Direct Imaging of Charge Redistribution due to Bonding at Atomic Resolution via Electron Ptychography
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Phase imaging in electron microscopy is sensitive to the local potential including charge redistribution from bonding. We demonstrate that electron ptychography provides the necessary sensitivity to detect this subtle effect by directly imaging the charge redistribution in single layer boron nitride. Residual aberrations can be measured and corrected post-collection, and simultaneous atomic number contrast imaging provides unambiguous sub-lattice identification. Density functional theory calculations confirm the detection of charge redistribution.

The electron charge density is of fundamental importance to the physics of materials. It is the redistribution of electrons that occurs when atoms bond that distinguishes materials from collections of independent atoms. The ground state electronic properties of any material system can be determined from the electron charge density, as stated by the Hohenberg–Kohn theorem [1, 2], the foundation on which density functional theory (DFT) is built. While DFT has been hugely successful as a tool for modeling materials systems quantum mechanically, the approximations used to make such calculations practical mean that there remains an important role for experiments to verify and inform DFT results. Therefore there is great interest in experimental methods that can measure bonding and charge distributions locally.

X-ray and electron diffraction are both sensitive to charge redistribution [3–6]. Such diffraction experiments are, however, limited to periodic structures and do not provide local information, precluding the study of charge transfer around defects and interfaces. This is a major drawback as these features so often play a crucial role in the physics of materials systems. Furthermore, only the intensities of diffracted beams can be measured directly and the phase is lost, a loss of information known as the phase problem. For diffraction from crystals with an inversion centre the diffraction structure factor phases are trivial, being either zero or π radians. For non-centrosymmetric crystals, however, the structure factors are complex and determination of their phases is necessary to quantitatively measure bonding effects. Mutual interference between multiply scattered beams in thicker samples, also known as dynamical scattering, does lead to diffracted intensities being dependent on structure factor phases, and this is exploited in the convergent beam electron diffraction (CBED) approach [7]. For thin samples, such as the monolayer used here, the required multiple scattering does not occur. Scanning tunnelling microscopy provides spectroscopy that is sensitive to the local electronic environment, but it is limited to use with surfaces. Electron energy loss spectroscopy (EELS) is not limited to surfaces, can be performed at atomic resolution and can provide local information on local electronic structure via the interpretation of fine structure features [8, 9]. However, such interpretation is an indirect method requiring matching of experimental spectra to forward simulations.

If a lens is used to reinterfere the diffracted beams, as occurs in HRTEM, the phase of the diffracted beams is significant and controls the position of features in the image. Phase contrast HRTEM is also one of the most dose efficient forms of local atomic resolution imaging, and its high phase sensitivity has been used to detect charge transfer at defects in graphene and in the polarised bonds of monolayer BN [10]. However to form contrast, HRTEM requires either the intentional retention of lens aberrations, reducing resolution, or the use of a physical phase plate, which can suffer stability and charging issues [11]. As a result, HRTEM imaging is highly sensitive to imaging parameters and is a potential cause for misinterpretation of the data. Phase-retrieval using off-axis holography is similarly limited, accurate measurements of the mean inner potential can be made, but detection of charge redistribution has proved elusive [12]. Thus a method is required that makes use of the phases of the diffracted beams to form a highly dose-efficient image that is sensitive to the electron charge density with robustness to residual aberrations.

