

## Three-Dimensional Critical Behavior with 2D, 1D, and 0D Dimensionality Crossover: Surface and Edge Specific Heats

M. O. Kimball, K. P. Mooney, and F. M. Gasparini

*Department of Physics, University at Buffalo, The State University of New York, Buffalo, New York 14260, USA*

(Received 27 May 2003; published 19 March 2004)

The critical behavior at a second order phase transition is characterized by the divergence of the correlation length  $\xi$ . We have studied the superfluid transition of  $^4\text{He}$  in a series of experimental cells in which this divergence of  $\xi$  is modified due to finite-size confinement. In particular, the design of these cells is such that the smallest dimension is kept the same,  $1\ \mu\text{m}$ , but the geometry is such that one obtains crossover to dimensionality of 2, 1, and 0. This corresponds to films, channels, and boxes filled with helium. We measure the specific heat and compare these results with theoretical expectations. We identify surface and line specific heat contributions by analyzing the deviation of the specific heat from its behavior in the thermodynamic limit. The design of these cells is made possible by a combination of silicon lithography and direct wafer bonding.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.92.115301

PACS numbers: 67.40.Kh, 64.60.Fr

The thermodynamic behavior of a system near a second order phase transition is well understood [1]. Singularities are observed in a number of thermodynamic properties. These result from the divergence of the correlation length  $\xi$  as the critical temperature  $T_c$  is approached. This length scale determines the spacial extent of fluctuations near  $T_c$ . While all systems studied are finite in extent, this is not reflected in typical measurements because one does not approach the transition temperature closely enough for  $\xi$  to become macroscopic. For typical systems,  $\xi$  is of the order of  $1\ \mu\text{m}$  at  $t \equiv |1 - T/T_c| \approx 10^{-6}$ . Thus, for samples of much greater dimensions one obtains behavior which is independent of their shape or size. One identifies this as the thermodynamic limit, or bulk behavior.

Alternatively, one may ask how a system with dimensions comparable to  $\xi$  reaches the thermodynamic limit as its small dimensions are increased. This represents an important problem in statistical mechanics. This limit can be approached by a confined system in which, at the simplest, one starts with one, two, or all three spacial dimensions uniformly small. One expects that, for equivalent confinements, one should be able to scale the data with critical exponents which are related to bulk properties [2]. This expectation is often used theoretically in calculations on finite systems and extrapolations to the thermodynamic limit [3]. Finite systems are inherently shape dependent. Thus, to study them, control of the confinement geometry is essential. Further, it is necessary to realize confinement in such a way that walls do not influence the ordering in an essential way.

The transition of liquid  $^4\text{He}$  from a normal fluid to a superfluid is ideal in many ways for such a study. The ordered state is characterized by a macroscopic wave function, which is often assumed to obey Dirichlet boundary conditions at walls. The local van der Waals field at the walls provides an inhomogeneity which is relatively

benign, since it influences the order parameter indirectly and at most over a limited spacial range. Lastly, the critical behavior in the thermodynamic limit is very well known [4]. In the limit in which three or two of the spatial dimensions of the confined helium are made small, no sharp critical behavior is expected. On the other hand, when only one dimension is small, the case of a film, one expects a Kosterlitz-Thouless (KT) behavior [5]. The challenge in studying finite-size effects is to achieve uniform confinement of the liquid at the  $\mu\text{m}$  scale and to make a high resolution measurement of a relatively small sample.

