

# The Role of Interfaces and Charge for Chemical Reactivity in Microdroplets

R. Allen LaCour<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Joseph P. Heindel<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Ruoqi Zhao<sup>1,2</sup>, Teresa Head-Gordon<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Kenneth S. Pitzer Theory Center and Department of Chemistry

<sup>2</sup>Chemical Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

<sup>3</sup>Departments of Bioengineering and Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering

University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

corresponding author: thg@berkeley.edu

\*Equal first authors

## Abstract

A wide variety of reactions are reported to be dramatically accelerated in aqueous microdroplets, making them a promising platform for environmentally clean chemical synthesis. However to fully utilize the microdroplets for accelerating chemical reactions requires a fundamental understanding of how microdroplet chemistry differs from that of a homogeneous phase. Here we provide our perspective on recent progress to this end both experimentally and theoretically. We begin by reviewing the many ways in which microdroplets can be prepared, creating water/hydrophobic interfaces which have been frequently implicated in microdroplet reactivity due to preferential surface adsorption of solutes, persistent electric fields, and their acidity or basicity. These features of the interface interplay with specific mechanisms proposed for microdroplet reactivity, including partial solvation and possible gas phase channels. We especially highlight the role of droplet charge, which appears key to understanding how certain reactions, like the formation of hydrogen peroxide and reduced transition metal complexes, are thermodynamically possible in microdroplets. Lastly, we emphasize opportunities for theoretical advances in the microdroplet field generally, and to suggest experiments which would greatly enhance our understanding of this fascinating and emerging subject.

# 1 Introduction

Many organic and redox reactions are reported to occur with much faster kinetics in water microdroplets and oil-water emulsions than in bulk solution. Although “on-water” reactions<sup>1,2</sup> and reactivity in atmospheric aerosols<sup>3,4</sup> have been studied longer and are well-established, the first reports on reactivity in laboratory-prepared aqueous microdroplets appeared only within the past two decades<sup>5-7</sup>. In early studies, which mainly concerned microdroplets prepared through electrospray ionization (ESI)<sup>8,9</sup>, many types of organic reactions were found to be accelerated<sup>6,7,10-19</sup>, indicating that microdroplets may be generally useful vessels for organic synthesis. Subsequently, acceleration was also reported in related interfacial environments, including water-in-oil emulsions<sup>20,21</sup>, thin films<sup>10,22,23</sup>, and levitated droplets<sup>24-29</sup>. Especially interesting is the wide variety of redox chemistry reported to occur in aqueous microdroplets<sup>30-39</sup>, including the reduction of various metals<sup>36,40</sup> and the oxidation of water into hydrogen peroxide<sup>31,41-43</sup>. Intriguingly, many of these reactions are thermodynamically unfavorable in bulk water.


However, explaining the origins of microdroplet reactivity has proven challenging, with the inherent complexity of the multiphase system leading to many plausible mechanisms for rate acceleration<sup>44-54</sup>. Due to the high surface-to-volume ratio of the microdroplets, most might agree that the interface likely plays a key role. Problematically, however, many aspects of water interfaces that are relevant for reactivity, such as their acidity or basicity<sup>55</sup>, have themselves proven challenging to understand<sup>56</sup>. Another important, but perhaps less appreciated, feature of microdroplets is their charge<sup>12,46,53,57</sup>, which is extremely relevant for reaction kinetics and thermodynamics<sup>57,58</sup>. This is an important clue as to what type of microdroplet preparation techniques generate charged or uncharged droplets, and in which of these cases is there observed accelerated reactivity.

Here we provide our perspective and understanding of the underlying reasons for chemical reactivity in microdroplets and related systems like oil-water emulsions. We begin by reviewing the experimental landscape for creating droplets, measuring their reactivity, and provide a brief catalogue of reactions that have been reported to be accelerated in droplets relative to the bulk phase. Next we discuss the current understanding of water/hydrophobic interfaces, highlighting areas of contention that may be relevant for microdroplet reactivity, like the recent attempts to spectroscopically characterize emulsion interfaces<sup>59,60</sup> or test spontaneous formation of hydrogen peroxide<sup>43,61</sup>. We also discuss the selectivity of organic molecules and ions for interfaces, and stress the importance of the strength of interfacial adsorption that dictates the thermodynamics of reactions in uncharged droplets.

We believe it is of primary importance to consider the role of droplet charge, which substantially alters the reaction thermodynamics of microdroplets.<sup>46,57,58</sup> Charge is key for redox reactions in particular, since the presence of both positively and negatively charged droplets likely explains the simultaneous reduction and oxidation potential of microdroplets.<sup>33</sup> Charged microdroplets are often created as a result of contact electrification which distinguishes them from bulk liquids where ionic strength, not excess charge, is the appropriate reaction variable. Finally, we critically assess contributions from other proposed mechanisms, while also highlighting their connections. For example, the presence of electric fields at hydrophobic-water interfaces can be regarded as a unified measure of molecular interactions which provides information about interfacial structure and whether or not a droplet is charged. We conclude our perspective by discussing remaining open questions about microdroplet reactivity, with suggestions for future experimental and theoretical studies that would advance this fascinating subject.

## 2 Preparing Microdroplets and their Reactivity

Figure 1 shows some of the different experimental techniques and conditions used for creating microdroplets. To draw out these distinctions more specifically, we discuss several methods for microdroplet formation as shown in Figure 1: (a) electrospray ionization, (b) gas nebulization, (c) ultrasonic humidification, (d) water condensation from the vapor, (e) deposited droplets, (f) levitated droplets, and (g) oil-water emulsions. We take each of the microdroplet preparations in turn to describe how the technique leads to generation of droplets, and their observed properties, as it is important to connect their features to observed reactive chemistry.



**Figure 1:** *Different ways of producing microdroplets.* (a) electrospray ionization. Adapted from wikipedia (b) gas nebulization. Adapted from reference<sup>62</sup> (c) ultrasound humidification. Adapted from reference<sup>63</sup> (d) water condensation. Adapted from reference<sup>64</sup> (e) deposited droplets. Adapted with permission from ref.<sup>65</sup> (f) Levitated or Leidenfrost droplet. Adapted from reference<sup>26</sup> (g) oil-in-water and water-in-oil emulsions. Adapted with permission from ref.<sup>66</sup>

**Electrospray Ionization.** Most early experiments used variants of electrospray ionization (ESI), in which charged aerosols are produced by applying high voltage to the liquid. These charged microdroplets demonstrate unique chemistry that differs dramatically from the aqueous phase. Examples include the acceleration of many common organic reactions<sup>11,12,15,67</sup>, the acceleration of acid- and base-catalyzed reactions in positively and negatively charged microdroplets, respectively<sup>6</sup>, and the formation of nanoparticles<sup>13</sup>. Bannerjee et al.<sup>9</sup> found the rate of several reactions to increase with applied voltage, highlighting the role of droplet charge. Furthermore, the species responsible for the droplet’s charge, including hydronium in positively charged droplets and hydroxide in negatively charged ones,<sup>9</sup> will be present in excess without counterions (as in the bulk water phase), influencing chemistry. These issues make the droplet surface created by electrospray unrepresentative of generic air-water interfaces<sup>68</sup> and may drive reactions via a pathway independent of the interface.

**Gas Nebulization.** Gas nebulization, in which gas flows into a stream of water to generate a fine mist of droplets, has been used extensively in microdroplet chemistry. The size of the droplets can be loosely controlled by varying the flow rate of the nebulizing gases (Figure 1). Gao et al. used gas nebulization to show that the Dakin and Baeyer-Villiger reactions proceed without the addition

of peroxides, which are necessary catalysts in the bulk aqueous phase.<sup>69</sup> Spontaneous reduction of several organic molecules was found to occur in microdroplets prepared by gas nebulization<sup>70</sup>: pyruvate to lactate, lipoic acid to dihydrolipoic acid, fumarate to succinate, oxaloacetate to malate, and the formation of both pyridyl anions and hydroxypyridine in microdroplets of a water/pyridine mixture.<sup>71</sup> From these observations it is speculated that it is the availability of free electrons and oxidative species such as  $\text{OH}^\bullet$  that can simultaneously reduce and oxidize to create products or to provide the needed hydrogen peroxide catalyst.<sup>70,71</sup> Gas nebulization also creates charged droplets through contact electrification<sup>72,73</sup>, a topic which we discuss in more detail below.

**Ultrasonic Humidification.** In ultrasonic humidification, a mist is created by mechanically vibrating a liquid in the kHz to MHz frequency ranges. The resulting mist contains droplets as small as  $\sim 1 \mu\text{m}$  in diameter. The droplets appear to be charged, with larger and smaller droplets more likely to be positively or negatively charged, respectively<sup>63</sup>. Using ultrasonic humidification, the Mishra lab<sup>42</sup> found spontaneous formation of  $\sim 1 \mu\text{M}$   $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ .

Nguyen and Nguyen argue that ultrasonication results in cavities in the fluid that collapse, releasing energy sufficient to produce reactive species such as  $\text{OH}^\bullet$ ,  $\text{H}^\bullet$ ,  $\text{HO}_2^\bullet$ , which eventually combine to form  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ .<sup>74</sup> Indeed, many highly unfavorable reactions have been observed to occur during cavitation.<sup>75</sup> In support of this argument, Nguyen demonstrated that doping the microdroplets with ions known to prefer the interior of a microdroplet, such as  $\text{SCN}^-$ , quenches  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  formation, as does the addition of HCl. Thus, sonication may also drive reactions via a pathway independent of the air/water interface. Recently, it has been claimed that only water containing dissolved  $\text{O}_2$  using gas nebulization, and subsequent collection of the product at the solid-water interface, forms  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ .<sup>61</sup> These conflicting experimental results indicate the sensitivity of the reactive outcome to details of droplet preparation and collection methods.

**Water Condensation.** Gently heating water at 50-70 °C and condensing the vapor onto a cold surface is likely the most benign way to create microdroplets. Although Lee et al.<sup>41</sup> originally reported that water condensation yielded fairly high concentrations of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  formation, more recent work<sup>42,76</sup> showed no detectable  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ . The lack of measurable reactivity relative to the other droplet methods may be because this method produces droplets larger than  $\approx 1 \mu\text{m}$ , which are known to be less reactive, and because this preparation does not yield charged droplets. Under these conditions, Eatoo and Mishra<sup>61</sup> also showed no  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  formation was detected with NMR.

**Deposited Droplets.** Small water droplets can also be prepared by depositing a small amount of solution onto a surface. Evaporation concentrates the reactants, so simply letting the droplet evaporate is one strategy for accelerating multi-reagent reactions.<sup>10</sup> As an example, Wei et al.<sup>23</sup> found a Claisen-Schmidt synthesis to be accelerated by two orders of magnitude and with much greater yield. Later, they found similar results for reactions involving a sugar and an amine in a thin film.<sup>77</sup> Li et al.<sup>78</sup> investigated the condensation chemistry of pyruvic acid in deposited droplets in a humidity- and temperature-controlled environment. They found that the reaction rate was proportional to the surface-to-volume ratio of the droplets, indicating that the reaction occurs at the air-water interface.

**Levitated Droplets.** Water droplets can be levitated using electric fields, acoustic waves, or the Leidenfrost effect. Doing so provides a convenient platform to study single droplets and their reactivity<sup>29,52</sup>. Like deposited droplets, they are also prone to evaporation if humidity is not controlled. Using acoustic levitation, Crawford et al.<sup>27</sup> found the accelerated degradation of pharmaceuticals. Bain et al.<sup>28</sup> reported the acceleration of many organic synthesis reactions in Leidenfrost droplets. Later, Li et al. examined the Krazynski reaction in Leidenfrost droplets in


great detail, finding that surface-active reagents experienced a greater rate acceleration. Levitated droplets can also acquire a charge, as Abdelaziz et al.<sup>26</sup> found for Leidenfrost droplets. Very recently, levitated droplets of millimeter scale have been manipulated to emit a spray of microdroplets which drive the same reactions found to occur in gas nebulization experiments.<sup>79</sup> This calls into question the recently claimed necessity of solid-liquid interfaces in microdroplet experiments<sup>61</sup> and bolsters the view that charged droplets provide alternative reaction pathways than in the bulk.

**Oil-water emulsions.** All of the above droplet generation techniques create an air-water interface, whereas oil-water emulsions replace the air phase with an oil phase. Oil-water emulsions can be stable for months, providing a key advantage over other microdroplets platforms. They have been shown to accelerate interface-active reactions like imine synthesis.<sup>20</sup> It is well known from electrophoresis experiments that, under an applied electric field, oil droplets move due to the fact that they carry charge, although the origin of this charge is not fully understood. We consider the evidence on whether air-water and oil-water emulsions are to be generically referred to as “hydrophobic-water” interfaces that can be used interchangeably. To this end, while we emphasize their common features, we also note that their dissimilarities can give rise to important differences in interfacial chemical reactivity.

### 3 The Role of the Hydrophobic-Water Interface in Reactivity

#### 3.1 The Structure of Planar Hydrophobic-Water Interfaces

A unifying characteristic of water microdroplets is their large interface. Consequently, many proposed mechanisms for microdroplet reactivity appeal to the properties of the interface. Due to the nanoscopic length scales involved, characterizing the interfaces requires advanced experimental techniques<sup>80</sup>. Sum frequency generation spectroscopy (SFG)<sup>81,82</sup> has proven extremely useful in this regard due to its surface-selective nature<sup>83–88</sup>. Phase-sensitive SFG<sup>89</sup>, which includes heterodyne-detected SFG<sup>90</sup>, offers the key advantage of the sign indicating whether a vibration’s transition dipole points towards the bulk water phase (negative values) or the other phase (positive values). In Figure 2 we show heterodyne-detected SFG spectra collected by Strazdaite et al.<sup>91</sup> under the *ssp*-polarization at (a) D<sub>2</sub>O/air and (b) D<sub>2</sub>O/hexane planar interfaces.



**Figure 2:** *The heterodyne-collected SFG spectra of two planar hydrophobic interfaces. (a) air-water interface and b) an oil-water interface. Adapted from reference<sup>91</sup> with the permission of AIP Publishing.*

Inspection of the D<sub>2</sub>O/air spectra shown in Figure 2a yields several insights. One is the presence of a positive peak around 2700 cm<sup>-1</sup> (3700 cm<sup>-1</sup> in H<sub>2</sub>O), which has been attributed to the presence of nonbonded DH-(OH-) stretches pointing towards the vapor phase<sup>82</sup>. Because they are not participating in hydrogen bonds, they are commonly denoted as “free” or “dangling” stretches. Second is the presence of a broad negative feature around 2500 cm<sup>-1</sup> (3400 cm<sup>-1</sup> in H<sub>2</sub>O). This feature has been attributed to the DH-(OH-) stretches of waters that are still participating in the hydrogen bonding network of water but have been perturbed by the presence of the interface. The negative sign implies that their net transition dipole is oriented towards the bulk phase. While SFG spectra do not show the relative location of these waters at the interface, these can be analyzed by comparison with molecular dynamics (MD) simulations. In agreement with experiment, the simulations reveal that many interfacial waters have a free OH, while waters further in the bulk (by  $\approx 1\text{-}4$  Å) tend to point towards the bulk phase.<sup>88,92</sup> Lastly, we note that a positive feature in the SFG at lower wavelengths (below 2350 cm<sup>-1</sup> in Figure 2a, below 3200 cm<sup>-1</sup> in H<sub>2</sub>O) was later shown to be an experimental artifact.<sup>93,94</sup>


Surprisingly, the SFG spectra obtained for planar water-oil interfaces are quite different than that of the air-water interface, as shown for a water-hexane interface in Figure 2b<sup>91</sup>. There is generally a free OH feature, although it is redshifted by  $\approx 20 - 40$  cm<sup>-1</sup> depending on experiment. This shift has been attributed to interactions between the oil and the water<sup>95,96</sup>, in part because the red shift resembles that for waters in the vicinity of alcohols like butanol<sup>97</sup>. Strikingly, the sign of the hydrogen-bonded OH stretch is now positive, indicating that the net dipole moment in the hydrogen-bound region points away from the bulk water phase, which sharply contrasts with the water-air interface. Similar results were found for other hydrophobic materials<sup>98-101</sup>, indicating that the change in sign may be general, although the shape of the positive region varies somewhat. The hydrogen-bonded region is also more intense, which Strazdaite et al.<sup>102</sup> interpreted to mean the hydrogen bonding network is more ordered than the air-water interface. We return to this interpretation later using other surface-sensitive spectroscopic techniques.

We note that the planar water-oil interface is more challenging to prepare than the planar water-air interface, and thus may be more susceptible to artifacts<sup>59</sup>. Indeed, ostensibly similar systems have yielded different results<sup>82,103,104</sup>, although most recent spectra seem to agree on the shift in the free OH peak and the net dipole of hydrogen-bonded water<sup>91,98-101</sup>. However, the SFG spectra disagree with MD simulations, which show that the net dipole of waters points towards the oil phase<sup>105</sup>, like with the air-water case. This discrepancy may result from ions adsorbed at the interface<sup>98</sup>, as discussed below.

### 3.2 Interfaces of Oil-Water Emulsions

Like other air-water microdroplets, oil-water emulsions (and gas bubbles in water) display accelerated reactivity.<sup>20,21</sup> Oil-water emulsions are examples of electrostatically stabilized droplets, in which the oil (or gas bubbles) carry a net charge that causes the droplets to repel each other, which keeps the emulsion stable by prohibiting their agglomeration into a bulk phase. Figure 3a shows one possible arrangement of charges in and around an oil droplet in water, but the actual identity of charged species is not fully understood in this case, a topic to which we return to below. Figure 3b shows a generic organization of charges and counterions that gives rise to a series of electric potentials at varying distances from the hydrophobic surface that helps explain emulsion stability. The surface potential corresponds to the region within which only one type of ion charge is strongly bound to the

surface. The Stern layer is defined by a region that includes a cloud of ions of the opposite charge and hence measures the potential due to a charge double layer. The theory of electrophoresis<sup>106</sup> states that outside the Stern layer are additional ions that also remain immobilized within the “slip plane” where the electric potential defines the so-called zeta potential, which can be measured via its relationship to droplet mobility when an electric field is applied. For the case of an electric field applied to gas bubbles or oil droplets in water, the droplets migrate towards the positive electrode indicating that they carry a negative charge (Figure 3c). The close similarity between the zeta potentials of gas bubbles and oil droplets also indicates that their interfaces are quite similar<sup>56</sup>.




**Figure 3:** *Molecular view of electrophoresis experiments and the nature of the zeta potential,  $\zeta$ .* (a) One type of ion is strongly bound to the surface and is surrounded by a cloud of counterions, forming a double layer. The Stern layer defines the immobilized double layer of charge; the slip plane is located further away from the interface such that during electrophoresis due to an applied electric field, ions between the slip plane and the droplet travel with the droplet. (b) An illustration of the potential due to the double layer. The  $\zeta$  is the value at the slip plane and is distinct from the Stern and surface potentials. (c) An illustration of electrophoresis; the net charge within the slip plane determines its movement.

Spectroscopic studies of water-oil emulsions have attempted to provide a molecular understanding of the zeta potential and origin of negative charge. With their much greater interfacial area relative to planar interfaces, emulsions have the added benefit of being less susceptible to artifacts arising from surface contaminants.<sup>60,107,108</sup> While interfacial spectroscopic measurements of oil-water emulsions have been dominated by SFG, and much has been learned from these experiments, they have a primary disadvantage that the infrared radiation is inevitably attenuated when going through the

aqueous medium. This affects the spectrum in a frequency-dependent manner<sup>109,110</sup>, making it difficult to isolate the features just due to the interface. In 2024, Shi et al.<sup>60</sup>, utilized the Raman multivariate curve resolution technique (Raman-MCR), originally developed for small solutes<sup>111</sup>, to obtain the solute-correlated Raman spectrum (SCRS) of oil-in-water emulsions as an alternative to sum frequency experiments. Its primary benefits are its ease of interpretation and ability to compare spectroscopic signatures to the bulk water phase.

Figure 4(a,b) compares the vibrational sum frequency scattering (VSFS) of hexadecane droplets in waters by Pullanchery et al.<sup>59</sup> along with the comparison with the SCRS spectrum of the same oil-water emulsion<sup>60</sup>. The VSFS and SCRS spectra are seen to resemble each other in the higher frequency range. Specifically, the free OH peak at 2750 (3700)  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  observed for the air-water interface, or for small hydrophobic solutes, is absent in either spectrum of the emulsion interface. However, in both cases, there is a new shoulder that is a free OH-peak that has been red-shifted due to the interaction with the oil. Interestingly, the lower frequency parts of the VSFS and SCRS spectra differ significantly. In the VSFS spectra, the intensity in this frequency region has increased relative to the water-air interface. In the SCRS spectrum, the opposite has occurred, in that the prominent shoulder at lower frequencies in the spectrum of bulk water has vanished. Considering that the lower frequency shoulder is typically associated with the degree of ordering in the hydrogen bonding network<sup>112–114</sup> (although its specific origin is Fermi Resonance<sup>115,116</sup>), the VSFS and SCRS spectra yield opposite conclusions as to degree of order at the interface. This discrepancy may in part be related to VSFS’s greater sensitivity to water orientation and Raman-MCR’s greater sensitivity to hydrogen bonding strength.



