Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Recent Work

Title

ELECTRONIC CHARGE DENSITIES AND THE TEMPERATURE DEPENDENCE OF THE FORBIDDEN (222) REFLECTION IN SILICON AND GERMANIUM

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9gr377hw>

Authors

Chelikowsky, James R.
Cohen, Marvin L.

Publication Date

1974-07-01

ELECTRONIC CHARGE DENSITIES AND THE TEMPERATURE
DEPENDENCE OF THE FORBIDDEN (222) REFLECTION
IN SILICON AND GERMANIUM

James R. Chelikowsky and Marvin L. Cohen

July 1974

Prepared for the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
under Contract W-7405-ENG-48

TWO-WEEK LOAN COPY

*This is a Library Circulating Copy
which may be borrowed for two weeks.
For a personal retention copy, call
Tech. Info. Division, Ext. 5545*

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

Electronic Charge Densities and the Temperature Dependence
of the Forbidden (222) Reflection in Silicon and Germanium*

James R. Chelikowsky and Marvin L. Cohen

Department of Physics, University of California, and

Inorganic Materials Research Division,

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720

Abstract

Using nonlocal pseudopotentials for silicon and germanium we are able to calculate the temperature dependence of the forbidden (222) reflection and find it to be in excellent agreement with experiment. The accuracy of the pseudocharge density for the case of silicon is also examined and found to be in good agreement with recent x-ray experimental results.

Remarkable progress has recently been made in the measurement of charge distributions in crystalline silicon and germanium.¹⁻⁶ These exceedingly precise measurements, in the case of silicon, have allowed the valence charge density to be accurately determined for the first time.⁵ Such measurements are, of course, of considerable value not only as a means of ascertaining the accuracy of band structure calculations and the resulting wavefunctions, but as a means of better understanding the bonding process itself. In this context there has been much interest in determining the behavior of the valence charge density, and in particular

the bonding electrons, as a function of temperature. By combining neutron and x-ray diffraction studies, Roberto, Batterman and Keating⁶ have been able to establish the temperature dependence of the "forbidden" (222) reflection in both silicon and germanium, and specifically, they have been able to determine the relative contributions to the forbidden reflection arising from the bonding electrons and from the anharmonic motion of the ion cores.

From a theoretical point of view, while the use of pseudopotentials has been well established in the calculation of charge densities, only recently has it been possible to compare the results directly to experiment. Such a comparison, in the case of silicon, has indicated that the pseudocharge density while adequately reproducing the bond maximum and magnitude fails to yield the correct bond shape.⁵ However, we shall demonstrate that this discrepancy is not a serious one, and it is a direct consequence of the local pseudopotential approximation. The discrepancy is eliminated through the use of an energy dependent nonlocal pseudopotential. In addition, for the first time, a calculated temperature dependence for the forbidden (222) reflection is found to be in excellent agreement with experimental results. Early attempts² to account for the temperature dependence were based on inaccurate experimental results,⁶ and are not in accord with the more recent data. More recent simplified models have also failed at the higher temperatures.⁶ As suggested by Phillips⁷ and Roberto,

Batterman, and Keating,⁶ we find that the change in bonding charge with temperature is significant. Further, we find under the assumption of an Einstein solid, that the Debye-Waller factor characteristic of the bond motion is one half that of the ion cores.

In establishing the temperature dependence of the bonding charge the anharmonic contribution from the ion motion must be subtracted out from the "forbidden" (222) reflection.⁶ This may be accomplished through the use of neutron diffraction techniques as neutrons interact primarily with the nuclei. In such a fashion, using the simple model of Dawson and Willis⁸ to account for the temperature dependence of the ion core contributions, Roberto et al. have separated out the anharmonic motion of the cores. Once this has been accomplished the resulting contributions to the forbidden reflection can arise only from non-centrosymmetric parts of the charge density, i.e. bonding charge.

Since the "forbidden" (222) reflection, corrected for the anharmonic motion of the ions, depends upon the structure factor, F_{222}^b , for the bond, the temperature dependence of this reflection can be analyzed in terms of this "bond" structure factor. The procedure which we shall follow in obtaining the temperature dependence of the structure factor for the bond will be analogous to the atomic structure factor case. In the atomic case the structure factor is the product of two factors: the fourier transform of the charge distribution, or scattering factor, and a Debye-Waller factor.

