Hydrogenation of amorphous silicon is critical to reducing defect densities, passivating mid-gap states and improving photoconductivity. However, achieving high accuracy with low computational cost in the treatment of Si-H interactions in atomistic simulations has been historically challenging. Here we introduce a machine-learning driven Gaussian approximation potential for atomistic simulations of various hydrogenated phases of silicon. Trained on density functional theory (DFT) measurements of energies, forces and stresses, this potential enables simulations of hydrogenated silicon with DFT-level accuracy but significantly reduced computational expense. We demonstrate the capabilities of the potential by using it to create hydrogenated liquid and amorphous silicon, and validating the structural measurements with excellent agreement against those of atomic configurations produced by density functional theory and experiment. These validations highlight the promise of using the potential for realistic and accurate simulations of a variety of hydrogenated silicon structures, particularly bulk a-Si:H and c-Si/a-Si:H heterojunctions.

I. MOTIVATION

Hydrogenated amorphous silicon (a-Si:H) is a widely used material, with applications ranging from thin-film transistors \(^1\) to solar cells \(^2, 3\). Created using plasma-enhanced chemical vapor deposition of silane gas (SiH\(_4\)) \(^4\), a-Si:H has far fewer defects than pure amorphous silicon due to the passivating role of the H atoms, the concentration of which typically ranges from 6 to 18 at. %. As a result, in comparison to pure amorphous silicon, a-Si:H has demonstrably superior electrical transport properties and photoconductivity \(^2, 6\). The role of H in a-Si:H films is crucial, and understanding the local environment interactions and long-term dynamics of H in this material remains an open area of research. Of particular interest are the Staebler-Wronski effect \(^7\), which is observed in bulk a-Si:H, and the degradation of hydrogen passivation at the interface in silicon heterojunctions \(^3, 8\). While significant modeling has been performed on pure amorphous silicon and its simpler atomic environment, far fewer rigorous computational studies of a-Si:H have been conducted. This is largely due to the limitations of present atomistic simulation methods in incorporating H into the simulations.

In general, the use of atomistic simulation methods is one of the primary tools for materials modeling. The most accurate of these methods are those based in electronic-structure theory, such as density functional theory (DFT), which are highly accurate at the cost of significant computational expense and unfavorable scaling behavior. Simulations of more than a few hundred atoms, or with millions of energy or force evaluations, instead are conducted using parameterized empirical interatomic potentials. The potentials are typically quite simple in their formulation, and are usually optimized to yield high levels of accuracy in reproducing a few carefully chosen observables on a particular subset of structures. The limitations of the functional forms of these potentials necessitate that a balance be struck between maximizing the accuracy for selected properties deemed the most crucial, and transferability in measuring other observables or simulating structures which the potential was not fitted to.

The imperfectness of these solutions, presenting a constant trade-off between accuracy or speed, has motivated the adoption of machine-learning (ML) methods to fit functions with non-parametric forms to DFT measured microscopic quantities. The goal of these methods is to create interatomic potentials with DFT levels of accuracy over a wide range of structures and observables, while maintaining a factor of 10x or more improvement over DFT capabilities in both simulation speed and number of simulation atoms. The functional forms of these potentials are highly flexible, due to their non-parametric nature, and can be fit to a wide range of structures.

The well-known limitation of ML models is that they are limited in their transferability. The flexibility of their functional form enables the use of a broad training database, which can encompass a wide variety of structures, and highly accurate interpolation between the constituent structures. However, the nature of this flexibility means that the ML model will be highly accurate for the structures within the training database, a good fit for structures near the database, and increasingly less accurate the farther away from the training database a structure lies. Training a truly “general-purpose” potential thus requires a very large database size, and even then is not wholly transferable to situations which it has never encountered.

