H$_2$-dependent attachment kinetics and shape evolution in chemical vapor deposition graphene growth
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Abstract

Experiments on graphene growth through chemical vapor deposition (CVD) involving methane (CH$_4$) and hydrogen (H$_2$) gases reveal a complex shape evolution and a non-monotonic dependence on the partial pressure of H$_2$ ($p_{H_2}$). To explain these intriguing observations, we develop a microkinetic model for the stepwise decomposition of CH$_4$ into mobile radicals and consider two possible mechanisms of attachment to graphene crystals: CH radicals to hydrogen-decorated edges of the crystals and C radicals to bare crystal edges. We derive an effective mass flux and an effective kinetic coefficient, both of which depend on $p_{H_2}$, and incorporate these into a phase field model. The model reproduces both the non-monotonic dependence on $p_{H_2}$ and the characteristic shapes of graphene crystals observed in experiments. At small $p_{H_2}$, growth is limited by the kinetics of attachment while at large $p_{H_2}$, growth is limited because the effective mass flux is small. We also derive a simple analytical model that captures the non-monotone behavior, enables the two mechanisms of attachment to be distinguished and provides guidelines for CVD growth of defect-free 2D crystals.

Layers of two-dimensional materials such as graphene and 2D chalcogenides have attracted considerable research interest due to their appealing electrical, optical and mechanical properties [8, 13, 5, 11, 36]. While multiple approaches can be used for synthesis, chemical vapor deposition (CVD) has emerged as the primary method for growing large-area graphene crystals [21, 26] using a combination of gases typically involving hydrogen (H$_2$) and methane (CH$_4$), with the latter being the source of carbon. However, CVD is a complex process and growth conditions are largely empirically determined.

CVD involves many mobile radicals stemming from the catalytic decomposition of CH$_4$ vapor on the surface (e.g., copper), as well as different edge terminations of graphene crystals [38]. Hence attachment and diffusion kinetics play an important role in the growth and morphologies of graphene. Intriguingly, the growth of monolayer graphene islands on copper (Cu) substrates in experiments is found to depend non-monotonously on H$_2$ pressure [33] (see Fig. 1). However, the role of hydrogen remains unclear [19]. It is believed that hydrogen termination plays a role in the kinetics of attachment and hence in determining the radicals that can attach, e.g., CH or C, [30] [7]. To elucidate the growth mechanisms and provide a rational method for optimizing processing conditions, a unified mathematical model that accounts for all these effects needs to be developed.

Here, we develop a phase field model that accounts for the stepwise decomposition of CH$_4$ into mobile radicals, the shape of the graphene islands and the structure of graphene edges. To relate the deposition rate with the partial pressures of CH$_4$ ($p_{CH_4}$) and H$_2$ ($p_{H_2}$), we develop a novel microkinetic model of the catalytic decomposition of CH$_4$ on Cu substrates. Our main assumption is that H$_2$ influences the attachment kinetics by attaching to the edge of the graphene layer
Figure 1: Experimentally-determined non-monotone relation between the sizes of graphene crystals and the hydrogen partial pressure $p_{H_2}$, adapted from Vlassiouk et al. [33] (with permission).

and facilitating the incorporation of CH radicals to the edge [30]. While recent results suggest that the attaching species is CH [30], we also consider the possibility that C radicals attach directly. We then develop models for the effective flux and kinetic coefficient and incorporate them into the phase field framework. Thus we are able to keep track of the evolving sizes and shapes of the graphene crystals and the abundance and spatial distribution of radicals.

The catalytic decomposition of CH$_4$ on copper has several stages, see the Appendix and Ref.18 for a detailed description. We assume that the rate-limiting step corresponds to the adsorption and first dehydrogenation of CH$_4$ on the Cu surface, because of its high activation energy[12]. An analysis of the reactions (see Appendix) shows that the surface coverages of CH radicals ($\theta_{CH}$) and C radicals ($\theta_C$) satisfy

$$\frac{d\theta_{CH}}{dt} = F_{CH} = \frac{K_1 K_2 k_{AD,CH_4} p_{CH_4}}{K_H} \frac{p_{CH_4}}{m_j},$$

and

$$\frac{d\theta_C}{dt} = F_C = \frac{K_1 K_2 K_3 k_{AD,CH_4} p_{CH_4}}{K_H^{3/2}} \frac{p_{CH_4}}{m_j^{3/2}},$$

where we have disregarded desorption for simplicity (the more general case is given in the Appendix). Here, $F_{CH}$ and $F_C$ are fluxes, $k_{AD,CH_4}$ is the rate of adsorption and dehydrogenation of CH$_4$ and the $K_j$ are equilibrium constants, which are defined in the Appendix. When the attachment of $C$ is considered (e.g., (1b)), we also investigated the possibility that the rate-limiting step is the decomposition of CH$_{a}$ radicals as suggested by the high activation energy of the process [37, 12, 20] (see Appendix). Here, the subscript $a$ denotes adsorbed species. However, the results lead to the same scaling of $F_C$ with $p_{CH_4}$ and $p_{H_2}$ and thus do not qualitatively alter our conclusions below.

The dissociative adsorption of H$_2$ on the edge leads to the following law for the hydrogen edge coverage $\theta_{H_2}$ (see Appendix):

$$\theta_{H_2} = \left( \frac{p_{H_2}}{p_{H_2,c}} \right)^{2m} \frac{2m}{1 + \left( \frac{p_{H_2}}{p_{H_2,c}} \right)^{2m}},$$

where $p_{H_2,c} = K_{H_2,c}^{-1}$ and $K_{H_2,c}$ is the equilibrium constant of the process. The order of reaction
Professionalizing as in [24], we obtain a Burton-Cabrera-Frank (BCF) type model:

\[ V = \nu_{CH}(\theta_{CH,+} - \theta_{CH,eq}) + \nu_{C}(\theta_{C,+} - \theta_{C,eq}) \] (3)

where \( \nu_{CH} \) and \( \nu_{C} \) are the attachment-detachment coefficients, \( \theta_{CH,+} \) and \( \theta_{C,+} \) are the coverages close to the step edge and \( \theta_{CH,eq} \) and \( \theta_{C,eq} \) are the equilibrium concentrations, which incorporate the dependence on the step curvature.

Next, we assume that CH attaches to the edges of the graphene crystal decorated by hydrogen and C attaches to bare edges. This can be modeled as:

\[ \nu_{CH} = \theta_{H(e)}' \nu_{CH}, \] (4)
\[ \nu_{C} = (1 - \theta_{H(e)}) \nu_{C}, \] (5)

where the primed attachment-detachment coefficients are taken as constants.

Let \( \theta_{eff} = \alpha_{CH} \theta_{CH} + \alpha_{C} \theta_{C} \) be an effective surface coverage and \( j_{n,eff,\pm} \) be the associated effective flux: \( j_{n,eff,\pm} = \mp \hat{n} \cdot D_{eff} \nabla \theta_{eff}|_{\pm} \mp \nu_{eff,\pm} \). An analysis (see Appendix) shows that these definitions are consistent with the fluxes of the individual species if and only if \( \alpha_{CH} = \alpha_{C} \) when the diffusion coefficients of the individual species are the same. For convenience we take \( \alpha_{CH} = \alpha_{C} = 1 \), which implies that \( D_{eff} = D \), the common diffusion coefficient of both species. Analogously, define the effective kinetic coefficient \( \beta_{eff} \) via the relation \( \beta_{eff} V = \theta_{eff} - \theta_{eff,eq} \). This, with the additional assumption that C and CH are in equilibrium on the step edge (see Appendix), \( \theta_{C,+} = K_{3,e}(\theta_{H(e)} - 1) \theta_{CH,+} \), leads together with Eqs. (2), (3), and (5) to the following expression for \( \beta_{eff} \) (see Appendix):

\[ \beta_{eff} \nu_{CH}' = \frac{\left(\frac{\rho_{4}}{\rho_{4,eq}}\right)^{2m} + K_{3,e}(\theta_{H(e)} - 1) \left(1 + \left(\frac{\rho_{4}}{\rho_{4,eq}}\right)^{2m}\right)}{\left(\frac{\rho_{4}}{\rho_{4,eq}}\right)^{4m} + (\nu_{C}'/\nu_{CH}')K_{3,e}} \] (6)

