Ultra-thin, Transferred Layers of Thermally Grown Silicon Dioxide as Biofluid Barriers for Bio-Integrated Flexible Electronic Systems

Hui Fang\textsuperscript{a,b,1}, Jianing Zhao\textsuperscript{b,c,1}, Ki Jun Yu\textsuperscript{a,b,1}, Enming Song\textsuperscript{b,d,1}, Amir Barati Fariman\textsuperscript{c,2}, Chia-Han Chiang\textsuperscript{e}, Xin Jin\textsuperscript{f}, Yeguang Xue\textsuperscript{g,h}, Dong Xu\textsuperscript{a,b}, Wenbo Du\textsuperscript{i}, Kyung Jin Seo\textsuperscript{a,b}, Yiding Zhong\textsuperscript{a,b}, Zijian Yang\textsuperscript{a,b}, Sang Min Won\textsuperscript{a,b}, Guanhua Fang\textsuperscript{a,b}, Seo Woo Choi\textsuperscript{a,b}, Santanu Chaudhuri\textsuperscript{i}, Yonggang Huang\textsuperscript{g,h}, Muhammad A. Alam\textsuperscript{f}, Jonathan Viventi\textsuperscript{e}, N. R. Aluru\textsuperscript{c}, and John A. Rogers\textsuperscript{a,b,3}

\textsuperscript{a}Department of Materials Science and Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

\textsuperscript{b}Frederick Seitz Materials Research Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

\textsuperscript{c}Department of Mechanical Science and Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

\textsuperscript{d}Department of Materials Science, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, People’s Republic of China

\textsuperscript{e}Department of Biomedical Engineering, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, USA

\textsuperscript{f}School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA

\textsuperscript{g}Department of Mechanical Engineering, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA

\textsuperscript{h}Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA

\textsuperscript{i}Illinois Applied Research Institute, Urbana, IL, 61820 USA

\textsuperscript{1}These authors contributed equally to this work.

\textsuperscript{2}Current address: Department of Chemistry, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, 94305

\textsuperscript{3}Corresponding author. E-mail: jrogers@illinois.edu (J.A.R)

Keywords: thin-film encapsulation, thermal silicon dioxide, transfer printing, reactive molecular simulation, chronic implant
Supplementary Information
Supplementary Note 1
Supplementary Figure Legends
Supplementary Figure S1-S25
Supplementary Table S1 and S2

Supplementary Note 1: Materials and Methods

Fabrication Methods for Devices and Test Structures with Thermal SiO$_2$ Barrier Layers

Fabrication of samples with layers of thermal SiO$_2$ as encapsulation began with wet oxidation (in O$_2$/H$_2$O) at high temperatures (typically at ~1150 °C) on the surfaces of standard silicon wafers (100-1000 nm thermal SiO$_2$, 500 µm Si substrate, 100 mm diameter, University Wafer). A mechanical grinding process (with an initial coarse grind and a final fine grind to achieve mirror like finish with thickness variance under 5 µm) reduced the thickness to 200 µm (Sygarus Systems). Photolithography and wet etching patterned layers of Ti/Mg (5 nm/100 nm) deposited by electron-beam evaporation into targeted resistor shapes (SI Appendix, Fig. S13A). For the capacitors (SI Appendix, Fig. S13B), sequential deposition and photolithography patterning of two layers of Cr/Au (5 nm/100 nm) between a dielectric layer of polyimide (1.5 µm, PI-2545, HD MicroSystems) yielded simple, parallel-plate designs (1 mm×1 mm capacitor plate). For the diodes and NMOS devices (SI Appendix, Fig. S13C and D), transfer printing delivered devices prefabricated on an SOI substrates using previously reported recipes onto the SiO$_2$/Si substrate, forming the Si nanomembrane diode and transistor (channel length $L = 600$ µm, width $W = 20$ µm, thickness $t = 100$ nm). A layer of Cr/Au (5 nm/100 nm) served as metal interconnects to reach probe pads outside the PDMS well (SI Appendix, Fig. S14A-C). For each type of device,
spin-coating, soft-baking and curing formed an overcoat of polyimide (PI-2545, HD MicroSystems) with a thickness of 3.5 µm. ALD produced a layer of Al₂O₃ on the polyimide, to facilitate bonding to a thick layer of polyimide (25.4 µm, Kapton, DuPont) coated with a bilayer of Ti/SiO₂ (5 nm/100 nm) deposited by electron-beam evaporation and laminated on a glass slide with a layer of PDMS. The bonding involved application of a commercial adhesive (Kwik-Sil, World Precision Instruments) applied at a pressure of ~50 kPa and cured at room temperature. Reactive ion etching (RIE) with SF₆/O₂ (Plasma Therm) followed by Inductively Coupled Plasma RIE (ICP-RIE, Surface Technology System) with SF₆ removed the Si substrate to leave a largely unaltered, pristine surface of the SiO₂ as a biofluid barrier and bio-interface.

