



PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

Strain and bond length dynamics upon growth and transfer of graphene by NEXAFS spectroscopy from first principles and experiment

Rojas, Wudmir; Winter, Allen; Grote, James; Kim, S.S.; Naik, Rajesh R. ; Williams, A.D.; Weiland, Conan; Principe, Edward; Fischer, D.A.; Banerjee, Sarbajit; Prendergast, D.; Campo, Eva

Langmuir

DOI:

[10.1021/acs.langmuir.7b03260](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.langmuir.7b03260)

Published: 01/01/2018

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

Rojas, W., Winter, A., Grote, J., Kim, S. S., Naik, R. R., Williams, A. D., Weiland, C., Principe, E., Fischer, D. A., Banerjee, S., Prendergast, D., & Campo, E. (2018). Strain and bond length dynamics upon growth and transfer of graphene by NEXAFS spectroscopy from first principles and experiment. *Langmuir*, 34(4), 1783-1794. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.langmuir.7b03260>

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Strain and bond length dynamics upon growth and transfer of graphene by NEXAFS spectroscopy from first principles and experiment

Wudmir Yudy Rojas, Allen Douglas Winter, James Gerard Grote, Steve S. Kim, Rajesh R. Naik, Adrienne D. Williams, Conan Weiland, Edward Principe, Daniel A Fischer, Sarbajit Banerjee, David Prendergast, and Eva M. Campo

Langmuir, **Just Accepted Manuscript** • DOI: 10.1021/acs.langmuir.7b03260 • Publication Date (Web): 29 Dec 2017

Downloaded from <http://pubs.acs.org> on January 2, 2018

Just Accepted

“Just Accepted” manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides “Just Accepted” as a free service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. “Just Accepted” manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. “Just Accepted” manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are accessible to all readers and citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). “Just Accepted” is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the “Just Accepted” Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the “Just Accepted” Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these “Just Accepted” manuscripts.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Strain and bond length dynamics upon growth and
8
9
10 transfer of graphene by NEXAFS spectroscopy from
11
12
13
14
15 first principles and experiment
16
17
18
19

20 *W. Y. Rojas¹, A. D. Winter¹, J. Grote², S.S. Kim², R.R. Naik², A. D. Williams², C. Weiland³, E.*
21 *Principe³, D. A. Fischer⁴, S. Banerjee⁵, D. Prendergast⁶, E. M. Campo^{1, 7*}*
22
23
24
25

26 ¹ School of Electronic Engineering, Bangor University, Bangor LL57 1UT, UK.
27
28

29 ² Materials and Manufacturing Directorate, Air Force Research Laboratory, Wright-Patterson
30 AFM, Ohio 45433, USA.
31
32
33

34 ³ Synchrotron Research Inc, Melbourne, FL 32901, USA
35
36
37

38 ⁴ National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899, USA.
39
40

41 ⁵ Departments of Chemistry and Materials Science and Engineering, Texas A&M University,
42 College Station, Texas 77842-3012, USA.
43
44
45

46 ⁶ The Molecular Foundry, Materials Science Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory,
47 Berkeley, California 94720, USA.
48
49
50

51 ⁷ Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Texas at San Antonio, TX 78249, USA.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 As the quest towards novel materials proceeds, improved characterization technologies are
4 needed. In particular, the atomic thickness in graphene and other 2D materials renders some
5 conventional technologies obsolete. Characterization technologies at wafer level are needed with
6 enough sensitivity to detect strain in order to inform fabrication. In this work, NEXAFS
7 spectroscopy was combined with simulations to predict lattice parameters of graphene grown on
8 copper and further transferred to a variety of substrates. The strains associated with the predicted
9 lattice parameters are in agreement with experimental findings. The approach presented here
10 holds promise to effectively measure strain in graphene and other 2D systems at wafer levels to
11 inform manufacturing environments.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Introduction**

26
27
28 Augmenting needs in processing speed and memory storage amongst others pave the way to
29 post-CMOS technologies, where materials discovery has long been identified as a limiting factor
30 given the inability of current gate and dielectric materials to yield improved mobilities while
31 maintaining a device switching ability.¹ A remedial approach by the Materials Genome Initiative
32 has identified graphene as a key material system suitable to be studied under a predictive
33 materials science approach,² i.e. Materials by Design, to effectively inform industry by closing
34 up the theory/experiment/data paradigm.³
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Graphene - a 2D layer of single carbon atom thickness arranged in a honeycomb lattice-has
45 attracted great interest owing to exceptional electrical properties at room temperature, as first
46 reported in 2004.⁴ In this scheme, mobilities in graphene have been quoted as high as 40-70k
47 $\text{cm}^2\text{V}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$.¹ Since then, novel concepts towards electronic and optoelectronic devices have been
48 reported.⁵ Graphene obtained by graphite exfoliation has been successfully used for proof of
49 concept device applications.⁴ However, grand challenges exist for industrial-scale fabrication of
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 large-area, defect-free graphene under controlled conditions and onto a desired substrate to
4 produce electronic devices such as graphene- based field effect transistors (GFETs).⁶ Some of
5 these challenges revolve around in plane and out of plane defects resulting from processing that
6 induce random strain fluctuations, which have been identified as the dominant disorder source in
7 graphene devices.⁷

8
9
10 Indeed, strain and rippling effects, i.e. in and out of plane strain,⁷ both generated early on
11 during growth prior to any processing, mostly as a result of thermal mismatch between metal
12 substrates and graphene.⁸ In addition, graphene growth has been reviewed recently to emphasize
13 the growth dynamics at the atomistic level on all metallic and SiC substrates, where a wealth of
14 intrinsic defects –beyond strain- such as dislocations and vacancies readily nucleate from
15 growth.⁹ Albeit, despite great success of graphene synthesis on Cu foils by CVD techniques^{10, 11}
16 in the last years to produce large area graphene at low cost, the quality of these films is typically
17 beneath that of epitaxially-grown graphene on SiC.¹² This is promoting research to devise
18 efficient methods to enable graphene transfer with higher fidelity.¹³ Improved transfer
19 approaches aim at minimizing structural defects, such as growth-derived mechanical strain and
20 ripples (responsible for in and out of plane strain as mentioned above), as well as impurities,
21 adsorbed atoms or molecules from transfer mechanisms, as well as transfer-derived mechanical
22 effects.^{14, 15}

23
24
25 The deleterious interplay between morphology and electronic properties in graphene has been
26 recently explored.¹⁶ Indeed, a detailed account of the electronic conductivity of graphene in
27 scenarios whose degree of corrugation varied from wide (135 nm) to narrow (16nm) wrinkles
28 with heights up to 6 nm was recently provided by Zhu et al.¹⁶ In particular, post processing
29 promoted conventional ripples to standing, collapsed and folded wrinkle morphologies, all with

1
2
3 specific electronic transport attributes. Albeit, some reports have highlighted the advantages of
4 such corrugated graphene layers as they improve on charge storage enhancement, strain
5 sensitivity, and chemical reactivity enhancement inclusive of band-gap opening.¹⁷ Clearly, these
6 properties are the subject of current studies to be leveraged in suitable applications. Indeed,
7 mechanical effects resulting from growth and processing have been the object of much attention
8 recently; where ripples, wrinkles and crumples become newly defined morphologies resulting
9 from intrinsic thermal fluctuation, thermal expansion and pre-stretched substrates whose
10 dimensions range on the 0.1-10 nm, 100 nm-1 μm , and above 1 μm respectively.

21 On the characterization end, a number of techniques have been employed to describe and
22 quantify the extent of mechanical deformation in graphene, such as Transmission Electron
23 Microscopy (TEM) and Scanning Tunnel Microscopy (STM) on the morphological end and Low
24 Energy Electron Diffraction (LEED), Raman, and Synchrotron spectroscopies on the
25 spectroscopic end.⁹ In particular, the value of Near Edge X-ray Absorption Fine Structure
26 (NEXAFS) spectroscopy has been recently highlighted to study graphene.¹⁸ NEXAFS
27 spectroscopy is a synchrotron technique, which consists on the excitation of a core electron to an
28 unoccupied antibonding state.¹⁹ Information on molecular orientation and chemistry can be
29 obtained.²⁰⁻²² On those lines, corrugations and doping in CVD-grown graphene on Cu have been
30 investigated effectively by theoretical and experimental NEXAFS analysis, as well as interface
31 chemical bonding of single layer graphene (SLG) deposited on Cu, Ni and Co substrates.²³⁻²⁵
32 Earlier, some of the authors had successfully used experimental NEXAFS to widely explore
33 rippling and interactions at interfaces of single and bilayer graphene growth on Cu by chemical
34 vapor deposition (CVD) and transferred to SiO_2 substrates.¹⁸

