



# Journal of Crystal Growth

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jcrysgro

# High-index $Cu_2O$ (113) film on faceted MgO (110) by molecular beam epitaxy



CRYSTAL GROWTH

Wenxing Huo<sup>a,b</sup>, Jin'an Shi<sup>c</sup>, Zengxia Mei<sup>b,\*</sup>, Lishu Liu<sup>b</sup>, Junqiang Li<sup>b</sup>, Lin Gu<sup>c,\*</sup>, Xiaolong Du<sup>b</sup>, Qikun Xue<sup>a,d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> School of Electronic Engineering, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing 100876, China

<sup>b</sup> Key Laboratory for Renewable Energy, Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

<sup>c</sup> Key Laboratory of Advanced Materials and Electron Microscopy, Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

<sup>d</sup> Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

#### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 29 December 2014 Received in revised form 27 February 2015 Accepted 2 March 2015 Communicated by H. Asahi Available online 20 March 2015

Keywords: A1. Crystal structure A1. Reflection high-energy electron diffraction A3. Molecular beam epitaxy B1. Oxides

B2. Semiconducting materials

#### 1. Introduction

Cuprous oxide  $(Cu_2O)$  is a typical p-type semiconductor with a direct band gap of 2.17 eV, which is of considerable interest due to its potential applications in photocatalytic water splitting and photovoltaic cells, as well as the possibility of realizing Bose-Einstein condensation (BEC) at relative high temperature [1]. In recent decades, various substrates have been used to fabricate Cu<sub>2</sub>O films, such as sapphire [2,3], SrTiO<sub>3</sub> [4–7], silicon [8–11], ZnO [12–14], and MgO [15–23]. Among them MgO has attracted most attention due to its smallest lattice mismatch ( $\sim$ 1.3%) with Cu<sub>2</sub>O. With the lowest energy [24], Cu<sub>2</sub>O (110) surface was found predominantly forming on MgO (001) substrate [15], and singleoriented Cu<sub>2</sub>O (110) films on MgO (110) substrate are highly reproducible and possess a much wider growth window [23]. On the other hand, Cu<sub>2</sub>O (001) epitaxial films were realized on MgO (001) by using plasma-assisted molecular beam epitaxy (MBE) technique [21].

\* Corresponding authors. E-mail addresses: zxmei@iphy.ac.cn (Z. Mei), l.gu@iphy.ac.cn (L. Gu).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrysgro.2015.03.021 0022-0248/Crown Copyright © 2015 Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

# ABSTRACT

We report the growth of single-oriented Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) film on faceted MgO (110) substrate by radiofrequency plasma assisted molecular beam epitaxy. A MgO {100} faceted homoepitaxial layer was introduced beforehand as a template for epitaxy of Cu<sub>2</sub>O film. The epitaxial relationship is determined to be Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113)//MgO (110) with a tilt angle of 4.76° and Cu<sub>2</sub>O [110]//MgO [110] by the combined study of in-situ reflection high-energy electron diffraction and ex-situ X-ray diffraction and transmission electron microscopy. The film demonstrates a good p-type conductivity and excellent optical properties, indicating that this unique approach is potentially applicable for high-index film preparation and device applications.

