Abstract

Kinetic Monte Carlo (KMC) is a powerful method for simulation of diffusion processes in various systems. The accuracy of the method, however, relies on extent of details used for the parameterization of the model. Migration barriers are often used to describe diffusion on atomic scale, but the full set of these barriers may become easily unmanageable in materials with increased chemical complexity or a large number of defects. In this work, we apply a machine learning approach for Cu surface diffusion. We train an artificial neural network on a subset of the large set of 2\textsuperscript{110} barriers needed to describe correctly the surface diffusion in Cu. Our KMC simulations using the obtained barrier predictor shows sufficient accuracy in modelling [100] and [111] surfaces. The [110] surface could be modelled by overriding a limited set of barriers given by the network.
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1. Introduction

Diffusion in crystalline material is an important phenomenon in many situations. For example, computational studies of irradiation damage may have a hard time finding agreement with experiments without accounting for bulk defect diffusion and annihilation after the initial collision cascade [1]. Surface diffusion, on the other hand, is hypothesised to play a role in e.g. the events preceding vacuum arcs in devices with high electric field gradients [2].

Diffusion is difficult to study with molecular dynamics (MD) because it is a much slower process compared to the MD timestep, which has to be small enough to capture the atomic vibrations. Kinetic Monte Carlo (KMC) is a more efficient way to simulate diffusion in crystalline solids. In this method, diffusion is approximated as a series of migration events (jumps) between potential energy minima. The jumps, while actually determined by Newton’s equations of motion, in aggregate, can be regarded as stochastic events that occur at rates determined by migration energy barriers.

Such migration energy barriers must be known for each event that is to be considered in the KMC simulation. They can be calculated with various methods, such as the nudged elastic band (NEB) method [3][4], which was used in this study. The barriers are described by their local atomic environments (LAE) — the configuration of the atoms surrounding the migration event. In a crystalline system, the configuration of atoms can be described with a sequence of digits associated with a type of object occupying each lattice position around the initial and the final positions of the jump. 0 denotes a vacancy, and 1, 2, etc. denote different atomic species. Depending on the desired specificity to distinguish between different events, the number of barriers that must be known may be too high to be calculated in a feasible time. Machine learning was proposed earlier as an alternative approach — the problem of too many barriers may be solved by only calculating accurately a subset of the barriers and obtaining the rest from a computationally inexpensive regression model. Djurabekova et al. used artificial neural networks (ANN) to predict migration barriers in Fe-Cu bulk [5]. Castin et al. [6][13], Pascuet et al. [14] and Messina et al. [15] have since applied them to study bulk diffusion in various Fe-based alloys. Genetic programming has been applied to predict vacancy-assisted [100] surface migration barriers in Cu-Co alloy by Sastry et al. [16].

In this paper, we will study the capabilities of ANNs to predict migration barriers on Cu surfaces. We will consider first nearest neighbour (1nn) jumps on arbitrary surface orientations and in arbitrary atomic environments. Our ANN barrier predictor is implemented into the Kimocs KMC program [17], developed earlier in our group for the purpose of modelling surface diffusion.

The KMC method, barrier calculations, and ANN models that we used are described in section 2. The results are presented in section 3 and discussed in section 4. Conclusions about the applicability of ANNs for the considered problems are drawn in section 5.

2. Methods

2.1. Kinetic Monte Carlo

KMC models the time evolution of a system by choosing events to be carried out one after another. The probability of an event to be chosen is proportional to its rate $\Gamma$, which in our
model is given by the Arrhenius equation:

\[ \Gamma = \nu \exp \left( -\frac{E_m}{k_B T} \right) \]

where \( \nu \) is the attempt frequency, \( E_m \) is the migration energy barrier, \( k_B \) is the Boltzmann constant and \( T \) is temperature. In our current model, \( E_m \) is strongly dependent on the local atomic environment of each jump, while \( \nu \) is taken to be the same for every event.

After a migration event has been carried out in a simulation step, time parameter is incremented according to the residence time algorithm [18]

\[ \Delta t = -\log u \sum_i \Gamma_i \]

where \( u \) is a random number in the interval \((0, 1)\) and the sum is over the rates of all events that were possible in this simulation step. This way time advances faster if the sum of the rates is small (processes are slow, system evolves slowly) and slower if the sum of rates is larger (there are fast processes in the system, requiring a shorter timestep). This gives a computationally efficient model for slow processes such as diffusion. Equation (2) results in a time parameter that is approximately proportional to real time [18]. The attempt frequency \( \nu \) of eq. (1), while connected to the vibration frequency of atoms, also contains the scaling factor for the time parameter. In ref. [17] this value was found to be \( \nu = 7.0 \cdot 10^{13} \text{s}^{-1} \) by fitting the time evolution to match MD simulation results. We used the same value in the KMC simulations of this paper.

