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Abstract

In many materials systems, such as catalytic nanoparticles, the ability to characterize dynamic atomic structural changes is important for developing a more fundamental understanding of functionality. Recent developments in direct electron detection now allow image series to be acquired at frame rates on the order of 1000 frames per second in bright-field transmission electron microscopy (BF TEM), which could potentially allow dynamic changes in the atomic structure of individual nanoparticles to be characterized with millisecond temporal resolution in favourable cases. However, extracting such data from TEM image series requires the development of computational methods that can be applied to very large datasets and are robust in the presence of noise and in the non-ideal imaging conditions of some types of environmental TEM experiments. Here, we present a two-dimensional Gaussian fitting algorithm to track the position and intensities of atomic columns in temporally resolved BF TEM image series. We have tested our algorithm on experimental image series of Ce atomic columns near the surface of a ceria (CeO$_2$) nanoparticle with electron beam doses of ~125-5000 e$^-$/Å$^2$ per frame. The accuracy of the algorithm for locating atomic column positions is compared to that of the more traditional centroid fitting technique, and the accuracy of intensity measurements is evaluated as a function of dose per frame. The code developed here, and the methodology used to explore the errors and limitations of the
measurements, could be applied more broadly to any temporally resolved TEM image series to track dynamic atomic column motion.

1. Introduction

Aberration-corrected transmission electron microscopy (TEM) is a powerful tool for characterizing atomic structures with sub-angstrom spatial resolution [1-3]. Atomic resolution TEM images generally have an acquisition time on the order of seconds, and analysis of the images typically treats atomic structures as static. However, in many systems, such as catalytic nanoparticles, the atomic structure may undergo dynamic changes, particularly at the particle surface [3-7]. The ability to characterize these dynamic atomic structural changes is important for developing a more fundamental understanding of catalytic functionality and requires imaging techniques with both atomic-scale spatial resolution and improved temporal resolution.

Recent advances in direct detection technology now allow TEM image series to be acquired at frame rates on the order of 1000 frames per second (fps), with high sensitivity at low electron fluences, or low electron doses, (using terminology more common in the electron microscopy community) [8-13]. This technology has the potential to allow atomic structures to be characterized with millisecond temporal resolution, which can potentially reveal new information about atomic structural dynamics. To extract quantitative information about structural dynamics from temporally resolved image series of a nanoparticle, computational methods are needed to calculate atomic column positions at each point in time. Ideally, these computational methods should also recover information about the three-dimensional structure of the particle. Conventional techniques for three-dimensional reconstruction in TEM such as electron tomography and ext-
wave reconstruction are not currently practical for temporally resolved analysis at the millisecond level, because these techniques require a series of a number of images to be taken for each 3D reconstruction [3,14]. In principle, partial 3D information about the sample can be recovered from a single TEM image by measuring the intensity of each atomic column and comparing these results with simulated images to calculate the number of atoms in each column. This has been demonstrated for high-quality TEM images [15], although the limitations of this method for noisier images acquired under low dose conditions require exploration.

There are several key challenges for developing computational methods to identify atomic column positions and intensities in TEM image series. Firstly, such methods must be robust in the presence of noise and non-ideal imaging conditions. Pushing the limits of temporal resolution will necessarily involve a low electron dose in each frame of an image series. For a given incident electron beam intensity, each frame of an image series acquired at 1000 fps will receive only 1/1000th of the total electron dose of a single frame acquired over 1 second. This means that the images in each frame of a temporally resolved image series will be significantly noisier than a single frame with 1 second exposure acquired under the same conditions. **The electron dose per frame will therefore be a critical factor limiting our ability to extract quantitative information from temporally resolved image series.** A primary motivation for our work is extracting information from *in situ* datasets. Dynamic changes during *in situ* observation often occur unexpectedly and imaging conditions may not be ideal. For example, nanoparticles often tilt and undergo drift during observation. The sample thickness and defocus may not be optimum when a dynamic event occurs. However, such datasets still contain a wealth of information on atomic-level sample dynamics and robust processing methods should be able to handle these situations.
Secondly, computational methods used to analyze temporally resolved TEM image series must be able to reliably separate signals from background. Achieving a high temporal resolution in TEM is more practical using the bright-field (BF) imaging mode, due to greater signal collection efficiency relative to dark-field imaging. However, this means that features of interest will appear on a bright background. With a relatively low electron dose in each frame, some of these features may appear weak relative to the background and will be challenging to distinguish from noise. This implies that methods developed for locating atomic column positions in annular dark-field scanning TEM (ADF STEM) [16,17], in which the background is dark (i.e. very low), may not be robust when applied to temporally resolved BF TEM datasets.

