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INTRODUCTION

Semiconductor alloys have been studied extensively due to their importance in applications. These materials have received considerable attention because physical properties, such as the band gap, mobility and lattice parameter, can be continuously controlled. 1 Having such continuous controls is of importance in applications such as electronic devices or optical devices. For example, the energy gap of the pseudobinary compound Ga1-xAlxAs can be varied between 1.4 and 2.2 eV by varying the composition x, and the wavelength of the solid-state laser made from this material can thus be tuned accordingly.

Unlike pure crystals, the difference in the bond lengths, associated with different chemical species in alloys induces internal strain. The structural characterization of alloys dates back to the work of Vegard 2 who found that the lattice constants of some alloys change linearly with the concentration of the constituents. A simplistic explanation of this phenomenon is the virtual-crystal approximation, 3 in which all the atoms are located on an ideal lattice with the lattice constant given by the compositional average of the constituents. This approximation completely neglects the local deformations, which would be expected to occur. In tetrahedrally coordinated semiconductor compounds, deformation also occurs in the bond angles. A better understanding of Vegard's law in random alloys was achieved recently, and the conditions under which Vegard's law is expected to hold was given. 4 These studies used a harmonic potential, which accounts for the bond-stretching and the bond-bending forces. It has been shown that Vegard's law is strictly obeyed when the force constants for bond-stretching and the bond-bending forces are the same for the end members from which the alloy is made, and are independent of the composition. In semiconductor alloys, these simplifications were exploited in a series of recent papers. 5-8
Most semiconductor alloys from III-V and II-VI elements follow Vegard's law very closely. The experimental structural characterization of alloys has been accomplished mainly using Bragg x-ray diffraction, and also using Bragg neutron diffraction. These experiments measure the structural quantities which are correlated over long distances, such as the lattice constant. More recently, extended x-ray absorption fine structure (XAFS) experiments have been used to study semiconductor alloys. Such experiments investigate the short range order, such as the mean near-neighbor, and occasionally next nearest neighbor spacings.

However, the diffuse background in diffraction experiments has not drawn much attention because it is more difficult to obtain and hard to analyze. Nonetheless, the diffuse background exists in all experimental data on alloys due to the local displacements. This information can be analyzed using the pair distribution function (PDF). PDF analysis has been used mainly in the characterization of atomic arrangements in amorphous materials such as non-crystalline alloys or liquids. Although it has long been known that the PDF method is well suited for analyzing crystalline as well as amorphous materials, it has only recently been applied to study the local structure of disordered crystalline materials. Because the real-space resolution is inversely proportional to the highest momentum data, it is essential to have high momentum-transfer scattering data to study local structures. High momentum-transfer scattering data have become available with the advent of sources such as synchrotron x-ray sources and spallation neutron sources. These data not only give information about local structures from the diffusive background but also allow accurate data normalization and thus reduce systematic errors in the experimentally determined PDF. Since it has now become rather routine to access high momentum-transfer scattering data, PDF analysis is becoming a good candidate for characterizing semiconductor alloys.

There are several advantages to using PDF analysis. On the one hand, it covers a wide range of pair distances. Therefore, it can be used to study local structural characteristics such as nearest neighbor distances or intermediate-range structures such as clustering. On the other hand, it gives a complete description of the structure in that not only the average distance between a pair but the width of the length distribution can also be obtained. Furthermore, this method is not subject to any arbitrary fitting parameters and the result of a theoretical calculation can be directly compared with the experimental data.

In this paper, we present a method of calculating the PDF of binary semiconductor crystals in the zinc-blende structure, AC, and the associated pseudobinary alloys A1-xBxC. Calculated PDFs are then compared with experimentally determined PDFs from the same compounds. We also discuss the advantages and limitations of using the PDF analysis in investigating local structures. To account for the local strain, we use a simple valence bond model, which has been successful in describing the local strain in semiconductor alloys.

Since experimental data is always subject to thermal broadening, thermal averaging should be taken into account also. This is done in this paper by using the proper Bose factors and also by employing the Debye-Waller theorem. We limit ourselves in our discussion of the PDF of semiconductor alloys to the zinc-blende structure in the form of random solid solutions. In particular, we focus on Ga1-xInxAs as an important example. But our method can be easily modified to any crystals and crystalline alloys, with or without local clustering present.