When carbon attachment is unlikely (\( \nu_{CH}' \gg \nu_{C}' \)) and \( \rho_{H,e}/\rho_{H,c} \ll 1 \), then Eq. (6) can be approximated by:

\[ \beta_{eff} \nu_{CH}' \approx 1 + K_{3,e} \left(\frac{\rho_{4}}{\rho_{4,eq}}\right)^{-4m} \] (7)

Putting everything together, incorporating kinetic and edge energy anisotropies and nondimensionalizing as in [24], we obtain a Burton-Cabrera-Frank (BCF) type model:

\[ \partial_{t} u = \nabla^{2} u + f_{eff}, \] (8)
\[ V = \hat{n} \cdot (\nabla u|_{+} - \nabla u|_{-}), \] (9)
\[ u_{I} = d_{0} \left( \xi_{e,n}(\psi) + \xi_{e,n}'(\psi) \right) \kappa + \bar{\beta}_{eff} \xi_{k,n}(\psi) V \] (10)
where $u = (\theta_{\text{eff}} - \theta_{\text{eff,eq}}) \Omega$ and $\Omega^{-1}$ is the density of sites on the Cu surface. The nondimensional flux is $f_{\text{eff}} = (F_C + F_{CH_2})l^2 \Omega/D$, where $l$ is an atomic length scale. The parameter $d_0$ is a nondimensional edge energy and $\xi_{e,n}(\psi)$ and $\xi_{k,n}(\psi)$ are the edge and kinetic anisotropies (normalized such that $\xi_{e,n} = \xi_{k,n} = 1$ in the isotropic case). $\psi$ is the normal angle (angle between the normal vector to the edge and the $x$-axis) and $\kappa$ is the edge curvature. The nondimensional kinetic coefficient is $\beta_{\text{eff}} = \beta_{\text{eff}} \Omega D/l$. We take the diffusion to be isotropic, a realistic assumption for many facets and substrates, but the model allows for diffusional anisotropies as well (see [23, 24]).

The values chosen for the equilibrium constants and reaction rates that are used in the definition of $f_{\text{eff}}$ are described in detail in the Appendix. The value of the diffusion coefficient has been chosen to give a target value of $f_{\text{eff}}$ that gives shapes similar to those observed in experiments. It is within the bounds of the expected values of $D$, see the Appendix. We have also taken $m = 1$; other choices give similar results (not shown). The kinetic and line energy anisotropies are $\xi_{e,n}(\psi) = 1 + \epsilon_{e,n} \cos(n\psi)$, $\xi_{k,n}(\psi) = 1 + \epsilon_{k,n} \cos(n\psi)$. In order to solve Eqs. (10) we use the phase field model developed in [24] (see Appendix).

Fig. 2 shows the time evolution of the average radius of a crystal, for three different values of $p_{H_2}$. Starting with an initially circular nucleus with radius $r_0 = 0.3$, the average radius (computed by dividing the area by $\pi$ and taking the square root) increases smoothly, but for $p_{H_2} = 1500$ Pa there is a sudden change of slope around $t \approx 0.8$ where the crystal starts growing much more rapidly. The transition is associated with a change from slow growth in the diffusion-limited regime to rapid growth in the kinetic-limited regime (see Figs. S2 and S3 in the Appendix for the behavior with other $p_{H_2}$). The figure also shows that at late times (after the diffusion-limited to kinetic-limited growth transition) the radius depends non-monotonically on $p_{H_2}$ with slow growth at small and large $p_{H_2}$ and more rapid growth in between. At high $p_{H_2}$, growth is slow because the flux $f_{\text{eff}}$ is small due to the scaling of $F_C$ and $F_{CH_2}$ with $p_{H_2}$, (e.g., Eqs. (1a) and (1b)), which reflects the fact that the enhanced coverage of $H_2$ decreases the available adsorption sites for $CH_2$ (see the Appendix). At small $p_{H_2}$, growth is limited by the kinetics of attachment (e.g., Eq. (5)).

The crystallite shapes also vary markedly. While the crystal is mostly circular for $p_{H_2} = 500$ Pa, $p_{H_2} = 2000$ Pa and for $p_{H_2} = 1500$ Pa for $t < 0.8$ (not shown), a complex morphology develops in the latter case for $t > 0.8$. Dendrites grow in the directions in which the kinetic coefficient is the smallest, and develop complex sidebranching patterns that eventually merge, thus creating a large and mostly hexagonal crystallite.

In Fig. 3 we plot the average graphene radii as a function of $p_{H_2}$ at three different times, as labeled. Insets show selected crystallite morphologies (at time $t_3$). At each time, the crystallite radius is a non-monotonic function of $p_{H_2}$, as anticipated in Fig. 2. A maximum is clearly found around $p_{H_2} = 1000$ Pa for $t = t_1$ that moves to around $p_{H_2} = 1250$ Pa for $t = t_3$. Also, notice how the curve for $t = t_1$ is nearly parabolic before flattening out for $p_{H_2} > 1500$ Pa, indicating that the effect of $p_{H_2}$ on the radius has saturated. Also, notice how the shapes of the crystallites at $t = t_3$ change with the pressure. The shapes for the lower pressures (e.g., $p_{H_2} = 750$ Pa) are smoothed six-point stars. As $p_{H_2}$ increases the side branching becomes more and more intense. As the side branches merge together, the overall shape becomes less star-like and more hexagon-like. Note that, for $p_{H_2} = 1750$ Pa the side branches have not yet merged, but
Figure 2: Evolution of the average radius of the crystallites as a function of time for different $p_{H_2}$ as labeled (insets show their shapes). When $p_{H_2} = 1500$ Pa there is a transition around $t \approx 0.8$ from slow diffusion-limited growth to fast kinetic-limited growth.

they merge at later times to become a shape very close to a hexagon (not shown). These results are consistent with experimental observations [33].

Next, we analyze the transition from the diffusion-limited growth regime to the kinetic-limited regime observed in Fig. 2 in more detail. Since this transition is general and does not depend qualitatively on the anisotropy, we consider the isotropic case and analyze the growth of a circular graphene crystallite. Reformulating Eqs. (8)-(10) in the special case of radial symmetry, it can be seen that the crystallite radius satisfies the boundary integral equation:

$$-d_0 \frac{dr}{r} - \beta_{eff} \dot{r} + f_{eff} \cdot t$$

$$- \int_0^t e^{-r'^2 + r^2} \frac{r'}{2(t-t')} I_0 \left( \frac{r'r}{2(t-t')} \right) r' \dot{r}' dt' = 0$$

where $r = r(t), r' = r(t')$, the overdot denotes the time derivative and $I_0$ is the modified Bessel function of order 0. We have solved numerically Eq. (11) with a simple code based on Chebyshev collocation, for the corresponding numerical parameters of the phase-field model.

In Fig. 4 we present the crystallite radii, as a function of $p_{H_2}$ at several different times, obtained from Eq. (11) using the two different definitions of $\beta_{eff}$ given in Eqs. (6) and (7). For $p_{H_2} > 400$ Pa both equations yield similar results and match qualitatively the behavior observed in the phase field simulations shown in Fig. 3. Differences in behaviors arise for smaller values of $p_{H_2}$. In Fig. 4(left), which corresponds to Eq. (5) where C and CH radicals both may attach to the graphene crystal (see inset), there is a local minimum in the radius around $p_{H_2} \approx 400$ Pa. As $p_{H_2}$ decreases further, the radius starts to increase due to the attachment of C in this
Figure 3: Average graphene crystal radii as a function of $p_{H_2}$ at three different times, as labeled ($t_1 = 0.775$, $t_2 = 0.9$ and $t_3 = 1.025$; insets show shapes at $t_3$). At each time, the radii depend non-monotonically on $p_{H_2}$. At low $p_{H_2}$ the crystallites are more star-like while as $p_{H_2}$ increases the shapes become more hexagon-like.