1
2
3 In this paper, we complement those initial studies through a hybrid theoretical/experimental
4 approach, by analyzing strain effects on the lattice parameter resulting from growth and
5 subsequent transfer to foreign substrates. In this scheme, with the aid of theoretical standards
6 calculated through first principles, lattice constants of transferred graphene are predicted as well
7 as average strains, by virtue of relationship between bond lengths and σ^* shifts in NEXAFS
8 spectroscopy. Indeed, early on Molecular Orbital calculations had showed that the σ^* positions
9 of atoms were dependent on bond lengths.²⁶ In this scheme, a strained bond yields a shift to
10 lower σ^* energy positions that can be recorded for the differently processed samples. To this end,
11 a total of six experimental samples and seven theoretical samples will be studied, as described in
12 the methodology description in the experimental section.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 The approach presented here is an alternative to Raman techniques to measure strain effects.
27 Like Raman,^{27, 28} the present approach is suitable to deployment in Cu derived graphene, given
28 the low charge transfer between substrate and epilayer, as will be demonstrated. In advantage of
29 Raman technologies, and owing to the advent of large area hyperspectral detectors,^{29, 30} this
30 technique is applicable to large substrates at wafer scale, with micro-meter resolution. The
31 combined experimental/theoretical approach featured in this study follows a Materials by Design
32 paradigm, and aims at addressing a pending issue in the context of post-CMOS technologies, as
33 has been described in policy-prompted communications. Lastly, this approach could be useful to
34 other 2D contenders. Moreover, it can be deployed at wafer scale and hence, is prone to
35 industrial-level assessment.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Experimental section**

55
56
57
58
59
60

Methodology

Indeed, we have made use of *ab initio* calculations to produce free standing and Cu-conformed mathematical graphene standards with varying degrees of deformation. Along these lines, free-standing graphene (SLG) samples of 2.42 Å, 2.47 Å and 2.51 Å lattice parameters were modeled to probe into the tensile/compressive deformation of the typically reported 2.46 Å CVD grown on Cu.³¹ Mathematical graphene samples will be compared to six experimental systems: CVD-grown graphene on Cu (CVD SLG/Cu), epitaxially-grown graphene on SiC, as well as single and four monolayers graphene grown via CVD on Cu, and subsequently transferred to both silicon- and carbon-terminated SiC (SLG/SiC-Si, SLG/SiC-C, 4LG/SiC-Si, 4LG/SiC-C).

Following similar arguments used in earlier publication of one of the authors from the the present work,³² this experimental design will establish a baseline in two realms; first with respect to the theoretical standard, and second with respect to the epitaxially grown graphene on SiC. Indeed, selection of this collection of substrates offers a quantitative window into further examining the effects of processing by comparing epitaxially grown graphene on SiC with CVD grown graphene that is later transferred onto SiC substrates. It is worth emphasizing that multiple layer graphene is an additional variable here, known to enhance conductivity,³³ where a multiplicity of stacking geometries enables tailoring of band structures.³⁴ In this scenario, initially nucleated deformation might propagate throughout the graphene stack or further relax depending on subsequent substrate interactions.

Sample fabrication

Graphene monolayers were grown on Copper foil by chemical vapor deposition (CVD) method in a tube furnace (OTF-1200x-STM, MTI Corp, CA) equipped with a scroll vacuum pump.^{10, 35} The Cu substrate was purchased by Lester Metals llc, Avalon Lake, Ohio, with a 99.99% purity

1
2
3 to yield oxygen-free Cu foil with 0.0005% O content, consisting of multidomains of ~10 μm
4 diameter sized grain boundaries. X-ray diffraction (XRD) measurements of the Cu foil shows
5
6 $\langle 200 \rangle$ is the preferred orientation of the polycrystalline grains, with a weaker $\langle 111 \rangle$
7
8 contribution, as shown in Figure S1 in the Supporting Information (SI).
9
10

11
12 Whilst the Cu foil was heated up to 1000 $^{\circ}\text{C}$, hydrogen gas was injected at 125 mTorr for 30
13 min, followed by injection of methane gas at 1.25 Torr for a further 30 min; the furnace was then
14 cooled down to room temperature while the flow of hydrogen and methane remained. In
15 preparation for graphene transfer, SiC substrates were solvent-cleaned through 15-minute
16 submersion steps through an Acetone, Methanol and Isopropyl alcohol sequence. The cleaning
17 and transfer procedures took place in a class 10000 cleanroom, with the cleaned substrates being
18 used immediately.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Transfer onto SiC substrates were achieved using a thermal release tape (Nitto Americas Inc.,
29 CA). The tape was placed over the graphene-coated Cu foil. A round metal bar was gently rolled
30 over the thermal release tape to secure the adhesion. Oxygen plasma ($35\text{mW}/\text{cm}^2$) was applied
31 on the exposed graphene-side of the Cu foil for 5 min to remove extra graphene and expedite the
32 following chemical Cu etching process. The ensemble was then etched in 100 mg/mL
33 $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_8$ solution for 2 hr, rinsed with deionized water, and dried with dry N_2 . Upon drying,
34 the graphene/thermal tape ensemble was layered onto SiC, as seen on the Etch/Rinse step in
35 Figure 1a. The SiC/graphene/thermal release tape ensemble was then heated at 125 $^{\circ}\text{C}$ to release
36 single monolayer graphene onto the substrate. Toluene washing was applied to the transferred
37 graphene to remove adhesive residues from the tape. This single layer graphene transfer process
38 was sequentially applied four times to prepare four monolayers graphene onto both Si- and C-
39 terminated SiC substrates. Figure 1(a) summarizes the fabrication process described here.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Following the above procedure, graphene single monolayer/four monolayers were transferred onto both Si- and C-terminated SiC. Indeed, our previous work on quartz crystal microbalance (QCM) based quantitative measurements for 1 layer to 4-layer thermal released tape transferred CVD graphene confirms that the repetitive graphene transfer used in this work is a reliable process for single to multilayer graphene on a hard metal/quartz substrate. Kim showed that the linear fit of 89.1 ng/cm^2 transferred-graphene was in close proximity to a theoretical single layer graphene aerial weight of 76.1 ng/cm^2 .³⁶

Following the same procedure, graphene was also transferred to a SiN transmission electron microscopy grid towards examination by Helium Ion Microscopy. In addition, epitaxially-grown single graphene monolayer on Si-terminated SiC was also fabricated for comparison.

Epitaxial graphene was grown on commercial nominally on-axis oriented 6H-SiC (0001) (SiCrystal AG, Germany). Prior to epitaxy, surface polishing damage was removed through etching in hydrogen for 15 min. at 1 bar and 1550 °C. Epitaxial growth was performed in a vertical cold-wall reactor with a double-walled, water-cooled quartz tube and a graphite susceptor in a slow flow of argon (purity 5.0). Heating and cooling rates were 2–3 °C per second. Typical annealing time was 15 min.




Figure 1. (a) Schematic showing fabrication, transferring and subsequent NEXAFS analysis of 1 transferred graphene layer. (b) Growth-transfer process details of graphene onto silicon-terminated SiC substrate. The process was later repeated 4 times to yield a 4-layer transferred ensemble.

Characterization

Experimental Carbon K-edge NEXAFS spectra were acquired at Beamline U7A (NSLS-I BNL) equipped with a LARIAT I detector (NSLS, Synchrotron Research Inc.) at the National Synchrotron Light Source, Brookhaven National Laboratory at 85° incidence of X-rays relative to the plane of the sample in partial electron yield (PEY) mode, with energy resolutions of 0.1 or 0.2 eV. The polarization is 85% in the horizontal direction. NEXAFS measurements were performed in partial electron yield (PEY) mode. Depth sensitivity in PEY NEXAFS is dependent on the kinetic energies of the collected electrons, but can be tuned in part by the application of a grid bias prior to the detector.^{37, 38} The grid acts as a high-pass filter, rejecting elastically-scattered electrons with lower energies which are likely to have been emitted from deeper within the sample. C K-edge measurements were performed with a grid bias of -225 V. A lower limit for the depth sensitivity can be taken as the inelastic mean free path of the C KLL signal ($E_K=263$ eV), which will comprise a significant portion of the detected signal with this grid bias; this is estimated to be 0.7 nm assuming a graphene density of 2.3 g/cm³.³⁷ Spectra normalization was performed with the LDF software (Synchrotron Research Inc.) and the scanned areas were 5 mm × 3 mm in size.

The systems reported in this paper are CVD SLG grown on Copper, and CVD graphene (single layer and four layers) grown on Copper transferred to both Si- and C-terminated SiC. Epitaxially grown graphene on SiC was also measured for comparison. Figure 1 shows the process from fabrication to transferred graphene onto a target substrate.

For Helium Ion Microscopy characterization, untreated CVD-grown graphene was transferred to a SiN grid and imaged in an ORION Plus He-IM Zeiss at 30kV and the assistance of a flood gun was not necessary to prevent surface charging.

Geometry relaxation and Band structure calculation

Structural relaxations were carried out using plane-wave density functional theory (DFT) implemented in Quantum Espresso within the pseudopotential approximation.^{39, 40} We employed ultrasoft pseudopotentials, energy cutoffs of 30 Ry for plane wave basis set and 320 Ry for charge density, k-sampling grid in the Monkhorst-Pack scheme of $30 \times 30 \times 1$ and vacuum of ~ 15 Å along the Z-axis. Total energy and electronic self-consistency criteria were set to 10^{-6} Ry and 10^{-8} Ry. Atomic forces at equilibrium position were converged below 0.01 eV/Å. All relaxations were modelled under the general-gradient approximation (GGA) with the Perdue-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) exchange-correlation functional.^{41, 42} The workflow is shown in Figure 2(a).