2.2. Barrier calculations

The barrier data set was calculated using the nudged elastic band (NEB) [3, 4] method implemented in the LAMMPS molecular dynamics program [19]. The NEB method finds the minimum energy path (MEP) between an initial and a final configuration. The barrier is the difference between the highest energy point along this path \( E_{\text{max}} \) (saddle point, since it is the maximum along the MEP) and the initial state energy \( E_i \):

\[ E_m = E_{\text{max}} - E_i \]

This is also illustrated in figure 1. The potential energy function was a Monte Carlo/molecular dynamics corrected effective medium (MC/MD-CEM) potential by Stave et al. [20].

To connect the barriers to the corresponding processes during KMC simulations, a process descriptor is required. This same descriptor can also be used when training the ANN regressor. We describe the migration processes by their local atomic environments (LAE) before the jumps take place. It includes the first and the second nearest neighbours (1nn and 2nn) of the initial and final position (always a vacancy). In systems with the face-centered cubic (fcc) structure, this covers 26 lattice sites in total (see figure 2). In ref. [17], the LAE was described using a 4-dimensional vector \((a, b, c, d)\), where \( a \) and \( c \) are the 1nns of the initial and the final position of the jump and \( b \) and \( d \) are the 2nns of the initial and final positions of the jump. This approach is later in ref. [22] referred to as the 4D description.
4D description does not include the information on the exact locations of the 26 LAE atoms, but only reflects the stability of the initial and the final positions by counting the number of neighbours in each neighbour shell. This descriptor is also not easily extensible to systems with multiple atomic species present. To save the location information, in our new descriptor the occupation state of each site is encoded with either 0 (vacant) or 1 (occupied). The descriptor is a 26-dimensional binary vector, referred to as the 26D description. The total number of different LAEs that can be distinguished with this descriptor is $2^{26} = 67$ million. This choice of LAE encoding does not restrict the fcc surface orientation that can be described, and it is equally well applicable for bulk diffusion processes or systems with more than one atomic species, by denoting different elements with 1, 2, etc. This approach is similar to what was taken in refs. [6-11,13,15] to describe processes in bulk systems with the body-centered cubic (bcc) structure.

The 26D descriptor is not compact in the sense that some LAEs are mirror images of each other, and thus have the same migration energy barrier: multiple descriptors have the same expected output. Up to four different LAEs may belong into these “families” of equivalent processes. This is problematic from the machine learning point of view: even though the redundant symmetric cases may be included in the training data for the ANN, training will never be perfect and the network output will be different for each case. If the ANN predicts different barriers for mirrored, but otherwise physically equivalent, LAEs, diffusion may work differently e.g. on different (100) facets like (100) and (010), or be biased towards some directions. This problem was solved by removing the redundant processes from the training set systematically: only one process represents each family in the training set. When calling the network to produce the barrier of a given jump, the LAE is first transformed to correspond to the “representative” that is shown (or would be shown, in the case of extrapolation) to the network in the training.

In the remainder of the paper we will refer to the LAE configuration around the initial and final jump positions up to the second nearest neighbour shells as the LAE cluster. Even though, as it is said, the 26D LAE cluster contains the information about the neighbours up to the second nearest neighbour shell, for barrier calculations by NEB-MD, we embed such a cluster in a larger lattice, where all the sites are occupied by the same atoms and affect the calculations in the systematic manner. Some atoms beyond the LAE are required to fill a cuboid shape suitable for periodic boundary conditions, and some more beyond that to mitigate the finite size effects. As a first approach we embed the LAE cluster in Cu bulk for the NEB calculations similarly as we did in refs. [17,22]. This is valid especially in studies where only a limited number of vacancies is present in the LAE. However, when calculating surface migration barriers, the LAE is on average half-empty. Previously we discovered [22] that in some cases embedding such an LAE, essentially a large vacancy cluster (void), behaves differently inside bulk compared to the surface, causing very strong forces and unphysically high barriers in the range of tens of eV. We thus returned to the original recipe, calculating all the barriers with the LAE clusters embedded in a surface (see figure 2).