**Mg Test Structures for Evaluation of Water Barrier Performance of Conventional Materials**

Photolithography with a positive photoresist (AZ nLOF 2070, MicroChemicals) formed 1 cm² square area on a clean glass substrate. Subsequent electron-beam evaporation and lift-off yielded a layer of Ti/Mg (5 nm/300 nm) in the pre-defined area. Various deposition techniques yielded different types of encapsulation layers for soak testing in PBS (SI Appendix, Table S1 and Table S2). Spin coating then prepared a photo-definable epoxy (SU-8 2000, MicroChem), polyimide (PI-2545, HD MicroSystems) and PDMS. PECVD formed SiO₂ and SiNₓ both with deposition frequencies of 13.56 MHz. Al₂O₃ and HfO₂ were grown by ALD at 150 °C.

*SI Appendix*, Table S1 and S2 summarizes all of the Mg test results. Popular organic passivation materials, for instance, SU-8 and PDMS, failed within 1 day at body temperature, indicating poor water barrier quality. Inorganic/organic multilayers can be more effective than simple bilayers with the same overall thickness due to the tortuous paths for water permeation through defects and interfaces in multiple layers. In certain cases, however, such as with
Parylene C, the multilayer yields poor results, possibly due to non-trivial thickness dependent effects for permeation through Parylene C.

**Impedance Measurements and Modeling**

Impedance measurements used a Gamry Reference 600 potentiostat system (Gamery Instrument). The SiO$_2$ coated Au electrodes individually connected as the working electrode, with the Ag/AgCl as the reference electrode and a Pt wire as the counter electrode. The experiments used an AC potential of 10 mV with a frequency range of 1 Hz to 1 MHz, and a DC bias of 1 V. PBS solution served as the electrolyte at room temperature. Analysis used an equivalent circuit model shown in *SI Appendix*, Fig. S3, where $R_s$ is the solution resistance, $C_c$ represents the capacitance of pristine material, and $R_{po}$ is the cumulative resistance of all pores, pinholes, microcracks and other defects. Additional liquid/metal interfaces form as the solution penetrates the coating. $R_{CT}$ corresponds to the charge transfer resistance and $C_{dl}$ is the double-layer capacitance associated with these interfaces. In all three types of SiO$_2$ materials:

$$C_c = \frac{\varepsilon_r \varepsilon_0 A}{t} \approx 0.86 \text{nF}$$

where the coating area $A = 0.25 \text{ cm}^2$, thickness $t = 1 \mu m$, relative permittivity $\varepsilon_r = 3.9$ and vacuum permittivity $\varepsilon_r = 8.854 \times 10^{-12} \text{ F} \cdot \text{m}^{-1}$. Non-linear least squares fitting yielded values for the various parameters.

