

**Geometrical Structures of the Ge/Si(111) Interface and the Si(111) (7×7) Surface**

B. N. Dev and G. Materlik

*Hamburger Synchrotronstrahlungslabor (HASYLAB), Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY,  
D-2000 Hamburg 52, Federal Republic of Germany*

F. Grey and R. L. Johnson

*Max-Planck-Institut für Festkörperforschung, D-7000 Stuttgart 80, Federal Republic of Germany*

and

M. Clausnitzer

*II. Institut für Experimentalphysik, Universität Hamburg, D-2000 Hamburg 50,  
Federal Republic of Germany*

(Received 18 July 1986)

The structure of the germanium-silicon interface has been analyzed by x-ray standing waves in an ultrahigh-vacuum environment. Structural models of the Si(111) (7×7) surface have been tested through the structure and energetics of the Si(111)(7×7)-Ge interface. Our results agree with the dimer-atom stacking-fault model of Takayanagi *et al.* for the bare surface. At the interface, Ge atoms occupy the atop sites on the surface atoms that offer dangling bonds as well as on the adatoms of the dimer-atom stacking-fault model of the Si(111) (7×7) surface.

PACS numbers: 68.35.Bs, 61.55.Dc, 68.55.Jk

A great deal of progress has been made over the past few years in the development of techniques to measure surface and interface structures with high local precision. Scanning tunneling microscopy has revealed the surface topology on the atomic scale; transmission electron microscopy and diffraction have recently been advanced to give detailed information of the surface reconstruction. Ion scattering spectroscopy and surface extended x-ray absorption fine structure (SEXAFS) measurements were done to determine the atomic geometry of the surfaces. The method of kinematic x-ray scattering is attacking the surface-structure problem in the same way that has been tremendously successful for the bulk structures. Finally, coherent x-ray interference was used in studies with x-ray standing waves (XSW) to determine the position of surface and adsorbed atoms relative to the substrate bulk diffraction planes. While the position accuracy of most of these techniques seems to be limited to about  $\geq 0.1$  Å, SEXAFS and XSW, which have profited tremendously by the availability of intense synchrotron radiation sources, can even give results with a resolution better than 0.01 Å. Except for SEXAFS, all the techniques have been applied to the challenging Si(111) (7×7) surface, and most to the Ge/Si(111) interface as well. The atomic arrangement in the (7×7) superlattice structure on Si(111) surface is not yet fully determined, although it has been the subject of many investigations for almost three decades. XSW results were reported for the relaxation of the (7×7)-reconstructed surface<sup>1</sup> and for the Ge/Si(111) interface.<sup>2</sup> Both studies have given results different from those of other methods and it is therefore of utmost importance to understand the reason

for the discrepancies.

In a preliminary study we have already reported XSW measurements with quite different results from those in Refs. 1 and 2.<sup>3</sup> We have now reinforced our previous observations<sup>3</sup> with more measurements, which we report here to complete the picture of the structure. We will additionally show that, for XSW analysis on interfaces of complicated structure, it is of utmost importance to make measurements under UHV conditions, to do systematic studies with different adsorbate densities and preparation conditions, and to include different Fourier components of the density function in the analysis.

We have studied the geometrical structure of the Si(111) (7×7) surface by forming a silicon-germanium interface through the adsorption of Ge. Because of the isoelectronic valence shells, and thus the chemical similarity, of Ge and Si the adsorption of Ge is not expected to perturb the silicon surface structure significantly. Moreover, the adsorption process itself is interesting. It is the primary stage in the epitaxial growth of thin films. The geometrical structures of surfaces and the way they change upon addition of a second material determines the electronic properties across the interface.

The XSW technique has recently been successfully applied to the determination of the positions of adsorbed atoms on crystal surfaces.<sup>4-6</sup> In this Letter we report XSW measurements on the Ge/Si(111) interface. The experiments were carried out at the wiggler beam line at the Hamburg Synchrotron Laboratory HASYLAB. The (111) surface of silicon samples was sputter cleaned with argon-ion bombardment, annealed at 950°C, and characterized by low-energy electron diffraction (LEED) and

ultraviolet photoemission spectroscopy. A sharp (7×7) LEED pattern was observed. Upon Ge deposition onto hot (530°C) substrates the surface retained the (7×7) LEED pattern. The coverage of germanium was determined with a quartz oscillator. During the *in situ* XSW measurements the pressure in the small transportable UHV chamber was maintained at 10<sup>-7</sup> Pa or better. The XSW experimental setup with the transportable UHV chamber at the wiggler beam line has been described in Ref. 3.

