Sim ulations of deposition grow th m odels in various dim ensions. A re overhangs im portant?

David Y.K.Ko and Flavio Seno

Department of Physics, University of Oxford, 1 Keble Road, Oxford, OX1 3NP, U.K.

W e present simulation results of deposition grow th of surfaces in 2, 3 and 4 dimensions for ballistic deposition where overhangs are present, and for restricted solid on solid deposition where there are no overhangs. The values of the scaling exponents for the two models are found to be di erent, suggesting that they belong to di erent universality classes.

PACS num bers: 68.55 Jk,05.70 Ln,61.50 C jC d,64.60 Ht

The deposition growth of surfaces [1] has been a subject of long continual theoretical and experimental interest [2] due to its relevance to non-equilibrium processes in general as well as its possible role in surface technology. The profession le of the deposited surface gradually roughens under the stochastic accumulation of particles, and early simulations by Family et. al. [3] suggested that the surface roughness exhibits a dynamical scaling behaviour. That is, the height-height correlation function, G (r r_{i}^{0} ;t) = h[h(r;t) h(r_{i}^{0} ;t)]^{2}i^{\frac{1}{2}}, scales with time, t, and separation, $i = jr r_{i}^{0}j$ as

h (r;t) is the height of the surface at position r and at time t. The dynam ical scaling behaviour is characterised by the roughness exponent, , and the dynam ical exponent, , with z = =. The scaling function f (x) behaves as f (x) = x for x 1 and f (x) = constant for x 1. Thus, the surface roughness grows as G (t) t initially, independent of size, and for a given size, `, the roughness saturates after a su ciently long time such that G (`) scales with `only as G (`)`.

Numerous sinulations in a variety of growth models [4,5,6,7] have since con med the hypothesis of dynam – ical scaling, including models which allow overhangs to form and models where overhangs are not allowed. An overhang is formed when a particle sticks at a position higher than the height of the surface at that point, such the space below the particle is not lled. Simulations of the restricted solid on solid model [10,11] where incom – ing particles fall directly onto the surface such that no overhangs can form, and may only stick at a site if the resulting nearest neighbour height di erences are less than som e predeterm ined value, have led to a further consensus that the values of the scaling corresponds to that of the K ardar-Parisi-Zhang equation [12],

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = r^2 h + \frac{1}{2} (r h)^2 + ;$$

where is a random variable. This equation is believed to be a continuum description of deposition growth, and was derived by assuming that the surface grow suniform ly in the direction of the local norm al. The exponents obtained are exact in 2 dimensions [12], and numerically determined in higher dimensions [8,9].

Results from simulations of the ballistic deposition model [13] where incoming particles stick at the rst point of contact and thus allow overhangs are more controversial. At present there is no clear consensus as to whether or not this system belongs to the same universality class as that described by the K ardar-P arisi-Z hang equation [14], or whether the presence of overhangs leads to a di erent set of scaling exponents. Early results by Meakin et. al. gave = 0:47 and = 0:331 in 2 dim ensions, and = 0.33 and = 0.24 in 3 dim ensions, in agreem ent with K im and K osterlitz's approximate formula [5] of = 2=(d + 2) and = 1=(d + 1) for the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation. More recent results suggest that the values of the scaling exponents m ay, in fact, be di erent. Baiod et. al. [15] obtained = 1=3 in 2 dimensions and = 0:3 and = 0.22 in 3 dimensions; o -lattice simulations have also given = 0:343 in 2 dimensions [16], but a clear scaling behaviour was not observed in 3 dim ensions [17].

In this Letter, we report results of simulations of ballistic deposition and restricted solid on solid growth. We

nd that the values of the scaling exponents for the ballistic deposition model are di erent to those of the restricted solid on solid model. A sum mary of our results is given in Table 1.

TABLE 1. Scaling exponents obtained from our sinulations.

	Ballistic			R estricted		
dim ension	deposition			solid on solid		
d			Z			Z
2	0.45	0.32	1.40	0.50	0.33	1.50
3	0.26	0.21	1.24	0.40	0.25	1.60
4	0.12			0.29	0.18	1.61

FIG.1. Ballistic deposition for 2 dimensions. The inset shows the plot of $\ln G$ (';t) versus \log_2 ' at the end of the simulation.

We also nd that while on-lattice simulations give excellent scaling behaviour for the restricted solid on solid m odel, the sam e is not true for ballistic deposition. Quasi o -lattice simulations were therefore carried out for the ballistic deposition m odel. N am ely, each axis of a surface of size L^{d 1} particle diam eters is divided into nL points such that incom ing particles can be centred on any one of these points. For n large, the surface approaches a continuum, and for n = 1, we recover the on-lattice m odel. The height of the surface at a position r is de ned to be the height of a new particle if it fell onto the surface at r. W e found that n = 3 is su cient to give a good scaling behaviour, and no di erences were found in the results with n = 5, 7 and 10. We perform ed simulations in 2, 3 and 4 dim ensions for both m odels and the sim ulations are run until the equivalent of at least 2000 layers of atom s have been deposited. The total num ber of particles deposited in each simulation is over 2 10°. The m in im um time required for each run is twenty-four CPU hours on a DEC A lpha 400 workstation. To obtain good statistics, averages over m any runs were often needed.