Finally, computational methods used to process and analyze temporally resolved TEM image series must be able to operate on very large datasets. For example, a TEM image series acquired at 1000 fps, on a 4096 x 4096 pixel direct electron detector with data saved in 32-bit format will reach 1 TB in size after only ~15 seconds of total acquisition time. For fast processing of data, simple computational methods are therefore preferable to more complex, computationally demanding methods.

Previous techniques for tracking objects in TEM image series have generally used a centroid (or centre of mass) fitting method [18,19], and this method has recently been applied to temporally resolved series of BF-TEM images to track the positions of atomic columns in a nanoparticle with a precision of ~10 pm [20]. However, a disadvantage of centroid fitting is that there is not a simple way to use this method to separate signal from background and measure atomic column intensities in BF TEM images. As discussed above, recording intensity as well as position is necessary to recover some information about three-dimensional atomic structure from the image series, which is important for the interpretation of phenomena such as dynamic atomic restructuring during
catalysis. An alternative to fitting a centroid is to fit a two-dimensional (2D) elliptical Gaussians to each atomic column. This method has previously been used to locate atomic columns in static TEM and STEM images with picoscale precision and can allow column intensity to be calculated [3,21-25]. Recently developed algorithms for ADF STEM have explored more advanced computational techniques such as machine learning [16], or advanced statistical analyses [25] for atomic column tracking. In these algorithms, a 2D Gaussian is often used as the underlying model to fit to atomic columns. In order for similar techniques to be applied to BF TEM image series, the performance of the 2D Gaussian model on noisy BF TEM images needs to be understood.

Here, we present a 2D elliptical Gaussian fitting method, implemented in MATLAB, for simultaneously extracting atomic column positions with sub-pixel precision and extracting atomic column intensities from temporally resolved BF TEM image series, allowing changes of the position and intensity of each column on a bright background to be tracked over time. The method was tested by measuring the picoscale changes of Ce atomic column positions and intensities close to the surface of a ceria (CeO$_2$) nanoparticle in an experimental TEM image series. The performance of the Gaussian fitting algorithm for determining positions is compared to that of the centroid fitting method. The relationship between electron beam dose per frame and the error on intensity measurements is explored. Some simple filtering techniques to improve signal-to-noise without sacrificing temporal resolution are evaluated.

The methodology that we have developed here may be useful for the wider TEM community as advances in instrumentation make tracking atomic structural dynamics more practical. We have therefore made our code, named “Temporally Resolved Atomic Column Tracking” (TRACT) available to download via Github (https://github.com/bdalevin).
2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Acquisition of Test Data

Experimental temporally resolved image series of CeO$_2$ nanoparticles imaged in a [110] projection were used to test the algorithms developed for this manuscript. Images were acquired using an aberration-corrected FEI Titan environmental transmission electron microscope, operated at 300 kV. Nanoparticles were observed at room temperature, with a pressure of $<10^{-6}$ Torr at the sample. Negative spherical aberration (Cs) imaging (NCSI) [26] was used for our experiments, with Cs = ~ -20 μm. This resulted in bright contrast for both cerium columns, and the more weakly scattering oxygen atomic columns. An electron dose of 5000 e$^{-}\text{Å}^{2}\text{s}^{-1}$ was applied to the nanoparticle to minimize electron beam damage effects. Images were acquired using a Gatan K2 IS direct electron detector, operated at 10-40 frames per second yielding an electron dose of ~125-500 e$^{-}\text{Å}^{2}$ per frame. The detector was operated in the electron counting mode [27], which reduces the maximum frame rate to ~40 frames per second, but improves signal to noise. The scale of the images acquired was ~4 pm per pixel. In this initial study, we have focused on the cerium cation columns in the image, rather than the oxygen anion columns, which have a lower intensity than the cerium columns, and can be more challenging to detect in individual frames.

