Using Molecular Design to Increase Hole Transport: Backbone Fluorination in the Benchmark Material Poly(2,5-bis(3-alkylthiophen-2-yl)thieno[3,2-b]-thiophene (pBTTT)

Pierre Bouffl et, Yang Han, Zhuping Fei, Neil D. Treat, Ruipeng Li, Detlef-M. Smilgies, Natalie Stingelin, Thomas D. Anthopoulos, and Martin Heeney*

The synthesis of a novel 3,3'-difluoro-4,4'-dihepadecyl-2,2'-bithiophene monomer and its copolymerization with thieno[3,2-b]thiophene to afford the fluorinated analogue of the well-known poly(2,5-bis(3-alkylthiophen-2-yl)thieno[3,2-b]-thiophene) (PBTTT) polymer is reported. Fluorination is found to have a significant influence on the physical properties of the polymer, enhancing aggregation in solution and increasing melting point by over 100 °C compared to nonfluorinated polymer. On the basis of DFT calculations these observations are attributed to inter and intramolecular S···F interactions. As a consequence, the fluorinated polymer PFBTTT exhibits a fourfold increase in charge carrier mobility compared to the nonfluorinated polymer and excellent ambient stability for a nonencapsulated transistor device.

1. Introduction

Polythiophenes and thiophene containing derivatives have been the subject of much research in the field of organic semiconductors, owing to their relative stability, ease of synthesis, tuneable energy levels, and propensity for self-assembly. The popularity of poly(3-hexylthiophene) (P3HT) as an active material in both organic-field-effect transistors (OFETs) and organic photovoltaics has led to many derivatives being investigated over the past decade.[1–3] In many semicrystalline polymers such as polythiophene derivatives, increased aggregation strongly correlates with increased transistor performance, providing the polymer aggregates and crystallites are appropriately interconnected with so-called ‘tie-molecules’. [4–7] Processing techniques such as thermal and solvent-vapor annealing, solvent choice for casting, and film-forming methods all affect the degree of aggregation and therefore device performance.[8–10] Rational design of the monomer repeat unit is also a useful tool to manipulate the aggregation behavior, and approaches have included fusing of aromatic rings, alterations in the alkyl chain density and regiochemistry, and heteroatom modification.[11,12]

One of the most successful and widely studied polythiophene derivatives is poly(2,5-bis(3-alkylthiophen-2-yl)thieno[3,2-b]-thiophene) (PBTTT).[13] Unlike P3HT, PBTTT is a liquid crystalline (LC) polymer, and annealing in the LC phase has been shown to lead to improved charge carrier mobilities ranging from 0.1 to 1 cm² V⁻¹ s⁻¹.[14] PBTTT is comprised of a tail-to-tail alkylated bithiophene moiety copolymerized with a thieno[3,2-b]thiophene unit which, as well as rigidifying the backbone and increasing the ionization potential (IP), acts as a spacer between the solubilizing alkyl chains, thus allowing side-chain interdigitation.[12,15,16] Thiophene–thiophene links provide considerable flexibility to the backbone, assisting with the solubility and allowing a relatively low density of electronically insulating alkyl chains in the thin film. However, torsional disorder between adjacent thiophene monomers in the solid state can reduce backbone planarity and therefore detrimentally decrease conjugation length.[17] Such torsional disorder is due to steric interactions between linked...
In this manuscript, we present a comparative study of hexadecyl derivatives of PBTTT and poly(2,5-bis(4-fluoro-3-hexadecyl-thiophen-2-yl)thieno[3,2-b]thiophene) (PFBT TT). We explore the effect of fluorination on backbone planarity through density functional theory (DFT), present the synthesis and characterization of these polymers, and probe the influence of fluorination on OFET performance and air stability, as well as thin film morphology through X-ray diffraction analysis and atomic force microscopy (AFM).

2. Results and Discussion

2.1. DFT Calculations

DFT calculations are a useful tool to predict and assess the potential planarity of conjugated polymers. Trimeric units (for A–B copolymer systems) are often used as analogues to the polymer as they strike an appropriate balance between predicting the basic properties of interest, while allowing these calculations to be completed within reasonable computational time. For this reason, we opted to run the geometry optimization calculations on units where the hexadecyl side chains were replaced with propyl groups in order to emulate the steric bulk near the polymer backbone while keeping computational time low. The minimum energy conformations of the monomeric species were optimized using the B3LYP functional and a 6.31g(d) basis-set, and from these optimized geometries the minimum energy conformations of the corresponding trimers (BTTT and FBTTT) were calculated using the same level of theory.