Results for SiO$_2$ formed by electron beam evaporation and PECVD interpreted using similar methods suggest pore resistances and charge transfer resistances that originate from defect sites (*SI Appendix*, Fig. S3). Moreover, in these material systems, $C_{dl}$ cannot be ignored. As expected from the EIS model, the phase response is characterized by two valleys both for these cases. The
lower valley (~$10^2$ Hz for evaporated and ~$10^3$ Hz for PECVD materials) can be attributed to $R_{po}$ and $R_{CT}$ in parallel with $C_{dl}$. The valley at $10^6$ Hz arises from the oxide capacitance and the solution resistance. Discrepancies between theory and experiment likely reflect limitations of the assumption that the pore/pinhole regions and the rest of the otherwise undamaged regions can be treated as parallel branches for charge transfer. In practice, the flow may be two-dimensional. In addition, the complexity of the electrode surface may require a modified representation for $C_{dl}$ (ref. 1). Nonetheless, the simple compact model captures the general trends of the experimental findings, and it is sufficiently sophisticated to identify qualitative differences between thermally grown and deposited forms of SiO$_2$, and their critical role in barrier performance.

**Electrical Leakage Tests**

Measurements of electrical leakage for different thicknesses of thermal SiO$_2$ and other conventional oxides as an additional comparison involved application of a voltage, comparable to that relevant for operation of standard electronics, between a surrounding bath of PBS and an underlying doped silicon wafer, as in *SI Appendix*, Fig. S4A and Fig. S5. These studies involved PECVD or ALD to form thin layers of SiO$_2$ or Al$_2$O$_3$ on n-type Si wafers (1-10 Ω.cm), and SiO$_2$ grown thermally. In these tests, the wafer connects to the cathode to prevent the possibility of anodizing the silicon; the anode is a wire of platinum in the PBS solution. A well structure made of poly(dimethyldsiloxane) (PDMS) confines the PBS to the central regions of the layers (~1 cm$^2$), thereby eliminating any effects of the edges of the samples. Ultraviolet ozone (UVO) treatment of the surfaces of these materials and the bottom surfaces of PDMS well (~1 cm in depth) structures enabled strong bonding upon physical contact, thereby yielding a waterproof seal around an exposed area of 1 cm$^2$. The well formed in this way confined the PBS solution during
the course of the testing. A Platinum (Pt) electrode dipped into the PBS served as an anode and the n-type Si substrate served as the cathode for measurements with the potentiostat system with two-terminal configuration under a constant 3 V DC bias.

As shown in SI Appendix, Fig. S4, at a pH of 7.4 and a temperature of 37 °C, leakage currents quickly (within 60 hours) reach levels that significantly exceed 10⁻⁶ A/cm² for 100 nm thick layers of PECVD SiO₂, and ALD Al₂O₃. Most polymers, including photocurable epoxies (SU-8) and elastomers such as PDMS exhibit leakage almost instantaneously after immersion in PBS solution (SI Appendix, Fig. S5). At the same thickness, thermal SiO₂ exhibits zero leakage, to within measurement uncertainties, throughout the 350-hour duration of the experiment. Leakage current here is a function of applied voltage for different organic layers at room temperature.

**Measurement and Modeling of Rates of Dissolution of Thermal SiO₂**

These measurements used pieces of Si wafers (1 cm× 2 cm dies) with thermal SiO₂ layers (100 nm thickness) grown across the top and bottom surfaces and the edges. Soaking occurred in plastic bottles containing PBS solution (25-30 ml) at room temperature, 37 °C, 50 °C, 70 °C and 90 °C separately. Ellipsometry defined the thickness of the SiO₂ as a function of soaking time.

Measurement results were also utilized to validate multiphysics models of the dissolution process coupling of all relevant continuum-scale physics: chemical species transport (using the Nernst-Planck equations), chemical reaction kinetics, electrostatics, and moving boundaries. Reaction kinetics were modeled using the Arrhenius form, with rate constant and activation energy for the primary SiO₂ dissolution reaction calculated from measurements and those of other reactions (forward and backward ionization of salts, PBS and water self-ionization) estimated to proceed much more quickly than SiO₂ dissolution. As seen in SI Appendix, Fig. S9A,
the dissolution rate is dominated by a half-order dependence on hydroxide concentration. The moving boundary velocity was calculated based on a mass balance at the boundary interface based on the local dissolution rate and assuming a baseline density of 2.19 g/cm³. This model allows the time-dependent evolution of a SiO₂ layer with arbitrary initial thickness to be directly calculated and visualized for arbitrary pH and temperature, and the lifetime to be predicted (SI Appendix, Fig. S9B). Simulations were performed on both 2-D and 3-D geometries using COMSOL Multiphysics®.

