

Comparison of the cyclic voltammetry of benzene-1,2-diol and benzene-1,2,3-triol and their ability to form films on the carbon working electrode after a single potential sweep cycle

Vincent Ball ^{1,2,*}

¹ University of Strasbourg, Faculté de Chirurgie Dentaire, 8 rue Sainte Elizabeth, 67000 Strasbourg, France

² Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale, Unité Mixte de Recherche 1121, 1 rue Eugène Boeckel, 67000 Strasbourg, France

*Corresponding author, e-mail address: vball@unistra.fr

Received 15 July 2023; accepted 31 August 2023; published online 20 October 2023

ABSTRACT


The deposition of thin films on electrode surfaces by methods like cyclic voltammetry (CV) or chronoamperometry was for a long time considered as a drawback owing to the passivation of the electrode and a subsequent reduction in its ability to allow for the determination of electroactive compounds. However, the easy deposition of thin films from electroactive molecules is also a surface functionalization method. In this article the ability of 1,2-dihydroxybenzene (catechol) and of 1,2,3-trihydroxybenzene (pyrogallol) to form films impermeable to potassium hexacyanoferrate after only one CV « deposition » cycle will be compared. The addition of an additional hydroxyl group on catechol improves the film forming ability in the potential sweep rate window between 1 and 100 mV.s⁻¹. The obtained data will be interpreted in terms of the reversible (mostly for catechol) versus irreversible nature (in the case of pyrogallol) of the « deposition » cycle.

1. INTRODUCTION


The formation of passivating films on electrodes upon potential cycling (as in cyclic voltammetry) or under potentiostatic regime (as in chronoamperometry) is often considered as a major drawback in electrochemical processes. For instance, the oxidation Br⁻ and I⁻ on platinum electrodes is inhibited in the presence of phenol which is oxidized and electropolymerized at the electrode surface [1]. However, the formation of electro or bioactive films from redox active monomers can also be considered as a major advantage to coat the conductive electrode material with a robust and conformal film for applications like in protection against corrosion [2] or as platforms for biosensing [3]. One non

negligible advantage of electrodeposition is that the molecules not in contact with the electrode or already deposited film are not lost and can be re-used for further deposition whereas oxidation induced by a soluble oxidant leads to film deposition at the solid/liquid interface and to uncontrolled precipitation in solution. For instance, conductive films can be obtained by the electropolymerization of aniline [4], pyrrole [5] and mixtures of aniline and pyrrole [6]. Catecholamines like dopamine in deaerated solutions [7-9] (at or near physiological pH), but also phenol [10, 11] and its derivatives like 1,2-dihydroxybenzene (catechol) [12-14], 1,2,3-trihydroxybenzene (pyrogallol) [15] yield conformal thin films upon electrodeposition. Interestingly, based on the effect

catechol



pyrogallol



Scheme 1. Structure of the two investigated compounds.

of inductive and resonance effects, the electrodeposition of the three isomers of dihydroxybenzenes is markedly different with almost no film deposition on amorphous carbon electrodes (at pH = 5.0 in the presence of 50 mM sodium acetate buffer) from 1,4-dihydroxybenzene containing solutions [16]. Comparing 1,3-dihydroxybenzene (resorcinol) with 1,2-dihydroxybenzene (catechol), the former undergoes oxidation at more anodic potentials (on an amorphous carbon electrode versus an Ag/AgCl reference electrode) than the later but passivates the electrode after only one CV cycle at 20 mV/s, whereas catechol requires at least 5 CV cycles in the same conditions to reach electrode passivation [16]. The same findings have been made for meta substituted phenol and aniline [17]. The oxidation pathways of other meta substituted phenols have also been investigated [18-20]. Even if major research efforts have been devoted to the mechanisms [18-20] able to explain the oxidation-reduction of such molecules and their subsequent chemical reactivity, much less attention has been given on the influence of small structural or compositional variations on the film forming ability of phenol derivatives.

