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A B S T R A C T

Environmentally friendly and low-cost sensors are needed for the next generation disposable electronics applications. Given its low-cost, availability and biodegradability, paper-based devices are a very promising. Here we demonstrate the fabrication of a tungsten disulphide (WS$_2$) strain sensor on standard copy paper. The WS$_2$ is deposited through direct abrasion of WS$_2$ powder against the paper surface making the fabrication of the device low-tech and cost effective. The fabricated strain gauge devices present gauge factors up to ~70 for strains in the ±0.5% range. These values are ~9 times larger than that obtained on devices with the same geometry but using a graphite film instead a WS$_2$ as a sensitive material. We demonstrate the potential of these WS$_2$-on-paper strain gauges by integrating them directly on a paper cantilever to sense mass and forces. We show how this very simple device can detect sub-milligram masses. Moreover, we also demonstrate the capability of transducing motion in mechanical resonators by gluing a WS$_2$-on-paper strain gauge on their surface.

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V.

Ubiquitous electronics applications like Internet of things, wearables or smart patches/tags will come together with an exponential growth of the electronic component production, eventually leading to an urgent problem of electronic waste handling [1–3]. In fact, only a very small fraction of standard silicon-based electronic components can be recycled thus motivating the exploration of alternative, eco-friendlier, substrate materials for electronic components. Although silicon will be still necessary in standard copier substrates using abrasion-induced deposited WS$_2$ films as sensing material. We obtained gauge factors up to ~70 for strains in the ±0.5% range, a factor 9–10 times larger than that measured using graphite based paper-supported strain gauges. We illustrate the potential of these WS$_2$-on-paper strain gauges by fabricating a simple force/mass sensor and by transducing motion of mechanical resonators.

As shown in Fig. 1a, the paper-supported strain sensor devices are fabricated by abrasion induced deposition of WS$_2$ onto standard copy paper [15–17]. Briefly, the outline of the device channel and electrodes is printed out in a piece of standard copy paper (80 g/m$^2$) with an office laser printer. Then, Post-It tape is used to create a stencil to delimit the channel area and micronized WS$_2$ powder (0.6 µm APS Micronised WS$_2$, HAGEN Automation ltd.) is rubbed...
against the surface of copy paper with a cotton swab to deposit the channel. The continuity of the film is tested with a handheld multimeter and the rubbing process is repeated until reaching a resistance between two probes separated by ~1–2 mm in the ~1–5 MΩ range. This relatively large resistance values span is due to the well-defined nature of the electrical transport in the WS₂ films, as demonstrated from the statistical analysis of more than 100 WS₂ devices in Ref [17]. After that, the stencil is removed and graphite electrodes are deposited by direct writing with a 4B pencil (~80% graphite content [19]) onto the WS₂ and paper surfaces following the printed electrode outline contour. This handcrafted device fabrication technique can limit their implementation in industrial applications. However, Nutting et al. recently implemented a system based on computer numerical control (CNC) to automatize a similar abrasion deposition technique, to deposit van der Waals materials on plastic substrates, opening a route for the scalability of this method [14].

Fig. 1b shows a picture of one of the WS₂ strain sensors fabricated on standard copy paper. A very comprehensive characterization of the morphology, chemical composition, electrical and optical properties of abrasion-induced deposited WS₂ films on copy paper can be found in Ref [17], and we address the reader to that work for further details. Fig. 1c shows a scanning electron microscopy (SEM) image of the interface between the bare, uncovered, paper substrate and the deposited WS₂ film. On the paper substrate one can readily resolve the fibrous structure, due to the cellulose fibers composing the substrate. The WS₂ film covers the surface of the paper, filling in the gaps between the cellulose fibers, and creating a compact film of interconnected flakes.

To characterize the suitability of these devices in strain sensing applications we load the fabricated devices into a home-built three-points bending jig apparatus (see the inset in Fig. 2a) [20]. The devices are subjected to well-defined strains while the electronic transport characteristics are determined. Fig. 2a shows current vs. voltage characteristics (IVs hereafter) acquired at different levels of uniaxial strain, including tensile strain (positive strain values) and compressive strain (negative strain values). The resistance of the device changes monotonically when uniaxial strain is applied, as indicated by the change in slope of the IVs. For tensile strains the resistance increases while for compressive strains the resistance decreases. We attribute this behavior mostly to the sliding of flakes within the film rather than stretching/compressing of the individual WS₂ flakes [21,22]. In fact, as these films are formed by interconnected WS₂ flakes that interact to each other through van der Waals forces the flake-to-flake friction forces are very small and thus flake sliding is expected to occur when moderate stress is applied [23,24].

