

Effect of step permeability on step instabilities due to alternation of kinetic coefficients on a growing vicinal face

| | |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| メタデータ | 言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2017-10-05 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: メールアドレス: 所属: |
| URL | https://doi.org/10.24517/00028508 |

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 International License.



Effect of Step Permeability on Step Instabilities Due to Alternation of Kinetic Coefficients on a growing vicinal face

Masahide Sato^a

Information Media Center of Kanazawa University, Kakuma-cho, Kanazawa 920-1192, Japan

Abstract. We study the effect of step permeability on step instabilities on a growing vicinal face. When alternation of kinetic coefficients is taken into account, pairing of steps occurs on the vicinal face. Irrespective of the step permeability, the step pairs are stable for a wandering instability. The bunching of step pairs occurs if the steps are impermeable. The bunch size increases with time as t^β with $\beta = 1/2$, which does not depend on the form of the repulsive interaction potential between steps. The repulsion influences the relation between the step distance in a bunch and the bunch size. When the repulsive potential ζ with the step distance l is given by $\zeta \sim l^{-\nu}$, the average step distance \bar{l} in a bunch decreases as $\bar{l} \sim N^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha = 1/(\nu + 1)$. The exponents, β and α are the same as those in the bunching induced by the Ehrlich-Schwoebel effect in growth.

PACS 81.10.Aj Theory and models of crystal growth – 05.70.Ln Nonequilibrium and irreversible thermodynamics – 47.20.Hw Morphological instability – 68.35.Ct Interface structure and roughness

1 Introduction

A Si(001) surface is reconstructed by the dimerization of surface atoms. On the vicinal face tilted in the $\langle 001 \rangle$ direction, terrace T_B with the dimers parallel to steps and terrace T_A with dimers perpendicular to the steps appear alternately [1]. Due to the formation of the dimer row, surface diffusion becomes anisotropic. Surface diffusion parallel to the dimer rows is faster than that perpendicular to the dimer rows [2,3].

When a specimen is heated by direct electric current, step bunching [4–6] and step wandering [6] occur on the Si(001) vicinal face. The cause of the instabilities is considered to be

^a e-mail: sato@cs.s.kanazawa-u.ac.jp

the drift of adatoms induced by the current [7–14]. If we take account of the alternation of the anisotropic surface diffusion, the step wandering occurs with step-up drift [12], and the bunching occurs irrespective of the drift direction [7–14]. The results agree with experiments [4–6].

On the Si(001) vicinal face, in addition to the diffusion coefficients, the type of step changes alternately [2]. Step S_A , which is at the lower side of T_A , is smoother than S_B , which is at the lower side of T_B . The difference in the smoothness causes differences in step properties, e.g., the step stiffness of S_A is larger than that of S_B [15–17] and kinetic coefficient of S_A is probably smaller than that of S_B . On the vicinal face, step bunching occurs at 490°C in growth [18,19]. Frisch and co-worker [20] theoretically studied the step bunching. They used a step flow model, in which the anisotropy of the surface diffusion and the kinetic coefficients are changed alternately, and showed that the alternation of the kinetic coefficients causes the step bunching on the growing vicinal face. In the study [20], they assume that the steps are impermeable. Without solidification, surface diffusion between neighboring terraces does not occur. The surface diffusion fields on neighboring terraces are independent of each other.

In general, if the kinetic coefficients are finite, the permeability can be incorporated in a macroscopic step flow model. Step permeability affects the condition which causes the step bunching. For example, in the drift-induced step instabilities on a Si(111) model, the drift direction to cause the instabilities changes with the step permeability [21–23]. In the present case, the permeability may also change the step behavior.

In this paper, bearing the growing Si(001) vicinal face in mind, we study the effect of the step permeability on step instabilities induced by alternation of kinetic coefficients. We neglect the alternation of anisotropy of surface diffusion. To see the effect of the step permeability clearly, we consider only two extreme cases: the vicinal face with perfectly permeable steps and that with impermeable steps. We show how the motion of the steps is changed by the step permeability. In Sec. 2, we introduce a step flow model. We study instabilities of the impermeable steps in Sec. 3, and those of the perfectly permeable steps in Sec. 4. We summarize the results and give brief discussions in Sec. 5.

2 Model

In our step flow model, alternation of the kinetic coefficients is taken into account. We consider a vicinal face with step distance l , where the y -direction is the step-down direction and the x -direction is parallel to the steps. When we neglect evaporation of adatoms, the diffusion equation of the adatom density $c(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is given by

$$\frac{\partial c(\mathbf{r}, t)}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r}, t) + F, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is the adatom current and F is impingement rate of atoms. The adatom current in the vicinal face is expressed as

$$\mathbf{j} = -D_s \left(\frac{\partial c}{\partial y} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x + \frac{\partial c}{\partial x} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_y \right), \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_y$ is the unit vector in the y -direction, $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_x$ is that in the x -direction and D_s is the diffusion coefficient. To focus on the effect of the kinetic coefficient, we neglect the alternation of anisotropy of surface diffusion.