In such a context, the major aim of this investigation is to compare the electrodeposition by CV of catechol and of pyrogallol (scheme 1) as function of the potential sweep rate at a constant pH equal to 5.0. This investigation complements a

previous one [15] in the sense that electrodeposition will be performed in broad potential rate range from 1 to 100 mV.s⁻¹. Both compounds are compared for their electron transfer coefficient to the electrode and in their ability to yield thin films impermeable to a redox probe as the negatively charged hexacyanoferrate anion after only one CV cycle performed at different potential sweep rates. The more impermeable the films are after only one potential sweep cycle, the better is the film forming ability of the investigated compound. This trend will also be confirmed by means of electrochemical impedance spectroscopy.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

All the required chemicals were used as purchased without further purification: catechol (ref. C9510, Sigma-Aldrich), pyrogallol (ref. P0381, Sigma) and potassium hexacyanoferrate (II) trihydrate (ref P9387).

The aqueous solutions were made from ultrapure and deionized water ($\rho=18.2 \text{ M}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}$, Direct-Q[®]3UV, Millipore). The solutions of the electroactive molecules were prepared at $9.0 \times 10^{-3} \text{ M}$ whatever the tested compound just before the electrochemical deposition. The supporting electrolyte was 50 mM sodium acetate (ref. 9023841 from Merck) buffer at pH 5.0. The pH was adjusted with concentrated hydrochloric acid (ref. 403871 from Carlo Erba) and monitored with a

calibrated pH meter (pH50 from VioLab, France). No care was taken to degas the used solutions, and therefore the electrochemical processes were investigated at potentials above -0.5 V vs the Ag/AgCl reference electrode.

The electrochemical deposition was performed with a PGSTAT204 potentiostat (Metrohm France) in a three electrode cell configuration using an amorphous carbon disk 2 mm in diameter (ref. CHI 104 from CHI Instruments, Austin, Texas) as the working electrode, a Pt wire as the counter electrode (ref. CHI 115) and Ag/AgCl (ref. CHI 111) as the reference electrode. The device was controlled with the Nova 2.1.6 software (Metrohm). The working electrode was freshly polished on a SiC cloth, and then with two alumina slurries (1 and 0.1 μm , from Escil, Villeurbanne, France) before sonication in two water baths during 2 min. The surface state of the electrode was controlled by performing a CV scan between -0.5 and +1.0 V vs Ag/AgCl at a potential sweep rate of 100 $\text{mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ in the presence of 1mM potassium hexacyanoferrate. The polished electrode was used for electrodeposition provided the oxidation and reduction peaks were separated by less than 80 mV (the theoretical value being 59 mV for a reversible one electron oxidation-reduction process [21]). For each investigated molecule (Scheme 1) the potential was swept between -0.5 and +1.0 V versus Ag/AgCl at potential sweep rates changing from 1 to 100 $\text{mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$. The permeability with respect to hexacyanoferrate of the deposited coating after only one "deposition cycle" (in the

presence of either catechol or pyrogallol) was investigated in the following manner: after the "deposition" cycle the electrode was rinsed with sodium acetate buffer and subjected to 1 CV cycle in the presence of this buffer between -0.5 and +1.0 V versus Ag/AgCl at a potential sweep rate of 100 $\text{mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$. The same experiment was then reiterated in the same buffer but in the presence of 1 mM potassium hexacyanoferrate. The oxidation peak potential was identified and located using the Nova 2.1.6 software. The oxidation current at this potential was measured and the current measured at the same potential but in the absence of the redox probe was subtracted from it. This difference corresponds to the faradic oxidation current of the hexacyanoferrate anion: I_{film} . This current was compared to the faradic current of the redox probe on the pristine and polished electrode: I_{elec} . The relative permeability after one CV deposition cycle is hence quantified by:

$$\text{Relative permeability} = \frac{I_{film}}{I_{elec}} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

A relative permeability of 0% corresponds to a totally impermeable and hence conformal film whereas a relative permeability close to 100 % corresponds to the absence of film deposition or to extremely porous films.