In gure 1, the correlation function, G (';t), for a 2 dimensional ballistic deposition simulation is plotted versus time in a log-log plot. The largest system size considered is ' = 2^{20} . For the larger values of ', the roughness has not saturated within the time scale of the simulation. In the dynamical scaling region, we see a clear power law behaviour, G (t) t. A los shown in the inset is a plot of lnG (';t) versus log₂ ' for the data at the end of our sim – ulation. For the smaller sizes where saturation has been reached, we also not a roughly linear dependence of lnG on log₂ ' in agreement with the predictions of dynam ical scaling.

D irect extrapolation of the scaling exponents from the gradients in the log-log plots turned out to be di cult because cross-over e ects due to the transition from the dynam ical scaling regim e to the saturated scaling regim e

introduce signi cant corrections. Instead, by rewriting equation (1) as

 $\ln G(';t) \quad \ln t = F(\ln' \ln t);$ (2)

we can obtained good estim ates of the dynam ical and roughness exponents by collapsing our data for all sizes and all tim es considered. This, in fact, provides a way of checking also whether the data corresponds to just one scaling regim e, or whether there is also a cross-over between di erent universality classes with di erent scaling exponents. We note that the surface roughness during the initial few time steps is strongly in uenced by transient e ects, and have been discarded in the data collapse.

The collapsed data for the 2 dimensional ballistic deposition result is shown in gure 2. Data for `ranging from 2^2 to 2^{19} are used in the plot, with over $6 10^9$ particles deposited. The values of the exponents used are = 0.45 and = 0.32. We have also carried out simulations of the restricted solid on solid model in 2 dimensions, and found that = 0.50 and = 0.33, in agreement with the results of previous simulations.

FIG.2. Collapsed data for 2 dimensional ballistic deposition simulation, with = 0.45 and = 0.32. The data used ranges from $\prime = 2^2$ to 2^{19} . The inset show the collapse obtained with the exponents obtained for the restricted solid on solid model.

The collapsed data for the 3 dimensional simulations are shown in gure 3. The upper diagram is for the restricted solid on solid model. The size of the system considered is 2^{10} 2^{0} , and over 2 10° particles were deposited in a nun. The data presented represents the average over seven independent nuns, and include values for 'ranging from 2^{2} to 2^{9} . The values of the scaling exponents obtained in this case are = 0.40 and = 0.25. This is in agreement with the approximate form ula of K im and K osterlitz [5], but the value of obtained is greater by 0.01 than that observed more recently by A la-N issila et. al. [11]. Ballistic deposition simulations in 3 dimensions are also carried out for system s with size equal to 2^{10} 2^{0} particle diameters, with three subdivisions per particle diameter. The collapsed data are shown in the lower diagram of gure 3. Again, over 2 1° particles were deposited per nun, and the results presented represent the average over ten nuns with data for $r = 2^{2}$ to 2^{9} used in the data collapse. The simulations were also carried out with seven subdivisions per particle diameter and no di erence was found. The value of the scaling exponents in this case are = 0.26 and = 0.21, signi cantly lower than the corresponding values for the restricted solid on solid m odel. the roughness exponent in 4 dimensions, however, give a value of 0:12. The uncertainty in this case is due to strong uctuations in the roughness as a result of the sm all system size, and the number of runs required to obtain better statistics is prohibitively large. For the restricted solid on solid model, the uctuations are sm aller even in 4 dimensions and we have been able to obtain reliable values for both the dynam ical and the roughness exponents. These are = 0.29 and = 0.18, in good agreem ent with those obtained by A la-N issila et. al. [11]. A gain, in accordance with the trend observed in low er dimensions, the exponent of the ballistic deposition model is low er than that of the restricted solid on solid model.

FIG.3. Collapsed data for the 3 dimensional restricted solid on solid simulation (upper diagram), and the ballistic deposition simulation (lower diagram) for $' = 2^2$ to 2^9 . The inset in the lower diagram shows the collapse obtained if the exponents obtained from the restricted solid on solid model were used instead.

We have also carried out simulations in higher dimensions for both models. However, due to computational di culties, we are restricted to relatively small sizes. For the ballistic deposition model the largest size possible in 4 dimensions or higher is still too small for the dynamical scaling regime to be observed. Estimates of FIG.4. A cross-section of ballistic deposition growth in 3 dim ensions taken at a height of 200 particle diam eters. The length of the horizontal and vertical axis correspond to 100 particle diam eters.

