_6]^{2+}$ and $[CoCl(H_2O)_5]^+$ Complexes onto Gold Electrode. J Electrochem Soc. 2013; 160:D246–D250.
- Allongue P, Maroun F. Electrodeposited Magnetic Layers in the Ultrathin Limit. MRS Bull. 2010; 35:761–770.



Figure 1.

Cyclic voltammetry of Au ultramicroelectrode in 5.0 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl, pH 3.0, at cathodic reversal potentials, E_c , of (gray) –1.20 V, (red) –1.45 V, and (black) –1.55 V. Sweep rate, v, 20 mV/s. Gray dashed line is supporting electrolyte. Red and black curves were shifted by –20 mA/cm² and –40 mA/cm², respectively, for clarity. Inset shows v = (blue) 5 mV/s, (red) 10 mV/s, (black) 20 mV/s, and (gray) 50 mV/s, where the potential axis was adjusted so that the peaks were aligned for clarity. Initial potential, 0.00 V; anodic potential limit, 0.00 V; electrode radius, 12.5 µm.



Figure 2.

Individual frames from optical microscopy of Au ultramicroelectrodes in 5 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl corresponding to (a) Video S1, (b) Video S2, (c) Video S3, (d) Video S4, and (e) Video S5 in the Supporting Information. (a) Brightfield and (b) darkfield images (last image is brightfield) during cyclic voltammetry; sweep rate, 10 mV/s; initial potential, 0.00 V. (c) Darkfield images (first image is brightfield) at open circuit after poising potential at -1.60 V for 180 s. (d,e) Brightfield images during chronoamperometry, where E= (d) -1.42 V at bare Au and (e) -1.55 V at Au/Ni, deposited at -1.20 V for 60 s. Images were collected at (a,b,c) 1 frame/s and (d,e) 5 frames/s. Applied potential and time in minutes:seconds (min:s) are labeled in upper and lower left corners, respectively. Electrode radius, 12.5 µm; scale bar, 20 µm.



Figure 3.

Optical microscopy of Ni electrodeposited by linear sweep voltammetry (swept) or chronoamperometry (stepped) at Au ultramicroelectrodes in 5 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl. (a) Bare Au. (b) Swept to -1.10 V and poised 120 s. (c) Stepped to -1.40 V for 60 s. (d) Swept to -1.40 V and poised 120 s. (e) Swept to -1.45 V and poised 60 s. (f) Swept to -1.46 V and poised 120 s. (g) Stepped to -1.50 V for 60 s. (h) Swept to -1.55 V and poised 120 s. For voltammetry: sweep rate, 20 mV/s; initial potential, 0.00 V. Electrode radius, 12.5 μ m; scale bar, 20 μ m.



Figure 4.

Linear sweep voltammetry with varying (a) concentration of Ni²⁺, c_{Ni} , and (b) pH. In (a), c_{Ni} was (red) 1.0 mmol/L, (black) 5.0 mmol/L, (orange) 10.0 mmol/L, (green) 16.0 mmol/L, (blue) 20.0 mmol/L, and (purple) 25.0 mmol/L NiCl₂ in 0.1 mol/L NaCl, pH 3.0. In (b), c_{Ni} was 5.0 mmol/L, and the pH of the 0.1 mol/L NaCl was (red) 2.6, (orange) 2.8, (black) 3.0, (green) 3.4, (blue) 4.0, and (gray) 4.5. Initial potential, 0.00 V; sweep rate, 20 mV/s; electrode radius, 12.5 µm. Dashed lines are the corresponding supporting electrolyte at bare Au.



Figure 5.

Cyclic voltammetry of Au/Ni in 0.1 mol/L NaCl, pH 3.0, in the absence of Ni²⁺. Deposition potential of Ni was (red) -1.20 V, (gray) -1.47 V, and (blue) -1.55 V in 5.0 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl. Dashed black line is bare Au, solid lines are first cycle of Au/Ni, and dashed lines are (red) fifth and (gray, blue) third cycle of Au/Ni. Gray and blue curves were shifted by -10 mA/cm² and -20 mA/cm², respectively. Sweep rate, 20 mV/s; initial potential, -0.50 V; electrode radius, 12.5 µm. Solid black line is the NiCl₂-NaCl electrolyte for comparison.



Figure 6.

Generation/collection mode of scanning electrochemical microscopy in 5.0 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl, pH 3.0. (a) Potential of Au generator (black) was swept while potential of Pt collector (red) was poised at 0.00 V. Dashed lines are in the absence of Ni²⁺. Inset shows expanded view of features near H₂O reduction. Diagram shows H₂ (1) generated at Au (2) diffusing to Pt collector (3) then being oxidized to protons, which can (4) diffuse back to Au. Electrode separation, 16 μ m; sweep rate, 10 mV/s; initial potential. Solid and dashed lines are for the Ni²⁺ electrolyte and supporting electrolyte, respectively. (c) Overlaid plots of the magnitude of the current density of (black) Au generator and (red) Pt collector near H₂O reduction, with the foot of the wave set to zero. Note that the potential axis is different in each panel.



Figure 7.

(a) Faradaic current (black) and pH probe potential and corresponding pH (red) as a function of Au ultramicroelectrode potential in 5.0 mmol/L NiCl₂ + 0.1 mol/L NaCl, pH 3.0. Dashed lines are in the supporting electrolyte. (b) Expanded view of features. Note that the range of both axes is different in (a) and (b). Electrode separation, 12 μ m; sweep rate, 10 mV/s; initial potential, 0.00 V; electrode radii, 12.5 μ m. Experiments were done under ambient conditions.



Figure 8.

Cyclic voltammetry of Au ultramicroelectrode in 5.0 mmol/L $CoCl_2 + 0.1$ mol/L NaCl, pH 3.0. Inset shows expanded view of wave in current response near -1.45 V. Sweep rate, 20 mV/s; initial potential, 0.00 V; anodic potential limit, 0.00 V; electrode radius, 12.5 μ m.