2.2 Pre-processing of Data to Reduce Noise

Temporally resolved image series were first aligned to correct for sample drift by cross-correlation in Digital Micrograph (Gatan, Inc.). The data was then exported for processing and analysis in other software. Due to high levels of noise in individual frames, several spatial imaging filters were tested in an effort to improve the signal-to-noise ratio in each frame without degrading the temporal resolution of the image series, and without significantly degrading spatial resolution. The
filters tested were chosen based on their relative simplicity, because we believed that these would potentially be more scalable for large datasets. Figure 1 shows a comparison of a sample of raw image data, with the same data after Gaussian Blur, Wiener, and TV-L1 Filtering. This sample frame is from the surface of a CeO$_2$ nanoparticle and is notable because the top-right atomic column is in an off-lattice position. The Gaussian Blur filter is implemented in ImageJ and operates by convolving a 2D image with a 2D circular Gaussian function. A sigma value of 2 pixels was chosen for the filtered image shown in Figure 1e. The Wiener filter was implemented in MATLAB, based on the description given by Robert Kilaas [28].

Wiener Filtering has been used in TEM imaging to enhance the contrast of crystal lattice on amorphous backgrounds for a number of years [29]. However, we have observed that by enhancing the contrast of periodic structures, the Wiener filter can also reduce the visibility of defects and can even alter the apparent position of atomic columns. This effect is clear in Figure 1d, where the visibility of the off-lattice site atomic column in the top right is clearly reduced relative to the other atomic columns. Since dynamic changes in surface structure may result in displacements of atomic columns from lattice sites, as in Figure 1, this suggests that the Wiener filter may be unsuitable for locating the precise, sub-pixel level position of atomic columns in temporally resolved structural analysis. The TV-L1 denoising filter attempts to generate an image that is similar to the raw data, but with a much lower variance, in an effort to preserve important image features such as edges whilst removing noise [30]. We found that the TV-L1 filter generally produced images that appeared reasonable when viewed at lower magnifications, but when zooming in to inspect potential shifts in atomic positions on the order of a few pixels, the filtered images appeared patchy, and difficult to interpret (Figure 1f). Of the filters tested, the Gaussian blur filter appeared to introduce the fewest image artifacts. ImageJ’s implementation of the Gaussian blur filter could
also be applied to an entire image series in less than 1 second, which was faster than the MATLAB implementations of the Wiener Filter and TV-L1 denoising filter. Therefore, we chose to use the Gaussian blur filter to pre-process data prior to atom tracking.

2.3 2D Gaussian Fitting Method

Our atom tracking method, TRACT, works by fitting 2D elliptical Gaussians to TEM image series containing atomic-resolution images using least squares curve fitting in MATLAB. 2D Gaussians are fitted about a user-specified array of points in the image, which should roughly correspond to the positions of atomic columns in the image. The general formula used for 2D Gaussian fitting is given by Equation 1.

**Equation 1**

\[ F(x, y) = G(x, y) + B \]

where:

\[ G(x, y) = Ae^{-\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{(x-x_0)\cos\theta-(y-y_0)\sin\theta}{\sigma_a} \right)^2} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{(x-x_0)\sin\theta+(y-y_0)\cos\theta}{\sigma_b} \right)^2} \]