The first factor accounts for the charge distribution, the second for thermal motion. To calculate the structure factor for the bond we first calculate the charge distribution with the ion cores in their equilibrium positions and determine the scattering factor for the bond. Next we take the bond motion into account by an appropriate Debye-Waller factor, and obtain the structure factor for the bond by the product of the scattering and Debye-Waller factors. However, unlike the atomic case we take into consideration the effect that the bonding charge may be significantly altered by temperature as suggested by Phillips.⁷ In order to account for this change in bonding charge, and the resulting change in the scattering factor, we calculate the effect of temperature on the crystalline potential. This may be done in a straight forward manner involving the use of the Debye-Waller ion core factors as indicated in reference 9.

In obtaining the effect of temperature on the charge density it is necessary to have a knowledge of the crystalline potential, the thermal expansion function of the solid, and the phonon spectra or Debye-Waller factors for the ion cores.⁹ This data, however, is well established for both silicon and germanium. Recent calculations on both silicon¹⁰ and germanium¹¹ using nonlocal pseudopotentials have been able to accurately obtain the optical gaps, photoemission results, and cyclotron masses, and these are the potentials which we shall use in the present calculation. Further, the thermal expansion function has been tabulated over an

extensive temperature range¹² and Batterman and Chipman¹³ have incorporated x-ray data on the ion core motion into Debye-Waller factors for both crystals.

After the scattering factor has been calculated in the manner outlined above, it is necessary to obtain a Debye-Waller factor for the bonding charge. Welsh has suggested that the Debye-Waller factor appropriate for the bonding charge should be smaller than the corresponding Debye-Waller factor for the ion cores.⁶ However, under the physically reasonable assumption that the motion of the bond should be characterized by the motion of the midpoint of near-neighbor atoms, and the additional assumption of an Einstein solid (appropriate for the temperatures involved¹³), it is easy to demonstrate that the Debye-Waller factor for the bond is exactly one half that of the ion cores.

The results of our calculations are given in Figure 1 for silicon and Figure 2 for germanium. Also indicated are the results from the simple model of Roberto et al.,⁶ which assumed that the valence charge density was not altered by temperature. They also assumed that the bond motion would be that of the ion cores and, hence, the same Debye-Waller factor could be used. Unlike their results, our calculations are in excellent agreement over the entire temperature range for both silicon and germanium. However, it should be pointed out that Roberto et al. recognized quite clearly the drawbacks of their model and, in fact, suggested that the temperature dependence of the scattering factor, or charge

density, combined with a reduced Debye-Waller factor for the bond motion might yield the correct temperature dependence for the "bond" structure factor.

We also mention in this context that Phillips⁷ has suggested that a decrease in the bonding charge, Z_b , alone could account for the observed temperature dependence of the structure factor. He has developed a theory for the magnitude of the bonding charge which states that it should vary as the inverse of the optical constant squared, i.e. $Z_b \propto n^{-2}$. If we evaluate $\Delta Z_b/Z_b$ in terms of finite differences over the temperature range of interest we find $\Delta Z_b/Z_b = 0.066 \pm 0.006$ for silicon and $\Delta Z_b/Z_b = 0.13 \pm 0.05$ for germanium using the experimental values of $n(T)$.¹⁴ If we associate the (222) component of the charge density, ρ_{222} , as a measure of the bonding charge, and evaluate $\Delta \rho_{222}/\rho_{222}$, we find $\Delta \rho_{222}/\rho_{222} = 0.062$ for silicon and $\Delta \rho_{222}/\rho_{222} = 0.099$ for germanium in good accord with the values predicted by Phillips. The values, however, for $\Delta F_{222}^b/F_{222}^b$ are 0.10 ± 0.01 for silicon and 0.18 ± 0.02 for germanium. Therefore, we note, at least in the case of silicon where the experimental values are determined with more precision than in germanium, the decrease in Z_b alone cannot adequately explain the observed temperature dependence of the forbidden (222) reflection. However, if a Debye-Waller factor appropriate for the bond is included, then Phillip's predicted values for $\Delta Z_b/Z_b$ can adequately account for the observed behavior.

