## Crossover e ects in the W olf{V illain m odel of epitaxial grow th in 1+1 and 2+1 dim ensions

Pavel Sm ilauer

Interdisciplinary Research Centre for Sem iconductor M aterials, Im perial College, London SW 7 2BZ, United K ingdom

M iroslav K otrla

Institute of Physics, Czech Academ y of Sciences, Na Slovance 2, 180 40 Praha 8, Czech Republic (January 12, 2022)

## Abstract

A simple model of epitaxial grow th proposed by W olf and V illain is investigated using extensive computer simulations. We nd an unexpectedly complex crossover behavior of the original model in both 1+1 and 2+1 dimensions. A crossover from the elective grow the exponent  $_{\rm e}$  0:37 to  $_{\rm e}$  0:33 is observed in 1+1 dimensions, whereas additional crossovers, which we believe are to the scaling behavior of an Edwards [W ilkinson type, are observed in both 1+1 and 2+1 dimensions. A nom abous scaling due to power [law grow th of the average step height is found in 1+1 D, and also at short time and length scales in 2+1 D. The roughness exponents  $_{\rm e}^{\rm C}$  obtained from the height [height correlation functions in 1+1 D (3=4) and 2+1 D (2=3) cannot be simultaneously explained by any of the continuum equations proposed so far to describe epitaxial grow th.

68.55.-a,68.35 Fx,61.50 C j64.60 Ht

Typeset using REVT<sub>E</sub>X

Simple (\toy") models of surface growth have become very popular recently, mainly as examples of externally driven non-equilibrium systems that exhibit simple (yet nontrivial) scaling behavior.<sup>1</sup> The focus is on the surface width (roughness) w de ned as  $w = h \frac{q}{h^2} - \frac{q}{h^2}$  i (the overbars denote spatial averages, hi a statistical average), i.e., the variance of the surface height prole h(r;t). The surface width scales with the time t and the linear dimension of the substrate L as w (t;L) / L f (t=L<sup>2</sup>), where the scaling function f(x) has the properties f(x) = const, x = 1 and f(x) / x ; x = 1, = =z. Thus, w grows according to a power law, w / t , until a steady state characterized by a constant value of the width is reached after a time t<sub>sat</sub> proportional to L<sup>2</sup>. The value of the saturated width w<sub>sat</sub> varies with the system size according to w<sub>sat</sub> / L. The exponents and (or and z) characterize the scaling behavior of the roughness for a particular model and determ ine its universality class in analogy with theory of critical phenomena.

A lternatively, one can study the surface roughness using the height{height correlation function G (r;t) = h[h (x + r;t) h (x;t)<sup>2</sup>]i which obeys the scaling relation<sup>1</sup> G (r;t) /  $r^2 \circ g(r=t^{1=z^\circ})$ , where the scaling function g(x) is constant for x 1 and g(x) / x<sup>2</sup>  $\circ$  for x 1 (equivalently, the structure factor S can be used, see e.g. Ref. 2). In most of grow th models the exponents obtained using the two di erent m ethods are equal.<sup>1</sup>

Scaling behavior of the surface roughness can be investigated using continuum, stochastic di erential equations which in the case of conserving models with surface di usion have the form

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

where (r;t) is a zero m ean, random noise term in the incoming ux, and the current j(r;t) is a function of the derivatives of h(r;t). In a number of recent theoretical studies,<sup>3 {11</sup> m odels in which surface di usion is the dominant physical mechanism of the surface sm oothing were studied. The scaling relation 2 = z d (where d<sup>0</sup> is the substrate dimension) holds for these m odels.<sup>4</sup> The most often studied cases were j/ r h Edwards{W ilkinson (EW ) m odel<sup>12</sup>], j/ rr<sup>2</sup>h (the linear di usion m odel<sup>3;13</sup>), and j/ r (r h)<sup>2</sup> and j/ (r h)<sup>3</sup> (the nonlinear di usion models<sup>4;6;11</sup> which we will denote I and II, respectively). The predicted values of exponents are<sup>3;4;6</sup>  $EW = (3 \ d)=4$ ,  $EW = (3 \ d)=2$ ,  $Iin = (5 \ d)=8$ ,  $Iin = (5 \ d)=2$ ,  $Iin = (5 \ d)=8$ ,  $Iin = (5 \ d)=2$ , Ii