Figure 4: Growth curves obtained from the boundary integral equation. The radius (solid) is plotted as a function of $p_{H_2}$ at different times (arrows indicate the direction of increasing time). Left: Both C and CH attach to the growing crystallite ($\beta_{eff}$ from Eq. 6). Right: only CH attaches ($\beta_{eff}$ from Eq. 7). A one-parameter fit from (12) is shown with dashed lines. Insets illustrate the attachment mechanisms.
regime where there is little or no H₂ decoration of the interface. A different behavior is observed in Fig. 4(right) where only CH radicals may attach (see inset) and Eq. (7) is used instead. In this case, there is no minimum and the radius decreases to zero as \( p_{H_2} \) decreases because the H₂ decoration of the interface, to which CH radicals need to attach, vanishes in this limit. From these results we may conclude: (1) the simple circularly symmetric model (in Eq. (11)) is able to reproduce qualitatively the non-monotone behavior of the average radius curves observed in Fig. 3 and (2) that this model allows us to distinguish between two possible mechanisms of graphene crystallite growth by analyzing the growth behavior at small \( p_{H_2} \). Comparing these results with the experimental results from [33] in Fig. 1 suggests that the experimental results are more consistent with the growth mechanism where only CH attaches at the crystal edge.

We return to this point below.

Finally, an analysis of Eq. (11) allows us to find a simple relation for the evolution of the radius in the kinetically-dominated regime, which is the relevant regime for the study of the sizes and shapes of the graphene crystallites at later growth times. It is easy to see that when the \( f_{eff} \cdot t \) term in Eq. (11) becomes large enough only the \( \beta_{eff} \dot{r} \) term can balance it. This leads to a quadratic relation between the radius and time:

\[
r(t) \approx r(0) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{f_{eff}}{\beta_{eff}} \left( t - \frac{1}{f_{eff}} \right)^2,
\]

which allows us to define precisely the kinetic-controlled regime. In addition, Eq. (12) enables us to predict the radius of the islands in that regime with surprising accuracy, given the appropriate \( f_{eff} \) and \( \beta_{eff} \). Fig. 4 displays examples of such fits with the radius from Eq. (12) plotted as the dashed curve. For a single value of \( r(0) \), independent of \( p_{H_2} \) and time, we see that Eq. (12) provides an excellent prediction of behavior of the crystallite radii at moderate-to-small values of \( p_{H_2} \), which is in the kinetic-dominated regime. The flat regions observed at large \( p_{H_2} \) correspond to the diffusion-dominated growth regime.

In this study, we developed a microkinetic model to account for the stepwise decomposition of CH₄ into mobile radicals during CVD growth of graphene on Cu substrates. We derived an effective kinetic attachment coefficient, which depends nonmonotonically on \( p_{H_2} \), and an effective mass flux that decreases with \( p_{H_2} \). Using these in a phase field model allowed us to reproduce the complex shape evolution of graphene crystals and the non-monotonic dependence of their sizes on the partial pressure of H₂. A simpler boundary integral model was used to analyze the mechanism behind the non-monotonic growth. In the kinetic regime, we found a simple equation that was capable of accurately reproducing the crystallite radii.

We analyzed two possible mechanisms of attachment. In one mechanism, both C and CH could attach (Eq. (5)) with C attaching to bare graphene edges and CH attaching to hydrogen-decorated edges. In the other, only CH was able to attach to hydrogen-decorated edges and there was no direct C attachment even if edges are bare (Eq. (7)). We found the latter mechanism to be most consistent with experimental results in [33]. However, a recent study [7] found graphene growth at extremely low values of \( p_{H_2} \), and argued that the results observed in [33] were due to the presence of oxidizing impurities. Our approach is capable of accounting for both possibilities and provides a litmus test to distinguish between them. For example, both attachment mechanisms yield similar results for \( p_{H_2} > 400 \) Pa. However, when both C and CH may attach, we find that the growth of crystallites is still possible for small values of \( p_{H_2} \) (Fig. 4).
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Appendix

A Phase field model

In order to solve the BCF model (Eqs. 8-10), we use the phase field model developed in [24]. The phase field variable \( \phi \), where \( \phi \approx 1 \) marks the graphene crystal domain, evolves according to

\[
\alpha \tau(\Theta) \epsilon^2 \partial_t \phi = \epsilon^2 \nabla \cdot [\xi_{e,n}(\Theta)^2 \nabla \phi] - f'(\phi) + \epsilon \lambda g'(\phi) u \\
- \epsilon^2 \partial_x (\xi_{e,n}(\Theta) \xi_{e,n}'(\Theta) \partial_y \phi) + \epsilon^2 \partial_y (\xi_{e,n}(\Theta) \xi_{e,n}'(\Theta) \partial_x \phi),
\]

(13)
where $\alpha$ is a parameter, $\epsilon$ is the edge (interface) thickness, $\tau(\Theta)$ is related to the kinetic anisotropy, see below. The angle $\Theta$ defined as $\tan \Theta = \frac{\partial_y}{\partial_x}\varphi$. The functions $f$ and $g$ are defined as $f(\phi) = \phi^2(1 - \phi)^2/4$, $g(\phi) = \phi^3(10 - 15\phi + 6\phi^2)/120$. The parameter $\lambda$ is a coupling constant for the diffusion field $u_\epsilon$, which satisfies

$$\partial_t u_\epsilon = \nabla^2 u_\epsilon + f_{\text{eff}} - \partial_t \varphi.$$  \hfill (14)$$

The method of matched asymptotic expansions [17, 24] can be used to show that the BCF Eqs. (8)-(10) are recovered in the limit $\epsilon \to 0$ with second order accuracy (in $\epsilon$) from the phase field model if we take $\lambda = a_1/d_0$, $\alpha = \frac{\bar{\beta}_{\text{eff}}}{d_0}$, and $\tau(\Theta) = \xi_{e,n}(\Theta)\xi_{k,n}(\Theta) + \epsilon a_2\xi_{e,n}(\Theta)^2/\bar{\beta}_{\text{eff}}$, where $a_1 = 10\sqrt{2}$, $a_2 = 47\sqrt{2}/60$. The phase field equations are discretized in space using a block-structured adaptive finite difference method and we use an implicit Crank-Nicolson scheme in time. The discrete equations are solved using the nonlinear adaptive multigrid algorithm developed by Wise et al. [35].

The phase-field parameters ($\epsilon = 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$, $d_0 = 6 \times 10^{-4}$) are the same as those in [24] as are anisotropies ($\epsilon_{k,6} = 0.08$ $\epsilon_{e,6} = 0.001$), and the length scale $l = 10^{-6}m$. We use up to eight levels of refinement for the multigrid, with the finest mesh having a spacing $\Delta x = 0.00195$. See also Table 7.

**B Chemical Reactions and Alternative Limiting Step**

We take the following reactions as an idealization of the dehydrogenation process of methane [18].

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CH}_4(g) + 2 S \overset{k_{AD,CH_4}}{\rightleftharpoons} & \text{CH}_3(a) + \text{H}_2(a) \quad \text{(15)} \\
\text{CH}_3(a) + S \overset{k_{+,CH_3}}{\rightleftharpoons} & \text{CH}_2(a) + \text{H}_2(a) \quad \text{(16)} \\
\text{CH}_2(a) + S \overset{k_{+,CH_2}}{\rightleftharpoons} & \text{CH}(a) + \text{H}_2(a) \quad \text{(17)} \\
\text{CH}(a) + S \overset{k_{+,CH}}{\rightleftharpoons} & \text{C}(a) + \text{H}_2(a) \quad \text{(18)} \\
\text{H}_2(g) + 2 S \overset{k_{AD,H_2}}{\rightleftharpoons} & 2 \text{H}_2(a) \quad \text{(19)}
\end{align*}
\]

where $S$ represents an adsorption site on the copper surface.
The kinetics of the previous reactions can be described by the following equations:

\[
\frac{d\theta_{CH_3}}{dt} = k_{AD,CH_4}p_{CH_4}(1 - \theta)^2 - k_{D,CH_3}\theta_{CH_3}\theta_H, \quad (20)
\]

\[
\frac{d\theta_{CH_2}}{dt} = k_{+,CH_3}[\theta_{CH_3}(1 - \theta) - K_1^{-1}\theta_{CH_2}\theta_H], \quad (21)
\]

\[
\frac{d\theta_{CH_4}}{dt} = k_{+,CH_2}[\theta_{CH_2}(1 - \theta) - K_2^{-1}\theta_{CH}\theta_H], \quad (22)
\]

\[
\frac{d\theta_C}{dt} = k_{+,CH}[\theta_{CH}(1 - \theta) - K_3^{-1}\theta_C\theta_H], \quad (23)
\]

\[
\frac{d\theta_H}{dt} = k_{AD,H_2}[p_{H_2}(1 - \theta)^2 - K_H^{-1}\theta_H^2], \quad (24)
\]

where \( \theta = \theta_{CH_3} + \theta_{CH_2} + \theta_{CH} + \theta_C + \theta_H \) is the total coverage, assumed to be small in the following. We define the equilibrium constants in the following way: \( K_1 = k_{+,CH_3}/k_{-,CH_2} \), \( K_2 = k_{+,CH_2}/k_{-,CH} \), \( K_3 = k_{+,CH}/k_{-,C} \) and \( K_H = k_{AD,H_2}/k_{D,H} \).