Upon tensile strain, the flakes slide apart reducing the flake-to-flake overlap and thus explaining the observed increase in the resistance. On the contrary, compressive strain makes flakes to slide towards a more compact configuration, increasing the overlap between flakes and reducing the resistance. The overall dependence of the device resistance on the applied strain can be better resolved in Fig. 2b where the relative change in resistance (with respect to the resistance at 0% strain, $R_0$) is displayed for different strain levels. The gauge factor (GF) or strain factor of the WS₂ paper-supported strain gauge device can be defined as:

$$\text{GF} = \frac{\Delta R}{R_0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$$

where $\varepsilon$ is the strain and $\Delta R$ is the difference in the resistance when subjected to a certain strain and $R_0$. The gauge factor is a very suitable figure-of-merit that allows to directly compare the performance of different strain sensors. In the WS₂-on-paper strain gauge shown in Fig. 2b we obtain a gauge factor of ~60 for tensile strain and ~40 for compressive strain. For comparison (Table 1), state-of-the-art metallic thin-film based strain gauges have gauge factors in the 2–10 range [25]. Recently, other paper-supported strain sensors, based on black phosphorus, ITO inks and carbon black, have been reported with gauge factors in the 4–40 range [26–28]. Graphite and graphene strain sensors on paper have been also demonstrated but the gauge factors span over a very broad range of values, 3–800 [29–32]. The reason for such a large variation in gauge factor of graphite/graphene-based strain sensors in different reports is unclear. We thus decided to carry out a benchmarking test with graphite-based strain sensors fabricated and tested with the exact same protocol as the WS₂ sensors. Fig. 2c shows the measured relative change in device resistance as a function of strain, measured for 17 WS₂ and 12 graphite (4B pencil, ~80% graphite content [19]) devices. One can observe that the WS₂ devices show a stronger resistance change upon straining as compared with the graphite devices. The Supporting Information shows datasets for 5 different WS₂ devices and one graphite (4B) device for comparison. We have also tested graphite devices fabricated out of pure nano-graphite powder (MKN-CG-50, Lower Friction, MK IMPEX CORP) obtaining a similar behavior than that of 4B pencil based devices, we address the reader.
Fig. 2. Strain dependent resistance of WS$_2$-on-paper devices. (a) Current vs. voltage characteristics of a paper supported WS$_2$ strain gauge device, measured for different uniaxial strains. (Inset) Picture of the device loaded in a three-point bending jig apparatus to apply controllable strains. (b) Resistance changes as a function of the applied strain. The gauge factor (GF) can be extracted from the slope of the curve. (c) Comparison between the strain dependent resistance changes measured on 17 WS$_2$ devices and that measured on 12 devices with graphite sensing channel. (d) Box plot summarizing the gauge factors measured, within ± 0.2% strain range, for the WS$_2$- and graphite-based devices.

Table 1
Summary of gauge factor values reported for other conventional and paper-supported strain gauges. The table indicates the strain sensitive material used, the substrate, the method to deposit the sensing material and the reported gauge factor. Gauge factor values highlighted with $^t$ or $^c$ indicate values obtained upon tensile or compressive strains, respectively.

| Sensing material           | Substrate                  | Method                                      | Gauge factor | Ref. |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------|------|
| Metallic thin-film         | Flexible polymer (usually Kapton) | Lithography + metal deposition | 2–10         | [25] |
| Black phosphorus           | Paper                      | Sonochemistry, hydrothermal                | 6.1          | [26] |
| Carbon black               | Paper                      | Dip-coating                                | 4.3          | [27] |
| ITO nanoparticles          | Paper                      | Hand-painting                              | 41.9$^t$; 21.36$^c$ | [28] |
| Graphite glue              | Paper                      | Stencil printing                           | 804.9$^t$; 142.1$^c$ | [29] |
| Water-based graphene inks | Paper                      | Inkjet-printing                            | 125          | [30] |
| Graphite pencil-trace (HB) | Paper                      | Drawing                                    | 26           | [31] |
| Graphite pencil-trace (2B) | Paper                      | Drawing                                    | 536.6        | [32] |
| graphite pencil-trace (2B) | Paper                      | Drawing                                    | 34           | [34] |
| Carbon black/carbon nanotube (CB/CNT) | Paper | Dip-coating | 7.5$^t$; 2.6$^c$ | [35] |
| Molybdenum carbide-graphene (MCG) composites | Paper | Direct laser writing | 73$^t$; 43$^c$ | [36] |
| Reduced graphene oxide (rGO) | Paper                      | Drop-casting                              | 66.6 ± 5     | [37] |
| Graphite                   | Hybrid graphite-paper     | Preparation of graphite infiltrated paper | 27           | [38] |
| Graphene                   | Mulberry paper             | Meyer-rod coating                          | 3.82         | [39] |
| Carbon paper               | Carbon paper               | Pyrolysis                                  | 25.3         | [40] |
| Carbonized crepe paper     | Carbonized crepe paper     | Pyrolysis                                  | 10.10        | [41] |
| Laser-fabricated graphitic platelets | Polyimide (PI)/paper | Direct laser writing | 13 | [42] |
| Au nanoparticles           | Abrasive paper             | Direct-current (DC) sputtering             | 75.8$^t$; 10.7$^c$ | [43] |
| Single-layer graphene      | PDMS                       | Chemical vapor deposition (CVD), photolithography | 42.2 | [44] |
| WS$_2$                     | PET                        | Atomized spray casting deposition          | 14           | [45] |
| WS$_2$ (4B)                | Paper                      | Direct abrasion                            | 67.5$^t$; 51.0$^c$ | This work |
| Graphite (nanographite)    | Paper                      | Direct abrasion                            | 10.2$^t$; 7.8$^c$ | This work |
|                           |                            | Direct abrasion                            | 9.5$^t$; 11.1$^c$ | This work |
to the Fig. S3 to see the results. From the slope at low strain values one can quantitatively extract the gauge factor of the different devices. Fig. 2d presents the statistical summary of the results in a box-plot. Our graphite devices show gauge factors with a median value of 5.7 (for tensile strain) that are compatible with the lower bound of the reported values in the literature for graphite/graphene strain sensors on paper. On the other hand, WS$_2$-on-paper devices show gauge factor values up to 67.6, ~9–10 times larger than that of

---

**Fig. 3.** Paper-based cantilever with integrated WS$_2$ strain gauge. (a) Picture of the paper cantilever with a WS$_2$ film strain gauge integrated at the base of the cantilever. (b) Resistance of the strain gauge as a function of the mass load. (Insets) Pictures of the cantilever: unload (top left) and loaded with ~1.0 g (bottom right). (c) Resistance of the WS$_2$ film vs. time while the paper cantilever is subjected to ~80 cycles of bending/releasing. (d) Resistance of the WS$_2$ film vs. time acquired when the paper cantilever, loaded with different test masses, is mechanically excited to induce a ring-down. The datapoints have been fitted to a damped harmonic oscillator model to extract the resonance frequency of the cantilever. (e) Resonance frequency of the cantilever measured for different mass loading conditions.
We attribute the device-to-device variation shown in Fig. 2c to the percolative nature of the WS$_2$ film [33] that introduces an intrinsic variability between devices as the conduction paths through a percolative network are randomly distributed.

In order to illustrate the potential of the WS$_2$-on-paper strain sensors we have fabricated paper-based force and mass sensors that use a WS$_2$ strain gauge as transducer. The force/mass sensor is based on a cantilever made of copy paper and we fabricated a WS$_2$ strain gauge on its base to convert the deflections of the cantilever into an electrical signal (see Fig. 3a). We first test the use of such device to sense mass by loading the cantilever free end with test-masses and measuring the change in resistance (Fig. 3b). Upon mass loading, the cantilever deflects downwards (see insets in Fig. 3b) creating a tensile strain on the base of the cantilever that can be detected with the WS$_2$ strain gauge integrated directly on the surface of the paper cantilever. The resistance of the device raises gradually with increasing mass loading, and one can obtain a slope of ~160 Ω/mg that represents the mass sensitivity of the sensor.

In order to test the reproducibility of this sensor we have subjected it to 80 deflection cycles by gluing a magnet at the free end of the cantilever and mounting another magnet on a motorized stage to deflect the cantilever through magnetic force repulsion. Fig. 3c presents the resistance changes during these deflection cycles, showing how the device responds fast to the deflection change and with a good reproducibility, with an overall drift of less than 0.8% in the 5 min measurement. We address the reader to the Fig. S4 to see a long-term test with nearly 600 loading/unloading cycles. In such long-term measurement one can see an overall slow drift of the current value. The drift is about 7% per hour (in good agreement with the drift observed in the short-term measurement) and we attribute it to temperature or humidity changes. Indeed, we have recently observed that changes in temperature in the order of few degrees can induce changes in the WS$_2$ resistance of up to ~10–20% [16]. Nonetheless, the strain-induced resistance modulation, due to the strain/release cycles, remains rather stable over long periods of time (~1.5 h). Therefore, even though temperature and humidity changes can alter the resistance baseline of the device the strain-induced resistance change is robust.