There are 7 fit parameters in total. \( A \) is the amplitude of the Gaussian. \( x_0, y_0 \) are the coordinates of the maximum, which can be determined with sub-pixel precision, and which we define as the position of the atomic column. \( \sigma_a^2 \) and \( \sigma_b^2 \) are the variances of the Gaussian along the major and minor axes. \( \theta \) is the angle of rotation of the major axis from the x-axis of the image. Unlike in ADF-STEM imaging where intensity falls to zero in the absence of atomic columns, in BF-TEM imaging the detector will register some spatially non-varying (or slowly varying) signal even when no atomic columns are present. The constant term \( B \) in Equation 1 accounts for this spatially non-
Fitting Gaussians to Multiple Atomic Columns in a Series of Images

After loading image series into MATLAB, approximate positions for each atomic column of interest are generated and used as initial guesses for the Gaussian fitting algorithm. For large datasets, this is achieved by using a MATLAB script to generate a periodic array of positions based on the periodicity of atomic columns in the image. Initial guesses and upper and lower bounds for each of the fit parameters, including amplitude, variance, and background, are chosen based on an examination of the size and intensity of atomic columns and background in the images. The upper and lower bounds placed on the fitting parameters act as constraints to ensure that the Gaussians are fitted to cerium columns and are not mistakenly deflected onto oxygen columns.

To ensure a more accurate set of initial parameters for Gaussian fitting to noisy data in individual frames, the algorithm is initially run on the sum of all of the images in the image series. The position of each atomic column in the summed image series is precisely located by first finding the local maximum within a user-specified radius from each initial position, fitting a centroid around each local maximum (limited to a small radius of ~10 pixels), and then fitting a 2D elliptical Gaussian around each centroid position. The coordinates of the maxima of each of the 2D Gaussians in the summed image define the positions of each atomic column. The centroid and Gaussian fitting stages of coding both make use of the particle tracking scripts originally written for the programming language IDL by Crocker, Grier, and Weeks [18] and implemented in MATLAB by Blair & Dufresne (http://physics.georgetown.edu/matlab/). After atomic column
positions are found in the summed image, a 2D Gaussian fit is applied to each atomic column in each individual frame of the image series, using the parameters obtained from fitting to the summed image as initial inputs. An identification number is assigned to each of the atomic columns, allowing changes in their position and intensity to be tracked between different frames in the image series. In an effort to ensure that Gaussians are fitted to genuine atomic columns, rather than noise, fit parameters were only saved and used for analysis if the amplitude of the Gaussian exceeds a threshold. We set this threshold at 2 times the level of the noise in the image, which would correspond to a 95% confidence level assuming normal statistics.

2.4 Extracting Atomic Column Positions and Errors

Once Gaussians were fitted to all atomic columns in an image series, the position of each column, \( x_0, y_0 \), may be extracted, and changes in the positions of the columns over time may be analyzed. The error on the measured position of the atomic columns may be taken by measuring the standard deviation of the measurements of the position of an object that is expected to remain stationary, as has been done in previous work involving centroid fitting [20].

2.5 Extracting Atomic Column Intensities and Errors

The intensity attributable to each atomic column is calculated as the intensity of the 2D Gaussian, \( G(x, y) \), with the constant term, \( B \), treated as background. To aid the reader in following the calculations, it is helpful to perform a simple rotation of the coordinate axes to remove the angular term \( \theta \). The 2D Gaussian formula then simplifies to:

\[
G(x', y') = Ae^{-\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{x'^2 - x'_0}{\sigma_a} \right)^2} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{y'^2 - y'_0}{\sigma_b} \right)^2}
\]
In this form, a Gaussian may be integrated analytically between ±∞. In one dimension, this gives:

\[
Column \ Intensity\ (\pm \infty, 1D) = A \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-a(x+c_1)^2} \, dx = A \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{a}}
\]

In two dimensions, this gives:

\[
Intensity\ (\pm \infty, 2D) = A \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-a(x+c_1)^2} \, dx \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-b(y+c_2)^2} \, dy = A \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{a}} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{b}} = \frac{A\pi}{\sqrt{ab}}
\]

In our case, \(a = \frac{1}{2\sigma_a^2}\), and \(b = \frac{1}{2\sigma_b^2}\). This implies that:

\[
Column \ Intensity\ (\pm \infty) = \frac{A\pi}{\sqrt{ab}} = 2A\pi\sigma_a\sigma_b
\]