In Figure 3 we compare the experimentally determined valence charge density for silicon with the results of an energy-dependent nonlocal pseudopotential. The results are similar to a previous charge density calculation using a local pseudopotential by Walter and Cohen¹⁵ in that the bond maximum lies at the midpoint between neighboring atoms, and the value of the bond maximum is the same. Both of these results are in good accord with experiment (the bond maxima are $26 \text{ e}/\Omega_{\text{c}}$ for both theoretical calculations and $28 \text{ e}/\Omega_{\text{c}}$ for experiment). However, as Yang and Coppen's⁵ have noted, the local pseudopotential result has an incorrect bond shape in that the bond axis runs perpendicular to the bonding direction.¹⁵ Further, they point out that such a discrepancy is far beyond the limits of experimental error. The energy dependent nonlocal pseudopotential, on the other hand, has the correct bond shape; in this case the bond axis is elongated parallel to the bonding direction. This rotation of the bond can be traced to the affect of the energy dependent part of the nonlocal pseudopotential on the bottom valence band. The need for an energy dependent nonlocal pseudopotential is also indicated by spectroscopic¹⁶ and photoemission data.¹⁰

Finally we mention that the accuracy of our pseudocharge density calculation in yielding an accurate temperature dependence for the forbidden (222) reflection, and in producing an accurate valence charge density is quite encouraging. We expect the pseudocharge density to fail to reproduce the

actual charge density in the core region; however, that it is so accurate away from the core region, e.g. the bonding region, suggests that other band calculations can be refined to give similar results, e.g. self-consistent orthogonalized plane wave (SCOPW) results¹⁷ have, thus far, not yielded accurate structure factors.

References

- * Supported in part by the National Science Foundation Grant GH 35688.
1. H. Hattori, H. Kuriyama, T. Katagawa and N. Kato, J. Phys. Soc. Japan 20, 988 (1965).
 2. S. Tanewura and N. Kato, Acta Cryst. A28, 69 (1972).
 3. P. J. E. Aldred and M. Hart, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A332, 223 (1973).
 4. P. J. E. Aldred and M. Hart, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A332, 239 (1973).
 5. Y. W. Yang and P. Coppens, to be published.
 6. J. B. Roberto, B. W. Batterman and D. T. Keating, Phys. Rev. B9, 2590 (1974).
 7. J. C. Phillips, Phys. Lett. 37A, 434 (1971).
 8. B. Dawson and B. T. M. Willis, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A298, 307 (1966).
 9. J. P. Walter, R. R. L. Zucca, M. L. Cohen and Y. R. Shen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 24, 102 (1970).
 10. J. R. Chelikowsky and M. L. Cohen, to be published.
 11. J. R. Chelikowsky and M. L. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 31, 1582 (1973).
 12. American Institute of Physics Handbook, ed. D. E. Gray, (McGraw Hill, New York) 1970, p. 4-119.
 13. B. W. Batterman and D. R. Chipman, Phys. Rev. 127, 690 (1967).
 14. P. Y. Yu and M. Cardona, Phys. Rev. B2, 3193 (1970).
 15. J. P. Walter and M. L. Cohen, Phys. Rev. B4, 1877 (1971).

16. A. E. O. Animalu, Technical Report No. 4, Solid State Theory Group, Cavendish Laboratory, Free School Lane, Cambridge, England.
17. P. M. Raccah, R. N. Euwema, D. J. Stuckel and T. C. Collins, Phys. Rev. B1, 756 (1970).

Figure Captions

Figure 1. The temperature dependence of the F_{222}^b structure factor for silicon. The experimental data points are from Roberto, Batterman, and Keating.⁶ The solid line shows the temperature dependence as calculated by a nonlocal pseudopotential, and the dotted line indicates the temperature dependence of the Debye-Waller factor for the ion core.

Figure 2. The temperature dependence of the F_{222}^b structure factor for germanium. The experimental data points are from Roberto, Batterman, and Keating.⁶ The solid line shows the temperature dependence as calculated by a nonlocal pseudopotential, and the dotted line indicates the temperature dependence of the Debye-Waller factor for the ion core.

Figure 3. The top figure^(a) shows the valence charge density for silicon as determined by Yang and Coppens⁵ (in the plane of the bonds). The bottom figure^(b) shows the valence charge density as calculated by a nonlocal pseudopotential in a section of the same plane.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

LEGAL NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Atomic Energy Commission, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION DIVISION
LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720