This problem of extrapolation is what motivated the development of the Gaussian approximation potential (GAP) framework. In previous GAP publications, it has been shown that the combination of a kernel-based fit which nimbly adapts to previously un-encountered sim-
ulation environments, and using an adaptive training database, does an excellent job in making up for these shortcomings [9,11]. Here, the term “adaptive training database” refers to, in an iterative process over time, growing the training database from the GAP learns. In this process, the GAP is fitted to an initial training set, and then is used to perform calculations such as structure optimizations or basic MD simulations. The results of these calculations are then validated against DFT calculations, and any ill-fitting results, corresponding to structures not contained in the interpolative structure space of the training set, are added to the training database. The progress of the potential is measured by computing the error (relative to DFT) of GAP measurements of energies, forces and virial stresses on a separate reference database. This process can be repeated as many times as necessary to yield satisfactory levels of accuracy, either on macroscopic observables or on the aforementioned microscopic quantities. This method has the advantage of only growing the training database in areas where the ML model fits poorly, rather than blindly training the model on a vast number of reference structures.

In this paper we report the modeling of various phases of hydrogenated silicon using a ML-based GAP. We validate our potential on hydrogenated liquid and amorphous silicon, which are the two phases most critical to the intended use of the potential, namely performing melt-quench simulations to create and study a-Si:H and c-Si/a-Si:H interfaces. We show how our potential outperforms state-of-the-art parameterized interatomic potentials, and demonstrate excellent agreement with DFT and experimental results. The development of this potential will be key for future works in accurate MD simulations of hydrogenated silicon solids.

II. TECHNICAL DETAILS

In this work we train our ML model by fitting a Gaussian approximation potential (GAP) using a SOAP (Smooth Overlap of Atomic Positions) kernel with a core predefined pair potential. This pair potential is chosen to be purely repulsive, and is given by cubic splines that are fitted to the interaction of pairs of atoms in vacuum as computed by DFT. Pair potentials are given for all 3 relevant atomic pairs: Si-Si, Si-H, and H-H. Including these core repulsive pair potentials serves a dual purpose. First, much of the interaction energy between atoms can be described by a simple pair potential, which describes exchange repulsion at close atomic approach, and some effects of chemical bonding at further distances. Second, this exchange repulsion piece of the potential is difficult to capture with kernel fitting in high dimensions due to the steepness of the energy curve in that region, and thus capturing it with a core potential enhances numerical efficiency.

The total GAP energy for the system is thus a sum of the predefined repulsive pair potential and the many-body term which is given by the linear sum over the kernel basis functions:

$$E = \sum_{i<j} V^{(2)}(r_{ij}) + \sum_{i} \sum_{s} \alpha_s K(R_i, R_s)$$

where $i$ and $j$ range over the number of atoms in the system, $V^{(2)}$ is the 2-body repulsive pair potential, $r_{ij}$ is the distance between atoms $i$ and $j$, $K$ is the SOAP kernel basis function, and $R_i$ is the collection of relative position vectors corresponding to the neighbors of atom $i$ which is termed a neighborhood. The final sum ranges over the set of $M$ representative atoms, selected from the input data set, whose environments are chosen to serve as a basis in which the potential is expanded. The coefficients $\alpha_s$ are determined by solving a linear system that is obtained when available data are substituted into the equation. These data are the total energies and gradients (forces and stresses) of the system, calculated by density-functional theory (DFT). The representative environments over which Eq. 1 is taken are selected by choosing basis environments which are maximally dissimilar to each other, such that the variety of the entire set of possible environments is well represented by interpolation over a small number of basis environments.

The kernel value determines the similarity between two neighborhoods, which is largest when the two neighborhoods are identical, and smallest when the two neighborhoods are maximally different. To compare the two neighborhoods, the neighborhood $R_i$ of atom $i$ is represented by its neighborhood density:

$$\rho_i(r) = \sum_{i'} f_{cut}(r_{i'i}) e^{-\left(r-r_{i'i}\right)^2/2\sigma_{atom}^2}$$

These neighbor densities are not calculated directly, but are instead represented by an expansion in a basis of spherical harmonics and radial functions.

The SOAP kernel used here to compare two neighborhoods is calculated from the integrated overlap of the neighbor densities:

$$\tilde{K}(R_i, R_j) = \int_{R \in \text{SO}(3)} d\hat{R} \left| \int d\mathbf{r}_i \rho_i(\mathbf{r}) \rho_j(\hat{R}\mathbf{r}) \right|^2$$

The final kernel is calculated by normalizing $\tilde{K}$ and raising it to an integer power:

$$K(R_i, R_j) = \delta^2 \left| \frac{\tilde{K}(R_i, R_j)}{\sqrt{\tilde{K}(R_i, R_i)\tilde{K}(R_j, R_j)}} \right|^\zeta$$

For further details of the GAP methodology, refer to Ref. [11].
III. FITTING A GAP TO SI-H

A. Training and Reference structures

When training ML models, it is important to have two sets of structures the ML model sees. One of these is the adaptive training set, the set of structures, iteratively growing over time, to which the GAP is fitted. The other is the reference set, a set of structures which is used for evaluation purposes. The ML model is never trained on this set of structures, but it does make comparative measurements against DFT, the accuracy of which is used to measure the progress of the potential.