**Reactive Molecular Dynamics (RMD) Simulations**

Reactive Molecular Dynamics (RMD) simulations provided molecular insights into the effects of temperature and defects/oxide density on the dissolution process. The RMD used the Reaxff potential, integrated in a Large-scale Atomic/Molecular Massively Parallel Simulator (LAMMPS) package(2, 3). Previous work establishes the accuracy of this potential for interactions between SiO₂ and H₂O, through comparison to the macroscale experimental properties of these interfaces(4). The calculations involved initially pristine slabs of SiO₂ (density of 2.33 g/cm³ and thickness of 2 nm, in lateral dimensions of 5 nm×5 nm) solvated in water (Fig. 3A). Removing a few SiO₂ molecules from the center of the slab yielded effective oxide densities of 2.27, 2.19, 2.06 and 1.95 g/cm³, each of which was then solvated again in water (Fig. 3B). The pH of the solution was fixed at 7.4 by balancing the number of protons in the system. Periodic boundary conditions were applied in all the directions. Energy minimization of the system was performed for 1,000,000 steps. The time step was 0.1 fs(ref. 5). The Nosé-Hoover thermostat(6) held the temperature constant. Simulations included 10 runs at temperatures between 10 °C-100 °C at intervals of 10 °C, for each oxide density. To generate statistical data, five replicas were
performed for each set. The presented data correspond to the average of five simulation runs, each for a total of 35 ns with data collection a 0.1 ps intervals.

The root mean square displacement (RMSD) of each Si atom in each simulation step defined the dissociation events. In particular, the RMSD of bound Si atoms is 1.56 Å. Upon dissociation, this value sharply increased to >10 Å. The molecular species associated with the dissociated Si was defined by the atoms that exist within a distance of 3.2 Å from the center of the Si.

Similar simulations can yield results on the influence of mass density and the density of pinhole defects (Fig. 3B and SI Appendix, Fig. S11). As might be expected, the number of Si dissolution events is highest for the lowest density (1.95 g/cm$^3$) and the highest temperature (100 °C) (SI Appendix, Fig. S11A). Specifically, the dissolution process increases exponentially with temperature (for temperatures between 10 °C and 100 °C) and density (for densities between 1.95 and 2.33 g/cm$^3$, at 80 °C and 100 °C), respectively (SI Appendix, Fig. S11). The rate of dissociation from defective sites greatly exceeds that from pristine sites, thereby suggesting that most dissolution occurs at defective/low density regions (SI Appendix, Fig. S12A). This phenomenon is consistent with the defect-assisted dissolution mechanisms presented elsewhere(7, 8). Although the modeling involves many simplifying assumptions, both of these trends are qualitatively consistent with experimental results. The dissolution rates, for all densities, increase with temperature in an Arrhenius manner, consistent with the previous studies(9, 10, 11).

In addition to these qualitative insights, the results allow quantitative extraction of weighted activation energies of dissolution for different densities, based on the ratio of the population of dissolution events ($P$ and $P_0$) at corresponding temperatures ($T$ and $T_0$) according to the Boltzmann distribution law, $E = -Kln\left(\frac{P}{P_0}\right)/\left(\frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T_0}\right)$, where $K$ is a constant. SI Appendix,
Fig. S12B summarizes the results normalized by the maximum $E$. The findings suggest that the energy needed to dissociate Si atoms from oxide layers with densities of 1.95 g/cm$^3$ is 70% of that for layers with densities 2.33 g/cm$^3$. The energy for dissociation increases with the density. This trend is consistent with previous experimental observations on deposited/grown oxides(11). Previously mentioned multiphysics models coupling reactive diffusion kinetics with electrostatics and moving boundaries can capture certain aspects based on continuum, non-atomistic effects(11). The results presented here complement the continuum modeling work by suggesting that low-density oxides present additional Si-OH dangling sites and therefore accelerated chemical reaction rates.