Electrochemical impedance spectra have been acquired on the films deposited after one CV scan at 50 mV/s in the presence of sodium acetate buffer containing 1 mM $\text{K}_4\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6$. The potential was




Figure 1. CV of catechol (panel A) and pyrogallol (panel B) at different potential sweep rates: (gray line—): 1 $\text{mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, (gray dashed line---): 2 $\text{mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, (black line —): 5 $\text{mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, (red line—): 10 $\text{mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, (blue line —): 20 $\text{mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, (green line —): 50 $\text{mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, (purple line —): 100 $\text{mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$.




Figure 2: Detail of some CVs of catechol (panel A) and pyrogallol (panel B) performed at (—, gray line): $1 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, (—, black line): $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ and (—, purple line); $100 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$. The CVs performed at 1 and $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ have been multiplied by 4.61 ($\ln 100$) and by 3.00 ($\ln 20$) respectively as explained in the main text.

swept around the oxidation peak potential of $\text{K}_4\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6$ on the pristine electrode with an AC modulation of 5 mV in the frequency range from 10^5 to 10^{-2} Hz. 12 measurements were done per frequency decade. The data were fitted with the eisanalyser software (available on the internet for free).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The CVs of catechol, pyrogallol, solubilized at $9 \times 10^{-3} \text{ mol}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ and in the presence of 50 mM sodium acetate buffer ($\text{pH}=5.0$) on a polished amorphous carbon electrode have been recorded at different potential sweep rates between -0.5 and 1.0 V vs Ag/AgCl (Figure 1). This potential window was selected because the reduction wave of dissolved oxygen would be apparent below -0.5 V vs Ag/AgCl in non de-gassed solutions as those used in this study. It appears that the oxidation wave of the two investigated compounds starts around +0.2 V vs Ag/AgCl and that the oxidation peaks are markedly influenced by the potential sweep rate as expected for either reversible or irreversible electrochemical processes [22]. In the case of pyrogallol, the CV is of irreversible nature, with no measurable reduction wave whatever the potential sweep rate. Hence, pyrogallol displays a markedly different behavior than catechol which CV displays a pronounced reversible character the more so the potential sweep rate is high. However, the CV of catechol becomes also irreversible, with no detectable

reduction wave, at potential sweep rates lower than $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (Figure 1A). As another interesting observation, the first oxidation peak of pyrogallol is followed by a second one at potential sweep rates higher than $10 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ as in other investigations but at a different electrode and in the presence of another electrolyte [22]. The appearance of this second peak may be related to a high reactivity of the first oxidation product of pyrogallol (a radical) allowing the occurrence of a second oxidation wave at high potential sweep rates, where the first oxidation product has no time to rearrange and form chemical bonds with neighboring pyrogallol molecules in the same oxidation state. However, at low potential sweep rates those radical intermediates have time to undergo some coupling with other molecules and loose hence their redox behavior, explaining the presence of only one redox wave at low potential sweep rates. Catechol displays a unique oxidation peak at those high potential sweep rates. However, the opposite holds true at low potential sweep rates. To emphasize the effect of the potential sweep rate, some typical CVs are plotted with the current multiplied by $\ln(100/v)$ because the highest potential sweep rate was equal to $100 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$. In this representation catechol (Figure 2A) displays two additional oxidation peaks (not apparent in Figure 1 because of the representation mode) at low potential sweep rates at potentials around +0.6 and +0.8 V vs Ag/AgCl. They are still present at $2 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (data not shown)




Figure 3: Evolution of the maximal oxidation current as a function of $\ln V$ for the two investigated molecules, panel A: catechol and panel B: pyrogallol. The full and dotted lines correspond to a linear regression to the data and the limit of the 95 % confidence interval respectively. Each point corresponds to an independent experiment. The slopes of the curves and the linear regression coefficients are given in the insets.

but are not observed anymore when the CV is performed at $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (Figure 2A).

