# C rossover e ects in the $W$ olff $V$ illain m odel of epitaxial grow th in $1+1$ and $2+1$ dim ensions 

Pavel Sm ilauent
Interdisciplinary Research C entre for Sem ioonductor M aterials, Im perial C ollege, London SW 7 2BZ, U nited $K$ ingdom

M iroslav K otrla
Institute of P hysics, C zech A cadem Y of Sciences, N a Slovance 2, 18040 P raha 8, C zech Republic (January 12, 2022)


#### Abstract

A sim plem odel ofepitaxial grow th proposed by $W$ olf and $V$ illain is investigated using extensive com puter sim ulations. W e nd an unexpectedly com plex crossover behavior of the originalm odelin both $1+1$ and $2+1$ dim ensions. A crossover from the ective grow th exponent e $0: 37$ to e $0: 33$ is observed in 1+1 dim ensions, w hereas additional crossovers, which we believe are to the scaling behavior of an Edw ards\{W ilkinson type, are observed in both 1+ 1 and 2+1 dim ensions. A nom alous scaling due to power\{law grow th of the average step height is found in $1+1$ D, and also at short tim e and length scales in 2+ 1 D. The roughness exponents $e_{e}^{c}$ obtained from the height $\{$ height correlation functions in $1+1 \mathrm{D}(3=4)$ and $2+1 \mathrm{D}(2=3)$ cannot be simultaneously explained by any of the continuum equations proposed so far to describe epitaxial grow th.
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Sim ple ( $\backslash$ toy") m odels of surface grow th have becom e very popular recently, mainly as exam ples of extemally driven non-equilibrium system $s$ that exhibit sim ple (yet nontrivial) scaling behaviorl $T$ he focus is on the surface $w$ idth (roughness) $w$ de ned as $w=h^{q} \overline{\overline{h^{2}} \quad \bar{h}^{2}}$ i (the overbars denote spatialaverages, hi a statistical average), i.e., the variance of the surface height pro $l \mathrm{l} h(\mathrm{r} ; \mathrm{t})$. T he surface width scales w ith the tim e t and the linear dim ension of the substrate $L$ asw ( $t$; L) / Lf( $t=L^{z}$ ), where the scaling function $f(x)$ has the properties $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{x})=$ const, $\mathrm{x} \quad 1$ and $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{x}) / \mathrm{x} ; \mathrm{x} \quad 1,==\mathrm{z}$. 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 tim $e t_{\text {sat }}$ proportional to $L^{z}$. The value of the saturated $w$ idth $w_{\text {sat }}$ varies $w$ th the system size according to $\mathrm{w}_{\text {sat }} / \mathrm{L}$. The exponents and (or and z) characterize the scaling behavior of the roughness for a particular m odeland determ ine its universality class in analogy w ith theory of critical phenom ena.

A ltematively, one can study the surface roughness using the height\{height correlation function $G(r ; t)=h[(x+r ; t) \quad h(x ; t))^{7}$ which obeys the scaling relation $G(r ; t) /$ $r^{2}{ }^{c} g\left(r=t^{1=z^{c}}\right)$, where the scaling function $g(x)$ is constant for $x \quad 1$ and $g(x) / x^{2}{ }^{c}$ for x 1 (equivalently, the structure factor $S$ can be used, see e.g. Ref. (Z) . In m ost of grow th $m$ odels the exponents obtained using the two di erent $m$ ethods are equal ${ }^{\text {l }}$