Solidification of adatoms and melting of solid atoms occur at step positions. At the i th step, solidification occurs if the adatom density is higher than the equilibrium value, $c_{\text{eq}}^{(i)}$, and melting occurs if the adatom density is lower than $c_{\text{eq}}^{(i)}$. The boundary conditions at the step are given by [24]

$$K_i(c|_{y_{i+}} - c_{\text{eq}}^{(i)}) = -\hat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \mathbf{j}|_{y_{i+}} + P_i(c|_{y_{i+}} - c|_{y_{i-}}), \quad (3)$$

$$K_i(c|_{y_{i-}} - c_{\text{eq}}^{(i)}) = \hat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \mathbf{j}|_{y_{i-}} + P_i(c|_{y_{i-}} - c|_{y_{i+}}), \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ is the unit vector normal to the step, K_i is the kinetic coefficient and P_i is the parameter for the step permeability. y_i represents the step position and the subscript $+(-)$ indicates the lower (upper) side of the step. The kinetic coefficient changes with the type of the step: $K_i = K_A$ for S_A and $K_i = K_B$ for S_B . Since S_B is rougher than S_A , we assume that K_B is larger than K_A . The parameter P_i should be changed with the type of steps, but to see the effect of the step permeability clearly, we also assume $P_A = P_B = P$.

In eqs. (3) and (4), the term on the left hand side represents the number of adatoms solidified at the steps. By the interaction potential ζ_i between steps, the equilibrium adatom density, $c_{\text{eq}}^{(i)}$ is given by

$$c_{\text{eq}}^{(i)} = c_{\text{eq}}^0 \left(1 + \frac{\Omega}{k_B T} \frac{\partial \zeta_i}{\partial y_i} \right), \quad (5)$$

where c_{eq}^0 is the equilibrium adatom density of an isolated step and Ω is the atomic area. On the Si(001) vicinal face, ζ_i is given by [25]

$$\zeta_i = -A(\ln l_i + \ln l_{i-1}), \quad (6)$$

where the terrace width l_i is given by $l_i = y_{i+1} - y_i$.

In eqs. (3) and (4), the first term on the right hand side represents the adatom current to the steps, and the second term represents the number of adatoms passing through the step without solidification. When $P \rightarrow \infty$, the step is called perfectly permeable. Without solidification, adatoms move to neighboring terraces. The difference in the adatom density vanishes. When $P \rightarrow 0$, the step is called impermeable. The diffusion fields on neighboring terraces are separated at the step position and independent of each other. The adatoms move to the neighboring terraces after solidification at the step. If the kinetic coefficient is finite, a gap in the adatom density appears.

By solving the diffusion equation, eq. (1) with the boundary conditions, eqs. (3) and (4), the adatom density is determined and the velocity V_i of the step is obtained as

$$V_i = \Omega \hat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot (\mathbf{j}|_{y_i-} - \mathbf{j}|_{y_i+}). \quad (7)$$

In general, the permeability P_i depends on the type of step, and is also related to the step kinetics. Since the kink density at S_B is more than that at S_A [15–17], solidification at S_A is easier than at S_B . The permeability of S_A may be larger than that of S_B . However, if the difference in the step permeability is taken into account, the situation becomes more complicated. Our aim is to see the effect of the permeability clearly. Thus, we assume the permeability of S_A is equal to that of S_B , and we treat two extreme cases: the instabilities with perfectly permeable steps and those with impermeable steps.

3 Instabilities with impermeable steps

We first study step instabilities of impermeable steps. To study the stability for the step bunching, we assume that the steps are straight. When we use the one-dimensional model, the velocity V_i of the i th step is given by

$$V_i = \frac{\Omega K_i [Fl_{i-1} \{K_{i-1} l_{i-1} + 2D_s\} + 2D_s K_{i-1} \Delta c_{i-1}]}{2\{D_s(K_i + K_{i-1}) + K_i K_{i-1} l_{i-1}\}} + \frac{\Omega K_i [Fl_i \{K_{i+1} l_i + 2D_s\} - 2D_s K_{i+1} \Delta c_i]}{2\{D_s(K_i + K_{i+1}) + K_i K_{i+1} l_i\}}, \quad (8)$$

where the difference Δc_i of the equilibrium adatom density is given by $\Delta c_i = c_{\text{eq}}^{(i+1)} - c_{\text{eq}}^{(i)}$.