The reason for choosing Ga1-xInxAs is that it is one of the largest bond-length mismatched alloys among III-V and II-VI compounds. Therefore, the effect of bond-length disorder will be most pronounced. Also it is one of the standard systems and has been studied quite extensively. One of the experimental advantages is that the two end members, GaAs and InAs, are completely miscible and form a random solid solution at all concentrations.
MODEL

To account for the forces between atoms tetrahedrally coupled by the valence bonding in zinc-blende structures, we adopt the Kirkwood model.\textsuperscript{15} The potential energy in this model is given by

\[ V = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \frac{\alpha_{ij}}{2} (L_{ij} - L_{ij}^0)^2 + L_\theta \sum_{\langle i,j,l \rangle} \frac{\beta_{ij}}{2} (\cos \theta_{ij} - \cos \theta^0)^2. \]  

(1)

Here, the first term describes the energy due to the bond-stretching force with the force constant \( \alpha_{ij} \) between atoms \( i \) and \( j \). The lengths \( L_{ij} \) and \( L_{ij}^0 \) refer to the actual and natural (unstrained) bond lengths between atoms \( i \) and \( j \), respectively. The second term in (1) is due to the bond-bending force with the force constant \( \beta_{ij} \) between the bonds \( ij \) and \( il \). \( \theta_{ij} \) and \( \theta^0 \) are the actual and natural (109.5°) angle between the bonds \( ij \) and \( il \). \( L_\theta \) is the nearest neighbor distance as given by the virtual crystal approximation. \( L_\theta \) is inserted in the second term to make \( \beta_{ij} \) have the same dimension as \( \alpha_{ij} \). The angular brackets under the summations denote counting each configuration only once to exclude double counting. The potential (1) has been used extensively in discussing the elastic strain in semiconductor alloys.\textsuperscript{5-8}

The harmonic approximation can be applied because we expect small positional changes in the alloy from the virtual crystal, which is used as a reference. There are two causes for the distortions, the static one from the bond-length mismatch and the dynamic one from the thermal motion. The change from bond-length mismatch is small since it is less than 10% of the unstrained bond lengths although Ga\textsubscript{1-x}In\textsubscript{x}As is one of the largest length-mismatched semiconductors. The thermal broadening is also quite small since we are interested in the low- to room-temperature range. It is therefore reasonable to use a harmonic approximation for the potential due to the displacements.

Let \( \mathbf{u}_i \) be the displacement vector of atom \( i \) from its perfect crystalline position. Expanding up to linear terms in \( \mathbf{u}_i \), we have

\[ L_{ij} = L_\alpha + \hat{r}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i, \]

(2)

where \( \hat{r}_{ij} \) is a unit vector in the perfect crystal pointing from atom \( i \) to its nearest neighbor \( j \), and \( \mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{u}_i \). Then the potential energy (1) can be expanded to have the form,\textsuperscript{6}

\[ V = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \frac{\alpha_{ij}}{2} (L_{ij} - L_{ij}^0 - \hat{r}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i)^2 + L_\theta \sum_{\langle i,j,l \rangle} \frac{\beta_{ij}}{2} \left[ \hat{r}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i + \hat{r}_{il} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i + \frac{1}{3} (\hat{r}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) \hat{r}_{il} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i - \hat{r}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i \hat{r}_{il} \cdot \mathbf{u}_i \right]^2. \]

(3)

We\textsuperscript{5-8} have preferred to use the Kirkwood model (3) rather than the Keating model\textsuperscript{16} because of the cleaner separation of length and angular displacements. Since the nearest-neighbor central force alone is not enough to stabilize the zinc-blende structure, this model is one of the simplest force models for the zinc-blende structure. This model (3) is not good enough to produce very exact phonon dispersion relations. However, it has been proved to be accurate enough to describe the local structure quantitatively.\textsuperscript{6} It also provides a clear picture for the important microscopic forces. Therefore, the model is a good starting point for our purpose and may be refined later as needed. It appears that this simple model can capture all the essential features in the PDF.

Equation (3) can be recast into a concise matrix form,
\[ V = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{F} + E_0 \]  \tag{4}

where \( \mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \ldots) \) is the displacement field vector and \( \mathbf{M} \) is a matrix derivable from Eq. (3). The components of the force vector field \( \mathbf{F} = (F_1, F_2, \ldots) \) are defined by

\[ F_i = -\sum_j \alpha_j \left( t_{ij}^0 - L_{ij}^0 \right) \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ij} \]  \tag{5}

which expresses the internal strain due to the disorder. The length disorder only appears through this vector. This form of the potential (4) is useful in that it gives a simple form from which to find the relaxed equilibrium positions of strained systems, namely,

\[ \mathbf{M} \mathbf{u} = -\mathbf{F}, \]  \tag{6}

and also in that the dynamical matrix is defined through the matrix \( \mathbf{M} \) as discussed in the next section.