Here we demonstrate that phase imaging with electron ptychography [13–17] in the scanning transmission electron microscope (STEM) provides just such an optimized means of imaging local electronic charge densities. STEM ptychography is one of a number of emerging phase imaging methods in STEM, including differential phase contrast (DPC) [18], integrated DPC [19] and first-moment [20] imaging. Although originally developed as a means of achieving superresolution [21, 22], the tech-
FIG. 1. Annular dark field imaging of monolayer hexagonal boron nitride using a) template matching average of experimental data and b) simulated data using the experimental conditions. The line profiles are taken from the areas under the yellow bars of the c) experimental image and d) the simulated image and are normalised to the average peak pixel intensity for N. The ratio between B and N in experiment is 0.54 and for simulation is 0.56. N is blue and B green in the overlaid model in a).

technique has recently been developed to provide high signal-to-noise phase images [23–26]. Most recently electron ptychography has been shown to provide higher signal to noise images than phase contrast HRTEM for the same dose [27]. No aberrations are required to form contrast in electron ptychography, the diffracted beam phase information is retrieved making use of the interference of overlapping diffracted discs, and once the phase problem is solved, the amplitude and phase of the scattering can be expressed in either reciprocal (diffraction) or real (imaging) space. Here we use a real-space representation to demonstrate a methodology that can also be applied to crystal defects. Furthermore, by performing the experiments in focus in the STEM, one obtains simultaneously the high angle annular dark field (HAADF) signal.

The HAADF signal provides an independent image that is unaffected by the electron charge density, and contains strong compositional information. This provides the vital ability to accurately determine which elements are where in a material, and correctly interpret the phase images. Moreover, although the ptychographic phase images are also sensitive to errors in the tuning of the aberrations, one can correct for such residual aberrations after taking the data [25]. As we show here, the ability to correct for such small errors in the electron optical aberration correction can prove crucial to achieving sufficient precision and accuracy to map the subtle effects of charge redistribution on the phase images.

For this study, a sample of monolayer hBN was imaged using a probe corrected JEOL ARM200CF microscope. The accelerating voltage was 80 kV with a 31.5 mrad semi-angle of convergence. A set of 16 512x512 probe position 4D data-sets was acquired using the JEOL 4DCanvas system incorporating a pnCCD device [28] using 66x264 pixels in the detector plane at 4000 frames per second. The real space sampling in the image plane corresponds to a pixel size of 0.135 Å.

Simultaneously acquired ADF image-series were used to diagnose environmental scanning-distortions using non-rigid registration (NRR) [29]. These distortions were then compensated throughout each of the 16 4D data sets before their signals were summed. This 4D NRR both improves spatial precision (by a factor close to the square root of the number of input frames), and yields a single 4D volume with a greater signal to noise ratio; this in-turn leads to a more precise aberration diagnosis and correction, as well as an increase in the attainable phase-precision compared to that which could be obtained from just a single scan. A high signal to noise ratio ADF image is also output [Fig. 1(a)], which is used for the unambiguous identification of the two sub-lattices. The average dose-per-frame was calculated to be 7.75x10^5 e−/Å^2, which leads to a total dose for the non-rigid aligned 4D data-set of 1.24x10^7 e−/Å^2. The ADF image also provides confirmation that the sample is indeed a monolayer. The ratio of the B and N site intensities in the ADF image matches that of the single layer simulation, as shown in Fig. 1, but not those of the thicker multilayer structures in which the difference between the two sites decreases significantly (see the supplemental information for further details).

The non-rigid aligned ptychographic data-set was then reconstructed using the Wigner distribution deconvolution (WDD) method [16] and the probe aberrations were determined using the method described in [25]. The retrieved phase images were analyzed using a modified version of the Absolute Integrator Software [30], to which Voronoi cells at the atomic sites were calculated to retrieve a phase signal integrated over area. We will refer to this quantity as the integrated phase cross-section (IPCS). The IPCS was found to be more robust to residual aberrations than the peak phase value (see supplemental information). The distribution of IPCS values for each of the B and N sites can be examined through statistical analysis. For example, Fig. 2(f) shows the his-
ogram of the IPCS for the two atom types (N - green and B - blue) for the ptychographic phase image reconstruction prior to correction of the residual aberrations. They are plotted with respect to the mean phase obtained in the middle of the hexagonal atomic rings, which is assumed to be vacuum and assigned a phase of zero. The mean IPCS values for each atom type are quoted along with their precisions which have been taken to be the standard error of the mean. The distributions for each atom type are also fitted with Gaussian functions as an aid to the eye. All the images presented in Fig. 2 were analysed in the same manner.