On a vicinal face with $l_i = l$, the effect of the repulsion on the equilibrium adatom density cancels from eq. (5): $c_{\text{eq}}^{(i)} = c_{\text{eq}}^{(i+1)} = c_{\text{eq}}^0$ and Δc_i vanishes. The step velocities, V_A^0 of S_A and V_B^0 of S_B are given by

$$V_A^0 = \frac{K_A Fl (K_B l + 2D_s)}{D_s (K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l}, \quad (9)$$

$$V_B^0 = \frac{K_B Fl (K_A l + 2D_s)}{D_s (K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l}. \quad (10)$$

Since we have assumed that K_B is larger than K_A , S_B advances faster than S_A . An equidistant array of step pairs separated by T_B is produced. By the difference in the terrace width, the equilibrium adatom density c_B of S_B is larger than c_A of S_A . From eqs. (5) and (6), the difference $\Delta c (= c_B - c_A)$ in the equilibrium adatom density is expressed as

$$\Delta c = \frac{2\Omega c_{\text{eq}}^0 A}{k_B T} \left(\frac{1}{l - \Delta l} - \frac{1}{l + \Delta l} \right) \approx \frac{4\Omega c_{\text{eq}}^0 A}{k_B T l^2} \Delta l, \quad (11)$$

where $\Delta l = (l_A - l_B)$ represents the difference in the terrace width.

Since the steps move as step pairs, S_A and S_B advance with the same velocity. From the condition $V_A = V_B$, Δc is expressed as

$$\frac{2K_A K_B \Delta c}{(K_B - K_A)F} = \frac{D_s(K_A + K_B)l}{D_s(K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l} + \frac{K_A K_B l_A l_B}{D_s(K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l}, \quad (12)$$

where l_B is the width of T_B and l_A is that of T_A . From eqs. (8) and (12), the velocity V_{pair} of the step pair is given by $V_{\text{pair}} = \Omega F l$. The difference between V_{pair} and $V_A^0(V_B^0)$ are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} V_B^0 - V_{\text{pair}} &= -(V_A^0 - V_{\text{pair}}) \\ &= \frac{F l D_s (K_A - K_B)}{D_s(K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

By the formation of step pairs, the velocity of S_A becomes faster and that of S_B becomes slower. V_{pair} is the average of V_A^0 and V_B^0 .

With a set of parameters, the step distance in a pair is uniquely determined. When the repulsion is strong, the step pair is loosely bound. Δl is much smaller than the average step distance l . From eq. (11), Δl is expressed as

$$\Delta l = \frac{k_B T l^2 (K_B - K_A) F}{8 K_A K_B \Omega A c_{\text{eq}}^0}. \quad (14)$$

When the repulsion is weak, the step pair is tightly bound and Δl is comparable to l . If l_A is so narrow that $l_A \ll (K_A + K_B) D_s / 2 K_A K_B l$, from eq. (12) Δc is approximated as

$$\Delta c = \frac{(K_B^2 - K_A^2) F D_s l}{2 D_s K_A K_B \{D_s(K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l\}}. \quad (15)$$

On the other hand, when l_A is much narrower than l_B , Δc is expressed as

$$\Delta c = \frac{2 \Omega c_{\text{eq}}^0 A}{k_B T} \left(\frac{1}{l_A} - \frac{1}{l_B} \right) \approx \frac{2 \Omega c_{\text{eq}}^0 A}{k_B T l_A}, \quad (16)$$

in which we use eq. (5). From eqs. (15) and (16), the step distance l_A is approximately given by

$$l_A \approx \frac{4 K_A K_B \{D_s(K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l\} \Omega A c_{\text{eq}}^0}{F D_s l (K_B^2 - K_A^2) k_B T}. \quad (17)$$

Hereafter, we study the instability of an equidistant train of tight step pairs. For small T_A , the adatom current is much smaller than that for large T_B . The stability of the equidistant array of step pairs is determined by the adatom current on large T_B . We give a small fluctuation to the width of T_B without changing l_A . We assume the narrow T_B with width $l_B - \delta l_B$ and wide T_B with $l_B + \delta l_B$ appear alternately. Since the repulsion is weak and l_B is large, the change of Δc is neglected. When the width of the upper side terrace is $l_B + \delta l_B$, the change of the velocity δV_{pair} of the step pair is given by

$$\delta V = \mu F \delta l_B, \quad (18)$$

where the coefficient μ is expressed as

$$\mu = \frac{D_s^2(K_B^2 - K_A^2)}{\{D_s(K_A + K_B) + 2K_A K_B\}} \times \frac{1}{\{D_s(K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B\}}. \quad (19)$$

When the difference in terrace width is small [20], δV is proportional to F^2 . In the present case, the tight step pairs are formed and the difference in terrace width is large. δV is proportional to F in eq. (18).