When considering the evolution of the mean oxidation peak current as a function of the potential sweep rate, no marked difference between catechol and pyrogallol appears whatever the potential sweep rate. The peak current should scale with $v^{1/2}$ when the electrochemical process is limited by diffusion to the electrode [21]. To confirm this the I_p vs V curve was plotted on a double logarithmic scale, yielding to slopes close to 0.5 as expected. However, in the case of pyrogallol the obtained slope of the $\ln(I_{pa})$ versus $\ln V$ curve has a smaller slope than the corresponding curve for catechol. There is no available explanation for this qualitative finding at the moment. However, it seems robust owing to the number of performed

experiments: 9 for catechol and for 11 pyrogallol (Figure 3).

However, a significant deviation from the theoretical behavior becomes pronounced when the main oxidation peak potential is plotted against the logarithm of the potential sweep rate (Figure 4). For an irreversible electron transfer, which is the case for pyrogallol at all investigated potential sweep rates and for catechol below $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, the following relationship is expected to be satisfied [22, 23]:

$$E_{p,a} = b + \left(\frac{RT}{2aF}\right) \cdot \ln v \quad (2)$$

where $E_{p,a}$, R , T and v are the anodic peak potential, the universal gas constant, the temperature and the potential sweep rate




Figure 4: Evolution of the oxidation peak potential (at the first CV scan) as a function of the logarithm of the potential sweep rate. Purple disks and lines: catechol (panel A), blue squares and lines: pyrocatechol (panel B). The full lines correspond to a linear regression to the experimental data for potential sweep rates larger than $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$. The dashed lines correspond to the limits of the 95 % confidence interval. Each point corresponds to an independent experiment.

respectively. b is a constant and a is the anodic electron transfer coefficient (sometimes represented by βn_{β} in the literature [22]). The fit of the equation (2) to the experimental data is satisfactory (Table 1) provided the sweep rate is higher than $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (Table 1) and this allows to provide an estimate of the value of the anodic electron transfer coefficient. But, both for catechol and pyrogallol, a clear change in the E_{pa} vs $\ln V$ regime is observed below this critical scan rate of $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (Figure 4). The quality of the fit of equation (2) to the experimental data is less good than the fit obtained for the $\ln I_{pa}$ versus $\ln V$ curves (Figure

3). This can be easily explained by the nature of the measurement itself: a current (Figure 3) and a potential (Figure 4). The potentials are measured versus a reference electrode (here Ag/AgCl) which is very stable, but the electrodes are polished and sonicated (see Materials and Methods) before every measurement and this slightly changes the peak potential values by a few mV. A measurement sequence starts with a CV cycle in a solution containing the reversible $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6^{3-} / \text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6^{4-}$ redox probe [21]. This experiment is aimed to check the cleanliness of the electrode. It appears however that the oxidation potential peak during

Table 1 : Values of the slopes of the anodic peak potential versus the logarithm of the potential sweep rate (Figure 4) for catechol and pyrogallol and the corresponding anodic electron transfer coefficients calculated according to equation (2).

compound	Slope of the E_{pa} vs $\ln V$ curve (for $V \geq 5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$)	r^2	anodic electron transfer coefficient – a in equation (2)
Catechol	0.019	0.66	0.68
pyrogallol	0.016	0.79	0.80

the oxidation of $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6^{4-}$ changes in a 20 mV interval from one experiment to the other. This largely explains the pretty large variations observed in Figure 4 (and absent in the current measurements, Figure 3). These variations may not only originate from the electrode cleaning process but also from slight changes in the relative position of the electrodes in the electrochemical cell inducing some small changes in the solution resistance and hence some small potential changes.