**DEFINITIONS**

Since different definitions are used in literature,\textsuperscript{17} we give the definitions we use in this study. To define the dynamical matrix \( \mathbf{D}(k) \), we need to distinguish the Bravais lattice and the basis to which the atom \( i \) belongs to. Let us divide \( N \) atoms into \( N \) Bravais lattice points, each containing \( p \) basis atoms \( [N = Np] \). Let \( l(l') \) and \( \mu(\mu') \) be the Bravais lattice and the basis labels of the atom \( i(l) \), respectively. Denoting the position of the atom \( i \) as \( \mathbf{r}_i \), we use the following definition of the dynamical matrix;

\[ \mathbf{D}_{\mu \alpha, \mu' \alpha'}(k) = \left( \mathbf{M}_\mu \mathbf{M}_{\mu'} \right)^{-1/2} \sum_r M_{\alpha \alpha'} e^{-ik \cdot \left( \mathbf{r}_r - \mathbf{r}_i \right)}. \]  \tag{7}

Here, \( \alpha \) and \( \alpha' \) denote three Cartesian coordinates, and hence the dynamical matrix is a \( 3p \times 3p \) matrix.

Since different nomenclature has been used for the PDF, we hereby give the definition.\textsuperscript{14} For the sake of simplicity, we begin with an arrangement of \( N \) identical atoms.\textsuperscript{10-13} Then, the atomic density function \( p(\mathbf{r}) \) is given by

\[ p(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_i), \]  \tag{8}

and the density-density correlation function \( C(\mathbf{r}) \) can be written as

\[ C(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{N} \left\langle \int p(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}') p(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}' \right\rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} \sum_{i'} \left\langle \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_i) \right\rangle = \rho(\mathbf{r}) + \delta(\mathbf{r}), \]  \tag{9}

where \( \mathbf{r}_{ij} = \mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_i \) is a vector from atom \( i \) to \( j \) and \( \langle \cdots \rangle \) denotes the statistical average which implies both configurational and thermal averages. The correlation function \( C(\mathbf{r}) \) describes the probability of finding an atom at position \( \mathbf{r} \) from a chosen atom at the origin. This probability density is further averaged by taking each atom in turn as the origin. The delta function \( \delta(\mathbf{r}) \) is the probability of an atom itself and appears as a constant background in the
momentum space of experiments. The function $\rho(r)$ defines the PDF. Defining $\rho_i(r) = \langle \delta(r-r_i) \rangle$, the PDF can be rewritten as

$$
\rho(r) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij}(r),
$$

where the prime in the summation means that $i = j$ is excluded.

In this study, the major interest lies in macroscopically isotropic materials, such as pure randomly-oriented crystallites or random solid solutions. In such materials, $\rho(r)$ depends only on the magnitude $r$. It is convenient to define the radial distribution function (RDF) as

$$
J(r) = 4\pi r^2 \rho(r).
$$

Then the probability should be interpreted as per unit length rather than per unit volume. The average number of atoms in a shell with radius $r$ and thickness $dr$ is given by $J(r)dr$.

However, the RDF tends to obscure the correlations between atoms as $r$ gets larger because it grows rapidly. Hence, it is customary to define the PDF as

$$
G(r) = 4\pi r \left[ \rho(r) - \rho_0 \right] = \frac{1}{r} \left[ J(r) - 4\pi r^2 \rho_0 \right],
$$

where $\rho_0$ is the average number density of the material. Since the average density is subtracted, $G(r)$ oscillates around zero and shows the correlations more clearly than does the RDF. Usually, it is this function to which the experimental data are transformed through the relation

$$
G(r) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F(q) \sin qr dq.
$$

Here $q$ is the magnitude of the scattering vector and $F(q)$ is the reduced scattering intensity defined by

$$
F(r) = q \left[ \frac{I(q)}{Nf^2} - 1 \right],
$$

where $f$ is the atomic form factor and $I(q)$ is the experimentally measured scattering intensity given by the square of the scattering amplitude;

$$
I(q) = \left| \sum_i^n f_i(q)e^{iqr_i} \right|^2.
$$

In the next section, the Kirkwood model of the previous section is utilized to calculate the PDF and results are given mainly in the form of the PDF which can be directly compared with experiments.

In case of multicomponent systems, the definition of the PDF is generalized to

$$
\rho(r) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t} \sum_{j} w_{ij} \rho_{ij}(r).
$$
Here, \( w_{ij} \) is given by \( f_i f_j / \bar{f} \), where \( f_i \) is the scattering strength of the atom \( i \) and \( \bar{f} \) denotes the arithmetic mean of \( f_i \)'s in the sample. Here \( f_i \) is the scattering factor in x-ray scattering, and the scattering length in neutron scattering. Eq. (15) is exact for neutron diffraction, where the scattering is from the nucleus which may be considered as a point. For x-ray scattering (15) is only an approximation as the \( f_i \) are due to the electron density associated with each atom, which in reality have different \( q \) dependence. Nevertheless we will use this approximation here so, that the \( f_i \) are proportional to the atomic charges \( Z_i \).