Since K_B is larger than K_A , the coefficient μ is positive in eq. (19). If $\delta l_B < 0$, *i.e.*, the upper side terrace is smaller than the lower side terrace, the step pair is decelerated. If $\delta l_B > 0$, the step pair is accelerated. Therefore, the equidistant array of step pairs is unstable against the fluctuation, and the pairing of step pairs occurs. When the similar process occurs successively, large bunches may be formed.

To study the behavior of an unstable array, we carry out numerical simulations. In our simulations, we use $\zeta_i = A_\nu(l_i^{-\nu} + l_{i-1}^{-\nu})$ or $\zeta_i = -A_0(\ln l_i + \ln l_{i-1})$ as the repulsive interaction potential. Figure 1 shows the time evolution of step positions with the logarithmic repulsive potential. The dimensionless time \tilde{t} , the dimensionless step position \tilde{y} and the dimensionless impingement rate \tilde{F} are defined as

$$\tilde{t} = \frac{tK_B^{\nu+3}\Omega^2\tilde{A}_\nu c_{\text{eq}}^0}{D_s^{\nu+2}k_B T}, \quad (20)$$

$$\tilde{y} = \frac{yK_B}{D_s}, \quad (21)$$

$$\tilde{F} = \frac{FD_s^2 k_B T}{K_B^3 \Omega \tilde{A}_\nu c_{\text{eq}}^0}, \quad (22)$$

where $\nu = 0$ and $\tilde{A}_\nu = A_0$ for the logarithmic repulsive potential and $\tilde{A}_\nu = \nu A_\nu$ for other potentials. The dimensionless impingement rate is $\tilde{F} = 20$ and the ratio of the kinetic coefficients is $K_A/K_B = 0.2$. The number of steps is 32 and the scaled system size is 64 with the periodic boundary condition. The dotted lines are the orbits of S_A and the solid lines are those of S_B .

Initially, the steps are equidistant with small random fluctuation. In an early stage, S_B advances faster than S_A , and pairing of the steps occurs. The step pairs are not broken into single steps. The equidistant array of the step pairs is unstable and step bunching occurs. In a later stage, collisions of step pairs to bunches occurs successively. When a step pair collides to a bunch from the upper side, another step pair separates from the lower side. By repeating the collision and separation, bunches gradually grow. In step bunching, the step pairs do not break and are stable, which agrees with a previous study [26].

The adatom density at the lower side of the step pair is higher than at the upper side. In the equidistant array of the pairs, the difference Δc_{pair} in the adatom density is given by

$$\Delta c_{\text{pair}} = \frac{Fl_A(K_B - K_A)}{2\{2D_s(K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l_A\}}, \quad (23)$$




Fig. 1. Time evolution of step positions. The number of steps is 32 and the system width is 64 with periodic boundary conditions.

where we assumed that step distance in a pair is small. On a vicinal face consisting of single steps with step distance l_A , the same gap is given if the kinetic coefficients are $K_A/2$ in the upper side of the step and $K_B/2$ in the lower side of the step. Since the steps move as step pairs, we can regard a step pair as an effective single step with the negative Ehrlich-Schwoebel (ES) effect [27,28]. Then, growth law is expected to be the same as that for step bunching, induced by the ES effect on the growing vicinal face [29].

Figure 2 shows the time evolution of the size of the largest bunch, which is averaged over 10 runs. The system size is twice as large as that in Fig. 1. Irrespective of the exponent ν of the repulsive interaction potential, the bunch grows as t^β with $\beta \approx 1/2$. The form of the repulsion affects the step distance in the bunch. Figure 3 shows the dependence of the average step distance \bar{l} on the number N_{\max} of steps in the largest bunch. With increasing the bunch size N_{\max} , the average step distance decreases as $\bar{l} \sim N_{\max}^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha = 2/(\nu+1)$. The exponent α with the logarithm repulsion ($\nu = 0$) seems to be slightly smaller than $\alpha = 2$, but the exponents α and β agree with those in theoretical studies [26,29,30].

In the above analysis, we assume that the steps are straight. In the two-dimensional system, however, the other type of step instability, step wandering may occur during growth. Since the evaporation of adatoms is neglected in the present case, we use the same analysis as that in Ref. [31]. We consider the equidistant train of steps whose normal direction is tilted from the y -axis with an angle θ . In growth, the vicinal face is unstable and the pairing of steps occurs. When the step pairs are formed, the total current J_x^A in the x -direction on T_A and J_x^B on T_B




Fig. 2. Time evolution of the size of the largest bunch, which is averaged over 10 runs: \circ with $\nu = 0$ and $\tilde{F} = 2 \times 10$, \square with $\nu = 2$ and $\tilde{F} = 2 \times 10^{-2}$, \triangle with $\nu = 4$ and $\tilde{F} = 2 \times 10^{-5}$ and \diamond with $\nu = 6$ and $\tilde{F} = 2 \times 10^{-8}$. The number of steps is 64 and the system width is 128.