**Figure 4:** *Experimental and simulated spectra of hexadecane in water emulsions.* (a), the vibrational sum frequency scattering frequency spectra for the oil-water emulsion in blue and the spectra of an air-water interface in red. From Reference<sup>59</sup> and reprinted with permission from AAAS. (b) the solute-correlated Raman spectra of the emulsion (blue shading). For comparison, the Raman of pure water (yellow shading) and *tert*-butyl alcohol (dashed red line) are shown. (c) The interfacial spectrum for the AMOEBA model after applying an extra electric field of 92.5 MV/cm to every free OH. Adapted with permission from reference<sup>60</sup>.

The relative simplicity of Raman-MCR also confers the key advantage that one can compute an equivalent spectrum in theoretical simulation. Figure 4c shows the simulated SCRS using the polarizable AMOEBA model in which the lower frequency shoulder’s disappearance in the corresponding experimental spectrum is because of weaker hydrogen bonding at the interface, which



shifts the Fermi peak off-resonance.<sup>60</sup> We also find that the simulated spectra of the red-shifted shoulder at higher frequencies can be reproduced by incorporating an additional electric field of 60-90 MV/cm (depending on water model), which is consistent with a zeta potential of  $\sim$ 40-60 mV.

On a molecular level, the reason why air<sup>117-119</sup> and oil droplets<sup>120,121</sup> dispersed in water have a negative charge and thus migrate towards a positive electrode in an electric field is not fully understood. One possibility is that there are accumulated hydroxide ions bound at the water-oil interface<sup>122</sup>, with a layer of compensating hydronium ions, as the origin of the zeta potential (and depicted in Figure 3a).<sup>20</sup> In contrast, Pullanchery et al.<sup>59</sup>, and others previously,<sup>107,123-125</sup> have proposed that the zeta potential of water emulsions results from charge transfer. In this scenario, many waters on the surface of air-in-water emulsions each transfer a small fraction of their electron density at the edge of the air droplets; in oil-in-water emulsions, the charge is transferred from water molecules to oil molecules. Indeed, an accumulation of charge is observable in MD simulations.<sup>123-125</sup>

However, we find the latter explanation unsatisfactory because it implies an unphysical slip plane. As mentioned above, charges (usually assumed to be ions) on the inner side of the slip plane move with the droplets, while charges on the other side do not. Although an individual water may share a small fraction of its electron density with the droplet, that fraction of electron density is still bound to the water and not the droplet, and thus moves with the water instead of the droplet. The alternative, that small fractions of electron density are bound to the droplet, is distinctly nonphysical because it requires the slip plane to be within individual electrons. And yet the former hypothesis suffers from the disagreement in the experimental literature as to surface acidity or basicity, with more recent studies favoring hydronium, not hydroxide, to be more strongly absorbed at the interface. Finally, some dismiss the idea that there are any inherent molecular interactions involving water and oil, but instead are simply the result of surface impurities. This last argument seems the least satisfying for explaining why enhanced chemical reactivity is observed in oil-water emulsions, given that surface contaminants are greatly reduced with this type of droplet preparation. Additionally, any possible impurity cannot originate in the oil itself since emulsions of air bubbles also accumulate a negative charge.

### 3.3 Interfacial Adsorption of Organic and Ionic Species

In microdroplets, reactions rates and thermodynamics will be strongly influenced by their concentration at the interface. Many reactions reported to be accelerated in microdroplets involve organic reagents and products. Famously, many organic molecules are poorly soluble in water, but they generally adsorb quite strongly to water/hydrophobic interfaces<sup>50,126-128</sup>. For example, a simulation study<sup>129</sup> found that anthracene is roughly 600 times more concentrated at the interface than in bulk water. The preference of organic molecules for the water-hydrophobic interface can be understood as a manifestation of the hydrophobic effect. While organic molecules interact favorably with water molecules, their presence in the bulk phase interferes with the highly favorable interactions between water molecules themselves, and thus they segregate toward the surface. Of course, the degree of surface adsorption varies strongly from molecule to molecule<sup>130</sup>, with soluble molecules having less impetus for the interface.<sup>131</sup> But the Gibb's adsorption isotherm indicates even molecules that are quite soluble in water, like small alcohols and acids<sup>132</sup> also partition to the interface. This behavior is also seen in MD simulations<sup>133,134</sup>. As the alkane chain of simple alcohols grows longer, their interfacial propensity also increases substantially<sup>135</sup>, which can give rise to complex interfaces such

as reverse micelles or lipid bilayers.

The interfacial behavior of ions has also been investigated. Like organic molecules, the degree of surface adsorption is correlated with their solvation energy.<sup>136–138</sup> Early theoretical considerations indicated that they should be repelled from the water-air interface<sup>139,140</sup>. Specifically, charged particles close to the interface between a high-dielectric material (like water) and a low-dielectric material (like a gas or oil phase) are expected to experience an “image charge repulsion” from the interface, where the ion experiences a force as if a like-charged ion were on the opposite side of the interface. In simpler terms, this can be understood by considering the fact that ions have strong, long-ranged interactions with water that are interrupted at the interface. However, both experimental and simulation efforts,<sup>56,138,141–145</sup> indicate that the situation is more complicated. As before, the surface excess of ions can be estimated with the Gibb’s adsorption isotherm<sup>137</sup>, which shows that many salts are indeed repelled from the surface. However, some large singly-charged anions are seen to preferentially adsorb to the interface. But the degree of surface adsorption for such ions is not excessive; for example, low-weight alcohols like methanol, which are not known for their surface propensity, adsorb more strongly than these simple ions according to the Gibb’s adsorption isotherm<sup>135</sup>. We note that the Gibb’s adsorption isotherm only reports on the total excess of ions at the interface. In some case, ions may adsorb strongly at particular interfacial depth but be depleted overall at the interface, leading to a negative surface excess.<sup>146</sup>

Of particular interest are the roles that hydronium, hydroxide, and electrons play in microdroplets, as well as their relative preferences for the hydrophobic-water interface or bulk phase.<sup>147</sup> The influence of the liquid-air interface on the concentration of  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$  and  $\text{OH}^-$  ions remains controversial<sup>56,148</sup>, with different experiments reaching opposite conclusions. One body of evidence comes from oil-in-water emulsions. Their electrophoretic mobility indicates that they carry a negative charge, for pH of 2-4<sup>56,122</sup>. Considering the pH dependence and  $\text{OH}^-$  being the only negative ion in the solution, this indicates that the surface is rich in  $\text{OH}^-$ . Colussi et al.<sup>149</sup> found that trimethylamine only became protonated at  $\text{pH} < 4$  when exposed to the microdroplet surfaces in the gas phase, despite becoming protonated at  $\text{pH} > 4$  when dissolved in the microdroplets, indicating that  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$  only becomes present on the surface at lower pH. However, at lower pH, surface  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$  appears to act like a superacid, protonating even very weak bases<sup>149</sup>. The movement of oil droplets in water towards a positive electrode has historically been attributed to hydroxide adsorbing to the oily interface.<sup>122</sup> This mechanism is consistent with the pH-dependence of the zeta potential<sup>107,120</sup>, whose magnitude is reduced to zero around a pH of 2-4, and the fact that solution pH drops when forming emulsion droplets<sup>130</sup>. Other interfacial behavior also points towards a negatively charged interface.<sup>122,150</sup> Several theoretical explanations exist to justify hydroxide’s propensity for the interface, such as its amphiphilic nature<sup>151</sup> or its reduction of water’s dielectric constant, which decreases dipolar fluctuations<sup>152</sup>.

In contrast, the Gibb’s adsorption isotherm, which is a general method for computing surface excess from surface tension data, indicates that hydroxide is lightly repelled from water-air interfaces.<sup>137</sup> Additionally, SFG spectra suggest that hydronium is more prevalent at the interface, but with the caveat that SFG is more sensitive to acids than bases.<sup>153–160</sup> Furthermore, depending upon the model employed, many MD simulations find that hydronium is at the outermost interface of air-water systems,<sup>48,161</sup> whereas hydroxide has no preferential adsorption to interfaces<sup>48,162–166</sup>, only adsorbs weakly<sup>101,167,168</sup>, or stays just below the hydronium interface to form a double layer<sup>145</sup> or possibly a triple layer<sup>122</sup> that flips the sign of charge again. Other spectroscopic techniques for probing surface concentrations frequently find the surface to be richer in  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$  than in bulk


water but not richer in  $\text{OH}^-$ .<sup>160,169</sup> Together this has been interpreted to mean that  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$  is more surface-active. However, preferential hydronium adsorption at the interface of oil-water emulsions is inconsistent with the zeta potential measurements as patiently pointed out by Beattie and co-workers<sup>122</sup>. To explain these discrepancies, Agmon et al.<sup>56</sup> cite the possibility of differences in the probing depth of spectroscopic techniques, interpretation of experimental quantities like electrokinetic mobility, and the influence of counterions on surface adsorption. Therefore, the molecular origin of the zeta potential remains an unresolved, open question.

Solvated electrons, possibly formed during the preparation of microdroplets, can also significantly influence reactivity. Whether the aqueous electron resides in the bulk or at the air-water interface has been the subject of wide theoretical<sup>170-173</sup> and experimental<sup>174-182</sup> interest. In particular, much effort has gone into determining the vertical binding energy (VBE) of the aqueous electron in water clusters and in bulk using ultrafast UV photoelectron spectroscopy. The VBE of the bulk aqueous electron,  $e_{\text{aq}}^-$ (b), was originally reported to be around 3.3 eV<sup>177</sup>, but has since been corrected to  $3.77 \pm 0.1$  eV after accounting for kinetic energy loss due to inelastic scattering<sup>178,179</sup>. In early experimental work, the extrapolation from very small water clusters<sup>175</sup> to larger clusters<sup>176</sup> suggested that electrons can also bind weakly at the aqueous surface for short times.<sup>177,183</sup> But like the debate on the surface propensity of the molecular hydronium and hydroxide ions, subsequent SFG and charge transfer to solvent (CTTS) experiments are at odds on whether the electron is partially (electron density exposed to the vapor phase) or fully solvated (density stabilized in a cavity) for an extended air-water interface.<sup>184,185</sup> As summarized by Herbert, the theoretical consensus is that most of the electron density is in the aqueous phase.<sup>186</sup> In a recent salvo using electronic absorption spectroscopy, Jordan and co-workers determined that the liberated electron from the surface active phenoxide anion rapidly diffuses into the bulk leaving behind the phenoxide radical at the surface.<sup>182</sup> Overall the observation that the electron is fully solvated is consistent with the known fact that  $e_{\text{aq}}^-$  is the only aqueous anion with a positive entropy of hydration<sup>187</sup>, of  $\Delta S_{\text{hyd}}^\circ = 118 \pm 20$  J/mol/ K<sup>o</sup>. It is also consistent with our recent work showing that hydroxide ions of a microdroplet have a lower vertical ionization energy (VIE) anywhere in the droplet in the presence of excess charge, a process thermodynamically favored by the fully solvated electron.<sup>49</sup>

## 4 The Mechanisms of Microdroplet Reactivity

### 4.1 Overview of Mechanisms

Having discussed different methods of droplet preparation and the properties of hydrophobic interfaces, we next discuss how those features contribute to reactivity in microdroplets. A number of rate-accelerating mechanisms have been proposed, and here we discuss the most prominent. We illustrate them in Figure 5. We first consider mechanisms that assume the mostly idealized situation in which a droplet is uncharged.



**Figure 5:** Possible mechanisms for enhanced droplet reactivity. For uncharged droplets the (a) thermodynamics of enhanced interfacial concentration, (b) partial solvation that favors transition state stabilization (or reactant destabilization), (c) gas phase absorption, and (d) evaporation are all relevant to explain reactivity in microdroplets. Additionally (e) the creation of a net charge through processes such as contact electrification will layer on top of processes (a)-(d). (f) Interfacial electric fields have received a lot of scrutiny but can be understood as a unifying feature across (a)-(e).

**Enhanced Interfacial Concentration.** Increased interfacial concentration is perhaps the most straightforward contribution and hence explanation to accelerated reactivity in microdroplets.<sup>50,51</sup> As described in Section 3, most organic species strongly adsorb to hydrophobic-water interfaces, resulting in a locally enhanced concentration. The higher concentration results in more reagent collisions and accelerated reactivity as per collision rate theory. Importantly, unimolecular reactions will not be accelerated by this mechanism, and indeed, bimolecular reactions appear much more likely to be accelerated in microdroplets.<sup>19,45</sup>

Increased interfacial concentrations can alter equilibrium reactant and product concentrations, due to their well-known dependence on the available volume from statistical thermodynamics. Specifically, if reactant species outnumber product species (or vice-versa), the equilibrium product (reactant) concentration will increase in smaller volumes. The imine synthesis reaction examined by Fallah-Araghi et al.<sup>20,68</sup> provides a lucid example illustrating this model. They examined the bimolecular reaction of an amine and an aldehyde to yield a fluorescent imine in a water-in-oil emulsion. All species had substantial affinities for the interface. Consequently, decreasing microdroplet size increased the equilibrium concentration of the product.

**Partial Solvation.** The concept of partial solvation<sup>44,45</sup> relies on the observation that many reactions are much faster in the gas phase than in the aqueous phase.<sup>188,189</sup> Thus, if the solvation state at the interface is intermediate between the unsolvated gas phase and the fully solvated aqueous phase, the reaction rates will likely lie between the gas phase and aqueous phase values. Discerning stabilization of the transition state in the gas vs. liquid phase<sup>188</sup>, is more challenging. Qiu et al.<sup>45</sup> attributed their observation that only bimolecular reactions are accelerated in microdroplets because these reactions have charge-disperse transition states, which are more stabilized at the interface than in the bulk liquid resulting in a lower barrier. Of course, the acceleration of bimolecular reactions is also expected from an increased interfacial concentration, so it is challenging to distinguish the importance of partial solvation from adsorption thermodynamics. Because it is an atomic-scale mechanism, simulations can help distinguish between different possibilities. To this end, Narendra et al.<sup>190</sup> used ab initio MD simulations to investigate hydrazone formation from phenylhydrazine

and indoline-2,3-dione, finding a reaction path at the interface that had a significantly lower barrier than in the bulk, indicating that partial solvation likely plays a large role in that reaction.


**Gas-Phase Absorption.** Other explanations point to factors beyond the surface properties of the microdroplets. One possibility is that some chemical reactivity is occurring in the gas phase between reactants that have desorbed from the microdroplet surface. Jacobs et. el.<sup>52</sup> investigated the production of sugar phosphates, which is reported to be accelerated in microdroplets, finding that the reaction occurred even when the reactants were in separate solutions, and thus concluded that gas-phase reactivity cannot be neglected. Similar conclusions were drawn by Gallo et al.<sup>191</sup> for a different microdroplet accelerated reaction.

Recent work has also found that surface enhancement and gas-phase channels are kinetically coupled to other reactions occurring in a droplet and that the kinetics of such processes accelerate sigmoidally as droplet size decreases, indicating the importance of the surface.<sup>78,192</sup> It has also been observed that when organic acids are present, formation and desorption of HNO<sub>3</sub> and HCl from the interface contribute to the droplet chemistry by pH modulation.<sup>193</sup> In fact, droplet pH strongly modulates uptake of many gaseous species which can accelerate interfacial reactions. One example is the interplay of O<sub>3</sub> uptake, pH, and iodide oxidation occurring at either the surface or in the bulk of a levitated droplet<sup>194</sup>. Taken together, these studies indicate that gas-phase reactivity can be the dominant contribution to accelerated reactivity in some cases and, through kinetic coupling with gas-phase channels, can accelerate reactions which might otherwise occur slowly.

**Droplet Evaporation.** This raises the possibility that, in general, droplets are evaporating over the course of the experiment, thus concentrating the reactants and accelerating the reaction. While evaporation can certainly occur, it is difficult to ascertain its relevance. In one set of experiments, Lai et al.<sup>195</sup> found that changing the distance that the droplets must travel to the detector had a limited effect on the reaction profile, indicating that limited evaporative concentration of reactants was occurring. On the other hand, when studying a reaction in which the reagents had limited surface propensity, Chen et al.<sup>54</sup> found that solvent evaporation dramatically influenced reaction rate.

## 4.2 Influence of Microdroplet Charge on Enhanced Reactivity.


Many redox reactions have been reported to be greatly accelerated in microdroplets, as summarized in the reviews of Jin et al.<sup>39</sup> and Vannoy et. al.<sup>196</sup> These include the reduction of the pyridyl anion<sup>197</sup>, which is thought to very unstable under normal conditions<sup>198</sup>, and the reduction of various metals<sup>36,40</sup>, yielding the formation of various complexes and even nanomaterials<sup>30</sup>. Many of these reactions are thermodynamically unfavorable in neutral microdroplets. A prominent example is the production of hydrogen peroxide from water:



which has equilibrium constant  $< e^{-40}$ . Nonetheless, a number of research labs<sup>42,43,74</sup> report its formation in aqueous microdroplets, generating much controversy regarding the underlying amount of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and the mechanism by which it happens.<sup>41,42,61,73,76</sup>

Hydrogen peroxide's formation might be justified if it exhibited a large binding affinity to the interface. However, its binding affinity to water-air interfaces is only around -1 kcal/mol<sup>199-201</sup>, so its formation clearly depends on factors beyond the thermodynamics of air-water interfacial absorption.

This point is further demonstrated by the fact that the amount of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  formed in microdroplets varies depending upon how the microdroplets are made. As shown in Figure 6a, Musskopf et. al.<sup>42</sup> found that the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  concentration in microdroplets formed from condensing water vapor depended upon whether the vapor was generated from an ultrasonic humidifier or by gentle heating. Only the droplets generated from the ultrasonic humidifier showed  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  above the detection limits of their analyzer (Figure 6a). Another study found substantially higher concentrations of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  using an ultrasonic mist maker as well<sup>74</sup>.



**Figure 6:** The formation of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  in droplets driven by destabilization of  $\text{OH}^-$  and  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$  by promoting electron transfer with excess charge. (a) hydrogen peroxide generated from condensing water vapor using gentle heating (Heat) compared to using an ultrasonic humidifier (Hum) and then condensed on hydrophobic (Phob) or hydrophilic (Phil) surfaces. Reproduced with permission from<sup>42</sup>. (b) the blue points give the VIE energies for  $\text{OH}^-$ ; the yellow points give the VEA energies for  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ . In the insert we show a proposed mechanism for how charged droplets are formed and for how redox chemistry occurs. Larger volumes of water separate into smaller microdroplets, for which the amount of  $\text{OH}^-$  and  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$  is not evenly divided. Electrons are then destabilized within the negative droplets but stabilized within the positive droplets. Adapted with permission from reference<sup>57</sup>.

How might the observed chemical reactivity of not only  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  but many redox reactions be explained? One immediately relevant and underappreciated property of microdroplets for redox chemistry is their charge. Experimentally, both negatively charged and positively charged droplets are present in water sprays<sup>63,202,203</sup>. The ESI experiment itself, for which the largest rate accelerations have been reported<sup>16,19</sup>, relies directly on the production of highly charged droplets<sup>9</sup>. Furthermore, droplets can acquire charge in other situations, and it even appears that producing uncharged water microdroplets is the exception. For example, water streams are known to spontaneously acquire charge<sup>204</sup>. Various levitated droplets<sup>26,205</sup> spontaneously acquire a charge, and sonication and even pipetting are both capable of producing a charged droplet<sup>206,207</sup>. Evidence in favor for the importance of charge is the lack of reactivity in droplets prepared by heating and cooling, as seen in Figure 6a, which are thought to have minimal charge. Likewise, Banerjee et al.<sup>12</sup> found that increasing microdroplet charge resulted in greater reactivity.

Certainly charged droplets substantially alter the thermodynamics of redox reactions relative

to neutral droplets. Colussi has made the claim that both hydroxide and hydronium ions are preferentially solvated at the surface of sprayed (i.e. charged) droplets, and that they have a dramatically lower hydration enthalpy that explains the observation of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  formation.<sup>58</sup> This work simply assumes surface activity of  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$  and  $\text{OH}^-$  and estimates the enthalpy of this surface state from gas phase thermodynamic tables.<sup>58</sup> However, the proposed mechanism is invalidated by our recent work based on quantitative simulations and theory using a thermodynamic cycle for nanodroplets with net charge.<sup>57</sup> We find that the ion spatial distribution in net charged environments is weakly perturbed with respect to the ion distribution when a droplet has just one charge, and furthermore is not a surface effect.<sup>57</sup> By computing the vertical ionization energies (VIEs) of hydroxide and vertical electron affinities (VEAs) of hydronium in nanodroplets that have an excess amount of hydroxide and hydronium, the VIEs and VEAs shift substantially.<sup>57</sup> The magnitude of the shift closely matches an unscreened Coloumb's law between like-charged ions as shown in Figure 6b. This observation and the computed hydration enthalpies of each ion provide a direct connection to the reaction thermodynamics explaining how solvated electrons and hydroxyl radicals can be produced spontaneously in sprayed droplets. Furthermore, the excess droplet charge that is needed for favorable thermodynamics is well below the Rayleigh limit. Finally, using scaling arguments to reach the micron scale, the thermodynamics only become more favorable for a particular fraction of the Rayleigh limit. It stands to reason that other unfavorable redox reactions may also become favorable under such conditions.