**EXPERIMENTAL DETERMINATION OF THE PDF**

The experimental determination of PDFs has been described extensively elsewhere. Data were collected from powders of Ni, InAs and Ga\(_{0.5}\)In\(_{0.5}\)As: The nickel and InAs samples were measured at room temperature using synchrotron x-rays at beamline X-7A at the National Synchrotron Light Source. The nickel was also measured at room temperature using a molybdenum sealed laboratory x-ray source. In each case the data were collected in symmetric reflection geometry. Data were corrected for polarization, absorption, multiple scattering, background and Compton scattering, divided by the average form factor and normalized for flux and sample volume to obtain \( \Phi(Q) \), the total structure function which was Fourier transformed to obtain \( G(r) \). No correction was made for thermal diffuse scattering since this contains important information about the correlations of the atomic dynamics.

The Ga\(_{0.5}\)In\(_{0.5}\)As sample was prepared by quenching a mixture of InAs and GaAs from the melt in an evacuated quartz ampoule. The sample was then annealed for a week under vacuum at 950°C, just below the solidus temperature. This annealing procedure was repeated twice with an intermediate grinding to obtain complete homogenization of the sample. Sample homogeneity was checked using x-ray diffraction. The Ga\(_{0.5}\)In\(_{0.5}\)As sample was measured at 10K with neutrons using the High Intensity Powder Diffractometer (HIPD) at the Manuel Lujan, Jr., Neutron Scattering Center at Los Alamos National Laboratory. Approximately 10g of sample were sealed in a vanadium tube in the presence of He transfer gas. This was cooled using a closed cycle helium refrigerator to 10K. The data were corrected for absorption, multiple scattering, backgrounds and inelasticity effects, and normalized to recover \( \Phi(Q) \), which was then Fourier transformed to obtain \( G(r) \).

**CALCULATION OF THE PDF**

In this section we evaluate the PDF of crystalline systems in the zinc-blende structure. The system may be either a pure binary semiconductor such as GaAs and InAs, or a pseudobinary alloy such as Ga\(_{1-x}\)In\(_x\)As. We first rewrite \( \rho_{ij}(r) \) as

\[
\rho_{ij}(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int dq e^{-iqr} \left\langle e^{i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{r}} \right\rangle.
\]

This function would be a \( \delta \)-function located at \( r_{ij} \) if all the atoms were stationary in a perfect crystal. However, this \( \delta \)-function is broadened by the thermal motions since the atoms move about the equilibrium positions even at zero temperature. Moreover, it is further broadened by the internal strains due to the bond-length mismatch in the case of alloys.
For the thermal motions, the Debye-Waller theorem can be utilized within the harmonic approximation. As shown in Appendix A, this leads to a Gaussian peak for $\rho_{ij}(r)$ centered at $r_{ij}$ with a width $\sigma_{ij}$ given by

$$\sigma_{ij} = \left( \langle u_{ij} \cdot \hat{r}_{ij} \rangle \right)^{1/2}.$$  \hfill (17)

Accordingly, the total PDF consists of a series of Gaussians from each pair in the system with an appropriate weight $w_{ij}$.

To proceed further, we make use of the quantum mechanical representation of the displacement. Let us divide $N$ atoms into $N$ Bravais lattice points, each containing $p$ basis atoms as before. Let $\mu(\nu)$ be the basis label of atoms $i(j)$ in a unit cell. Rewriting $u_{ij}$ in terms of phonon operators, it can be shown that

$$\sigma_{ij}^2 = \frac{2\hbar}{N} \sum_{k,s} \frac{1}{\omega_s(k)} \left( \langle n_{k,s} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \right)$$
$$\times \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{e_{\mu}(k,s) \cdot \hat{r}_{ij}}{M_{\mu}} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{e_{\nu}(k,s) \cdot \hat{r}_{ij}}{M_{\nu}} \right)^2 \right] - \left[ \frac{e_{\mu}(k,s) \cdot \hat{r}_{ij}}{M_{\mu}} \right] \left( \frac{e_{\nu}(-k,s) \cdot \hat{r}_{ij}}{M_{\nu}} \right),$$  \hfill (18)

where $\omega_s(k)$ is the eigenvalue of the dynamical matrix $(7)$ with the wavevector $k$ in branch $s$; $n_{k,s}$ is the number operator in that mode, and $e_{\mu}(k,s)$ is the corresponding eigenvector associated with the basis $\mu$ and mass $M_{\mu}$. In the summation, $k$ runs from 1 to $N$ and $s$ runs from 1 to $3p$. Now, the problem of finding the effect of thermal broadening is reduced to solving the eigenvalue problem of the dynamical matrix. Solving the eigenvalue problem analytically for general $k$ with a large supercell has to rely on numerical methods.

Below, we distinguish between the pure and disordered systems. In the former, the only reason for line broadening is the thermal motion. In the latter, there are two reasons, the thermal motion and the static internal strains.

**Example: Ni**

As an example, we first consider powdered crystalline Ni. Crystalline Ni has the fcc structure and the phonons are well described by a nearest neighbor central force model. The experimental phonon density of states was found by measuring the phonon dispersion curves$^{19}$ in a single crystal of in the (100), (110) and (111) directions using inelastic neutron scattering. These dispersion relations were fit with a model with many parameters, but the density of states is very close to that obtained with a single nearest neighbor central force,$^{20}$ and we will use this simple model here.