In hBN, the transfer of electrons occurs from B to N sites, leading to an increased screening of the potentials of the N nuclei [31]. This effect induces a smaller phase-shift in the electron wave than the neutral atom potential. Figure 2(a) shows the reconstructed phase image without ptychographic aberration correction and its corresponding phase difference histogram in Fig. 2(f). It can be observed that the mean IPCS difference between N and B is -1.51 mrad Å². After performing ptychographic aberration correction, this difference is refined to 0.88 mrad Å² [Fig. 2(b) and Fig. 2(g)]. It is therefore clear that the small residual aberrations, although not observable in the ADF image, are still significant at the precision of measurement offered by ptychography. In Fig. 2 we compare the experimental results with image simulations. We used an in-house code to simulate the CBED patterns that were used to obtain ptychographic phase images. An electron source probe broadening of FWHM 0.95 Å was used, as this was determined to match the mean IPCS of all N and B atoms present in the experimental image. The same source size effect was included in the ADF simulations which also match the experimental data, offering confidence in this value. The peak broadening due to thermal lattice vibrations was included by randomly shifting the whole calculated atomic potentials based on similar 2D material atomic displacements [32], and it is the main contributor to the width of the histogram peaks for the simulated images. Figures 2(c) and (h) show the results when simulating a 4D dataset using the independent atom model (IAM) that does not include bonding. Our IAM potentials are obtained from DFT calculations with isolated atoms using the PBE exchange-correlation functional [33]. By using DFT to obtain the IAM potentials, we avoid the need to use parametrized IAM potentials which are commonly used in electron microscopy simulation software [34]. As can be observed in Fig. 2(h), the mean difference between the IPCS values for the two species is +6.11 mrad Å² using the IAM potentials, far greater than the experimental result. It can be inferred that the experimental results indicate the direct observation of charge transfer and the necessity of simulations that include bonding effects.

To include the effects of bonding we used projected potentials obtained from two different materials modelling codes; the plane-wave pseudopotential code CASTEP [35] and the all-electron LAPW+lo code WIEN2K [36]. A modified version of the wien2venus script [37] was used to calculate projected potentials from WIEN2k. To compute the projected potentials from CASTEP it is necessary to correctly account for the use of pseudopotentials, the details of our implementation are reported elsewhere [38]. Calculations were performed on an orthorhombic cell of monolayer hBN containing 4 atoms and with lattice parameters of \( a = 2.50 \text{ Å}, b = 4.34 \text{ Å}, \) and \( c = 10.58 \text{ Å} \). The WIEN2K SCF calculation was performed using a value of 7 for the quantity \( R_{MT} \cdot K_{\text{max}} \).

For the SCF calculation in CASTEP, a planewave cutoff energy of 1100 eV was used, along with pseudopotentials generated using the ultrasoft scheme [39]. All calculations used the PBE functional [33] and a maximum k-point spacing of 0.095 Å⁻¹. The ptychographic phase image simulations were performed using the same source broadening and phonon configurations used for the IAM simulations. The resulting images are shown in Fig. 2(d) and (e) with their corresponding histograms in (i) and (j). The analysis of these simulations shows that the results of these two modelling approaches are within the statistical error of each other, consistent with the findings of a recent comparison [40] of results from WIEN2k and the projector-augmented wave method code GPAW.