Crown Copyright © 2015 Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

In addition to the Cu<sub>2</sub>O films with low-index surface orientations, polycrystalline Cu<sub>2</sub>O films with a high-index (113) surface were often observed [25-28]. The Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) surfaces exhibit a much higher catalytic activity than the low-index surfaces, considering the fact that a higher density of atomic steps, ledges, and kinks exist in high-index surfaces [29]. It is significant, therefore, to find a route for the synthesis of single-oriented Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) films and investigate its optical and electrical properties as an active layer. Interestingly, Sugawara and Mae [30] have presented their findings of {100} facets on MgO (110) homoepitaxial surface when the substrate temperature was higher than 500 °C. Although in other researches single phase Cu<sub>2</sub>O films grown on MgO (110) substrate were all (110) oriented [17-19,23], Cu<sub>2</sub>O films on faceted MgO (110) substrate may not definitely follow the normal cubeon-cube orientations. Herein we adopted the faceted MgO (110) surface as a template for the epitaxy of Cu<sub>2</sub>O, and finally achieved a single-oriented Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) film. The epitaxial relationship was investigated by the in-situ observation of reflection high-energy electron diffraction (RHEED) and ex-situ characterization of X-ray diffraction (XRD) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM). A special epitaxial relationship of  $Cu_2O(113)//MgO(110)$  is revealed, with a tilt angle of 4.76°. The in-plane orientation relationship is determined as  $Cu_2O [1\overline{10}]//MgO [1\overline{10}]$ . Concurrently,  $Cu_2O (113)$ 



**Fig. 1.** RHEED patterns of (a) MgO (110) surface after loaded into the chamber and (b) MgO buffer layer with incident electron beams along  $[1\overline{10}]$ ,  $[\overline{111}]$  and [001] orientations, respectively; (c) Cu<sub>2</sub>O buffer layer and (d) Cu<sub>2</sub>O epilayer with incident electron beam along  $[1\overline{10}]$ . (e) Simulated diagram of kinematical electron diffraction of Cu<sub>2</sub>O with Y axis along [110] and zone axis along  $[1\overline{10}]$ .



**Fig. 2.** (a)  $60^{\circ}$  rotation of the simulated diagram in Fig. 1 (e) and its mirror image, with spots marked by blue and orange, respectively. (b) Integrated diagram of the two diagrams in (a). (c) Fit of the RHEED pattern with the dotted box part of the integrated diagram. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

film demonstrates a good p-type conductivity and excellent optical properties, suggesting that high-index  $Cu_2O$  (113) film is promising for further device applications.

### 2. Experimental

Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) film was grown on MgO (110) single crystal substrate by using radio frequency plasma-assisted MBE (rf-MBE) technique. Elemental Cu (6 N) and Mg (5 N) were evaporated from commercial Knudsen cells while active oxygen radicals were produced by an rf-plasma source. After degreased in acetone and ethanol, the substrate was loaded into the MBE chamber and then thermally cleaned at 750 °C for 30 min, followed by oxygen plasma treatment (300 W/2.0 sccm) at 500 °C for 30 min. A homoepitaxial MgO buffer layer ( $\sim$  30 nm) was firstly deposited at 500 °C and subsequently annealed at 750 °C for 10 min. A regular two-step growth process was performed for Cu<sub>2</sub>O synthesis, that is, a low temperature buffer layer grown at 500 °C for 20 min and a high temperature epilayer grown at 700 °C for 3 h. The growth conditions for both layers were kept the same, that is, Cu cell temperature of 1000 °C, rfpower of 230 W and oxygen flux of 1.0 sccm, respectively. The growth rate is  $\sim 100 \text{ nm/h}$ , much larger than that of the Cu<sub>2</sub>O (111) on sapphire (0001) ( $\sim$  50 nm/h) [2].

In situ RHEED was applied to monitor the whole growth process. Kinematical electron diffraction simulations were performed on the website of Web Electron Microscopy Applications Software (WebEMAPS, http://emaps.mrl.uiuc.edu/). XRD (Rigaku SmartLab, Cu K $\alpha$  radiation,  $\lambda$ =1.5406 Å) measurements were carried out to confirm the growth orientation and epitaxial relationship, which were further evidenced via TEM (JEOL-ARM200F). The surface morphology was characterized by scanning electron microscope (SEM, Hitachi 4800) and atomic force

microscopy (AFM, SIINT SPA400). Hall measurements and transmittance spectroscopy characterization were also performed to study the electrical and optical properties, respectively.