We compute the eigenvalues and eigenvectors by diagonalising the $3 \times 3$ dynamical matrix for Ni, and use the value of the central force constant $\alpha = 88$N/m.$^{19,20}$ The various $\sigma_{ij}$ for each neighbor set is obtained by doing the complete Brillouin Zone integration as given in Eq. (18) with $p=1$. There are no adjustable parameters and the result is shown in Figure 1. We have convoluted this result with the appropriate $q_{\text{max}}$ using Eq. (A6) and the results are shown for two different values of $q_{\text{max}}$ in Figures 2 and 3. It can be seen that the agreement with experiment is very good, particularly considering that there are no adjustable parameters.
Figure 1. Theoretical calculation of the reduced PDF of Ni at room temperature.

Figure 2. Comparison of theoretical result with experiment in Ni using \(q_{\text{max}}=16\text{Å}^{-1}\) at room temperature (with an X-ray source).

Figure 3. Comparison of theoretical result with experiment in Ni using \(q_{\text{max}}=21\text{Å}^{-1}\) at room temperature (with a synchrotron source).
Example: InAs

Consider a pure binary semiconductor crystal, AC, with A atoms in one sublattice and C in the other. As with Ni, there is only one source of peak broadening, the thermal motion, which is characterized by \( \sigma_{ij} \) in Eq. (18). For a pure crystal, the force constants \( \alpha_{ij} \) in Eq. (3) assume the same value \( \alpha \) for all bonds and we assume that \( \beta_{ij} \) also takes the same value \( \beta \) for all angles. These parameters can be determined independently from standard experimental data.\(^6\) Since \( p = 2 \) in the zinc-blende structure, the dynamical matrix is a 6×6 matrix. It can be calculated analytically in a closed form for general \( k \).\(^8\)

\[
D_k = \alpha \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{4}{3} \mathbf{1} & \tau_{-k} \\
-\tau_{k} & \frac{4}{3} \mathbf{1}
\end{bmatrix} + \beta \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{4}{3} \mathbf{1} + \frac{1}{2} v_k v_{-k} & \tau_{-k} - \frac{2}{3} \gamma_{-k} \mathbf{1} \\
\tau_{k} - \frac{2}{3} \gamma_k \mathbf{1} & \frac{4}{3} \mathbf{1} + \frac{1}{2} v_k v_k
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
+ \frac{\beta}{9} \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{4}{3} \mathbf{1} + \frac{1}{2} v_{-k} v_k + \frac{1}{3} \gamma_{-k} \tau_{-k} + \frac{1}{3} \gamma_k \tau_k & \tau_{-k} - 2 \gamma_{-k} \mathbf{1} \\
\tau_{k} - 2 \gamma_k \mathbf{1} & \frac{4}{3} \mathbf{1} + \frac{1}{2} v_{-k} v_k + \frac{1}{3} \gamma_{-k} \tau_{-k} + \frac{1}{3} \gamma_k \tau_k
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(19)

Here, \( \mathbf{1} \) is the 3×3 unit matrix, and the scalar \( \gamma_k \) is given by

\[
\gamma_k = \sum_\delta e^{-\kappa r}
\]

\[
= 4 \left[ \cos \frac{k_x L_x}{\sqrt{3}} \cos \frac{k_y L_y}{\sqrt{3}} \cos \frac{k_z L_z}{\sqrt{3}} + i \sin \frac{k_x L_x}{\sqrt{3}} \sin \frac{k_y L_y}{\sqrt{3}} \sin \frac{k_z L_z}{\sqrt{3}} \right].
\]

(20)

The vector \( v_k \) and the tensor \( \tau_k \) are defined to be \( v_k = (i \nabla_k / L_k) \gamma_k, \tau_k = (i \nabla_k / L_k) (i \nabla_k / L_k) \gamma_k \), respectively. Using Eq. (19), the eigenvalue problem can be solved numerically, and the summation in Eq. (18) can be carried out using Monte Carlo integration over the first Brillouin zone.

There is no internal strain for a pure system as discussed previously. Figure 4 presents the result for the width \( \sigma \) for InAs at different temperatures. We used \( \alpha = 80 \text{ N/m} \) and \( \beta = 10.3 \text{ N/m} \) for InAs.\(^6\) Note that there is a factor of 3 difference in the values of the force constants used here and previously\(^6\) due to different definitions. Also note that the values of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are smaller by about 20% from those used in a previous theoretical publication by Chung and Thorpe.\(^21\) We did adjust \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) to get a reasonable fit to the PDF experiments, and then values of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) used previously\(^21\) were clearly too large. These previous values were derived from measurements of the elastic constants and using the Kirkwood model. In the present set of experiments we have not attempted to optimize \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), but rather to get them to within a few percent of the optimal values. This was done by noticing that the width of the near neighbor peak is primarily dependent on \( \alpha \) alone and so we used this width to fix \( \alpha \). The value of \( \beta \) was then obtained subsequently by fitting the width of the distant neighbors, which is constant beyond about 10\AA.