To achieve uniform confinement we use a combination of lithography and direct silicon wafer bonding [6]. A "cell" consists of two wafers bonded together, thus defining a specific geometry. We use standard optical lithography to pattern  $\text{SiO}_2$  grown on a 5 cm wafer. For planar confinement (2 dimensional, 2D crossover) we pattern the oxide with a series of posts  $1\ \mu\text{m}$  high, and about 1 mm apart on which the second wafer is then bonded. The posts maintain a uniform separation between the wafers over the full volume of the cell. For 1D crossover we pattern the oxidized wafer with  $1\ \mu\text{m} \times 1\ \mu\text{m} \times 4\ \text{mm}$  channels. The experimental cell is tiled with a pattern so that there is about 0.5 km of channels. For 0D crossover the oxide is patterned with an array of  $10^9$  cylindrical boxes  $1\ \mu\text{m}$  high by  $1\ \mu\text{m}$  diameter. This latter cell is distinguished from the others by having the top wafer also patterned with shallow, 18.5 nm high,  $1\ \mu\text{m}$  wide lines to fill the boxes [7]. Thus, this cell may be reliably regarded as a collection of uncoupled boxes [7]. Further details of our cells can be found in [6,8]. For all cells, one can deduce the spacing after bonding via a measurement of interference fringes in the infrared. From these, we deduce that the separation is uniform to better than 10 nm across the area of the wafers. This is much better than the free-state flatness of these wafers which can have

variations as large as  $10^4$  nm. The uniformity is achieved by incorporating a substantial stress in the wafers as they contour to each other in the bonding process.

To measure the specific heat of confined helium, a cell is staged on a cryostat in such a way as to allow for the presence of a small amount of bulk helium *outside* the wafers. This yields the bulk transition temperature,  $T_\lambda$ . The heat capacity of the confined helium is determined by measuring the amplitude of the temperature oscillations when the cell is heated with an ac current. This is done at such a frequency, typically 25–40 Hz, whereby the bulk helium, due to its longer relaxation time, does not contribute to the heat capacity. This was checked explicitly [8].

Our data for the specific heat of helium in the neighborhood of the maximum are shown in Fig. 1. The insets of this figure are electron micrographs of the channel and box geometries. The planar geometry may be viewed simply as a film  $1\text{ }\mu\text{m}$  thick and of infinite lateral extent. The specific heats behave qualitatively very much as one might expect. That is, the more one restricts the dimensionality of the system, thereby further limiting critical fluctuations, the weaker the specific heat maximum becomes. Hence the data nest under the solid line, which is the bulk behavior, with a hierarchy of film, channels, and then boxes. Note as well that the shift in the specific heat

maximum also follows the same hierarchy, with the maximum for the boxes undergoing the largest shift.

The expectation for finite-size behavior is that the specific heat for a system confined uniformly to a small dimension  $L$  should obey a scaling form which can be cast in several ways [10]. In particular, one may write

$$[C(t, \infty) - C(t, L)]t^\alpha = \Delta C t^\alpha \equiv g_2(x), \quad (1)$$

where  $t = |1 - T/T_\lambda|$ . The variable  $x$  is  $tL^{1/\nu}$ . The exponents,  $\alpha = -0.0115$  and  $\nu = 0.6705$ , characterize the singularity in the bulk specific heat  $C_p \sim t^{-\alpha}$  and the divergence of the correlation length  $\xi \sim t^{-\nu}$ . These exponents [11] are well established in helium and are related via the hyperscaling relation  $3\nu + \alpha = 2$ . The scaling variable, apart from a constant, is simply  $(L/\xi)^{1/\nu}$ .

An alternative way of representing the data is as [12]

$$[C(t, L) - C(t_0, \infty)]L^{-\alpha/\nu} = f_1(x), \quad (2)$$

where  $t_0$  is the temperature at which  $\xi = L$ . These two functions are equivalent, but their different forms are useful because they emphasize different features of the specific heat.