Scaling behavior of the surface roughness can be investigated using continuum , stochastic di erentialequations which in the case of conserving $m$ odels $w$ ith surface di usion have the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{@ h(r ; t)}{@ t}=r j(r ; t)+(r ; t) ; \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $(r ; t)$ is a zero $m$ ean, random noise term in the incom ing $u x$, and the current $j(r ; t)$ is a function of the derivatives of $(r ; t)$. In a num ber of recent theoretical studies ${ }^{3} 11 \mathrm{~m}$ odels in which surface di usion is the dom inant physical mechanism of the surface sm oothing were studied. The scaling relation $2=z \quad d$ (where $d^{0}$ is the substrate dim ension) holds for these $m$ odels $T$ he $m$ ost often studied cases were $j / \quad r h \mathbb{E d w a r d s \{ W}$ ilkinson (EW) $m$ ode [13] $j / r r^{2} h$ (the linear di usion modelats), and $j / r(r h)^{2}$ and $j /(r h)^{3}$ (the
nonlinear di usion models细国 which we will denote I and II, respectively). The predicted

 non lin II $=\left(\begin{array}{ll}5 & d\end{array}\right)=4$ where $d=d+1$. It should be noted that these values are usually based on renom alization group ( $\mathrm{R} G$ ) calculations w ithin the one\{loop approxim ation (e.g., Refs. [6, 14) or on F lory \{type approxim ation (Ref.(3) .

A ltemative approach is to em ploy a pow erful com puter and study discrete m odels $w$ ith m icroscopic rules re ecting physically im portant surface processes 1 From a wide variety of discretem odels we focus our attention on the one proposed by $W$ olfand $V$ illain ( $W$ V ) which is based on the solid \{on \{solid $m$ odel of crystal grow the and has been designed $w$ th grow th by m olecular\{beam epitaxy (MBE) in $m$ ind. The grow th rules of the $m$ odel (see below ) are supposed to $m$ in ic surface di usion, the principalm echanism of surface $s m$ oothing during M BE. O riginal sim ulations of the m odell in 1+1D yielded exponents $e=0: 365 \quad 0: 015$ and e $=1: 4 \quad 0: 1$ (thus $z_{e}=3: 8 \quad 0: 5$ ) in agreem ent $w$ the theoretical prediction of the linear model. H ow ever, a subsequent num erical work has shown that in $2+1 \mathrm{D}$ the values of the exponents are $e=0: 206 \quad 0: 02$ and $e_{e}=0: 66 \quad 0: 03$ (thus $z_{e}=3: 2 \quad 0: 5$ ) which correspond to the prediction of the nonlinear $m$ odel I. The puzzling di erence betw een the behavior of the $m$ odel in 1+ 1 and 2+1 D has been con $m$ ed in another num erical study $T$ he possible explanation could be a slow crossover from exponent of the linear m odel 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 model 19 To com plicate the situation even further, it has been proposed recently by K rug, P lischke, and Siegertid that the W V m odel should cross over to EW behavior form ore than $1 \delta^{\delta}(1+1 \mathrm{D})$ or 210 (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 ( $r^{2} h$ ) in continuum di erential equations ${ }^{515}$, T he EW term is m ore relevant (in the RG sense) than all allowed nonlinear term $\$ 14_{4}^{4}$ and govems the asym ptotical behavior of the model. The long time needed to observe the asym ptotic regim e m ay be explained as due to a very sm all coe cient in front
of the EW term. Finally, it has been found very recently that the $\mathrm{W} V \mathrm{~m}$ odel in $1+1 \mathrm{D}$ does not ful $l l$ standard 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 ${ }^{[1]}$ 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 $\underset{e}{c} \quad 0: 31$ ) very close to the nonlinear m odel II predictionst $T$ he authors also suggested that this anom alous behavior is present in $2+1 \mathrm{D}$ as well.

The need for better sim ulation data apparent from the above sum $m$ ary has $m$ otivated the present work. W e perform ed large\{scale simulations of the $\mathrm{W} V \mathrm{~m}$ odel in $1+1$ and 2+1 D. In 1+1 D, we used system sizes as large as $L=40000$ sites and deposited up to $2^{27} \quad$ 1:3 18 layers whereas in 2+1 D we used lattice sizes of up to $1000 \quad 1000$ depositing up to $2^{17} \quad$ 1:3 $\quad 10$ layers. O ur results for exponents obtained from the surface $w$ idth show (i) a crossover from e $0: 37$ ( ${ }^{\mathrm{lin}}$ ) to e $0: 33$ ( ${ }^{\mathrm{non} \operatorname{lin} \mathrm{I}}$ ) in 1+1D, (ii) crossovers from e nonlin I to the scaling behavior which we believe is of the EW model in both 1+1 and 2+1 D. Exponents calculated from the correlation function are in agreem ent $w$ th those of the nonlinear model II in 1+1 D ( ${ }_{e}^{c} \quad 0: 75$ ) and the nonlinear model I in $2+1 \mathrm{D}$ ( $\left.{ }_{e}^{c} \quad 0: 65\right)$.