### B.1 Simplifications

#### B.1.1 CH Attachment

If we assume that, according to recent studies \[30\], CH is diffusing and attaching directly to graphene and hence we disregard equation (23), if we take \( k_{AD,H_2}p_{H_2} \gg k_{AD,CH_4}p_{CH_4}, k_{+,CH_4} \gg k_{AD,CH_4}p_{CH_4}, k_{+,CH_2} \gg k_{AD,CH_2}p_{CH_4} \), given the comparatively small activation energies, and if in addition we take \( \theta \ll 1 \), i.e., we take a small coverage, then we can put together the previous equations in the following form:

\[
\frac{d\theta_{CH}}{dt} = \frac{K_1K_2k_{AD,CH_4}p_{CH_4}}{K_H}\frac{p_{CH_4}}{p_{H_2}} - k_{D,CH_3}\sqrt{K_Hp_{H_2}}\theta_{CH} \quad (25)
\]

Note that the previous equation follows from considering that \( \theta_{CH_3}, \theta_{CH_2}, \) and \( \theta_H \) are fast variables, and \( \theta_{CH_3} \) has slow dynamics. This leads to a relation of proportionality between \( \theta_{CH} \) and \( \theta_{CH_3} \) which permits rewriting Eq. (20) as Eq. (25).

If we accept that CH is the diffusing species, then we can make the following identifications:

\[
F_{CH} = \frac{1}{\Omega} \frac{K_1K_2k_{AD,CH_4}p_{CH_4}}{K_H}\frac{p_{CH_4}}{p_{H_2}}, \quad (26)
\]

\[
\tau = \frac{1}{k_{D,CH_3}\sqrt{K_Hp_{H_2}}}, \quad (27)
\]

where \( \Omega \) is an average area per atom in the low-index surfaces of copper \[10\]. We will take \( \tau \to \infty \) and hence disregard desorption.

Hence, the non-dimensional deposition rate \( f = l^2F_{CH}\Omega/\bar{D} \) will be proportional to the ratio of the partial pressures \( r = p_{CH_4}/p_{H_2} \).
B.1.2  C Attachment

If we assume now that it is C what is diffusing and attaching to graphene, and again we take CH₄ adsorption and first dehydrogenation as the time-limiting process then \[ k_{AD, H_2} p_{H_2} \gg k_{AD, CH_4} p_{CH_4}, k_{+, CH} \gg k_{AD, CH_4} p_{CH_4}, k_{+, CH} \gg k_{AD, CH_4} p_{CH_4}. \]

This assumption is made to keep the model as simple as possible. For CH attachment the assumption was done on the basis of very different activation energies, but this is not the case for C attachment. See this section below for an alternate assumption. With the assumptions above, the equation for C kinetics takes then the following form for small coverage:

\[
\frac{d\theta_C}{dt} = \frac{K_1 K_2 K_3 k_{AD, CH_4} p_{CH_4}}{K_H^{3/2}} p_{CH_4}^{3/2} - k_{D, CH_3} \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{K_{H} p_{H_2} \theta_C}. \tag{28}
\]

Note that, as with \[ \text{(28)} \] the previous equation follows from considering that \( \theta_{CH_2}, \theta_{CH_3}, \theta_C, \text{ and } \theta_{H} \) are fast variables, and \( \theta_{CH_4} \) has slow dynamics. This leads to a relation of proportionality between \( \theta_C \) and \( \theta_{CH_3} \) which permits rewriting Eq. \[ \text{(20)} \] as Eq. \[ \text{(28)}. \]

If we accept that atomic C is the diffusing and attaching species, then we can make the following identifications:

\[
F_C = \frac{1}{\Omega} \frac{K_1 K_2 K_3 k_{AD, CH_4} p_{CH_4}}{K_H^{3/2}} p_{CH_4}^{3/2}, \tag{29}
\]

\[
\tau = \frac{1}{k_{D, CH_3} \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{K_{H} p_{H_2}}}. \tag{30}
\]

As in the case of CH, we take \( \tau \rightarrow \infty \) and hence disregard desorption.

Hence, \( f = l^2 F_C \Omega / D \) it is not proportional to the ratio of the partial pressures \( r = p_{CH_4} / p_{H_2} \) anymore.

Alternate assumption  If we consider CH dissociation the limiting step, a similar equation can be derived, by assuming \( k_{AD, CH_4} p_{CH_4} \gg k_{+, CH} \). Following these new assumptions we arrive to the following analogue of Eq. \[ \text{(28)} \]:

\[
\frac{d\theta_C}{dt} = \frac{k_{+, CH} k_{AD, CH_4} K_1 K_2 p_{CH_4}}{k_{D, CH_3} K_H^{3/2}} p_{CH_4}^{3/2} - k_{+, CH} \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{K_{H} p_{H_2} \theta_C}. \tag{31}
\]

This equation leads to the following definitions (tildes denote the different limiting process):

\[
F'_C = \frac{1}{\Omega} \frac{k_{+, CH} k_{AD, CH_4} K_1 K_2 p_{CH_4}}{k_{D, CH_3} K_H^{3/2}} p_{CH_4}^{3/2}, \tag{32}
\]

\[
\tau' = \frac{K_3}{k_{+, CH} \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{K_{H} p_{H_2}}}. \tag{33}
\]

Note that the dependency on \( p_{CH_4} / p_{H_2}^{3/2} \) is the same as in Eq. \[ \text{(29)}. \]

\[ \text{1The activation energy of CH dissociation is of the same order as that of CH₄ first dehydrogenation [37, 12].} \]
Table 1: Summary of the values of the numerical parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_{CH_4}$</td>
<td>4 Pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_1$</td>
<td>$4.23 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>[20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_2$</td>
<td>$1.29 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>[20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_3$</td>
<td>$6.41 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>[20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{H_3}$</td>
<td>$3.05 \times 10^{-10} \text{ Pa}^{-1}$</td>
<td>see text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{3,(e)}$</td>
<td>$6.0 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>fitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{H_3,(e)}$</td>
<td>$3.8 \times 10^{-7} \text{ Pa}^{-1}$</td>
<td>fitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{AD,CH_4}$</td>
<td>$2.78 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ Pa}^{-1}$</td>
<td>see text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>$1.79 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$</td>
<td>fitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu_{CH}'/\nu_{C}$</td>
<td>$10^9$</td>
<td>fitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_s (\Omega^{-1})$</td>
<td>$1.47 \times 10^{19} \text{ m}^{-2}$</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C Numerical Parameters

In this section we discuss the different options considered for the parameters. In Table 1 we show the value of the parameters chosen and their sources.

