

Step Repulsion Mediates Wandering on a Si(001) Vicinal Face

Masahide Sato^{1,*}, Makio Uwaha², Yukio Saito³, and Yukio Hirose¹

¹*Department of Computational Science, Kanazawa University, Kakuma-cho, Kanazawa 920-1192, Japan*

²*Department of Physics, Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya 464-8602, Japan*

³*Department of Physics, Keio University, 3-14-1 Hiyoshi, Kohoku-ku, Yokohama 223-8522, Japan*

(Dated: March 22, 2022)

With a Si(001) vicinal surface in mind, we study step wandering instability on a vicinal surface with an anisotropic surface diffusion whose orientation dependence alternates on each consecutive terrace. In a conserved system step wandering takes place with step-up adatom drift. Repulsive interaction between steps is found indispensable for the instability. Monte Carlo simulation with a strong repulsive step interaction confirms the result of linear stability analysis, and further shows that in-phase step wandering produces straight grooves. Grooves widen as their amplitudes increase in proportion to the square root of time.

PACS numbers: 81.10.Aj, 05.70.Ln, 47.20.Hw, 68.35.Fx

On a vicinal surface of a crystal, steps undergo two types of dynamical instabilities: wandering and bunching. Step wandering is the instability for step deformation along the step, and step bunching is the one for the inter-step distance¹. Both instabilities are caused by some asymmetry in the surface diffusion field. There are many effects which cause the asymmetry, and the drift flow of adsorbed atoms (adatoms) is one of them. On Si(111) and Si(001) vicinal faces, a direct electric current induces drift of adatoms and the instabilities have been observed under its application².

Si(001) surface is reconstructed and forms rows of dimerized atoms arranged in a 2×1 unit cell (Figure 1). On the reconstructed surface, the adatom surface diffusion is anisotropic such that it takes place more easily in parallel to the dimer rows than in perpendicular. On a vicinal face terraces of different heights are bounded by steps. On consecutive terraces the dimer orientation alternates, and we call the 1×2 terrace T_A and the 2×1 terrace T_B .

Due to the alternation of the orientation of fast surface diffusion on different terraces, conditions of the step instabilities for a Si(001) vicinal face differ from those for a Si(111) vicinal face. Experimentally, bunching is observed on a (001) vicinal face with a finite current irrespective of its direction^{3,4,5}, and the step wandering with the step-up current⁶. Since the drift is believed to be parallel to the current⁷, the drift direction to cause the step wandering is opposite to that on a Si(111) vicinal face.

Theoretically, step bunching on a Si(001) vicinal face is studied by a one-dimensional step flow model^{8,9,10} and by Monte Carlo simulations¹¹. When the alternation of anisotropic surface diffusion is taken into account, the step bunching instability is found irrespective of the drift direction, in agreement with the experiments^{3,4,5}. On the contrary, there is no theoretical study on the step wandering on a Si(001) vicinal face so far, which we undertake in this paper.

Atoms detached from steps migrate on terraces and attach to some steps. For the wandering instability, the

adatom drift is necessary as well as the diffusive motion. Evaporation and impingement are omitted. Steps are running parallel to the x -direction on average, and the positive y -direction is chosen in the step-down direction. The drift is assumed in the y -direction. With the anisotropy of the diffusion coefficient, the diffusion equation of adatom density $c(x, y, t)$ is expressed as

$$\partial_t c = D_x \partial_x^2 c + D_y \partial_y^2 c - f D_y \partial_y c, \quad (1)$$

where ∂_t , ∂_x and ∂_y represent the partial derivatives with respect to the subscripts, D_x is the diffusion coefficient in the x -direction, D_y in the y -direction, and $f (= F/k_B T)$ the force to induce the drift divided by the temperature. The meaning of D_x and D_y depends on which terrace we are discussing, on T_A or T_B , and we come to this point later. For simplicity, we assume that the step kinetics is fast enough that the adatom density attains its local equilibrium value at each step: $c|_{\pm} = c_{eq}^0 [1 + \Omega(\tilde{\beta}\kappa + \partial_y \zeta)/k_B T]$. Here $+$ ($-$) indicates the lower (upper) side of the step, c_{eq}^0 is the equilibrium adatom density of a free straight step, Ω is the atomic area, $\tilde{\beta}$ the step stiffness, κ the curvature of the step, and ζ the step-step interaction potential. We assume that ζ is a function of the step distance l in the y -direction as $\zeta = A(l_+^{-2} + l_-^{-2})$ with a positive constant A , corresponding to step repulsion. There is a more detailed model where ζ is expressed by an integration of the force dipole along the step¹². But in the linear analysis the complication is shown to be incorporated into the renormalization of the stiffness. Therefore, we use the simple form for ζ here.