**Fig. 3.** XRD curves of Cu<sub>2</sub>O film grown on MgO (110) substrate: (a) normal  $\theta$ - $2\theta$  scan; (b)  $\theta$ - $2\theta$  scan curves with  $\chi$  varying from 2.5° to 5.2°; (c)  $\varphi$  scan curve with  $\chi$ =60°,  $\theta$ =31.14° and  $2\theta$ =62.27°. The  $\varphi$  scan curve for MgO substrate with the same configurations is also presented.

#### 3. Results and discussion

The evolution of RHEED patterns during the sample preparation process is shown in Fig. 1. Three well-defined patterns, containing distinct Kikuchi lines, are observed with incident electron beams along [110], [111] and [001] directions of the pretreated MgO substrate [Fig. 1(a)]. The patterns along  $[1\overline{10}]$  and [111] become brighter and more streaky after the homoepitaxy of MgO (110) buffer layer [Fig. 1(b)], indicating an improved crystal quality. Meanwhile, the pattern along [001] shows diffraction streaks parallel to [100] and [010], originating from the (100) and (010) facets which were well depicted in Ref. [30]. In our case, the formation of faceted MgO (110) buffer layer plays an important role in growth of high-index Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) film, which will be discussed later. The RHEED patterns, observed along MgO [110], change drastically when the growth of Cu<sub>2</sub>O starts [Fig. 1(c)], and evolve into more distinct diffraction spots with an improved contrast against the background during the rest growth process [Fig. 1(d)]. To understand these complicated patterns, we simulated the diagram of kinematical electron diffraction with zone axis along  $Cu_2O$  [110] orientation by WebEMAPS, as shown in Fig. 1(e). Obviously, it is quite different from those patterns we observed in Fig. 1(d), indicating that the growth does not follow the commonly reported cube-on-cube orientation due to the insertion of faceted MgO (110) buffer layer.

After careful analysis, we found that the symmetric spots in present Cu<sub>2</sub>O RHEED patterns could be divided into two groups,



**Fig. 5.** Schematic of growth orientation relationship between Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) and MgO (110), the 180° rotation domains are marked by orange and blue arrows, respectively. The angle *A* is equal to 30°. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



**Fig. 4.** (a) Cross-sectional TEM image of  $Cu_2O$  film observed along MgO [110] orientation. The dotted polygon shows the domain boundary. (b) and (c): HAADF images of  $Cu_2O$  film on MgO in two different domains. Primitive cells were marked out by rectangles in the enlarged regions.

corresponding to two different domains. They are proved to be 180° rotated with each other, confirmed by XRD and TEM results which will be discussed below. Each group of spots occupies a rectangular lattice with an aspect ratio of  $\sqrt{2}$ : 1, which is similar to the diagram in Fig. 1(e) except for a rotation of  $60^{\circ}$ . Hence, by rotating and mirroring, the simulated diagrams of kinematical electron diffraction for the 180° rotation domains are obtained, as shown in Fig. 2(a). Note that  $Cu_2O$  [113] is inclined at 64.76° to Cu<sub>2</sub>O [110], so that Cu<sub>2</sub>O [113] is close to the normal direction of substrate, namely, MgO [110]. The simulated diagrams are overlapped together and the integrated diagram is shown in Fig. 2(b). The dotted box part of the integrated diagram matches very well with the observed RHEED patterns [Fig. 2(c)], while other parts cannot be seen in RHEED due to apparatus limitation. Some spots in RHEED patterns are missing in the integrated diagram because of extinction phenomenon. Therefore, we can make a conclusion that Cu<sub>2</sub>O [110] orientations of the 180° rotation domains are inclined at  $60^{\circ}$  to MgO [110], and Cu<sub>2</sub>O [113] is the epitaxial orientation despite of a small tilt angle of 4.76°, which has further been confirmed by XRD and TEM analysis shown below.