Fig. 3. Dependence of average step distance in the largest bunch on the number N_{\max} of the step, which is averaged over 10 runs. The parameters and symbols are the same as those in Fig. 2.

are given by

$$J_x^A = -\mu_A \tan \theta, \quad (24)$$

$$J_x^B = -\mu_B \tan \theta. \quad (25)$$

The coefficients μ_A and μ_B are expressed as

$$\mu_A = -\frac{D_s \tilde{l}_A [F \tilde{l}_A (K_B - K_A) + 2K_A K_B \Delta \tilde{c}]}{2[(K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B \tilde{l}_A]}, \quad (26)$$

$$\mu_B = -\frac{D_s \tilde{l}_B [F \tilde{l}_A (K_A - K_B) - 2K_A K_B \Delta \tilde{c}]}{2[(K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B \tilde{l}_B]}, \quad (27)$$

where $\tilde{l}_A + \tilde{l}_B = l \cos \theta$ and $\Delta \tilde{c}$ is the difference of the adatom density on the tilted system.

When the difference of the terrace width is small, the total current $J_x = J_x^A + J_x^B$ per step pair is given by

$$J_x = -\frac{F^2 (K_B - K_A) k_B T l^4}{16 K_A K_B \Omega c_{\text{eq}}^0 A} \times \frac{\tan \theta \cos^4 \theta}{\{D_s (K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l \cos \theta\}}. \quad (28)$$

When an in-phase wandering occurs and the fluctuation is expressed as $\zeta(x, t)$, the time evolution of the fluctuation is given by

$$\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial t} = -\Omega \frac{\partial J_x}{\partial x} \approx \gamma \frac{\partial^2 \zeta}{\partial x^2}, \quad (29)$$

where we use $\partial \zeta / \partial x = \tan \theta$. In eq. (29), the coefficient γ is expressed as

$$\gamma = \frac{F^2 (K_B - K_A) k_B T l^4}{16 K_A K_B c_{\text{eq}}^0 A [D_s (K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l]^2}. \quad (30)$$

If l_A is so narrow that $J_x \approx J_x^B$, the coefficient γ is expressed as

$$\gamma = \frac{F l^2 (K_B - K_A) [2(K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l]}{2[(K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l]^2}. \quad (31)$$

Irrespective of the width of l_A , the coefficient γ is positive. Then, with the alternation of the kinetic coefficients, the step wandering does not occur on the growing vicinal face.

4 Step instabilities with perfectly permeable steps

When the steps are perfectly permeable, the parameter $P \rightarrow \infty$. The boundary conditions, eqs. (3) and (4) are expressed as

$$c|_{y_i+} = c|_{y_i-} = c_s, \quad (32)$$

$$2K_i (c_s - c_{\text{eq}}^{(i)}) = \hat{\mathbf{e}}_y \cdot (\mathbf{j}|_{y_i-} - \mathbf{j}|_{y_i+}). \quad (33)$$

The step velocity is given by

$$V_i = 2\Omega K_i (c_s - c_{\text{eq}}^{(i)}). \quad (34)$$

On the vicinal face, the step velocities, V_A and V_B are the same as those with the impermeable steps, which are given by eqs. (9) and (10). Since S_A advances faster than S_B , step pairs separated by T_B are formed. When the width of T_B is l_B and that of T_A is l_A , the velocities are given by

$$V_A = \frac{\Omega K_A l (2D_s F l + K_B l_A l_B + 2K_B \Delta c)}{(K_A + K_B) D_s l + K_A K_B l_A l_B}, \quad (35)$$

$$V_B = \frac{\Omega K_B l (2D_s F l + K_A l_A l_B - 2K_A \Delta c)}{(K_A + K_B) D_s l + K_A K_B l_A l_B}. \quad (36)$$

From the condition $V_A = V_B$, the difference Δc in the equilibrium adatom density is obtained as

$$\Delta c = \frac{F l (K_B - K_A)}{2K_B K_A}, \quad (37)$$

which does not depend on Δl . The form of Δc is different from that in the impermeable case, which is given by eq. (12). The velocity of the step pair, however, is the same as that in the impermeable case and given by $V_{\text{pair}} = \Omega F l$.