The base training and reference structure sets were assembled by adding H to pure Si structures of various phases. Approximately 150 structures are contained in the initial training set, and approximately 110 structures are contained in the reference set. These pure Si structures were taken either from our previous work on a-Si/c-Si interface degradation [12], from the reference database on which the published Si-only GAP was trained [11], or were generated using the Atomic Simulation Environment [13]. The representative phases of Si were: 1) Amorphous Silicon; 2) Liquid Silicon; 3) Diamond Silicon with a vacancy; 4) Diamond Silicon with a divacancy; 5) Diamond Silicon with an interstitial Si; 6) Amorphous/Crystalline Silicon interface structures; 7) Diamond surface structures, both (100) and (111). The atomic concentration of H added was between 6 and 12 at. % for the liquid, amorphous and interface phases, and between 4 and 8 at. % for the bulk diamond phases and between 12 and 20 at. % for the diamond surfaces, as sufficient H was added to passivate all dangling or strained bonds. Since we specifically want to model hydrogen-related defects, structures with plus or minus an additional H atom were also added into both the training database and reference database.

It should be noted that the training set also contains a single structure with an isolated Si atom, and a single structure with an isolated H atom. Isolated here means the structure possesses a large enough unit cell that the atom is effectively in isolation. Including these isolated atomic structures is essential because the potential is fit to the binding energy, not the total energy (i.e., the binding energy plus the energy of isolated atoms). As such, it is necessary to properly account for the individual atomic energies when fitting the potential.

B. DFT Calculations

DFT was used to calculate the total energy, forces on each atom, and the virial stress of each of the atomic structures contained in the training set. These 3 pieces of information are what the GAP is fitted to structure-by-structure.

The DFT calculations were performed using the Quantum Espresso 6.2.1 software package [14][15]. The main parameters of the electronic-structure calculations we performed are as follows: the Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) exchange-correlation functional was used with periodic boundary conditions [17]. The core and valence electron interactions were described by the Norm-Conserving Pseudopotential function. The calculations were performed with Marzari-Vanderbilt electronic smearing [15]. This smearing method was chosen as it ensures that the DFT energies and forces are consistent. An energy cutoff of 42 Ry was employed for the plane-wave basis set, and a Monkhorst-Pack grid method was used to define the k-point mesh which samples the Brillouin-Zone. The k-point spacing was chosen to be 0.2Å⁻¹.

Care was taken to ensure that the energy/atom calculated for each structure was accurate to within 1 meV/atom. That is, ±1 meV/atom of the value that would emerge from calculations with an exceptionally large cutoff energy and k-point density.

The PWSCF module of Quantum Espresso software was employed to perform DFT Born–Oppenheimer molecular dynamics (DFT-BOMD) simulations. The self-consistent Hellmann-Feynman theorem was used in order to calculate the interatomic forces at the electronic ground state at each time step. The same exchange-correlation functional as the single point DFT calculations was used. An energy cutoff of 36 Ry was used for the plane-wave basis set, and the first Brillouin zone was sampled using only the Γ point. A Gaussian smearing width of 0.01 Ry to the density of states was implemented to avoid convergence problems with metallic configurations.

C. GAP Fitting

As described in the technical details, we used a SOAP (Smooth Overlap of Atomic Positions) kernel in combination with a repulsive pair potential to fit our GAP. Two SOAP kernels were used, one for the Si atoms, and one for the H atoms. Several input parameters are needed for each SOAP kernel. These include: 1) $n_{\text{max}}$ and $l_{\text{max}}$, the maximum number of radial and angular indices for the spherical harmonic expansion of the neighbor densities; 2) $\delta$, a hyperparameter which corresponds to the energy scale of the many-body term in the SOAP kernel; 3) $\zeta$, the integer power to which the SOAP kernel is raised; 4) the cutoff radius $r_{\text{cut}}$ and an associated transition width $w$, characterizing the point beyond which, and how fast, the cutoff function smoothly goes to zero in the calculation of the neighbor densities; 5) $\sigma_{\text{atom}}$, the smearing parameter for the neighbor density function. For the values of these parameters used, see Table [II].