Embedding the cluster in a surface is more complicated than in bulk. It is not immediately obvious which surface should be used, and how each LAE should be oriented to be best fit into the surface. To answer these questions, we developed an automated procedure, where

1. Three different surfaces were considered: \(\{100\}\), \(\{110\}\) and \(\{111\}\).
2. For each of these three surfaces, trial configurations was generated by embedding the LAE cluster in every possible orientation (with the constraint that the lattice points of the LAE have to match the lattice points of the surface). The LAE was embedded deep enough that at most one layer of atoms was above the rest of the surface — the “adatom layer”.
3. The centre-of-mass of the LAE cluster was calculated in each of the trial configurations. The configuration with the lowest centre-of-mass with respect to the surface was considered to be the most stable one, and was selected to be used in the NEB calculation to find the barrier in this LAE.

We used a simulation cell of approximately 45 Å by 45 Å by 25 Å in size. Depending on the selected crystal orientation, the exact dimensions varied. Expanding the cell beyond this size did not affect the barrier value significantly. The boundary conditions were periodic in the horizontal dimensions and two fixed atom layers at the bottom.

Eleven replicas were used in the NEB calculations. In addition to the force given by the MC/MD-CEM potential, a tethering spring force was applied on each atom in the same way as in [22]. This way the atoms are kept close to their initial lattice sites. If any atoms slip to unintended lattice sites during the NEB relaxation, the process will no longer correspond to its 26D descriptor, and thus the obtained descriptor-barrier pair cannot be used in the KMC simulations. This is a feature of the rigid-lattice KMC with only single atom jump events, where, for instance, concerted movement of atoms is not allowed. The problem is more severe when performing NEB calculations on the surface, where there are other adatoms around the jumping atom, which may also have very few neighbours and thus are not strongly bound to the their lattice site. These loosely bound adatoms tend to easily “follow” the jumping atom, or otherwise leave their original lattice sites. The tethering force constant was set to 2.0 eV/Å². For details about the tethering force approach, see [22].

The first set of barriers was calculated for adatom migration processes on flat \(\{100\}\), \(\{110\}\) and \(\{111\}\) surfaces, with the migrating atom surrounded by different configurations of atoms in the same atomic layer. The ANNs were first tested by training and predicting barriers within this flat surface set, comprising 3168 processes.

The set was then expanded by calculating the barriers for all processes where every atom within the LAE cluster and the migrating atom had at least three 1nn atoms around it when embedded on a surface. In total, 11 652 085 processes were found in this category — approximately 17% of the entire LAE space.
2.3. Artificial neural networks

ANNs are a class of machine learning methods that can be used for classification and function regression. A regressor is trained with known input-output pairs to learn the underlying function and also predict output for previously unseen input, or, in other words, generalize. In this work, ANNs were fitted to predict values of the migration barrier function $E_m = E_m(\text{LAE})$.

Two different ANN models were studied: multilayer perceptrons (MLP) and radial basis function (RBF) networks. The MLP implementation was taken from the Fast Artificial Neural Network (FANN) library [23], and the RBF networks are from Python’s SciPy package [24].

2.3.1. Multilayer perceptrons

MLPs consist of one input layer, one output layer, and one or more hidden layers between them. The layers hold nodes that are connected to each other. In a fully connected feed-forward network without shortcut connections, all nodes of each layer are connected to all nodes of the next layer (see figure 3 for a schematic illustration). This was one of the network structures used in this work. The other type of MLP structure used here was a cascade network where hidden nodes are added one by one during training so that each new node is connected to each of the old nodes. This way the network will have $N$ hidden nodes in $N$ hidden layers with shortcut connections between each layer.

The input is mapped to the output by passing it through the hidden nodes: each node calculates the weighted sum of its inputs and passes this value to the next nodes through an activation function. Sigmoid (logistic) functions were used as activation functions in this work. The standard logistic function has

range from 0 to 1, so the output values must be scaled down to this interval during training if necessary, and scaled back accordingly during usage of the network.

The weights held by the hidden nodes are chosen in an iterative training process to produce minimal error in the training set. The training algorithm used in this work was the FANN library implementation of the improved resilient back-propagation (iRPROP) algorithm proposed by Igel and Hüsken [25]. The cascade network construction is done with the Cascade2 algorithm [26] in the FANN library.

The number of input and output nodes is determined by the problem at hand. In the case of learning the 1D energy values that correspond to 26D input, the input layer will have 26 nodes, and the output layer will have one node. The number of hidden layers and nodes is another matter of optimisation. In this study, a single hidden layer with 35 nodes was found to be optimal for the static (non-cascade) network. Attempts to train a static network with multiple hidden layers did not converge. The same is true for attempts to train cascade networks using the full barrier set of 11.7 million barriers.