In order to see the intermediates and final products of Si in the solution, the simulation tracked the molecular identity of each Si which is dissolved in different temperatures. Simulations show that Si first forms $\text{Si(OH)}_2^{2+}$ and dissolves into solution. In the solution $\text{Si(OH)}_2^{2+}$ forms bonds with two more OH$^-$ groups to yield $\text{Si(OH)}_4$(ref. 12). The timescale for the reaction $\text{Si(OH)}_2^{2+} \rightarrow \text{Si(OH)}_4$ is 60-70 ns at 37 °C(ref. 12). Results did not indicate any $\text{Si(OH)}_2^{2+}$ conversions for temperatures below 80 °C within the simulation time i.e. 35 ns while at 80 °C and 90 °C, the simulation observed the $\text{Si(OH)}_2^{2+} \rightarrow \text{Si(OH)}_3^+$ (SI Appendix, Figure S12). For 100 °C, we the reaction $\text{Si(OH)}_2^{2+} \rightarrow \text{Si(OH)}_3^+ \rightarrow \text{Si(OH)}_4$ occurs in 32 ns. The hypothesis is that high temperatures boost the conversion of intermediates and the formation of $\text{Si(OH)}_4$.

**Cyclic Bending of Active Electronics with Thermal Oxide Encapsulation**

As shown in *SI Appendix*, Fig. S25, cyclic bending test was applied to the flexible electronic system with dual-side thermal oxide encapsulation by bending the device to a radius of 5 mm for
10,000 cycles. Yield, gain and mean noise RMS remain nearly unchanged after 10,000 bending cycles.

**Sodium Ion Transport Simulations**

Modeling of sodium ion transport processes used the drift-diffusion equation and Poisson’s equation. These equations were solved on a one-dimensional domain shown in *SI Appendix, Fig. S19* using COMSOL Multiphysics®. A value of the diffusivity ($D$) of Na$^+$ in wet thermal SiO$_2$ from previous reports allowed calculation of the corresponding ion migration mobility ($\mu$) using the Nernst-Einstein relation (13). Physically, $x = 0$ and $x = h$ correspond to the PBS/SiO$_2$ and SiO$_2$/Si interfaces, respectively, where $h$ is the thickness of thermal SiO$_2$. The boundary condition for the drift-diffusion equation is $[Na^+] = 2 \times 10^{25}m^{-3}$ at $x = 0$. This value corresponds to the solid solubility limit of Na$^+$ in wet thermal SiO$_2$ because the concentration of Na$^+$ in PBS solution is a very large $[8.24 \times 10^{25}m^{-3}(137mmol/L)]$. At $x = h$, the simulation used a reflective boundary condition based on the assumption that Na$^+$ diffusivity inside the underlying Si is so low that most Na$^+$ ions are reflected at the SiO$_2$/Si interface. The boundary conditions for the electrostatic potential are $V = V_{app}$ at $x = 0$ and $V = 0$ at $x = h$. The assumption is that the resistance of SiO$_2$ is much larger than the PBS solution. The voltage drops primarily across the oxide layer.

*SI Appendix, Fig. S20* shows the Na$^+$ concentration and potential distribution within a thick ($h = 900 nm$) SiO$_2$ layer at 37 °C after 2 years of operation. The potential bias $V_{app}$ swept from 0 V to 2 V with an increment of 0.5 V. The Na$^+$ concentration decreases significantly near $x = 0$ and Na$^+$ accumulates at the other side, namely, at $x = 900 nm$. A time-dependent rise in the potential barrier retards the Na$^+$ transport process. In this simulation, failure corresponds to the
point at which the shift in the threshold voltage $\Delta V_T$ for an 100 nm equivalent oxide thickness (EOT) reaches 1 V. $\Delta V_T$ can be expressed as a function of spatially distributed $Na^+$ density (14):

$$\Delta V_T(t) = \frac{1}{C_0} \left[ \frac{1}{h} \int_0^h x \cdot \rho_{Na^+}(x, t) dx \right]$$

where $C_0$ is the gate capacitance.