The optimized ground-state geometries of the fluorinated and nonfluorinated trimers are shown in Figure 1a. The thiophene link exhibits a dihedral angle ($\theta_1$) of 12.7° in the nonfluorinated trimer, but upon fluorination this angle becomes 0.1°, indicating that the two fluorinated thiophenes are essentially coplanar. We believe this planarization is Coulombic in nature, as is the case in the aforementioned F-P3AT systems. Mulliken charges show that both the hydrogen atom in the 4-position of the thiophene unit and the proximate sulfur atom in the neighboring thiophene ring have a slight positive charge in the BTTT trimer, tending to electrostatic repulsion and therefore a nonnegligible torsional angle. In contrast, in FBTTT the 4-position is occupied by a fluorine atom that exhibits a slight negative charge, leading to an attractive interaction, consequently reducing the torsional angle to near planarity. While we acknowledge that Mulliken charges must be treated with caution in conjugated systems, they nevertheless provide an indication of the sign of the charge on atoms, which in this case proves crucial to rationalizing the seemingly contradicting planarization incurred by substituting a hydrogen atom for a fluorine atom that has a larger covalent radius. Also of interest is the very slight planarization of the thiophene–thienothiophene link ($\theta_2$), from 41.8° to 39.1° upon fluorination of the bithiophene unit.

The planarizing effect of the fluorine substitution is particularly evident when observing the change in potential energy as a function of $\theta_1$ for the trimers, as shown in Figure 1b. We note that the slight asymmetry in the potential energy scan is present regardless of the rotation direction calculated. Aside from the minimum energy conformation being closer to planarity in FBTTT, the barrier to rotation is also much larger in FBTTT than BTTT, and the syn conformation of the thiophene–thiophene link is strongly disfavored in the former case. This conformation places both the fluorine atoms in close proximity, with the steric and electrostatic repulsion leading to the observed higher potential energy. This is less apparent in BTTT, presumably due to the smaller Van der Waals radius of hydrogen compared to fluorine, and lower partial charge (+0.15 and −0.28 respectively). A Boltzmann analysis of the relative populations at room temperature (Figure 1c) clearly illustrates this. Indeed, while BTTT shows a non-negligible population of syn thiophene–thiophene links ($\theta_1 = \pm 180^\circ$), FBTTT exhibits a narrow distribution of conformations around the trans coplanar conformer ($\theta_1 = 0^\circ$) and a very small proportion of the competing syn analogue. Together these results suggest that fluorination will result in a significant increase in the rigidity of the backbone and a preference for the trans coplanar conformation.

Visual representations of the HOMO and LUMO of BTTT and FBTTT trimers are shown in Figure S1 (Supporting Information). Both show extended delocalization of the two frontier molecular orbitals, typical of all-donor conjugated units. The substitution of hydrogen atoms by fluorine in the bithiophene unit seems to have only a minimal effect on the orbital distribution, in the form of a minor contribution to both the HOMO and the LUMO.

2.2. Synthesis

Building upon our recent synthesis of short chain 3-alkyl-4-fluorothiophene derivatives, we decided to utilize the fluorinated building block 1 and introduce the hexadecyl side chain via a cross-coupling methodology (Scheme 1). Since backbone fluorination can result in a reduction in polymer solubility, the hexadecyl side chain was chosen as it is the longest solubilizing group which has been demonstrated to still afford good FET performance in PBTTT. Alkylation of 1 was best achieved via Negishi coupling using commercially available hexadecylzinc bromide in the presence of catalytic Pd(dpff)Cl$_2$. Superheating of the tetrahydrofuran (THF) solvent to 100 °C in a microwave reactor was required to afford good yields of 2. This was purified either by reverse-phase chromatography on C18-functionalized silica using a mixed acetoni-trile/THF
eluent, or the crude mixture was deprotected to give 3, which was then purified by normal-phase flash chromatography on silica. We opted for the latter for larger scale reactions, since unfunctionalized silica can support a higher loading capacity.

Tail-to-tail dimerization of 3-alkylthiophenes is usually easily achieved through lithiation followed by oxidative coupling using copper(II) chloride. Though the initial lithiation of 3 was achieved, as confirmed by quenching with a solution of iodine in dry THF, the oxidative coupling step proved problematic. Evidently, the fluorine substitution at the 4-position plays a role in hindering the oxidative coupling with copper(II) chloride. We therefore decided to regioselectively metallate 3 using the sterically hindered Knochel–Hauser base before adding 0.5 equivalents of Ni(dppp)Cl₂. Reductive elimination from the resulting Ni(II) salt afforded the desired tail-to-tail bithiophene 4 in good yield (73%). Subsequent bromination led to monomer

Scheme 1. Synthesis of the fluorinated bithiophene monomer 4 and PFBTTT via microwave-assisted Stille polycondensation reaction.
5, which was copolymerized with 2,5-bis(trimethylstannyl)thieno[3,2-b]thiophene under microwave polymerization conditions to yield PFBT TT.\(^{[33]}\) For comparison purposes, PBTT T was synthesized under identical microwave polymerization conditions. Both polymers were purified by precipitation and subsequent Soxhlet extraction with methanol, acetone, and hexane to remove catalyst impurities and low molecular weight oligomers. In the case of PFBT TT the crude polymer was also extracted with chloroform to remove low molecular weight polymeric material, before extraction into chlorobenzene. In both cases, a final purification by precipitation of chlorobenzene solutions into methanol was performed.

2.3. Physical Properties

In order to ensure a fair comparison and exclude molecular weight effects, which are known to affect the performance of PBTT T,\(^{[34–36]}\) we compared batches of similar molecular weight distribution PBTT T and PF BT T \((M_n 42 \text{ kDa}, D 1.5 \text{ and } M_n 44 \text{ kDa}, D 2.0, \text{ respectively, as measured by high-temperature gel-permeation chromatography (HT GPC)}\) against polystyrene standards). The basic physical properties of PFBT T all tend to suggest a greater degree of aggregation when compared to its nonfluorinated analogue PBTT T. First, PFBT T is only soluble in near-boiling chlorobenzene, rendering processing from this traditional solvent difficult. We therefore adopted 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene (TCB) as a solvent for most processing techniques due to its good solubilizing properties and high boiling point. In TCB, PFBT T is readily soluble at temperatures exceeding 135 °C, yet precipitates soon after cooling to 130 °C, while PBTT T remains soluble for several minutes at room temperature.

The solution UV–vis spectra of PBTT T, both hot and at room temperature, exhibit a single broad absorption band typical of fully solvated polythiophene derivatives (Figure 2 and Table 1).\(^{[37]}\) The slight blueshift of 12 nm of the absorption maximum upon increasing the solution temperature is attributed to the increased backbone torsion, which reduces the effective conjugation length. In contrast, the hot and room temperature solution spectra of PFBT T are very different. The hot solution spectrum shows that the majority of the absorption arises from solvated polymer, similar to PBTT T. There is very little difference in \(\lambda_{\text{max}}\) for the two polymers in hot solution. When the FBT T solution is cooled, the absorption spectrum red-shifts by 69 nm to give an absorption spectrum which strongly resembles that of the thin film, suggesting the polymer has planarized and aggregated in solution, similar to the formation of polythiophene aggregates in poor solvents.\(^{[38–41]}\) Even in the hot solution, the presence of a slight shoulder at higher wavelengths suggests some aggregate is still present.

Figure 2. a) Solution UV–vis spectra of PBTT T and PF BT T in TCB at room temperature (RT) and hot solutions (>80 °C). b) UV–vis spectra of as spun and annealed (200 °C) thin films of PBTT T and PF BT T. c,d) Flash DSC traces of PBTT T and PF BT T, respectively (heating and cooling rate of 500 K s\(^{-1}\)).
Upon thin film formation, both polymers display a redshift in $\lambda_{\text{on}}$ of around 70 nm compared to the hot solutions as the polymers planarize in the solid state. In the case of PFBTTT, this is accompanied by the appearance of pronounced shoulders both at longer and shorter wavelengths. These shoulders are typical of the vibronic progression observed in many polythiophenes and ascribed to the formation of ordered aggregates in the film. For PBTTT, the vibronic features are less obvious in the as-spun film, but become sharper upon thermal annealing at 200 °C. Thermal annealing also results in changes to the DFT spectra, with the longer wavelength shoulder increasing in intensity and the short wavelength diminishing. These changes are consistent with some structural reordering in the films upon annealing. Both polymers exhibit very similar optical band gaps, as measured by DFT calculations, at 1.91 eV for PBTTT and 1.93 eV for PFBTTT, with a widening in the optical band gap. The DFT calculations suggest that fluorination would result in a modest stabilization of the HOMO of 0.16 eV and the LUMO of 0.18 eV over the non-fluorinated trimer. The difference between the experimental and the theoretical results may therefore be related to error of the PESA measurement, since we note that the transistor results (vide infra) show higher contact resistance for the fluorinated polymer over the nonfluorinated polymer, which would support a slight increase in IP upon fluorination.