Nevertheless, the slopes of the obtained curves and hence the calculated electron transfer coefficients (Table 1) are similar for catechol and pyrogallol. This implies that the first oxidation event of both molecules is probably the same at

sufficiently high potential sweep rates ($V \geq 5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$). It has to be noted that the electron transfer coefficient of pyrogallol on an amorphous carbon electrode and at $\text{pH} = 5.0$ (this investigation) is significantly higher than the values obtained on a Pt working electrode in the presence of 0.5 M H_2SO_4 [22]. Indeed, in these conditions two oxidation peaks are observed for pyrogallol one at around + 0.45 V and the second at around +0.9 V versus the saturated calomel electrode [22]. Since both the nature of the working electrode as well as the supporting buffer changed, it is not easy to compare the electron transfer coefficient of pyrogallol obtained in the present investigation with the value reported in [22]. Nevertheless the value reported herein ($a=0.80$) is about twice the value




Figure 5: Capacitive curves acquired (at a potential sweep rate of $100 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$) for catechol (panel A) and pyrogallol (panel B) films obtained after 1 CV cycle performed at different scan rates: (gray line —): $1 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, (gray dashed line ---): $2 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, (black line —): $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, (red line —): $10 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, (blue line —): $20 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, (green line —): $50 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, (purple line —): $100 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$.

obtained on Pt for the corresponding peak ($\alpha=0.43$) [22].

The most interesting, and intriguing finding of the present investigation, is the change in the peak potential variation with the potential sweep rate below about $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (Figure 4). This is totally unexpected with respect to the theory of electron transfer (equation (2)) but is related to the appearance of different oxidation peaks at those low potential sweep rates (Figure 2). At the present state of knowledge one can thus just make the assumption that the mechanism of catechol/pyrogallol oxidation and the subsequent non electrochemical processes they undergo, as radical coupling followed by polymerisation [18, 19, 22] are radically different when more time is allowed for the radical species to react, namely at low potential sweep rates. The effect is anyway higher for catechol than for pyrogallol, because the former keeps some partial reversible character (manifested by the appearance of a reduction current at high potential sweep rates) whereas the later displays irreversible CV curves (with no measurable faradic reduction current) in the whole potential sweep rate window. The strong influence of the potential sweep rate on the electron transfer to the electrode and the subsequent non electrochemical processes should also manifest in a change in the composition and structure of the deposited coatings. To assess this point in a

qualitative manner, CV measurements of the electrodes after the first « deposition » cycle in the presence of catechol or pyrogallol were done at $100 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ in the presence of sodium acetate buffer only (without additional added redox probe) (Figure 5). The CV curves (displayed after the CV in the presence of catechol or pyrogallol have been performed between 1 and $100 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$) display an oxidation wave and a reduction wave in the case of catechol, whereas no reduction wave is measured in the case of pyrogallol. But the measurement of an oxidation wave for both molecules is a proof that an electroactive film has been deposited. These films are electroactive because they can be oxidized (and reduced in the case of catechol). Catechol based films distinguish from the pyrogallol ones not only by the partially reversible character of the measured CV but also by the following points:

- (i) The oxidation wave at potential sweep rates higher than about $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ is made of two peaks.
- (ii) A new anodically shifted oxidation peak is detected at about $+0.5 \text{ V}$ versus Ag/AgCl.

Observation (ii) may be related to the upshifted oxidation potential peak measured during the CVs performed with catechol solutions at low potential sweep rates (Figure 2 and Figure 4) and suggests that the reaction product obtained from catechol is totally different when the deposition is performed at




Figure 6: Some representative capacitive curves (dashed lines) and oxidation-reduction of hexacyanoferrate (full lines) before (black color) and after (purple color) 1 deposition CV cycle performed at either 5 or $100 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ as indicated above the curves. The black and purple arrows indicate the faradic current due to the oxidation of hexacyanoferrate anions on the polished electrode and on the electrode after 1 CV cycle respectively, in the presence of catechol ($1 \text{ mg}\cdot\text{mL}^{-1}$ in 50 mM sodium acetate buffer at $\text{pH} = 5.0$).

a sufficiently low potential sweep rate. In the case of pyrogallol the deposited species seem to be relatively independent on the potential sweep rate during the deposition CV cycle (Figure 5).