In order to calculate errors due to noise in our image, we need to define an area over which to measure the noise. Bounds of ±∞ are impractical, so instead we choose to define this area as an ellipse with major and minor radii 2\(\sigma_a\) and 2\(\sigma_b\) (60 – 80). To ensure that noise and intensity are calculated within the same area, we also scale the calculated intensity of the Gaussian. Numerically, in one dimension, 95.45% of a Gaussian’s total integrated intensity lies within a radius of 2\(\sigma\). In 2 dimensions, this is (95.45%)² or 91.11% of the Gaussian’s total integrated intensity.

Our formula for calculating atomic column intensity from our Gaussian fits is therefore:

**Equation 3:**

\[
Column \ Intensity\ (\pm 2\sigma) = 0.9111 \times 2A\pi\sigma_a\sigma_b
\]

To calculate the error on this value, we assume that the variance of the total signal, and the variance of the background follow Poisson statistics, which may be reasonable for a direct detector in
counting mode since other sources of noise such as Landau noise are eliminated (Li et. al. 2013). The variance, extracted column intensity may be derived as follows:

**Equation 4:**

i. \[ I_{Total} = I_{Column} + I_{Background} \]

ii. \[ Variance(I_{Total}) = I_{Total} \]

iii. \[ Variance(I_{Background}) = I_{Background} \]

iv. \[ Variance(I_{Column}) = Variance(I_{Total}) + Variance(I_{Background}) \]

v. \[ Variance(I_{Column}) = I_{Column} + 2I_{Background} \]

The error is given by the square root of the variance within our ellipse defined by radii \( 2\sigma_a \) and \( 2\sigma_b \), with area \( 4\pi\sigma_a\sigma_b \). This implies that error is given by:

**Equation 5:**

\[
Column\ \text{Intensity\ Error} \approx \sqrt{Column\ \text{Intensity} + 8B\pi\sigma_a\sigma_b}
\]

2.6 Estimating Atomic Column Occupancy from Gaussian Intensity

A limited amount of information about the three-dimensional structure of a TEM specimen can in principle be recovered by comparing the intensities of atomic columns in experimental data with those in simulated images [15]. Multislice simulations of a material surface can be performed with varying atomic column occupancies. The intensities of the atomic columns in the simulated images can be measured using the Gaussian fitting procedure described above, and then compared to
intensities measured in experimental data. This can allow the number of atoms in each column in the experimental data to be estimated. The accuracy of this estimate will be limited by the contrast of the atomic columns, and the level of noise of the image. The output of the simulated data may have different units, and a different pixel density to the experimental data. In order to perform a comparison, both the simulated and experimental images should be normalized such that the intensity in a given area of vacuum (far from the sample) are equal in both sets of data. We have chosen to normalize the data such that the integrated intensity in an area of vacuum equal to 1 Å² is equal to 1. In our experiments, this normalization was performed by averaging over a large area in vacuum (> 100 Å²), and so the error associated with the normalization is expected to be much smaller than the error associated with Equation 4. Simulations and comparison between data and experiment are described in the Results and Discussion section below.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Measuring Changes in Atomic Column Position

The most fundamental output of the TRACT code is a data file containing the 2D Gaussian fit parameters of every atomic column analyzed, in every frame of an image series. This includes the x and y coordinates of each column in each frame, along with the intensities of those columns, and an estimate of the error of the intensity due to noise. With the positions and intensities of each of the atomic columns known over time, one can perform more complex analysis of the data, by tracking the motion of atomic columns over time, and modelling changes in column occupancy with time. Some basic examples of each of these analyses are given below. Figure 3 shows the results of a measurement of four Ce atomic column positions in two different frames on the same
area of a CeO$_2$ nanoparticle (111) surface. The measured difference in position for three of the four atomic columns are found to be 2 pm or less, which is less than half of the width of 1 pixel in the data. However, for the top left column, a difference in position of 8.5 pm is measured, which is over twice the width of a pixel in the data.