XRD curves of Cu<sub>2</sub>O film on MgO (110) substrate are shown in Fig. 3. A normal  $\theta$ -2 $\theta$  scan curve [Fig. 3(a)] only presents two peaks at 62.27° (denoted by Peak 1) and 72.55° (denoted by Peak 2), corresponding to the diffractions from MgO (220) and Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) surfaces, respectively. Peak 2 shifts approximately 1.01° from the standard 73.56° position for bulk Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) (ICDD PDF no. 78-2076), which is attributed to the out-of-plane expansion of the film. Here we exclude the possibility of Peak 2 originating from CuO (113) surface despite of the close peak position (72.44°, ICDD PDF no. 80-1917), as CuO phase does not exist in this epitaxial film, which has been proved by the well-defined RHEED patterns [Fig. 1(d)] and an optical bandgap of 2.54 eV (determined by the transmittance spectrum, not given here).  $\gamma$ -dependent ( $\gamma$  is a left-handed rotation about a horizontal axis)  $\theta$ -2 $\theta$  scans are performed to identify the tilt angle between Cu<sub>2</sub>O [113] and MgO [110], as shown in Fig. 3(b). The intensity of Peak 1 greatly reduces when  $\chi = 2.5^{\circ}$  and disappears when  $\chi = 5.2^{\circ}$ . Concurrently, Peak 2 achieves its maximum when  $\chi = 4.7^{\circ}$  while Peak 1 is almost ignorable. Thus the tilt angle between Cu<sub>2</sub>O [113] and MgO [110] is reasonably judged around 4.7°. Fig. 3(c) shows the  $\varphi$  scan ( $\varphi$ is an in-plane rotation around the center of the sample) curve of the film performed with  $\chi$ ,  $\theta$  and  $2\theta$  fixed at 60°, 31.14° and 62.27°, respectively, while that of MgO substrate with same configuration is also presented as a reference. Two relatively broad Cu<sub>2</sub>O (220) peaks with a  $180^{\circ}$  interval are observed, proving the existence of  $180^{\circ}$ rotation domains, which strongly supports the RHEED observations. The additional four sharp peaks have originated from MgO (202), (022),  $(02\overline{2})$ , and  $(20\overline{2})$ , respectively. Additionally, Cu<sub>2</sub>O (220) peaks are in the middle of MgO (202) and (022) or MgO (02 $\overline{2}$ ) and (20 $\overline{2}$ ) peaks, indicating that the two rotation domains could be simultaneously observed along MgO [110] orientation, which have already been observed in the RHEED patterns [Fig. 1].

Further evidences of the film orientation and microstructure by TEM are shown in Fig. 4. Cross-sectional TEM image of Cu<sub>2</sub>O film viewed down the Cu<sub>2</sub>O [110] zone axis is shown in Fig. 4(a). Two regions of different domains are selected and the corresponding 2D fast Fourier transform (FFT) patterns reveal that the orientations of the two domains are rotated around the film normal axis by 180° each other, confirming again the existence of 180° rotation domains. Domain boundary marked by dotted polygon consists of some superlattice structure. The cross-sectional high-angle annular dark-field (HAADF) images show the interface of Cu<sub>2</sub>O film and MgO substrate in two domains [Fig. 4(b) and (c)], respectively. The zone axes are along MgO [110] orientation for both images. Primitive cells selected in the enlarged regions belong to Cu<sub>2</sub>O  $\{1\overline{10}\}$  surfaces, which proves that Cu<sub>2</sub>O  $[1\overline{10}]$  are different crystal