Spectroscopic and structural investigations, like infrared, Raman spectroscopies and transmission electron microscopy need to be performed on the obtained coatings and will be the subject of upcoming investigations. Those kinds of film characterizations have already been done for catechol based films deposited at $20 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ in the same sodium acetate buffer on amorphous carbon electrodes as a function of an increasing number of potential sweep cycles [14]. It was found that the obtained films, obtained in conditions where the CV displays a partially reversible character, are close to graphene oxide. One important question will be to know if this structure is conserved or lost when the deposition of catechol is performed at potential sweep rates below the critical $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ value.

Figure 5 shows that an electroactive deposit is obtained from catechol or pyrogallol containing solutions whatever the potential sweep rate chosen during the CV. It is of interest to investigate if these coatings, obtained after a single CV scan, are conformal without defects, allowing for a redox probe to reach the electrode and to be oxidized or reduced there. To that aim, in every experiment

performed, after the CV scan performed in buffer without redox probe (the data are displayed in Figure 5), a new CV scan at $100 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ but in the presence of 1 mM potassium hexacyanoferrate was performed (Figure 6).

When the deposition was performed at $1 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ no faradic current in addition to that measured on the film but without redox probe was found. When the deposition was performed above $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ an additional faradic current was found but the oxidation peak potential was anodically shifted in an almost constant amount in the case of pyrogallol but with a decreasing shift in the case of catechol (see the purple curves in Figure 6). When the deposition cycle is performed at $100 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$, almost no current reduction and almost no peak potential shift is obtained with respect to the polished electrode before the deposition (compare the full black and the full purple curve in Figure 6B) even if some material has been deposited on the electrode (purple dashed line in Figure 6B).

These data, comparing the faradic current on the film and on the polished electrode with the currents measured in the absence of $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6^{4-}$ (arrows in Figure 6) allow to calculate the remaining permeability of the film towards the redox probe according to equation (1).




Figure 7: Permeability change as a function of the scan rate for catechol and pyrogallol (as indicated in the inset) after only one CV “deposition” cycle. The purple line is aimed to guide the eye in the case of catechol based films whereas the blue line is aimed to guide the eye in the case of the films made from pyrogallol.





Figure 8: Nyquist plots of the electrochemical impedance spectra of pyrogallol (black circles) and catechol (blue triangles) based coatings obtained after 1 CV cycle at a potential sweep rate of 50 mV/s. The full lines correspond to the fit of a model corresponding to the Randless equivalent circuit (Scheme 2).

It appears that the catechol and pyrogallol based films are fully impermeable to the used (negatively charged) redox probe only when the deposition potential sweep rate is equal to 1 mV.s⁻¹. At all the higher potential sweep rates, the films display some permeability and are either porous or non conformal. But a marked difference is observed

between the catechol and pyrogallol based deposits : in the case of catechol the permeability gradually increases to 100 % (hence very few material deposition) whereas the potential sweep rate during the deposition cycle has almost no influence on the permeability to hexacyanoferrate for pyrogallol based films when the potential sweep



Scheme 2: Randless equivalent circuit used for the modelization of the electrochemical impedance spectra shown in Figure 8: R_1 , R_2 , CPE and W represent the solution resistance, the resistance of the film to the electron transfer, the constant phase element and the Warburg impedance respectively [23].

Table 2: Fitting parameter values of the Randless equivalent circuit to the electrochemical impedance spectra of the catechol and pyrogallol based films obtained after CV induced deposition (one cycle at 50 mV/s).

Compound	R_1 ($\Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$)	R_2 ($\Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$)	CPE ($\mu\text{F} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2}$)	n	W ($\Omega \cdot \text{cm}^2$)
Catechol	1450 \pm 80	(1.05 \pm 0.10) $\times 10^4$	7 \pm 3	0.59 \pm 0.02	2300 \pm 400
Pyrogallol	1600 \pm 50	(2.06 \pm 0.15) $\times 10^4$	16 \pm 1	0.66 \pm 0.01	6400 \pm 900