Also important to the fitting are the chosen regularization parameters, $\sigma$. These parameters represent the desired accuracy of the potential in fitting to the data, and correspondingly also determine the relative weight of each structure in the fitting procedure. Separate $\sigma$ values are assigned for the energies ($\sigma_{\text{energy}}$), forces ($\sigma_{\text{force}}$), and
TABLE I. Table of SOAP kernel parameter values, for each atomic type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>(a_{\text{max}})</th>
<th>(l_{\text{max}})</th>
<th>(\delta)</th>
<th>(\zeta)</th>
<th>(r_{\text{cut}})</th>
<th>(w)</th>
<th>(\sigma_{\text{atom}})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low T anneal of a-Si:H

- Heating a-Si:H from 1100K to 1400K at 10 K/s
- Added new a-Si:H structures
- Quenching liq-Si:H from 2000K to 1500K at 10 K/s
- Added new liq-Si:H structures
- Med T anneal (1100K) of a-Si:H
- Added c-Si/a-Si:H interface structures
- New c-Si divacancy structures
- Added new c-Si/a-Si:H interface structures
- Added new c-Si vacancy structures
- Added new c-Si interstitial structures
- Low T anneal of c-Si/a-Si:H interface structures
- Optimization of c-Si/a-Si:H interface structures
- NPT high T anneal of liq-Si:H structures
- Quenching liq-Si:H from 2000K to 1500K at 10 K/s
- Annealing quenched liq-Si:H structures at 1500K
- Quenching liq-Si:H from 1500K to 1400K at 10 K/s
- Added hydrogen passivated c-Si surface (100) and c-Si surface (111) structures

TABLE II. Table of \(\sigma_{\text{energy}}\) values for each structure type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>(\sigma_{\text{energy}}) [eV/atom]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amorphous Silicon</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid Silicon</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-Si/c-Si Interface</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Si Phases</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Atom</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III. Structure types added each iteration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iteration</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Optimized structures (all phases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Optimized structures (all phases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low T anneal of a-Si:H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High T anneal of liq-Si:H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High T anneal of liq-Si:H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Med T anneal (1100K) of a-Si:H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Heating a-Si:H from 500K to 800K at 10^{13} K/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Heating a-Si:H from 800K to 1100K at 10^{13} K/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Heating a-Si:H from 1100K to 1400K at 10^{13} K/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Heating a-Si:H from 1100K to 1400K at 10^{13} K/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Heating a-Si:H from 800K to 1400K at 10^{13} K/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Added new a-Si:H structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Add new a-Si:H structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Added c-Si/a-Si:H interface structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Added c-Si/a-Si:H interface structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Added new c-Si divacancy structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Added new liq-Si:H structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Added new c-Si vacancy structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Added new c-Si interstitial structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Low T anneal of c-Si/a-Si:H interface structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Optimization of c-Si/a-Si:H interface structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>NPT high T anneal of liq-Si:H structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>NVT high T anneal of liq-Si:H structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Quenching liq-Si:H from 2000K to 1500K at 10^{13} K/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Annealing quenched liq-Si:H structures at 1500K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Quenching liq-Si:H from 1500K to 1400K at 10^{13} K/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Added hydrogen passivated c-Si surface (100) and c-Si surface (111) structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Virial stresses \(\sigma_{\text{virial}}\). It is possible to input these \(\sigma\) values to the potential in a number of different ways, including as single values for all structures, or on a "structure type" basis, assigning single values to all structures in a single phase (for instance, liquid Si). Our approach was slightly different than these methods: we instead chose to assign the \(\sigma\) values on a structure-by-structure basis. The \(\sigma_{\text{energy}}\) values were chosen to be the same for all structures in a given phase, see Table I for these values. \(\sigma_{\text{force}}\) was assigned on a per-atom basis as:

\[
\sigma_{\text{force}} = \begin{cases} 
0.1 & |F| < 2.0 \text{eV} \text{Å}^{-1} \\
0.05|F| & |F| \geq 2.0 \text{eV} \text{Å}^{-1} 
\end{cases},
\]

where \(|F|\) is the magnitude of the force vector on that respective atom. \(\sigma_{\text{virial}}\) was assigned on a per-structure basis as:

\[
\sigma_{\text{virial}} = \begin{cases} 
0.025N_{\text{atoms}} & \max(|\tau_i|) < 1.0 \text{eV} \\
0.025N_{\text{atoms}} \times \max(|\tau_i|) & \max(|\tau_i|) \geq 1.0 \text{eV}
\end{cases},
\]

where \(N_{\text{atoms}}\) is the number of atoms in the structure, and \(\max(|\tau_i|)\) is the max norm of the virial stress tensor.

D. Iterative Training

As described in the motivation section above, the conventional wisdom is that a ML model needs to be trained on a broad database of structures, containing as many structures as possible, in order to be usable in a general sense. To mitigate this, we have adopted an adaptive training procedure, wherein the potential is used to conduct MD simulations on the structures already contained in the training database, and the results of these simulations are validated against DFT measurements of energies, forces, and virial stresses. Ill-fitting results are then added to the training database, thus growing the training database in an iterative manner. Using this procedure, it is not necessary to add thousands of structures, as the potential will naturally gravitate towards regions of configuration space where it is ill-fitting on its own, without any external input or danger of over-fitting.

All MD simulations were performed using the LAMMPS software package built with QUIP package support [19–21].

The error metric used to evaluate the accuracy of the GAP compared to DFT is the weighted root mean square error (RMSE). As the desired accuracy of the GAP varies from structure to structure, as determined by the \(\Sigma\) values, the RMSE itself loses some meaning, as structures with a high RMSE value may also have a high \(\sigma\) value. To account for this, we weight the RMSE by \(\sigma^2\):

\[
\text{RMSE}_{\text{weighted}} = \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (x_{i,\text{GAP}} - x_{i,\text{DFT}})^2/\sigma_i^2}{N} \right)^{1/2}
\]

where \(\Sigma\) is the magnitude of the force vector on that respective atom. \(\sigma_{\text{virial}}\) for each structure type. Virial stresses \(\sigma_{\text{virial}}\). It is possible to input these \(\sigma\) values to the potential in a number of different ways, including as single values for all structures, or on a "structure type" basis, assigning single values to all structures in a single phase (for instance, liquid Si). Our approach was slightly different than these methods: we instead chose to assign the \(\sigma\) values on a structure-by-structure basis. The \(\sigma_{\text{energy}}\) values were chosen to be the same for all structures in a given phase, see Table I for these values. \(\sigma_{\text{force}}\) was assigned on a per-atom basis as:

\[
\sigma_{\text{force}} = \begin{cases} 
0.1 & |F| < 2.0 \text{eV} \text{Å}^{-1} \\
0.05|F| & |F| \geq 2.0 \text{eV} \text{Å}^{-1} 
\end{cases},
\]

where \(|F|\) is the magnitude of the force vector on that respective atom. \(\sigma_{\text{virial}}\) was assigned on a per-structure basis as:

\[
\sigma_{\text{virial}} = \begin{cases} 
0.025N_{\text{atoms}} & \max(|\tau_i|) < 1.0 \text{eV} \\
0.025N_{\text{atoms}} \times \max(|\tau_i|) & \max(|\tau_i|) \geq 1.0 \text{eV}
\end{cases},
\]

where \(N_{\text{atoms}}\) is the number of atoms in the structure, and \(\max(|\tau_i|)\) is the max norm of the virial stress tensor.
Here, \( N \) is the number of data points, \( x_{\text{GAP}} \) is the value measured by GAP, and \( x_{\text{DFT}} \) is the value measured by DFT.