orientations in Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) film, and they can equally form along MgO  $[1\overline{1}0]$ . That is the reason why 180° rotation domains occur in the Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) film. The orientation relationship is demonstrated in the images as well. As we expected, unlike the normal cube-oncube epitaxial relationship of Cu<sub>2</sub>O (110)//MgO (110) and Cu<sub>2</sub>O [001]//MgO [001], Cu<sub>2</sub>O [110] orientations are inclined at 60° to MgO [110]. Although Cu<sub>2</sub>O [112] orientation is also close to MgO [110], the angle between Cu<sub>2</sub>O [110] and [112] is  $54.74^{\circ}$ , so Cu<sub>2</sub>O [112] is inclined at 5.26° to MgO [110], which is bigger than that of Cu<sub>2</sub>O [113]. Furthermore, the atoms of Cu<sub>2</sub>O film at the interface arrange along  $[33\overline{2}]$ , which is vertical to [113]. The lattice mismatch between  $Cu_2O[1\overline{1}0]$  (3.016 Å) and MgO  $[1\overline{1}0]$  (2.978 Å) is 1.3%, and 15.8% between Cu<sub>2</sub>O [332] (5.004 Å) and MgO [001] (4.213 Å). Through 6/7 domain matching, the latter could be reduced to 1.77%. Therefore, Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) surface can follow an epitaxy growth on MgO (110) substrate with misfit dislocations.

Given the above results, the crystal orientation and epitaxial relationship are clearly evidenced and schematically illustrated in Fig. 5. The as-grown film is confirmed to be  $Cu_2O$  (113), which is inclined at  $4.76^{\circ}$  to MgO (110) and consists of  $180^{\circ}$  rotation domains. This special growth is most likely caused by MgO {100} faceted homoepitaxial layer. In SEM and AFM characterizations, the Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) film manifests a grainy surface and a relatively small root mean square roughness of 9.9 nm. The film thickness is determined as  $\sim$  350 nm by cross-sectional SEM image. A good p-type conductivity (hole concentration of  $1.5 \times 10^{16}$  cm<sup>-3</sup>, mobility of 36.5 cm<sup>2</sup>/V s and resistivity of 12  $\Omega$  cm) is attributed to the smooth and continuous film structure. The optical transmittance of the Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) film shows a sharp absorption edge and opacity beyond 480 nm, while the band gap  $E_g$  is deduced as 2.54 eV (not shown here). More investigations will be needed to explore the growth mechanism of high-index Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) film on MgO (110) substrate with {100} facets.

# 4. Conclusion

Single-oriented Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) film has been fabricated on faceted MgO (110) substrate by rf-MBE. The complicated RHEED patterns originate from the unique orientation and the existence of 180° rotation domains. XRD curves and TEM images confirm that the Cu<sub>2</sub>O film is [113] orientated with a tilt angle of 4.76° to MgO [110], and 180° rotation domains are proved to exist in this high-index film. The smooth and continuous surface, good p-type conductivity and high transparency beyond the band gap indicate this Cu<sub>2</sub>O (113) film can be promisingly applied in further device applications.

### Acknowledgment

This work is supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology of the People's Republic of China (Grant nos. 2011CB302002 and 2011CB302006), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant nos. 11174348, 51272280, 11274366, 61204067, and 61306011), and the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

#### References

- [1] J.L. Lin, J.P. Wolfe, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 1222.
- [2] J. Li, Z. Mei, D. Ye, H. Liang, Y. Liu, X. Du, J. Cryst. Growth 353 (2012) 63.
- [3] Z. Zang, A. Nakamura, J. Temmyo, Mater. Lett. 92 (2013) 188.
- [4] Y. Du, S. Atha, R. Hull, J.F. Groves, I. Lyubinetsky, D.R. Baer, Appl. Phys. Lett. 84 (2004) 5213.
- [5] Z.Q. Yu, C.M. Wang, M.H. Engelhard, P. Nachimuthu, D.E. McCready, I.V. Lyubinetsky, S. Thevuthasan, Nanotechnology 18 (2007) 115601.
- [6] S.V.N.T. Kuchibhatla, S.Y. Hu, Z.Q. Yu, V. Shutthanandan, Y.L. Li, P. Nachimuthu, W. Jiang, S. Thevuthasan, C.H. Henager Jr., S.K. Sundaram, Appl. Phys. Lett. 95 (2009) 053111.