rate exceeds 5 $\text{mV} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$. This points to a more efficient electrochemical deposition behavior by CV for pyrogallol when compared to catechol. It has to be noted that for both investigated molecules a completely impermeable film (with respect to $\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6^{4-}$) can be obtained after a higher number of « deposition » CV cycles [13, 15]. But in the present investigation, it is shown that the impermeable state can be reached after only one « deposition » CV cycles for both compounds, hence in conditions where enough time is allowed between the onset of oxidation at about +0.2 V vs Ag/AgCl and the end of the CV cycle at -0.5 V vs Ag/AgCl. At 1 $\text{mV} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ this time duration amounts to 2300 s whereas it amounts to only 23 s when the potential is swept at 100 $\text{mV} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$. During such a long time interval oxidized and still absorbed molecules can diffuse on the surface and undergo some radical coupling to yield a conformal film.

To get more semi quantitative information about the electrochemical properties of the deposited films, namely their electrical conductivity, capacity and ionic transport properties related to their permeability (Figure 7) some electrochemical impedance spectroscopy experiments in the presence of 1 mM $\text{K}_4\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6$ were performed. Those electrochemical impedance spectra (Figure 8) could be fitted satisfactorily with the model corresponding to the Randless equivalent circuit (Scheme 2). It appeared that the pyrogallol based film displays a much larger value of the Warburg impedance (by a factor of almost 3, see Table 2) than the catechol based film. This strongly suggests that the hexacyanoferrate anions have more difficulties to diffuse across the pyrogallol based film than catechol based one or that the

former are less porous than the later. These data are consistent with the finding that the pyrogallol based films are much less permeable to the used redox probe (Figure 7) than their catechol based counterparts (after 1 CV cycles and at this particular potential sweep rate). Note that the electrochemical impedance spectra of the pyrogallol and catechol based films obtained after two CV cycles performed at 20 mV/s are given in Fig. 4 of [15] and are coherent with the findings presented in this study: namely that the pyrogallol based coatings are less permeable to hexacyanoferrate anions than the catechol based coatings. The difference in permeability is just more pronounced after two CV (in ref. [15]) deposition cycle than after one cycle (herein).

In addition, the fit of the Randless equivalent circuit model to the data indicates that the pyrogallol based film displays a higher resistance to the electron transfer (by a factor of 2) and a higher capacitance (by a factor of 2 also) than the catechol based film. This could suggest that the pyrogallol based films are either thicker or more compact than their catechol counterparts. In the future, this assumption needs to be confirmed by imaging techniques like Atomic Force Microscopy. Anyway this property to yield films with low permeability to the used redox probe seems to be closely related to the shape of the CV curves (Figure 1 and 2). Important film deposition and significant or total permeability suppression occurs only for irreversible CVs, i.e. without measurable faradic reduction current. In the case of pyrogallol, the « deposition » CV display an irreversible character at all the investigated potential sweep rates and a full or about 60 % permeability

reduction. However in the case of catechol, the CV become irreversible only when the deposition is performed below $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (Figure 2A). At higher potential sweep rates, the reduction wave during the CV becomes more marked (Figures 1A and 2A) and the permeability of the deposit markedly increases (Figure 7).

4. CONCLUSIONS

This investigation was aimed to complement the previous one [15] aimed to compare film deposition on amorphous carbon electrodes and at $\text{pH} = 5.0$ from catechol and pyrogallol differing by the addition of an additional OH group on position 3 of phenol (Scheme 1). It appears that the CV of pyrogallol solutions are of an irreversible nature (without an observable reduction current) for potential sweep rates between 1 and $100 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ as those of resorcinol [16] but the onset of oxidation occurring at much lower potentials in the case of pyrogallol (about $+0.2 \text{ V}$ vs Ag/AgCl) compared to resorcinol (about $+0.7 \text{ V}$ vs Ag/AgCl) [16]. However, the CVs of catechol containing solutions display a reduction peak of increasing intensity when the potential sweep rate is higher than about $5 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ and become irreversible only below this critical potential rate value. The possibility to obtain films impermeable to hexacyanoferrate anions after only one "deposition" CV cycle is more efficient for pyrogallol than for catechol even if both molecules yield to impermeable films when the deposition is performed at $1 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$. At the highest investigated potential sweep rate, the catechol based coatings are totally permeable to the used redox probe whereas the pyrogallol based coatings display a reduction of permeability close to 60 %. This investigation highlights, as the previous one on the same topic [15], that the addition of a third OH group on the meta position of catechol improves the film forming ability of the derivative. Further studies will be aimed to investigate the chemical composition and the structure of the pyrogallol based films at all the investigated potential sweep rates and to compare them with the catechol based coatings which are known to yield graphene oxide based films on amorphous carbon electrodes at a potential sweep rate of $20 \text{ mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ [14].