The difference in the IPCS values for the DFT calculations is 2.5 mrad Å², much closer to the 0.88 mrad Å² observed experimentally than the 6.11 mrad Å² value for the IAM. The DFT calculations have therefore explained about 75% of the change in the IPCS values seen experimentally, but there remains a statistically significant mismatch. The method described here may be useful to compare and validate the results from different exchange correlation functionals.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated the experimental observation of charge transfer in hexagonal boron nitride using non-rigid aligned aberration-free phase imaging by means of WDD electron ptychography. The use of ptychographic post-collection aberration correction ensures the phase measurements accurately reflect the influence of bonding. Only simulations that included the effects of bonding via DFT match the experimental images. Furthermore by performing the phase imaging in focus in STEM we have shown how the simultaneous ADF signal allows one to unambiguously identify the different elements, averting misinterpretation of the phase images.
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FIG. 2. WDD phase images of BN from experimental data a) without and b) with post-collection aberration correction, are compared to images from simulated data using c) IAM, d) DFT-CASTEP and e) DFT-WIEN2K potentials. f) to j) show the histograms of the IPCS of N and B with respect to vacuum obtained from the parametric model fitted to the images in a) to e). The values for the mean IPCS of each atom type with their corresponding precision are displayed for each of the measurements. The grayscale bar at the bottom right indicates the quantitative value of the phase in the images in rad and the scale bar corresponds to 1 nm.
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Supplemental information: Direct imaging of charge redistribution in monolayer hexagonal boron nitride using electron ptychography in the scanning transmission electron microscope
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ROBUSTNESS OF IPCS VS PHASE PEAK VALUES

Integrated phase cross-sections (IPCSs) were used rather than peak phases to provide a metric to compare with simulated images that is more robust to any uncorrected, residual aberrations. The robustness can be seen in Fig. S1 where the correction of aberrations during the ptychography reconstruction causes smaller changes in the IPCSs of the B and N atoms than occurs for the peak phases. The enhanced robustness is because part of the effect of residual aberrations will be to broaden the peaks in the phase image by redistributing the pixel values. Similar to the discussion in [?] for annular dark-field imaging, the integration over a peak to form a cross-section captures the redistributed values.

FIG. S1. Comparison of IPCS vs peak phase difference (relative to the vacuum) values for non-aberration corrected and aberration corrected WDD electron ptychography. Histograms show the values of N (blue) and B (green) sites with respect to vacuum (yellow). a) and b) correspond to non-aberration corrected case, while c) and d) show the results of aberration correction up to 2nd order.
CONFIRMATION OF HBN MONOLAYER

ADF STEM image simulations using the experimental conditions were performed in order to confirm that the experimental data was indeed a monolayer of hBN. The simulations were carried out using the MULTEM software [? ], which uses the IAM model approach which is appropriate because ADF STEM images are insensitive to charge transfer. The simulated images were normalised in order to perform a relative comparison of the scattered intensities of N and B atoms. The normalisation consisted of subtracting a constant background so that the hexagonal holes in between atoms would have a mean value of 0 and then dividing by the mean value of the N atomic sites. The mean peak intensity of the N sites is then 1. Figure S2 a), b) and c) show the simulated images of a monolayer, bilayer and trilayer of hBN respectively. Their corresponding line profiles are shown in S2 d), e) and f). These profiles integrate the scattered intensity over the width of the atoms, which for this case is 7 pixels (0.95 Å). The ratios of B to N are 0.55, 0.97 and 0.65 for a monolayer, bilayer and trilayer respectively. The experimental value is 0.54 confirming monolayer hBN.

PHASE IMAGE COMPARISON USING IAM AND DFT APPROACHES

Figure S3 shows the difference between the phase images obtained from simulating the hBN potential using the IAM and DFT approaches. These images correspond to Figure 2 d) and g). An overlay of the atoms positions have been depicted in the figure, in which N atoms correspond to black dots and B atoms correspond to white dots. As it can be observed, the main phase changes occur close to the atom sites, particularly at the N atom positions. The localisation of the phase changes close to the atom sites also supports the procedure of integrating the phase over the atom sites, that is, the IPCS. By doing so, we can account for the charge transfer in a robust way.
FIG. S3. Difference between phase images of IAM and DFT simulations. Black dots correspond to N atom positions and white dots to B atom positions. Scale bar is 1 nm and color bar is in [rad]