27 full rounds of iterative training were conducted. See Fig. [1] for an iteration-by-iteration progression of the average of the RMSE measured for each force component when comparing the Si-H GAP to DFT on the reference database, for both Si and H separately. Primarily, the new structures have been added in the same procedure as described above, conducting basic MD simulations in order to find structures where the GAP struggles to match DFT measurements. However, beginning in iteration 12, the method of adding H to pure Si structures was refined from the beginning of the training procedure, and subsequently a few sets of such structures from various phases were added to the training set. Once this process was complete, the training set once again was expanded by conducting MD simulations on constituent structures. See Table III for a list of all additions to the training set which have been conducted thus far. For a visualization of the RMSE accuracy of the Si-H GAP relative to DFT when making energy measurements per atom on the reference set, after iteration 27, see Fig. [2].

Of note here is the increase in accuracy that occurs in iteration 7. This increase in accuracy was driven by changing the method by which the regularization parameters were assigned. Previously, the per-structure or per-atom \( \sigma \) values mentioned in the GAP fitting section were not calculated on a per-structure or per-atom basis, but were instead assigned to be the same value for all structures in a given phase. In addition, the force \( \sigma \) fitting protocol was changed to be dependent upon the magnitude of the atomic force measured by DFT, increasing accuracy as tightly as possible. This change in accuracy meant that the average RMSE now more closely matches the desired regularization, as the regularisation in fitting to structures with large forces and stresses was relaxed. This method has led to a sizeable reduction in the RMSE.

FIG. 1. Iterative progression of the average of the RMSE of the (a) Si and (b) H cartesian force components, measured with respect to DFT on the reference structure set.

FIG. 2. Comparison between GAP and DFT measurements of the energies/atom on the reference set of structures, after iteration 27.

E. Determining the Usability of the Si-H GAP

The final step in assessing the usability of the potential is to conduct MD simulations representative of how the potential will ultimately be used, and assess the accuracy of the relevant observables in comparison to both DFT and lab results. Our primary goal in developing this Si-H GAP was to use it to create highly accurate a-Si:H structures via a melt-quench procedure, and to subsequently use it to measure defect creation/annihilation energy barriers via the use of the nudged elastic band method.

As such, the most critical round of assessment is the evaluation of the representative liq-Si:H and a-Si:H structures emerging from fully GAP-driven melt-quench procedures. There are several different metrics for evaluating the "realness" of the resulting structures. These include: 1) the radial distribution function (RDF), or correspond-
ingly the partial pair correlation function when multiple atomic species are present; 2) the bond length and angle distributions; 3) the excess energy, measured relative to c-Si; 4) the vibrational spectra. Of these, there is widespread debate concerning which is the most important metric, with different proponents arguing in favor of either the RDF, or the vibrational spectra [22]. It is significantly easier to measure the RDF computationally, but experimental comparison is difficult, requiring x-ray diffraction measurements of the structure factor \( S(Q) \) out to at least 40 Å [23]. Conversely it is much easier to measure the vibrational spectra experimentally using Raman and FTIR spectroscopy [24], but it is a substantial challenge computationally. In this paper we report measurements of the partial pair correlation function, leaving vibrational spectra measurements to future work.

To simulate the structure of liquid Si infused with H, we performed constant volume (NVT ensemble) molecular dynamics simulations as implemented in the LAMMPS software package, built with QUP package support [19–21]. One calculation was performed using the Si-H GAP, and one calculation was performed using a Si-H Tersoff potential [25, 26] to provide a point of comparison. Each simulation started with a cubic supercell of side-length 5.26 Å, containing 64 Si atoms and 8 H atoms placed at random, corresponding to a density of 2.58 g/cm³. The coordinates of these atoms were optimized with the given interatomic potential, before equilibrating at 2000K for 150000 0.5 fs timesteps. Structural data was gathered over an additional 10000 0.25 fs timesteps. Reference DFT data was gathered from an analogous DFT-BOMD simulation performed using Quantum Espresso. Just as above, the starting configuration consisted of 64 Si and 8 H atoms located at random nonoverlapping positions, in a cubic supercell of side-length 5.26 Å. Simulations consisted of equilibrating the structure at 2000K over 100000 0.25 ps timesteps using the Verlet algorithm, rescaling the velocities at every step to keep the temperature fixed at 2000 K. After equilibration, structural data was gathered over an additional 6000 0.25 ps time steps.