These issues may be caused by the vanishing gradient problem or saturation of the activation functions [27]. Learning in gradient based methods is done through understanding how small variations in network parameter can alter network output. The activation function has a primordial importance in this behaviour. Sigmoid and tanh activation functions flatten their inputs in a very small range and as a result large input area can be mapped on very small ranges. A large variation on input will then correspond to a very small change in the output. This problem is obviously worsened if many layers are used.

The training procedure was checked for overfitting by conducting tests in which the barriers were separated into two groups: a training set and a validation set. Various validation set sizes ranging from 10 to 90% were used in these tests. In each test, the network was trained using only the training set while monitoring the root mean square error in both sets. Only a subset of ~500 000 barriers of the full 11.7 million barriers were used in this scan in order to finish it within a feasible time. The accuracy was found to saturate after around 100 000 epochs in all cases (see figure 4). Overfitting, i.e., an increasing error in the validation set and consequently decline of generalization efficiency, was not observed at this stage of training. Based on these tests, all networks used in KMC were trained for 100 000 epochs.

2.3.2. Radial basis function networks

RBF networks are somewhat similar to MLPs. The difference is that the activation functions are radially symmetric functions that depend on the distance $r$ of the input vector to the prototype vector of each node. The Gaussian function is an example of a radial basis function. In this work, we used multiquadric functions

$$f(r) = \sqrt{\left(\frac{r^2}{\varepsilon}\right) + 1}$$

as basis functions; $\varepsilon$ is a width parameter that was automatically adjusted by the library function.
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Table 1: Confusion matrix for the surface classifier ANN. The numbers on the diagonal represent correctly classified LAEs. The total success rate was 99.39 %.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>(100)</th>
<th>(110)</th>
<th>(111)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>6640</td>
<td>17104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(110)</td>
<td>3310</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>21242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(111)</td>
<td>4580</td>
<td>18582</td>
<td>8994483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using this technique, the RMS prediction error decreased by approx. 11 % compared to using only a single predictor for the entire data set.

Secondly, multiple ANN regressors that were trained on the same training set were combined into an regressor ensemble. The predicted barrier for each LAE was taken to be the average of the predictions given by the individual networks. The RMS prediction error decreased by 4–9 % compared to using only a single predictor for each surface. Combining the ensembles and the classifier reduced the RMS error by a total of 16 %, or 0.019 eV.

In addition to calculating the RMS error estimate, the accuracy of the barrier predictions was assessed by implementing the ANN barrier function into the Kimocs code, and simulating the flattening of a 12 monolayer (576 atoms) cuboid nanotip on the three lowest-index fcc surfaces, [100], [110], and [111], at 1000 K. These systems are the same as the test cases in ref. [17]. As some curious behaviour was observed in the [110] nanotip simulations, further tests were conducted on that surface: the system was studied also without the initial tip (just a flat surface), and also at 600 K in addition to 1000 K. Finally, the [110] nanotip system was also simulated using only the NEB-calculated training set of ~11.7 million barriers instead of the ANN.

2.3.3. Additional error reduction techniques

When the barrier set was expanded from the initial ~3000 barriers to the 11.7 million barriers, the MLP accuracy decreased significantly. Two additional techniques were used to reduce the error in barrier prediction. Firstly, the barriers calculated on each surface — [100], [110], or [111] — were treated as separate sets and different ANN predictors were trained to predict barriers on each of these sets. The issue of knowing which predictor to call to get the barrier for an arbitrary LAE encountered during KMC was solved by introducing an ANN classifier. This network uses the same LAE input encoding, but instead of energy output, it outputs the class, or the surface that the input LAE corresponds to. We used 1-of-C encoding for the surfaces, meaning that the classifier has three output nodes with each node corresponding to one of the surface classes. A very good success rate was achieved for the classifier (see table 1). During the KMC simulation, every encountered LAE is first passed to the classifier and an appropriate regressor based on the classifier output is used to obtain the migration barrier.

The migration energy distribution in the full ~11.7 million barrier set is shown in figure 7. The large quantity of 0 eV barriers are for processes that are either spontaneous (like the reverse process of evaporation), or have an intermediate low-energy position along the reaction path. This includes some processes on the [111] surface that happen via hexagonal close-packed (hcp) sites. The full barrier set is submitted as a Data in Brief entry [28] along with this article.