C.0.3 CH Attachment

By using the different coefficients and equilibrium constants estimated in Appendix D together with $K_1 K_2$ estimated from transition state theory, we can approximate $F_{CH}$ from equation (26) as follows:

$$F_{CH} = 1.6936 \times 10^{19} \frac{P_{CH_4}}{P_{H_2}} \left( \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \right).$$

(34)

With Li et al. [20] data for $K_1$ and $K_2$, we obtain

$$F_{CH,alt} = 7.31947 \times 10^{19} \frac{P_{CH_4}}{P_{H_2}} \left( \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \right),$$

(35)

which is about four times higher. Note that we do not use their data for the equilibrium of CH$_4$ and CH$_3$, as we assume that adsorption is dissociative and take the experimental data for the dissociative adsorption coefficient.

In order to recover the numerical parameter $f$ we need an estimate of the diffusion coefficient for CH. We can approximate it in the usual way from transition state theory:

$$\bar{D} \approx \Omega \nu e^{-\frac{E_{diff,CH}}{k_B T}},$$

(36)

where we take $\Omega$ as the distance between adsorption sites squared. We can approximate $\nu$ from the Cu-C vibration frequency which gives $\nu = 1.73 \times 10^{13} \text{ s}^{-1}$.

The most problematic quantity is the height of the diffusion barrier, $E_{diff,CH}$, as its value it is unavailable and it can change wildly depending on the Cu surface. We can nevertheless
approximate it. For C atoms on Cu(111) it has been found to be $E_{\text{diff,C}} = 0.09$ eV [15]. We would expect the value of the diffusion barrier to be a bit lower for CH, as the binding energy with the substrate is also lower, this is the case in the CH$_x$/Ni(111) system [25]. This number gives the following value of the diffusion coefficient:

$$\bar{D}_{(111)} = 5.26 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2\text{s}^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (37)

We can proceed in a similar way for the Cu(100) face. Again from [16], we have that $E_{\text{diff,C}} = 2.12$ eV, which gives the following value of the diffusion coefficient, assuming that the other parameters do not change much:

$$\bar{D}_{(100)} = 7.07 \times 10^{-15} \text{ m}^2\text{s}^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (38)

We see that the two results are very different, with a jump of eight orders of magnitude between the two. This gives the following two values of $f$:

$$f_{(111)} = \frac{F l^2 \Omega}{\bar{D}_{(111)}} = 2.19 \times 10^{-6} \frac{p_{\text{CH}_4}}{p_{\text{H}_2}},$$ \hspace{1cm} (39)

$$f_{(100)} = \frac{F l^2 \Omega}{\bar{D}_{(100)}} = 162 \frac{p_{\text{CH}_4}}{p_{\text{H}_2}},$$ \hspace{1cm} (40)

where we take $l = 10^{-6}$ m. We observe a variation of 8 orders of magnitude, which probably means that our method for estimating the diffusion coefficient based in transition state theory or the barrier energies are not correct for CH/Cu.

Taking the values of the equilibrium constants from Li et al. [20], we obtain an analogously large difference between both values of $f$:

$$f_{(111),\text{alt}} = \frac{F_{\text{CH,alt}} l^2 \Omega}{\bar{D}_{(111)}} = 9.47 \times 10^{-6} \frac{p_{\text{CH}_4}}{p_{\text{H}_2}},$$ \hspace{1cm} (41)

$$f_{(100),\text{alt}} = \frac{F_{\text{CH,alt}} l^2 \Omega}{\bar{D}_{(100)}} = 704 \frac{p_{\text{CH}_4}}{p_{\text{H}_2}},$$ \hspace{1cm} (42)

C.0.4 C Attachment

Similarly, we can compute all the previous numbers for C attachment, using the two approximations discussed, for Cu(111):

$$F_C = 1.83 \times 10^{18} \frac{p_{\text{CH}_4}}{p_{\text{H}_2}} \left( \text{m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1} \right),$$ \hspace{1cm} (43)

$$F_C' = 2.30 \times 10^{20} \frac{p_{\text{CH}_4}}{p_{\text{H}_2}} \left( \text{m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1} \right),$$ \hspace{1cm} (44)

and with Li et al. [20] data,

$$F_{C,\text{alt}} = 2.68 \times 10^{18} \frac{p_{\text{CH}_4}}{p_{\text{H}_2}} \left( \text{m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1} \right),$$ \hspace{1cm} (45)

$$F_{C,\text{alt}}' = 1.20 \times 10^{19} \frac{p_{\text{CH}_4}}{p_{\text{H}_2}} \left( \text{m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1} \right).$$ \hspace{1cm} (46)
With the assumptions that the diffusion coefficients are similar, we would obtain values for the reduced deposition coefficients ($f$) with prefactors of the same order of magnitude than Eqs. (39) and (40).

D Estimating the Model Parameters

We find most of the parameters from experiments and from DFT calculations, in a similar way as Kim et al. [18]. In this section we give a short overview of the problem of determining the adsorption energies, and in the following sections we will go in the detail of our choice.

The adsorption (physisorption) energy for CH$_4$ comes from [34] (the adsorption energy is equated with the desorption energy, assuming a negligible adsorption barrier, as it is common [4, 14]). The same applies for the physisorption energy of H$_2$, obtained from Andersson and Persson [2]. The physisorption values are very small and hence we will ignore it, in favor of experimental calculations of the dissociative adsorption.

The energy barrier of dissociative adsorption for H$_2$ is not well defined as it depends on the particular rotational and vibrational state of the molecule that it is attaching, and hence it depends on temperature in a way much more complex than an Arrhenius law [29]. The variation found goes from $0.3 - 0.8$ eV. Kim et al. [18] use the data from Tabatabaei et al. [32], who reported $E_{b,H_2} = 0.44$ eV for polycrystalline copper supported on alumina. For unsupported Cu Rasmussen et al. [28] reported $E_{b,H_2} = 0.50$ eV for the (100) face of Cu, but both of these results are low temperature ($T \approx 250$K). The latter value is consistent with the value computed theoretically by Sakong and Groβ [31].

We take the dissociative desorption data for H$_2$ from [15, 9], together with the prefactor. We have compared also with the values given by Tabatabaei et al. [32], which is the source for the dissociation enthalpy of H$_2$ on Cu, $\Delta H_{H_2 \rightarrow H + H} = -0.27$ eV, which is also consistent with theoretical values from Sakong and Groβ [31], who report values of $-0.21$ eV and $-0.35$ eV for the Cu(100) and Cu(111) faces, respectively. The activation energies for each of the intermediate species CH$_x$ come from [37], [12] and [22]. A summary of all the considered energies and enthalpies is given in Table 2.

D.1 Hydrogen Adsorption/Desorption

The rate of Hydrogen adsorption is modeled as follows:

$$k_{AD,H_2} = \frac{2\Omega}{\sqrt{2\pi m_{H_2} k T}} s_0 f(\theta) \exp \left( -\frac{E_{b,H_2}}{kT} \right),$$

(47)

where $k$ is Boltzmann’s constant, $m_{H_2}$ is the mass of the molecule, $s_0 f(\theta)$ is the sticking pre-exponential factor, which depends on the coverage ($f(0) = 1$). We take the Langmuir form $f(\theta) = (1 - \theta)^2$. Note the factor 2 in the numerator due to the second order kinetics. These parameters can be found in Tabatabaei et al. [32], they are listed in Table 3.
Table 2: Summary of the values of the barrier energies and reaction enthalpies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value(eV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adsorption Energy of CH&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt; on Cu</td>
<td>$E_{\text{ad,CH}_4}$</td>
<td>-0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physisorption Energy of H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; on Cu</td>
<td>$E_{\text{ad,H}_2}$</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Barrier Dissociative Adsorption H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; → 2H</td>
<td>$E_{b,H}_2$</td>
<td>0.3-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Barrier Associative Desorption 2H → H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>$E_{\text{des,H}}$</td>
<td>0.63 &lt;sup&gt;[9]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Barrier Associative Desorption 2H → H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>$E_{\text{des,H}}$</td>
<td>0.81 &lt;sup&gt;[15]&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissociation Enthalpy of H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; on Cu</td>
<td>$\Delta H_{\text{H}_2\rightarrow\text{H}+\text{H}}$</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthalpy of reaction of CH&lt;sub&gt;3,a&lt;/sub&gt; from CH&lt;sub&gt;4,a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>$\Delta H_{\text{CH}_4\rightarrow\text{CH}_3+\text{H}}$</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthalpy of reaction of CH&lt;sub&gt;2,a&lt;/sub&gt; from CH&lt;sub&gt;3,a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>$\Delta H_{\text{CH}_3\rightarrow\text{CH}_2+\text{H}}$</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthalpy of reaction of CH&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; from CH&lt;sub&gt;2,a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>$\Delta H_{\text{CH}_2\rightarrow\text{CH}+\text{H}}$</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: H<sub>2</sub> adsorption parameters from Tabatabaei et al. <sup>[32]</sup>.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$s_0$</td>
<td>0.0198</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{b,H}_2$</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>eV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the rate of Hydrogen desorption we take the following:

$$k_{D,H} = \nu_{d0} \exp \left( \frac{-E_{\text{des,H}_2}}{kT} \right) \theta_H^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (48)

where $\nu_{d0}$ is the prefactor rate coefficient, with dimensions of frequency.