The partial pair coordination functions are presented in Fig. 3. Results are given for the Si-Si partial pair correlation function as well as the Si-H partial pair correlation function. The GAP is in excellent agreement with the DFT in both cases, matching peak locations and heights. The Tersoff potential is visibly in much worse agreement.

The angular distribution functions, also known as the bond-angle distribution functions, are presented in Fig. 4. The cutoff bond length is taken to be the first minimum value of the partial pair correlation functions after their initial peaks, 3.1 Å for Si-Si, and 2.2 Å for Si-H. Again, the GAP is in excellent agreement with the DFT on both cases, completely reproducing the notable features and closely tracking the DFT results. Again the Tersoff potential is visibly in much worse agreement.

The partial pair coordination functions are presented in Fig. 3. Results are given for the Si-Si partial pair correlation function as well as the Si-H partial pair correlation function. The GAP is in excellent agreement with the DFT in both cases, matching peak locations and heights. The Tersoff potential is visibly in much worse agreement.

Finally, coordination statistics of the Si atoms are presented in Fig. 5. Results are only given for the Si-H GAP and DFT. Here the coordination includes both neighboring Si atoms and neighboring H atoms, and the coordination shell for each atomic species is again defined using the first minimum of the corresponding partial pair correlation function. On this front the GAP is also in excellent agreement with the DFT.

It can be noted that all of these structural quantities are very similar to those of pure liquid Si. See for instance Ref. [27] for a point of comparison.
FIG. 4. Angular distribution functions, or \( g_3(r, \theta) \), of equilibrated liquid Si infused with H, with a density of \( 2.58 \text{ g/cm}^3 \), and \( T=2000\text{K} \). Top: Si-Si-Si; bottom: Si-Si-H. Comparison provided between the Si-H GAP, a Si-H Tersoff potential, and DFT.

2. Amorphous

To simulate the structure of a-Si:H, we performed both constant volume (NVT ensemble) and constant pressure (NPT) molecular dynamics simulations, again as implemented in the LAMMPS software package with QUIP package support. One calculation was performed using the Si-H GAP, and one calculation was performed using a Si-H Tersoff potential \([25, 26]\) to provide a point of comparison. Each simulation started with the same general procedure as the previous section to create liquid Si infused with H, except with a larger supercell containing 216 Si atoms and 28 H atoms, and an initial density of \( 2.3 \text{ g/cm}^3 \). Once the liquid structures were equilibrated, the same general procedure was followed for each potential, except the Tersoff calculations used cooling rates which were reduced by a factor of two for further accuracy. The GAP procedure is as follows.

Once the liquid structure was equilibrated, it was cooled in the NVT ensemble down from 2000K to 1500K at a rate of \( 10^{13} \text{ K/s} \) with a timestep of 1 fs. Further equilibration was then performed at 1500K for 100 ps, before the structure was cooled down to 500K at a rate of \( 10^{12} \text{ K/s} \). Both of these steps were also performed in the NVT ensemble. To collect structural data, the structure was relaxed to the local energy minimum in atomic positions, then equilibrated for 20000 1 fs timesteps in the NPT ensemble at 0 pressure and 500K, before gathering the structural data over an additional 10000 timesteps. This procedure resulted in a-Si:H with a mass density of approximately \( 2.22 \text{ g/cm}^3 \), consistent with PECVD films containing 12 at. % H \([34]\).

No reference DFT-BOMD data was gathered for these simulations. Instead, experimental neutron scattering measurements \([28]\) and DFT data from another paper \([29]\) were used. This is both because using experimental data when available is preferential, and DFT-MD simulations with the number of timesteps given above are extremely computationally expensive, with reduced necessity if there is available reference DFT data to compare against.