Comparisons between the 11.7 million barrier full set and the 4D-parameterized barrier sets of refs. [22] [29] are shown in figures 8 and 9. Overall agreement between the sets is good.

The combination MLP regressor accuracy in the full ~11.7 million barrier set is shown in figure 10. As explained in section 2.3.3, the final barrier predictor consists of three ensem-
Relative count (%)  

10 12 0 2 4 6 0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1  

$E_m$ (eV)  

Figure 5: Distribution of migration barriers of the 3168 flat surface processes.

ables (one for each low-index surface) of three regressors, and a classifier to combine them. The ten trained networks are also included in the Data in Brief entry [28].

A 12 monolayer nanotip flattening on [100], [110], and [111] surfaces was simulated with KMC at 1000 K using the trained combination MLP as a barrier predictor. The [100] and the [111] systems behaved as expected: the nanotips collapsed to half of its original height in 11 ± 2 ns and 14 ± 2 ns for the [100] and the [111] surfaces, respectively. In ref. [17], the corresponding flattening times were found to be 31.0 ± 6.61 ns and 18.8 ± 0.96 ns with KMC, and 1.62 ± 0.60 ns and 6.01 ± 1.48 ns in MD. Figure 11 shows the initial and the typical final configurations of these simulations.

Simulations on the [110] surface with the ANN barrier predictor displayed curious behaviour. If an initial nanotip was present, atoms would immediately start to gather in the corners between the tip and the surface, forming [111] and [100] facets that continued growing until the original [110] surface was completely depleted. See figure 12 for a time series of a simulation on the [110] surface.

Without an initial tip, the [110] surface would remain quite stable for some nanoseconds, until a small protrusion starts nucleating somewhere in the system usually during the first few nanoseconds. From that point onwards, the system evolves swiftly into a similar completely roughened state as in the simulations with the initial nanotip present.

The behaviour of the smooth [110] surface at 600 K was almost identical, although the surface remained stable for a few nanoseconds longer than at 1000 K.

In the simulations, where only the table of 11.7 million barriers (the training set) was used as parameterization instead of the ANN, the [110] surface remained stable, and the nanotip could be considered to have flattened in approximately 20 ns. It should be noted that since the table does not include barriers for the unstable jumps, these jumps are completely forbidden in this Kimocs simulation. This leads to some artificial phenomena, such as single-atom pillars staying up long after the rest of the nanotip has flattened around them. The pillars did not have a large effect on the overall development of the surface itself and thus these simulations were sufficient for the purpose of validating the training set quality for simulating the [110] surface.

After observing the stability of the surface with the table barriers, it was possible to find the processes that contributed most to the roughening phenomenon by comparing the differences in how many times each process happened between the simulations with the ANN predictor and the simulations with the table. Then the ANN-KMC simulations were re-run with the problematic processes having barriers with fixed values from the table, whereas the rest of the processes got their barriers from the ANN. It was found that fixing 89 processes was sufficient to stabilise the [110] surface. The LAEs of these 89 processes were associated with atoms jumping out of the [110] surface onto an adjacent [111] surface. The barriers for [110]→[111] jumps were underestimated by 0.067 eV on average by the ANN (the mean barrier was 0.675 eV), while their reverse barriers were overestimated by 0.018 eV on average (the mean barrier was 0.107 eV).

4. Discussions

The prediction performance of ANNs in the set of the 3168 flat surface process barriers (fig. 6) is extremely good. This evidence supports the applicability of ANNs for surface migration barrier prediction, and the validity of the 26D parameterization for describing LAEs. The accuracy observed in the full ~11.7 million barrier set was considerably lower (fig. 10). Some improvement was achieved by introducing ANN ensembles and dividing the data set into three subsets according to the surface orientation that was used in the NEB calculation. Even with these additional techniques, an accuracy comparable to the flat surface case was not reached.

The reason for the loss of accuracy in the full set is not entirely clear. The full set is three orders of magnitude larger than the set of flat surface barriers, with a more heterogeneous composition of LAEs and a larger range of barrier values, but the range should not make a difference since the barrier values were in any case scaled down to between 0 and 1 before training. Also the data itself seems to be of reasonable quality, as the overall agreement with previous barrier sets (figs. 8 and 9) is good.