The thermal properties of the two polymers were investigated by differential scanning calorimetry (DSC). Our initial experiments utilized conventional DSC at heating rates of 10°C min$^{-1}$ (Figure S13, Supporting Information). In these experiments, we were able to clearly observe the LC phase of PBTTT, with two well-defined endotherms on heating, at 126 and 238 °C, which have previously been attributed to a side chain and backbone melt. However, despite heating to 390 °C, we could not observe a well-defined backbone melt for PFBTTT. We therefore moved to flash DSC in which heating rates of 500 K s$^{-1}$ are obtainable. Such rapid heating and cooling rates increase the sensitivity of the measurement and also allow the investigation of temperatures regimes not readily accessible with conventional DSC due to competing decomposition processes. The flash DSC thermograms of both polymers are shown in Figure 2. The effect of the two fluorine atoms on the thermal properties is remarkable, with an increase in the backbone melt of approximately 100°C, from 250°C for PBTTT to 350 °C for PFBTTT. Note that melting enthalpies are not readily accessible with flash DSC due to the small sample size. This increase is much more substantial than would be expected by a simple molecular weight argument (based upon the increased atomic mass of F over H), and is therefore supportive of the increased intra- and intermolecular interactions that would result from the more coplanar bithiophene unit suggested by DFT calculations. It is also interesting that the temperature of the low-temperature endotherm reduces upon fluorination, from 66 to 55 °C. A similar reduction in side-chain melting point is observed for a PBTTT analogue in which the alkyl side chains are moved from the bithiophene unit, in which each thiophene can rotate independently, to a thieno[3,2-b]thiophene in which case each alkyl side chain must move co-operatively. A similar co-operative movement of the side chains might be expected for the fluorinated bithiophene if the S...F interaction was pronounced, as suggested by the DFT calculations. Finally, we note that thermogravimetric analysis of PFBTTT demonstrates that it exhibits excellent thermal stability, with 5% weight loss occurring only beyond 420 °C (Figure S14, Supporting Information).

### 2.4. Transistor Fabrication and Characterization

The electrical properties of the polymers were studied employing thin film transistors. Films were prepared by spin-coating from TCB in both cases, followed by annealing at 200 °C for 30 min. We note that the transistor performance of PBTTT, to the best of our knowledge, has not been previously reported for films cast from TCB. Bottom-gate top-contact configuration devices for both polymers exhibit typical unipolar hole transporting behavior with low hysteresis between the forward and reverse gate voltage ($V_G$) sweeps and moderate on/off channel current ratios of $10^2$ to $10^4$, as shown in Figure 3. It is notable that both the peak and average charge carrier mobility values increase upon fluorination by approximately a factor of 4, with the best devices exhibiting a saturated mobility of $0.32 \text{ cm}^2 \text{V}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$ for the fluorinated polymer, compared to $0.069 \text{ cm}^2 \text{V}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$ for the nonfluorinated analogue. The performance data of the two polymers is summarized in Table 2. Although significantly lower than the record charge carrier mobilities recorded for

Table 1. Summary of physical properties of PBTTT and PFBTTT.

| Polymer  | $M_r$ [kDa] D$^{-1}$ | $\lambda_{\text{on}}$ [nm] | $E_{\text{F}, \text{opt}}$ [eV] | IP [eV] | LUMO [eV] | $T_{\text{on}}/T_{\text{off}}$ | $T_{\text{m}}/T_{\text{g}}$ |
|----------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| PBTTT    | 42.1/1.5          | 488 (476)       | 559 (591)       | 1.91   | -5.10     | 3.19            | 67/249          |
| PFBTTT   | 44.2/2.0          | 550 (481)       | 547 (510, 594)  | 1.93   | -5.10     | 3.17            | 6/535           |