By solving eq. (1) with the boundary conditions in the quasi-static approximation ($\partial_t c = 0$), the adatom density c and then the adatom current \mathbf{j} are determined. The step velocity is given by $V = \Omega \hat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot (\mathbf{j}|_- - \mathbf{j}|_+)$, where $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ is the normal vector in the step-down direction.

Due to the different orientation of the dimer rows on T_A and T_B , a set of diffusion coefficients (D_x, D_y) corresponds different combinations; (D_x, D_y) = (D_{\parallel}, D_{\perp}) on T_A and (D_x, D_y) = (D_{\perp}, D_{\parallel}) on T_B , and D_{\perp} is larger than D_{\parallel} . Since the step S_B is rougher than S_A on a

Si(001) vicinal face, step parameters are different in general for the two types of steps, S_A and S_B , but for simplicity, we neglect these differences.




FIG. 1: A Si(001) vicinal face. Short lines on terraces represent dimers.

On a flat vicinal face where parallel steps are arranged equidistantly, the adatom concentration is homogeneous as c_{eq}^0 . The step velocities V_A and V_B of the steps S_A and S_B are calculated as $V_A = -V_B = -\Omega f(D_{\perp} - D_{\parallel})c_{eq}^0$. Since the step velocities V_A and V_B are nonvanishing and opposite for a finite drift ($F \neq 0$), the flat vicinal face is unstable against step pairing. Without the repulsive step-step interaction, the adatom concentration is homogeneous as c_{eq}^0 irrespective of the step distance. The steps move with the velocities V_A and V_B given above, and by coalescence the surface is covered by one type of terrace; for instance, T_A for positive F since $D_{\perp} > D_{\parallel}$.

If the repulsive interaction is granted, the difference of terrace widths l_A and l_B of terraces T_A and T_B causes the difference of the equilibrium adatom densities c_A and c_B at steps S_A and S_B . Then the steady state with vanishing step velocities can be established even with the drift as

$$\frac{D_{\perp}(c_A e^{fl_A} - c_B)}{e^{fl_A} - 1} = \frac{D_{\parallel}(c_B e^{fl_B} - c_A)}{e^{fl_B} - 1}. \quad (2)$$

Since the average terrace width of the vicinal face is fixed to l , wide and narrow terraces appear alternately as $l_A = l + \delta l/2$ and $l_B = l - \delta l/2$, and the equilibrium densities also alternate as $c_A = c_{eq}^0 - \Delta c/2$ and $c_B = c_{eq}^0 + \Delta c/2$, respectively. For a small drift fl and the strong repulsive interaction, the density difference $\Delta c = c_B - c_A$ is approximated by $\Delta c/c_{eq}^0 \approx \sigma fl$ with $\sigma = (D_{\perp} - D_{\parallel})/(D_{\perp} + D_{\parallel})$, and the terrace width difference is $\delta l/l \approx k_B T \sigma fl^2 / 12 \Omega A$. Without repulsive interaction $A = 0$, the terrace width cannot remain finite. Also the above equation indicates that the deviation of the terrace width $\delta l/l$ is small under a very strong step repulsion.

We now study the stability of this steady state with alternating terrace widths under the adatom drift. When the step repulsion is strong enough, the perturbations to step positions $\delta y_A(x, t)$ and $\delta y_B(x, t)$ of a wavenumber q can be shown to merge into the in-phase fluctuation of the same amplitude $\delta y_A(x, t) = \delta y_B(x, t) = \delta y_q e^{\omega_q t} e^{iqx}$. With this deformation the terrace widths in the y direction remain l_A and l_B as before. For small q , the

amplification rate is calculated to be

$$\omega_q = \alpha_2 q^2 - \alpha_4 q^4, \quad (3)$$

where $\alpha_2 = -\Omega(D_{\perp} - D_{\parallel})\Delta c/2$ and $\alpha_4 = \Omega^2 c_{eq}^0 (D_{\parallel} l_A + D_{\perp} l_B) \tilde{\beta} / 2 k_B T$. Here we have assumed that the terrace widths are small as $ql_{A,B} \ll 1$.