One possible explanation is, in addition to the different ranges, the different distributions of barrier values in the sets. The full set distribution (fig. 7) resembles half of a Gaussian distribution except for the large amount of zero barriers, while the 3000-barrier flat set distribution (fig. 5) has no such “discontinuities”. This kind of discontinuity in the output value distribution may be one of the reasons for the difficulties in the training. To verify this, in future work it could be considered that some negative pseudo-barrier was assigned to the 0 eV cases for the duration of training to make the output distribution smoother. During KMC, negative barriers given by the ANN would be set back to the data set into subsets of [100], [110], and [111] processes,
Figure 6: The static MLP (left), the cascade MLP (centre), and the RBF networks (right) accuracy for flat surface migration barrier prediction. All of the networks were trained using 50% of the data set. Colouring is according to the point density on a logarithmic scale. The RMS errors were 0.036 eV (static MLP), 0.033 eV (cascade MLP) and 0.024 eV (RBF).

Figure 7: Distribution of migration barriers in the full ~11.7 million barrier data set.

Figure 8: Comparison of barriers of the full barrier set to the 4D-parameterized Cu set 1 of ref. [22, 29] that was calculated without the tethering force. Because the correspondence between the 26D and 4D descriptions is many-to-one, standard deviation error bars for the 26D values are shown.

Figure 9: Comparison of barriers of the full barrier set to the 4D-parameterized Cu set 2 of ref. [22, 29] that was calculated with the additional tethering force. The error bars are standard deviations of the 26D descriptions corresponding to each 4D value.

Figure 10: Accuracy of the combination MLP in the full ~11.7 million barrier data set. The plotted result is from 10 individual networks: an ensemble of three for each surface type (\{100\}, \{110\} and \{111\}) and a classifier to combine the ensembles. The RMS error is 0.093 eV.
further subdivisions could be made based on the jumping direction on the surface or on the stability of the LAE (e.g. how many neighbours that the least bound atom in the LAE has).

Other reasons for the loss of accuracy could lie in the network architecture — is a single hidden layer MLP complex enough to fit to the large heterogeneous data set? However, the networks used in this work are very similar to what has been found to work well in earlier studies on machine learning for barrier prediction. References [5–11, 13–15] use ANNs with only one hidden layer. Cascade networks are used in refs. [12] and [6]. The earlier rigid-lattice variants of the method also use a similar descriptor: a vector of lattice sites encoded with integers according to the occupation state of each site. One of the differences in the and earlier studies compared to this work is the size of the LAE — up to hundreds of atoms instead of the 26 used here. Expanding the LAE could thus provide an additional way to improve accuracy, although in reference [16] genetic programming was successfully applied to predict barriers using LAE with up to 2nn sites.

Despite the lower accuracy of the ANN in the full set, it could be successfully used in KMC simulations primarily involving Cu {100} and {111} surfaces. The nanotip flattening time results were in the same order of magnitude with the 4D parameterized simulations and the relative stability of the {100} and {111} tips matched the MD results given in ref. [17]. It should be noted that, as the simulation time is inversely proportional to the attempt frequency \( \nu \) (see eq. (1)), the absolute time scale of these processes should not be expected to exactly match MD results without first having fitted \( \nu \) for the ANN parameterization.

As for the Cu {110} surface, a strong roughening was observed when using the same ANN predictor. This behaviour is not observed with the 4D parameterized KMC model or in MD, so the phenomenon appears to be an artefact. It is not caused by errors in the 11.7 million barrier training set, since the simulations where only this pre-calculated table was used as parameterization behaved well. Instead, it was found that the roughening is due to slight prediction errors in as few as 89 barriers associated with atoms jumping between the {110} and {111} surfaces: if the ANN-given barriers of all of these processes were replaced with the table values during the simulation, roughening was not observed. The errors were in the order of tens of meV, or approximately 10% of the barriers and they were systematically biased so that atoms would have smaller barriers to jump out of the {110} surface and larger barriers to make the jump back. This erratic behaviour appears to be sufficient to destabilise the {110} surface when using the ANN parameterization.

5. Conclusions

Artificial neural networks are found to be applicable for predicting barriers for Cu surface migration. Sufficient accuracy was achieved to model the {100} and {111} surfaces in kinetic Monte Carlo simulations using predicted barriers. The neural network still predicts the {110} surface to be unstable, contrary to the barrier set that was used in training, so further work is needed to produce a generally applicable machine learning method for modelling surface diffusion. Possible ways to improve the accuracy could be expanding the local atomic environment to include atoms beyond the second nearest neighbours, or manipulating the barrier distribution to be smoother for easier fitting.
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Figure 12: Behaviour of the (110) surface with the ANN barrier predictor. The surface starts roughening immediately and eventually the whole surface is covered by [100] and [111] facets.
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