A single layer of graphene conformed onto copper substrate along the (111) surface orientation (SLG/Cu) and free-standing graphene (SLG) samples of 2.42 Å, 2.47 Å and 2.51 Å lattice parameters were modelled. SLG was simulated considering a unit cell of 2 C atoms whereas for SLG/Cu the unit cell contains 4 Cu atoms, one per each layer, and 2 C atoms for the SLG, as well as, considered the most stable configuration *top-fcc*. Lattice constants of Cu substrates has been adapted to graphene accordingly, as depicted in Figure 2(b).^{43, 44} Interface distance of 3.25 Å, accurately calculated by Olsen *et. al.* under the random phase approximation (RPA) to consider interface chemical bonding and van der Waals interactions, has been taken for all SLG/Cu systems.^{24, 45} Ground state band structures were performed by sampling the Brillouin Zone with $200 \times 200 \times 1$, where convergence of Fermi energy is achieved within the self-consistent field calculations of ± 0.01 eV. High symmetry k-points (M and K) were explicitly included.

1
2
3 Graphene ripple was relaxed under same criteria of SLG and SLG/Cu except that k-sampling
4 grid in the Monkhorst-Pack scheme of $10 \times 10 \times 1$ and equilibrium atomic force of 0.02 eV/\AA were
5 applied. The supercell contains 200 C atoms.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 **NEXAFS simulation**

13
14 To simulate NEXAFS, supercells assembled by 7 replications of unit cell along X and Y axis
15 has been employed. This supercell's size provides a suitable distance between absorbing atoms
16 to avoid interaction between them due to the periodic boundary conditions. Such supercell size
17 contains 98C atoms for each SLG and 294 atoms (98 C and 196 Cu atoms) for SLG/Cu. *Ab-initio*
18 NEXAFS spectroscopy calculations at C K-edge were modelled in the framework of the excited
19 electron and core-hole (XCH) approximation at 55° of incidence of an X-ray beam to enhance
20 π^* and σ^* resonances; which was implemented in the in-house code Shirley by one of the
21 authors.⁴⁶ In order to simulate the excitation of the carbon atom due to the X-ray, one electron
22 from the 1s level of the carbon pseudopotential has been removed. One carbon atom from the
23 supercell has been used to calculate the unoccupied states under the pseudopotential
24 approximation that includes the core-hole interactions. XCH-NEXAFS uses the PBE form for
25 the exchange–correlation potential within GGA approximation. A simplified scheme of the
26 procedure to simulate NEXAFS is shown in Figure 2(a). A final alignment with experiment has
27 been carried out through the electronic transition $\pi^* \text{ C=C}$ of 285 eV for every NEXAFS spectra
28 simulated.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2. Schematics describing first-principles NEXAFS calculations of SLG and SLG/Cu, where (a) the procedure to calculate NEXAFS from first-principles details the calculation of chemical shift embedded in the Shirley code. This chemical shift is the result of variation of excited total energy of the system (E_{sys}^{XCH}) respect to isolated excited atom (E_{ref}^{XCH}) and ground total energy of the system (E_{sys}^{GS}) respect to isolated atom at ground state (E_{ref}^{GS}), then it is set to the Fermi energy of the system. For instance, the chemical shift calculated for SLG/Cu of 2.51 Å with the Shirley code showed a value of -1.87615 eV (Chemical shift = [-13445.55631458 - (-18.71081349)] - [-13437.59127593 - (-10.71888784)] * 13.6 eV - 2.24196267040978 eV = -1.87615 eV) (b) Most stable top-fcc atomic configuration of SLG/Cu represented by four atomic layers of Cu where the two carbon atoms (α and β) in SLG unit cell cover Cu atoms in layers A and C.

Results and Discussion

1
2
3 Graphene films were etched from the Cu substrates and transferred to SiC wafers, as shown in
4 Figure 1(a), to be analyzed through both experimental and theoretical NEXAFS spectroscopy.
5
6 The substrates of choice were Si and C- terminated SiC so that the resulting single and multiple
7 layer stacks on SiC could be compared to the experimental standard epitaxial SLG/SiC. Transfer
8 engineering allows for multiple layer stacking, with the possibility of favoring device mobility so
9 that 4LG/SiC samples on both terminations were assembled and also examined by NEXAFS
10 spectroscopy. Indeed, multiple layer graphene is an additional variable here, known to enhance
11 conductivity,³³ where a multiplicity of stacking geometries enables tailoring of band structures,
12 inclusive of band-gap opening.³⁴ In this scenario, initially nucleated deformations might
13 propagate throughout the graphene stack or further relax depending on subjacent substrate
14 interactions.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3. (a) Calculated C K-edge NEXAFS spectra of SLG. Position of σ^* resonance is a function of graphene lattice parameter, or bond length. (b) Experimental C K-edge NEXAFS of epitaxially grown graphene on SiC and chemical vapor deposited graphene on copper result in

1
2
3 different carbon–carbon bond lengths, evidenced by different σ^* resonance energy positions.
4
5 Experimental C K-edge NEXAFS spectra of single-layer graphene and four graphene layers
6
7 transferred onto Silicon-terminated (d) and Carbon-terminated (d) SiC substrate.
8
9

10
11 As described in methodology, both theoretical (Figure 3(a)) and experimental spectra (Figure
12
13 3(b-d)) of graphene are considered in this discussion. In particular, theoretical spectra of
14
15 graphene with different lattice parameters (Figure 3(a)) will be used as a theoretical standard in
16
17 this discussion. Similarly, spectra of epitaxial SLG/SiC and CVD/Cu (Figure 3b) will be
18
19 considered an experimental standard. Spectral signatures from both standards will be compared
20
21 against spectral signatures from processed (i.e. transferred) graphene and from SiC substrates in
22
23 both Si and C terminations (Figure 3(c-d)).
24
25

26
27 Presence of π^* C=C intensities at 285 eV on SiC substrates (Figure 3(b-d)) show signs of
28
29 contamination, resulting from exposure of SiC substrates to environments outside cleanroom
30
31 settings, prior to synchrotron experiments. Experimental spectra of transferred SLG in all scans
32
33 in Figure 3(c-d) is dominated by π^* C=C intensities at 285 eV, σ^* C-H at 287 eV, π^* C=O at
34
35 288 eV and σ^* C-C at 292 eV as expected.¹⁸ The different properties of graphene grown on Si
36
37 and C terminations of SiC have been well documented,¹² and these results suggest that the SiC
38
39 termination also has an effect on NEXAFS spectra of transferred CVD-grown graphene. In
40
41 particular, while the spectrum of SLG/SiC(Si) in Figure 3(c) is dominated by graphene, the
42
43 distinctive sharp σ^* resonance of graphene is not observed for SLG/SiC(C) in Figure 3(d).
44
45 Instead, a broad σ^* resonance is recorded, which is attributed to the convolution of σ^* C-C and
46
47 σ^* Si-C signals from the substrate (Figure 3(d)). Indeed, measurements from SLG/SiC-C do not
48
49 resemble typical graphene spectra (Figure 3(d)). These findings indicate that the spectra
50
51 collected from SLG/SiC-C is dominated by the substrate. Along those lines, experimental and
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 theoretical spectra of SiC in both 3C and 6H polytypes have been examined by Pedio and
4 coworkers and show comparable signals as those shown here,⁴⁷ with higher texture in the 287,
5 288 eV and 292 eV regions for 6H-SiC than for 3C-SiC, as shown in Figure 3).
6
7
8
9

10 The spectrum from SLG/SiC-Si owes its clear predominance of the graphene signal to the Si
11 atomic layer residing between carbon in the substrate and graphene,⁹ which suppresses Auger
12 emissions from the substrate. Upon four monolayers transfer, the substrate termination produces
13 little effect in NEXAFS spectra, other than increased intensities of oxygenated states. Decreased
14 intensities at 287 eV in 4LG/SiC(Si) suggests that C-H impurities could be mostly in the
15 substrate. Conversely, π^* C=O signal \sim 288 eV has a decreased intensity in the substrate and
16 increases with graphene in both terminations, suggesting carboxylic impurities are being
17 generated on the graphitic structure throughout chemical processing.⁴⁸
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 4. He Ion Microscopy (He-IM) of CVD-grown graphene grown on Cu and later transferred to a SiN TEM grid. This technique conveniently emphasizes characteristic ripples of ~50 nm width that are visible throughout the sample.

From a morphological perspective, the extent of large out of plane mechanical deformations can be conveniently described through He Ion Microscopy (He-IM).⁴⁹ He-IM images of CVD-grown graphene on Cu transferred to a SiN TEM grid show extensive regions of high corrugation, even on the freestanding portions, with features up to 50 nm wide, combined with flat areas, as seen in Figure 4. The scan width in this micrograph is $15 \times 15 \mu\text{m}^2$, whereas scanned regions at the NEXAFS scans were $5 \times 3 \text{ mm}^2$. He-IM imaging of soft matter systems is well known to reproduce topographic features with high fidelity, which indicates the observed

1
2
3 corrugation was not originated by electron beam heating.⁵⁰ In addition, absence of coating layers
4
5 to prevent charging also guarantee high fidelity of graphene rippling effects, which are the result
6
7 from growth and transfer to any given substrate, albeit with varying widths and heights. Widths
8
9 from tens to hundreds of nanometers as well as heights of up to 6 nm have been recorded by
10
11 AFM upon transfer.¹⁶ In addition to the obvious out of plane features, in plane effects will also
12
13 result from growth and processing, whose morphological description requires of high resolution
14
15 TEM or STM approaches that will, nonetheless, only provide a description at a very local level.⁹
16
17

18
19 With the purpose of solving this sensitivity/length scale conundrum, the present approach
20
21 combines the experimental NEXAFS data above with theoretical spectra to analyze mechanical
22
23 deformation through lattice parameter variation at wafer scales; paving the way to industrial
24
25 application.
26
27

28
29 On those lines, three theoretical standards were constructed with free standing graphene of
30
31 lattice parameters reported in the literature 2.42 Å,²³ and 2.47 Å,²⁴ as well as 2.51 Å for
32
33 completion. These structures were relaxed through first principle procedures, as highlighted in
34
35 the methods section and briefly introduced in Figure 2(a) and the flow of the
36
37 experimental/theoretical sequence is shown in Figure 1(b). It is worth highlighting that these
38
39 calculations resemble earlier ones by some of the authors, now with a smaller 7×7 supercell for
40
41 computational economy that did not produce undesirable edge effects on the spectra and showed
42
43 consistent fingerprints.
44
45

46
47 The resulting NEXAFS spectra through the excited core hole approximation yielded by the
48
49 Shirley code, as described in the methods section, are shown in Figure 2(a) and constitute a set of
50
51 theoretical standards against which experimental data will be compared. On a first level
52
53 comparison, experimental NEXAFS of epitaxially grown SLG on Cu through CVD methods and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 on SiC through Si sublimation (i.e. experimental standards reported here) have also been
4 measured, as shown in Figure 3(a). Since substrate effects need to be addressed, calculations also
5 were performed on graphene grown on Cu, (SLG/Cu); which will be discussed in the next
6 section. These calculations feature the reportedly most stable top fcc configuration, as described
7 in Figure 2(b),^{43, 44} and an interface distance d_z of 3.25 Å, as reported by Banerjee et al, to
8 adequately describe the van der Waals interaction between Cu and SLG.²⁴
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Both calculated (projected to 55°) and experimental (acquired at 85°) NEXAFS spectra of
21 graphene standards feature typical $1s \rightarrow \pi^*$ C=C and $1s \rightarrow \sigma^*$ C-C electronic transitions at ~285
22 and 291 eV respectively (Figure 3(a-b)).^{18, 23} In addition, experimental spectra show peaks
23 between 287 and 288 eV attributed to σ^* C-H and π^* C=O impurity states, similar to those in
24 Figure 3(c-d). At this time, a discussion is needed per the depth sensitivity of the reported
25 signals. As mentioned earlier, both experimental and theoretical spectra have confirmed surface
26 termination-sensitivity in NEXAFS studies on SiC.⁴⁷ In addition, polarization and detector bias
27 variations have yielded descriptions of the graphene/substrate interactions.⁹
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The assignment of C-C σ^* intensities and correlation with bond length has been a
39 controversial topic of research in the NEXAFS literature pertaining to molecules where
40 conjugation and localization effects have been thoroughly discussed by Piancastelli and
41 Stohr.^{51,52} Historically, the bond length correlation model sought to establish an empirical
42 relationship between bond lengths and the energy position as well as the lineshape of a σ^*
43 resonance. While the model works reasonably well for simple diatomic molecules, it is of limited
44 utility in systems with more delocalized sigma bonding such as benzene. In recent work, the core
45 excitonic nature of C-C σ^* states in graphene have been confirmed,⁵³ building upon Ågren's
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 theoretical and Brühwiler's experimental work, which has also confirmed the core excitonic
4 character of the ~ 292 eV intensity associated to sp^2 graphite.^{54, 55} Interestingly, density functional
5 theory calculations suggest a clear empirical correlation between the peak position of σ^*
6 resonances and bond lengths of graphene, which likely derives from the relatively localized
7 excitonic nature of the resonances. However, this assumes entirely uniform strain with retention
8 of conjugation. While the limits of this correlation have not been explored, the calculated
9 empirical correlation provides a valuable means of assessing substrate-induced strain effects.
10 First, on the interpretation realm, we have calculated the effects of substrate charge transfer
11 (Figure S2) and substrate screening to graphene NEXAFS spectra (Figure S3), to which σ^* shifts
12 can also be attributed. We have found both these effects to be small for Cu substrates. This
13 discussion has been fully detailed in the SI and will be further developed in the next section.
14 Second, on the computational realm, we have confirmed that in-plane strained graphene leads to
15 a shift of the σ^* resonances exclusively, Figure 3(a-b), and no hybridization with the π^* C=C
16 signals in the graphitic lattice is possible. Similarly, adjacent atoms in an out of plane
17 deformation, i.e. along a ripple, will also present shifted σ^* resonances (see upcoming section
18 "Interpretation of σ^* shifts as they correlate to strain and lattice parameter"); indicative of lattice
19 parameter variation, since hybridization with adjacent π^* C=C signals is not viable. The density
20 functional theory calculations thus provide a practical measure of strain within the samples likely
21 as a result of the highly excitonic nature of σ^* resonances.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 *Lattice parameter calculations*

50
51 Shifts in σ^* energy positions are clearly observed in experimental spectra of epitaxial SLG/SiC
52 and CVD SLG/Cu (Figure 3(a-b)). These scans produced σ^* resonances at 291.8 and 291.3 eV
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 respectively, suggesting a smaller lattice parameter in CVD SLG/Cu than in SLG/SiC. Further,
4 transferred SLG onto SiC substrates produced σ^* energy positions shifted by different amounts
5 at 291.8 eV for SLG/SiC(Si), and 291.9 eV for both 4LG/SiC(Si) and 4LG/SiC(C). Growth
6 method, substrate, and processing differ in the experimental samples discussed here. However,
7 for the calculated spectra the only variable is the bond length, yet spectra still produced σ^* shifts
8 with varying bond lengths. Hence, taking into account the discussion in the prior section, we are
9 attributing differences in C–C bond lengths as reflected in experimental NEXAFS to effects from
10 growth, substrate, and processing. Indeed, of the three substrate-related factors discussed in the
11 prior section, substrate shielding effects can be bypassed by monitoring $E(\sigma^*) - E(\pi^*)$ rather
12 than absolute σ^* energies in the prediction of bond lengths for Cu-derived systems, which
13 follows. As a consequence, and given that charge transfer is below the experimental resolution,
14 all σ^* energy positions from Cu-derived graphene (both grown and transferred) in this discussion
15 reflect lattice parameter exclusively. In this calculation, epitaxial SLG/SiC is also tentatively
16 included. However, this system will be discussed further below, due to the undocumented effects
17 of substrate shielding.

18
19 In the time-independent density functional theory calculations, graphene with various lattice
20 constants were used as theoretical standards to fit a linear relationship between σ^* resonance
21 energy $E(\sigma^*) - E(\pi^*)$ and bond length R of the form:

$$E(\sigma^*) - E(\pi^*) = aR + b \quad (1)$$

22
23 In this approach, we have calculated theoretical standards (SLG and SLG/Cu) with lattice
24 constants 2.42, 2.47, and 2.51 Å, which has the underlying assumption of uniform strain. A
25 theoretical study of freestanding SLG, addressed band structure engineering by strain through
26 first principles calculations,⁵⁶ and found that the characteristic band structure from graphene was

1
2
3 lost for those values of lattice constants above 3.209 Å. These findings justify the choice of
4 lattice parameters of theoretical SLG standards; whose band structures (both as free standing and
5 as SLG/Cu) have the expected graphitic components. In fact, we have taken an experimental
6 value from CVD SLG/Cu from the literature with lattice constant of 2.46 Å, which is close to the
7 typically used reference of *graphite*, with lattice constant 2.461 Å.^{31,56}

14 In order to follow the rationale above and measure exclusively σ^* shifts irrespectively of
15 substrate effects, $E(\sigma^*) - E(\pi^*)$ as given in Eq. (1) was used to predict the bond lengths of
16 experimental samples as shown in Figure 5, and in agreement with discussion in the prior
17 section. Notably, we have plotted $E(\sigma^*) - E(\pi^*)$ versus lattice parameters from the theoretical
18 standards associated to SLG and to SLG/Cu, as seen in Figure 5, both linear fits showing a slight
19 difference in fitting parameters, as highlighted in the caption. Indeed, as it was shown in Figure
20 5, charge transfer effects had a subtle effect on σ^* energy positions, whose associated shifts were
21 on the order of 0.01 eV, much below the energy resolution limit in the present setup. For
22 consistency, we have used the regression associated to SLG/Cu to predict the bond lengths of the
23 experimental as-grown and of transferred samples, for which only the $E(\sigma^*) - E(\pi^*)$ is known
24 through experimental NEXAFS.




Figure 5. The carbon–carbon bond lengths (R) for the various graphene systems display the predicted linear correlation with the σ^* resonance energy position, as discussed in the text. Linear fits with equation (1) from the text yielded the fitting parameters $a = -17.5$ and $b = 31.6$ for freestanding graphene, and $a = -17.6$ and $b = 31.6$ for SLG/Cu. For both freestanding SLG and SLG/Cu, the correlation coefficients are close to unity, indicating a reasonable empirical description of the relationship between R and σ^* resonance energy position. Data points represented by black and red circles have been theory-derived to yield a linear fit on which experimental σ^* resonance energy positions are placed atop to deduce values of R . Green circles represent the deduced values of R . The inset shows the same regression magnified in the 6.80–6.95 eV and 1.3905–1.404 Å where data from transferred and epitaxial graphene lie.

1
2
3 Figure 5 shows the bond length predictions of CVD SLG/Cu and of epitaxially-grown
4 SLG/SiC (Figure 3(b)). In fact, the predictions were derived from the regression tendered from
5 the calculated SLG/Cu. The experimental error for predicted bond lengths is calculated as the
6 energy resolution (0.05 and 0.1 eV for beamlines U12 and U7 respectively) divided by fitting
7 parameter a in Equation 1. The inset in Figure 5 shows the bond length predictions for the
8 transferred systems.
9

10
11
12 The prior section established that charge transfer in graphene grown on SiC is small, and
13 therefore not affecting σ^* resonance energy positions. An additional clarification is needed here
14 in the context of SiC, not as growth but as transfer substrate. In this scenario, it is worth
15 highlighting that those SLG that have been transferred will likely engage in Van der Waals
16 interaction with the subjacent SiC substrates. Since the transfer is conducted at temperatures
17 much below those typical in growth; it is expected that those van der Waals interactions will be
18 weak, therefore yielding no charge exchange or any other substrate artifact and hence, producing
19 no spectral signature and justifying the predictions in SiC transferred systems.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 With all, values of bond lengths of CVD SLG/Cu, Epitaxial SLG/SiC and transferred SLG to
36 SiC on both terminations were predicted through the regressions in Figure 5 and plotted in Table
37 1 along with calculated strain values with respect to a CVD grown experimental standard found
38 in the literature with lattice parameter 2.46 \AA ,³¹ which is a similar value to graphite, often used in
39 the literature as a comparative standard in the calculation of strains.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Strain was calculated with the following equation:
47
48

$$49 \text{ Strain} = \left[\frac{R_{\text{predicted}} - R_{\text{reference}}}{R_{\text{reference}}} \right] \times 100\% \\ 50 \\ 51 \\ 52 \\ 53 \\ 54 \\ 55 \\ 56 \\ 57 \\ 58 \\ 59 \\ 60$$

1
2
3 Where R is bond length and the bond length used for reference (1.42 Å), which is indeed a value
4 from the literature that was derived from Low Energy Electron Diffraction measurements on
5 CVD-grown graphene on Cu substrate as reported by Avila. [1]
6
7

8
9
10 In this study, we have used SiC as transferred substrates aimed at comparing the resulting
11 ensembles with epitaxial SLG/SiC as well as SLG-Cu as experimental references. It is clear
12 from Figure 3(b) that the growth substrate influences the carbon-carbon bond length. We note
13 that predicted C-C bond lengths of all experimental systems, shown in Table 1, are lower than
14 the typically cited length of 1.42 Å by less than 2%.²⁰ In fact, Gui et al estimated that under small
15 strain (less than 2%) the Poisson ratios in the two directions take the same values, indicating that
16 graphene is isotropic (deformation along X and Y axis take same values).⁵⁶ Under even
17 smaller strain (less than 1.5%), the Poisson ratios were constant (0.1732). According to this
18 discussion, values in Table 1 (below 2%) suggest that transferred SLG are all under compressive
19 isotropic strain, and the predicted values are within the available experimental findings in the
20 literature.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Table 1.** Predicted carbon-carbon bond lengths for all studied graphene systems. R(A)
39 correspond to values of bond length of the standards, which are free standing graphene and
40 graphene on Cu. These are theoretical samples, and R(A) is the bond length value by design on
41 free standing graphene and the value of bond length for Graphene on Cu at the interface distance
42 reported by Olson. Predicted R(A) are values of bond lengths that have been estimated over
43 experimental samples with the assistance of theoretical standards, where a correlation between
44 bond length and Sigma emission energy was established.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

System	$E(\sigma^*)-E(\pi^*)$ (eV)	R (Å)	Predicted R (Å)	Strain (%)
SLG (2.46 Å)*	---	1.42	---	---
SLG (2.42 Å) ^a	6.888	1.397	---	-1.62
SLG (2.47 Å) ^a	6.430	1.426	---	0.42
SLG (2.51 Å) ^a	5.975	1.449	---	2.04
SLG/Cu (2.42 Å) ^b	6.906	1.397	---	-1.62
SLG/Cu (2.47 Å) ^b	6.446	1.426	---	0.42
SLG/Cu (2.51 Å) ^b	5.985	1.449	---	2.04
CVD SLG/Cu	6.64± 0.05	---	1.413 ± 0.003	-0.49
T-SLG/SiC(Si)	6.8± 0.1	---	1.403± 0.006	-1.17
T-4SLG/SiC(Si)	6.9± 0.1	---	1.398± 0.006	-1.57
T-4SLG/SiC(C)	6.8± 0.1	---	1.403± 0.006	-1.17
Epitaxial SLG/SiC	6.9± 0.1	---	1.398± 0.006	-1.57

^a Calculated NEXAFS spectra where the graphene lattice constant is given in parentheses.

^b Spectra used to fit Equation 1.

* Ref (Avila, et. al.)³¹

Table 1 indicates that Epitaxial SLG/SiC, for instance, has a strain of -1.57%; suggesting an overestimation, since it is commonly thought that the maximum strain possible would be on the order of 1%.^{9, 57} Albeit, we are using three theoretical graphene systems to calibrate a line through which we predict bond lengths of real systems which are far from pristine graphene, as shown in the HeIM image in Figure 4. This will be addressed further in the section below.

Interpretation of σ^* shifts as they correlate to strain and lattice parameter

At this time, it is unclear how individual morphologies throughout the scanned regions are contributing to a strain variation. Indeed, the dynamics of how their spectroscopic signatures are combined to produce a certain σ^* position which yields a certain amount of strain have not yet been discussed. Incidentally, it is worth highlighting that in unsupported graphene (equivalently, graphene that is not experiencing effects from subjacent substrates like the transferred systems), by assuming theoretical SLG (2.47 Å) as standard, we find SLG (2.42 Å) is compressed by little under 3%. Even under this large strain, graphene properties—both electronic and crystallographic—remain unchanged according to the band structure as shown in Figure S2 (b).

It should also be noted that while the theoretical models are molecularly homogenous, where every bond is uniformly strained by the same amount. However, experimental spectra average through morphologies that include multiple local inhomogeneities such as localized strain and rippling, as seen in Figure 4. With the purpose of analyzing at the atomic level, a rippled morphology, showing strained bonds throughout, has been modeled.

More specifically, in a rippled region, such as that described in Figure 6, we have calculated spectra associated to atoms along the ripple. In this scheme, the associated σ^* resonances were also plotted (Figure 6 right) to reveal energy shifts in the σ^* resonance associated with individual strained bond lengths. The single strain value predicted for an experimental system is the result of strain homogeneities throughout the scanned region. The variation of σ^* energies for atoms 1 and 10 has been highlighted; showing the sensitivity of this technique to capture variations at the atomic scale that will be further averaged. In fact, we have verified that the average spectra along

the rippled region provides a σ^* energy position that is the resulting average of the individual shifts from each atom along the ripple.




Figure 6. Theoretical NEXAFS calculations for atoms along a graphene ripple. Individual atoms produce σ^* resonances at various energies, indicating different bond lengths.

These results suggest that every morphology is going to contribute to the measured integrated σ^* , allowing the identification of an unevenly deformed real system with a certain value of strain to an equivalent homogeneously strained system. Both would indeed yield the same integrated spectra. It is important to remember that σ^* shifts register not only in plane strain, but out of plane strain as well. Albeit, high curvature in large corrugations might not be registered due to transition prohibition, or, geometrically, due to the orthogonality of beam polarization and vector associated with the σ^* orbitals.¹⁹ However, most morphologies will be captured by this technique.

It is important to emphasize that this technique provides a clear description of the value of averaged spectra over large areas. The large areas are inclusive of wafer size regions- where the molecular detail of individual atoms is preserved and averaged out with the collective. These NEXAFS-specific capabilities are further emphasized through the value brought forward by large area hyperspectral NEXAFS. Indeed, with a dynamic range between 40 μm to the tens of

1
2
3 mms, this analysis can be deployed in specific regions of interest as well as to the overall wafer;
4
5 opening the possibility of thorough strain metrics.
6

7
8 Given the interest on the increased transport properties resulting from stacked configurations
9
10 upon multiple transfers,³³ as mentioned previously, it is worth highlighting this methodology
11
12 allows for the characterization both at wafer and micron levels (due to the advent of
13
14 hyperspectral spectroscopy) of transferred graphene to substrates of technological relevance,
15
16 beyond native substrates.
17

18
19 Following transfer of a single layer to SiC(Si), the bond length of CVD SLG/Cu decreases to
20
21 1.403 Å. On transfer of subsequent layers the bond length is further decreased. However, prior to
22
23 providing an interpretation on the specifics behind transferred systems, a comparative discussion
24
25 is needed on the experimental standards CVD SLG/Cu and epitaxial SLG/SiC.
26

27
28 Bertran et al. demonstrated how fine control over experimental variables such as H₂ flow could
29
30 have a large impact over strain on CVD SLG/Cu.⁵⁸ Indeed, by measuring Raman shifts of the 2D
31
32 phonon mode compared to that of unstrained pristine graphene, compressive strain could be
33
34 lowered from 0.2% to 0.026%. Further, by combining Raman spectroscopy with molecular
35
36 dynamics simulations, He et al. confirmed an average compressive strain of 0.5% for CVD
37
38 SLG/Cu, which is the resulting average of local C-C bond lengths being deformed in the
39
40 amounts of 0.009-0.005 Å, which yield strains between 0.3% and 0.6%.⁵⁹ These results suggest
41
42 that the predicted strain in CVD SLG/Cu (-0.49%) in Table 1 falls within the expected range.
43
44

45
46 Discussion of the experimental standard SLG/SiC is less straightforward. Indeed, growth of
47
48 epitaxial graphene has been recently reviewed; biaxial strain first arises from epitaxial stress
49
50 during graphene growth on a substrate, and is energetically costly.⁹ In fact, strain in excess 1%
51
52 has been quoted as prohibitive, since it cannot even be achieved in the graphene-metal
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 systems. In the present scenario, strain predicted in SLG/SiC is compressive by 1.57%, which is
4 not consistent with Tetlow's parameters. In addition, engaging in the calculation of band
5 structure and NEXAFS spectrum of epitaxial SLG/SiC is computationally expensive. As
6 mentioned earlier, Coletti et al have measured the Dirac point energy on a SLG/SiC ensemble to
7 be on the order of 0.42 eV, comparable to that observed in SLG/Cu, which produced little impact
8 on the σ^* shift.⁶⁰ These results led to the conclusion that charge transfer in SLG/SiC would not
9 be prone to σ^* energy shifting. However, in order to conclude that this particular methodology
10 of σ^* resonance shifts is applicable to SLG/SiC, the substrate effects on SLG/SiC need to be
11 elucidated. Substrate effects had promoted a hard shift in Cu ensembles, and the effects in SiC
12 systems had not been derived. In fact, the value of predicted strain in epitaxial SLG/SiC in Table
13 1 being higher than 1% is unexpected, suggesting that SiC substrate effects might be more
14 complex than a spectral hard shift.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Indeed, Ferralis reported evidence of structural strain in epitaxial graphene on 6H-SiC(0001),
32 calculated compressive strain at room temperature of 0.8%, associated to long annealing times.⁵⁷
33 The rendered films were under residual compressive strain at room temperature, which again
34 results from a large difference in the thermal expansion coefficients of graphene and SiC. The
35 residual strain has been reported to be tunable by varying the growth time, between the
36 theoretical maximum of almost 0.8% and an empirical minimum value of 0.1%. Following this
37 trend, Schuman et al, reported a compressive strain of 0.2%.⁶¹
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Comparing these available data to value reported here of -1.57%, the prediction for epitaxial
48 SLG/SiC is too high, suggesting the need to account for the specific SiC screening effects in the
49 growth ensemble. To further test the applicability of the calibrated trend in Figure S3 in SI, strain
50 predictions using equation 1 from NEXAFS Carbon K-edge spectra of epitaxially grown
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 graphene on SiC(Si) found in the literature yielded 0.46%,⁶² 0.67%,⁶³ and 1.07%.⁶⁴ Further
4 highlighting the importance of identifying substrate-specific screening effects, these predictions
5 suggest tensile strain in graphene, in opposition to accepted lattice parameter dynamics of
6 epitaxial graphene/SiC that render in reality a compressed epilayer. These results confirm that
7 this methodology will not be applicable to epitaxial SLG/SiC, until impact of substrate effects
8 are accounted for. In particular, substrate screening effects in this system need to be elucidated.
9

10
11 It is worth highlighting that transferred systems do not engage in covalent bonding with the
12 subjacent SiC substrate, and the van der Waals interactions will be weak. Therefore, substrate
13 effects (charge transfer or substrate shielding) will not need to be taken into account here.
14 Although the predicted values for the transferred systems are in excess of the 1% limit identified
15 by Tetlow,⁹ these will be highly rippled systems, without substrate pinning effects, which justify
16 the larger values, which are still below 2% compression, and therefore preserving the band
17 structure typical of graphene, as shown in Figure S2 (b). In this scheme, Table 1 shows that
18 transferred systems exhibit larger compressive strain than CVD SLG/Cu, and this increase could
19 be increasing with subsequent transferred layers. Indeed, the initial -0.49% strain in CVD
20 SLG/Cu augments to -1.17% for T-SLG/SiC(Si) and -1.57% for T-4SLG/SiC(Si). The strained
21 value for T-4SLG/SiC(C) is equal (-1.17%) to that of T-SLG/SiC(Si). In view of these results,
22 transfer seems to augment the frequency and magnitude of rippling events, (as expected) which
23 are subject to be monitored by the σ^* shift method discussed here. These data also suggest that
24 transfer of multiple epilayers could have an impact on the level of compressive stress generated,
25 and the dependence on substrate termination is unclear at this time.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Finally, it was mentioned earlier that the microscopy-hyperspectral acquisition mode used
52 here has the ability to characterize segmented regions in each system, applying the σ^* shift
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 method to each one. This would yield not only a strain value for the smaller regions, but an
4
5 indication of strain variations at wafer level. In this work, only integrated regions of $5 \times 3 \text{ mm}^2$
6
7
8 were analyzed. However, this technology has the capacity to image regions as large as 20×20
9
10 mm^2 with a resolution under $10 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$. Hence, the advent of hyperspectral synchrotron
11
12 spectroscopy paves the way to spatially resolved mechanical deformation at the micron level and
13
14 wafer scale (which has not been explored here), maintaining molecular sensitivity, and hence,
15
16 overcoming detectability limits. The procedure highlighted here, demonstrates the methodology
17
18 needed to curate and process big data in hyperspectral high throughput files in an analytical
19
20 fashion. Further developments will include the deployment of machine –learning algorithms at
21
22 different length scales to fully exploit the information derived to inform on mechanical
23
24 deformation upon growth and processing at industrial scales. In addition, for optimum results,
25
26 the acquisition needs to be set at the highest energy resolution that the detector and/or
27
28 spectrometer is capable of. In the present work, most scans have been acquired at 0.2 eV
29
30 resolution, rather than the maximum 0.06 eV that would yield higher sensitivity in the predicted
31
32 lattice parameters. For this implementation to come to full term, newly developed hyperspectral
33
34 NEXAFS detectors need to become forefront technology, accessible in various beamlines. This
35
36 availability will promote extensive use and exploitation of the technological advancements that
37
38 this detector portrays.
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 In essence, this work demonstrates that interfacial substrate interactions can induce measurable
46
47 changes in the peak positions of NEXAFS resonances, calibrated with the aid of density
48
49 functional theory calculations, providing a means of mapping strain across transferred graphene
50
51 samples. In addition, the ability of the σ^* shift method to reflect out of plane strain effects has
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 also been demonstrated. This finding is crucial to account for the ripple-derived strain effects
4
5 that are known to develop throughout the whole wafer.
6
7
8
9

10 **Summary and Conclusions**

11
12 This work proposes a methodology to measure graphene strains at wafer levels using a robust
13 correlation derived from density functional theory calculations and originating from the excitonic
14 nature of σ^* and π^* resonances. This methodology is directly applicable to CVD-grown
15 graphene on Cu systems as well as to those graphene films that are transferred to substrates with
16 which the established van der Waals interactions are weak. The methodology is also applicable
17 to SiC-derived graphene, although the specifics of substrate interactions need to be elucidated
18 and accounted for. Similarly, this method is applicable to other transition metal substrates,
19 however, measurements of both charge transfer between graphene and substrate (known to be
20 more prominent than in Cu), as well as substrate screening, are needed to isolate the σ^* energy
21 dependence on bond length and strain. The validity of the σ^* energy shift correlation with strain
22 rests in the excitonic character of this resonance, having a localized absorbing electron which
23 leads to a core electron decay, being likely the reason for the observed calculations. Importantly,
24 this method holds promise in other 2D materials, probing the bond length directly by measuring
25 a ubiquitous σ^* signal, taking into account substrate/epilayer relations as described above. To
26 this end, further work is required to analyze the correlation between functionalization and
27 dimensional reduction.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **AUTHOR INFORMATION**

53 54 **Corresponding Author**

1
2
3 * evamcampo@gmail.com
4
5
6
7
8

9 **Supporting Information has been compiled to delve into the topics discussed in this**
10 **manuscript. This information is available free of charge via the Internet at**
11 **<http://pubs.acs.org/>.**
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Funding Sources**