As with gas bubbles and oil emulsions in water, the fundamental origin behind the charging of air-water droplets and oil-water emulsions is unclear. It is likely related to contact electrification<sup>73,208</sup>, which refers to the generic observation that charge can be exchanged between two materials in contact, leaving both with a net charge.<sup>72,209,210</sup> While CE has been observed to occur in all combinations of gas, liquid, and solid contacts<sup>72</sup>, the most relevant types of CE for microdroplet reactivity are gas-liquid, liquid-liquid, and liquid-solid. Unfortunately, the theory of CE remains incomplete and poorly understood especially when liquids are involved.<sup>72,211</sup> Nonetheless, recent work studying sonication of water in contact with fluorinated ethylene propylene (FEP) found that  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  is generated by two pathways.<sup>212</sup> The first involves the reduction of  $\text{O}_2$  to  $\text{O}_2^{\bullet-}$  by electron transfer from either FEP or  $\text{OH}^-$ . The second involves oxidation of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  to  $\text{H}_2\text{O}^+$  which immediately decays to  $\text{OH}^\bullet$  or direct oxidation of  $\text{OH}^-$  to  $\text{OH}^\bullet$ . This type of process is referred to as contact-electro-catalysis<sup>213</sup> because it produces  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  via an oxidative and reductive pathway such that the FEP surface acts as both a source and sink of electrons.

Analogously, charge-stabilized oil-water emulsions can be seen to arise from liquid-liquid CE where sonication plays the role of repeatedly driving the contact between the oil and water. In the aforementioned study, the charges are electrons originating from the solid or liquid<sup>212</sup>, while in the case of an oil-water emulsion it is believed that the surface charges are molecular ions, usually identified as  $\text{OH}^-$ .<sup>122</sup> There is also direct evidence of the CE process between a gas and levitated liquid droplet in which the levitated droplet accumulates a positive charge.<sup>205</sup> This is interpreted to mean that electrons are transferred from the droplet to gas molecules.

Droplet charges can impact reactivity in other ways as well. For clarity, we note that the pH is defined as the logarithm of the activity of  $\text{H}^+$ , so the pH at the interface necessarily equals the value in bulk<sup>214</sup>. Nonetheless, the concentration of  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$  or  $\text{OH}^-$  may be enriched at the surface such that the water interface has been called both a "superacid"<sup>149,215</sup>, and a "superbase"<sup>149,216,217</sup>. Consequently, while uncharged planar air-water interfaces may not behave like superacids or superbases, the interfaces of charged microdroplets might. Enhanced reactivity has also been


reported in water emulsions. Specifically, hydrogen peroxide may form spontaneously in water droplets dispersed in another phase<sup>218</sup>, and the droplets may be generally useful for electrochemical reactions<sup>21</sup>. Considering that emulsion droplets also carry a charge, their enhanced reactivity may have a common origin to that of aerial microdroplets. At the same time, oil-water emulsion droplets all have the same charge whereas aerial droplets can have either sign of charge. Thus, reactivity in emulsions may be limited to certain types of redox reactions compared to aerial microdroplets prepared by ESI or gas nebulization. In either case there is enhanced redox reactivity in droplet preparations that create charged droplets relative to neutral droplets.

### 4.3 Interfacial Electric Fields

Like electrostatic preorganization known to occur in enzymes<sup>219-222</sup>, microdroplets also have an organized water structure at their interfaces. that depends on how the droplet is prepared (charged or uncharged), what type of water interface is formed (air, oils, or solid surfaces), and what types of surface sensitive adsorbants accumulate at the interface. Thus measured electric fields can be regarded as a unified and quantitative gauge of how these many molecular interactions integrate at formed water interfaces as demonstrated in Figure 7a.<sup>221,223</sup> There are net field strengths of 10 to 100 MV/cm that arise from intermolecular interactions at the molecular surfaces, as well as much larger fields originating from the large potential gradients inside the electron density of molecules<sup>224,225</sup>. We are typically interested in the former for understanding chemical reactivity since reactant molecules cannot overlap strongly with the internal electron density of other molecules. Mechanistically, if the electric field is parallel to a reaction coordinate axis, the electric field will promote ionization along the bond<sup>226</sup> and consequently reduce the energy required for the bond to break. Thus, electric fields have been put forth as an explanation for a wide array of accelerated reactions in enzymes<sup>227</sup>, synthetic catalysts<sup>228,229</sup>, electrocatalytic surfaces<sup>221</sup>, and most recently for microdroplet chemistry.<sup>48</sup>

Water, with its large dipole moment, generates large electric fields. While molecules in bulk water can experience large fields of around 100 - 300 MV/cm<sup>230</sup>, rotational averaging creates fields that are very short-ranged and short-lived such that projections along reacting bonds are largely very rare events. However at the interfaces formed by water the reactant molecules can experience electric fields that are more persistent both in direction and in time. Hence there is great interest in estimating the surface field strengths experienced by reactant solutes that might drive chemical reactivity. In 2020, Xiong et. al.<sup>47</sup> used the rhodamine 800 probe to image the electric field at the surface of a water-in-oil emulsion using stimulated Raman excited fluorescence (SREF) (Figure 7b). They found that the frequency of the probe’s nitrile group, which is sensitive and calibrated to the local electric field, was shifted at the interface by  $5\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , which corresponds to a field strength of  $\approx 10\text{ MV/cm}$  (Figure 7c). Likewise, Hao et al.<sup>48</sup> examined the cumulative charge density, surface potential, and electric fields for a water nanodroplet, quantities experienced by the OH vibrational stretches at the interface relative to bulk (Figure 7d). They found that the mean electric field at the interface is close to  $\approx 10\text{ MV/cm}$ , in agreement with the SREF experiment. This average electric field value is likely too small to drive chemical reactions even with perfect alignment along a breaking bond, which requires at least another order of magnitude in field strength. But the soft interface can fluctuate to create a Lorentzian spread of field values that would certainly be large enough to influence reactivity with reasonably high probability as seen in Figure 7e.<sup>48,226,231</sup>





**Figure 7:** Electric fields measured at water interfaces. (a) Stimulated Raman excited fluorescence (SREF) imaging of water microdroplets in oil. (b), the frequency of the nitrile stretch of rhodamine 800 at the interface of a water-in-oil emulsion and in the bulk. (c) cumulative charge density as simulated with a reactive force, ReaxFF/C-GeM<sup>232</sup>, for the air-water interface of nanodroplets showing fluctuations over the nm lengthscale. (d) Lorentzian distribution of electric fields evaluated at the air-water interface using ReaxFF/C-GeM. Adapted with permission from references<sup>47,48</sup>.

The presence of net charge of an air/water droplet or oil-water emulsion can lead to a greater surface potential and electric field, but also manifests as electric fields that are longer-ranged and extend over the entirety of the microdroplet as shown by Chamberlayne and Zare.<sup>46</sup> Microdroplets in emulsion systems also carry a charge, which can increase the strength of electric fields for these hydrophobic-water interfacial systems as well. In a well-cited study, the surface charge density (which must be sufficient to stabilize the emulsion) is obtained by measuring the size of the emulsion droplets by electroacoustics and the quantity of NaOH required to keep the pH constant during homogenization.<sup>130</sup> Hence, the measured pH of the solution drops so that the surface charge density of negative ions can be measured by titration.<sup>130,233</sup> For hexadecane, the net surface charge density is approximately  $-4.6 \mu\text{C}/\text{cm}^{-2}$  at neutral pH. Application of Gauss' law for a 125 nm droplet using this experimentally derived charge density estimate yields an electric field of  $\approx 55 \text{ MV}/\text{cm}$  at the surface of oil-water emulsions. In the SCRS spectra described in Section 2<sup>60</sup>, we estimated the electric field at the interface due to the zeta potential in an oil-in-water emulsion to be around 40-90 MV/cm, which is substantially larger than the values reported at uncharged interfaces. We thus suspect that fields that arise due to microdroplet charge play a more important role in accelerating microdroplet chemistry than the fields inherent to uncharged water interfaces.

## 5 Conclusions

Water microdroplets show promise in enabling a diverse array of reactions, many of which are quite unfavorable in a homogeneous phase, and providing a "clean" synthesis platform that is being explored for the ability to extend them to the industrial scale. To achieve this requires that we confront the complexity of aqueous microdroplets, which is underscored by deficiencies in our understanding of water/hydrophobic interfaces in general. In this perspective we have reviewed this understanding, emphasizing insights from recent work while also highlighting areas of disagreement.

One aspect of microdroplets that we are confident is relevant for their reactivity is their charge. Recent work of ours and others demonstrates that charge can dramatically change the reaction thermodynamics, making unfavorable reactions favorable, although further work is needed to establish the origin of the charge. Therefore, experiments able to explicitly connect the zeta potential and interfacial electric fields to specific molecular species will be tremendously insightful. Additionally, both experimental and theoretical insights into the mechanisms of contact electrification at liquid-gas, liquid-liquid, and liquid-solid interfaces are needed to tell the complete story of microdroplet reactivity. To this end, UV-vis spectroscopy of oil-water emulsions could help elucidate the presence or absence of radical anions produced by sonication since hemi-bonded systems tend to have intense UV-vis absorption bands between 200-400nm. The importance of contact electrification for microdroplet reactivity is that the kinetic energy of molecules is transformed into large charge separations. In this sense, contact electrification can be thought of as the original source of energy which is used to drive the myriad reactions we have discussed above. Therefore, elucidating the mechanisms of contact electrification involving liquids is critical for designing efficient reactions in charged microdroplets.

Throughout this perspective, we have argued that there are fundamental similarities between sprayed microdroplets and oil-water emulsions. This argument has been made on the grounds that each system has regions of net-negative and net-positive charge and these charged regions should alter the thermodynamics of chemical reactions in fundamentally similar ways. For these reasons,

we also expect that there are both experimental and theoretical connections to be made between microdroplet chemistry and the chemistry which occurs at electrochemical interfaces.<sup>46,221</sup>

It should also be emphasized that theoretical models such as Gouy-Chapman<sup>234,235</sup> or theory for dielectric saturation<sup>236–239</sup> starts with the assumption of system neutrality that is violated by the preparations that create charged droplets, preparations that exhibit the greatest level of rate accelerations. Reformed theoretical models of this kind would allow the effect of excess charge on thermodynamics and electronic structure to be studied routinely while also providing insights into ion distribution in charged systems. Additionally, hydroxyl radicals are centrally important in many reactions which occur in aqueous microdroplets, but there are few reactive models of  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ ,  $\text{OH}^-$ , and relevant radical species, that are currently available.<sup>240,241</sup> Microdroplets are thus an excellent motivation for the development of new reactive force fields.<sup>242</sup>

We have summarized the diverse and fascinating chemistry which occurs in microdroplets and the mechanisms by which these reactions are thought to occur. In neutral systems, we believe that a complex combination of interfacial electric fields, partial solvation, gas-phase absorption, and concentration enhancements are all mechanistically relevant. Many of the most interesting applications of microdroplets involve accelerating redox chemistry. For such reactions, we argue that excess charge is the key variable. This excess charge can be dispersed throughout the system, as with sprayed droplets, or concentrated in a specific region as with the electric double layer stabilizing oil-water emulsions.

## Acknowledgments

We thank the Air Force Office of Scientific Research through the Multidisciplinary University Research Initiative (MURI) program under AFOSR Award No. FA9550-21-1-0170 for the microdroplet chemistry application. We also thank the CPIMS program, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Chemical Sciences Division of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC02-05CH11231 for the Raman monomer-field theory. We thank the National Science Foundation under Grant CHE-2313791 for the reactive force field used in modeling microdroplets.

## Author contributions

J.H., R.A.L. and T.H-G. conceived the theme and wrote the manuscript, and all authors contributed to all insights through extensive discussion.

## Competing interests

All authors declare no competing interests.

## References

- (1) Sridhar Narayan, John Muldoon, MG Finn, Valery V Fokin, Hartmuth C Kolb, and K Barry Sharpless. “on water”: unique reactivity of organic compounds in aqueous suspension. *Angewandte Chemie*, 117(21):3339–3343, 2005.

- (2) Arani Chanda and Valery V Fokin. Organic synthesis “on water”. *Chemical Reviews*, 109(2): 725–748, 2009.
- (3) TE Graedel and CJ Weschler. Chemistry within aqueous atmospheric aerosols and raindrops. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 19(4):505–539, 1981.
- (4) K. A. Prather, C. D. Hatch, and V. H. Grassian. Analysis of atmospheric aerosols. *Annu Rev Anal Chem (Palo Alto Calif)*, 1:485–514, 2008. ISSN 1936-1327. doi: 10.1146/annurev.anchem.1.031207.113030.
- (5) Shinichi Enami, MR Hoffmann, and AJ Colussi. Acidity enhances the formation of a persistent ozonide at aqueous ascorbate/ozone gas interfaces. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(21):7365–7369, 2008.
- (6) Marion Girod, Encarnacion Moyano, Dahlia I Campbell, and R Graham Cooks. Accelerated bimolecular reactions in microdroplets studied by desorption electrospray ionization mass spectrometry. *Chemical Science*, 2(3):501–510, 2011.
- (7) Richard H Perry, Maurizio Splendore, Allis Chien, Nick K Davis, and Richard N Zare. Detecting reaction intermediates in liquids on the millisecond time scale using desorption electrospray ionization. *Angewandte Chemie*, 123(1):264–268, 2011.
- (8) John B Fenn, Matthias Mann, Chin Kai Meng, Shek Fu Wong, and Craig M Whitehouse. Electrospray ionization for mass spectrometry of large biomolecules. *Science*, 246(4926): 64–71, 1989.
- (9) Shibdas Banerjee and Shyamalava Mazumdar. Electrospray ionization mass spectrometry: a technique to access the information beyond the molecular weight of the analyte. *International Journal of Analytical Chemistry*, 2012, 2012.
- (10) Abraham K Badu-Tawiah, Dahlia I Campbell, and R Graham Cooks. Accelerated c–n bond formation in dropcast thin films on ambient surfaces. *Journal of the American Society for Mass Spectrometry*, 23(9):1461–1468, 2012.
- (11) Thomas Müller, Abraham Badu-Tawiah, and R Graham Cooks. Accelerated carbon-carbon bond-forming reactions in preparative electrospray. *Angewandte Chemie Int. Ed.*, 47(51): 11832–11835, 2012.
- (12) Shibdas Banerjee and Richard N Zare. Syntheses of isoquinoline and substituted quinolines in charged microdroplets. *Angewandte Chemie*, 127(49):15008–15012, 2015.
- (13) Anyin Li, Qingjie Luo, So-Jung Park, and R Graham Cooks. Synthesis and catalytic reactions of nanoparticles formed by electrospray ionization of coinage metals. *Angewandte Chemie Int. Ed.*, 53(12):3147–3150, 2014.
- (14) Jae Kyoo Lee, Samuel Kim, Hong Gil Nam, and Richard N Zare. Microdroplet fusion mass spectrometry for fast reaction kinetics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(13):3898–3903, 2015.

- (15) Inho Nam, Jae Kyoo Lee, Hong Gil Nam, and Richard N Zare. Abiotic production of sugar phosphates and uridine ribonucleoside in aqueous microdroplets. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(47):12396–12400, 2017.
- (16) Shibdas Banerjee, Elumalai Gnanamani, Xin Yan, and Richard N Zare. Can all bulk-phase reactions be accelerated in microdroplets? *Analyst*, 142(9):1399–1402, 2017.
- (17) Xin Yan. Emerging microdroplet chemistry for synthesis and analysis. *International Journal of Mass Spectrometry*, 468:116639, 2021.
- (18) Jae Kyoo Lee, Shibdas Banerjee, Hong Gil Nam, and Richard N Zare. Acceleration of reaction in charged microdroplets. *Quarterly Reviews of Biophysics*, 48(4):437–444, 2015.
- (19) Zhenwei Wei, Yangjie Li, R Graham Cooks, and Xin Yan. Accelerated reaction kinetics in microdroplets: Overview and recent developments. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry*, 71:31–51, 2020.
- (20) Ali Fallah-Araghi, Kamel Meguellati, Jean-Christophe Baret, Abdeslam El Harrak, Thomas Mangeat, Martin Karplus, Sylvain Ladame, Carlos M. Marques, and Andrew D. Griffiths. Enhanced chemical synthesis at soft interfaces: A universal reaction-adsorption mechanism in microcompartments. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 112:028301, 2014.
- (21) Yan B Vogel, Cameron W Evans, Mattia Belotti, Longkun Xu, Isabella C Russell, Li-Juan Yu, Alfred KK Fung, Nicholas S Hill, Nadim Darwish, Vinicius R Gonçalves, Michelle L. Coote, K. Swaminathan, Iyer, and Simone Ciampi. The corona of a surface bubble promotes electrochemical reactions. *Nature Communications*, 11(1):6323, 2020.
- (22) Xin Yan, Rodinei Augusti, Xin Li, and R Graham Cooks. Chemical reactivity assessment using reactive paper spray ionization mass spectrometry: the katritzky reaction. *ChemPlusChem*, 78(9):1142–1148, 2013.
- (23) Zhenwei Wei, Michael Wlekinski, Christina Ferreira, and R Graham Cooks. Reaction acceleration in thin films with continuous product deposition for organic synthesis. *Angewandte Chemie*, 129(32):9514–9518, 2017.
- (24) Yangjie Li, Yong Liu, Hong Gao, Roy Helmy, W Peter Wuelfing, Christopher J Welch, and R Graham Cooks. Accelerated forced degradation of pharmaceuticals in levitated microdroplet reactors. *Chemistry—A European Journal*, 24(29):7349–7353, 2018.
- (25) Yangjie Li, Tsdale F Mehari, Zhenwei Wei, Yong Liu, and R Graham Cooks. Reaction acceleration at air-solution interfaces: Anisotropic rate constants for katritzky transamination. *Journal of Mass Spectrometry*, 56(4):e4585, 2021.
- (26) Ramzy Abdelaziz, Duygu Disci-Zayed, Mehdi Keshavarz Hedayati, Jan-Hendrik Pöhls, Ahnaf Usman Zillohu, Burak Erkartal, Venkata Sai Kiran Chakravadhanula, Viola Duppel, Lorenz Kienle, and Mady Elbahri. Green chemistry and nanofabrication in a levitated leidenfrost drop. *Nature Communications*, 4(1):2400, 2013.

- (27) Elizabeth A Crawford, Cemal Esen, and Dietrich A Volmer. Real time monitoring of containerless microreactions in acoustically levitated droplets via ambient ionization mass spectrometry. *Analytical chemistry*, 88(17):8396–8403, 2016.
- (28) Ryan M Bain, Christopher J Pulliam, Fabien Thery, and R Graham Cooks. Accelerated chemical reactions and organic synthesis in leidenfrost droplets. *Angewandte Chemie Int. Ed.*, 55(35):10478–10482, 2016.
- (29) Michael I Jacobs, James F Davies, Lance Lee, Ryan D Davis, Frances Houle, and Kevin R Wilson. Exploring chemistry in microcompartments using guided droplet collisions in a branched quadrupole trap coupled to a single droplet, paper spray mass spectrometer. *Analytical chemistry*, 89(22):12511–12519, 2017.
- (30) Jae Kyoo Lee, Devleena Samanta, Hong Gil Nam, and Richard N Zare. Spontaneous formation of gold nanostructures in aqueous microdroplets. *Nature Communications*, 9(1):1562, 2018.
- (31) Jae Kyoo Lee, Devleena Samanta, Hong Gil Nam, and Richard N Zare. Micrometer-sized water droplets induce spontaneous reduction. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 141(27):10585–10589, 2019.
- (32) Chu Gong, Danyang Li, Xilai Li, Dongmei Zhang, Dong Xing, Lingling Zhao, Xu Yuan, and Xinxing Zhang. Spontaneous reduction-induced degradation of viologen compounds in water microdroplets and its inhibition by host–guest complexation. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 144(8):3510–3516, 2022.
- (33) Lingqi Qiu and R Graham Cooks. Simultaneous and spontaneous oxidation and reduction in microdroplets by the water radical cation/anion pair. *Angewandte Chemie*, 134(41):e202210765, 2022.
- (34) Xiaowei Song, Yifan Meng, and Richard N Zare. Spraying water microdroplets containing 1, 2, 3-triazole converts carbon dioxide into formic acid. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 144(37):16744–16748, 2022.
- (35) Huan Chen, Ruijing Wang, Jinheng Xu, Xu Yuan, Dongmei Zhang, Zhaoguo Zhu, Mary Marshall, Kit Bowen, and Xinxing Zhang. Spontaneous reduction by one electron on water microdroplets facilitates direct carboxylation with  $\text{CO}_2$ . *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 145(4):2647–2652, 2023.
- (36) Xu Yuan, Dongmei Zhang, Chiyu Liang, and Xinxing Zhang. Spontaneous reduction of transition metal ions by one electron in water microdroplets and the atmospheric implications. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 145(5):2800–2805, 2023.
- (37) Dong Xing, Xu Yuan, Chiyu Liang, Tianyun Jin, Shuquan Zhang, and Xinxing Zhang. Spontaneous oxidation of  $\text{I}^-$  in water microdroplets and its atmospheric implications. *Chemical Communications*, 58(89):12447–12450, 2022.