The widths of the peaks are shown in Figure 4 at three separate temperatures. The symbols at 2.62\AA depict the width of nearest neighbors, and those at 4.28\AA represents that of the second neighbors, etc. Although the highest temperature 1000K is not realistic because it is beyond the melting point, still the width \( \sigma \) is very much less than the interatomic spacing. It is to be noted that the width for the nearest neighbors does not vary as much as those for other neighbors as the temperature is increased. This is because nearest neighbor pairs are connected by the strong bond-stretching force. All other neighbors are connected by at least one bond-bending force, which is considerably weaker than the bond-stretching force in covalently-bonded materials. Therefore, further neighbors connected by bond-bending forces become more sensitive to the thermal agitation, while
nearest neighbor pairs can remain rather rigid. This has an experimental significance; if one wants to improve the experimental resolution by lowering the temperature, it does not help much for the nearest neighbor peak, which might be the most interesting, as it does for the rest of peaks.

![Graph showing the theoretical width σ as a function of distance r for pure InAs crystal at different temperatures.](image)

**Figure 4.** The theoretical width σ for pure InAs crystal as a function of the distance from the origin r at different temperatures (× at 1000K, ◦ at 300K and ○ at 10K). The force constants used are α = 80 N/m and β = 10.3 N/m. The leftmost symbol corresponds to the nearest neighbor. At certain distances, where two types of neighbors (e.g. In-In and As-As) occur, symbols may overlap.

In calculating the PDF, the symmetry of the system can be made use of in the summation of Eq. (18). Since the same type of neighbors have the same distance and the same width, PDF peaks with the same type are simply weighted by the number of neighbors of that type in addition to the weighting factor \( w_{ij} \). For example, nearest neighbor by 4, next nearest neighbor by 12, and so on. The PDF \( G(r) \) of InAs at 300K are depicted in Figure 5. The curve at 10K shows much sharper peaks as expected. As the temperature is raised, however, peak widths are increased and hence peak heights are decreased substantially due to the effect of the thermal broadening.

![Graph showing temperature dependence of the reduced PDF of pure InAs crystal.](image)

**Figure 5.** Temperature dependence of the reduced [x-ray] PDF of pure InAs crystal is plotted as a function of the distance from the origin r at 300K. The force constants used in the theory are α = 80 N/m and β = 10.3 N/m.
Figure 6. The reduced (x-ray) PDF of InAs from the theoretical calculation is compared with the experiment at 300K. The theoretical curve is convoluted with $q_{\text{max}}=22\text{Å}^{-1}$ at room temperature (with synchrotron source). The force constants used in the theory are $\alpha = 80 \text{ N/m}$ and $\beta = 10.3 \text{ N/m}$.

Figure 7. Comparison of theoretical width $\sigma$ with experimentally determined values for InAs, at room temperature. The force constants used in the theory are $\alpha = 80 \text{ N/m}$ and $\beta = 10.3 \text{ N/m}$.

In figure 6, the PDF at 300K is compared with an x-ray diffraction experiment. The theoretical curve is convoluted with the experimental resolution function as discussed in the Appendix B. This convolution not only makes small wiggles appear at the bottom of the curves but also lowers and broadens the peaks. The figure shows that the calculation reproduces essentially every feature in the experiment. Our calculation gives better resolution than the experiment, which is not surprising. What is surprising is that our simple model with no adjustable parameters even allows a quantitative comparison with experiment. This confirms that the model is adequate to be used for semiconductor alloys.

The PDF peak widths can be extracted directly from the experimental PDF by fitting Gaussian functions to each peak in the data. This has been done for the InAs data at 300K shown in Fig. 6. The results are shown in Figure 7 compared to the predicted PDF peak widths from the theory.
Example: Ga$_{0.5}$In$_{0.5}$As

Consider a pseudobinary semiconductor alloy in the zinc-blende structure, A$_1$B$_2$C with A and B atoms in one sublattice and C in the other. Although disorder is introduced only in one sublattice in this study, it would be straight forward to generalize it to both sublattices. As mentioned before, there are two reasons for peak broadening, because the internal strain due to bond-length mismatch between A-C and B-C bonds comes into play as well as the thermal motion. As in the case of the pure crystal, for simplicity, we take $a_C = a$ for all pairs and $b = b$ for all angles. We believe that this simplification does not affect the result much because the values of $a$'s and $b$'s do not vary much among III-V and II-VI compounds. This restriction can easily be relaxed to include more general cases. Note that even large changes in the force constants produce only small changes in the internal strains.