The partial pair coordination functions are presented in Fig. 5. Results are given for the Si-Si partial pair correlation function as well as the Si-H partial pair correlation function. All structural Si-Si data gives the same key features, with three strong peaks at about \( 2.4 \text{ Å} \), \( 3.8 \text{ Å} \), and \( 5.6 \text{ Å} \), corresponding the first, second and third
TABLE IV. Short-range order of the a-Si:H produced by the Si-H GAP compared to Tersoff, DFT, and PECVD and sputtering (experiment) methods. \( N_c \) is the average coordination of the Si atoms. \( r \) and \( \sigma_r \) are the mean and the deviation of the Si-Si bond length. \( \theta_{\text{Si-Si-Si}} \) and \( \sigma_{\theta,\text{Si-Si-Si}} \) are the mean and the deviation of the Si-Si-Si bond angle distribution. The coordination and means are gathered at \( T = 300 \) K, while the deviations correspond to static disorder and are measured at \( T = 0 \) K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a-Si:H structure (H at. %)</th>
<th>( N_c )</th>
<th>( r(\text{Å}) )</th>
<th>( \sigma_r(\text{Å}) )</th>
<th>( \theta_{\text{Si-Si-Si}} )</th>
<th>( \sigma_{\theta,\text{Si-Si-Si}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si-H GAP (11.5%)</td>
<td>3.98 ± 0.01</td>
<td>2.376</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tersoff (11.5%)</td>
<td>4.14 ± 0.01</td>
<td>2.392</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarolimek (DFT, 11.1%) 29</td>
<td>3.89 ± 0.03</td>
<td>2.377</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipponi (PECVD, 8%) 30</td>
<td>3.88 ± 0.12</td>
<td>2.35 ± 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignoli (PECVD, 12%) 31</td>
<td>3.71 ± 0.07</td>
<td>2.37 ± 0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakagi (sputtering, 12.8%) 32</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.363 ± 0.004</td>
<td>0.038 ± 0.008</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kail (various, 12-15%) 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from this information that the GAP values are within expectations for the bond length and bond angle distributions. The width of the bond angle distribution is slightly higher than experiment, but significantly lower than that of the Tersoff supercell and the reference DFT data. Notably, the coordination of the Si atoms is very close to 4, which indicates that very few dangling bonds are present in the GAP supercell even at \( T = 300 \) K.

We also performed further relaxation using DFT in order to measure the lowest achievable excess energy of the supercell. The excess energy, which is the energy difference of the supercell compared to a supercell containing
hydrogenated crystalline silicon with the same number of Si and H atoms, was found after DFT relaxation to be 0.09 eV/atom. This is well within the measured a-Si:H experimental range of 0.06 to 0.13 eV/atom [35]. As expected, it is lower than the excess energies of 0.13 to 0.14 eV/atom of pure amorphous silicon structures that we generated using the Si-only GAP [11] for a previous work [12], as the presence of the H atoms relieves some of the atomic strain.

IV. CONCLUSION

This work clearly demonstrates the utility of using a non-parameterized ML model, here trained by fitting a Gaussian approximation potential with a SOAP kernel to DFT data. The Si-H GAP was not only able to closely match DFT measurements of microscopic quantities such as energies, forces and virial stresses, but it was also able to reproduce structural characteristics such as partial pair correlation functions and the vibrational spectra. Reference structural data taken from Tersoff MD calculations was also provided, and highlighted the improvement that is gained by adopting the non-parameterized model and more accurately matching the target potential energy surface. While the computational complexity, and hence cost, of using a GAP is much higher than a traditional parameterized interatomic potential, it remains significantly faster than DFT-MD, with a much tighter alignment in all key metrics.

The potential presented here is limited in a few ways. (i) It was not developed to be a general-purpose interatomic potential, and thus does not include structural phases beyond the key phases which are needed in order to reliably produce experimentally accurate a-Si:H. For instance, it does not include the various surface reconstructions of diamond Si. Fortunately, future training would simply be a matter of adding additional structures to the training set, and thus the potential can be adapted as needed. (ii) Long-range interactions beyond 5 Å for Si and 3.5 Å for H are not included. This limits the maximum accuracy of the potential, as it runs into locality limits. For a discussion of this phenomenon, see Ref. [36]. Properly including a long-range interaction and integrating it into the short-range interactions is still an outstanding problem with the underlying GAP framework. (iii) The training database was assembled by hand, and did not include any automated procedures for constructing the database. Using an active learning approach would reduce the DFT cost, as DFT would only be performed on an "as needed" basis, and would speed up the training of the potential.

Those issues aside, the merits of the presented potential are undeniable: for the specific structural phases considered, it is more accurate than any potential before it. Few Si-H interatomic potentials have been developed, and they are not commonly used. This is surprising, as the majority of experimental amorphous silicon structures contain at least trace amounts of atomic H. This potential will thus be able to fill an immediate role.
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