Them icroscopic rules of the basic $m$ odel are the sam e as in Ref.4. In every tim e step, a particle is added at a random ly chosen lattice site and then relaxes tow ard a nearest\{neighbor site which o ers the highest coordination (the num ber of nearest neighbors) where it stidks for the rest of the sim ulation. If the num ber 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 $2+1 \mathrm{D}$ is straightforw ard.

In $1+1$ D, we carried out sim ulations for lattioe sizes $L=150,300,600,800,1000,2000$, and 40000 depositing from $2^{25}$ to $2^{27}$ layers (except for $\mathrm{L}=40000$ where only $2^{23}$ layers were deposited), see Fig. 1 . (N ote that the curves for lattioe 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 sym bols size.) The crossover of the exponent e from the
value 0:372 0:007 corresponding to the linear m odel ( ${ }^{\text {lin }}=\frac{3}{8}$ ) to $0: 336 \quad 0: 009$ in very good agreem ent w th the nonlinear model I prediction ( ${ }^{\text {non lin } I}=\frac{1}{3}$ ) can be best observed for the largest sim ulated lattioe, $\mathrm{L}=40000$. It is apparent from F ig. 1 that this crossover takes place after approxim ately $2^{15} \quad 310$ layers have been deposited. The values of $w_{\text {sat }}$ we have obtained (48 1;91 10, and 20920 for $\mathrm{L}=150 ; 300$, and 600, respectively) , give $e=1: 05 \quad 0: 1$, in very good agreem ent $w$ th the nonlinear $m$ odel I prediction, $e^{\text {non lin } I}=1$. H ow ever, a m ore surprising observation can be m ade after close inspection of the data in Fig. 1 . A ll the curves (w ith the possible exception of the one for $\mathrm{L}=40000 \mathrm{w}$ here few er layers were deposited) show another decrease in the value of the exponent e after the deposition of $2^{21} 210$ layers. The curves for L 800 seem to follow the slope corresponding to the value $=\frac{1}{4}$ of the EW model in 1+1D (see Fig. (1). Because the tim et $\mathrm{t}_{\text {sat }}(\mathrm{L})$ needed for the saturation depends on the system size as $L^{2}$, we obtain $t_{\text {sat }}(L=2000)>2^{27}$ based on our results for $t_{\text {sat }}$ for sm all lattioe sizes (even if we use $\mathrm{z}^{\text {non lin II }}=5=2$ ). M oreover, the position of the crossover seem s not to depend on the lattice size. H ence we can exchude that this is the e ect of the saturation.

Sim ilar behavior is revealed by an inspection of $2+1 \mathrm{D}$ results in F ig. Z . T he 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 $e=0: 220: 05$, very close to (but de nitely higher than) the nonlinear $m$ odel I prediction $\frac{1}{5}$. A fter $\quad 10^{\natural}$ layers are deposited, a crossover takes place. A gain it cannot be due to the vicinity of the saturation regim e because the estim ate of $t_{\text {sat }}$ in 2+1D fror $L=500$ is larger than $2^{22}$ layers based on our previous resultd and the position of the crossover does not shift w ith the lattice size. A logarithm ic increase of the roughness ( ${ }^{\text {EW }}=0$ ) is expected for the EW m odel in 2+1 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 offig. R $^{2}$. The statistics of the data are unsu cient to draw a de nitive conclusion, but it seem $s$ that the sem ilogarithm ic plot follow s a straight line w hereas the log $\{\log$ one is curved. Thus, we believe our data suggest that in both $1+1$ and $2+1$ D we observe crossovers to the scaling behavior of the EW model predicted by K nug et al ${ }^{10}$ and it should be noted that
even the positions of these crossovers agree well w ith this prediction.
Follow ing the paperby Schroeder et all ${ }^{11}$ we also studied the behavior ofG $(r ; t)$. The tim e dependence ofG $(r ; t)$ in $1+1$ and $2+1 D$ is shown in $F$ ig. 3 . The exponent ${ }_{e}^{c}=0: 75$ 0:03 we obtained in 1+ 1 D using the initialslope of the correlation function for $t=2^{19} \mathrm{~m}$ onolayers and $\mathrm{L}=40000$ ( F ig. 3 (a)) di ers substantially from the value e 1 obtained from the surface w idth behavior at later tim es (see above) and corresponds to non lin II $=3=4$. H ow ever, the value ${ }_{e}^{c}=0: 65 \quad 0: 03$ obtained in $2+1 \mathrm{D} \quad(\mathrm{F}$ ig. $\sqrt{\beta}(\mathrm{b}))$ for $\mathrm{L}=500$ and $\mathrm{t}=2^{7} \mathrm{~m}$ onolayers is de nitely di erent from $2+1$ D value of nonlin $I I=1=2$ and ismuch closer to nonlin $I=2=3$ which was also obtained from the surface width behaviorl The values of the exponents ${ }_{e}^{c}$ obtained from $G(r ; t)$ are thus to the best of our know ledge inconsistent $w$ ith any sim ple m odel of epitaxial grow th proposed so far.

In agreem ent w ith Ref.11, we see the initialpow er\{ law increase of the average step height $G(1 ; t) / t$ with $=0: 38 \quad 0: 01$ in $1+1 \mathrm{D}$, and $=0: 095 \quad 0: 003$ in $2+1 \mathrm{D}$, see the insets in Fig.3. In Ref.11, it is show $n$ how this can explain e ective exponents corresponding to the linear equation and the discrepancy betw een $e$ and ${ }_{e}^{c}$ in $1+1$ D provided the nonlinear m odel II is used. N otioe also that the crossover from the exponent e 0:375 to the value e $\quad 0: 33$ coincides w ith the beginning of $(1 ; t)$ saturation. In $2+1 \mathrm{D}$, if we use the values of the nonlinear m odel I and $0: 095$, we obtain e $0: 84$ and e $0: 23$. T he value of $e$ is in agreem ent w ith the results obtained here for short tim est $2^{0}$ [see above; notiae again that this is the region w here we observe the power\{ law grow th of $(1 ; t)$ ] and also the value of $e$ is not inconsistent $w$ ith the in itial slope of the plot $w$ vs. L in $F$ ig. 2 of Ref. (7. H ence, the theory of Ref. 11 agrees w ith our results provided we use di erent \underlying" models in $1+1$ and $2+1 \mathrm{D}$. 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.

W e also tried to nd changes in the correlation function behavior that should take place follow ing the crossovers which we suppose are to the EW behavior (see the thick lines in Fig. $\mathbf{B}^{(1)}$ ) In 1+1 D $\mathbb{E}$ ig. 3 (a) ], a decrease to the value of $\underset{e}{c} \quad 2=3$ is observed for $L=2000$ and $2^{27} \mathrm{~m}$ onolayers deposited, but this is still signi cantly higher than the EW m odel value

Ew = 1=2. In 2+1D $\mathbb{E}$ ig. ${ }^{3}$ (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. H ow ever, we have found that the structure factor calculated for $L=2000$ and $2^{27} \mathrm{~m}$ onolayers does at large wavelengths follow the slope 2 expected for the EW behavior. Statistics of these data are not su cient to provide unam biguous proof and $m$ ore work is needed.