*SI Appendix, Fig. S21A* shows $\Delta V_T$ as a function of time with different bias voltages. The red dashed horizontal lines correspond to the failure criteria of threshold voltage shift. In *SI Appendix, Fig. S21B*, a normalization of the time to $\tau_{\text{trans}} = \frac{h}{\mu k} = \frac{h^2}{\mu V} = \frac{kT h^2}{D q V}$ corresponds to the drift-dominated ion transport with time-independent linear potential drop. In other words, this transport time does not account for charge accumulation self-consistently. If self-consistent were unimportant, the lines would be scaled to a universal curve which cross the horizontal threshold voltage line at $t/\tau_{\text{trans}} = 1$. However, the curves in *SI Appendix, Fig. S21B* all shift to the right, i.e. a longer failure time. This non-linear electric field dependency arises from changes in the potential associated with spatially distributed $Na^+$. 
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Supplementary Figure Captions

**Fig. S1.** The SEM image in a 45° view of a ~100-nm-thick thermal SiO₂ above the polyimide layer, of the test vehicle shown in Fig. 1B.

**Table S1.** Summary of Mg soak tests for different candidate barrier materials.

**Table S2.** Summary of properties of all different encapsulation strategies examined.

**Fig. S2.** Mg soak test of a 50-µm-thick stainless steel foil in 70 °C PBS solution throughout 84 days.

**Fig. S3.** Theoretical modeling of EIS measurement of different SiO₂. (A) Equivalent circuit consists of both pristine and defective parts. (B) Parameters used for SiO₂ produced by evaporation, PECVD and thermally grown.

**Fig. S4.** (A) Schematic illustration of the two-terminal potentiostat system (left) used to measure leakage current through 100-nm-thick layers of PECVD SiO₂, ALD Al₂O₃ and thermal SiO₂ at 37 °C. Measurements involved a 3V DC bias continuously applied between a Pt electrode immersed in the PBS solution and a highly doped n-type silicon substrate using a two-electrode configuration. The results (right) highlight that thermal SiO₂ maintained leakage current below 100 nA throughout 360 hours while both PECVD SiO₂ and ALD Al₂O₃ failed within 50 hours. (B) Leakage currents associated with thermal SiO₂ encapsulation layers with different thickness at 96 °C.

**Fig. S5.** Leakage current as a function of applied voltage for different organic layers with a thickness of 1 µm, tested at room temperature.

**Fig. S6.** The SEM image in a 45° view of a 1000 nm thermal SiO₂ dissolved after accelerating PBS soak test at 96 °C, compared with unchanged thickness in the area of PDMS covered side.

**Fig. S7.** A sequence of SEM images in a 45° view illustrate dissolution of the 50-µm-thick stainless steel foil in accelerating PBS soak test at 96 °C throughout 60 days.

**Fig. S8.** The edge effect in thermal SiO₂ dissolution rate test.
**Fig. S9.** Multiphysics simulations of thermal SiO$_2$ dissolution. (A) Dissolution rate dependence on pH (Order 1: $k_0=3.85 \times 10^9$ m$^4$mol$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$, Order 0.5: $k_0=6.11 \times 10^7$ m$^{2.5}$mol$^{-0.5}$s$^{-1}$, Order 0.25: $k_0=7.68 \times 10^6$ m$^{1.75}$mol$^{-0.25}$s$^{-1}$). (B) Visualization of layer after 0 and 300 days separately (pH = 7.4, T = 50 °C).

**Fig. S10.** Number of reaction products during simulation of Si dissolution at 100 °C.

**Fig. S11.** Theoretical analysis of density and temperature effect on Si dissolution. (A) Number of Si dissolved in different temperatures and for different oxide densities. (B) Number of Si dissolved for different oxides at temperatures 80 °C and 100 °C.

**Fig. S12.** (A) The probability of SiO$_2$ dissolved from defective sites versus pristine regions. (B) Weighted activation energy associated with reaction of SiO$_2$ dissolution as a function of oxide density. (C) Number of Si compounds that exist in the solution at different temperatures.

