

Characterization of the Real Surface Increasing of Structured Implant Materials by Electrochemical Impedance Spectroscopy

R. Lange, K. Biala, P. Elter, <u>U. Beck</u> Dept. of Informatics and Electrical Engineering, University of Rostock, Germany



Introduction

Electrochemical methods are a good choice for the characterization of implant materials because conditions in the human body can well simulated by using a physiological liquid as electrolyte. Among others the electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) is a common used method for the determination of the real surface area of rough or otherwise structured surfaces [1]. By this method the increasing of the real surface area can be determined by measuring the capacity of the electrochemical double layer (EDL) that is covering the material surface in the electrolyte. In real measurement the capacitance of the EDL shows a no ideal behavior, i.e. a frequency dependency of the capacitance is observed. This frequency dispersion is considered by replacing the ideal capacity in the equivalent circuit by a Constant Phase Element (CPE). But in this case the difficulty is the conversion of the CPE capacitance parameter into the real capacitance. Although this problem is known a long time there are only few publications dealing with this problem and its application in practice [2,3]. In our special case we tried to compare the real surface area of structured titanium surfaces with regular geometry. Two methods are introduced and their results are compared.

Material and methods

Traditio et Innovatio

Titanium surfaces with regular geometry were produced by structuring silicon substrates with common used methods (Deep Reactive Ion Etching, DRIE) and then sputter coated with 100 nm Titanium (ZfM Chemnitz, Germany) [4]. We used pillar arrays in different lateral dimensions and the same depth of 5 μ m. The pillars were quadratic with the dimensions of 2 μ m (2x2x5), 3 μ m (3x3x5) and 5 μ m (5x5x5). The distance between the pillars was always the same as their width. For the flat reference sample Silicon was polished and also sputter coated with 100 nm Titanium. The samples were characterized by Scanning Electron Microscopy (FE-SEM Supra 25, Zeiss, Germany) and EIS (IM6e, Zahner Elektrik, Germany). The measuring area in the electrochemical experiment was the same for all samples (A_m = 19,6 mm²). The theoretical relative surface increasing of the samples (A_{rel}) was obtained by calculating A_{geomtr} from geometry and multipliing it with the surface increasing of the sputtered titanium film (A_{TI}) measured by atomic force microscopy (JPK Berlin, Germany). SEM pictures in high magnification (see aside) show that the fine structure of the Titanium is the same on the flat reference (above) and structured (below) samples.



SEM and AFM $2x2x5 A_{rel} = 3,5*A_{Ti} = 3,745$



Analysis of impedance spectra with Constant Phase Elements (CPE)

The measured impedance spectra (see examples below, one for each surface modification) were fitted with a simple equivalent circuit using a Constant Phase Element (CPE) considering the observed frequency dispersion instead of a capacitance. The admittance of a CPE used for the fit by the Zahner-Software is given by equations (1-3). The frequency dependent capacity was calculated from the CPE parameters V, $_0$ and n using equation (2).





Results of Electrochemical Impedance Spectroscopy

In the picture aside the results for the capacity are shown for all investigated samples. The first three groups (1kHz, 6 Hz, 1 mHz) show the results obtained by the first way using a fixed reference frequency for all samples. The last group (f_m) shows the results for the second way recommended in literature. As you can see, we got different results for the proportions of the capacity of the structured samples among each other. But because the samples have a defined geometrical structure it is possible to evaluate these experimental results by calculating the theoretical surface increasing and comparing it with them.



1.E+00 + 0 1.E-04 1.E-03 1.E-02 1.E-01 1.E+00 1.E+01 1.E+02 1.E+03 1.E+04 f [Hz]

The reference frequency $_{0}$ is an arbitrarily selectable parameter, whose value by default is given with 6,28 kHz (f₀=1kHz) by the Zahner software but the user can change it as needed. Otherwise using equation (2) it is also possible to convert [$_{0}$;V] to other pairs of values [;C]. The results are shown in the figure below for the same examples shown in the diagram above. As you can see the frequency dependency of the capacity is higher when the exponent n stronger deflects from 1.