On surface consisting of equidistant step pairs, from eq. (37), the total adatom currents J_A on T_A and J_B on T_B are given by

$$J_A = \frac{l_B D_s [2K_A K_B \Delta c + F(K_A - K_B)l]}{2[D_s l (K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l_A l_B]} = 0, \quad (38)$$

$$J_B = \frac{l_A D_s [-2K_A K_B \Delta c + F(K_B - K_A)l]}{2[D_s l (K_A + K_B) + K_A K_B l_A l_B]} = 0. \quad (39)$$

Step bunching occurs when the average adatom current in the upper side direction increases with increasing the inclination of the surface [32]. In the present case, the average adatom currents are absent on both T_A and T_B . Then, step bunching probably does not occur.

To examine the stability of the array of step pairs, we use a two-dimensional square lattice model and carry out a Monte Carlo simulation. The algorithm is similar to that in a previous study [33], in which the model is in the limit of large ES effect. Diffusion between neighboring terraces is forbidden. In our model, the ES effect is neglected and adatom diffusion between neighboring terrace without solidification is allowed.

Adatoms and solid atoms are distinguished in our model. We repeatedly choose a solid atom, which is at a step position, or an adatom. When an adatom is chosen, the adatom hops into a neighboring site with the probability $1/4$ if the site is empty. In our algorithm, the diffusion constant $D_s = 1$. In one diffusion trial, the increase Δt of time is expressed as $\Delta t = 1/4N_a$, where N_a is the number of adatoms. After a few diffusion trials, impingement of adatoms is periodically carried out. In the continuum limit, the distribution of adatom density obeys eq. (1) if the adatom density is low. In our model, solidification of adatoms and melting occurs only

at step positions, and the nucleation of two dimensional islands and vacancies is forbidden. After the hopping trial, the solidification trial is successively carried out if the adatom attaches to a step from the lower side. When a solid atom is selected, a melting trial is carried out. The melted atom stays in the same site as an adatom. For S_B steps, the probability p_+ of solidification and p_- of melting are given by

$$p_{\pm} = \left[1 + \exp \left(\frac{\Delta E_s \mp \phi}{k_B T} \right) \right]^{-1}. \quad (40)$$

$\Delta E_s = \epsilon \times$ (the increment of the step perimeter), where ϵ is half of the bonding energy. ϕ is the decrease in the chemical potential by solidification. For S_A steps, the probabilities are given by $p_k p_{\pm}$, where the parameter p_k represents the ratio of the kinetic coefficients and $p_k < 1$. With equilibrium adatom density c_{eq}^0 , the frequency of solidification is equal to that of melting at a kink site. Irrespective of the type of step, the equilibrium adatom density is given by

$$c_{\text{eq}}^0 = \left[1 + \exp \left(\frac{\phi}{k_B T} \right) \right]^{-1} \quad (41)$$

The estimation of kinetic coefficients from microscopic models has been carried out in previous papers [34–36]. Solidification and melting mainly occur at kink sites. When the step kink density is high, we can roughly estimate the kinetic coefficient. The number ΔN_s of solidified adatoms and the number ΔN_m of melting atoms are roughly estimated as

$$\Delta N_s = \frac{c_s p_s L}{N_a}, \quad (42)$$

$$\Delta N_m = \frac{(1 - c_s) p_m L}{N_a}, \quad (43)$$

where c_s is the adatom density at the step, L is the system length, p_s is the average solidification probability, and p_m is the average melting probability. The probabilities are approximately the same as those at a kink site. For S_B steps, the net number of solidification atoms per unit length is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta N_s - \Delta N_m}{L} &= \frac{c_s p_s + (1 - c_s) p_m}{N_a} \\ &= \frac{c_s (p_s + p_m) - p_m}{N_a} \\ &= \frac{c_s - c_{\text{eq}}^0}{N_a} = 4 \Delta t (c_s - c_{\text{eq}}^0), \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where we used $p_m = c_{\text{eq}}^0$ at the kinks and $\Delta t = 1/4N_a$. By comparison of eqs. (3) and (4) with eq. (44), the kinetic coefficient of S_B is estimated as $K_B = 4$. For S_A , the kinetic coefficient is given by $K_A = 4p_k$.

In our model, we introduced the probability p_k to change the kinetic coefficient of S_A , but we can change the kinetic coefficient by changing the step energy ϵ of S_A . When the step energy

of S_A is larger than that of S_B , the step stiffness of S_A is larger than that of S_B . Thus, the kink density of S_A is smaller than that of S_B , and K_A becomes smaller than K_B . However, if we change the step energy, we cannot use the rough estimation given by eq. (44). Thus, we introduced the probability p_k and changed the kinetic coefficient. In our model, the step stiffness $\tilde{\beta}$ of S_A is the same as that of S_B , and given by

$$\tilde{\beta} = \frac{2k_B T}{a} \sinh^2 \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \quad (45)$$

where a is the lattice constant. In simulation, we set $a = 1$.

