

University of Groningen

## Strain and composition effects in epitaxial ferroelectrics

Rispens, Gijsbert

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*

2010

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Rispens, G. (2010). Strain and composition effects in epitaxial ferroelectrics: structural studies on  $\text{PbxSr}_{1-x}\text{TiO}_3$  thin films grown by MBE. Groningen: s.n.

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Take-down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

## Appendix A

# Matlab script for simulating experimental CTR profiles

The MATLAB code used to calculate the truncation rods of  $\text{PbTiO}_3$  films on  $\text{SrTiO}_3$  is shown. The equations used in this program are described in chapter 3. Figures 3.13 and 4.4. The script refers to a number of other scripts that contain the atomic scattering factors and the calculation of the unit cell structure factors.

```
%X-ray simulation file.
clear;
%File control

dir = 'directory\';
file = 'filename';
fid = [dir file '.xrdml'];

% Film parameters
N_avg = 50; %Thickness (Number of unit cells)
s_pto = 2; %RMS Film Roughness
s_sto = 0; %RMS Substrate Roughness
dist = 2.5; %thickness Distribution FWHM
bg = 0; %constant background
x = 0.75; %Domain fraction up
```

```
d = 0.0; %Expansion at interface
a_sto = 3.903; %Cubic STO lattice parameter
c_pto = 4.115; %Out of plane PTO lattice parameter
S = 10*10^6; %scaling factor

% Constants
R = 2.82E-5; %Thomson radius of electron
lambda = 1.540; %X-ray wavelength, Cu k-alpha radiation

%load data files
ASF %Atomic Scattering factors
DATA_PTO %PTO coordinates, DW factors, Absorption
DATA_STO %STO coordinates, DW factors, Absorption

%load experimental data
t = XRDMLread(fid);
tt_exp = t.Theta2;
I_exp = t.data;
theta_exp = tt_exp/2;

%Simulation
q_001_pto = 2*pi/c_pto;
q_001_sto = 2*pi/a_sto;
a_pto = a_sto; %coherent epitaxial thin film
m = 1;
p = pdf('Normal', -2:2, 0, dist); %gaussian distribution of thicknesses
for theta = theta_exp, I = I_exp;
    q = 4*pi/lambda*sin(theta*(2*pi/360));
    SF_PTO %PTO structure factors
    SF_STO %STO structure factors

%STO substrate
F_ctr_STO = F_sto / (1-exp(-a_sto*(i*q + e_sto/q)));
for n = [1,2,3,4,5]
    P = p(n);
```

---

```

N = N_avg + (n-3);

%PTO film
F_ctr_film_up = F_pto_up*(1-exp(-c_pto*(N)*(i*q + e_pto/q)))/
(1-exp(-c_pto*(i*q + e_pto/q))) + F_pto_pbo_up*exp(i*c_pto*q);
F_ctr_film_down = F_pto_down*(1-exp(-c_pto*(N)*(i*q + e_pto/q)))/
(1-exp(-c_pto*(i*q + e_pto/q))) + F_pto_pbo_down*exp(i*c_pto*q);

%Reflectances
r_ctr_sub = (i*4*pi*R/(a_pto^2*q))*F_ctr_STO;
r_sub = (2*r_ctr_sub/(1+(1+(2*r_ctr_sub)^2)^1/2))*
exp(-0.5*s_sto^2*(q-q_001_sto)^2);
r_ctr_film_up = ((i*4*pi*R/(a_pto^2*q))*F_ctr_film_up)*
exp(-0.5*s_pto^2*(q-q_001_pto)^2);
r_ctr_film_down = ((i*4*pi*R/(a_pto^2*q))*F_ctr_film_down)*
exp(-0.5*s_pto^2*(q-q_001_pto)^2);
r_tot_up = r_ctr_film_up + r_ctr_sub*
exp(-c_pto*(N+d)*(i*q + e_pto/q));
r_tot_down = r_ctr_film_down + r_ctr_sub*
exp(-c_pto*(N+d)*(i*q + e_pto/q));
r_tot_up_p(n) = P*r_tot_up;
r_tot_down_p(n) = P*r_tot_down;
end
r_TOT_up = sum(r_tot_up_p);
r_TOT_down = sum(r_tot_down_p);

%Intensities
I_sim(m) = S*(abs(x*r_TOT_up + (1-x)*r_TOT_down))^2;
    %Simulated intensity
diff(m) = log10(I(m)) - log10(I_sim(m));
    %Difference between experiment and simulation
m = m+1;
end

%Plotting

```

```
axes('FontSize', 14)
subplot(3,1,[1 2])
semilogy(tt_exp, I_exp, '+', 'color',[0,0,0], 'LineWidth',2);
hold on
semilogy(tt_exp, I_sim, '-', 'color',[0.4,0.4,0.4], 'LineWidth',2);
ylabel ('Intensity (counts/s)', 'FontSize',14)
hold off
subplot(3,1,3)
plot(tt_exp, diff, 'color',[0,0,0], 'LineWidth',2);
line(tt_exp,0, 'color',[0,0,0], 'LineWidth',3)
xlabel('2{\theta}(\circ)', 'FontSize',14)
ylabel ('diff. (a.u.)', 'FontSize',14)
```

## Appendix B

# Landau Coefficients for $\text{PbTiO}_3$ and $\text{SrTiO}_3$

Landau coefficients used for the Landau-Ginzburg simulations in this thesis.

Coefficient	$\text{PbTiO}_3$ [34]	$\text{SrTiO}_3$ [129]	Units
$\alpha_1$	$3.8 \cdot (T - 752)$	$7.45 \cdot (T - 51.64)$ [102]	$10^5 \text{ J m} / \text{C}^2$
$\alpha_{11}$	-0.7252	1.04	$10^8 \text{ J m}^5 / \text{C}^4$
$\alpha_{12}$	7.5	0.746	$10^8 \text{ J m}^5 / \text{C}^4$
$\alpha_{111}$	2.606	0	$10^8 \text{ J m}^9 / \text{C}^6$
$\alpha_{112}$	6.1	0	$10^8 \text{ J m}^9 / \text{C}^6$
$Q_{11}$	8.9	4.96	$10^{-2} \text{ m}^4 / \text{C}^2$
$Q_{12}$	-2.6	6.75	$10^{-2} \text{ m}^4 / \text{C}^2$
$Q_{44}$	6.75	1.9	$10^{-2} \text{ m}^4 / \text{C}^2$
$s_{11}$	8.0	3.52	$10^{-12} \text{ m}^3 / \text{J}$
$s_{12}$	-2.5	-0.85	$10^{-12} \text{ m}^3 / \text{J}$
$s_{12}$	9	7.87	$10^{-12} \text{ m}^3 / \text{J}$
$c_{11}$	1.746	3.36	$10^{11} \text{ J} / \text{m}^3$
$c_{12}$	0.794	1.07	$10^{11} \text{ J} / \text{m}^3$
$g_{11}$	1.14	1.25	$10^{10} \text{ J m} / \text{C}^2$
$g_{12}$	0.0463	-0.108	$10^{10} \text{ J m} / \text{C}^2$

Table B.1:

