Comment on ''Vibrational Recognition of Hydrogen-Bonded Water Networks on a Metal Surface''

Meng *et al.* [1] report *ab initio* total-energy and Meng *et al.* [1] report *ab initio* total-energy and molecular-dynamics calculations for $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3} R30^{\circ}$ adsorption layers of $H_2O/Pt(111)$. Their inference that ''theoretical energetics and vibrational dynamics indicate the existence of a well-ordered molecular bilayer on this surface'' is unpersuasive for several reasons. One is that the reported bilayer binding energy, 534 meV per H_2O excluding zero-point energy [2], is ~ 0.2 eV below the theoretical lattice energy of a water molecule in ice-I*h* [3]. Thus, the bilayer is thermodynamically unstable against forming a three-dimensional ice mound. Another is that both He-atom and electron diffraction have shown that both He-atom and electron diffraction have shown that the wetting layer on Pt(111) has $\sqrt{39} \times \sqrt{39} R$ 16.1[°] periodicity with 32 water molecules per primitive surface riodicity with 32 water molecules per primitive surface
unit cell, not $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3} R30^{\circ}$ periodicity with two [4,5]. The reason is that the Pt-Pt distance is too large compared to the lattice constant of ice. In the *R*16.1[°] superlattice, with \sim 23% more water molecules per unit area lattice, with \sim 23% more water molecules per unit are
than in a $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3} R30^{\circ}$ bilayer, this problem is solved.

an in a $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3} R 30^\circ$ bilayer, this problem is solved.
Figure 1 shows a representative "H-down" [6] $\sqrt{39} \times$
29 pm of the proton of the problem is the projection $\sqrt{39} R16.1^{\circ}$ water adlayer. Note that because of the unit cell's 16.1° rotation, *few O atoms are in atop sites*. Thus, the discussion in Ref. [1] of atop-site bonding is largely beside the point [7]. More important, the adsorption energy of the optimized structure of Fig. 1 is 0.60 eV [8] (using the VASP computer code [9] as in Ref. [1]). Though still ~ 0.1 eV too small to explain why wetting occurs,

FIG. 1. An "H-down" $\sqrt{39} \times \sqrt{39} R16.1$ °water layer on Pt(111) [6]. Top view, with Pt, O, and H atoms shown as gray, white, and black spheres. Dashed line indicates the surface unit cell. Black and white arrows point to H_3O - and OH-like adspecies formed as this structure was optimized.

this energy is 66 meV larger than the result of Meng *et al.*, this energy is 66 mev larger than the result of Meng *et al.*,
implying that the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3} R30^{\circ}$ bilayer in Ref. [1] is far from optimal, even among 2D adsorption structures.

om optimal, even among 2D adsorption structures.
To understand why Pt(111) wets, analysis of the $\sqrt{39} \times$
20 p.16.18 structure is unavaidable. Of sensiderable in $\sqrt{39} R16.1^{\circ}$ structure is unavoidable. Of considerable interest are the energetic significances of local proton disorder in the *R*16.1° water adlayer [10] and of the formation of H_3O - and OH-like surface species. Both are apparent in Fig. 1.

This work was supported by the DOE Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Division of Materials Science and Engineering. SNL is operated by Sandia Corporation, a Lockheed-Martin Company, for the U.S. DOE under Contract No. DE-AC04-94AL85000.

Peter J. Feibelman*

Sandia National Laboratories Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185-1413, USA

Received 5 December 2002; published 29 July 2003 DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.91.059601 PACS numbers: 68.43.Bc, 68.35.–p, 82.30.Rs

*Electronic address: pjfeibe@sandia.gov

- [1] S. Meng *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 176104 (2002).
- [2] Meng *et al.* do not mention zero-point energy. Without including it, I reproduce the energy they report.
- [3] P. J. Feibelman, Science **295**, 99 (2002), Table I.
- [4] A. Glebov *et al.*, J. Chem. Phys. **106**, 9382 (1997).
- [5] S. Haq, J. Harnett, and A. Hodgson, Surf. Sci. **505**, 171 (2002).
- [6] ''H-down'' means that H atoms not participating in H bonds have O atoms above them and Pt's below, as in Ref. [1], Fig. 1(d).
- [7] A similar criticism applies to the effort of H. Ogasawara *et al.*, to deduce water-adlayer structure from x-ray spectroscopic measurements [see Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 276102 (2002)]. These authors appeal to yet another 2/6102 (2002)]. These authors appeal to yet another
first-principles optimization of a $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3} R30^{\circ}$ water layer on Pt(111) adsorption layer data to interpret their spectra.
- [8] The optimization was on a three-layer Pt(111) slab with bottom layer Pt atoms fixed at theoretical bulk Pt-Pt separations. Particulars of the calculation were as in Ref. [1], but for a larger plane wave basis cutoff, 400 eV, and a surface Brillouin zone sample consisting of $\overline{\Gamma}$ only.
- [9] G. Kresse and J. Hafner, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 558 (1993); **49**, 14 251 (1994); G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, Comput. Mater. Sci. **6**, 15 (1996); Phys. Rev. B **54**, 11169 (1996).
- Mater. Sci. **6**, 15 (1996); Phys. Kev. B **54**, 11 lb9 (1996).
[10] The $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3} R30^{\circ}$ bilayer *must* be perfectly proton ordered because there are only two water molecules in its unit cell.