20
21
22 Project supported by AFOSR Grants FA9550-17-1-0082, FA9550-15-1-0289, and FA9550-14-1-
23
24 0099 and by the U.S. DOE, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, contract number
25
26 DEAC02-98CH10886. Computational work was performed in part through High Performance
27
28 Computing Wales project numbers 095 and 224, as part of the HPCW-Project No. 80621,
29
30 through European Regional Development Funding and a Fujitsu Fellowship. Simulations of
31
32 NEXAFS spectra were executed as part of a User Project at the Molecular Foundry, Lawrence
33
34 Berkeley National Laboratory, which is supported by the Office of Science, Office of Basic
35
36 Energy Sciences of the U.S. DOE, contract number DE-AC02-05CH11231.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

45
46 EMC was supported by the IR/D program at the National Science Foundation. We thank Dr.
47
48 Chuong Huynh at Carl Zeiss Microscopy for assistance in Helium Ion Microscopy and Dr.
49
50 Fahima Ouchen at Air Force Research Laboratory for overseeing graphene processing
51
52 procedures.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. Schwierz, F., Graphene transistors. *Nature nanotechnology* **2010**, *5* (7), 487-496.
2. Jain, A.; Ong, S. P.; Hautier, G.; Chen, W.; Richards, W. D.; Dacek, S.; Cholia, S.; Gunter, D.; Skinner, D.; Ceder, G.; Persson, K. A., Commentary: The Materials Project: A materials genome approach to accelerating materials innovation. *APL Materials* **2013**, *1* (1), 011002.
3. Sun, W.; Dacek, S. T.; Ong, S. P.; Hautier, G.; Jain, A.; Richards, W. D.; Gamst, A. C.; Persson, K. A.; Ceder, G., The thermodynamic scale of inorganic crystalline metastability. *Science Advances* **2016**, *2* (11).
4. Novoselov, K. S.; Geim, A. K.; Morozov, S. V.; Jiang, D.; Zhang, Y.; Dubonos, S. V.; Grigorieva, I. V.; Firsov, A. A., Electric Field Effect in Atomically Thin Carbon Films. *Science* **2004**, *306* (5696), 666-669.
5. Avouris, P., Graphene: electronic and photonic properties and devices. *Nano letters* **2010**, *10* (11), 4285-4294.
6. Zhan, B.; Li, C.; Yang, J.; Jenkins, G.; Huang, W.; Dong, X., Graphene Field-Effect Transistor and Its Application for Electronic Sensing. *Small* **2014**, *10* (20), 4042-4065.
7. Couto, N. J.; Costanzo, D.; Engels, S.; Ki, D.-K.; Watanabe, K.; Taniguchi, T.; Stampfer, C.; Guinea, F.; Morpurgo, A. F., Random strain fluctuations as dominant disorder source for high-quality on-substrate graphene devices. *Physical Review X* **2014**, *4* (4), 041019.
8. Hattab, H.; N'Diaye, A. T.; Wall, D.; Klein, C.; Jnawali, G.; Coraux, J.; Busse, C.; van Gastel, R.; Poelsema, B.; Michely, T., Interplay of wrinkles, strain, and lattice parameter in graphene on iridium. *Nano letters* **2012**, *12* (2), 678-682.
9. Tetlow, H.; De Boer, J. P.; Ford, I.; Vvedensky, D.; Coraux, J.; Kantorovich, L., Growth of epitaxial graphene: Theory and experiment. *Physics Reports* **2014**, *542* (3), 195-295.
10. Li, X.; Cai, W.; An, J.; Kim, S.; Nah, J.; Yang, D.; Piner, R.; Velamakanni, A.; Jung, I.; Tutuc, E.; Banerjee, S. K.; Colombo, L.; Ruoff, R. S., Large-area synthesis of high-quality and uniform graphene films on copper foils. *Science* **2009**, *324* (5932), 1312-1314.
11. Mattevi, C.; Kim, H.; Chhowalla, M., A review of chemical vapour deposition of graphene on copper. *Journal of Materials Chemistry* **2011**, *21* (10), 3324-3334.
12. Norimatsu, W.; Kusunoki, M., Epitaxial graphene on SiC {0001}: advances and perspectives. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **2014**, *16* (8), 3501-3511.
13. Ambrosi, A.; Pumera, M., The CVD graphene transfer procedure introduces metallic impurities which alter the graphene electrochemical properties. *Nanoscale* **2014**, *6* (1), 472-476.
14. Jung, W.; Kim, D.; Lee, M.; Kim, S.; Kim, J. H.; Han, C. S., Ultraconformal contact transfer of monolayer graphene on metal to various substrates. *Advanced Materials* **2014**, *26* (37), 6394-6400.
15. Colombo, L.; Wallace, R. M.; Ruoff, R. S., Graphene growth and device integration. *Proceedings of the IEEE* **2013**, *101* (7), 1536-1556.
16. Zhu, W.; Low, T.; Perebeinos, V.; Bol, A. A.; Zhu, Y.; Yan, H.; Tersoff, J.; Avouris, P., Structure and electronic transport in graphene wrinkles. *Nano letters* **2012**, *12* (7), 3431-3436.
17. Deng, S.; Berry, V., Wrinkled, rippled and crumpled graphene: an overview of formation mechanism, electronic properties, and applications. *Materials Today* **2016**, *19* (4), 197-212.
18. Lee, V.; Park, C.; Jaye, C.; Fischer, D. A.; Yu, Q.; Wu, W.; Liu, Z.; Bao, J.; Pei, S.-S.; Smith, C.; Lysaght, P.; Banerjee, S., Substrate hybridization and rippling of graphene evidenced by near-edge X-ray absorption fine structure spectroscopy. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **2010**, *1* (8), 1247-1253.
19. Stöhr, J., *NEXAFS Spectroscopy*. Springer: 2003.

- 1
2
3 20. Winter, A. D.; Larios, E.; Alamgir, F. M.; Jaye, C.; Fischer, D. A.; Omastova, M.;
4 Campo, E. M., Thermo-active behaviour of ethylene-vinyl acetate | multiwall carbon nanotube
5 composites examined by in situ near edge x-ray absorption fine structure spectroscopy. *The*
6 *Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **2014**, *118* (7), 3733-3741.
- 7
8 21. Winter, A. D.; Jaye, C.; Fischer, D.; Omastová, M.; Campo, E. M., Prestrain relaxation in
9 non-covalently modified ethylene-vinyl acetate | PyChol | multiwall carbon nanotube
10 nanocomposites. *APL Materials* **2014**, *2* (6), 066105.
- 11
12 22. Winter, A. D.; Larios, E.; Alamgir, F. M.; Jaye, C.; Fischer, D.; Campo, E. M., Near-edge
13 x-ray absorption fine structure studies of electrospun poly (dimethylsiloxane)/poly (methyl
14 methacrylate)/multiwall carbon nanotube composites. *Langmuir* **2013**, *29* (51), 15822-15830.
- 15
16 23. Schultz, B. J.; Patridge, C. J.; Lee, V.; Jaye, C.; Lysaght, P. S.; Smith, C.; Barnett, J.;
17 Fischer, D. A.; Prendergast, D.; Banerjee, S., Imaging local electronic corrugations and doped
18 regions in graphene. *Nature communications* **2011**, *2*, 372.
- 19
20 24. Schultz, B. J.; Jaye, C.; Lysaght, P. S.; Fischer, D. A.; Prendergast, D.; Banerjee, S., On
21 chemical bonding and electronic structure of graphene-metal contacts. *Chemical Science* **2013**, *4*
22 (1), 494-502.
- 23
24 25. Schultz, B. J.; Dennis, R. V.; Lee, V.; Banerjee, S., An electronic structure perspective of
25 graphene interfaces. *Nanoscale* **2014**, *6* (7), 3444-3466.
- 26
27 26. Sheehy, J.; Gil, T.; Winstead, C.; Farren, R.; Langhoff, P., Correlation of molecular
28 valence-and K-shell photoionization resonances with bond lengths. *The Journal of chemical*
29 *physics* **1989**, *91* (3), 1796-1812.
- 30
31 27. Ni, Z.; Wang, Y.; Yu, T.; Shen, Z., Raman spectroscopy and imaging of graphene. *Nano*
32 *Research* **2008**, *1* (4), 273-291.
- 33
34 28. Wang, Y. Y.; Ni, Z. H.; Yu, T.; Shen, Z. X.; Wang, H. M.; Wu, Y. H.; Chen, W.; Shen
35 Wee, A. T., Raman studies of monolayer graphene: the substrate effect. *The Journal of Physical*
36 *Chemistry C* **2008**, *112* (29), 10637-10640.
- 37
38 29. Baio, J. E.; Jaye, C.; Fischer, D. A.; Weidner, T., Multiplexed Orientation and Structure
39 Analysis by Imaging Near-Edge X-ray Absorption Fine Structure (MOSAIX) for Combinatorial
40 Surface Science. *Analytical chemistry* **2013**, *85* (9), 4307-4310.
- 41
42 30. Konicek, A.; Jaye, C.; Hamilton, M.; Sawyer, W.; Fischer, D.; Carpick, R., Near-Edge X-
43 ray Absorption Fine Structure Imaging of Spherical and Flat Counterfaces of
44 Ultrananocrystalline Diamond Tribological Contacts: A Correlation of Surface Chemistry and
45 Friction. *Tribology Letters* **2011**, *44* (1), 99-106.
- 46
47 31. Avila, J.; Razado, I.; Lorcy, S.; Fleurier, R.; Pichonat, E.; Vignaud, D.; Wallart, X.;
48 Asensio, M. C., Exploring electronic structure of one-atom thick polycrystalline graphene films:
49 A nano angle resolved photoemission study. *Scientific reports* **2013**, *3*.
- 50
51 32. Winter, A. D.; Rojas, W. Y.; Williams, A. D.; Kim, S. S.; Ouchen, F.; Fischer, D. A.;
52 Weiland, C.; Principe, E.; Banerjee, S.; Huynh, C., Monitoring Deformation in Graphene
53 Through Hyperspectral Synchrotron Spectroscopy to Inform Fabrication. *The Journal of*
54 *Physical Chemistry C* **2017**, *121* (29), 15653-15664.
- 55
56 33. Kasry, A.; Kuroda, M. A.; Martyna, G. J.; Tulevski, G. S.; Bol, A. A., Chemical doping
57 of large-area stacked graphene films for use as transparent, conducting electrodes. *ACS nano*
58 **2010**, *4* (7), 3839-3844.
- 59
60 34. Latil, S.; Henrard, L., Charge carriers in few-layer graphene films. *Physical Review*
Letters **2006**, *97* (3), 036803.