Figure 3 shows an evaluation of the differences in position between four atomic columns in two frames, but a more typical temporally resolved image series will likely require analysis of many atomic column positions over many frames. This makes comparison between positions in individual frames laborious, and therefore simpler methods of comparison are required. One technique that is useful for quickly identifying the atomic columns that exhibit the greatest degree of motion is to plot the standard deviation of the atomic column position, as shown in Figure 4a below. The Figure shows a more extended area of the (111) CeO$_2$ nanoparticle surface from Figure 3. Coloured circles overlaid on the atomic columns indicate the magnitude of the standard deviation in atomic column position. The atomic columns with the largest standard deviation in position are generally located on the surface of the particle, particularly at step-edge sites.

Calculating standard deviations is also useful for obtaining an estimate in the error on the measurement of column position. For the CeO$_2$ nanoparticle in Figure 4, atomic columns away from the surface are not expected to move significantly because bulk oxygen ion transport does not occur at room temperature in CeO$_2$, and atomic columns away from the surface cannot interact with the environment. Assuming that the motion of Ce atoms on the top and bottom surfaces of a column have only a small effect on the apparent motion of the whole column, measured displacements of sub-surface atomic columns between frames may be assumed to result from statistical errors due to noise. The typical standard deviation of sub-surface column positions (~5 pm) can be used to characterize the error of the measurement of position.
This rationale has also been applied in previous work using centroid fitting [20]. Assuming normal statistics, a measured displacement of greater than 5 pm can be considered genuine at the 68% confidence level, and a displacement of greater than 10 pm can be considered genuine at the 95% confidence level. For comparison, we repeated the measurement of the standard deviation in column positions using a more traditional centroid fitting method (Figure 4b). The results are qualitatively similar to those obtained by Gaussian fitting in that they show a larger standard deviation in position for surface columns than for sub-surface columns. However, the typical standard deviation of a sub-surface column is larger for centroid fitting (~7 pm) than it is for Gaussian fitting, suggesting that the Gaussian fitting algorithm is more robust. It is possible that the centroid fits were more easily skewed by fluctuations in noise, or by the intensity of oxygen columns, adjacent to the Ce columns. The standard deviation measured by centroid fitting also appears to be lower for some atomic columns at the surface. This may be because the Gaussian fitting algorithm was able to exclude frames in which no atomic column appeared to be present with an amplitude of at least twice the level of the noise, as described in the methods section above. The centroid fitting algorithm is not able to perform a similar task, so the standard deviation may be skewed by centroid measurements of frames in which an atomic column is not clearly visible above the noise level.

3.2 Estimating Atomic Column Occupancy

Multislice simulations for CeO$_2$ were performed using the JEMS software package (Stadelmann, http://www.jems-saas.ch/) Imaging conditions for the simulations were chosen to match those of the experimental data, with the optic axis along the [110] direction. Thicknesses of 1-12 Cerium atoms per column were simulated. It was noted that the intensity of Ce columns increased from 1 to 6 atoms per column, and then began to decrease from 7 to 12 atoms per column. Oxygen column
intensities were not measured, but it was noted that these appeared to increase as the number of atoms per column increased from 1-12 atoms and did not appear to decrease. The intensity of the Ce columns above the background was measured by Gaussian fitting at each thickness using Equation 3. This allowed a lookup table to be generated indicating the expected intensity of Ce columns with a given occupancy. In order for the lookup table and experimental data to be comparable, both were normalized such that the integrated intensity of an area of 1 Å² in vacuum was equal to 1, as described in Methods above. Error bars in the lookup table indicate the range of measured intensities between Ce columns at surface and sub-surface sites in the simulated structure, as well as sites where the Ce atoms are located in different depths along the [110] axis. Results from the simulations are shown in Figure 5.

In our experimental data from a CeO₂ nanoparticle, the intensity of oxygen columns at the (111) surface is very low. This suggests that the thickness of the particle at this surface is in the 1-6 atom per column range. From the experimental data, atomic column intensity can be measured by Gaussian fitting using Equation 3, and the error on the measurement may be estimated using Equation 4. In order to investigate the relationship between electron dose and the error in intensity measurement, the results of the intensity of an atomic column is analyzed as a function of dose per frame in Figure 6.