- (38) Dongmei Zhang, Xu Yuan, Chu Gong, and Xinxing Zhang. High electric field on water microdroplets catalyzes spontaneous and ultrafast oxidative c-h/n-h cross-coupling. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 144(35):16184–16190, 2022.
- (39) Shuihui Jin, Huan Chen, Xu Yuan, Dong Xing, Ruijing Wang, Lingling Zhao, Dongmei Zhang, Chu Gong, Chenghui Zhu, Xufeng Gao, et al. The spontaneous electron-mediated redox processes on sprayed water microdroplets. *JACS Au*, 3(6):1563–1571, 2023.
- (40) Qian He, Ningxin Zhang, Yifan Qiao, Chenchen Li, and Jing Zhang. Vapor generation of mercury and methylmercury in aqueous microdroplets produced by pneumatic nebulization. *Journal of Analytical Atomic Spectrometry*, 37(9):1894–1901, 2022.
- (41) Jae Kyoo Lee, Hyun Soo Han, Settasit Chaikasetsin, Daniel P Marron, Robert M Waymouth, Fritz B Prinz, and Richard N Zare. Condensing water vapor to droplets generates hydrogen peroxide. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(49):30934–30941, 2020.
- (42) Nayara H Musskopf, Adair Gallo Jr, Peng Zhang, Jeferson Petry, and Himanshu Mishra. The air–water interface of water microdroplets formed by ultrasonication or condensation does not produce h<sub>2</sub>o<sub>2</sub>. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 12(46):11422–11429, 2021.
- (43) Masoud A Mehrgardi, Mohammad Mofidfar, and Richard N Zare. Sprayed water microdroplets are able to generate hydrogen peroxide spontaneously. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 144(17):7606–7609, 2022.
- (44) Xin Yan, Ryan M Bain, and R Graham Cooks. Organic reactions in microdroplets: Reaction acceleration revealed by mass spectrometry. *Angewandte Chemie Int. Ed.*, 55(42):12960–12972, 2016.
- (45) Lingqi Qiu, Zhenwei Wei, Honggang Nie, and R Graham Cooks. Reaction acceleration promoted by partial solvation at the gas/solution interface. *ChemPlusChem*, 86(10):1362–1365, 2021.
- (46) Christian F Chamberlayne and Richard N Zare. Simple model for the electric field and spatial distribution of ions in a microdroplet. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 152(18), 2020.
- (47) Hanqing Xiong, Jae Kyoo Lee, Richard N Zare, and Wei Min. Strong electric field observed at the interface of aqueous microdroplets. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 11(17):7423–7428, 2020.
- (48) Hongxia Hao, Itai Leven, and Teresa Head-Gordon. Can electric fields drive chemistry for an aqueous microdroplet? *Nature Communications*, 13(1):280, 2022.
- (49) Joseph P Heindel, Hongxia Hao, R Allen LaCour, and Teresa Head-Gordon. Spontaneous formation of hydrogen peroxide in water microdroplets. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 13(43):10035–10041, 2022.
- (50) Hanqing Xiong, Jae Kyoo Lee, Richard N Zare, and Wei Min. Strong concentration enhancement of molecules at the interface of aqueous microdroplets. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 124(44):9938–9944, 2020.

- (51) Manuel F Ruiz-López and Marilia TC Martins-Costa. Disentangling reaction rate acceleration in microdroplets. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 24(48):29700–29704, 2022.
- (52) Michael I Jacobs, Ryan D Davis, Rebecca J Rapf, and Kevin R Wilson. Studying chemistry in micro-compartments by separating droplet generation from ionization. *Journal of the American Society for Mass Spectrometry*, 30(2):339–343, 2018.
- (53) Grazia Rovelli, Michael I Jacobs, Megan D Willis, Rebecca J Rapf, Alexander M Prophet, and Kevin R Wilson. A critical analysis of electrospray techniques for the determination of accelerated rates and mechanisms of chemical reactions in droplets. *Chemical Science*, 11(48):13026–13043, 2020.
- (54) Casey J Chen and Evan R Williams. The role of analyte concentration in accelerated reaction rates in evaporating droplets. *Chemical Science*, 14(18):4704–4713, 2023.
- (55) Ralf Zimmermann, Uwe Freudenberg, Rüdiger Schweiß, David Küttner, and Carsten Werner. Hydroxide and hydronium ion adsorption—a survey. *Current Opinion in Colloid & Interface Science*, 15(3):196–202, 2010.
- (56) Noam Agmon, Huib J Bakker, R Kramer Campen, Richard H Henchman, Peter Pohl, Sylvie Roke, Martin Thamer, and Ali Hassanali. Protons and hydroxide ions in aqueous systems. *Chemical Reviews*, 116(13):7642–7672, 2016.
- (57) Joseph P Heindel, R Allen LaCour, and Teresa Head-Gordon. The role of charge in microdroplet redox chemistry. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):3670, 2024.
- (58) Agustín J Colussi. Mechanism of hydrogen peroxide formation on sprayed water microdroplets. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 145(30):16315–16317, 2023.
- (59) Saranya Pullanchery, Sergey Kulik, Benjamin Rehl, Ali Hassanali, and Sylvie Roke. Charge transfer across c–h...o hydrogen bonds stabilizes oil droplets in water. *Science*, 374(6573):1366–1370, 2021.
- (60) Lixue Shi, R Allen LaCour, Xiaoqi Lang, Joseph P Heindel, Teresa Head-Gordon, and Wei Min. Water structure and electric fields at the interface of oil droplets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.02207*, 2024.
- (61) Muzzamil Ahmad Eatoo and Himanshu Mishra. Busting the myth of spontaneous formation of h<sub>2</sub> o<sub>2</sub> at the air–water interface: contributions of the liquid–solid interface and dissolved oxygen exposed. *Chemical Science*, 2024.
- (62) Masoud A. Mehrgardi, Mohammad Mofidfar, Jia Li, Christian F. Chamberlayne, Stephen R. Lynch, and Richard N. Zare. Catalyst-free transformation of carbon dioxide to small organic compounds in water microdroplets nebulized by different gases. *Advanced Science*, 11(38):2406785, 2024. ISSN 2198-3844. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/advs.202406785>. URL <https://doi.org/10.1002/advs.202406785>.
- (63) Shiquan Lin, Leo NY Cao, Zhen Tang, and Zhong Lin Wang. Size-dependent charge transfer between water microdroplets. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(31):e2307977120, 2023.



- (64) Jae Kyoo Lee, Hyun Soo Han, Settasit Chaikasetsin, Daniel P Marron, Robert M Waymouth, Fritz B Prinz, and Richard N Zare. Condensing water vapor to droplets generates hydrogen peroxide. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(49):30934–30941, 2020.
- (65) Liying Liu, Shuangfeng Wang, Xinjuan Zeng, Pihui Pi, and Xiufang Wen. Dropwise condensation by nanoengineered surfaces: Design, mechanism, and enhancing strategies. *Advanced Materials Interfaces*, 8(24):2101603, 2021. ISSN 2196-7350. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/admi.202101603>. URL <https://doi.org/10.1002/admi.202101603>.
- (66) Anali Sawant, Seema Kamath, Hemanth Kg, and Girish Pai Kulyadi. Solid-in-oil-in-water emulsion: An innovative paradigm to improve drug stability and biological activity. *AAPS PharmSciTech*, 22(5):199, 2021. ISSN 1530-9932. doi: 10.1208/s12249-021-02074-y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1208/s12249-021-02074-y>.
- (67) Inho Nam, Hong Gil Nam, and Richard N Zare. Abiotic synthesis of purine and pyrimidine ribonucleosides in aqueous microdroplets. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(1):36–40, 2018.
- (68) Kevin R Wilson, Alexander M Prophet, Grazia Rovelli, Megan D Willis, Rebecca J Rapf, and Michael I Jacobs. A kinetic description of how interfaces accelerate reactions in micro-compartments. *Chemical Science*, 11(32):8533–8545, 2020.
- (69) Dan Gao, Feng Jin, Jae Kyoo Lee, and Richard N. Zare. Aqueous microdroplets containing only ketones or aldehydes undergo dakin and baeyer–villiger reactions. *Chemical Science*, 10(48):10974–10978, 2019.
- (70) Jae Kyoo Lee, Devleena Samanta, Hong Gil Nam, and Richard N Zare. Micrometer-sized water droplets induce spontaneous reduction. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 141(27):10585–10589, 2019.
- (71) Lingling Zhao, Xiaowei Song, Chu Gong, Dongmei Zhang, Ruijing Wang, Richard N. Zare, and Xinxing Zhang. Sprayed water microdroplets containing dissolved pyridine spontaneously generate pyridyl anions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(12):e2200991119, 2022.
- (72) Zhong Lin Wang and Aurelia Chi Wang. On the origin of contact-electrification. *Materials Today*, 30:34–51, 2019.
- (73) Bolei Chen, Yu Xia, Rongxiang He, Hongqian Sang, Wenchang Zhang, Juan Li, Lufeng Chen, Pu Wang, Shishang Guo, Yongguang Yin, et al. Water–solid contact electrification causes hydrogen peroxide production from hydroxyl radical recombination in sprayed microdroplets. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(32):e2209056119, 2022.
- (74) Duy Nguyen and Son C Nguyen. Revisiting the effect of the air–water interface of ultrasonically atomized water microdroplets on h<sub>2</sub>o<sub>2</sub> formation. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 126(16):3180–3185, 2022.
- (75) Kenneth S Suslick and David J Flannigan. Inside a collapsing bubble: sonoluminescence and the conditions during cavitation. *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, 59:659–683, 2008.

- (76) Adair Gallo Jr, Nayara H Musskopf, Xinlei Liu, Ziqiang Yang, Jeferson Petry, Peng Zhang, Sigurdur Thoroddsen, Hong Im, and Himanshu Mishra. On the formation of hydrogen peroxide in water microdroplets. *Chemical Science*, 13(9):2574–2583, 2022.
- (77) Zhenwei Wei, Xiaochao Zhang, Jinyu Wang, Sichun Zhang, Xinrong Zhang, and R Graham Cooks. High yield accelerated reactions in nonvolatile microthin films: chemical derivatization for analysis of single-cell intracellular fluid. *Chemical Science*, 9(40):7779–7786, 2018.
- (78) Meng Li, Christian Boothby, Robert E Continetti, and Vicki H Grassian. Size-dependent sigmoidal reaction kinetics for pyruvic acid condensation at the air–water interface in aqueous microdroplets. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 145(41):22317–22321, 2023.
- (79) Xiaoxu Li, Xianyu Nong, Chenghui Zhu, Xufeng Gao, Huan Chen, Xu Yuan, Dong Xing, Lu Liu, Chiyu Liang, Duyang Zang, et al. Atomization by acoustic levitation facilitates contactless microdroplet reactions. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 2024.
- (80) Shane W Devlin, Franky Bernal, Erika J. Riffe, Kevin R. Wilson, and Richard J. Saykally. Spiers memorial lecture: Water at interfaces. *Faraday Discussions*, 249(0):9–37, 2024.
- (81) Q Du, R Superfine, E Freysz, and YR Shen. Vibrational spectroscopy of water at the vapor/water interface. *Physical Review Letters*, 70(15):2313, 1993.
- (82) Quan Du, Eric Freysz, and Y Ron Shen. Surface vibrational spectroscopic studies of hydrogen bonding and hydrophobicity. *Science*, 264(5160):826–828, 1994.
- (83) PB Miranda and YR Shen. Liquid interfaces: A study by sum-frequency vibrational spectroscopy, 1999.
- (84) Angela Perry, Christine Neipert, Brian Space, and Preston B Moore. Theoretical modeling of interface specific vibrational spectroscopy: Methods and applications to aqueous interfaces. *Chemical Reviews*, 106(4):1234–1258, 2006.
- (85) Akihiro Morita and Tatsuya Ishiyama. Recent progress in theoretical analysis of vibrational sum frequency generation spectroscopy. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 10(38):5801–5816, 2008.
- (86) Tatsuya Ishiyama, Takako Imamura, and Akihiro Morita. Theoretical studies of structures and vibrational sum frequency generation spectra at aqueous interfaces. *Chemical Reviews*, 114(17):8447–8470, 2014.
- (87) CS Tian and YR Shen. Recent progress on sum-frequency spectroscopy. *Surface Science Reports*, 69(2-3):105–131, 2014.
- (88) Fujie Tang, Tatsuhiko Ohto, Shumei Sun, Jeremy R Rouxel, Sho Imoto, Ellen HG Backus, Shaul Mukamel, Mischa Bonn, and Yuki Nagata. Molecular structure and modeling of water–air and ice–air interfaces monitored by sum-frequency generation. *Chemical Reviews*, 120(8):3633–3667, 2020.

- (89) N Ji, V Ostroverkhov, CS Tian, and YR Shen. Characterization of vibrational resonances of water-vapor interfaces by phase-sensitive sum-frequency spectroscopy. *Physical Review Letters*, 100(9):096102, 2008.
- (90) Satoshi Nihonyanagi, Shoichi Yamaguchi, and Tahei Tahara. Direct evidence for orientational flip-flop of water molecules at charged interfaces: A heterodyne-detected vibrational sum frequency generation study. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 130(20), 2009.
- (91) Simona Strazdaite, Jan Versluis, and Huib J Bakker. Water orientation at hydrophobic interfaces. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 143(8), 2015.
- (92) Simone Pezzotti, Daria Ruth Galimberti, and Marie-Pierre Gaigeot. 2d h-bond network as the topmost skin to the air–water interface. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 8(13):3133–3141, 2017.
- (93) Shoichi Yamaguchi. Development of single-channel heterodyne-detected sum frequency generation spectroscopy and its application to the water/vapor interface. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 143(3), 2015.
- (94) Satoshi Nihonyanagi, Ryoji Kusaka, Ken-ichi Inoue, Aniruddha Adhikari, Shoichi Yamaguchi, and Tahei Tahara. Accurate determination of complex  $\chi$  (2) spectrum of the air/water interface. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 143(12), 2015.
- (95) LF Scatena, MG Brown, and GL Richmond. Water at hydrophobic surfaces: weak hydrogen bonding and strong orientation effects. *Science*, 292(5518):908–912, 2001.
- (96) GL Richmond. Structure and bonding of molecules at aqueous surfaces. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry*, 52(1):357–389, 2001.
- (97) PN Perera, KR Fega, C Lawrence, EJ Sundstrom, J Tomlinson-Phillips, and Dor Ben-Amotz. Observation of water dangling oh bonds around dissolved nonpolar groups. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(30):12230–12234, 2009.
- (98) CS Tian and YR Shen. Structure and charging of hydrophobic material/water interfaces studied by phase-sensitive sum-frequency vibrational spectroscopy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(36):15148–15153, 2009.
- (99) Alex GF de Beer, Yixing Chen, Rudiger Scheu, John C Conboy, and Sylvie Roke. Analysis of complex spectra using fourier filtering. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, 117(50):26582–26587, 2013.
- (100) Stephanie E Sanders and Poul B Petersen. Heterodyne-detected sum frequency generation of water at surfaces with varying hydrophobicity. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 150(20), 2019.
- (101) Shanshan Yang, Mohan Chen, Yudan Su, Jianhang Xu, Xifan Wu, and Chuanshan Tian. Stabilization of hydroxide ions at the interface of a hydrophobic monolayer on water via reduced proton transfer. *Physical Review Letters*, 125(15):156803, 2020.

- (102) Simona Strazdaite, Jan Versluis, Ellen HG Backus, and Huib J Bakker. Enhanced ordering of water at hydrophobic surfaces. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 140(5), 2014.
- (103) DE Gragson and GL Richmond. Comparisons of the structure of water at neat oil/water and air/water interfaces as determined by vibrational sum frequency generation. *Langmuir*, 13(18):4804–4806, 1997.
- (104) FG Moore and GL Richmond. Integration or segregation: How do molecules behave at oil/water interfaces? *Accounts of chemical research*, 41(6):739–748, 2008.
- (105) HongYan Xiao, Zhen Zhen, HuanQuan Sun, XuLong Cao, ZhenQuan Li, XinWang Song, XiaoHong Cui, and XinHou Liu. Molecular dynamics study of the water/n-alkane interface. *Science China Chemistry*, 53:945–949, 2010.
- (106) John L Anderson. Colloid transport by interfacial forces. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*, 21(1):61–99, 1989.
- (107) S Pullanchery, S Kulik, Halil I Okur, HB De Aguiar, and S Roke. On the stability and necessary electrophoretic mobility of bare oil nanodroplets in water. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 152(24), 2020.
- (108) Andrew P Carpenter, Emma Tran, Rebecca M Altman, and Geraldine L Richmond. Formation and surface-stabilizing contributions to bare nanoemulsions created with negligible surface charge. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(19):9214–9219, 2019.
- (109) Sergey Kulik, Saranya Pullanchery, and Sylvie Roke. Vibrational sum frequency scattering in absorptive media: A theoretical case study of nano-objects in water. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, 124(42):23078–23085, 2020.
- (110) Andrew P Carpenter, Marc J Foster, Konnor K Jones, and Geraldine L Richmond. Effects of salt-induced charge screening on aot adsorption to the planar and nanoemulsion oil–water interfaces. *Langmuir*, 37(29):8658–8666, 2021.
- (111) Pradeep Perera, Melanie Wyche, Yvette Loethen, and Dor Ben-Amotz. Solute-induced perturbations of solvent-shell molecules observed using multivariate raman curve resolution. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 130(14):4576–4577, 2008.
- (112) GE Walrafen, MR Fisher, MS Hokmabadi, and W-H Yang. Temperature dependence of the low-and high-frequency raman scattering from liquid water. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 85(12):6970–6982, 1986.
- (113) Qiang Sun. Local statistical interpretation for water structure. *Chemical Physics Letters*, 568:90–94, 2013.
- (114) Shannon R Pattenaude, Louis M Streacker, and Dor Ben-Amotz. Temperature and polarization dependent raman spectra of liquid h<sub>2</sub>o and d<sub>2</sub>o. *Journal of Raman Spectroscopy*, 49(11): 1860–1866, 2018.

- (115) Kelly M Hunter, Farnaz A Shakib, and Francesco Paesani. Disentangling coupling effects in the infrared spectra of liquid water. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 122(47):10754–10761, 2018.
- (116) R Allen LaCour, Joseph P Heindel, and Teresa Head-Gordon. Predicting the raman spectra of liquid water with a monomer-field model. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 14(51):11742–11749, 2023.
- (117) G v Quincke. Ueber die fortführung materieller theilchen durch strömende elektricität. *Annalen der Physik*, 189(8):513–598, 1861.
- (118) HA McTaggart. Xxxiii. the electrification at liquid-gas surfaces. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, 27(158):297–314, 1914.
- (119) A Graciaa, G Morel, P Saulner, J Lachaise, and RS Schechter. The  $\zeta$ -potential of gas bubbles. *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science*, 172(1):131–136, 1995.
- (120) JC Carruthers. The electrophoresis of certain hydrocarbons and their simple derivatives as a function of p h. *Transactions of the Faraday Society*, 34:300–307, 1938.
- (121) KG Marinova, RG Alargova, ND Denkov, OD Velez, DN Petsev, IB Ivanov, and RP Borwankar. Charging of oil- water interfaces due to spontaneous adsorption of hydroxyl ions. *Langmuir*, 12(8):2045–2051, 1996.
- (122) James K Beattie, Alex M Djerdjev, and Gregory G Warr. The surface of neat water is basic. *Faraday Discussions*, 141:31–39, 2009.
- (123) Robert Vácha, Steven W Rick, Pavel Jungwirth, Alex GF de Beer, Hilton B de Aguiar, Jean-Sebastien Samson, and Sylvie Roke. The orientation and charge of water at the hydrophobic oil droplet–water interface. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 133(26):10204–10210, 2011.
- (124) Robert Vacha, Ondrej Marsalek, Adam P Willard, Douwe Jan Bonthuis, Roland R Netz, and Pavel Jungwirth. Charge transfer between water molecules as the possible origin of the observed charging at the surface of pure water. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 3(1):107–111, 2012.
- (125) Emiliano Poli, Kwang H Jong, and Ali Hassanali. Charge transfer as a ubiquitous mechanism in determining the negative charge at hydrophobic interfaces. *Nature Communications*, 11(1):901, 2020.
- (126) Christine M Roth, Kai-Uwe Goss, and René P Schwarzenbach. Adsorption of a diverse set of organic vapors on the bulk water surface. *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science*, 252(1):21–30, 2002.
- (127) DJ Donaldson and Veronica Vaida. The influence of organic films at the air- aqueous boundary on atmospheric processes. *Chemical Reviews*, 106(4):1445–1461, 2006.