When the drift is in the step-down direction ($F > 0$), l_A is larger than l_B , and c_B is larger than c_A . Then the quadratic term in q is negative and the steady state is stable. When the drift is in the step-up direction ($F < 0$), c_A is larger than c_B , and the quadratic term is positive. Then the steady state with straight steps is unstable and in-phase step wandering occurs. Thus the first term indicates an instability of the steady state by changing its sign with the drift direction. Note that the wandering is caused by the difference Δc of equilibrium concentrations at the steps originated from the step repulsion. Thus the step repulsion is indispensable for the establishment of wandering instability on a Si(001) vicinal. Also note that there is no critical value for the step-up drift. If the drift changes from step-down to step-up, steps immediately shows the wandering instability, because the Gibbs-Thomson effect gives only a quartic term, higher than the destabilizing quadratic term.

For a strong repulsive interaction, the difference of the step distance δl is small and the wavelength of the most unstable mode is given by $\lambda_{\max} = 2\pi \sqrt{2\alpha_4/\alpha_2} = 2\pi \sigma^{-1} \sqrt{2\Omega \tilde{\beta}/|F|}$. The characteristic wavelength is inversely proportional to the square root of the external field E which causes the drift: $\lambda_{\max} \propto 1/\sqrt{E}$.

After the instability sets in, the step deformation amplifies, and a nonlinear analysis is wanted. Assuming an in-phase motion of steps due to the strong step repulsion, a heuristic argument is possible on the nonlinear evolution of the step wandering $\delta y(x, t) = \eta(x, t)$. This simultaneously reveals the physical origin of the wandering. Since the number of atoms is conserved, the in-phase step motion is controlled by the adatom current in the x direction. The drift current has only the y component so that only the diffusion current determines the evolution of step fluctuation.

There are two contributions of diffusion current. One is the current across the terrace induced by the difference of the equilibrium densities at both ends of the terrace. When two bounding steps are tilted from the y direction with an angle $\theta = \tan^{-1}(\partial_x \eta)$, the gradient of the adatom density in a terrace T_A is $\nabla c_A = (\Delta c/l_A \cos \theta)(-\sin \theta, \cos \theta)$. The diffusion current is obtained as $\mathbf{j}^A = (D_{\parallel} \Delta c \tan \theta / l_A, -D_{\perp} \Delta c / l_A)$, and the x component of the total flux on T_A is $J_x^A = j_x^A l_A = D_{\parallel} \Delta c \tan \theta$ (one obtains the same result by solving (1)). Similarly the x component of the flux on T_B is $J_x^B = -D_{\perp} \Delta c \tan \theta$, and the average flux per step is $J_x^{(1)} = (J_x^A + J_x^B)/2 = -(D_{\perp} - D_{\parallel}) \Delta c \partial_x \eta / 2$. A steady state condition similar to eq. (2) with tilted steps gives the difference of the equilibrium adatom density as $\Delta c = \sigma fl c_{eq}^0 \cos^2 \theta$, and the extra factor $\cos^2 \theta$ appears.




FIG. 2: Snapshots of the step wandering (a) with step-down drift at $t \approx 5.0 \times 10^5$, (b) with step-up drift at $t \approx 2.5 \times 10^5$, and (c) with step-up drift at $t \approx 12.4 \times 10^5$. The number of steps is 32 and the system size is 256×256 .

When $\Delta c < 0$ (*i.e.* $F < 0$), the flux is an increasing function of the slope and an instability is expected.

The other is the diffusion current along the steps due to the chemical potential change with curvature. Considering that the normal distance between steps for a tilted part is $l_{A,B} \cos \theta$, the flux (per step) passing through the two terraces induced by the chemical potential gradient is $J_x^{(2)} = -(l_A \cos \theta D_{\parallel} + l_B \cos \theta D_{\perp}) c_{\text{eq}}^0 \cos \theta \partial_x \mu / 2k_B T$. The chemical potential μ is determined solely by the Gibbs-Thomson effect $\Omega \tilde{\beta} \kappa$ and independent of the step repulsion in the present choice of interaction ζ , since the terrace width in the y direction is constant for the in-phase modulation. More general expression given by Paulin and co-workers¹² might modify the following result quantitatively but not qualitatively.