We have found two sets of parameters for the previous equation. Fei et al. <sup>[9]</sup> results for H<sub>2</sub> desorption from Cu(111) (Table 4) and Genger et al. <sup>[15]</sup> together with Anger et al. <sup>[3]</sup> (Table 5).

The values from Table 5 depend on the coverage and are more in line with other calculations, and hence we will keep them. They imply the following values of $k_{D,H}$ and $k_{AD,H}_2$:

$$k_{AD,H}_2 = 0.0879 \text{ Pa}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (49)
$$k_{D,H} = 2.885 \times 10^8 \text{ s}^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (50)

Table 4: H<sub>2</sub> desorption parameters from Fei et al. <sup>[9]</sup>.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\nu_{d0}$</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^9$</td>
<td>s&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{\text{des,H}_2}$</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>eV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: H\textsubscript{2} desorption parameters from Genger et al. [15] and Anger et al. [3].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \nu_{d0} )</td>
<td>( 3 \times 10^{11} )</td>
<td>s(^{-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E_{des,H_2} )</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>eV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Initial sticking coefficient for CH\textsubscript{4} on Cu(100) (figure recreated from [1] using g3data)

D.2 Methane and CH\textsubscript{x} microkinetics

The values of \( k_{AD,CH_4} \) and \( k_{D,CH_3} \) can be approximated in a similar way to those of H\textsubscript{2}, but the equilibrium constants \( K_1 \), \( K_2 \), and \( K_3 \) remain unknown due to the unknown ratio of the exponential prefactors. We take their value from [20].

In order to obtain \( k_{AD,CH_4} \) we need the initial sticking coefficient. We have recovered the data from Alstrup et al. [1] for CH\textsubscript{4}/Cu(100) (see Fig. 5) and then by fitting an Arrhenius law, we have obtained the values in Table 6.

Table 6: Parameters for CH\textsubscript{4} adsorption from [1] (see Fig. 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( s_0 )</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E_{b,CH_4} )</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>eV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The barrier energy from Table 6 is in good agreement with \( E_b = 1.77 \text{ eV} \) for Cu(100) and it is somewhat larger than the value for the Cu(111) surface, \( E_b = 1.59 \text{ eV} \) \([37]\) and \( E_b = 1.57 \text{ eV} \) \([12]\).

We will take \( E_{b, CH_4} = 1.59 \text{ eV} \) and \( s_0 = 5 \). It is common to arbitrarily take the value \( s_0 = 1 \) \([6, 18]\), but in light of the previous experimental result, \( s_0 = 5 \) is probably a more realistic choice. With this value, the expected value of \( k_{AD, CH_4} \) is:

\[
 k_{AD, CH_4} = \frac{2\Omega}{\sqrt{2\pi m_{CH_4} kT}} s_0 f(\theta) \exp \left( \frac{-E_{b, CH_4}}{kT} \right) = 2.777 \times 10^{-4} \text{s}^{-1} \text{Pa}^{-1}, \tag{51}
\]

where we have approximated \( f(\theta) \approx 1 \).

### E Attachment Kinetics

In the previous sections we have computed the kinetic laws for the deposition of CH and C, but our goal is to describe graphene growth based on the attachment of both species, as a function of \( p_{H_2} \). We will assume that the attaching species is either C at low \( p_{H_2} \) or CH, in accordance with Safron and Arnold \([30]\).

Our main hypothesis is that C attaches to graphene when the interface is not decorated with H and CH attaches to it when the interface is decorated. With the idea of maintaining the model as simple as possible, we will take the model as a single species model, with coverage \( \theta_{eff} \) and derive the effective deposition rate and the effective attachment kinetics that are consistent, with a minimal amount of further assumptions.

We begin by describing the hydrogen decoration of the edge, continue by describing the kinetics and finally, in light of the conservation of the coverage, derive the effective value of the kinetic attachment coefficient and the effective deposition rate.

#### E.1 Hydrogen decoration of the Step Edge

Our first assumption in order to model the system is that \( H_2 \) adsorption is selective, meaning that it is easier to attach at the step edge. Then, we will have the following reaction at the step edge (where we ignore all possible attachment processes, e.g. \( H_2 \) diffusion):

\[
 H_2(g) + 2 S_e \xrightarrow{k_{AD, H_2}} 2 H(e), \tag{52}
\]

where \( S_e \) are adsorption sites at the edge. The previous reaction results in the following equation:

\[
 \frac{d\theta_{H(e)}}{dt} = k_{AD, H_2} \left[ p_{H_2} \left( 1 - \theta_{H(e)} \right)^2 - K_{H(e)}^{-1} \theta_{H(e)}^2 \right]. \tag{53}
\]
If we impose equilibrium, we obtain the following value for \( \theta_{H(e)} \):

\[
\theta_{H(e)} = \frac{\left( \frac{p_{H_2}}{p_{H_2, e}} \right)^{1/2}}{1 + \left( \frac{p_{H_2}}{p_{H_2, e}} \right)^{1/2}}.
\]

where \( p_{H_2, e} = K_{H(e)}^{-1} \). Note that \( K_{H(e)} \) is unknown, although we will initially estimate it with a value that should be larger than \( K_H \), the equilibrium constant at the crystal terraces. Eq. (54) is at best an approximation, as we do not know the real kinetics of this edge-attachment process for \( H_2 \).

If we accept a more general reaction order, we have:

\[
\theta_{H(e)} = \frac{\left( \frac{p_{H_2}}{p_{H_2, e}} \right)^{2m}}{1 + \left( \frac{p_{H_2}}{p_{H_2, e}} \right)^{2m}},
\]

E.2 Kinetic Coefficient

Following Pierre-Louis [27] we have the following relations in the frame of reference of an advancing step with velocity \( V \):

\[
- (j_{+CH} - j_{r,CH}) \cdot \hat{n} = L_{+CH,+CH}X_{+CH} + L_{+CH,+C}X_{+C} + L_{+CH,-CH}X_{-CH} + L_{+CH,-C}X_{-C}
\]

\[
- (j_{+C} - j_{r,C}) \cdot \hat{n} = L_{+C,+CH}X_{+CH} + L_{+C,+C}X_{+C} + L_{+C,-CH}X_{-CH} + L_{+C,-C}X_{-C}
\]

\[
(j_{-CH} - j_{r,CH}) \cdot \hat{n} = L_{-CH,+CH}X_{+CH} + L_{-CH,+C}X_{+C} + L_{-CH,-CH}X_{-CH} + L_{-CH,-C}X_{-C}
\]

\[
(j_{-C} - j_{r,C}) \cdot \hat{n} = L_{-C,+CH}X_{+CH} + L_{-C,+C}X_{+C} + L_{-C,-CH}X_{-CH} + L_{-C,-C}X_{-C}
\]