By using the regular spatial periodicity of x-ray standing-wave fields one determines the phase ( $\phi$ ) and amplitude ( $f$ ) of the  $H$  Fourier component of the adsorbate density function relative to the ( $hkl$ ) bulk diffraction planes.  $\phi$  and  $f$  are closely related to the actual positions of the adsorbed atoms and the fraction of the total number of atoms at each adsorption site. The quantities  $\phi$  and  $f$  are obtained by a least-squares fit of the normalized fluorescence yield with the dynamical theory of x-ray diffraction.

The results of two measurements using a (111) reflection are shown in Fig. 1.<sup>7</sup> These are explained in terms of the dimer-adatom stacking-fault (DAS) model of Takayanagi *et al.* for the bare silicon (111) (7×7) surface,<sup>8</sup> the top view of which is shown in Fig. 2(a). The side view of a part of the Si(111) (7×7) unit cell in this model is shown in Fig. 2(b). In the DAS model, the (7×7) unit cell is divided into two equal triangular halves, one of which has regular diamond-structure stacking, whereas the other half has stacking faults in the surface region. Region I shows the normal stacking




FIG. 1. Measured (pluses) and calculated (dashed line) reflectivity for silicon (111) reflection,  $R$ , and corresponding germanium  $K\alpha$  fluorescence yield,  $Y$ , as a function of wavelength of the incident x rays.  $\Delta\lambda$  ( $=\lambda-\lambda_B$ ) is the deviation from  $\lambda_B$  that satisfies the Bragg condition. The range of  $\Delta\lambda$  corresponds to an energy range of 3.6 eV. The equivalent  $\Delta\theta$  ( $=\theta-\theta_B$ ) scale is shown at the top. Circles, fluorescence data for a Ge coverage of 0.2 ML; squares, fluorescence data for a coverage of 0.4 ML.

sequence 123456, and region II shows the stacking fault in the surface region: 56'. In the DAS model there are twelve Si adatoms (each bonded to three surface Si atoms) and six surface Si atoms (not bonded to any adatom), each of which provides a dangling bond for chemisorption. Our results are explained by adsorption of Ge atoms at the surface-atop [A and B in Fig. 2(b)] sites for low coverage, and coadsorption at the surface-atop and the adatom-atop [C, D, E, and F in Fig. 2(b)] sites for higher coverage, with a fraction of the Ge atoms




FIG. 2. (a) Top view of the dimer-adatom stacking-fault model of Takayanagi *et al.* showing the positions of the adatoms and the surface atoms that offer dangling bonds for chemisorption. The (7×7) unit cell is shown by the dashed lines. The dash-dotted line divides the unit cell into two triangular subunits. (b) Side view showing a part of the unit cell. Region I has normal diamond-structure stacking (123456), and region II shows the stacking faults in the topmost bilayer (56'). Ge atoms are shown at the surface-atop (A and B) and the adatom-atop (C, D, E, and F) sites.

in random distribution. When germanium atoms occupy only the surface-atop sites, the expected phase value from a (111)-Bragg-reflection XSW measurement is  $0.89d_{111}$ . Adsorption only at the adatom-atop sites would give rise to a phase value of  $1.14d_{111}$ . Occupation of sites of both types with equal population would give  $1.02d_{111}$ . The measured phases of  $(0.87 \pm 0.02)d_{111}$  (Fig. 1, curve 1) and  $(1.06 \pm 0.02)d_{111}$  (Fig. 1, curve 2) for germanium coverages of 0.2 ML (monolayer) and 0.4 ML, respectively, are explained by our assuming that at low coverage only surface-atop sites (position 0.89) are occupied, and with increasing coverage, the surface-atop sites having been filled, the only available adatom-atop sites (position 1.14) are occupied, giving rise to an effective phase value between the two limits. In fact, with the proper weight factor<sup>9</sup>—six surface-atop and twelve adatom-atop sites per  $(7 \times 7)$  unit cell—the expected phase value is  $1.07d_{111}$ . The assumption of preferential filling on a hot substrate is corroborated by the results of measurements on a Ge/Si(111) interface using a (220) Bragg reflection.