- [7] I. Pallecchi, E. Bellingeri, C. Bernini, L. Pellegrino, A.S. Siri, D. Marré, J. Phys. Appl. Phys. 41 (2008) 125407.
- [8] J. Antony, Y. Qiang, M. Faheem, D. Meyer, D.E. McCready, M.H. Engelhard, Appl. Phys. Lett. 90 (2007) 013106.
- [9] A. Chen, H. Long, X. Li, Y. Li, G. Yang, P. Lu, Vacuum 83 (2009) 927.
- [10] I.S. Brandt, V. Stenger, V.C. Zoldan, J.J.S. Acuña, D.L. da Silva, A.D.C. Viegas, A.A. Pasa, Top. Catal. 54 (2011) 97.
- [11] N. Gupta, R. Singh, F. Wu, J. Narayan, C. McMillen, G.F. Alapatt, K.F. Poole, S.J. Hwu, D. Sulejmanovic, M. Young, G. Teeter, H.S. Ullal, J. Mater. Res. 28 (2013) 1740.
- [12] M. Izaki, T. Shinagawa, K.T. Mizuno, Y. Ida, M. Inaba, A. Tasaka, J. Phys. Appl. Phys 40 (2007) 3326.
- [13] S. Jeong, E.S. Aydil, J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A 28 (2010) 1338.
- [14] L.M. Wong, S.Y. Chiam, J.Q. Huang, S.J. Wang, J.S. Pan, W.K. Chim, J. Appl. Phys. 108 (2010) 033702.
- [15] K. Kawaguchi, R. Kita, M. Nishiyama, T. Morishita, J. Cryst. Growth 143 (1994) 221.
- [16] P.R. Markworth, X. Liu, J.Y. Dai, W. Fan, T.J. Marks, R.P.H. Chang, J. Mater. Res. 16 (2001) 2408.
- [17] Z.G. Yin, H.T. Zhang, D.M. Goodner, M.J. Bedzyk, R.P.H. Chang, Y. Sun, J.B. Ketterson, Appl. Phys. Lett. 86 (2005) 061901.

- [18] H. Kobayashi, T. Nakamura, N. Takahashi, Mater. Chem. Phys. 106 (2007) 292.
- [19] K. Matsuzaki, K. Nomura, H. Yanagi, T. Kamiya, M. Hirano, H. Hosono, Appl. Phys. Lett. 93 (2008) 202107.
- [20] W. Seiler, E. Millon, J. Perrière, R. Benzerga, C. Boulmer-Leborgne, J. Cryst. Growth 311 (2009) 3352.
- [21] D.S. Darvish, H.A. Atwater, J. Cryst. Growth 319 (2011) 39.
- [22] Y. Fu, H. Lei, X. Wang, D. Yan, L. Cao, G. Yao, C. Shen, L. Peng, Y. Zhao, Y. Wang, W. Wu, Appl. Surf. Sci. 273 (2013) 19.
- [23] Y. Tolstova, S.S. Wilson, H.A. Atwater, J. Cryst. Growth 410 (2015) 77.
  [24] A. Soon, M. Todorova, B. Delley, C. Stampfl, Phys. Rev. B 75 (2007) 125420.
  [25] Y.M. Lu, C.Y. Chen, M.H. Lin, Mater. Sci. Eng. B 118 (2005) 179.
- [26] S. Sung, S. Kim, K. Jo, J. Lee, J. Kim, S. Kim, K. Chai, S.J. Pearton, D.P. Norton, Y. Heo, Appl. Phys. Lett. 97 (2010) 222109.
- [27] S. Wu, Z. Yin, Q. He, G. Lu, X. Zhou, H. Zhang, J. Mater. Chem. 21 (2011) 3467.
- [28] Q. Huang, L. Wang, X. Bi, J. Phys. Appl. Phys. 46 (2013) 505101.
- [29] Y. Liang, L. Shang, T. Bian, C. Zhou, D. Zhang, H. Yu, H. Xu, Z. Shi, T. Zhang, L.Z. Wu, C.H. Tung, CrystEngComm 14 (2012) 4431.
- [30] A. Sugawara, K. Mae, Surf. Sci. 558 (2004) 211.