With two contributions together, mass conservation leads to the following nonlinear time evolution of the in-phase step deformation $\eta(x, t)$;

$$\partial_t \eta = -\partial_x \left[g^{-1} \left(\alpha_2 \partial_x \eta + \alpha_4 \partial_x \left(g^{-3/2} \partial_x^2 \eta \right) \right) \right], \quad (4)$$

where $g = 1 + (\partial_x \eta)^2 = \sec^2 \theta$. α_2 and α_4 are those in eq. (3). With $\eta = \delta y_q e^{iqx + \omega t}$ the linear amplification rate ω_q is recovered from eq.(4). Interestingly eq.(4) is the same as the nonlinear equation obtained for other conserved systems^{12,13,14,15,16} although the mechanism looks very different.

The above theoretical analysis is now compared with the results of Monte Carlo simulations. For the simulation algorithm, consult Refs.11,17,18. We study steps with an average distance $l = 8$ on a square lattice system of size 256×256 or 512×128 . Length hereafter is measured in the unit of lattice constant a , and time in the unit of a^2/D_{\perp} . The parameters are so chosen as the equilibrium adatom density $c_{\text{eq}}^0 = 0.18$, the step stiffness $\tilde{\beta}/k_B T = 0.13$, $D_{\parallel} = 0.5$ and $D_{\perp} = 1.0$. There is no extra energy barrier for the over-step diffusion. Kinetic coefficient is large enough so that the local equilibrium condition is valid. The strength of repulsive potential

$A/k_B T = 46$ is large enough to suppress step bunching in the following simulations.

In Figure 2 we show snapshots of the step wandering under various drift forces; $f = 0.1$ for Fig. 2(a) and -0.1 for Fig. 2(b) and (c). Solid lines represent the step S_A and dotted lines represent the step S_B . We start the simulation with an equidistant train of straight steps. With step-down drift in Fig. 2(a) (upward drift in the figure), steps remain straight. With step-up drift in Fig. 2(b) and (c) step wandering occurs, in agreement with the linear stability analysis. Because the wandering is in phase, grooves appear parallel to the y -axis.

Since $|fl| = 0.8$ is not very small, we have to use a general formula for the wavelength of the most unstable mode, and it is obtained as $\lambda_{\text{max}} \approx 77$, in good agreement with the result $\lambda \approx 64$ in Fig. 2 (b). There, the wandering amplitude (the average step fluctuation width) is $w \approx 14.5$. In a late stage shown in Figure 2(c) the amplitude increases up to $w \approx 37.2$ when the wavelength of the grooves is about 85. Thus, the structure coarsens parallel as well as perpendicular to the steps.

Recently, Paulin and co-workers¹² studied the step wandering induced by the Ehrlich-Schwoebel effect in a conserved system. They found perpetual enhancement of the wandering amplitude as $w \sim t^{\beta}$ with $\beta \sim 1/2$, irrespective of the step repulsion, but the coarsening of the wavelength of grooves took place only with a step repulsion. Although we take account of the long-ranged step repulsion only in the y -direction but not in the x -direction as Paulin et al. did, the entropic repulsion may have caused an effective repulsion in the x -direction and eventually the coarsening in our case, too.

In Figure 3 open circles represent the time evolution of the wandering amplitude w for $f = -0.1$. The result is obtained by averaging over 10 runs of the size 512×128 with 16 steps. In an early stage ($t \leq 2 \times 10^5$), the step width increases rapidly. Then, the width enhancement slows down to $w \approx t^{1/2}$. The exponent is the same with the values obtained for the step wandering in other con-




FIG. 3: Time evolution of the step width (\circ), $w \sim t^{1/2}$, and the groove wavelength (\square), $\lambda \sim t^{1/6}$.

served systems^{12,13,14,15,16}. The slowing down of the fluctuation amplification is attributed to the suppression of the diffusion current due to the narrowing of the terrace width¹². The groove wavelength λ is obtained by counting the number of grooves for 10 samples, and is depicted by open squares in Fig. 3. The slow increase as $\lambda \sim t^\alpha$ with $\alpha = 0.17 \pm 0.04$ is consistent with the one found with the use of a generalized version of eq.(4)¹².