- (128) Amélie C Lemay, Ethan J Sontarp, Daniela Martinez, Philip Maruri, Raneem Mohammed, Ryan Neapole, Morgan Wiese, Jennifer AR Willemsen, and Ian C Bourg. Molecular dynamics simulation prediction of the partitioning constants of 82 legacy and emerging organic contaminants at the water–air interface. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 57(15):6296–6308, 2023.
- (129) Robert Vácha, Pavel Jungwirth, Jing Chen, and Kalliat Valsaraj. Adsorption of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons at the air–water interface: Molecular dynamics simulations and experimental atmospheric observations. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 8(38):4461–4467, 2006.
- (130) James K Beattie and Alex M Djerdjev. The pristine oil/water interface: Surfactant-free hydroxide-charged emulsions. *Angewandte Chemie Int. Ed.*, 43(27):3568–3571, 2004.
- (131) John Tasman Davies. *Interfacial phenomena*. Elsevier, 2012.
- (132) DJ Donaldson and Darren Anderson. Adsorption of atmospheric gases at the air- water interface. 2. c1- c4 alcohols, acids, and acetone. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 103(7):871–876, 1999.
- (133) Jochen S Hub, Carl Caleman, and David van der Spoel. Organic molecules on the surface of water droplets—an energetic perspective. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 14(27):9537–9545, 2012.
- (134) David van der Spoel, Erik JW Wensink, and Alex C Hoffmann. Lifting a wet glass from a table: A microscopic picture. *Langmuir*, 22(13):5666–5672, 2006.
- (135) Gonzalo Vazquez, Estrella Alvarez, and Jose M Navaza. Surface tension of alcohol water+ water from 20 to 50. degree. c. *Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data*, 40(3):611–614, 1995.
- (136) Michael J Hey, David W Shield, Janet M Speight, and Malcolm C Will. Surface tensions of aqueous solutions of some 1: 1 electrolytes. *Journal of the Chemical Society, Faraday Transactions 1: Physical Chemistry in Condensed Phases*, 77(1):123–128, 1981.
- (137) Peter K Weissenborn and Robert J Pugh. Surface tension of aqueous solutions of electrolytes: relationship with ion hydration, oxygen solubility, and bubble coalescence. *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science*, 184(2):550–563, 1996.
- (138) Delfi Bastos-González, Leonor Pérez-Fuentes, Carlos Drummond, and Jordi Faraudo. Ions at interfaces: the central role of hydration and hydrophobicity. *Current Opinion in Colloid & Interface Science*, 23:19–28, 2016.
- (139) CARL Wagner. Die oberflächenspannung verdünnter elektrolytlösungen. *Phys. Z*, 25:474–477, 1924.
- (140) Lars Onsager and Nicholas NT Samaras. The surface tension of debye-hückel electrolytes. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 2(8):528–536, 1934.

- (141) Pavel Jungwirth and Douglas J Tobias. Ions at the air/water interface. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 106(25):6361–6373, 2002.
- (142) Poul B Petersen and Richard J Saykally. On the nature of ions at the liquid water surface. *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, 57:333–364, 2006.
- (143) Pavel Jungwirth and Bernd Winter. Ions at aqueous interfaces: From water surface to hydrated proteins. *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, 59:343–366, 2008.
- (144) Douglas J Tobias, Abraham C Stern, Marcel D Baer, Yan Levin, and Christopher J Mundy. Simulation and theory of ions at atmospherically relevant aqueous liquid-air interfaces. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry*, 64:339–359, 2013.
- (145) Yair Litman, Kuo-Yang Chiang, Takakazu Seki, Yuki Nagata, and Mischa Bonn. Surface stratification determines the interfacial water structure of simple electrolyte solutions. *Nature Chemistry*, 16(4):644–650, 2024.
- (146) Pavel Jungwirth and Douglas J Tobias. Molecular structure of salt solutions: a new view of the interface with implications for heterogeneous atmospheric chemistry. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 105(43):10468–10472, 2001.
- (147) Richard J. Saykally. Two sides of the acid–base story. *Nature Chemistry*, 5(2):82–84, 2013.
- (148) Manuel F Ruiz-Lopez, Joseph S Francisco, Marilia TC Martins-Costa, and Josep M Anglada. Molecular reactions at aqueous interfaces. *Nature Reviews Chemistry*, 4(9):459–475, 2020.
- (149) Agustín J Colussi, Shinichi Enami, and Shinnosuke Ishizuka. Hydronium ion acidity above and below the interface of aqueous microdroplets. *ACS Earth and Space Chemistry*, 5(9):2341–2346, 2021.
- (150) Himanshu Mishra, Shinichi Enami, Robert J. Nielsen, Logan A. Stewart, Michael R. Hoffmann, William A. Goddard, and Agustin J. Colussi. Bronsted basicity of the air-water interface. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 109(46):18679–18683, 2012.
- (151) Konstantin N Kudin and Roberto Car. Why are water- hydrophobic interfaces charged? *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 130(12):3915–3919, 2008.
- (152) Angus Gray-Weale and James K Beattie. An explanation for the charge on water’s surface. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 11(46):10994–11005, 2009.
- (153) C Radüge, V Pflumio, and YR Shen. Surface vibrational spectroscopy of sulfuric acid-water mixtures at the liquid-vapor interface. *Chemical Physics Letters*, 274(1-3):140–144, 1997.
- (154) Steve Baldelli, Cheryl Schnitzer, Mary Jane Shultz, and DJ Campbell. Sum frequency generation investigation of water at the surface of h<sub>2</sub>o/h<sub>2</sub>so<sub>4</sub> binary systems. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 101(49):10435–10441, 1997.

- (155) Teresa L Tarbuck, Stephanie T Ota, and Geraldine L Richmond. Spectroscopic studies of solvated hydrogen and hydroxide ions at aqueous surfaces. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 128(45):14519–14527, 2006.
- (156) Lori M Levering, M Roxana Sierra-Hernandez, and Heather C Allen. Observation of hydronium ions at the air- aqueous acid interface: vibrational spectroscopic studies of aqueous hcl, hbr, and hi. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, 111(25):8814–8826, 2007.
- (157) Chuanshan Tian, Na Ji, Glenn A Waychunas, and Y Ron Shen. Interfacial structures of acidic and basic aqueous solutions. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 130(39): 13033–13039, 2008.
- (158) Sudipta Das, Sho Imoto, Shumei Sun, Yuki Nagata, Ellen HG Backus, and Mischa Bonn. Nature of excess hydrated proton at the water–air interface. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 142(2):945–952, 2019.
- (159) Sanghamitra Sengupta, Daniel R Moberg, Francesco Paesani, and Eric Tyrode. Neat water–vapor interface: Proton continuum and the nonresonant background. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 9(23):6744–6749, 2018.
- (160) Sudipta Das, Mischa Bonn, and Ellen HG Backus. The surface activity of the hydrated proton is substantially higher than that of the hydroxide ion. *Angewandte Chemie Int. Ed.*, 58(44):15636–15639, 2019.
- (161) Victoria Buch, Anne Milet, Robert Vácha, Pavel Jungwirth, and J. Paul Devlin. Water surface is acidic. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(18):7342–7347, 2007.
- (162) Martin Mucha, Tomaso Frigato, Lori M Levering, Heather C Allen, Douglas J Tobias, Liem X Dang, and Pavel Jungwirth. Unified molecular picture of the surfaces of aqueous acid, base, and salt solutions. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 109(16):7617–7623, 2005.
- (163) Collin D Wick and Liem X Dang. Investigating hydroxide anion interfacial activity by classical and multistate empirical valence bond molecular dynamics simulations. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 113(22):6356–6364, 2009.
- (164) Ying-Lung Steve Tse, Chen Chen, Gerrick E Lindberg, Revati Kumar, and Gregory A Voth. Propensity of hydrated excess protons and hydroxide anions for the air–water interface. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 137(39):12610–12616, 2015.
- (165) Jochen S Hub, Maarten G Wolf, Carl Caleman, Paul J van Maaren, Gerrit Groenhof, and David van der Spoel. Thermodynamics of hydronium and hydroxide surface solvation. *Chemical Science*, 5(5):1745–1749, 2014.
- (166) Miguel de la Puente and Damien Laage. How the acidity of water droplets and films is controlled by the air–water interface. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 145(46): 25186–25194, 2023.
- (167) Christopher J Mundy, I-Feng W Kuo, Mark E Tuckerman, Hee-Seung Lee, and Douglas J Tobias. Hydroxide anion at the air–water interface. *Chemical Physics Letters*, 481(1-3):2–8, 2009.



- (168) Chen Bai and Judith Herzfeld. Surface propensities of the self-ions of water. *ACS Central Science*, 2(4):225–231, 2016.
- (169) Zhefu Li, Chenghan Li, Zhi Wang, and Gregory A Voth. What coordinate best describes the affinity of the hydrated excess proton for the air–water interface? *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 124(24):5039–5046, 2020.
- (170) John M Herbert and Martin Head-Gordon. First-principles, quantum-mechanical simulations of electron solvation by a water cluster. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 103(39):14282–14287, 2006.
- (171) Thomas Sommerfeld, Albert DeFusco, and Kenneth D Jordan. Model potential approaches for describing the interaction of excess electrons with water clusters: Incorporation of long-range correlation effects. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 112(44):11021–11035, 2008.
- (172) Leif D Jacobson and John M Herbert. A one-electron model for the aqueous electron that includes many-body electron-water polarization: Bulk equilibrium structure, vertical electron binding energy, and optical absorption spectrum. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 133(15):154506, 2010.
- (173) Ross E. Larsen, William J. Glover, and Benjamin J. Schwartz. Does the hydrated electron occupy a cavity? *Science*, 329(5987):65–69, 2010.
- (174) John Wilson Boag and Edwin J Hart. Absorption spectra in irradiated water and some solutions. part i. absorption spectra of 'hydrated' electron. *Nature*, 197, 1963.
- (175) Nathan I. Hammer, Joong-Won Shin, Jeffrey M. Headrick, Eric G. Diken, Joseph R. Roscioli, Gary H. Weddle, and Mark A. Johnson. How do small water clusters bind an excess electron? *Science*, 306(5696):675–679, 2004.
- (176) J. R. Verlet, A. E. Bragg, A. Kammrath, O. Cheshnovsky, and D. M. Neumark. Observation of large water-cluster anions with surface-bound excess electrons. *Science*, 307(5706):93–6, 2005.
- (177) Katrin R Siefermann, Yaxing Liu, Evgeny Lugovoy, Oliver Link, Manfred Faubel, Udo Buck, Bernd Winter, and Bernd Abel. Binding energies, lifetimes and implications of bulk and interface solvated electrons in water. *Nature Chem.*, 2(4):274–279, 2010.
- (178) David Luckhaus, Yo-ichi Yamamoto, Toshinori Suzuki, and Ruth Signorell. Genuine binding energy of the hydrated electron. *Sci. Adv.*, 3(4):e1603224, 2017.
- (179) Junichi Nishitani, Yo-ichi Yamamoto, Christopher W West, Shutaro Karashima, and Toshinori Suzuki. Binding energy of solvated electrons and retrieval of true uv photoelectron spectra of liquids. *Sci. Adv.*, 5(8):eaaw6896, 2019.
- (180) Daniel T. Elg, Hernan E. Delgado, Daniel C. Martin, R. Mohan Sankaran, Paul Rumbach, David M. Bartels, and David B. Go. Recent advances in understanding the role of solvated electrons at the plasma-liquid interface of solution-based gas discharges. *Spectrochimica Acta Part B: Atomic Spectroscopy*, 186:106307, 2021.

- (181) Arturo Sopena Moros, Shuai Li, Kai Li, Gilles Doumy, Stephen H. Southworth, Christopher Otolowski, Richard D. Schaller, Yoshiaki Kumagai, Jan-Erik Rubensson, Marc Simon, Georgi Dakovski, Kristjan Kunnus, Joseph S. Robinson, Christina Y. Hampton, David J. Hoffman, Jake Koralek, Zhi-Heng Loh, Robin Santra, Ludger Inhester, and Linda Young. Tracking cavity formation in electron solvation: Insights from x-ray spectroscopy and theory. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 146(5):3262–3269, 2024.
- (182) Caleb J. C. Jordan, Marc P. Coons, John M. Herbert, and Jan R. R. Verlet. Spectroscopy and dynamics of the hydrated electron at the water/air interface. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):182, 2024.
- (183) Ryan M. Young and Daniel M. Neumark. Dynamics of solvated electrons in clusters. *Chemical Reviews*, 112(11):5553–5577, 2012.
- (184) Korenobu Matsuzaki, Ryoji Kusaka, Satoshi Nihonyanagi, Shoichi Yamaguchi, Takashi Nagata, and Tahei Tahara. Partially hydrated electrons at the air/water interface observed by uv-excited time-resolved heterodyne-detected vibrational sum frequency generation spectroscopy. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 138(24):7551–7557, 2016.
- (185) Paweł J. Nowakowski, David A. Woods, and Jan R. R. Verlet. Charge transfer to solvent dynamics at the ambient water/air interface. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 7(20):4079–4085, 2016.
- (186) John M. Herbert and Marc P. Coons. The hydrated electron. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry*, 68:447–472, 2017.
- (187) P Han and David M Bartels. Reevaluation of arrhenius parameters for hydrogen atom+ hydroxide. *Journal of Physical Chemistry*, 94(18):7294–7299, 1990.
- (188) William N Olmstead and John I Brauman. Gas-phase nucleophilic displacement reactions. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 99(13):4219–4228, 1977.
- (189) Jayaraman Chandrasekhar, Scott F Smith, and William L Jorgensen. Sn2 reaction profiles in the gas phase and aqueous solution. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 106(10):3049–3050, 1984.
- (190) Namita Narendra, Xingshuo Chen, Jinying Wang, James Charles, R Graham Cooks, and Tillmann Kubis. Quantum mechanical modeling of reaction rate acceleration in microdroplets. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 124(24):4984–4989, 2020.
- (191) Adair Gallo, Andreia SF Farinha, Miguel Dinis, Abdul-Hamid Emwas, Adriano Santana, Robert J Nielsen, William A Goddard, and Himanshu Mishra. The chemical reactions in electrosprays of water do not always correspond to those at the pristine air–water interface. *Chemical Science*, 10(9):2566–2577, 2019.
- (192) Meng Li, Shu Yang, Meenal Rathi, Satish Kumar, Cari S Dutcher, and Vicki H Grassian. Enhanced condensation kinetics in aqueous microdroplets driven by coupled surface reactions and gas-phase partitioning. *Chemical Science*, 15(33):13429–13441, 2024.

- (193) Kyle J Angle and Vicki H Grassian. Direct quantification of changes in pH within single levitated microdroplets and the kinetics of nitrate and chloride depletion. *Chemical science*, 14(23):6259–6268, 2023.
- (194) Alexander M Prophet, Kritanjan Polley, Emily K Brown, David T Limmer, and Kevin R Wilson. Distinguishing surface and bulk reactivity: Concentration-dependent kinetics of iodide oxidation by ozone in microdroplets. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 2024.
- (195) Yin-Hung Lai, Shyam Sathyamoorthi, Ryan M Bain, and Richard N Zare. Microdroplets accelerate ring opening of epoxides. *Journal of The American Society for Mass Spectrometry*, 29(5):1036–1043, 2018.
- (196) Kathryn J Vannoy, Myles Quinn Edwards, Christophe Renault, and Jeffrey E Dick. An electrochemical perspective on reaction acceleration in droplets. *Annual Review of Analytical Chemistry*, 17, 2024.
- (197) Lingling Zhao, Xiaowei Song, Chu Gong, Dongmei Zhang, Ruijing Wang, Richard N Zare, and Xinxing Zhang. Sprayed water microdroplets containing dissolved pyridine spontaneously generate pyridyl anions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(12):e2200991119, 2022.
- (198) I Nenner and GJ Schulz. Temporary negative ions and electron affinities of benzene and n-heterocyclic molecules: pyridine, pyridazine, pyrimidine, pyrazine, and s-triazine. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 62(5):1747–1758, 1975.
- (199) Robert Vacha, Petr Slavicek, Martin Mucha, Barbara J Finlayson-Pitts, and Pavel Jungwirth. Adsorption of atmospherically relevant gases at the air/water interface: Free energy profiles of aqueous solvation of N<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub>, OH, H<sub>2</sub>O, HO<sub>2</sub>, and H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 108(52):11573–11579, 2004.
- (200) Marilia TC Martins-Costa and Manuel F Ruiz-López. Reaching multi-nanosecond timescales in combined qm/mm molecular dynamics simulations through parallel horsetail sampling. *Journal of Computational Chemistry*, 38(10):659–668, 2017.
- (201) D James Donaldson. Experimental confirmation of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> adsorption at the water–air interface. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 126(33):5647–5653, 2022.
- (202) Joshua T Maze, Thaddeus C Jones, and Martin F Jarrold. Negative droplets from positive electrospray. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 110(46):12607–12612, 2006.
- (203) Lloyd W Zilch, Joshua T Maze, John W Smith, George E Ewing, and Martin F Jarrold. Charge separation in the aerodynamic breakup of micrometer-sized water droplets. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 112(51):13352–13363, 2008.
- (204) Michael Faraday. Iii. experimental researches in electricity.—eighteenth series. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, (133):17–32, 1843.
- (205) Fan Wang, Peng Yang, Xinglin Tao, Yuxiang Shi, Shuyao Li, Zhaoqi Liu, Xiangyu Chen, and Zhong Lin Wang. Study of contact electrification at liquid-gas interface. *ACS nano*, 15(11):18206–18213, 2021.

- (206) Dongwhi Choi, Horim Lee, Do Jin Im, In Seok Kang, Geunbae Lim, Dong Sung Kim, and Kwan Hyoungh Kang. Spontaneous electrical charging of droplets by conventional pipetting. *Scientific Reports*, 3(1):2037, 2013.
- (207) Jamilya Nauruzbayeva, Zhonghao Sun, Adair Gallo Jr, Mahmoud Ibrahim, J Carlos Santamarina, and Himanshu Mishra. Electrification at water–hydrophobe interfaces. *Nature Communications*, 11(1):5285, 2020.
- (208) Kathryn J Vannoy and Jeffrey E Dick. The pluses and minuses of microdroplet separation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(37):e2311576120, 2023.
- (209) J Lowell and AC Rose-Innes. Contact electrification. *Advances in Physics*, 29(6):947–1023, 1980.
- (210) Cheng Xu, Yunlong Zi, Aurelia Chi Wang, Haiyang Zou, Yejing Dai, Xu He, Peihong Wang, Yi-Cheng Wang, Peizhong Feng, Dawei Li, et al. On the electron-transfer mechanism in the contact-electrification effect. *Advanced materials*, 30(15):1706790, 2018.
- (211) Mingzi Sun, Qiuyang Lu, Zhong Lin Wang, and Bolong Huang. Understanding contact electrification at liquid–solid interfaces from surface electronic structure. *Nature Communications*, 12(1):1752, 2021.
- (212) Andy Berbille, Xiao-Fen Li, Yusen Su, Shunning Li, Xin Zhao, Laipan Zhu, and Zhong Lin Wang. Mechanism for generating h<sub>2</sub>o<sub>2</sub> at water-solid interface by contact-electrification. *Advanced Materials*, 35(46):2304387, 2023.
- (213) Ziming Wang, Xuanli Dong, Wei Tang, and Zhong Lin Wang. Contact-electro-catalysis (cec). *Chemical Society Reviews*, 2024.
- (214) Agustín J Colussi. Can the ph at the air/water interface be different from the ph of bulk water? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(34):E7887–E7887, 2018.
- (215) Shinichi Enami, Logan A Stewart, Michael R Hoffmann, and Agustín J Colussi. Superacid chemistry on mildly acidic water. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 1(24):3488–3493, 2010.
- (216) Yusuke Tabe, Nobuaki Kikkawa, Hideaki Takahashi, and Akihiro Morita. Surface acidity of water probed by free energy calculation for trimethylamine protonation. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, 118(2):977–988, 2014.
- (217) Kai-Hung Huang, Zhenwei Wei, and R Graham Cooks. Accelerated reactions of amines with carbon dioxide driven by superacid at the microdroplet interface. *Chemical Science*, 12(6):2242–2250, 2021.
- (218) Lynn E Krushinski and Jeffrey E Dick. Direct electrochemical evidence suggests that aqueous microdroplets spontaneously produce hydrogen peroxide. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(12):e2321064121, 2024.
- (219) A Warshel. Energetics of enzyme catalysis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 75:5250–5254, 1978.