Another approach in describing a finite system is to consider how, in a region where  $\xi/L$  is small (far from the transition), it might begin to deviate from bulk behavior. This may be expressed as being due to topological aspects of the confining geometry, such as corners, edges, and surfaces [3]. The edge ( $e$ ) and surface ( $s$ ) contributions to the full scaling function may be written, respectively, as

$$\Delta C t^\alpha \approx -\frac{g_e A_e}{L^2 \alpha_e} t^{\alpha - \alpha_e}, \quad (3)$$

$$\Delta C t^\alpha \approx -\frac{g_s A_s}{L \alpha_s} t^{\alpha - \alpha_s}. \quad (4)$$

These are the dominant contributions in the edge and surface regions of the scaling plots. The surface and edge expressions no longer apply if  $tL^{1/\nu}$  becomes small. They are part of the crossover behavior contained in the full scaling function. This differs for each type of confinement. For Eqs. (3) and (4) to be functions of  $\xi/L$ , one must have  $\alpha_s = \alpha + \nu$  and  $\alpha_e = \alpha + 2\nu$ . The amplitude for the surface specific heat,  $A_s$ , has been calculated recently [13]. The amplitude for the edge specific heat,  $A_e$ , is unknown and, as far as we are aware, has never been measured for a critical system. These amplitudes are *independent of the geometry*. The constants  $g_s$  and  $g_e$  however, do depend, respectively, on the surface to volume and edge to volume ratios for a particular geometry. In our case, for films, channels, and boxes  $g_s$  is 2, 4, and 6, respectively. Similarly, for  $g_e$  one has 0, 4, and  $8g_0$ . This  $g_0$ , which is between 0.5 and 1, reflects the uncertainty in the alignment of the filling lines relative to the boxes. According to Eq. (4) one expects the surface contribution between the three geometries to be in the ratio of 1:2:3.

In Fig. 2 we show data for  $T > T_\lambda$  plotted as  $\Delta C t^\alpha$  versus the scaling variable  $tL^{1/\nu}$ . For the planar confinement




FIG. 1 (color). Specific heat near the superfluid transition of helium confined to a film of thickness  $L$  [9], a channel  $L \times L$ , and a box  $L \times L \times L$  all with  $L = 1\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ . The insets are scanning electron microscopy images of the patterns showing the boxes and the channels. For the latter, a wider channel is shown. This communicates with a filling capillary which brings helium into the cell.

we use the results of Ref. [9] (see also Ref. [14]) which comprises a series of measurements for *various* planar confinements which were shown to display universal data collapse. To calculate  $\Delta C$  we use the bulk specific heat representation obtained in Ref. [8]. The measured heat capacity is normalized to the bulk data in the region above  $T_\lambda$  where finite-size effects are negligible,  $t \gtrsim 10^{-2}$ . The trend in the data in Fig. 2 shows the behavior expected from Eqs. (1), (3), and (4). At large  $tL^{1/\nu}$ , the channel and boxes data show the effect of the edge specific heat:  $\Delta Ct^\alpha$  is consistent with a power-law behavior of  $-2\nu$ , the solid lines. At intermediate  $tL^{1/\nu}$ , the surface specific heat dominates, hence the exponent is  $-\nu$ , the dashed lines. For smaller  $tL^{1/\nu}$ , one picks up the full finite-size effects as  $\Delta Ct^\alpha$  “rolls over” to a much weaker temperature dependence. The data for 2D confinement have a well-defined region where the surface specific heat dominates (there are no edge effects for this geometry), while the boxes and channels have at best a transition region between the edge specific heat and the fully developed finite-size effects. One can contrast the behavior of the present 1D data to those with a cylindrical geometry [15]. For the latter, the surface specific heat region extends to  $tL^{1/\nu} = 10^4$ , with no evidence of a change in power law. This is expected, long cylinders have a negligible edge contribution which comes from its ends; thus, one can take  $g_e \approx 0$ .

The equivalent plot for the region  $T < T_\lambda$  is shown in Fig. 3. Here the data show more structure because of the specific heat maximum. In particular one notes that the data for 2D confinement have a very striking minimum on this plot compared with more subtle changes of curvature for the 1D and 0D confinements. It seems likely




FIG. 2. The difference in the specific heat of confined helium from the bulk for  $T > T_\lambda$  plotted according to Eq. (1). The solid lines for large values of  $tL^{1/\nu}$  indicate the behavior of the edge specific heat. The dashed lines, at intermediate  $tL^{1/\nu}$ , indicate the behavior of the surface specific heat. For small  $tL^{1/\nu}$  the full effect of confinement is manifest.  $L$  is in Å.

that this difference for 2D is a reflection of KT behavior. Also drawn on this plot are lines corresponding to the behavior of the surface and edge specific heats. The data for 1D confinement could not be obtained into the edge region because of the onset of a superfluid resonance.