In conclusion, we have studied kinetic roughening in 1+ 1 and $2+1$ dim ensions of a sim ple $m$ odelofepitaxialgrow th proposed by $W$ olfand $V$ illain $\operatorname{ll}$ From the study of the surface $w$ idth in 1+1D, we have found a crossover from the scaling behavior of linear di erentialequation proposed to describe M BE grow th ( e $0: 37$ ) to that corresponding to a nonlinear m odel I equation (e $0: 33$ ). A coording to $R$ ef. 1 and our results, unusualbehavior of the $m$ odel in $1+1 \mathrm{D}$ is due to a power\{ law grow th of the average step height, $\mathrm{G}(1 ; \mathrm{t}) / \mathrm{t}$ where $0: 38$ in 1+1 D and 0:095 in 2+1 D. As a consequence, the exponent ${ }_{e}^{c}$ obtained in $1+1 \mathrm{D}$ from the height\{height correlation function di ers from the value obtained from the scaling of the surface $w$ idth and does not change during the crossover. Its value in $1+1 \mathrm{D}\left(\begin{array}{ll}c \\ e & 3=4)\end{array}\right.$ corresponds to another nonlinear m odel II proposed by Laiand D as Sarm a ${ }^{6}$ H ow ever, the value of the exponent $\underset{e}{c} \quad 2=3$ in $2+1 \mathrm{D}$ is consistent w th the nonlinear m odel I. O ne possibility of how to explain the discrepancy between the behavior in $1+1$ and $2+1 \mathrm{D}$ in term sofa continuum equation is to suppose that both relevant nonlinearities $\left[r^{2}(r h)^{2}\right.$ and $\left.r(r h)^{3}\right]$ are present but w th di erent coe cients (and thus di erent im portance) in $1+1$ and $2+1$ D.

In both 1+1 and 2+1 D, we se additional crossovers and our results seem to indicate these are to the scaling behavior of the EW model. The conclusion that the asym ptotic behavior of the \ideal" M BE grow th $m$ odel is of EW type is in agreem ent $w$ th the recent suggestion by K nug et all 1 . It would be interesting to see this crossover also in other discrete $m$ odels, in particular in the full\{di usion $m$ odel of $R$ ef. 9 which was very successful in describing the in intial stages of M BE grow th. In som e variants of the $m$ odels $w$ ith surface
di usion, the nal crossover to the EW behavior m ay be absent and instead the instability $m$ ay develop. W e expect this kind ofbehavior in $m$ odels $w$ ith barriers to interlayer transport.
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## FIG URES

F IG . 1. Surface width vs. tim e for the $W$ V model in $1+1 \mathrm{D}(\mathrm{L}=150$ (4);300( );600 $\square$ ), 800 ( );1000 ( );2000 ( ); and 40000 ( )). N otice that data for larger lattioe sizes ( L 800) were - set to avoid overlapping of data points.

FIG.2. Surface width vs. tim e for the $W$ V m odel in $2+1$ D ( $L=500(4)$ and 1000()$)$. D ata for $L=1000$ were 0 set to avoid overlapping of data points. $T$ he inset show $s$ the last seven data points for $L=1000$ in sem ilogarithm ic ( ) and double logarithm ic ( ) scales (see text).

F IG .3. (a) The height\{height correlation function $G(r ; t)$ in $1+1 \mathrm{D}$ for $\mathrm{L}=40000$ and the tim es $\left.t=2^{1}() ; Z^{2}() ; 2^{2}() ; Z^{0}() ; 2^{13} \square\right), 2^{16}() ; 2^{9}(4) ; 2^{22}(+)$; and for $L=2000$ and $t=2^{27}(-)$; (b) The height\{height correlation function $G(r ; t)$ in $2+1 D$ for $L=500$ and the tim es $t=2^{2}()$; $\boldsymbol{2}^{(\square), ~}$ $2^{6}() ; 2^{8}(4) ; 2^{10}() ; 2^{2}() ; 2^{4}()$, and $2^{7}(\boldsymbol{*})$. The insets show the pow er\{ law increase of $(1 ; t)$.