- (220) S. C. Kamerlin, P. K. Sharma, Z. T. Chu, and A. Warshel. Ketosteroid isomerase provides further support for the idea that enzymes work by electrostatic preorganization. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 107(9):4075–80, 2010.
- (221) Valerie Vaissier Welborn, Luis Ruiz Pestana, and Teresa Head-Gordon. Computational optimization of electric fields for better catalysis design. *Nature Catalysis*, 1(9):649–655, 2018.
- (222) Wan-Lu Li and Teresa Head-Gordon. Catalytic principles from natural enzymes and translational design strategies for synthetic catalysts. *ACS Central Science*, 7(1):72–80, 2021.
- (223) Stephen D Fried and Steven G Boxer. Electric fields and enzyme catalysis. *Annual review of biochemistry*, 86(1):387–415, 2017.
- (224) Murat Nulati Yesibolati, Simone Laganà, Hongyu Sun, Marco Beleggia, Shawn M. Kathmann, Takeshi Kasama, and Kristian Mølhave. Mean inner potential of liquid water. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 124:065502, Feb 2020.
- (225) Shawn M. Kathmann. Electric fields and potentials in condensed phases. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 23(41):23836–23849, 2021.
- (226) Sason Shaik, Debasish Mandal, and Rajeev Ramanan. Oriented electric fields as future smart reagents in chemistry. *Nature chemistry*, 8(12):1091–1098, 2016.
- (227) Valerie Vaissier Welborn and Teresa Head-Gordon. Computational design of synthetic enzymes. *Chemical Reviews*, 119(11):6613–6630, 2019.
- (228) Wan-Lu Li and Teresa Head-Gordon. Catalytic principles from natural enzymes and translational design strategies for synthetic catalysts. *ACS Central Science*, 7(1):72–80, 2020.
- (229) Anwasha Maitra, William R. Lake, Ahmed Mohamed, Sean C. Edington, Pratyusha Das, Barry C. Thompson, Sharon Hammes-Schiffer, Mark Johnson, and Jahan M. Dawlaty. Measuring the electric fields of ions captured in crown ethers. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 15(29):7458–7465, 2024. doi: 10.1021/acs.jpcllett.4c01303. URL <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpcllett.4c01303>.
- (230) Jared D Smith, Christopher D Cappa, Kevin R Wilson, Ronald C Cohen, Phillip L Geissler, and Richard J Saykally. Unified description of temperature-dependent hydrogen-bond rearrangements in liquid water. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(40):14171–14174, 2005.
- (231) Sason Shaik, David Danovich, Jyothish Joy, Zhanfeng Wang, and Thijs Stuyver. Electric-field mediated chemistry: uncovering and exploiting the potential of (oriented) electric fields to exert chemical catalysis and reaction control. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 142(29):12551–12562, 2020.
- (232) Itai Leven, Hongxia Hao, Akshaya Kumar Das, and Teresa Head-Gordon. A reactive force field with coarse-grained electrons for liquid water. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 11(21):9240–9247, 2020.

- (233) Patrice Creux, Jean Lachaise, Alain Graciaa, James K Beattie, and Alex M Djerdjev. Strong specific hydroxide ion binding at the pristine oil/water and air/water interfaces. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 113(43):14146–14150, 2009.
- (234) M Gouy. Sur la constitution de la charge électrique à la surface d’un électrolyte. *J. Phys. Theor. Appl.*, 9(1):457–468, 1910.
- (235) David Leonard Chapman. Li. a contribution to the theory of electrocapillarity. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, 25(148):475–481, 1913. ISSN 1941-5982. doi: 10.1080/14786440408634187. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/14786440408634187>.
- (236) Peter J. W. Debye. *Polar molecules*, by P. Debye. The Chemical Catalog Company, inc., New York, 1929.
- (237) Lars Onsager. Electric moments of molecules in liquids. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 58(8):1486–1493, 1936. ISSN 0002-7863.
- (238) John G. Kirkwood. The dielectric polarization of polar liquids. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 7(10):911–919, 1939. ISSN 0021-9606.
- (239) F. Booth. The dielectric constant of water and the saturation effect. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 19(4):391–394, 1951. ISSN 0021-9606. doi: 10.1063/1.1748233. URL <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1748233>.
- (240) Chris Knight, Gerrick E. Lindberg, and Gregory A. Voth. Multiscale reactive molecular dynamics. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 137(22):22A525, 2012. ISSN 0021-9606. doi: 10.1063/1.4743958. URL <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4743958>.
- (241) Itai Leven, Hongxia Hao, Akshaya Kumar Das, and Teresa Head-Gordon. A reactive force field with coarse-grained electrons for liquid water. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, 11(21):9240–9247, 2020. doi: 10.1021/acs.jpcllett.0c02516. URL <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpcllett.0c02516>.
- (242) Itai Leven, Hongxia Hao, Songchen Tan, Xingyi Guan, Katheryn A. Penrod, Dooman Akbarian, Benjamin Evangelisti, Md Jamil Hossain, Md Mahbubul Islam, Jason P. Koski, Stan Moore, Hasan Metin Aktulga, Adri C. T. van Duin, and Teresa Head-Gordon. Recent advances for improving the accuracy, transferability, and efficiency of reactive force fields. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, 17(6):3237–3251, 2021. ISSN 1549-9618. doi: 10.1021/acs.jctc.1c00118. URL <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.1c00118>.

# Reactivity in Water Microdroplets: Droplet Charge, Electric Fields, and the Nature of Water-Hydrophobic Interfaces

R. Allen LaCour<sup>1,2</sup>, Joseph P. Heindel<sup>1,2</sup>, Ruoqi Zhao<sup>1,2</sup>, Sruthy K. Chandy<sup>1,2</sup>,  
Teresa Head-Gordon<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Kenneth S. Pitzer Theory Center and Department of Chemistry

<sup>2</sup>Chemical Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

<sup>3</sup>Departments of Bioengineering and Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering  
University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

corresponding author: thg@berkeley.edu

## Abstract

A wide variety of reactions are reported to be dramatically accelerated in water microdroplets, opening the possibility that they may become as a general platform for chemical synthesis. Fully utilizing (typically aqueous) microdroplets for accelerating chemical reactions requires understanding how microdroplet chemistry differs from that in bulk on a fundamental level, and here we provide our perspective on recent progress to this end. Due to the high surface-to-volume ratio of microdroplets, the water interface is frequently implicated in its reactivity. We discuss recent insights into the nature of water-hydrophobic interfaces, including the spectroscopic measurements of water-in-oil emulsions, which differ from that of planar water-air interfaces. We particularly highlight the role of droplet charge, which appears key to understanding how certain reactions, like the formation of hydrogen peroxide and reduced transition metal complexes, are thermodynamically possible in microdroplets. We discuss specific mechanisms proposed for microdroplet acceleration, highlighting how many of them are interrelated such as charged droplets and electric fields. Lastly, we emphasize opportunities for theoretical advances in the field generally, and to suggest experiments which would greatly enhance our understanding of this fascinating and emerging subject.

## 1 Introduction

Many organic and redox reactions are reported to occur significantly faster in water microdroplets than found in the bulk liquid phase. Although “on-water” reactions<sup>1,2</sup> and reactivity in atmospheric aerosols<sup>3</sup> have been studied for longer, the first reports on reactivity in laboratory-prepared microdroplets appeared only within the past two decades<sup>4,5</sup>. In early studies, which were largely concerned with microdroplets prepared through electrospray ionization (ESI)<sup>6,7</sup>, many types of organic reactions were found to be accelerated<sup>8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100</sup>, indicating that microdroplets may be generally useful vessels for organic synthesis. Subsequently, acceleration was

also reported in similar systems, including water-in-oil emulsions<sup>1,2</sup>, thin films<sup>3,4</sup>, and levitated droplets<sup>5,6</sup>. Especially interesting is the wide variety of redox chemistry reported to occur in microdroplets<sup>7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100</sup>, including the reduction of various metals<sup>1,2</sup> and the oxidation of water into hydrogen peroxide<sup>3,4</sup>. Intriguingly, many of these reactions are thermodynamically unfavorable in bulk water.

However, explaining microdroplet reactivity has proven challenging, with the inherent complexity of the multiphase system leading to many plausible mechanisms for rate acceleration<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100</sup>. Due to the high surface-to-volume ratio of the microdroplets, most agree that the interface plays a key role. Problematically, many aspects of water interfaces that are relevant for reactivity, such as their acidity or basicity<sup>1,2</sup>, have themselves proven challenging to understand<sup>3,4</sup>. Another important, but perhaps less appreciated, feature of microdroplets is their charge<sup>5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100</sup>, which is extremely relevant for reaction kinetics and thermodynamics<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100</sup>.

Here we provide our perspective on the underlying reasons for chemical reactivity of microdroplets and related systems like thin films or water emulsions. We begin by reviewing the experimental landscape for creating droplets, measuring their reactivity, and provide a brief catalogue of reactions that have been reported to be accelerated in droplets relative to the bulk phase. Next we discuss the current understanding of water/hydrophobic interfaces, highlighting areas of contention that may be relevant for microdroplet reactivity, like the recent attempts to spectroscopically characterize emulsion interfaces or test spontaneous formation of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. We also discuss the adsorption of organic molecules and ions to interfaces, and stress the importance of the strength of interfacial adsorption that dictates the thermodynamics of reactions in uncharged droplets. We next emphasize the role of droplet charge that can substantially alter the reaction thermodynamics of microdroplets, especially for redox reactions, since the presence of both positively and negatively charged droplets likely explains the simultaneous reduction and oxidation potential of microdroplets. Finally, we critically assess contributions from other proposed mechanisms, but also highlighting their interconnectivity. For example the presence of electric fields at formed hydrophobic-water interfaces that can be regarded as a unified and quantitative gauge of many interactions, including whether or not a droplet is charged. We conclude our perspective on remaining open questions in regards microdroplet reactivity, with suggestions on future experimental and theoretical studies that would bring about further advances in this fascinating subject.

## 2 Preparing Microdroplets


Water microdroplets have been prepared Figure 1 shows some of the different experimental techniques and conditions used for creating microdroplets. To draw out these distinctions more specifically, we discuss the primary methods for microdroplet formation: 1) electrospray ionization<sup>1,2</sup>, 2) ultrasonic humidification,<sup>3,4</sup> 3) gas nebulization,<sup>5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95,96,97,98,99,100</sup>, 4) water condensation from the vapor,<sup>1,2</sup> and 5) oil-water emulsions<sup>3,4</sup>. We take each of the microdroplet preparations in turn to describe at a high-level how the technique leads to generation of droplets, and their observed properties, as it will be important to connect their features to observed reactive chemistry, if any. We acknowledge that levitated droplets and thin films are alternative preparations for observing accelerated reactivity, but we do not discuss them extensively here.

**Electrospray Ionization:** In electrospray ionization (ESI) experiments, droplets are generated by applying a high voltage to a liquid which produces charged aerosols. These charged particles have



been shown to undergo unique chemistry which differs dramatically from the aqueous phase<sup>???</sup> and has recently been reviewed.<sup>?</sup> These methods yield air-water interfaces and highly charged environments which yield a very reactive microdroplet. The rates of many acid- and base-catalyzed reactions in positively- and negatively charged microdroplets, respectively, are found to be accelerated compared to the bulk solution rates.<sup>?</sup> However the underlying mechanisms underlying accelerated reaction rates in ESI experiments are thought to be complicated by multi-phase kinetics, and droplets created by ESI may not be a representative of the air-water interface.<sup>?</sup>

**Ultrasonic Humidification.** Ultrasonic humidification uses a device which mechanically sonicates water at  $\sim 1\text{-}2$  MHz, producing a fine mist above the water bath. This mist is then allowed to condense onto a hydrophobic substrate resulting in microdroplets as small as  $\sim 1\ \mu\text{m}$  in diameter. It is noteworthy that this same microdroplet formation technique used in the Mishra<sup>?</sup> and Zare<sup>?</sup> groups lead to the same level of  $\sim 1\ \mu\text{M}$   $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  concentration, and above the detection limit of the experiments. This preparation of droplets create an air-water interface and evidence shows that they too are charged.



**Figure 1:** *Different ways of producing microdroplets.* Gentle heating and water condensation<sup>?</sup>, gas nebulization<sup>?</sup>, sonication<sup>?</sup>, and electro spray ionization and related techniques.<sup>?</sup> Thin films can be produced through dropcasting.<sup>?</sup> Levitated droplets include Leidenfrost<sup>??</sup> droplets and acoustically levitated<sup>?</sup> droplets. Water emulsion typically involve water dispersed in hydrophobic solution<sup>?</sup>, or vice-versa<sup>?</sup>.

Nguyen and Nguyen argue that ultrasonication results in cavitation of water and these cavities facilitate the production of reactive species such as  $\text{OH}^\bullet$ ,  $\text{H}^\bullet$ ,  $\text{HO}_2^\bullet$ , and possibly other radicals which eventually combine to form  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ .<sup>?</sup> In support of this argument, Nguyen demonstrates that doping the microdroplets with ions known to prefer the interior of a microdroplet, such as  $\text{SCN}^-$ , quenches  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  formation, as does the addition of  $\text{HCl}$ . Indeed, many highly unfavorable

reactions have been observed to occur during cavitation.<sup>?</sup> These experiments seem to indicate that sonication drives reactions via a totally different pathway which is dependent on the formation of cavities inside the droplet as opposed to being a surface active process.

**Gas Nebulization.** Gas nebulization generates droplets by flowing a gas or mixture of gases into a stream of water which breaks up the water into a fine mist with an air-water interface. The size of the droplets can be loosely controlled by varying the flow rate of the nebulizing gases (Figure 1). Recent work by Zhou et al. observed the formation of both pyridyl anions and hydroxypyridine in a spray of a water/pyridine mixture using gas nebulization.<sup>?</sup> From these observations they speculate that it is the availability of free electrons and oxidative species such as OH<sup>-</sup> that can simultaneously reduce and oxidize pyridine.<sup>?</sup> Gao et al.<sup>?</sup> using gas nebulization and mass spectrometry, showed that the Dakin and Baeyer-Villiger reactions proceed without the addition of peroxides that are known to be required catalysts in the bulk aqueous phase. Finally, spontaneous reduction of several organic molecules was found to occur in microdroplets prepared by gas nebulization<sup>?</sup> : pyruvate to lactate, lipoic acid to dihydrolipoic acid, fumarate to succinate, and oxaloacetate to malate. Lee speculated that the source of electrons are OH<sup>-</sup> species that may more readily give up an electron at the air-water interface.<sup>?</sup> Gas nebulization also is thought to create charged droplets through contact electrification<sup>?</sup> , a topic which we discuss in detail below.

**Water Condensation.** The most benign process for creating microdroplets is condensation of water onto cold surfaces from vapor produced by heating water to between 50-70 °C. Although Lee et al. originally reported fairly high concentrations of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> formation by this process, more recent work by Gallo et al. showed no detectable presence of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> under these microdroplet generation conditions.<sup>?</sup> The lack of measurable reactivity relative to the other droplet methods may be because this methods produce much larger droplets, when there is a known size dependence for reactivity of 1 μm in droplet diameter, and this evaporative process does not create enough droplets of this smaller size. Another compelling argument against observing reactivity under these conditions is it does not create charged microdroplets.


**Oil-water emulsions.** All of the above droplet generation techniques create primarily an air-water interface, whereas oil-water emulsions have an interface involving an oil phase with molecular features of a soft fluctuating environment. Oil-water emulsions also accelerate reactions such as imine synthesis<sup>?</sup> It is well known from electrophoresis experiments that under an applied electric field oil droplets move due to the fact that they carry charge, forces that arise at the slip plane that defines the region of the zeta potential, although the origin of this charge is not fully understood. We consider the evidence on whether air-water and oil-water emulsions are to be generically referred to as "hydrophobic-water" interfaces, emphasizing their common features, or whether they are in fact dissimilar in important ways that may give rise to different droplet behavior in regard chemical reactivity.

## 3 The Nature of the Hydrophobic-Water Interface

### 3.1 Planar Hydrophobic-Water Interfaces

A unifying characteristic of water microdroplets is their large interface with air or other hydrophobic interfaces such as oil-water emulsions.<sup>????</sup> . The nano- to mesoscopic length scales of water-hydrophobic interfaces necessitate the use of advanced experimental techniques to char-

acterize them.<sup>?</sup> Sum frequency generation spectroscopy (SFG) collected in either homodyne or heterodyne variants<sup>???</sup> has proven extremely useful in this regard due to its surface-selective nature<sup>?????</sup>. When applied to water-hydrophobic interfaces, heterodyne-detected SFG (HD-SFG) offers the key advantage of the sign indicating whether the transition dipole is pointing towards the bulk water phase (negative values) or the other phase (positive values). In Figure 2 we show heterodyne-detected SFG (HD-SFG) spectra collected by Strazdaite et al.<sup>?</sup> under the *ssp*-polarization at (a) D<sub>2</sub>O/air and (b) D<sub>2</sub>O/hexane interfaces.



**Figure 2:** The heterodyne-collected SFG spectra of (a) air-water interface and (b) an oil-water interface. Adapted with permission from ref<sup>?</sup>

Inspection of the D<sub>2</sub>O/air spectra shown in Figure 2a yields several insights. One is the presence of a positive peak around 2700 cm<sup>-1</sup> (3700 cm<sup>-1</sup> in H<sub>2</sub>O), which has been attributed to the presence of nonbonded DH-stretches pointing towards the vapor phase<sup>?</sup>. Because they are not participating in hydrogen bonds, they are commonly denoted as “free” or “dangling” stretches. Second is the presence of a broad negative feature around 2500 cm<sup>-1</sup> (3400 cm<sup>-1</sup> in H<sub>2</sub>O). This feature has been attributed to the DH-stretches of waters that are still participating in the hydrogen bonding network of water but have been perturbed by the presence of the interface. The negative sign implies that their net dipole is oriented towards the bulk phase. While SFG spectra do not show the relative location of these waters at the interface, these can be analyzed by comparison with molecular dynamics (MD) simulations. In agreement with experiment, the simulations reveal that many interfacial waters have a free OH, while waters further in the bulk (by a few Å) tend to point towards the bulk phase.<sup>??</sup> Lastly, we note that a positive feature in the SFG at lower wavelengths (below 2350 cm<sup>-1</sup> in Figure 2a, below 3200 cm<sup>-1</sup> in H<sub>2</sub>O) was later shown to be an experimental artifact.<sup>??</sup>

Surprisingly, the SFG obtained for water/oil interfaces, which are relevant for microdroplets in water-in-oil emulsions, are quite different than that of the air-water interface. We show the HD-SFG spectra of Strazdaite et al.<sup>?</sup> in Figure 2b. As in the water/air spectra, there is generally a free OH feature, although it is redshifted by  $\approx 30 - 40$  cm<sup>-1</sup>. This shift has been attributed to interactions between the oil and the water<sup>??</sup>, in part because the red shift resembles that for waters in the vicinity of alcohols like butanol<sup>?</sup>. Strikingly, the sign of the hydrogen-bonded OH stretch is now positive, indicating that the net dipole moment in the hydrogen-bonded region now points away from the bulk water phase, which sharply contrasts with the water/air interface. Similar results were found at the interface of water with a hydrophobic octadecyltrichlorosilane monolayer<sup>???</sup>, indicating that the change in sign may be general for oily interfaces, although other work attributes

it to the charge of the oily substrate<sup>?</sup>. The hydrogen-bonded region is also more intense, which Strazdaite et al.<sup>?</sup> interpreted to mean the hydrogen bonding network is more ordered. We also note that SFG spectra of oil-water interfaces may be subject to issues to like partial wetting<sup>??</sup>, leading to disagreements among SFG experiments for water-hydrophobic interfaces.

## 4 Reactivity at Uncharged Water-Air Interfaces

### 4.1 Enhanced interfacial concentration

Perhaps the most straightforward contribution to reactivity at water interfaces is an enhanced interfacial concentration. If the reagents adsorb to the interface, their local concentration will increase, yielding more reagent collisions and a faster reaction rate. The interfacial region occupies a large fraction of a microdroplet’s volume, making this effect much more prominent in microdroplets than in bulk. As system size decreases, the interfacial region occupies a larger fraction of the droplet, so this mechanism will be especially relevant in small microdroplets. Furthermore, in non-stoichiometric reactions, interfacial concentration can change the equilibrium concentrations of species. The effect can be understood by considering an equilibrium constant in a reaction where two reactants A and B combine to form the product C:


$$K_{eq}^b = \frac{[C]}{[B][A]} \quad (1)$$

where  $[i]$  denotes the concentration of component  $i$ . If the concentration is increased, the equilibrium concentration of the product must increase more rapidly than the reagent concentration. This effect holds anytime the products outnumber the reactants. Conversely, if products outnumber the reactants, reactants will be favored. Again, the relatively large interfacial volume in microdroplets can make this effect quite substantial.