These measurements suggest that, when using the experimental conditions described in Methods, an electron dose of at > 2500 e Å⁻² per frame is needed to determine that the occupancy of an individual column of 3 Ce atoms to accuracy of less than ± 1 atom at 95% confidence. It should be noted that even at 5000 e Å⁻² per frame, the error bars exceed the difference in intensity between 4 and 5 atoms per column, implying that a dose much greater than 5000 e Å⁻² per frame would be required to determine these occupancies accurately. At a dose of 5000 e Å⁻² per frame, we can
determine that there are 2 atoms in the top right column and 3 atoms in each of the others to 95% confidence (these occupancies are shown in Figure 6b). In general, using a larger electron beam dose is likely to lead to improved precision of intensity measurement. However, increasing electron dose will also increase the probability that any dynamic changes observed are caused by electron beam damage, or that electron beam damage may alter the structure during the acquisition of an image. This may be undesirable if the goal of an experiment is to observe only non-beam-induced processes, although in some situations, it may be desirable to use the effects of the electron beam to drive physical changes in the specimen. It is possible that varying microscope parameters such as electron beam voltage and defocus may improve the contrast of the atomic columns and allow column occupancy to be determined with greater accuracy at lower beam dose. However, extensive multislice simulations would be needed to determine optimum conditions. The optimum conditions are likely to differ for different materials and may differ when imaging the material at different orientations.