Also, as an inset in Fig. 3, we show a comparison of the 1D data with a Monte Carlo calculation of  $f_1(x)$  [16]. The theory is in good agreement with the data except near the specific heat maximum. Here the theory *exceeds* the maximum indicating that it does not capture the full import of confinement. In a similar comparison for 2D confinement, the theoretical maximum also exceeds the locus of the data [9]. A field theory calculation of  $A_s$  for planar confinement is shown as a dashed line [13]. For the channel and box geometries one would position this line, respectively, a factor of 2 and 3 higher. In all cases this line lies *below* the respective data. By contrast, above  $T_\lambda$ , one has *excellent agreement* with theory [9,14]; see Table I. We have also compared the 0D data with recent Monte Carlo calculations [17]. Excellent agreement is found for temperatures above the specific heat maximum.

To compare the magnitude of the surface and edge specific heat we have collected in Table I values of  $A_s^+$ ,  $A_s^-$ ,  $A_e^+$ , and  $A_e^-$ , as well as the overall prefactor ratios for various geometries. The  $+$ ,  $-$  refer to  $T > T_\lambda$  and  $T < T_\lambda$ , respectively. The amplitudes, which are independent of geometry, can be compared with theory where available. The ratios of the prefactors should yield the expected geometric ratios. One can see from this Table that these ratios are in agreement with expectations except for some




FIG. 3 (color online). The difference in the specific heat of confined helium from the bulk for  $T < T_\lambda$  plotted according to Eq. (1).  $L$  is in Å. The solid lines through the data are drawn with slopes corresponding to the surface and edge specific heat, Eqs. (3) and (4). The dashed line is a theoretical prediction for the surface region. The inset shows the data, plotted according to Eq. (2), for the channel geometry compared with a theoretical calculation for the same geometry. For the inset the reduced temperature is taken as negative for the region below  $T_\lambda$ .

TABLE I. Specific heat amplitudes and ratios for surface and edge specific heats.  $A_s$  and  $A_e$  are in units of  $\text{J } \text{\AA}^2/\text{mol K}$  and  $\text{J } \text{\AA}^2/\text{mol K}$ , respectively. The numbers in parentheses are the expected ratios for the geometric factors.

	Surface: $T > T_\lambda$	Surface: $T < T_\lambda$	Edge: $T > T_\lambda$	Edge: $T < T_\lambda$
Channel/planar	$1.5 \pm 0.1$ (2)	$2.0 \pm 0.1$ (2)	...	...
Box/planar	$2.1 \pm 0.1$ (3)	$2.7 \pm 0.2$ (3)	...	...
Box/channel	$1.4 \pm 0.1$ (1.5)	$1.3 \pm 0.1$ (1.5)	$1.8 \pm 0.2$ (1-2)	...
Amplitude (Exp.)	$A_s^+ = -5.9 \pm 0.2$	$A_s^- = -8.6 \pm 0.5$	$A_e^+ = -370 \pm 40$	$A_e^- = -1100 \pm 110$
Amplitude (Theory)	$A_s^+ = -5.7$	$A_s^- = -2.0$	...	...

of the surface terms for  $T > T_\lambda$ . Here the ratios channel/planar and box/planar are shy of the expected values  $1.5 \pm 0.2$  vs 2, and  $2.1 \pm 0.1$  vs 3. It seems likely that this is a reflection of the rather limited region in which the surface term is manifest for the box and channel geometries. The magnitude of  $A_s^+$  is in excellent agreement with theoretical calculations, as has already been pointed out in [9,14]. For  $A_s^-$  however, there is a strong disagreement with theory. This is true for 2D, 1D, and 0D confinements. While the theoretical values of  $A_s$  are from a first order calculation and are not expected to be very accurate [13], it is nevertheless interesting that it is on the superfluid side that one finds disagreement. This is also the region, at least for 2D, where one finds the data for various  $L$ 's do not scale [9]. The edge amplitudes have not been calculated theoretically for a system such as helium. We believe these are the first measurements near a critical point to identify such a contribution.