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Bejerano, Ch. Forgacs, E. Gileadi, *Electron. Chem. & Interf. Electrochem.* **27**, 69-79 (1970).
- [2] G. Mengoli, M.M. Musiani, *Prog. Org. Coat.* **24**, 237-251 (1994).
- [3] E. Wajs, N. Fernández, A. Fragoso, *Analyst* **141**, 3274-3279 (2016).
- [4] Y.Z. Li, Y. Yi, W.F. Yang, X.Q. Liu, Y.Y. Li, W. Wang, *J. Electron. Mater.* **46**, 1324-1330 (2017).
- [5] S.B. Saidman, M.E. Vela, *Thin Solid Films* **493**, 96-103 (2005).
- [6] J.Q. Iroh, R. Rajagopalan, *Surf. Eng.* **16**, 481-486 (2000).
- [7] F. Bernsmann, J.-C. Voegel, V. Ball, *Electrochim. Acta* **56**, 3914-3919 (2011).
- [8] Y. Li, M. Liu, C. Xiang, Q. Xie, S. Yao, *Thin Solid Films* **497**, 270-278 (2006).
- [9] S. Li, H. Wang, M. Young, F. Xu, G. Cheng, H. Cong, *Langmuir* **35**, 1119-1125 (2019).
- [10] R. Lapuente, F. Cases, P. Garcès, E. Morallón, J.I. Vázquez. *J. Electroanal. Chem.* **451**, 163-171 (1998).
- [11] M. Gattrell, D.W. Kirk, *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **139**, 2736-2744 (1992).
- [12] Q. Lin, Q. Li, C. Batchelor-McAuley, R.G. Compton, *J. Phys. Chem. C* **119**, 1489-1495 (2015).
- [13] V. Ball, *Colloids & Surf. A: Physicochem. Eng. Aspects* **518**, 109-115 (2017).
- [14] N. Ortiz-Peña, D. Ihiwakrim, V. Ball, S. Stanescu, M. Rastei, C. Sanchez, D. Portehault, O. Ersen, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **11**, 9117-9122 (2020).
- [15] V. Ball, *J. Electroanal. Chem.* **909**, art. 116142 (2022).
- [16] V. Ball, M.-L. Alfieri, K. Ziegler, Y. Arntz, M. d'Ischia, *Surfaces and Interfaces*. **20**, art.101841 (2022)
- [17] B. Kennedy, A. Glidle, V.J. Cunnane, *J. Electroanal. Chem.* **608**, 22-30 (2007).
- [18] T.A. Enache, A.M. Oliveira-Brett, *J. Electroanal. Chem.* **655**, 9-16 (2011).
- [19] K. Ngamchuea, B. Tharat, P. Hirunsit, S. Suthirakun, *RSC. Adv.* **10**, 28454-28463 (2020).
- [20] M.R. Deakin, R. M. Wightman, *J. Electroanal. Chem.* **206**, 167-177 (1986).
- [21] P.T. Kissinger, W.R. Heineman, *J. Chem. Educ.* **60**, 702-706 (1983).
- [22] H. Nady, M. El-Rabiei, G.A. El Hafez, *Egypt. J. Pet.* **26**, 669-678 (2017).
- [23] E. Gileadi, Physical Electrochemistry-Fundamentals, techniques and applications, chapter 15, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim (2011).