We define \( X_{+CH} = (\theta_{CH,+} - \theta_{CH,eq}) \) on the substrate (+) side and respectively for the graphene (−) side (similar definitions apply to C). We define \( \nu_{+CH} = L_{+CH,+CH} - \nu_{0,CH} \) and \( \nu_{+C} = L_{+C,+C} - \nu_{0,C} \) where \( \nu_0 \) is the coefficient of direct exchange between terraces, \( L_{+CH,-CH} = L_{-CH,+CH} = -\nu_{0,CH} \) and \( L_{+C,-C} = L_{-C,+C} = -\nu_{0,C} \). We disregard all other cross coefficients, assuming they correspond to a slower timescale. The resulting equations read:

\[
- (j_{+CH} - j_{r,CH}) \cdot \hat{n} = \nu_{+CH}(\theta_{CH,+} - \theta_{CH,eq}) + \nu_{0,CH}(\theta_{CH,+} - \theta_{CH,-})
\]

\[
- (j_{+C} - j_{r,C}) \cdot \hat{n} = \nu_{+C}(\theta_{C,+} - \theta_{C,eq}) + \nu_{0,C}(\theta_{C,+} - \theta_{C,-})
\]

\[
(j_{-CH} - j_{r,CH}) \cdot \hat{n} = \nu_{-CH}(\theta_{CH,-} - \theta_{CH,eq}) + \nu_{0,CH}(\theta_{CH,-} - \theta_{CH,+})
\]

\[
(j_{-C} - j_{r,C}) \cdot \hat{n} = \nu_{-C}(\theta_{C,-} - \theta_{C,eq}) + \nu_{0,C}(\theta_{C,-} - \theta_{C,+})
\]
If we add the left hand side of the previous system, we obtain the following:

\[(j_{\text{-}CH} - j_{\text{+}CH} + j_{\text{-}C} - j_{\text{+}C}) \cdot \mathbf{n} = V,\]  

(56)
i.e. the velocity of the step

Now, assuming that \(\nu_{\pm} \ll \nu_0\) (the transparency approximation), we will have that \(\theta_{\text{CH,}+} = \theta_{\text{CH,-}}\) and \(\theta_{\text{C,}+} = \theta_{\text{C,-}}\), which implies, by adding the right hand side of the system:

\[V = (\nu_{\text{+}CH} + \nu_{\text{-}CH})(\theta_{\text{CH,}+} - \theta_{\text{CH,eq}}) + (\nu_{\text{+}C} + \nu_{\text{-}C})(\theta_{\text{C,}+} - \theta_{\text{C,eq}}).\]  

(57)

In the transparency limit, the distinction between \(\nu_{+}\) and \(\nu_{-}\) is lost, and hence, by defining \(\nu_{\text{CH}} = \nu_{\text{+}CH} + \nu_{\text{-}CH}\) and \(\nu_{\text{C}} = \nu_{\text{+}C} + \nu_{\text{-}C}\) we have that

\[V = \nu_{\text{CH}}(\theta_{\text{CH,}+} - \theta_{\text{CH,eq}}) + \nu_{\text{C}}(\theta_{\text{C,}+} - \theta_{\text{C,eq}}).\]  

(58)

Finally, we introduce our assumption of zero CH attachment in the absence of H decoration and zero C attachment when the interface is fully decorated. We can enforce this explicitly by rewriting the attachment-detachment coefficients as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\nu_{\text{CH}} &= \theta_{\text{H,eq}} \nu'_{\text{CH}}, \\
\nu_{\text{C}} &= (1 - \theta_{\text{H,eq}}) \nu'_{\text{C}}.
\end{align*}
\]

Hence,

\[V = \theta_{\text{H,eq}} \nu'_{\text{CH}}(\theta_{\text{CH,}+} - \theta_{\text{CH,eq}}) + (1 - \theta_{\text{H,eq}}) \nu'_{\text{C}}(\theta_{\text{C,}+} - \theta_{\text{C,eq}}).\]  

(59)

Now, we define the effective species kinetic coefficient through Eq. (59):

\[
\beta_{\text{eff}} V = \theta_{\text{eff}} - \theta_{\text{eff,eq}} = \\
\beta_{\text{eff}} \left[ \theta_{\text{H,eq}} \nu'_{\text{CH}}(\theta_{\text{CH,}+} - \theta_{\text{CH,eq}}) + (1 - \theta_{\text{H,eq}}) \nu'_{\text{C}}(\theta_{\text{C,}+} - \theta_{\text{C,eq}}) \right].
\]

(60)

E.3 Flux Consistency

If we define \(\theta_{\text{eff}}\) as a linear combination of the coverages of C and CH,

\[\theta_{\text{eff}} = \alpha_{\text{CH}} \theta_{\text{CH}} + \alpha_{\text{C}} \theta_{\text{C}}\]  

(61)

we have an additional condition on the admissible combinations, derived from conservation of the coverage.

By the definition of normal flux, at the interface (negative implies incoming flux, into a small Gaussian pillbox):

\[j_{n,\text{eff,}+} = \mp \hat{n} \cdot D_{\text{eff}} \nabla \theta_{\text{eff}} \bigg|_+ \mp V \theta_{\text{eff,}+},\]  

(62)

where \(\hat{n}\) is the interface normal, from the \(-\) side to the \(+\) side.

The conservation of \(\theta_{\text{eff}}\) and the transparency approximation imply the following:

\[j_{n,\text{eff,}+} + j_{n,\text{eff,}-} = \hat{n} \cdot D_{\text{eff}} \left( \nabla \theta_{\text{eff}} \bigg|_- - \nabla \theta_{\text{eff}} \bigg|_+ \right) = -V.\]  

(63)
Now, we can investigate whether $\theta_{\text{eff}}$ is in effect conserved and what is the value of $D_{\text{eff}}$.

To check the consistency of the approach, we can break down the flux as C flux and CH flux, by using the definition of $\theta_{\text{eff}}$. We ignore the values at the boundary as we know that they would eventually cancel when finding the jump condition:

$$j_{n,\text{eff},+} = \mp \hat{n} \cdot D_{\text{eff}} \alpha_{\text{CH}} \nabla \theta_{\text{CH}}|_{\pm} \mp \hat{n} \cdot D_{\text{eff}} \alpha_{\text{C}} \nabla \theta_{\text{C}}|_{\pm}$$

(64)

Ignoring cross-diffusion effects, if we take the diffusion coefficient of C and CH as $D$, then we can write the jump condition as follows:

$$j_{n,\text{eff},+} + j_{n,\text{eff},-} = D_{\text{eff}} \alpha_{\text{CH}} (j_{n,\text{CH},+} + j_{n,\text{CH},-}) + D_{\text{eff}} \alpha_{\text{C}} (j_{n,\text{C},+} + j_{n,\text{C},-}).$$

(65)

Global conservation of coverage implies that

$$j_{n,\text{CH},+} + j_{n,\text{CH},-} + j_{n,\text{C},+} + j_{n,\text{C},-} = -V;$$

(66)

but this condition alone does not allow us to recover Eq. (63).

Going back to equation (65), we see that it is consistent with (66) only if $\alpha_{\text{CH}} = \alpha_{\text{C}} = \alpha$ and $D_{\text{eff}} = D/\alpha$. In other words, what is conserved is the coverage.

By setting $\alpha = 1$ so that $D_{\text{eff}} = D$, we obtain that $\theta_{\text{eff}} = \theta_{\text{CH}} + \theta_{\text{C}}$, and kinetics depending on the concentration at the interface. Explicitly, from Eq. (60):

$$\beta_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\theta_{\text{CH},\pm} + \theta_{\text{C},\pm} - \theta_{\text{CH},\text{eq}} - \theta_{\text{C},\text{eq}}}{\theta_{H(\text{e})} \nu_{\text{CH}}^{*} (\theta_{\text{CH},\pm} - \theta_{\text{CH},\text{eq}}) + (1 - \theta_{H(\text{e})}) \nu_{\text{C}}^{*} (\theta_{\text{C},\pm} - \theta_{\text{C},\text{eq}})}.$$  

(67)

### E.4 Additional Assumptions

While Eq. (67) is very complicated, a single assumption puts it in a very simple form. This assumption is that Eq. (23) is also valid close to the step edge, its equilibration is fast enough and hence $\theta_{\text{C},\pm} \propto \theta_{\text{CH},\pm}$. Explicitly, considering $\theta_{\text{C},\pm}, \theta_{\text{CH},\pm} \ll 1$:

$$\theta_{\text{C},\pm} = K_{3,\text{e}} \left( \frac{1}{\theta_{H(\text{e})}} - 1 \right) \theta_{\text{CH},\pm},$$

(68)

where $K_{3,\text{e}}$ is the analogue of $K_{3}$ close to the edge.