**Fig. S13.** (A-D) Cross-sectional sketch of resistors, capacitors, diodes and NMOS transistors.

**Fig. S14.** Optical microscope images of capacitor (A), p-n diode (B) and MOSFET (C) encapsulated with 1,000-nm-thick thermal SiO$_2$ for accelerating soak test. Device part sealed in PDMS well, with gold metal wire extended to contact pad.

**Fig. S15.** Electrical characteristics of control devices including capacitor (A), p-n diode (B) and MOSFET (C) in PBS soak test at 96 °C.

**Fig. S16.** Cross-section illustrations of Mg device with double-sided thermal SiO$_2$ encapsulation layers (A), and control device (B).

**Fig. S17.** 70 °C PBS soak test of Mg device with double-sided thermal SiO$_2$ encapsulations (A), and control device (B).

**Fig. S18.** Bending the Mg device with double-sided thermal SiO$_2$ encapsulations to a radius of 5 mm exhibits high flexibility.

**Fig. S19.** Set up of sodium ion transport simulation with constant boundary condition at $x = 0$ and reflective boundary condition at $x = h$.

**Fig. S20.** Na$^+$ concentration and potential distribution within thermal SiO$_2$ ($h = 900$ nm) layer at the end of 2-years simulation at $T = 37$ °C.
**Fig. S21.** $\Delta V_T$ threshold voltage shift as a function of time ($A$) and normalized time ($B$) with different SiO$_2$ bias voltage at $T = 37$ °C.

**Fig. S22.** Exploded-view schematic illustration of sensing system with top and bottom side thermal SiO$_2$.

**Fig. S23.** Images of active multiplexed electronics in four key fabrication steps: 1. isolated Si transistors above thermal SiO$_2$; 2. photolithographic patterning of 1$^{st}$ metallization for source, drain, gate (connected to sensing electrode pad) and row wires for multiplexing; 3. 2$^{nd}$ metallization of the column wires for signal output; 4. final device layout after removing Si substrate with exposed thermal SiO$_2$ as frontside encapsulation.

**Fig. S24.** Si transistor performances of the active multiplexed electronics. ($A$) Optical microscope image of a test transistor layout. ($B$) Transfer characteristics in both linear and semi-log scale, with supply voltage $V_{DS}=0.1$ V. ($C$) Output characteristics, $V_{GS}$ ranging from -1 V to 4 V with a step of 1 V.