In summary, we have presented data of the specific heat of helium confined at the same smallest dimension but with different dimensionality crossover. This demonstrates for the first time the role of the lower dimension for the same small confinement  $L$ . We have also identified surface, and for the first time, edge contributions to finite-size effects. Comparison with theory shows agreement in some aspects and disagreement in others.

We acknowledge the support of the National Science Foundation, DMR 9972287, DMR 0242246, and the Cornell Nanofabrication Facility, 526-94.

- [1] See, for instance, Shang-Keng Ma, *Modern Theory of Critical Phenomena* (Benjamin/Cummings, Reading, MA, 1981).
- [2] M. E. Fisher, in *Critical Phenomena*, Proceedings of the 51st "Enrico Fermi" Summer School, Varenna, Italy, edited by M. S. Green (Academic Press, New York, 1971); see also M. E. Fisher and M. N. Barber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 1516 (1972).

- [3] V. Privman, *Finite Size Scaling and Numerical Simulations of Statistical Systems* (World Scientific, Teaneck, NJ, 1990), see, in particular, Eqs. 2.28 and 2.41–2.42.
- [4] See, for instance, G. Ahlers, in *The Physics of Liquid and Solid Helium*, edited by K. H. Bennemann and J. B. Ketterson (J. Wiley, New York, 1976).
- [5] J. M. Kosterlitz and D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. C **6**, 1181 (1973).
- [6] I. Rhee, D. J. Bishop, A. Petrou, and F. M. Gasparini, Rev. Sci. Instrum. **61**, 1528 (1990).
- [7] The helium in the connecting lines represents 1.8% by volume of the total sample in the cell. However, due to its small spatial confinement,  $0.018 \mu\text{m} \times 1 \mu\text{m}$ , we find that it contributes negligibly to the heat capacity.
- [8] S. Mehta, M. O. Kimball, and F. M. Gasparini, J. Low Temp. Phys. **114**, 467 (1999).
- [9] M. O. Kimball, S. Mehta, and F. M. Gasparini, J. Low Temp. Phys. **121**, 29 (2000).
- [10] For a review of finite-size scaling, see M. N. Barber, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, edited by C. Domb and J. L. Lebowitz (Academic Press, New York, 1983), Vol. 8; V. Privman, *Finite Size Scaling and Numerical Simulations of Statistical Systems* (Ref. [3]).
- [11] The exponents  $\alpha$  and  $\nu$  have been obtained in a variety of experiments and theoretical calculations. For the latest experimental determinations, see J. Lipa, D. R. Swanson, J. A. Nissen, T. C. P. Chui, and U. Israelsson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 944 (1996); L. S. Goldner, N. Mulders, and G. Ahlers, J. Low Temp. Phys. **93**, 131 (1993); for theory, see M. Campostrini, A. Pelissetto, P. Rossi, and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 5905 (2000).
- [12] R. Schmolke, A. Wacker, V. Dohm, and D. Frank, Physica (Amsterdam) **575B**, 165 (1990); see also V. Dohm, Phys. Scr. **T49**, 46 (1993).
- [13] U. Mohr and V. Dohm, Physica (Amsterdam) **284B–288B**, 43 (2000).
- [14] J. A. Lipa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4894 (2000).
- [15] J. A. Lipa, M. Coleman, and D. A. Stricker, J. Low Temp. Phys. **124**, 443 (2001).
- [16] N. Schultka and E. Manousakis, J. Low Temp. Phys. **111**, 783 (1998).
- [17] K. Nho and E. Manousakis, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 174503 (2003).