To realize the alloy, we employ the periodic supercell which consists of $L \times L \times L$ cubic unit cells of the zinc-blende structure, each containing 8 atoms. The dynamical matrix becomes a $3p \times 3p$ matrix where $p = 8L^3$. This method has several advantages over other methods of calculating $\sigma$, such as the equation of motion technique. Since this method simply extends the size of the basis, it is conceptually clear and we can closely follow most of the arguments about the pure system given above. Another computational merit of taking a large supercell is that we may sum only over modes at $k=0$ in Eq. (18). This is because the zone folding in the reduced-zone scheme enables us to sample enough k-points in the original Brillouin zone if we use a big enough supercell. It also reduces computational time since all calculations can be done in real mode rather than in complex mode. For the results presented in this section, we used $L=4$ so that we dealt with 512 atoms and hence a 1536x1536 dynamical matrix. The typical error in $\sigma$ is estimated to be less than 1% by comparison with the Brillouin zone integration scheme for the perfect crystal. A configurational average is taken over 10 realizations.

The displacement vector $\mathbf{u}$ in this case contains the distortion due to the static strain $\mathbf{u}$, as well as the thermal motion $\mathbf{u}_t$. Since we are interested in the first order correction in the harmonic approximation, the total $\mathbf{u}$ can be written as a simple sum of these two terms. The static strains $\mathbf{u}$ due to the bond-length mismatch, are found by relaxing the system according to Eq. (6). The thermal fluctuations $\mathbf{u}_t$ around the relaxed positions enter into Eq. (17). The calculational procedure for alloys is as follows: for a given random number seed a configuration of the system is realized. Then the matrix $\mathbf{M}$ in Eq. (4) is constructed and the system is relaxed using the conjugate gradient method to find the static equilibrium displacement $\mathbf{u}$ using Eq. (6). From $\mathbf{M}$, dynamical matrix $\mathbf{D}$ is numerically constructed using Eq. (7). The eigenvalue problem for the matrix $\mathbf{D}$ is solved numerically. The solution is used in the integration (18) to obtain $\sigma_{ij}$. This whole procedure is iterated over many realizations to perform a configurational average and finally Eq. (15) gives the PDF.

Figure 8 shows the PDF $G(r)$ for Ga$_{0.5}$In$_{0.5}$As at 10K. Every peak basically consists of many Gaussians as in the pure case. However, due to the internal strains each Gaussian from a particular neighbor is centered at a different distance given by the relaxed positions of each realization. The width $\sigma_{ij}$ also depends on the particular realization. Therefore, we cannot make use of the symmetry of the system to reduce computational time as in the pure case. The distribution of the pair distance implies that each peak from a particular type of neighbor is already broadened even at very low temperature. Therefore, there is no dramatic change in peak width and height as in the pure system as the temperature is varied.

For a more detailed analysis, the first neighbor peak at 10K is redrawn in Figures 9 and 10 along with the partial bond-length distributions. It is clear that the structure in the first peak results from two different types of bonds (Ga-As and In-As). The lengths of two types of bonds are relaxed to new equilibrium lengths (2.47Å and 2.60Å) from those of pure cases.
Figure 8. Comparison of theory with experiment for Ga_{0.3}In_{0.7}As, using $q_{\text{max}}=40\AA^{-1}$ (neutron data) at $T=10$K. The force constants used in the theory are $\alpha = 80$ N/m and $\beta = 10.3$ N/m. (2.45Å and 2.62Å). This change in the bond-lengths has been studied both experimentally\textsuperscript{9} and theoretically.\textsuperscript{24} Our calculation shows that the change in the average length and the width of the distribution of the nearest-neighbor bond lengths can be measured in a PDF experiment at a sufficiently low temperature. A quantitative measurement of the width may not be trivial because the thermal broadening is comparable to the width of the length distribution itself. However, it is this capability of measuring the width that makes a PDF analysis potentially superior to other experimental methods. For example, XAFS experiments only measure the average length of nearest and perhaps also next nearest neighbor peaks. By contrast, a PDF experiment can give the average length \textit{and} the width of the length distribution without any adjustable parameters. The only empirical parameters in our theoretical analysis are the force constants $\alpha$, $\beta$ and the lattice constant [See Eq. (3)]. These can be determined independently by standard experiments such as elasticity measurements, optical measurements and Bragg x-ray scattering.

Figure 9. Comparison of theory with experiment for the first peak in Ga_{0.3}In_{0.7}As, using $q_{\text{max}}=40\AA^{-1}$ (neutron data) at $T=10$K. The force constants used in the theory are $\alpha = 80$ N/m and $\beta = 10.3$ N/m.
Figure 10. Theoretical calculation of partial PDF of Ga$_{0.5}$In$_{0.5}$As at $T=10$K. The partial PDFs are shifted downward for clarity. The force constants used in the theory are $\alpha = 80$ N/m and $\beta = 10.3$ N/m.