The results of two measurements with a (220) reflection are shown in Fig. 3. In order to point out some important features with respect to (220) measurements, let us focus our attention on the atoms A and B at the surface-atop sites in region I and region II, respectively [Fig. 2(b)]. In XSW measurements the fluorescence response from an adsorbed atom depends on the distance of that atom from the nearest diffraction plane. There-




FIG. 3. Measured (pluses) and calculated (dash-dotted line) reflectivity for Si (220) reflection,  $R$ , and corresponding Ge  $K\alpha$  fluorescence yield,  $Y$ , as a function of  $\Delta\lambda$ . The range of  $\Delta\lambda$  corresponds to an energy range of 1.1 eV. Circles, fluorescence data for a germanium coverage of 0.2 ML. Squares, fluorescence data for a coverage of 0.5 ML. Curves  $a$  and  $b$  are those expected from the atom at A and at B [Fig. 2(b)], respectively. The effective response due to the occupation of both A and B sites is given by the fitted curve 1. Curve 2 corresponds to occupation of both surface-atop (A and B) and the adatom-atop (C, D, E, and F) sites.

fore, the atoms A and B ( $d_{A_1} = d_{B_1}$ ) would give rise to the same fluorescence angular profile for a (111)-reflection measurement. However, because of the stacking faults in region II, atoms A and B have different distance components ( $d_A \neq d_B$ ) with respect to (220) planes. The expected fluorescence angular profile from the Ge atoms at site A<sup>10</sup> is shown by curve  $a$  ( $d_A = 1.02d_{220}$ ) in Fig. 3, and the corresponding profile for site B is shown by curve  $b$  ( $d_B = 0.69d_{220}$ ). The expected joint profile is the curve 1 fitted to the data, corresponding to a phase value of  $(0.85 \pm 0.02)d_{220}$  for 0.2 ML Ge coverage. The observed coherently adsorbed coverage of Ge atoms<sup>10</sup> ( $0.2 \times 0.60$  or 0.12 ML) is what would be expected if only all the A and B sites, i.e., the surface-atop sites, are occupied. There are six such sites per  $(7 \times 7)$  unit cell, while 49 corresponds to a monolayer. The fluorescence response from a (220) measurement for a higher Ge coverage (0.5 ML) is shown by curve 2 in Fig. 3. This is explained as follows. Adsorption at C and D sites would give rise to a response similar to that for adsorption at the B site [ $d_C = d_D = d_B$ , Fig. 2(b)]. The number of such sites per unit cell is twelve. Therefore, occupation of all the available atop sites would give rise to a joint response close to the curve  $b$ . In fact, with proper weight<sup>9</sup>—three atoms at  $1.02d_{220}$  and fifteen atoms at  $0.69d_{220}$ —the expected phase of  $0.72d_{220}$  agrees well with the observed phase of  $(0.75 \pm 0.01)d_{220}$  (curve 2 in Fig. 3). The fit corresponds to a coverage arising from the occupation of all the atop sites (0.37 ML).

The results of (111)- and (220)-reflection measurements, as described above, for 0.2 ML Ge coverage clearly demonstrate the presence of stacking faults in only one half of the Si(111)  $(7 \times 7)$  unit cell, and rule out the models involving stacking faults in the entire region of the  $7 \times 7$  unit cell. The results for higher Ge coverages show, in addition to the presence of stacking faults, the existence of adatoms in the unit cell. Thus, our XSW results agree only with the dimer-adatom stacking-fault (DAS) model of the Si(111)  $(7 \times 7)$  surface by Takayanagi *et al.*<sup>8</sup>

The fact that Ge can be adsorbed preferentially at the surface-atop site for lower coverages indicates a higher binding energy for Ge at the surface-atop site compared to the adatom-atop site. Higher substrate temperature during Ge evaporation helps an adatom to diffuse on the surface before it settles in a deeper potential well.

For the adsorption at the one-fold atop sites, Ge contributing four electrons and Si one, the picture of bonding is not very clear. In fact, one may wonder whether the binding at the atop site is possible at all. A self-consistent-field cluster calculation<sup>11</sup> involving one H atom and one Si atom, which is similar to a Ge atom attached to a single dangling bond of Si, however, suggests the possibility of binding.