An alternative way of sensing mass with this device is to use the WS$_2$ strain gauge to study the dynamics of the paper cantilever. Fig. 3d shows the resistance of the WS$_2$ film as a function of time for a cantilever loaded with 1–4 test masses (73.6 mg each test mass) when it is mechanically excited. One can observe that the current oscillates in time and its amplitude decays, as expected for a damped harmonic oscillator. One can fit the measured resistance vs. time traces to a damped oscillator to accurately extract the resonance frequency of the paper cantilever, that decreases monotonically upon mass loading (see Fig. 3e). Therefore, one can determine the mass load alternatively to the direct resistance change measurement from the determination of the resonance frequency of the cantilever. For low mass load, the change in frequency is in the order of 20 mHz/mg and thus one could easily resolve sub-mg test masses.

The capability of the WS$_2$-on-paper strain gauges to transduce strain dynamically (Fig. 3e) motivated us to test the performance of these devices to transduce the motion of mechanical resonators by directly sticking a paper with a WS$_2$ strain gauge on the surface of the mechanical resonator. Fig. 4a shows pictures of a WS$_2$-on-paper strain sensor glued on the backside of a piezo-buzzer disc. The piezo-buzzer is then excited by sending a sine wave signal to the piezoelectric material with a function waveform generator (Tennma 72–14110) and the resistance of the WS$_2$-on-paper strain gauge is measured. Fig. 4b shows the resistance of the WS$_2$ strain gauge as a function of time when the piezo-buzzer is excited with sine waves of frequencies 0.5 Hz, 1 Hz, 2 Hz and 4 Hz. One can see how the
resistance of the WS$_2$ strain gauge oscillates following a sine wave of the same frequency as the piezo-buzzer excitation, indicating that the motion of the piezo-buzzer induces a strain on the WS$_2$-on-paper that is transduced as a change in resistance. By repeating the experiment at different piezo-buzzer excitation frequencies one can get information about the mechanical resonances of the piezo-buzzer disc (Fig. 4c). In this example the disc has a broad resonance around 256 Hz. Interestingly, the paper-based strain gauge could be used to transduce the motion of the piezo-buzzer up to 2 kHz (the upper frequency limitation of our electrical measurement system) and thus the response time of the WS$_2$-on-paper strain gauge is < 0.5 ms.

1. Conclusions

In summary, we fabricated strain sensors on standard copy paper substrates integrating a WS$_2$ film, as sensing material, contacted with graphite electrodes. The WS$_2$ was deposited through a low tech and cost effective all dry abrasion-induced deposition method that does not require of any specialized fabrication instrumentation. The graphite electrodes were directly drawn onto the WS$_2$ film using a high-graphite content pencil (B-type). The resistance of the strain sensors strongly depends on the applied strain, reaching gauge factor values up to ~70, 9–10 times larger than the values obtained when a graphite film is used. We demonstrate the direct integration of the WS$_2$-on-paper strain sensor on a paper cantilever, allowing for the transduction of cantilever deformation, allowing for mass and force sensing. We demonstrate a mass sensitivity of ~160 Ω/mg using this simple disposable mass sensor. We have also demonstrated how gluing these paper-based sensors to a mechanical resonator we can transduce its motion even at frequencies > 2 kHz. The results presented here open the door to the integration of other van der Waals materials in the fabrication of biodegradable, low-cost and disposable paper-supported strain sensors.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Materials

Standard (untreated) copy printer paper (80 g/m$^2$) were used as supporting substrates because their low cost and availability. Tungsten disulfide (WS$_2$) from HAGEN automation Ltd. (0.6 μm APS Ultra Grade Micronised) was used as sensing channel material. Graphite pencil (4B, Faber Castell) was used to pattern graphite-based electrical leads to connect the WS$_2$ channel to the readout electronics. Nano-graphite powder with the average particle size of 50 nm (PN: MKN-CG-50) was purchased at Lowerfriction Lubricants.

2.2. SEM and EDX

Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDX), using a FE-SEM, FEI Nova NANOSEM 230, was used to characterize the morphology and the composition of the WS$_2$ films deposited on paper. An electron energy of 7 keV were used for imaging and 14 keV for EDX spectroscopy.

2.3. Electrical measurements

Electrical measurements were carried out with a Keithley 2450 source measure unit. The WS$_2$-on-paper devices were fixed on a home-made three-points bending setup to conduct the well-defined tension and compression deformations. The electrical resistance of the device was determined by measuring current vs. voltage characteristics at various uniaxial strains. The variation of electrical resistance of the strain sensor was monitored with a fixed voltage of 1 V.
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