W e have found that variations in the value of either or by as little as 0:01 is su cient to give clear deterioration of the data collapse plots. The values we present are therefore accurate to the gures quoted. The most important implication of this is that from our results, the dynam ical scaling behaviour of the ballistic deposition model and the restricted solid on solid model belong to di erent universality classes. W e have shown in the inset to gures 2 and 3 what happens when we try to collapse the ballistic deposition data with the exponents obtained from the corresponding restricted solid on solid simulations. It is clear from the diagram s that even in 2 dimensions where the di erences between the values of the scaling exponents for the ballistic deposition m odeland those of the restricted solid on solid m odelare apparently sm all, a satisfactory data collapse cannot be obtained. In view of the belief that the dynam ics of the restricted solid on solid model corresponds to that of the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation, our results would therefore further suggest that the K ardar-P arisi-Zhang is not appropriate in describing deposition growth in situations where overhangs are dom inant. Indeed, our values of the scaling exponents for the ballistic deposition m odel in 2,

3 and in 4 dimensions lie outside the range of the values for the K ardar-P arisi-Zhang exponents [12,8,9].

FIG.5. The fraction x of sites occupied along a substrate dimension versus the substrate dimension.

W e have also tried to exam ine the structure of the solid form ed by growth under ballistic deposition conditions. Figure 4 show a cross-section of the bulk form ed in a 3 dim ensional ballistic deposition simulations. The crosssection corresponds to a height of 200 particle diam eters from the substrate, and is taken after all the particles at this height are covered. The cross section shown corresponds to an area of 100 100 particle diam eters. W e

nd that there are very few connected lines, and no connected rings in the cross section. In addition, we have calculated the fraction of sites, x, which are occupied in a linear direction from the average density, . For a d_s dimensional surface, the density is given by $= x^{d_s}$. In

gure 5 a plot of x versus substrate dimension is shown. The results indicate that of order 0.4 of the sites along a line on the surface are occupied in all dimensions. This, together with the cross section plot, corroborates with the idea that particles grow on the edges of overhangs, and almost immediately branch o to form a complex tree like structure.

In sum m ary, we have found that the presence of overhangs is an important factor in determining the scaling properties of deposition growth. In a model such as ballistic deposition, overhangs will form when the local surface gradient exceeds a critical value corresponding to the presence of a sharp step in the surface pro le. In such a situation, the next particle will stick to increase the lateral size of the overhang region rather than to reduce the surface gradient by falling to the lower surface. Thus, as overhangs begin to form, they will tend to increase the lateral correlation at a fast rate, and the surface will no longer grow in the direction of its local gradient. The result m ay be an anisotropic growth which when coarse grained lead to broader and atter structures. A lthough such a picture can give a behaviour consistent with the results of our simulations, the search for a proper theory for deposition growth in the presence of overhangs remain an important challenge.

W e thank H. Aoki, B K. Chakrabarti, R A. Cow Ley, K. Inata, A. Maritan, A L. Stella for useful discussions. F S. acknow Ledges the European Community for a postdoctoral fellow ship under the Human Capital and M obility Programme. This was was carried out under grant G R/G 02727 of the Science and Engineering Research Council of the United Kingdom.

- [L] D ynam ics of Fractal Surfaces, edited by F.Fam ily and T. Vicsek, W orld Scienti c, Singapore (1991); C.G odreche (ed), Solids far from equilibrium, proceedings of the Beg-Rohu Sum m er School (1989), C am bridge University Press, C am bridge (1991).
- [2] See for example: J. Chevrier, V. le Thanh, R. Buys and J. Darrien, Europhys. Lett. 16, 732 (1991); Y L. He, H N. Yang, T M. Lu and G C. W ang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 3770 (1992); M A. Cotta, R A. Hamm, T W. Statley, S N G. Chu, L R. Harriot, M B. Panish and H. Tem kin, Phys. Rev. Lett 70, 4106 (1993).
- [3] F.Fam ily and T.Vicsek, J.Phys.A 18, L75 (1985).
- [4] P.M eakin, P.Ram an lal, L.M. Sander and R C. Ball, Phys. Rev A 34, 5091 (1986).
- [5] JM.K im and JM.Kosterlitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 2289 (1989)
- [6] F.Fam ily, Physica A 168, 561 (1990).
- [7] C.Tang and S.Liang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 2769 (1993).
- [8] J.G.Amarand F.Family, Phys.Rev.A41, 3399 (1990).
- [9] K. Moser, J. Kertesz and D E. Wolf, Physica A 178, 215 (1991).
- [10] B M . Forrest and L H . Tang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 1405 (1990).
- [11] T. Ala{Nissila, T. Hjelt, JM. Kosterlitz and O. Venalainen, J. Stat. Phys. 72, 207 (1993).
- [12] M.Kardar, G.Parisiand Y C.Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 889 (1986).
- [13] M.J. Vold, J. Colloid. Interface Sci. 14, 168 (1959) and
 M.J. Vold, J. Chem. Phys. 63, 1608 (1960).
- [14] A. Maritan, F. Toigo, J. Koplik and J.R. Banavar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 3193 (1992).
- [15] R.Baiod, D.Kessler, P.Rammanal, L.Sanderand and R. Savit, Phys. Rev. A 38, 3672 (1988).
- [16] P.M eakin and R.Jullien, J. Physique 48, 1651 (1987).
- [17] R. Jullien and P. Meakin, Europhys. Lett. 4, 1385 (1987).