In this paper, we studied the drift-induced step wandering on a vicinal face with an anisotropic surface diffusion whose orientation dependence alternates on consecutive terraces. The step-step interaction is shown to play an essential role for the step wandering, since it not

only prevents steps from coalescing but also creates the difference Δc of the equilibrium adatom density. The imbalance of the diffusion current between different steps induced by Δc causes the step wandering. Thus the step repulsion mediates steps to establish the asymmetry in the diffusion field. Due to this asymmetry, the step wandering occurs with step-up drift. The in-phase wandering leads to the formation of straight grooves on a vicinal face, in accordance with other conserved systems^{12,13,14,15,16}.

Recently, in an experiment by Nielsen and coworkers⁶ a dimpled specimen was used and the step wandering on Si(001) vicinal face was observed with the application of a direct electric current. Near the bottom of the dimple, where the inclination is very small, the step bunching occurs irrespective of the current direction¹⁹. Fluctuation of bunches with the step-up current is larger than that with the step-down current. On increasing the inclination, which means increasing the repulsive interaction, the in-phase step wandering occurs and straight grooves parallel to the current appear with the step-up current. The step wandering was observed in a range of inclination angle between 0.08° and 0.5° . In Si(001) vicinal face, the direction of the drift of adatoms is believed to be the same as that of the electric current⁷, and our results of step wandering under a step-up drift qualitatively agree with the experiment⁶.

This work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from Japan Society of the Promotion of Science. M.U. and Y.S. benefited from the inter-university cooperative research program of the Institute for Materials Research, Tohoku University.

* Electronic address: sato@cs.s.kanazawa-u.ac.jp

- ¹ M. Sato and M. Uwaha, Surf. Rev. Lett. **5**, 841 (1998); M. Uwaha in *Fundamentals and Applications of Crystal Growth Research and Technology* ed. K. Sato, K. Nakajima and Y. Furukawa (Elsevier, 2001), pp.78-99.
- ² K. Yagi, H. Minoda and M. Degawa, Surf. Sci. Rep. **43**, 45 (2001).
- ³ H. Kahata, and K. Yagi, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. **28**, L858 (1989).
- ⁴ L. V. Litvin, A. B. Krasilnikov, and A. V. Latyshev, Surf. Sci. Lett. **244**, L121 (1991).
- ⁵ A. V. Latyshev, L. V. Litvin, and A. L. Aseev, Appl. Surf. Sci. **130/132** 139 (1998).
- ⁶ J.-F. Nielsen, M. S. Pettersen, and J. P. Pelz, Surf. Sci. **480**, 84 (2001).
- ⁷ J.-J. Métois, J.-C. Heyraud, A. Pimpinelli, Surf. Sci. **420**, 250 (1999).
- ⁸ S. Stoyanov, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. **29**, L659 (1990).
- ⁹ A. Natori, H. Fujimura, and H. Yasunaga, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. **92**, 1164 (1992).
- ¹⁰ A. Natori, H. Fujimura, and M. Fukuda, Appl. Surf. Sci.

60/61, 85 (1992).

- ¹¹ M. Sato, M. Uwaha, and Y. Saito, J. Cryst. Growth **237-239**, 43 (2002).
- ¹² S. Paulin, F. Gillet, O. Pierre-Louis, and M. Misbah, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5538 (2001).
- ¹³ M. Sato, M. Uwaha, Y. Saito, and Y. Hirose, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 245427 (2002).
- ¹⁴ O. Pierre-Louis, C. Misbah, Y. Saito, J. Krug, and P. Politi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4221 (1998).
- ¹⁵ F. Gillet, O. Pierre-Louis, and C. Misbah, Eur. Phys. J. B **18**, 519 (2000).
- ¹⁶ R. Kato, M. Uwaha, Y. Saito, Surf. Sci. to be published.
- ¹⁷ M. Sato, M. Uwaha, and Y. Saito, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 8452 (2000).
- ¹⁸ Y. Saito and M. Uwaha, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 10677 (1994).
- ¹⁹ In Ref.⁶ this phenomenon is used to determine the drift direction on anisotropic surfaces. However, we demonstrated in a Monte Carlo simulation that the bunching occurs irrespective of the current direction¹¹.