A Itemative approach is to employ a powerful computer and study discrete models with m icroscopic rules re ecting physically in portant surface processes.<sup>15</sup> From a wide variety of discrete models we focus our attention on the one proposed by Wolfand Villain<sup>4</sup> (WV) which is based on the solid {on {solid m odel of crystal grow th<sup>16</sup> and has been designed with grow th by molecular {beam epitaxy (MBE) in mind. The growth rules of the model (see below) are supposed to m in ic surface di usion, the principal mechanism of surface sm oothing during MBE.O riginals in ulations of the model<sup>4</sup> in 1+1D yielded exponents  $_{e} = 0.365 \quad 0.015$  and  $_{\rm e}$  = 1:4 0:1 (thus  $z_{\rm e}$  = 3:8 0:5) in agreement with the theoretical prediction of the linear m odel. However, a subsequent num erical work<sup>7</sup> has shown that in 2+1 D the values of the exponents are e = 0.206 0.02 and e = 0.66 0.03 (thus z = 3.2 0.5) which correspond to the prediction of the nonlinear model I. The puzzling di erence between the behavior of the model in 1+1 and 2+1 D has been con med in another num erical study.<sup>8</sup> The possible explanation could be a slow crossover from exponent of the linear model to the exponent of the nonlinear model I observable in 1+1 D only for large system sizes and long times, sim ilar to a crossover observed in a full{di usion solid {on {solid m odel.9 To com plicate the situation even further, it has been proposed recently by K rug, P lischke, and Siegert<sup>10</sup> that the W V m odel should cross over to EW behavior for more than  $10^{\circ}$  (1+1D) or 2 10 (2+1 D) deposited layers. This result was based on the study of the inclination {dependent di usion current which is supposed to generate the EW term (r<sup>2</sup>h) in continuum di erential equations.<sup>15;17</sup> The EW term is more relevant (in the RG sense) than all allowed nonlinear term  $s^{14}$  and governs the asymptotical behavior of the model. The long time needed to observe the asymptotic regime may be explained as due to a very small coe cient in front

of the EW term. Finally, it has been found very recently that the WV model in 1+1 D does not full llstandard scaling and that di erent values of the exponents are obtained from behavior of the surface width and the correlation function or the structure factor.<sup>11</sup> The exponents obtained in 1+1 D from the behavior of the structure factor were  $_{e}^{c} = 0.75 \quad 0.05$  and  $z_{e}^{c} = 2.4 \quad 0.1$  (thus  $_{e}^{c} = 0.31$ ) very close to the nonlinear model II predictions.<sup>11</sup> The authors also suggested that this anom alous behavior is present in 2+1 D as well.

The need for better simulation data apparent from the above summary has motivated the present work. We performed large (scale simulations of the WV model in 1+1 and 2+1 D. In 1+1 D, we used system sizes as large as  $L = 40\,000$  sites and deposited up to  $2^{27}$ 10 layers whereas in 2+1 D we used lattice sizes of up to 1000 1000 depositing 1:3 up to 2<sup>17</sup> 1:3 10 layers. Our results for exponents obtained from the surface width show (i) a crossover from  $_{\rm e}$  0:37 (<sup>lin</sup>) to  $_{\rm e}$  0:33 (<sup>nonlin I</sup>) in 1+1D, (ii) crossovers <sup>non lin I</sup> to the scaling behavior which we believe is of the EW model in both from e 1+1 and 2+1 D. Exponents calculated from the correlation function are in agreem ent with those of the nonlinear model II in 1+1 D ( $_{e}^{c}$  0:75) and the nonlinear model I in 2+1 D ( ° 0:65).

The m icroscopic rules of the basic m odel are the sam e as in R ef. 4. In every time step, a particle is added at a random ly chosen lattice site and then relaxes toward a nearest {neighbor site which o ers the highest coordination (the number of nearest neighbors) where it sticks for the rest of the simulation. If the number of nearest neighbors cannot be increased, particularly in the case of tie (one or m ore neighboring sites have the sam e coordination as the original site) the particle stays at the initial position. The generalization to 2+1 D is straightforward.