*Measured in 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene (TCB) at 140 °C relative to polystyrene standards; *b) Measured in room temperature TCB, or hot (>80 °C) TCB in parentheses; *c) Films spin-coated from TCB; *d) Optical band gap estimated from the absorption onset of as-spun films; *e) Ionization potential measured by photoelectron spectroscopy in air (PESA) error ±0.05 eV; *f) Lowest unoccupied molecular orbital estimated from the optical band gap and PESA measurements; *g) Measured by flash DSC at heating and cooling rates of 500 K s$^{-1}$. 
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donor–acceptor polymers, these values are still high for an all-donor system. While the mobilities reported here for PBTTT devices (max 0.069 cm² V⁻¹ s⁻¹) are lower than those often reported in the literature (0.1–1 cm² V⁻¹ s⁻¹), we attribute this mainly to the longer hexadecyl alkyl-chain length used in our case (as opposed to tetradecyl used previously in higher performing PBTTT-based transistors), as well as the different processing solvent (TCB compared to mixtures of chloroform and chlorobenzene). In fact, the few reports of hexadecyl-substituted PBTTT transistor properties involve either highly optimized and rigorous device fabrication process or a tailored ‘spread-and-compress’ film formation on top of an ionic liquid. The marginally higher threshold voltages (V_TH) required for PFBTTT devices along with the slightly sigmoidal output curves and the increasing slope of the I_d² versus V_g curve suggest increased contact resistance and/or localized high-energy trap states for PFBTTT over PBTTT. Previously, the use of high work function electrodes like Pt has been shown to reduced contact resistance in PBTTT and may provide a possible solution to further improve device performance.

Previous reports have demonstrated that fluorination of the conjugated side chain or backbone can result in improved device stability in the presence of ambient air, with the effect being ascribed to either an increase in the IP as a result of the electron withdrawing influence of fluorine or to a kinetic effect reducing water ingress due to closer packing of the conjugated molecules in the solid state. Therefore, we investigated the stability of the PBTTT and PFBTTT devices by removing them from the glove box and storing them in the dark under ambient conditions with an average temperature of 20 °C and relative humidity of 50%. The air-stability of PBTTT-based devices varies considerably in the literature. In the case of C_{12}- and C_{14}-PBTTT devices, stability in ambient conditions is known to be quite poor, with off current rising and charge mobility dropping to about 20% of the original value after 5 and 22 d, respectively. Humidity was shown to have a significant deleterious impact on the charge carrier mobility, with storage at low humidity shown to drastically improve the operational lifetime of these devices. High humidity levels have been shown to result in the formation of charge traps in the film in studies on related polythiophenes. It is worth noting that the increase in off-current and shift in threshold voltage reported for many polythiophene derivatives may not be due solely to the effects of oxygen or water, but also to minor impurities in ambient air such as ozone, which can act as a reversible dopant.

Table 2. Summary of OFET performance of devices in bottom-gate top-contact configuration.

| Polymer | µ [cm² V⁻¹ s⁻¹] | Linear | Saturated (peak value) | V_th [V] | V_on/V_off |
|---------|----------------|--------|------------------------|----------|------------|
| PBTTT   | 0.048 ± 0.013  | 0.058 ± 0.0086 (0.069) | −0.3 ± 0.6 | 10⁻¹⁻¹⁰⁴ |
| PFBTTT  | 0.11 ± 0.067   | 0.23 ± 0.07 (0.32)    | −17.8 ± 3.0 | 10⁻¹⁻¹⁰⁴ |

Figure 3. a,c) Transfer characteristics of PBTTT and PFBTTT, respectively. b,d) Output characteristics of PBTTT and PFBTTT, respectively. Devices made in bottom-gate top-contact configuration, with channel width and length of 1000 and 50 µm, respectively.
for the polymer.\textsuperscript{[51]} To our knowledge, the only stability study performed on the C\textsubscript{16}-PBTCTT was performed by Umeda et al. in which repeated stressing in ambient conditions over 2 d had little impact on the field effect characteristics such as mobility and on/off ratio.\textsuperscript{[29]}