If solidification does not occur, the adatom stays at the same position. The adatom coming from the upper terrace stays on the lower terrace. By the next diffusion trial, the adatom can move to the neighboring terrace. If a difference in the adatom density between the upper terrace and the lower terrace is present, the gap can be removed by the diffusion. Since the extra potential barrier is absent in the diffusion between the neighboring terraces, irrespective of the type of step, $c|_- = c|_+ = c_s$ in the continuum limit. Thus, the steps are perfectly permeable in our model. If we change the steps to impermeable steps, the adatom motion at the step positions is more complicated as in Ref. [22]

Figure 4 shows a snapshot of the surface. The dotted lines are S_A and the solid lines are S_B . Parameters are $\epsilon/k_B T = 2.0$, $\phi/k_B T = 1.5$, $F = 0.005$ and $p_k = 0.1$. The step stiffness $\tilde{\beta}$ is $\tilde{\beta}/k_B T = 2.7$. Since the kink density is $\sim (\tilde{\beta}/k_B T)^{-1} = 0.37$, the steps have many kinks and the estimation by eq (44) is valid.




Fig. 4. Snapshot of the step pairs. The system size is 256×256 with periodic boundary condition and the number of steps is 32.




Fig. 5. Time evolution of positions of steps. Parameters are the same as those in Fig. 4

Initially, the steps are straight and equidistant. When impingement starts, the pairing of steps occurs. The equidistant array of steps seems to be stable, and step bunching does not occur. To examine the stability of an equidistant array of step pairs, we started the simulation with an isolated large bunch. Figure 5 shows the time evolution of the average step positions. In the initial stage, the step pair at the front side of the step bunch successively separates from the bunch, and the bunch is broken to step pairs. Thus, on the vicinal face with permeable steps, the equidistant array of step pairs is stable and step bunching does not occur.

In Fig. 4, step wandering does not seem to occur. When the step is perfectly permeable, the adatom currents are $J_A = J_B = 0$. If the system is tilted, the total adatom current J_x in the x -direction is absent, and $\partial\zeta/\partial x = 0$. From the same analysis as that in Sec. 3, we can show that the step pairs are marginal compared to in-phase step fluctuation. When the Gibbs-Thomson effect is taken into account, the fluctuation is suppressed and the array of step pairs is stable for step wandering.

5 Summary and discussions

In this paper, taking a growing Si(001) vicinal face as an example, we studied the effect of step permeability on step instabilities induced by the alternation of kinetic coefficients. Irrespective of the step permeability, the growing vicinal face is unstable and pairing of steps occurs. The pairs are stable for a wandering instability. The stability for step bunching changes with step permeability. The equidistant array of step pairs is stable if the step is perfectly permeable, but

the step bunching occurs if step is impermeable. In experiment [18,19], step bunching occurs at 490°C. Then, the steps are probably impermeable on the growing Si(001) vicinal face.

In our simulation, the number N of steps in the largest bunch increases as $N \sim \bar{t}^\beta$ with $\beta = 1/2$, and the average step distance \bar{l} in the bunch decreases as $\bar{l} \sim N^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha = 2/(\nu+1)$. The exponents, β and α are the same as those in step bunching by the negative ES effect on the growing vicinal face [29,30]. In our model, since the steps move as step pairs, the step pair is regarded as single step with the negative ES effect [27,28,26]. Then, the exponents, α and β agree with those in previous studies [29,30].

In a previous study [20], step pairing does not occur when the impingement rate is larger than the critical value. In our model, from eq. (17), the step distance in a pair l_A decreases as $l_A \sim F^{-1}$, and the critical impingement rate does not appear. In the previous paper [20], they set $l_A = 1$ and found the suitable l_B . Then, with large impingement rate, l_A cannot be smaller and the formation of tight step pairs is forbidden, which explains the disagreement.

With the alternation of the kinetic coefficients, step wandering does not occur irrespective of the step permeability. In our model, the alternation of the diffusion coefficients, which causes the step wandering with the drift of adatoms [12], is neglected. The alternation may cause step wandering on the growing vicinal face. We are currently studying the possibility of step wandering caused by alternation of the diffusion coefficients.

In a real system, when the adatoms attach to steps, they migrate along the step and solidify at the kink sites. When the kink density is high, the majority of adatoms can solidify, and the step is impermeable. When the kink density is low, many adatoms cannot find the kink sites. The adatoms detach from the step without solidification, and the step is permeable. The step permeability is changed by the kink density. Since the kinetic coefficient is related to the kink density, the permeability depends on the kinetic coefficients. Though we assumed that the permeability of S_A is the same as that of S_B in our model, we should change the permeability of S_A from that of S_B . However, to derive the relation between the kinetic coefficient and the permeability, the detailed parameters of the materials are necessary and the situation becomes complicated. Then, for the first step, we changed the permeability independently of the kinetic coefficients.

By using this simple model, we studied only the two extreme cases: the instabilities with perfectly permeable steps and those with impermeable steps. When the steps are impermeable and the kinetic coefficient is finite, large bunches are formed and the growth laws in impermeable steps are consistent with experiment [26]. Thus, the steps on Si(001) vicinal faces at low temperature may be regarded as impermeable steps. However, we studied only the two extreme causes. To carry out more quantitative comparison with experiments [18,19,26], we have to study more general causes.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

References

1. D. J. Chadi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59** (1987) 1691.
2. Y.-W. Mo and M. G. Lagally, Surf. Sci. **248** (1991) 313.
3. Y.-W. Mo, J. Kleiner, M. B. Webb and M. G. Lagally, Surf. Sci. **268** (1992) 275.
4. L. V. Litvin, A. B. Krasilnikov and A. V. Latyshev, Surf. Sci. **244** (1991) L121.
5. A. L. Latyshsv, L. V. Litvin and A. L. Aseev, Appl. Surf. Sci. **130-132** (1998) 139.
6. J.-F. Nielsen, M. S. Pettersen and J. P. Pelz, Surf. Sci. **480** (2001) 84.
7. S. Stoyanov, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. **29** (1990) L659.
8. A. Natori, H. Fujimura and H. Yasunaga, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. **92** (1992) 1164 .
9. A. Natori, H. Fujimura and M. Fukuda, Appl. Surf. Sci. **60/61** (1992) 85.
10. M. Sato, M. Uwaha and Y. Saito, J. Cryst. Growth **237-239** (2002) 43.
11. M. Sato, M. Uwaha, T. Mori and Y. Hirose, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn **72** (2003) 2850.
12. M. Sato, M. Uwaha, Y. Saito and Y. Hirose, Phys. Rev. B **67** (2003) 125408.
13. M. Sato, T. Mori, M. Uwaha and Y. Hirose, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn **73** (2004) 1827.
14. M. Sato, M. Uwaha and Y. Hirose, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn **75** (2006) 043601.
15. N. C. Bartelt, R. M. Tromp and E. D. Williams, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73** (1994) 1656.
16. N. Akutsu and Y. Akutsu, Surf. Sci. **92** (1997) 92.
17. N. Akutsu and Y. Akutsu, Phys. Rev. B **57** (1998) R4233.
18. C. Schelling, G. Springholtz and F. Schäffler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999) 995.
19. J. Mysliveček, C. Schelling, F. Schäffler, G. Springholz, P. Šmilauer, J. Krug and B. Voigtländer, Surf. Sci. **520** (2002) 193.
20. T. Frisch and A. Verga, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94** (2005) 226102.
21. J.J. Métois and S. Stoyanov, Surf. Sci. **440** (1999) 407
22. M. Sato, M. Uwaha and Y. Saito, Phys. Rev. B **62** 8452.
23. O. Pierre-Louis, Surf. Sci. **529** (2003) 114.
24. M. Ozdemir and A. Zangwill, Phys. Rev. B **45** (1992) 3718.
25. O. L. Alerhand, D. Vanderbilt, R. D. Meade and J. D. Joannopoulos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61** (1988) 1973.
26. A. Pascale, I. Berbezier, A. Ronda, A. Videcoq and A. Pimpinelli, Appl. Phys. Lett. **89** (2006) 104108.
27. R. L. Schwoebel and E. J. Shipsey, J. Appl. Phys. **37** (1966) 3682.
28. G. Ehrlich and G. Hudda, J. Chem. Phys. **44** (1966) 1039.
29. M. Sato and M. Uwaha, Surf. Sci. **493** (2001) 494.

30. A. Pimpinelli, V. Tonchev, A. Videcoq and M. Vladimirowa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88** (2002) 206103.
31. F. Gillet, O. Pierre-Louis and C. Misbah, *Euro. Phys. J. B* **18** (2000) 519.
32. M. D. Johnson, C. Orme, A. W. Hunt, D. Graff, J. Sudijono, L. M. Sander and B. G. Orr, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72** (1993) 116.
33. Y. Saito and M. Uwaha, *Phys. Rev. B* **49** (1994) 10677.
34. O. Pierre-Louis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** (2001) 106104.
35. S. N. Filimonov and Yu. Yu. Hervieu, *Surf. Sci.* **553** (2004) 133.
36. L. Balykov and Axel Voigt, *Phys. Rev. E* **72** (2005) 022601.