- 1
2
3 35. Bae, S.; Kim, H.; Lee, Y.; Xu, X.; Park, J.-S.; Zheng, Y.; Balakrishnan, J.; Lei, T.; Kim,
4 H. R.; Song, Y. I., Roll-to-roll production of 30-inch graphene films for transparent electrodes.
5 *Nature nanotechnology* **2010**, *5* (8), 574-578.
- 6 36. Kim, S. S.; Kuang, Z.; Ngo, Y. H.; Farmer, B. L.; Naik, R. R., Biotic–Abiotic
7 Interactions: Factors that Influence Peptide–Graphene Interactions. *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*
8 **2015**, *7* (36), 20447-20453.
- 9 37. Seah, M. P.; Dench, W. A., Quantitative electron spectroscopy of surfaces: A standard
10 data base for electron inelastic mean free paths in solids. *Surface and interface analysis* **1979**, *1*
11 (1), 2-11.
- 12 38. Genzer, J.; Kramer, E. J.; Fischer, D. A., Accounting for Auger yield energy loss for
13 improved determination of molecular orientation using soft x-ray absorption spectroscopy.
14 *Journal of applied physics* **2002**, *92* (12), 7070-7079.
- 15 39. Kohn, W.; Sham, L. J., Self-consistent equations including exchange and correlation
16 effects. *Physical Review* **1965**, *140* (4A), A1133.
- 17 40. Giannozzi, P.; Baroni, S.; Bonini, N.; Calandra, M.; Car, R.; Cavazzoni, C.; Ceresoli, D.;
18 Chiarotti, G. L.; Cococcioni, M.; Dabo, I., QUANTUM ESPRESSO: a modular and open-source
19 software project for quantum simulations of materials. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*
20 **2009**, *21* (39), 395502.
- 21 41. Perdew, J. P.; Zunger, A., Self-interaction correction to density-functional
22 approximations for many-electron systems. *Physical Review B* **1981**, *23* (10), 5048.
- 23 42. Perdew, J. P.; Burke, K.; Ernzerhof, M., Generalized gradient approximation made
24 simple. *Physical review letters* **1996**, *77* (18), 3865.
- 25 43. Fuentes-Cabrera, M.; Baskes, M. I.; Melechko, A. V.; Simpson, M. L., Bridge structure
26 for the graphene/Ni (111) system: a first principles study. *Physical Review B* **2008**, *77* (3),
27 035405.
- 28 44. Xu, Z.; Buehler, M. J., Interface structure and mechanics between graphene and metal
29 substrates: a first-principles study. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **2010**, *22* (48), 485301.
- 30 45. Olsen, T.; Yan, J.; Mortensen, J. J.; Thygesen, K. S., Dispersive and covalent interactions
31 between graphene and metal surfaces from the random phase approximation. *Physical review*
32 *letters* **2011**, *107* (15), 156401.
- 33 46. Prendergast, D.; Galli, G., X-Ray Absorption Spectra of Water from First Principles
34 Calculations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2006**, *96* (21), 215502.
- 35 47. Pedio, M.; Giglia, A.; Mahne, N.; Nannarone, S.; Giovannini, S.; Cepek, C.; Boscherini,
36 F.; Carboni, R.; Benfatto, M.; Della Longa, S., C k-edge NEXAFS of 6H-SiC and 3C-SiC
37 systems. *Physica Scripta* **2005**, *2005* (T115), 308.
- 38 48. Banerjee, S.; Hemraj-Benny, T.; Wong, S. S., Covalent surface chemistry of single-
39 walled carbon nanotubes. *Advanced Materials* **2005**, *17* (1), 17-29.
- 40 49. Bell, D. C.; Lemme, M. C.; Stern, L. A.; Williams, J. R.; Marcus, C. M., Precision cutting
41 and patterning of graphene with helium ions. *Nanotechnology* **2009**, *20* (45), 455301.
- 42 50. Campo, E. M.; Larios, E.; Huynh, C.; Ananth, M., Helium ion microscopy of electrospun
43 CNT–polymer composites. *Journal of Materials Research* **2015**, *30* (01), 130-140.
- 44 51. Piancastelli, M. N.; Lindle, D. W.; Ferrett, T. A.; Shirley, D. A., The relationship
45 between shape resonances and bond lengths. *The Journal of chemical physics* **1987**, *86* (5),
46 2765-2771.
- 47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 52. Hitchcock, A. P.; Stöhr, J., K-shell shape resonances and intramolecular bond lengths. Comments on “The relationship between shape resonances and bond lengths”. *The Journal of chemical physics* **1987**, *87* (5), 3253-3255.
- 4
5
6
7 53. Lee, V.; Dennis, R. V.; Schultz, B. J.; Jaye, C.; Fischer, D. A.; Banerjee, S., Soft x-ray absorption spectroscopy studies of the electronic structure recovery of graphene oxide upon chemical defunctionalization. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **2012**, *116* (38), 20591-20599.
- 8
9
10
11 54. Ågren, H.; Vahtras, O.; Carravetta, V., Near-edge core photoabsorption in polyacenes: model molecules for graphite. *Chemical physics* **1995**, *196* (1-2), 47-58.
- 12
13
14 55. Brühwiler, P. A.; Maxwell, A. J.; Puglia, C.; Nilsson, A.; Andersson, S.; Mårtensson, N., π^* and σ^* Excitons in C 1 s Absorption of Graphite. *Physical review letters* **1995**, *74* (4), 614.
- 15
16
17 56. Gui, G.; Li, J.; Zhong, J., Band structure engineering of graphene by strain: first-principles calculations. *Physical Review B* **2008**, *78* (7), 075435.
- 18
19
20 57. Ferralis, N.; Maboudian, R.; Carraro, C., Evidence of structural strain in epitaxial graphene layers on 6H-SiC (0001). *Physical review letters* **2008**, *101* (15), 156801.
- 21
22 58. Chaitoglou, S.; Bertrán, E., Control of the Strain in CVD Grown Graphene Over Copper via the H₂ Flow. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **2016**.
- 23
24 59. He, R.; Zhao, L.; Petrone, N.; Kim, K. S.; Roth, M.; Hone, J.; Kim, P.; Pasupathy, A.; Pinczuk, A., Large physisorption strain in chemical vapor deposition of graphene on copper substrates. *Nano letters* **2012**, *12* (5), 2408-2413.
- 25
26
27 60. Coletti, C.; Riedl, C.; Lee, D. S.; Krauss, B.; Patthey, L.; von Klitzing, K.; Smet, J. H.; Starke, U., Charge neutrality and band-gap tuning of epitaxial graphene on SiC by molecular doping. *Physical Review B* **2010**, *81* (23), 235401.
- 28
29
30 61. Schumann, T.; Dubsclaff, M.; Oliveira Jr, M. H.; Hanke, M.; Lopes, J. M. J.; Riechert, H., Effect of buffer layer coupling on the lattice parameter of epitaxial graphene on SiC (0001). *Physical Review B* **2014**, *90* (4), 041403.
- 31
32
33 62. Aristov, V. Y.; Urbanik, G.; Kummer, K.; Vyalikh, D. V.; Molodtsova, O. V.; Preobrajenski, A. B.; Zakharov, A. A.; Hess, C.; Hänke, T.; Buchner, B., Graphene synthesis on cubic SiC/Si wafers. Perspectives for mass production of graphene-based electronic devices. *Nano letters* **2010**, *10* (3), 992-995.
- 34
35
36
37 63. Kim, K.-j.; Choi, J.; Lee, H.; Lee, H.-K.; Kang, T.-H.; Han, Y.-H.; Lee, B.-C.; Kim, S.; Kim, B., Effects of 1 MeV electron beam irradiation on multilayer graphene grown on 6H-SiC (0001). *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **2008**, *112* (34), 13062-13064.
- 38
39
40
41 64. Kim, K.-j.; Lee, H.; Choi, J.; Lee, H.; Kang, T.; Kim, B.; Kim, S., Temperature dependent structural changes of graphene layers on 6H-SiC (0001) surfaces. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **2008**, *20* (22), 225017.
- 42
43
44

45 **Table of Contents Figure**

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