The transfer plots of \textit{PBTCTT} and \textit{PFBTTT} after 3, 55, and 75 d storage in the dark in ambient air are shown in Figure 4 and the data are summarized in Table 3. For both polymers the charge carrier mobility remained relatively constant over the test period, but we did observe changes in the threshold voltage and on/off channel current ratio over time. In particular, the off current rose rapidly after 3 d, with a large positive shift in the threshold voltage for both materials. Upon continued storage the threshold voltage moved back toward the original values, and the off currents dropped. The fluorinated polymer consistently maintained a higher on/off ratio than \textit{PBTCTT}, with the device after 75 d exhibiting a value around \(5 \times 10^4\). The \textit{PFBTTT} transistor also demonstrated a sharper turn-on with a narrower subthreshold swing than \textit{PBTCTT}. As discussed above, the shifts in threshold and increase in off-current are typical of oxidative doping making the device more conductive, and as such difficult to switch-off. The fluctuations in threshold and off ratio over time suggest that this doping is reversible, and the lower currents for the fluorinated polymer suggest it is less susceptible to such doping, in common with other fluorinated materials.\textsuperscript{[52,53]}

2.5. Thin Film Morphology

While it is widely accepted that \textit{PBTCTT} possesses a high degree of order in the lamellar direction, the \(\pi\)-stacking direction exhibits a relatively high degree of paracrystallinity.\textsuperscript{[53,54]} The factors that allow \textit{PBTCTT} to have high hole mobilities are therefore considered to be its relatively low-energy trap states and high edge-on orientation.\textsuperscript{[53-55]} In order to assess the impact of \textit{PBTCTT} fluorination on its orientational order, we performed grazing incidence wide-angle X-ray scattering (GIWAXS) on films prepared in the same way as the OFET devices (Figure 5). Both films exhibit diffraction patterns consistent with lamellar ordering of the polymers with an edge-on orientation with respect to the substrate. In the as cast films, the crystalline domains of \textit{PFBTTT} possesses a higher degree of edge-on orientation, which is apparent from the more localized out-of-plane scattering patterns corresponding to diffraction in the lamellar direction. Indeed, arcing of these diffraction peaks is attributed to misalignment of the crystallites with respect to the surface.\textsuperscript{[55]} The lamellar spacing is similar for both polymers, at 2.33 nm for \textit{PFBTTT} and 2.35 nm for \textit{PBTCTT}. This is in agreement with the \(d\)-spacing previously observed for C\textsubscript{16}-PBTCTT and suggests that the alkyl side chains of adjacent polymer backbones are interdigitated for both polymers.\textsuperscript{[56]} Annealing the films results in an increase in the intensity of the diffraction peaks for both polymers, most clearly observed in the out-of-plane line profiles in the Supporting Information (Figure S15). The \(d\)-spacing does not change for \textit{PFBTTT}, while it slightly narrows for \textit{PBTCTT} to 2.315 nm, suggesting either enhanced crystallinity or a change in crystal orientation in the film. That the in-plane lamellar diffraction peaks gradually disappear for \textit{PFBTTT} with annealing would suggest the latter, that the misaligned polymer domains reorientate to become predominately edge-on. For \textit{PBTCTT}, the out-of-plane peaks also increase in intensity and the arcing reduces, consistent with a similar increase in edge-on alignment. However the in-plane scan suggests that the misaligned domains remain upon annealing (Figure S15, Supporting Information), which was not the case for \textit{PFBTTT}. High-resolution X-ray diffraction measurements also show an increase in intensity of the (100) and corresponding higher order diffraction peaks upon annealing for both polymers (Figure S16, Supporting Information), thus confirming the increased crystallinity suggested by GIWAXS. The greater orientational order in \textit{PBTCTT} compared to \textit{PFBTTT} could therefore be one of the factors resulting in the increase in mobility upon fluorination. We also note that \textit{PBTCTT} films annealed at 150 °C exhibit a split in the (100) and higher order out-of-plane signals, possibly due to different degrees of interdigitation, and side-chain reorganization.