With the previous result, we can rewrite Eq. (67) as follows:

$$\beta_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\theta_{H(\text{e})} + (1 - \theta_{H(\text{e})}) K_{3,\text{e}}}{\theta_{H(\text{e})}^{2} \nu_{\text{CH}}^{*} + (1 - \theta_{H(\text{e})})^{2} \nu_{\text{C}}^{*} K_{3,\text{e}}^{2}}.$$  

(69)
Then, using Eq. (55) we obtain:

\[
\beta_{\text{eff}} \nu_C' = \left( \frac{p_{\text{H}_2}}{p_{\text{H}_2,c}} \right)^{2m} + K_{3,(e)} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{p_{\text{H}_2}}{p_{\text{H}_2,c}} \right)^{2m} \right].
\] (70)

The previous expression has a maximum for the following value of the pressure:

\[
p_{\text{H}_2}^{2m} = p_{\text{H}_2,c}^{2m} \left[ K_{3,(e)} \left( 1 - \frac{\nu_{\text{CH}}'}{\nu_C'} \right) + \sqrt{K_{3,(e)} \left( K_{3,(e)} + \frac{\nu_{\text{CH}}'}{\nu_C'} \right) + 1} \right].
\] (71)

And has a finite value for \( p_{\text{H}_2} \to 0 \), \( \beta_{\text{eff}} \nu_C' = 1 \), as expected. If we assume that carbon attachment is unlikely, then \( \nu_C \to 0 \) and we have that:

\[
\beta_{\text{eff}} \nu_{\text{CH}}' \approx 1 + K_{3,(e)} \left( \frac{p_{\text{H}_2}}{p_{\text{H}_2,c}} \right)^{-4m}
\] (72)

where we have taken into account that, in general \( p_{\text{H}_2}/p_{\text{H}_2,c} \ll 1 \). Note how, even though it is assumed to be small, the leading order term is multiplied by \( K_{3,(e)} \). Using this formula does not alter substantially the observed results.

F Alternative Values of the Kinetic Parameters

While in the main text we have only considered the case \( m = 1 \), we have also explored other possible values of the order of reaction \( m \) in Eq. (55). In addition, we have investigated the effect of nonlinearity in the attachment of \( \text{CH} \):

\[
V = \theta_{\text{H}_2}^n \nu_{\text{CH}}'(\theta_{\text{CH},\pm} - \theta_{\text{CH},\text{eq}}) + (1 - \theta_{\text{H}_2})\nu_C'(\theta_{\text{C},\pm} - \theta_{\text{C},\text{eq}}),
\] (73)

where we have taken \( n = 1 \) in the main text. Note that there could be another nonlinearity in the attachment of \( \text{C} \) but we do not take it into account given the relation \( \nu_{\text{CH}}'/\nu_C' \gg 1 \). In all cases, we obtain results similar to those shown in the present paper.

G Summary

Putting everything together, we have a model of the following form:

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t \theta_{\text{eff}} &= \nabla \cdot (D_{\text{eff}} \nabla \theta_{\text{eff}}) + F_{\text{eff}}, \\
V &= \hat{n} \cdot D_{\text{eff}} \left( \nabla \theta_{\text{eff}} \big|_+ - \nabla \theta_{\text{eff}} \big|_- \right), \\
\beta_{\text{eff}} V &= \theta_{\text{eff}} - \theta_{\text{eff},\text{eq}}.
\end{align*}
\] (74a) (74b) (74c)
where $D_{\text{eff}} = D_C = D_{\text{CH}}$, $\theta_{\text{eff}} = \theta_C + \theta_{\text{CH}}$, $F_{\text{eff}} = F_C + F_{\text{CH}}$ and

$$
\beta_{\text{eff}} \nu_C' = \frac{(p_{\text{H}_2} / p_{\text{H}_2,c})^{2m} + K_{3,e}}{(p_{\text{H}_2} / p_{\text{H}_2,c})^{4m} \nu_P / \nu_C' + K_{3,e}} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{p_{\text{H}_2}}{p_{\text{H}_2,c}} \right)^{2m} \right],
$$

(74d)

where $\nu_C'$ is the kinetic attachment-detachment coefficient of C to graphene at zero hydrogen edge coverage and $\nu_{\text{CH}}'$ is the attachment-detachment coefficient of CH for a fully hydrogen-decorated edge.

Next, we define the parameters for the BCF and phase field models presented in the main text. From the definition in the main text we obtain that

$$
f_{\text{eff}} = \frac{l^2 \Omega}{D} (F_C + F_{\text{CH}}) = \frac{l^2 \Omega}{D} F_{\text{eff,pre}} \left( \frac{K_3}{\sqrt{K_H p_{\text{H}_2}}} + 1 \right),
$$

(75)

where

$$
F_{\text{eff,pre}} = \frac{p_{\text{CH}_4} K_1 K_2 k_{AD,CH_4}}{\Omega K_\text{H}},
$$

(76)

and $D$ are computed so that $f_{\text{eff}}|_{p_{\text{H}_2}=1250\text{Pa}}$ corresponds to a shape similar to the ones found in Vlassiouk et al. [33], its value is given in Table 1. This fixes our timescale and it is well within the range of possible values of $D$ discussed above.

From Eq. (6) we obtain that

$$
\beta_{\text{eff}} = \frac{K_{3,e}^2 + 1}{\nu_P (K_{3,e} + K_{4,e}^2 p_{\text{H}_2}^2)} \left( K_{4,e} K_{\text{kin}} p_{\text{H}_2}^4 + K_{3,e} \right),
$$

(77)

where $K_{\text{kin}} = \nu_{\text{CH}}' / \nu_C'$, its value is defined in Table 1.

Since $\nu_C'$ is unknown, we rescale $\beta_{\text{eff}}$ so that at its peak it has a reference value corresponding to the one found in Meca et al. [24].

$$
\beta_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\beta_{\text{eff}}}{\beta_{\text{eff}}|_{p_{\text{H}_2}=1250\text{Pa}}}.
$$

(78)

Note that the previous values are non-dimensional. See [24] and the discussion therein on its value. In order to obtain this value of the kinetic parameter, parameter $\alpha$ in Eq. (13) has to be defined as:

$$
\alpha = \frac{\lambda \sqrt{2}}{20} \beta_{\text{eff}},
$$

(79)

where $\lambda$, the other phase-field parameter, is defined as $\lambda = 10 \sqrt{2} / d_0$ where $d_0$ is the capillary parameter. The value given in Table 7 implies a capillary length of $d_0 l = 6 \times 10^{-10}\text{m}$. 
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference Kinetic Coefficient</td>
<td>$\beta_0$</td>
<td>$5.54 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capillary parameter</td>
<td>$d_0$</td>
<td>$6 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface width</td>
<td>$\epsilon$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinetic anisotropy</td>
<td>$\epsilon_{k,6}$</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge energy anisotropy</td>
<td>$\epsilon_{e,6}$</td>
<td>$10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensional length</td>
<td>$l$</td>
<td>$10^{-6}$ m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefactor for $F_{eff}$</td>
<td>$F_{eff,pre}$</td>
<td>$7.31 \times 10^{19}$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ Pa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Additional parameters needed for the numerical solution of the Phase-Field model. All parameters are defined as in Meca et al. [24], except for $F_{eff,pre}$, which is computed using Table 1.

Figure 6: Evolution of the average radius of the crystallites as a function of time. Case $n = 1$, $m = 1$.

H Additional figures

Fig. 6 includes more curves with the evolution of the average radius than Fig. 2. They can be compared with those from Fig. 7 that features the solution curves of Eq. (11). Additionally, Fig. 7 displays a fit to Eq. (12) where we allow $r(0)$ to depend on $p_{H_2}$, as opposed to the fits shown in Fig. 4.
Figure 7: Growth curves obtained from the boundary integral (Eq. [11]). The red color represents the kinetics-controlled regime, while the blue is the diffusion-controlled regime. Dashed curves correspond to a one-parameter ($r(0)$) fit to Eq. [12].