The reagents must adsorb to the interface for this mechanism to be relevant. Many reactions reported to be accelerated in microdroplets involve organic species which, famously, are poorly soluble in water. However, they generally adsorb quite strongly to water/hydrophobic interfaces<sup>????</sup>. Of course, the degree of surface adsorption varies strongly from molecule to molecule<sup>?</sup>, since well-stabilized molecules as reflected in their solvation energy in bulk water have less impetus for the interface.<sup>?</sup> One measure of interfacial propensity is the Gibb’s adsorption isotherm, in which interfacial concentration can be inferred from surface tension measurements. The Gibb’s adsorption isotherm indicates even molecules that are quite soluble in water, like small alcohols and acids<sup>?</sup>, also partition substantially to the interface as seen in experiments and MD simulations.<sup>???</sup> As the alkane chain of simple alcohols grow longer, their interfacial propensity also increases substantially<sup>?</sup>, which can give rise to complex interfaces such as reverse micelles or lipid bilayer organizations.

Only multi-reagent reactions are expected to be accelerated by this mechanisms, and indeed, they appear to more likely to be accelerated.<sup>??</sup> In one example, Qiu et al.<sup>?</sup> examine several unimolecular and bimolecular reactions, finding that only the bimolecular ones were accelerated in microdroplets. The imine synthesis reaction examined by Fallah-Araghi et al.<sup>?</sup> provides a another lucid example.<sup>?</sup> Specifically, they examined the bimolecular reaction of an amine and an aldehyde into a fluorescent imine in a water-in-oil emulsion. In bulk,  $K_{eq}$  for this reaction is quite low and little product is formed, as shown in Figure 10a. In contrast, more product is formed in

emulsion droplet, with the measured  $K_{eq}$  (when measured in terms of concentrations) increasing with decreasing droplet radius, as shown in Figure 10b. Furthermore, by considering the forwards and backwards rate coefficients, they were able to infer that the change in  $K_{eq}$  was related to the destabilization of the reactants.



**Figure 3:** The thermodynamics and kinetics of imine synthesis inside a water-in-oil emulsion. In a), the product concentration with time is shown. Emulsion droplet systems are given by their volumes in  $pL$ . In b) the effective equilibrium concentrations are shown as a function of radius ratio. In c), estimated changes to the free energy profile are shown. Adapted with permission from reference<sup>?</sup>.

## 4.2 Altered solvation environments

The solvation environment of a species determines their relative relative stability in solution. The interface will significantly perturb a molecule’s solvation environment, which can lead to significantly perturbed reaction kinetics and thermodynamics. Importantly, changes to the reaction thermodynamics are reflected in the surface affinities of reactants and products. Specifically, if the interfacial adsorption free energies of different species differ by  $\Delta\mu_{ads}$ , equilibrium concentrations at the interface will differ by  $e^{-\beta\Delta\mu_{ads}}$ .


Likewise, the solvation environment of a reaction’s transition state can be stabilizing or destabilizing, leading to increased or decreased reaction kinetics. One proposed mechanism is partial solvation<sup>??</sup>, which relies on the observation that many reactions are  $\approx 10^{10}$  faster in the gas phase than in aqueous phase.<sup>??</sup> The solvation state at the interface may be intermediate between the unsolvated gas phase and the fully solvated aqueous phases, and thus reaction rates may lie somewhere in between the bulk phase values. Such large differences have been attributed to destabilization of the transition state in the liquid phase<sup>?</sup>. Qiu et al.<sup>?</sup> attributed their observation that only bimolecular reactions are accelerated because these reactions have more charge-disperse transition states, which are more stable at the interface than in the bulk. Of course, the acceleration of bimolecular reactions is also expected from an increased interfacial concentration, so it is challenging to distinguish the importance of partial solvation from an enhanced interfacial concentration. Due to the microscopic nature of this mechanism, simulations can help distinguish between different possibilities. To this end, Narendra et al.<sup>?</sup> used MD simulations to investigate hydrazone formation from phenylhydrazine and indoline-2,3-dione, finding a reaction path at the

interface with a significantly lower barrier than in the bulk, indicating that partial solvation may play a large role in that reaction.

Other proposed mechanisms pertain to molecular orientation at the interface. Unlike in bulk, many molecules adopt specific orientations at the interface<sup>??</sup>, which certainly influences their reactivity. Most notably, surfactants orient their hydrophilic groups toward the water phase<sup>?</sup>. Zhou et al.<sup>?</sup> found that rhodamine 6G adopts specific orientations at interfaces<sup>?</sup>; Xiong et al.<sup>?</sup> later found the same behavior for several other water-soluble probes. Such behavior likely influences the reaction pathway that the molecules can take, as found by Narendi et al.<sup>?</sup> in their simulations.

### 4.3 Interfacial Electric Fields

Electric fields are known to significantly accelerate reactions.<sup>??</sup> Specifically, if the electric field is parallel to the reaction axis, the electric field will promote ionization along the bond<sup>?</sup> and consequently reduce the energy required for the bond to break. In addition to externally applied electric fields, molecules can generate electric fields themselves. Water, with its large dipole moment, generates particularly large electric fields. Intriguingly, both experiment and simulation indicate that electric fields are stronger at the water-hydrophobic interfaces. While molecules in bulk water can experience very short-ranged fields around 100 - 300 MV/cm<sup>?</sup>, their orientations undergo rotational averaging whereas interfacial electric fields are persistent in their perpendicular direction to the air-water surface. In 2020 Xiong et. al.<sup>?</sup> used rhodamine 800 probe to study the electric field at the surface of a water-in-oil emulsion using SREF (Figure ). They found that the frequency of probe’s nitrile group, which is sensitive and calibrated to the local electric field, was shifted at the interface by 5 cm<sup>-1</sup>, which corresponds to a field strength of  $\approx 10$  MV/cm. Likewise, Hao et al.<sup>?</sup> examined the electric field experienced by the OH vibrational stretches at the interface relative to bulk, as illustrated in Figure 7b. They found that the average electric field at the interface is close to  $\approx 10$  MV/cm, in agreement with the SREF experiment. Furthermore, Hao et al.<sup>?</sup> found that field strengths could fluctuate to much larger values, which should be most relevant for reactivity.



**Figure 4:** Electric fields measured at water interfaces. In a), we show the frequency of the nitrile stretch of rhodamine 800 at the interface of a water-in-oil emulsion and in the bulk. In b) we show the distribution of electric fields measured in bulk and at the interface in of a microdroplet in simulations using the reaxff-CGEM model<sup>?</sup> for water. Adapted with permission from references<sup>??</sup>.

We emphasize that the distinction as to whether a microdroplet is charged or uncharged is not necessary to define since the electric field can be regarded as a unified and quantitative gauge of many interactions occurring between water molecules in the bulk and at formed hydrophobic-water interfaces.<sup>??</sup>





Figure 5: Electric fields as proxies for molecular interactions. Adapted with permission from references<sup>??</sup>.

## 5 Charged Water Droplets


### 5.1 Influence on Reactivity

Some reactions reported in microdroplets appear to defy thermodynamic constraints. For example, the production of hydrogen peroxide from water:



has an equilibrium constant  $< e^{-40}$ , but  $\mu\text{m}$  concentrations have been observed to form in water microdroplets.<sup>??</sup> Considering that hydrogen peroxide has a binding affinity to water/air interfaces around  $-1 \text{ kcal/mol}$ <sup>??</sup>, its formation clearly depends on factors beyond the thermodynamics of air/water interfaces. This point is further demonstrated by the fact that the amount of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  formed in microdroplets varies depending upon how the microdroplets are made. As shown in Figure 6, Musskopf et. al.<sup>??</sup> found that the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  concentration in microdroplets formed from condensing water vapor depended upon whether the vapor was generated from an ultrasonic humidifier or by gentle heating. Only the droplets generated from the ultrasonic humidifier showed  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  above the detection limits of their analyzer, as shown in Figure 6. Another study found substantially higher

concentrations using an ultrasonic mist maker<sup>?</sup>. These conflicting observations made the initial reports of hydroxide peroxide formation in microdroplets quite controversial.<sup>?????</sup>



**Figure 6:** The formation of  $H_2O_2$  in droplets generated from condensing water vapor. “Heat” indicates that the the vapor was generated by heating bulk water. “Hum” indicates that the vapor was generated using an ultrasonic humidifier. “Phob” indicates that the water was condensed on a hydrophobic surface, while “Phil” indicates that the water was condensed on a hydrophilic surface. Adadpted from<sup>?</sup>.


However, many other thermodynamically unfavorable redox reactions have also been reported, as summarized in the reviews Jin et al.<sup>?</sup> and Vannoy et. al.<sup>?</sup> These include the reduction of the pyridal anion<sup>?</sup>, which is thought to very unstable under normal conditions<sup>?</sup>. Various metals<sup>??</sup> are also reduced, yielding the formation of various complexes and even nanomaterials<sup>?</sup>. These provide clear evidence of the redox properties of water microdroplets.

One immediately relevant property of microdroplets for redox chemistry is their charge. The ESI experiment itself, for which the largest rate accelerations have been reported<sup>??</sup>, relies directly on the production of highly charged droplets<sup>?</sup>. However, droplets can acquire charge in other situations, and it even appears that producing uncharged water microdroplets may be the exception. For example, water streams are known to spontaneously acquire charge<sup>?</sup>. Various levitated droplets<sup>??</sup> also spontaneously acquire a charge, and even pipetting is capable of producing a charge<sup>??</sup>. As with gas bubbles and oil emulsions in water, the fundamental mechanism behind the charging of air-water droplets is unclear. It is likely related to contact electrification<sup>??</sup>, but the mechanism of contact electrification is itself uncertain<sup>??</sup>, a topic which we return to below.

Importantly, regardless of the charge’s origin, charged environments substantially alter the thermodynamics of redox reactions. Negatively charged ions are destabilized in negatively charged environments, while positively charged ions will be destabilized in positively charged environments. We recently demonstrated this<sup>?</sup> by computing the vertical ionization energies (vertical electron affinities) of hydroxide (hydronium) in small nanodroplets that had excess hydroxide (hydronium). We found that the energies shifted substantially, with the magnitude of the shift closely matching an unscreened Coloumb’s law, as shown in Figure 7a. This correspondence indicates that the destabilization stems from interaction between like-charged ions. Analogous modifications of the



hydration enthalpies of each ion were observed thereby providing a direct connection to the reaction thermodynamics.



**Figure 7:** The destabilization of OH<sup>-</sup> and H<sub>3</sub>O<sup>+</sup>. In a), the blue points give the VIE energies for OH<sup>-</sup>. The yellow points give the VEA energies for H<sub>3</sub>O<sup>+</sup>. In b) we show a proposed mechanism for how charged droplets are formed and for how redox chemistry occurs. Larger volumes of water separate into smaller microdroplets, for which the amount of OH<sup>-</sup> and H<sub>3</sub>O<sup>+</sup> is not evenly divided. Electrons are then destabilized within the negative droplets but stabilized within the positive droplets. Adapted with permission from reference<sup>?</sup>.

Both negatively charged and positively charged droplets are present in water sprays<sup>???</sup>. In our work<sup>?</sup> we showed that, for physically realizable droplet charges, the transfer of an electron from OH<sup>-</sup> in a negatively charged environment to a H<sup>+</sup> in a positively charged environment became spontaneous. We illustrate this process in Figure 7b under the assumption that the negative and positive charges are due to excess OH<sup>-</sup> and H<sub>3</sub>O<sup>+</sup>, respectively. It stands to reason that other unfavorable redox reactions may also become favorable under such conditions, although specifics of the process are still being investigated. In 2023, Lin et al.<sup>?</sup> proposed that much of the charge transfer occurred during the initial separation of the liquid into positively and negatively charged droplets. Solid-liquid contact electrification before the water droplets have been sprayed may also be relevant.<sup>??</sup>

Droplet charges likely impact reactivity in other ways as well. Due to observed reactivity, the water interface has been called both “a superacid”<sup>??</sup>, and a “superbase”<sup>???</sup>. For clarity, we note that the pH is defined as the logarithm of the activity of H<sup>+</sup>, so the pH at the interface necessarily equals the value in bulk<sup>?</sup>. Nonetheless, the concentration of H<sup>+</sup> or OH<sup>-</sup> may be enriched at the surface, which is what is usually meant when the interface is called more acidic or basic than bulk. As described in Section 3.3, there is little evidence for hydronium or hydroxide adsorption at planar water/air interfaces but much implied evidence for oil-water emulsions. However, in charged air-water systems, the charges are likely concentrated at the edges of droplets to minimize the potential energy.<sup>????</sup> Thus the surface may be enriched in H<sub>3</sub>O<sup>+</sup> in positively charged systems and enriched in OH<sup>-</sup> in negatively charged systems<sup>?</sup>. Consequently, while uncharged planar air-water interfaces may not behave like superacids or superbases, the interfaces of charged microdroplets might. **The experimental preparations described in Section 2 show that the droplets**

**prepared by heating and cooling have no charge and are completely unremarkable in regards exhibiting any unusual chemical reactivity.**

For these reasons we think that microdroplet charge is frequently the critical variable in microdroplet reactivity. Further evidence comes from the fact that rate acceleration is frequently highest in ESI and related methods<sup>?</sup>, for which the droplets are more charged. In one experiment, Banerjee et al.<sup>?</sup> actually varied the charge of the droplets by adjusting the voltage in ESI, finding that larger charges results in greater reactivity.

Enhanced reactivity has also been reported in water emulsions, although they are less explored. Specifically, hydrogen peroxide may form spontaneously in water droplets dispersed in another phase<sup>?</sup>, and the droplets may be generally useful for electrochemical reactions<sup>?</sup>. Considering that emulsion droplets behave as if they carry a charge, as discussed in section 2.2 (although the presence of a double layer complicates simple interpretations), their enhanced reactivity may be similar to that of aerial microdroplets. Furthermore, although this is more speculative, their interfaces may be enriched in hydronium or hydroxide. One key difference is the lack of both negatively and positively charged droplets in the same emulsion; instead all droplets in an emulsion have the same charge. Thus reactivity in emulsions may be limited relative to aerial microdroplets prepared by ESI or gas nebulization but enhanced relative to neutral droplets.

## 5.2 Influence of charge

## 5.3 Contact Electrification

One of the main explanations for how charge accumulates in sprayed droplets and throughout the emulsification process is contact electrification, (CE) which is also referred to as triboelectrification.<sup>???</sup> CE is the name given to the generic observation that charge be exchanged between two materials in contact, leaving both with a net charge. CE has been observed to occur in all combinations of gas, liquid, and solid contacts<sup>?</sup>. Unfortunately, the theory of CE remains incomplete and poorly understood. There are three viable hypotheses as to the source of the charge accumulated on the contacting materials, all of which have experimental support in certain situations. Below, we briefly summarize the three points of view and their relevance to microdroplet chemistry before describing experimental observables that could clarify the picture most relevant to microdroplet chemistry.

The first proposed mechanism of charge separation in CE is electron transfer. There is significant experimental evidence that electron transfer is the dominant mechanism of CE in the case of solid-solid contacts involving metals.<sup>????</sup> Solid-solid CE of metals is arguably the simplest case to consider since the distribution of electronic states will be approximately continuous (i.e. there is a band structure) and the atoms are fixed in place so ion transfer is basically ruled out by construction. Electron transfer is undoubtedly the dominant source of charge in most solid-solid CE since the process can be reversed by elevating the temperature to induce thermionic emission.<sup>????</sup> Thermionic emission can then be used to infer the potential experienced by the electrons trapped in surface states. There is also direct evidence of the CE process between a gas and levitated liquid droplet in which the levitated droplet accumulates a positive charge.<sup>?</sup> This observation is likely attributable to electron transfer since the amount of charge separation can be modulated by the presence of a charged solid surface. That is, the air is able to carry the excess charge between the levitated droplet and the charged solid. This strongly implies an electron transfer mechanism since

the solid surface and air will be able to stably accommodate electrons but not molecular ions.

A natural second possibility for CE is the transfer of atomic or molecular ions between the contacting materials. This mechanism is supported by experiments measuring the current induced by repeatedly dropping water onto pre-neutralized hydrophilic surfaces<sup>?</sup> and collision of glass beads in humid environments.<sup>?</sup> In essence, materials coated with water induce the formation of an electric double layer of  $\text{OH}^-$  and  $\text{H}^+$  originating in the water. Surface-active groups on the material are expected to play a role in forming this double layer. As an example, surface-active hydroxyl groups can be deprotonated by contact with water. When the water is removed by heating, the surface-active groups often remain deprotonated.<sup>?</sup> Alternatively, as contact between the material and water is broken, some of the ions in the double layer can remain bound to the material rather than the droplet. That is to say, the wettability of the material should determine the ease with which a portion of the double layer is left behind. In fact, it is observed that CE by ion transfer is highly sensitive to the contact angle of water with the solid material and the free energy of adsorption of  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$  and  $\text{OH}^-$  to the material interface.<sup>??</sup>

The third proposed mechanism of CE is that mechanically contacting materials results in the production of radicals<sup>????</sup> (so-called mechano-radicals) and it is these radicals which stabilize atomic or molecular ions at the material surface. The radicals themselves can also be ionic species. It has been argued that certain experiments capable of distinguishing electron transfer from ion transfer in metal-metal and metal-dielectric contacts are incapable of discerning the relevant mechanism in dielectric-dielectric material contacts.<sup>??</sup> Because of this, experiments arguing for the role of anion-radical pairs at the surface of dielectrics study the chemistry one would expect to be driven by each mechanism and find evidence that electron transfer alone is insufficient to explain the observed chemistry.<sup>???</sup>

The plausibility of radicals stabilized by ions is supported by theoretical calculations demonstrating that both cation-radical and anion-radical adducts form hemi-bonds of strength between 40-80 kcal/mol.<sup>?</sup> The ion-radical mechanism is supported by experiments showing that the chemistry driven by statically charged polymers differs if the polymer is charged by an electron beam or if it is charged by mechanical contact.<sup>?</sup> The same experiments showed that the sign of the charge does not determine the chemistry as one would expect if the presence or absence of electrons explained the charge. Instead, positive, negative, and even net-neutral polymers which have been mechanically deformed can all quench fluorescent radical probes. Recently, many experiments have focused on understanding the mechanism of CE between two polymeric materials or a liquid and a polymer.<sup>?</sup> A definitive mechanism is not available. Many experiments suggest that mechanical contact between polymers produce radicals via heterolytic bond cleavage.<sup>???</sup> These radicals can subsequently associate with ions resulting in surface charging mass transfer. This complicated arrangement of electrons, radicals, and ions has been dubbed a hybrid layer<sup>?</sup>, in contrast to the usual electric double layer consisting of just aqueous ions.

In our view, any of the three mechanisms could be relevant to microdroplet chemistry, broadly defined. For instance, it seems quite probable that the charging of water droplets produced by nebulization<sup>??</sup> can occur both from electron transfer and from mass transfer due to asymmetric partitioning of incipient  $\text{OH}^-$  and  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$  as the droplets are formed. On the other hand, charge-stabilized oil/water emulsions produced by sonication may undergo processes similar to the charging of polymers in which bonds are broken, ultimately resulting in the formation of ion-radicals. It is already known that  $\text{H}^\bullet$  and  $\text{OH}^\bullet$  are produced during sonication.<sup>?</sup> Considering the seeming importance of charge to the enhanced reactivity of microdroplets, we think it is critically important

that the charging mechanisms be better understood. To this end, UV-vis spectroscopy of oil-water emulsions could help elucidate the presence or absence of mechano-anions since hemi-bonded systems tend to have intense UV-vis absorption bands between 250-400nm.


## 5.4 Interfaces of Oil-Water Emulsions

Similar to that observed for aerial microdroplets, water-based emulsions and gas bubbles in water also display accelerated reactivity.<sup>??</sup> With their much greater interfacial area relative to planar interfaces, emulsions have long been viewed as part of the paradigm of water-hydrophobic interfaces. And yet the dissimilar behavior of water/air and water/oil emulsions using SFG indicates that their interfaces behave differently. This raises the possibility that the latter has a net charge.

Within the theory of electrophoresis<sup>?</sup>, motion of a droplet in an applied electric field is attributed to ions of a specific charge preferentially adsorbing to the droplet’s surface. In the absence of an applied field, the adsorbed ion’s charge causes a second layer of ions of opposite charge to also congregate near the adsorbed ion surface that gives rise to a double layer with an electric potential gradient. When a field is applied the oil droplets gravitate towards one of the electrodes, driven by a charge imbalance of net adsorbed ions in the inner layer that exceeds the ions of opposite charge in the diffuse outer layer. All ions that move with the droplet are thought to be within the “slip plane” of the droplet, and the so-called zeta potential is defined as the potential at the slip plane. In the absence of a surfactant, a stable emulsion requires a finite zeta potential above 30-40 meV, otherwise the droplets would aggregate. The close similarity between the zeta potentials of gas bubbles and oil droplets indicates that their interfaces are quite similar<sup>?</sup>. Intriguingly, Yang et al.<sup>?</sup> found that the SFG spectra of the water/oil interface is quite sensitive to pH, with large changes observable between pH of 5 and 12, providing further evidence that water/air and water/oil interfaces may be fundamentally different because of the presence of a zeta potential.