The surface morphology of the films was also investigated by AFM in films made under the same conditions as used for device fabrication. The first point to note is that the film morphology achieved for \textit{PBTCTT} from spin-coating from TCB

**Table 3.** Summary of OFET lifetime characteristics for \textit{PBTCTT} and \textit{PFBTTT} from 0 to 75 d.

| Polymer   | \(\mu_{\text{sat}} [\text{cm}^2 \text{V}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}]\) | \(V_{\text{TH}} [\text{V}]\) | Channel current on/off ratio |
|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
|           | 0 d 3 d 55 d 75 d               | 0 d 3 d 55 d 75 d | 0 d 3 d 55 d 75 d   |
| \textit{PBTCTT} | 0.058 0.059 0.058 0.059 | \(-1\) \(\text{13}\) \(8\) \(1\) | \(2.6 \times 10^4\) \(5.8 \times 10^3\) \(7.3 \times 10^1\) \(2.0 \times 10^2\) |
| \textit{PFBTTT} | 0.18 0.20 0.17 0.16 | \(-22\) \(4\) \(-3\) \(-6\) | \(2.8 \times 10^1\) \(2.3 \times 10^1\) \(6.6 \times 10^4\) \(5.3 \times 10^4\) |
is very different from the terraced nanostructure observed when spin-coating from other solvents such as 1,2-dichlorobenzene and chloroform. Indeed we observe that PBTTT appears to have a large quantity of pin holes distributed across the whole film (Figure S17, Supporting Information), which were likely formed by the solvent-vapor bubbles during drying. Although films of PBTTT and PFBTTT have similar a similar RMS roughness (6.79 nm and 6.99 nm respectively), these holes probably have a detrimental effect on the continuity of the film and introduce extra traps, potentially hindering the transport of charge carriers. However, in the case of PFBTTT, we observe a film comprised of a more fibrillar morphology (Figure S17, Supporting Information). Though highly entangled, the fibrillar structure could facilitate the release of solvent vapor, leaving a more continuous film with fewer pinholes. In fact, when diluted to 2 mg mL$^{-1}$, PFBTTT forms interconnected nanofibrils, with heights of approximately 5 nm and widths of 200–500 nm (Figure 6), unlike PBTTT under the same dilution (Figure S18, Supporting Information). This network of intricately woven fibers could be a morphological explanation for the increased mobility observed in PFBTTT. Indeed, recent studies have shown that interconnectivity of ordered domains is crucial to achieve high mobilities with polythiophene derivatives.

3. Conclusions

In conclusion, we have described the synthesis of a novel 3,3′-difluoro-4,4′-dihexadecyl-2,2′-bithiophene monomer and report its copolymerization with thieno[3,2-b]thiophene to afford the fluorinated analog of the well-known PBTTT polymer. We find that backbone fluorination has a pronounced influence on the physical properties of the polymer, with a significantly enhanced degree of aggregation compared to the nonfluorinated analog. Remarkably, we find that the incorporation of just two fluorine atoms on the polymer backbone results in an increase in the polymer melting temperature of 100 °C. DFT calculations suggest this increased aggregation originates from a greater degree of backbone planarity and rigidity. A result of this greater rigidity is an enhancement of the edge-on orientational order, and consequently a significant increase in hole mobility in OFET devices, which is also aided by an appreciably interwoven fibrillar morphology. In addition, the fluorinated polymer exhibits excellent ambient stability for a nonencapsulated transistor device. We believe...
that these results demonstrate that backbone fluorination is a useful tool in designing high-performance organic semiconductors.

4. Experimental Section

Materials: Reagents and chemicals were purchased from Aldrich and Acros, except hexa dezyl chloride, which was purchased from Rieke Metals. All reactions were carried out under argon using anhydrous solvents and reagents as commercially supplied, unless otherwise stated.

PBT1T, 2,5-bis(trimethylstannyl)thieno[3,2-b]thiophene and 3-bromo-4-fluoro-5-(trimethylsilyl)thiophene (I) were synthesized as previously reported.11 Melting points were taken as peak maximum of DSC traces in all cases.
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scans. The wavelength of X-ray was 1.107 Å. An attenuator was used to allow ψ/7 beam flux through and avoid saturation in the case of PBTTT sample at 200 °C annealing.

**Device fabrication and characterization:** All film preparation and characterization steps were carried out under inert atmosphere. Bottom-gate/top-contact devices were fabricated on heavily doped n-type Si (100) wafers with 400 nm thick thermally grown SiO₂ substrates. The Si/SiO₂ substrates characterization steps were carried out under inert atmosphere. Bottom-gate/top-contact devices were fabricated on heavily doped n-type Si (100) wafers with 400 nm thick thermally grown SiO₂ substrates. The Si/SiO₂ substrates characterization steps were carried out under inert atmosphere.
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