4. Conclusions/Summary

In summary, we have developed an algorithm to track the position and intensities of atomic columns in temporally resolved BF TEM image series using 2D Gaussian fitting. This algorithm has been tested on Ce atomic columns in images of a CeO$_2$ nanoparticle acquired with a negative spherical aberration imaging technique. We have evaluated several commonly used image filters for pre-processing data to reduce noise, finding that the Gaussian blur filter is reasonable, but that the Wiener Filter is inappropriate, as it reduces the contrast of defects in the sample. The accuracy of the 2D Gaussian fitting algorithm for measuring position was compared with centroid fitting by measuring the standard deviation in the position of stationary sub-surface columns in the CeO$_2$
nanoparticle. The Gaussian fitting method was found to be slightly more accurate than centroid fitting in this case. The accuracy of using intensity measurements to determine atomic column occupancy was evaluated assuming error due to Poisson noise. For our conditions, it was found that an electron beam dose of 5000 eÅ⁻² per frame or greater was required to determine Ce column occupancy to 95% confidence. Electron dose per frame is a critical limiting factor in accurately tracking atomic column positions and intensities. In general, a higher electron beam dose per frame should yield improved signal-to-noise, which should in turn yield more precise measurements. However, high electron dose per frame will also increase the probability that artifacts may be introduced into the data due to radiation damage effects. In future related work, we aim to use the methods presented here to analyse the relationship between Ce column motion and atomic site in more detail, and to analyze dynamic restructuring of CeO₂ in images acquired with greater dose per frame, and at greater temporal resolution. We believe that the code developed here, and the methodology used to explore the errors and limitations of the measurements, could be applied more broadly to any temporally resolved TEM image series to track dynamic atomic column motions, and have made our MATLAB code available for the community to use on Github (https://github.com/bdalevin). Further work, which will require extensive collaboration with specialists in advanced image processing techniques, may examine the effects of different and more advanced imaging filters for noise reduction and incorporating more advanced computational methods such as machine learning into the 2D Gaussian algorithm.
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Figure 1. a) Structural diagram of CeO$_2$ viewed in a [110] projection. b) Unfiltered, summed image of a step edge on a (111) CeO$_2$ nanoparticle surface with a total 1s exposure. c) Raw unfiltered image of the same step edge as (b) with 0.1 s exposure time. The radiation dose used to acquire this frame was ~500 e$^-$. d) The result of applying a Weiner filter to (c). e) The result of applying
a Gaussian blur filter of radius 2 pixels to (c). f) The result of applying a TV-L1 denoising filter to (c). g) Intensity profiles through each of the images (c) – (e) along the line indicated by the dashed arrow in (a). The Intensity profiles are vertically offset from each other but have not been scaled. This highlights the apparent reduction in noise due to each of the image filters. The Gaussian blur filter appears to be particularly effective at noise reduction in this case.
Figure 2. a) Image of a Ce atomic column in a CeO$_2$ nanoparticle, with 1 second total exposure, after applying a Gaussian blur. The red and green lines across the image respectively show the major and minor axes of a 2D Gaussian fitted to the column. b) A 3D representation of the 2D Gaussian fit. c) A 1D cross section through the data along the major axis of the 2D Gaussian fit. The red circles represent image intensities, and the black line is the cross section of the fit. d) A 1D cross section through the data along the minor axis of the 2D Gaussian fit. The green circles represent image intensities, and the black line is the cross section of the fit (pixel size = 4 pm).
Figure 3. a) A frame from an image series of 4 Ce atomic columns on the (111) surface of a CeO$_2$ nanoparticle. The cyan crosses represent the positions of the columns, as found using 2D Gaussian fitting. The frame was acquired with a dose of 500 e$^{-}$Å$^{-2}$, and the frame was filtered using a Gaussian blur (see Materials and Methods) b) A second frame from the same image series as (a). The red crosses represent the positions of the columns found by using 2D Gaussian fitting. c) A summed image of the frames in (a) and (b) with the cyan and red crosses marking Ce column positions overlaid. This shows that the most significant shift in position between the frames occurred for the top left column. d) A quiver plot showing the direction and magnitude of the shifts in position of the Ce columns between frames (a) and (b).
Figure 4. a) Summed image of the stepped (111) surface of a CeO$_2$ nanoparticle. The coloured circles overlaid on the Ce atomic columns indicate the standard deviation of the positions of the Ce columns calculated from Gaussian fitting. A larger standard deviation may imply more frequent, and larger displacements between frames in the image series. The typical standard
deviation of a sub-surface column is ~ 5 pm, which we use to characterize the error on a positional measurement. b) The same image as shown in (a), but with the standard deviation of positions of the Ce columns calculated by Centroid fitting, instead of Gaussian fitting. The results are qualitatively very similar, but the Centroid fitting results in a larger standard deviation of ~7 pm for the stationary sub-surface columns, suggesting that the Gaussian fitting method is more robust.
Figure 5. Multislice simulations of a (111) CeO$_2$ surface, viewed along the [110] axis at different thicknesses. The imaging conditions for the simulations were chosen to match the conditions of the experimental data in Figure 3 and Figure 4. a) 1 Ce atom per column, b) 5 Ce atoms per column, c) 12 Ce atoms per column. d) Average of measured intensity at 4 different sites. The error bars represent the range of intensities between the sites. For occupancies of less than 5 atoms per column, the relationship between occupancy and intensity is approximately linear, and the difference in intensity between different sites is negligible.
Figure 6. a) A frame from an image series of 4 Ce atomic columns on the (111) surface of a CeO$_2$ nanoparticle. This frame was acquired with a dose of $\sim$125 e$^{-}\text{Å}^{-2}$, and the frame was filtered using a Gaussian blur (see Materials and Methods). b) A summed image of 40 frames of the same area of CeO$_2$ as in (a) with a total dose for the image of 5000 e$^{-}\text{Å}^{-2}$, filtered using a Gaussian blur. The numbers above each Ce column indicate the estimated number of Ce atoms in that column based on comparison with multislice simulations c) A graph showing intensity of the atomic column
inside the white circle in (a) and (b) calculated for different total doses per image, normalized for comparison with the lookup table in Figure 5d. The error bars are calculated using Equation 4. The bold error bar represents 64% confidence, and the thinner error bar represents 95% confidence. For comparison with the lookup table (Figure 5d), all intensities have been normalized such that the integrated intensity of an area of 1 Å² in vacuum is equal to 1.