In the present analysis a Si—Ge bond length of 2.40 Å, which is the average of Si—Si bond length in bulk sil-

icon and the Ge—Ge bond length in bulk germanium, has been assumed. In the DAS model, the atomic displacements in the direction normal to the surface are not specified. We have assumed the bulk bilayer separation, 0.78 Å, for the distance between the adatom-silicon and the surface-silicon layers. This is within the error bar of the scanning-tunneling-microscope observation of  $0.7 \pm 0.1$  Å.<sup>12</sup>

Our results do not agree with the large contraction (0.5 Å) of the Si(111) (7×7) surface recently measured by Durbin *et al.*,<sup>1</sup> unless this relaxation is removed by Ge deposition. Because of the chemical similarity of germanium and silicon, and the unchanged (7×7) superstructure upon germanium deposition, the adsorption process is not expected to relieve a relaxation as large as 0.5 Å.

Our results disagree with those of Patel *et al.*<sup>2</sup> who made open-air XSW measurements on samples prepared in UHV and protected with amorphous silicon cap. A recent study on the interface between a silicon (111) substrate and amorphous silicon has shown that the structure of the buried surface differs from that of the clean surface, even though the (7×7) periodicity is preserved.<sup>13</sup>

In most of our measurements we observe a fraction of germanium atoms that are not adsorbed at a particular site (random). Disorder was also observed for this system in previous channeling experiments.<sup>14</sup>

In conclusion, the positions of the germanium atoms on silicon (111) surface have been determined by x-ray standing waves by measuring the distance components in the [111] and [220] directions. The structure of the bare silicon surface has been derived from the position of the adsorbed atoms, and has been found to support the dimer-adatom stacking-fault model of Takayanagi *et al.*<sup>8</sup> On this structure Ge atoms have been found to occupy the atop sites on the Si adatoms as well as on the surface atoms that offer dangling bonds. The present study shows that surface structures can be determined by means of tagging the surface atoms with chemically similar atoms. From the results of measurements made on samples prepared at different substrate temperatures

it is concluded that the binding energy of germanium at the surface-atop site is higher than that for the adatom-atop site.

The financial support of this project by the German Federal Minister for Science and Technology is gratefully acknowledged.

<sup>1</sup>S. M. Durbin, L. E. Berman, B. W. Batterman, and J. M. Blakely, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 236 (1986).

<sup>2</sup>J. R. Patel, J. A. Golovchenko, J. C. Bean, and R. J. Morris, *Phys. Rev. B* **31**, 6884 (1985).

<sup>3</sup>B. N. Dev, G. Materlik, R. L. Johnson, W. Kranz, and P. Funke, *Europhysics Conference Abstracts, Eighth European Conference on Surface Science, Jülich, 1986* (unpublished), p. 21, and *Surf. Sci.* (to be published).

<sup>4</sup>P. L. Cowan, J. A. Golovchenko, and M. F. Robbins, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44**, 1680 (1980).

<sup>5</sup>G. Materlik, A. Frahm, and M. J. Bedzyk, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 441 (1984).

<sup>6</sup>G. Materlik, *Z. Phys. B* **61**, 405 (1985).

<sup>7</sup>Bragg's law:  $2d \sin \vartheta = \lambda$ . In the present experiment a Bragg condition is selected for a particular value of  $\lambda$  (say,  $\lambda_B$ ) and then a scanning in energy (i.e.,  $\lambda$ ) is performed with  $\vartheta$  kept fixed. The abscissae of Figs. 1 and 3 are  $\Delta\lambda = \lambda - \lambda_B$ . The equivalent  $\Delta\vartheta = \vartheta - \vartheta_B$  scales are shown at the top.

<sup>8</sup>K. Takayanagi, Y. Tanishiro, M. Takahashi, and S. Takahashi, *J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A* **3**, 1502 (1985).

<sup>9</sup>B. N. Dev, V. Aristov, N. Hertel, T. Thundat, and W. M. Gibson, *Surf. Sci.* **163**, 457 (1985).

<sup>10</sup>The measurement showed that 40% of the Ge atoms were randomly distributed. Therefore, the curves *a* and *b* have been calculated by our assuming the remaining 60% to be at either A or B sites, respectively. The joint profile has been computed by our assuming an equal population—30% at A and 30% at B sites.

<sup>11</sup>K. Hermann and P. S. Bagus, *Phys. Rev.* **20**, 1603 (1979).

<sup>12</sup>G. Binnig, H. Rohrer, C. Gerber, and E. Weibel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50**, 120 (1983).

<sup>13</sup>J. M. Gibson, H. J. Gossmann, J. C. Bean, R. T. Tung, and L. C. Feldman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 355 (1986).

<sup>14</sup>H. J. Gossmann, L. C. Feldman, and W. M. Gibson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 294 (1984), and *Surf. Sci.* **155**, 413 (1985).