[_= 1 mHz

45 -

15 -

10 -

1.E-04

Now the question arises at which reference frequency ₀ the capacity of the CPE reflects the "real capacity" of the surface and is suitable for comparison of the surface increasing of the different structured samples?

In the first way we used a fixed reference frequency to compare all samples. We did this for three several frequencies (1 mHz, 6Hz and 1 kHz), see the picture aside. 30 5^{25} 25 20

The second way is given by literature [2]. Here it is proposed to use $_{m}$ as reference frequency:

$(C_m R_P)^{-1}$ (4)

which is represented by the reciprocal of the time constant, where the modulus of the imaginary part of the impedance Z'' has a maximum.

1.E-03

1.E-02

 $|Z''(_m)|$ max

Because the time constant C*Rp is different for all samples the reference frequency $f_m = \frac{m}{2}$ also had to be determined individually for all samples, see the picture above. As you can see, f_m for the flat reference sample is very different from that of the other samples because Rp is much higher.



y = 10.947x
 $R^2 = 0.9863$ In this figure the capacity is shown as a
function of the relative theoretical
increasing of the surface area A_{rel} given by
the geometry of the samples and their fine
structure of the titanium film. All curves
show a good linear dependency, that
means that the relations between the
samples in surface increasing are
reflected correctly independent of the use
of several reference frequencies.

Merely the slope of the regression line is different depending on the use of the several reference frequencies. But what is the physical meaning of this slope? It must be the capacity C_0 of a sample with A_{rel} =1, i.e the total capacity of a sample with a flat surface of the measuring area $(A=A_m=19,6 \text{ mm}^2)$.

In our experiment this capacity C_0 is different depending on the used reference frequency and so we have to decide which C_0 is the right value for the total capacity.

The second method proposed in literature (reference frequency f_m) seems to be plausible, using this method we obtain app. 7,31 μ F for the total capacity of a flat sample with A_{rel} =1, or measuring area A=A_m of 19,6 mm², respectively. But there is no evidence for the accuracy of this result and it has to be find to evaluate the result in practice.

Conclusions and Summary

Characterizing the surface increasing of structured samples by measuring the double layer capacity with EIS is a common used method. But normally at structured surfaces a frequency dispersion appears and this has to be considered by using a CPE in curve fitting and calculating its capacitance from the CPE-parameters V and n. Especially if the exponent n of the CPE strongly deflects from 1 the error in calculated capacity can be very high. With the help of defined geometrically structured samples we tried to calculate the surface capacity considering the frequency dispersion and we used two methods for it. We got different results depending on the choosed method. Now it is necessary to find another method for verification these results and to decide which method is better suited to obtain a value for the real capacity from the CPE.

Dependency of the capacitance parameter C of the CPE from the frequency

f_o=6 Hz

→ Ti-Ref (n=0.923)

→ 5x5x5 (n=0.9218)

1.E+02

f_o=1kHz

1.E+03

1.E+04

References

[1] Robyr C., Mettraux P., Agarwal P., Landolt D.: Thin Solid films 310 (1997) 87-93
[2] Hsu C.H., Mansfeld F: Corrosion 57 (2001) 747-748
[3] Jovic VD, Jovic BM: J Electroanal. Chem 541 (2003) 1-11
[4] Lange R, Elter P, Biala K, Matschegewski C, Stählke S, Löffler R, Fleischer M, Nebe JB, Kern D, Beck U: Surf. and Interf. Anal. 42 (2010) 497–501

Acknowledgement

This work was financially supported by the "Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft" (BE 2362/2-1, NE560/7-1, KE 611/7-1).



Regina Lange
University of Rostock, Department of Informatics and Electrical Engineering
Albert-Einstein-Str. 2, D-18051 Rostock
+49 381 498 7236 Fax +49 381 498 118 7236
E-Mail: regina.lange@uni-rostock.de