Spectroscopic studies of the water/oil emulsions have attempted to provide a molecular understanding of the zeta potential. In 2021, Pullanchery et al.<sup>?</sup> performed vibrational sum frequency scattering (VSFS) of hexadecane droplets in waters. The resulting spectrum is shown in Figure 8a, and its comparison with the SFG spectrum of a water/air interface. In 2024, we, in collaboration with Shi et al.<sup>?</sup>, used the Raman multivariate curve resolution technique (Raman-MCR)<sup>?</sup> to obtain the solute-correlated (SC) Raman spectra of the same hexadecane in water emulsion, which reflects changes in the behavior of waters close to the emulsion surface with the spectra shown in Figure 8b.

Interestingly, the lower frequency parts of the SFS and SC spectra differ significantly. In the SFS spectra, the lower frequency region of the spectrum have increased in intensity relative to the water/air interface. In the SC Raman spectra, the opposite has occurred, in that the prominent shoulder at lower frequencies in the spectrum of bulk water (not shown) has vanished. Considering that the lower frequency shoulder is typically associated with the degree of ordering in the hydrogen bonding network<sup>???</sup> (although its specific origin is more likely Fermi Resonance<sup>??</sup>), the SFS and SC spectra yield opposite conclusions as to degree of order at the interface. This discrepancy may be related to SFS’s greater sensitivity to water orientation and Raman-MCR’s greater sensitivity to hydrogen bonding strength. The theoretical simplicity of Raman-MCR confers the key advantage that one can compute an equivalent spectrum in simulation. Our simulations showed that the shoulder’s disappearance in the SC spectrum is related to weaker hydrogen bonding at the interface (which shifts the Fermi peak off-resonance).<sup>?</sup>



**Figure 8:** Spectra of hexadecane in water emulsions. In a), we show the sum frequency scattering spectra for emulsion in blue and the spectra of an air/water interface in red. In b), we show the solute-correlated Raman spectra of the emulsion. The blue line shows the spectra, while the green and red gaussians show its decomposition into two peaks. Adapted with permission from references<sup>??</sup>.

The spectra displayed in Figure 8 closely resemble each other in the higher frequency range. Specifically, there is no free OH peak at 2750 (3700)  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  in either spectrum of the emulsion interface. However, in both cases, there is a new shoulder at higher frequencies in the hydrogen-bonded region. In the solute-correlated spectra, the overall spectrum is decomposed into two Gaussian distributions to better emphasise the new shoulder. We and Pullanchery et al.<sup>??</sup> agree that the shoulder is likely a free OH-peak that has been red-shifted due to interaction with the oil. We also agree that the shift is related to the zeta potential of the oil droplets, albeit through different mechanisms.

In our work we found that, agnostical of the zeta potential's origin, we could theoretically reproduce the shift by incorporating an additional electric field of  $\sim 60$  MV/cm coming from the oil in our calculation, consistent with a zeta potential of 40 meV. The fact that air<sup>???</sup> and oil droplets<sup>??</sup> dispersed in water migrate towards a positive electrode in an electric field, one possibility is that there is well-bound hydroxide accumulation at the water-oil interface<sup>?</sup>, with an imbalance or more diffuse layer of compensating hydronium ions, as the origin of the zeta potential.<sup>?</sup> In contrast, Pullanchery et al.<sup>?</sup>, and others previously<sup>????</sup> have proposed that the zeta potential of water emulsions results from charge transfer between water molecules (and between water and oil molecules in the case of oil-in-water emulsions). In this scenario, many waters on the surface of the droplet each transfer a small fraction of their electron density to the droplet. In air-in-water emulsions, the charge is transferred to waters at the edge of the air droplets; in oil-in-water emulsions, the charge is transferred to oil molecules. Indeed, an accumulation of charge is observable in MD simulations.<sup>???</sup>

However, we find the latter explanation unsatisfactory because it implies an unphysical slip plane. As mentioned above, charges (usually assumed to be ions) on one side of the slip plane are thought to move with the droplets, while charges on the other side are not. Although an individual water may share a small fraction of its electron density with the droplet, that fraction of electron density is still bound to the water and not the droplet, and thus moves with the water instead of the droplet. The alternative, that small fractions of electron density are bound to the droplet, is distinctly nonphysical because it requires the slip plane to be within individual electrons.

And yet the former hypothesis suffers from the disagreement in the experimental literature as to surface acidity or basicity, with more recent studies favoring hydronium, not hydroxide, to be more strongly absorbed at the interface. Finally, many dismiss the idea that there are any inherent molecular interactions involving water and oil, but instead are simply the result of impurities. This last argument seems the least satisfying for explaining why chemical reactivity is observed in oil-water emulsions.

## 5.5 Interfacial Adsorption of Organic and Ionic Species

Many reactions reported to be accelerated in microdroplets involve organic reagents and products. Famously, many organic molecules are poorly soluble in water, and thus they adsorb quite strongly to water/hydrophobic interfaces<sup>1,2,3</sup>, which has large implications for their reactivity in droplets. The concentration profile of benzene and anthracene in terms of the potential of mean force (PMF), which is analogous to the free energy of adsorption, shows that both species are most concentrated at the interface.<sup>4</sup> In fact anthracene with its greater hydrophobic surface adsorbs more strongly than benzene, such that its concentration is 600 times greater at the interface than in bulk water. The preference of organic molecules for the water-hydrophobic interface can be understood as a manifestation of the hydrophobic effect, i.e. that while organic molecules interact favorably with water molecules through dispersion interactions, their presence in the bulk phase interferes with the highly favorable interactions between water molecules themselves such that they segregate toward the surface.

Of course, the degree of surface adsorption varies strongly from molecule to molecule<sup>5</sup>, since well-stabilized molecules as reflected in their solvation energy in bulk water have less impetus for the interface.<sup>6</sup> But the Gibb's adsorption isotherm indicates even molecules that are quite soluble in water, like small alcohols and acids<sup>7</sup>, also partition to the interface as seen in experiments and MD simulations.<sup>8,9</sup> As the alkane chain of simple alcohols grow longer, their interfacial propensity also increases substantially<sup>10</sup>, which can give rise to complex interfaces such as reverse micelles or lipid bilayer organizations.

The interfacial behavior of ions has also been investigated. Early theoretical considerations indicated that they should be repelled from the water-air interface<sup>11,12</sup>. Specifically, charged particles close to the interface between a high dielectric constant material (like water) and a low dielectric material (like a gas or oil phase) are expected to experience an "image charge repulsion" from the interface, where the ion experiences a force as if a like-charged ion were on the opposite side of the interface. In simpler terms, this can be understood by considering the fact that ions have strong, long-ranged interactions with water that are interrupted at the interface. However, both experimental and simulation efforts, of which there are many,<sup>13,14,15,16,17,18,19</sup> indicate that the situation is more complicated. As before, the surface excess of ions can be estimated with the Gibb's adsorption isotherm<sup>20</sup>, which shows that many salts are indeed repelled from the surface, but some large singly-charged anions also preferentially adsorbed at the interface. But the degree of surface adsorption for such ions is not excessive; for example, low-weight alcohols like methanol, which are not known for their surface propensity, adsorb more strongly than these simple ions<sup>21</sup>.

Of great interest are the special roles that hydronium and hydroxide and electrons play in microdroplets, and their relative preferences for the hydrophobic-water interface or bulk phase.<sup>22</sup> As water can self-ionize into hydroxide and hydronium, the movement of oil droplets in water towards a positive electrode has historically been attributed to hydroxide adsorbing to the oily interface.<sup>23</sup>

This mechanism is inline with the pH-dependence of the zeta potential<sup>??</sup>, whose magnitude is reduced as the pH declines (approaching 0 around a pH of 2-4), and the fact that solution pH drops when forming emulsion droplets<sup>?</sup>. Other interfacial behavior also points towards a negatively charged interface.<sup>??</sup> From the pH-dependence of the zeta potential, Marinova et al.<sup>?</sup> estimated the binding strength of hydroxide to be  $\sim 15$  kcal/mol. Several theoretical explanations exist to justify hydroxide’s propensity for the interface, such as its amphiphilic nature<sup>?</sup> or its reduction of water’s dielectric constant, which decreases dipolar fluctuations<sup>?</sup>.

**Figure 9:** The adsorption of hydronium and hydroxide to the water/air interfaces. Adapted with permission from reference.

In contrast, other measurements show that hydroxide does not adsorb to water/interfaces, or does so weakly. The Gibb’s adsorption isotherm, which is a general method for computing surface excess from surface tension data, indicates that hydroxide is lightly repelled from water/air interfaces.<sup>?</sup> Additionally, SFG spectra suggest that hydronium is more prevalent at the interface, but with the caveat that SFG is more sensitive to acids than bases.<sup>??????</sup>. Together this has been interpreted to mean that  $H^+$  is more surface-active, which agrees with the surface tension data.<sup>?</sup> Furthermore, most MD simulations find (depending upon the model employed) that hydronium is at the outermost interface of air-water systems,<sup>??</sup> whereas hydroxide has no preferential adsorption to interfaces<sup>?????</sup> or only adsorbs weakly<sup>??</sup>. However preferential hydronium absorption at the interface of oil-water emulsions is inconsistent with the zeta potential measurements as patiently pointed out by Beattie and co-workers<sup>?</sup>, and the origin of the zeta potential remains an unresolved and open question.

Like the debate on the surface propensity of the molecular ions, where the electron resides in interfacial water systems is also controversial.<sup>????</sup> The fully solvated electron itself is a notoriously difficult species to describe accurately and has been the subject of wide theoretical<sup>???</sup> and experimental<sup>??????</sup> interest. In particular, much effort has gone into determining the vertical binding energy (VBE) of the solvated electron, which is typically measured using ultrafast UV photoelectron spectroscopy. The VBE of the bulk aqueous electron,  $e_{aq}^-(b)$ , was originally reported to be around 3.3 eV<sup>?</sup>, but has since been corrected to  $3.77 \pm 0.1$  eV after kinetic energy loss due to inelastic scattering was accounted for<sup>??</sup>. It is known that  $e_{aq}^-$  is the only aqueous anion with a positive entropy of hydration<sup>?</sup>, of  $\Delta S_{hyd}^\circ = 118 \pm 20$  J/mol/ K<sup>o</sup>.

The extrapolation from very small water cluster experiments<sup>?</sup> to larger clusters<sup>?</sup> have determined that electrons can bind at the aqueous surface. In fact the earlier work of the Neumark group in the VBE assignment of a surface bound state of large water clusters (up to 200 waters) appears to extrapolate well to a VBE for surface-bound  $e_{aq}^-(s)$ , of  $\sim 1.6$  eV determined by Sieferman and co-workers.<sup>?</sup> However recent work by Jordan and co-workers although very<sup>?</sup>

The concept of partial solvation<sup>??</sup> relies on the observation that many reactions are  $\approx 10^{10}$  faster in the gas phase than in the aqueous phase.<sup>??</sup> The solvation state at the interface may be intermediate between the unsolvated gas phase and the fully solvated aqueous phases, and thus reaction rates may lie somewhere in between the bulk phase values; as described in section 3, the solvation state is likely different at the interface. Discerning stabilization of the transition state, which has been proposed to explain the deceleration in the liquid phase<sup>?</sup>, is more challenging. Qiu et al.<sup>?</sup> attributed their observation that only bimolecular reactions are accelerated because these

reactions have more charge-disperse transition states, which are more stabilized at the interface than in the bulk. Of course, the acceleration of bimolecular reactions is also expected from an increased interfacial concentration, so its challenging to distinguish the importance of partial solvation from absorption thermodynamics. Because its an atomic-scale mechanism, simulations can help distinguish between different possibilities. To this end, Narendra et al.<sup>?</sup> used MD simulations to investigate hydrazone formation from phenylhydrazine and indoline-2,3-dione, finding a reaction path at the interface that had a significantly lower barrier than in the bulk, indicating that partial solvation may in fact play a large role in that reaction.

Other explanations point to factors beyond the properties of the microdroplets. One possibility is that some chemical reactivity is occurring in the gas phase between reactants that have desorbed from the microdroplets. Jacobs et. el.<sup>?</sup> investigated the production of sugar phosphates, which is reported to be accelerated in microdroplets, finding that the reaction occurred even when the reactants were in separate solutions, and thus concluded that gas-phase reactivity cannot be neglected. Similar conclusions were drawn by Gallo et al.<sup>?</sup> for a different reaction, and hence gas-phase reactivity can be the dominant contribution to accelerated reactivity in some cases.

Another possibility is that the droplets are evaporating over the course of the experiment, thus concentrating the reactants and accelerating the reaction. While evaporation likely occurs, it is difficult to ascertain its relevance. In one set of experiments, Lai et al.<sup>?</sup> found that changing the distance that the droplets must travel to the detector had a limited effect on the reaction profile, indicating that limited evaporative concentration of reactants was occurring. On the other hand, when studying a reaction in which the reagents had limited surface propensity, Chen et al.<sup>?</sup> found that solvent evaporation dramatically influenced reaction rate.


Reaction thermodynamics provides a clarifying lens through which to understand microdroplet reactivity<sup>?</sup><sup>?</sup><sup>?</sup>, since in an uncharged system the largest perturbation to the reaction thermodynamics is the interface. In a reacting system with an interface, equilibrium will be reached when 1) the ratio of product to reactant activities equals the equilibrium constant and 2) the activity of each species is equal at the interface and in the bulk. Concentrations at the interface may be different from bulk at the same activity. Specifically, at low concentration, the interface concentration will change by  $e^{-\beta\mu_{ads}}$ , where  $\mu_{ads}$  is the free energy of surface adsorption. Consequently, if the adsorption free energies of reactants and products in unimolecular reaction differ by  $\Delta\mu_{ads}$ , their relative concentrations at the interface will differ from the bulk by  $e^{-\beta\Delta\mu_{ads}}$ . Importantly, in unimolecular reactions where both reactants and products have the same surface propensity, there will be no change in their relative concentrations. *Likewise, changes in their relative concentration, such as the formation of a species that is thermodynamically unfavorable in bulk, implies that one species must be adsorbing more strongly than the other.*

Non-stoichiometric reactions differ due to the well-known dependence of the equilibrium concentrations on reaction volume. If reactant species outnumber product species (or vice-versa), the product (reactant) concentration will increase with the available volume. Increased adsorption to the interface will increase local concentration; thus, the relative concentrations can change even if reactants and products adsorb with similar affinity, unlike in unimolecular reactions. *Importantly, smaller droplets will have a greater surface-to-volume ratio, and thus, when reactant species outnumber reactant species, greater product formation.*

The imine synthesis reaction examined by Fallah-Araghi et al.<sup>?</sup> is a lucid example of this mechanism, thus it has also been the focus of other theoretical treatments<sup>?</sup>. They examined the bimolecular reaction of an amine and an aldehyde to yield a fluorescent imine in a water-in-oil



emulsion. All species had similar surface propensities. In bulk,  $K_{eq}$  for this reaction is quite low and little product is formed, as shown in Figure 10a. In contrast, more product is formed in the emulsion droplet, with the measured  $K_{eq}$  (when measured in terms of concentrations) increasing with decreasing droplet radius, as shown in Figure 10b.




**Figure 10:** The thermodynamics and kinetics of imine synthesis inside a water-in-oil emulsion. In a), the product concentration with time is shown. Emulsion droplet systems are given by their volumes in  $pL$ . In b) the effective equilibrium concentrations are shown as a function of radius ratio. Adapted with permission from reference<sup>?</sup>.

We note that the excellent work of Rovelli et al.<sup>?</sup> explicitly attempted to distinguish between several of these mechanisms using numerical models, finding that gas-phase absorption and droplet evaporation are all relevant, as well as droplet charge which we consider next.


## 6 Interfacial Electric Fields

Electric fields are known to significantly accelerate reactions.<sup>??</sup> Specifically, if the electric field is parallel to the reaction axis, the electric field will promote ionization along the bond<sup>?</sup> and consequently reduce the energy required for the bond to break. In addition to externally applied electric fields, molecules can generate electric fields themselves. Water, with its large dipole moment, generates particularly large electric fields. The field experienced by aqueous solutes depends on the behavior of the solvation waters, so its possible that the disruption of water ordering at the interface, as discussed in section 2, substantially alters the electric fields experienced by the reactants. Thus electric fields have been put forth as explanation for a wide array of accelerated reactions in enzymes, surfaces, and most recently for microdroplet chemistry. We emphasize that the distinction as to whether a microdroplet is charged or uncharged is not necessary to define since the electric field can be regarded as a unified and quantitative gauge of many interactions occurring between water molecules in the bulk and at formed hydrophobic-water interfaces.<sup>??</sup>



**Figure 11:** Electric fields as proxies for molecular interactions. Adapted with permission from references<sup>?</sup>.

Both experiment and simulation indicate that electric fields are stronger at the hydrophobic-water interface. While molecules in bulk water can experience very short-ranged fields around 100 - 300 MV/cm<sup>?</sup>, their orientations undergo rotational averaging whereas interfacial electric fields are persistent in their perpendicular direction to the air-water surface. In 2020 Xiong et. al.<sup>?</sup> used rhodamine 800 probe to study the electric field at the surface of a water-in-oil emulsion using SREF (Figure ). They found that the frequency of probe's nitrile group, which is sensitive and calibrated to the local electric field, was shifted at the interface by 5 cm<sup>-1</sup>, which corresponds to a field strength of  $\approx 10$  MV/cm. Likewise, Hao et al.<sup>?</sup> examined the electric field experienced by the OH vibrational stretches at the interface relative to bulk, as illustrated in Figure 7b. They found that the average electric field at the interface is close to  $\approx 10$  MV/cm, in agreement with the SREF experiment, but more importantly the soft interface can fluctuate to create a distribution of field strengths with high probability that would certainly be large enough to influence reactivity.<sup>??</sup>. In general, the primary role of the electric field is to reduce the barrier for reaction in a microdroplet<sup>?</sup>, in which the electric field and its fluctuation are largest at the water-hydrophobic interface.<sup>?</sup>



**Figure 12:** Electric fields measured at water interfaces. In a), we show the frequency of the nitrile stretch of rhodamine 800 at the interface of a water-in-oil emulsion and in the bulk. In b) we show the distribution of electric fields measured in bulk and at the interface in of a microdroplet in simulations using the reaxff-CGEM model<sup>?</sup> for water. Adapted with permission from references<sup>?</sup> .

Furthermore, the presence of charge can lead to much longer-ranged fields extending over the entirety of the microdroplet, as shown by Chamberlayne et al.<sup>?</sup>, which leads to a greater surface potential. Microdroplets in emulsion systems also behave as if they are carrying a charge, which can increase the strength of electric fields. In a recent work<sup>?</sup>, we estimated the electric field at the interface due to the zeta potential in an oil-in-water emulsion to be around 30-70 MV/cm, which is substantially larger than the values reported at uncharged interfaces. [discuss pH expts that are consistent with 60 MV/cm](#) We thus suspect that fields due to microdroplet charge play a more important role in accelerating microdroplet chemistry than the fields inherent to uncharged water interfaces.

## 7 Conclusions

Water microdroplets show promise in enabling a diverse array of reactions. Many of these reactions are quite unfavorable and may, outside of microdroplets, require other hazardous chemicals to complete. Water is abundant and distinctly nonhazardous, and thus the microdroplets provide a “clean” synthesis method. Water microdroplets are also complex systems, and thus pinning down the mechanism of reaction acceleration is challenging. The challenge is underscored by deficiencies in our understanding of water/hydrophobic interfaces. Here we have reviewed this understanding, emphasizing insights from recent work but also highlighting areas of disagreement, like the unexplained zeta potential of water emulsions. One aspect of microdroplets that we are confident is relevant for their reactivity is their charge. Recent work of ours and others demonstrates that charge can dramatically change the reaction thermodynamics, making unfavorable reactions favorable, although further work is needed to establish the nature of the charge. In summarizing recent work and reviewing open questions, we hope to bring the promise of microdroplet reactivity closer to fruition.

zeta potentials, connection to electric fields, etc

To us, droplet charge is especially important because it can explain the altered thermodynamics in microdroplets.

Throughout this perspective, we have made the argument that there are fundamental similarities between sprayed microdroplets and oil-water emulsions. This argument has been made on the grounds that each situation has regions of net-negative and net-positive charge and these charged regions should alter the thermodynamics of chemical reactions in fundamentally similar ways. Note that this argument is independent of how these charged regions are formed. As an example, it has been observed that forming oil-water emulsions results in the production of both  $\text{H}^\bullet$  and  $\text{OH}^\bullet$  radicals as measured by electron paramagnetic resonance.<sup>7</sup> It is not clear if the charged droplets produced by gas nebulization<sup>7</sup> require electron transfer or if the charging process can be understood by simply partitioning  $\text{H}^+$  and  $\text{OH}^-$  ions unevenly between the fragmented droplets.

**Some experiments which could be useful. Perhaps do some calculations on the oil radical hydroxide binding affinity.**

Also implicated in microdroplet reactivity are interfacial electric fields, which may differ from bulk due to the orientational ordering induced by the interface, as discussed in Section 2.1.