**Fig. S25.** ($A$-$C$) Yield, gain and mean noise RMS remain unchanged after $10^4$ bending cycles. Inset in the left figure shows a photograph of a device bent to a radius of ~5 mm on a glass tube.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SU-8</td>
<td>1µm</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>20min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI2545</td>
<td>1µm</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>20.5hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parylene C</td>
<td>1µm</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>1.5hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDMS</td>
<td>1µm</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>65min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCP</td>
<td>25 µm</td>
<td>70°C</td>
<td>9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECVD low-dep SiO$_2$</td>
<td>1µm</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>15min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECVD SiN$_x$</td>
<td>1µm</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>25min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALD Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>100nm</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>10min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALD HfO$_2$</td>
<td>100nm</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>80min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiO$_2$/SiN$_x$ x3</td>
<td>16.6/16.6nm x3</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>15min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al$_2$O$_3$/HfO$_2$ x3</td>
<td>16.6/16.6nm x3</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>37min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al$_2$O$_3$/Parylene C</td>
<td>50/100nm</td>
<td>70°C</td>
<td>7.5hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al$_2$O$_3$/Parylene C</td>
<td>50/6000nm</td>
<td>70°C</td>
<td>12hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al$_2$O$_3$/Parylene C x3</td>
<td>50/283.3nm x3</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>50min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al$_2$O$_3$/PI2545 x3</td>
<td>50/950nm</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>30min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al$_2$O$_3$/PI2545 x3</td>
<td>50/283.3nm x3</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>10hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiN$_x$/Al$_2$O$_3$/Parylene C</td>
<td>50/50/900nm</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>62.5hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti/Pt</td>
<td>5/100nm</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>5min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr/Au</td>
<td>5/100nm</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>5min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr/Au</td>
<td>5/1000nm</td>
<td>37°C</td>
<td>75min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Deposition method</th>
<th>Thickness for Mg test</th>
<th>Barrier lifetime (at 37 °C)</th>
<th>Leakage mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SU-8</td>
<td>Spin coating</td>
<td>1 µm</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Bulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Polyimide (PI)</td>
<td>Spin coating</td>
<td>1 µm</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Bulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parylene C</td>
<td>CVD</td>
<td>1 µm</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Bulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PDMS</td>
<td>Spin coating</td>
<td>1 µm</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Bulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LCP</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25 µm</td>
<td>147 – 309 day*</td>
<td>Bulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SiO_x</td>
<td>PECVD</td>
<td>1 µm</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Bulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SiN_x</td>
<td>PECVD</td>
<td>1 µm</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Bulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Al_2O_3</td>
<td>ALD</td>
<td>100 nm</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>HfO_2</td>
<td>ALD</td>
<td>100 nm</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inorganic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SiO_x/SiN_x x 3</td>
<td>PECVD</td>
<td>16.6/16.6 nm x3</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-layer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Al_2O_3/HfO_2 x 3</td>
<td>ALD</td>
<td>16.6/16.6 nm x3</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Al_2O_3/Parylene C</td>
<td>ALD/CVD</td>
<td>50/950 nm</td>
<td>3 - 7 day*</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Al_2O_3/Parylene C</td>
<td>ALD/CVD</td>
<td>50/6000nm</td>
<td>5 – 11 day</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Al_2O_3/Parylene C x3</td>
<td>ALD/CVD</td>
<td>50/283.3 nm x3</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Al_2O_3/PI</td>
<td>ALD/Spin coating</td>
<td>50/950 nm</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Al_2O_3/PI x3</td>
<td>ALD/Spin coating</td>
<td>50/283.3 nm x3</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>HfO_2/Parylene C</td>
<td>ALD/CVD</td>
<td>50/950 nm</td>
<td>102 - 214 day*</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>HfO_2/Parylene C x3</td>
<td>ALD/CVD</td>
<td>50/283.3 nm x3</td>
<td>22 - 39 day</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>HfO_2/PI</td>
<td>ALD/Spin coating</td>
<td>50/950 nm</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>HfO_2/PI x3</td>
<td>ALD/Spin coating</td>
<td>50/283.3 nm x3</td>
<td>&lt; 1 day</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>SiN_x/Al_2O_3/Parylene C</td>
<td>PECVD/ALD /CVD</td>
<td>50/50/900 nm</td>
<td>2 - 3 day</td>
<td>Pinhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal Oxide</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>SiO_2</td>
<td>Thermally grown</td>
<td>100 nm</td>
<td>6-7 years**</td>
<td>Slow dissolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permeability measured at 37°C, 90% Relative Humidity
* Indicates data from accelerated soak test. Reaction Rate Factor Q10 = 2 - 2.5.
** Barrier lifetime defined as the soaking time period before any defect area on Mg pad reach 30mm².
Soaked in PBS at 70 °C
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circuit element</th>
<th>Physical Meaning</th>
<th>Expression of impedance</th>
<th>Evaporated SiO(_x)</th>
<th>PECVD SiO(_2)</th>
<th>Thermal SiO(_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( R_{\text{sol}} / \Omega )</td>
<td>Solution resistance</td>
<td>( R_{\text{sol}} )</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_{\text{po}} / \Omega )</td>
<td>Pore resistance</td>
<td>( R_{\text{po}} )</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_{\text{CT}} / \Omega )</td>
<td>Charge transfer resistance</td>
<td>( R_{\text{CT}} )</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>48000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{\text{dt}} / \mu F )</td>
<td>Double layer capacitance</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{j\omega C_{\text{dt}}} )</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{\text{C}} / nF )</td>
<td>Coating capacitance</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{j\omega C_{\text{C}}} )</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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