In 1+1 D, we carried out simulations for lattice sizes L = 150, 300, 600, 800, 1000, 2000, and 40 000 depositing from  $2^{25}$  to  $2^{27}$  layers (except for  $L = 40\,000$  where only  $2^{23}$  layers were deposited), see Fig. 1. (Note that the curves for lattice sizes L 800 have been o set in Fig. 1 to avoid confusion due to overlapping data points; statistical errors of the data points are not larger than the symbols size.) The crossover of the exponent  $_{e}$  from the value 0:372 0:007 corresponding to the linear model ( $^{\text{lin}} = \frac{3}{8}$ ) to 0:336 0:009 in very good agreem ent with the nonlinear model I prediction ( $^{\text{nonlin I}} = \frac{1}{3}$ ) can be best observed for the largest simulated lattice, L = 40000. It is apparent from Fig. 1 that this crossover takes place after approximately  $2^{15}$  3 10 layers have been deposited. The values of w<sub>sat</sub> we have obtained (48 1;91 10, and 209 20 for L = 150;300, and 600, respectively), give  $_{e} = 1.05$  0:1, in very good agreem ent with the nonlinear model I prediction,  $_{e}^{\text{nonlin I}} = 1$ .

However, a more surprising observation can be made after close inspection of the data in Fig.1. All the curves (with the possible exception of the one for L = 40 000 where fewer layers were deposited) show another decrease in the value of the exponent  $_{\rm e}$  after the deposition of  $2^{21}$  2 10 layers. The curves for L 800 seem to follow the slope corresponding to the value  $=\frac{1}{4}$  of the EW model in 1+1 D (see Fig.1). Because the time  $t_{\rm sat}$  (L) needed for the saturation depends on the system size as  $L^z$ , we obtain  $t_{\rm sat}$  (L = 2000) >  $2^{27}$  based on our results for  $t_{\rm sat}$  for sm all lattice sizes (even if we use  $z^{\rm non lin \ II} = 5=2$ ). M oreover, the position of the crossover seem s not to depend on the lattice size. Hence we can exclude that this is the e ect of the saturation.

Sin ilar behavior is revealed by an inspection of  $2^{+} 1 \text{ D}$  results in Fig. 2. The data given for the lattice sizes L = 500 and L = 1000, correspond at rst (between  $2^{3}$  and  $2^{10}$  layers deposited) to the value of  $_{e} = 0.22$  0.05, very close to (but de nitely higher than) the nonlinear model I prediction  $\frac{1}{5}$ . A fier  $10^{4}$  layers are deposited, a crossover takes place. A gain it cannot be due to the vicinity of the saturation regime because the estimate of  $t_{sat}$ in  $2^{+} 1 \text{ D}$  for L = 500 is larger than  $2^{22}$  layers based on our previous results<sup>7</sup> and the position of the crossover does not shift with the lattice size. A logarithm ic increase of the roughness ( $^{EW} = 0$ ) is expected for the EW m odel in  $2^{+} 1 \text{ D}$ . D ouble(logarithm ic and sem ilogarithm ic plots of the last seven data points (averaged over the both curves) are shown in the inset of Fig. 2. The statistics of the data are unsu cient to draw a de nitive conclusion, but it seems that the sem ilogarithm ic plot follows a straight line whereas the log(log one is curved. Thus, we believe our data suggest that in both  $1^{+} 1$  and  $2^{+} 1 \text{ D}$  we observe crossovers to the scaling behavior of the EW m odel predicted by K rug et al.<sup>10</sup> and it should be noted that even the positions of these crossovers agree well with this prediction.

Following the paper by Schroeder et al.<sup>11</sup> we also studied the behavior of G (r;t). The time dependence of G (r;t) in 1+1 and 2+1 D is shown in Fig. 3. The exponent  $_{e}^{c} = 0.75 \quad 0.03$  we obtained in 1+1 D using the initial slope of the correlation function fort =  $2^{19}$  m onolayers and L = 40 000 (Fig. 3 (a)) di ers substantially from the value  $_{e}$  1 obtained from the surface width behavior at later times (see above) and corresponds to  $^{nonlin II} = 3=4$ . However, the value  $_{e}^{c} = 0.65 \quad 0.03$  obtained in 2+1 D (Fig. 3 (b)) for L = 500 and t =  $2^{17}$  m onolayers is de nitely di erent from 2+1 D value of  $^{nonlin II} = 1=2$  and is much closer to  $^{nonlin I} = 2=3$  which was also obtained from the surface width behavior.<sup>7</sup> The values of the exponents  $_{e}^{c}$  obtained from G (r;t) are thus to the best of our know ledge inconsistent with any sin ple m odel of epitaxial grow th proposed so far.

In agreem ent with Ref.11, we see the initial power{law increase of the average step height G (1;t) / t with = 0.38 0.01 in 1+1 D, and = 0.095 0.003 in 2+1 D, see the insets in Fig. 3. In Ref.11, it is shown how this can explain e ective exponents corresponding to the linear equation and the discrepancy between  $_{e}$  and  $_{e}^{c}$  in 1+1 D provided the nonlinear m odel II is used. Notice also that the crossover from the exponent  $_{e}$  0.375 to the value  $_{e}$  0.33 coincides with the beginning of G (1;t) saturation. In 2+1 D, if we use the values of the nonlinear m odel I and 0.095, we obtain  $_{e}$  0.84 and  $_{e}$  0.23. The value of  $_{e}$  is in agreement with the results obtained here for short times t  $2^{10}$  [see above; notice again that this is the region where we observe the power{law grow th of G (1;t)] and also the value of  $_{e}$  is not inconsistent with the initial slope of the plot w vs. L in Fig. 2 of Ref. 7. Hence, the theory of Ref. 11 agrees with our results provided we use di erent \underlying" m odels in 1+1 and 2+1 D. The anom alous behavior due to power{law grow th of G (1;t) is much weaker in 2+1 D but can be observed at short tim e and length scales.

We also tried to nd changes in the correlation function behavior that should take place following the crossovers which we suppose are to the EW behavior (see the thick lines in Fig. 3). In 1+1 D [Fig. 3 (a)], a decrease to the value of  $_{e}^{c}$  2=3 is observed for L = 2000 and  $2^{27}$  m onolayers deposited, but this is still signi cantly higher than the EW m odel value EW = 1=2. In 2+1 D [Fig. 3 (b)], the behavior of the correlation function after the crossover does not change appreciably. A probable explanation is that the range of length scales (larger than the relevant crossover length) where G (r;t) is in uenced by the EW behavior is too short to be resolved in our data. However, we have found that the structure factor calculated for L = 2000 and  $2^{27}$  m onolayers does at large wavelengths follow the slope 2 expected for the EW behavior. Statistics of these data are not su cient to provide unambiguous proof and m ore work is needed.

In conclusion, we have studied kinetic roughening in 1+1 and 2+1 dimensions of a simple m odelofepitaxial grow th proposed by W olfand V illain.<sup>4</sup> From the study of the surface width in 1+1D, we have found a crossover from the scaling behavior of a linear di erential equation proposed to describe MBE growth ( $_{\rm e}$  0:37) to that corresponding to a nonlinear model I equation ( e 0:33). A coording to Ref. 11 and our results, unusual behavior of the model in 1+1D is due to a power{law growth of the average step height, G (1;t)/t where 0:38 0:095 in 2+1 D.As a consequence, the exponent  $_{e}^{c}$  obtained in 1+1 D in 1+1 D and from the height (height correlation function di ers from the value obtained from the scaling of the surface width and does not change during the crossover. Its value in 1+1 D  $\,$  (  $_{\rm e}^{\rm c}$ 3=4) corresponds to another nonlinear model II proposed by Lai and D as Samma.<sup>6</sup> However, the value of the exponent 2=3 in 2+1 D is consistent with the nonlinear model I. One possibility of how to explain the discrepancy between the behavior in 1+1 and 2+1 D in terms of a continuum equation is to suppose that both relevant nonlinearities  $[r^{2} (r h)^{2}]$  and r  $(r h)^3$ ] are present but with di erent coe cients (and thus di erent in portance) in 1+1 and 2+1D.

In both 1+1 and 2+1 D, we see additional crossovers and our results seem to indicate these are to the scaling behavior of the EW model. The conclusion that the asymptotic behavior of the \ideal" M BE growth model is of EW type is in agreement with the recent suggestion by K rug et al<sup>10</sup>. It would be interesting to see this crossover also in other discrete models, in particular in the full{di usion model of R ef. 9 which was very successful in describing the initial stages of M BE growth. In some variants of the models with surface di usion, the nalcrossover to the EW behavior may be absent and instead the instability may develop. We expect this kind of behavior in models with barriers to interlayer transport.

We thank Professor D.W olf and Professor D.D.V vedensky for stimulating discussions and communicating their results prior to publication, and to Dr. M.W ilby for a critical reading of the rst version of the manuscript. The calculations reported here were performed on a Meiko In nity Series i860 C om puting Surface at Imperial College and on C ray Y/MP-EL at the Institute of Physics. W ork performed at Imperial College was supported by Imperial College and the Research D evelopment Corporation of Japan. The work was supported in part by grant No. 110110 of the Academ y of Sciences of C zech Republic.

## REFERENCES

A lso at: Department of Physics, The B lackett Laboratory, Imperial College, London SW 7 2BZ, United Kingdom; on leave from Institute of Physics, Cukrovamicka 10, 162 00 Praha 6, Czech Republic

- <sup>1</sup> For reviews, see, e.g., F. Fam ily, Physica A 168, 561 (1990); J. Krug and H. Spohn, in Solids Far from Equilibrium: Growth, Morphology and Defects, edited by C. Godreche, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990), p. 479; M. Kotrla, Czech. J. Phys. B 42, 449 (1992).
- <sup>2</sup> M. Plischke, Z. Racz, and D. Liu, Phys. Rev. B 35, 3485 (1987).
- <sup>3</sup> J.V illain, J.Phys. I1, 19 (1991).
- <sup>4</sup>D E.W olf and J.V illain, Europhys. Lett. 13, 389 (1990).
- <sup>5</sup>S.DasSarm a and P.Tamborenea, Phys.Rev.Lett. 66, 325 (1991).
- <sup>6</sup>Z.W.Lai, S.Das Samma, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 2348 (1991).
- <sup>7</sup>M.Kotrla, A.C.Leviand P.Sm ilauer, Europhys. Lett. 20, 25 (1992).
- <sup>8</sup> S.Das Samma and S.V.Ghaisas, Phys.Rev.Lett. 69, 3762 (1992). See also M.Plischke, J.D.Shore, M.Schroeder, M.Siegert, and D.E.Wolf, ibid. 71, 2509 (1993) and S.Das Samma and S.V.Ghaisas, ibid. 71, 2510 (1993).
- <sup>9</sup> M R.W ilby, D D.V vedensky, and A.Zangwill, Phys.Rev.B 46, 12896 (1992); (errata) ibid. 47, 16068 (1993).
- <sup>10</sup> J.K rug, M.Plischke, and M.Siegert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 3271 (1993); (errata) ibid. 71, 949 (1993).
- <sup>11</sup> M. Schroeder, M. Siegert, D. E. Wolf, J.D. Shore, and M. Plischke, Europhys. Lett. 24, 563 (1993)..

<sup>12</sup> S.F. Edwards and D.R.W ikinson, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A 381, 17 (1982).

<sup>13</sup>W W .M ullins, J.Appl. Phys. 28, 333 (1957).

<sup>14</sup>L.{H. Tang and T. Natterm an, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 2899 (1991).

- <sup>15</sup> In m any cases, it is very di cult (orm aybe in possible) to establish an explicit connection between a speci c m icroscopic m odel and a continuum di erential equation. In fact, we know about the only system atic attempt to obtain a continuum equation from the rules of a discrete m odel [D D . V vedensky, A . Zangw ill, C . Luse, and M R . W ilby, Phys. Rev. E 48, 852 (1993)] but even this m ethod em ploys several approximations. In this paper, we compare the results from simulations of the W V m odel with results from various continuum m odels proposed to describe M BE grow thas it is usual in literature but the reader should keep the above caveat in m ind.
- <sup>16</sup>G H.Gilmer and P.Bennema, J.Appl.Phys. 43, 1347 (1972); JD.W eeks and G.H. Gilmer, Adv.Chem.Phys. 40, 157 (1979).
- <sup>17</sup> The procedure described in the paper cited in Ref. 15 does not provide the EW term for the W V model (just the ordinary nonlinear equation proposed in Refs. 4,6) [D D. V vedensky (private communication)].

## FIGURES

FIG.1. Surface width vs. time for the W V model in 1+1 D (L = 150(4);300();600 ()), 800();1000();2000(); and 40000-()). Notice that data for larger lattice sizes (L 800) were o set to avoid overlapping of data points.

FIG.2. Surface width vs. time for the W V model in 2+1 D (L = 500(4) and 1000()). Data for L = 1000 were o set to avoid overlapping of data points. The inset shows the last seven data points for L = 1000 in sem ilogarithm ic () and double logarithm ic () scales (see text).

FIG. 3. (a) The height {height correlation function G (r;t) in 1+1D for L = 40000 and the times  $t = 2^{1}(); 2^{2}(); 2^{0}(); 2^{13} \square), 2^{16}(); 2^{9}(4); 2^{22}(+);$  and for L = 2000 and t =  $2^{27}$  (-); (b) The height {height correlation function G (r;t) in 2+1D for L = 500 and the times  $t = 2^{2}(); 2^{2}(); 2^{3}(4); 2^{10}(); 2^{2}(); 2^{4}(), and 2^{7}$  (-). The insets show the power{law increase of G (1;t).