Figure 11. Theoretical results at $T=10$K and $T=300$K Details of the first three peaks of the reduced [neutron] PDF of Ga$_{0.5}$In$_{0.5}$As are compared with the pure end members, GaAs and InAs, at 10K and 300K. Solid lines are for the alloy, broken lines for GaAs, and dotted lines for InAs. Note that the resolution changes substantially with the temperature. The force constants used in the theory are $\alpha = 80$ N/m and $\beta = 10.3$ N/m.

The first three peaks are plotted again in figure 11 along with those from the pure end members, GaAs and InAs. The internal structure of the first neighbor peak at 10K clearly shows that it retains the characteristics of the pure systems, although it is almost unrecognizable at 300K due to the thermal broadening. This is again because the nearest neighbors are only connected by the strong bond-stretching force. From the second neighbors and beyond, however, there can be many different intermediate configurations.
connected by the weak bond-bending forces. Hence each peak appears as a distribution of Gaussians centered at the length given by the virtual crystal approximation, with the peak of the alloy tracking the first moment of that peak, which is temperature independent and goes linearly with the composition \( x \) between the two pure crystal limits.

CONCLUSIONS

We have developed a method of calculating the PDF of binary semiconductor crystals and pseudobinary alloys having the zinc-blende structure. The PDF reveals the local structure directly and can be compared with experiments. Our approach can be easily generalized for various crystal structures including fcc, diamond and wurtzite structures. To facilitate the calculation, we have used a harmonic Kirkwood potential model with bond-stretching and bond-bending forces. Temperature dependence is treated quantum mechanically using the dynamical matrix and appropriate Bose factors.

The PDF turns out to consist of a series of Gaussians with the weight \( w_{ij} \) given by the type of atoms at site \( i \) and \( j \) and with width \( \sigma_{ij} \) given as a function of phonon properties. In the case of a pure system, each type of neighbor pair has the same width and are further weighted by the number of neighbors of that type. However, in the case of the alloy, each peak from the same type of neighbor is relaxed to a different distance with a different width by the internal strains.

This method is used to calculate the PDF of a InAs pure crystal and a Ga\(_{1-x}\)In\(_x\)As alloy, with \( x=0.5 \). The result for the pure crystal agrees well with the neutron diffraction experiment even though there are no adjustable parameters. The harmonic model we used describes the behavior of the system adequately. The result for the alloy suggests that two different types of nearest neighbors can be resolved experimentally at sufficiently low temperature. The information on the width of the length distribution can be obtained as well as the average length. The resolution of such an experiment, however, is somewhat limited by the zero point motions.

This method does not suffer from possible artifacts which may arise from fitting the experimental data with adjustable parameters, which other methods such as XAFS do. However, it has some limitations in resolutions due to zero-point motions. This makes it difficult to resolve different types of bonds beyond the first neighbor peak. One possible improvement is to explore the partial PDF which measures peaks involving a certain atom.\(^{24}\) But this would require a large experimental effort, involving isotope substitution or anomalous x-ray scattering techniques.

Despite these limitations, PDF analysis is almost the only method of studying the intermediate range properties of the semiconductor alloys. Therefore it has been important to develop a microscopic model to understand the observed behavior microscopically and provide a clear physical picture. The model and analysis used in this study has proved to be quite versatile and robust.
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APPENDIX

Derivation of Gaussian Peaks

Let us rewrite Eq. (16) as

$$\rho_q(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int e^{-iqr} C_q(q) dq,$$  \hspace{1cm} (A1)

where $C_q(q) = \langle e^{iqr} \rangle$. In the harmonic approximation, the interatomic spacing $r_{ij}$ can be written as

$$r_{ij} = r_{ij}^0 + \mathbf{u}_{ij} \cdot \hat{r}_{ij},$$  \hspace{1cm} (A2)

where $r_{ij}^0$ is the distance between the atoms $i$ and $j$ in the perfect unstrained lattice. Using the Debye-Waller theorem, we have

$$C_{ij}(q) = e^{iaq} \langle e^{iaq} \rangle = e^{iaq} e^{-\langle q^2 \rangle}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A3)

Putting this back to Eq. (A1), we have

$$\rho_q(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int e^{-\langle q^2 \rangle} \langle e^{i \hat{r}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{q}} \rangle dq$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \langle (\mathbf{u}_{ij} \cdot \hat{r}_{ij})^2 \rangle}} e^{-\langle q^2 \rangle}.$$

Therefore, $\rho_{ij}(r)$ is a Gaussian peak centered at $r_{ij}$ with the width

$$\sigma_q = \langle (\mathbf{u}_{ij} \cdot \hat{r}_{ij})^2 \rangle^{1/2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (A5)

which is Eq. (17).

Modeling Finite Data.

In experiments, data can be collected only over a finite range of the scattering momentum $q$ from 0 to $q_{\text{max}}$, although the Fourier transformation in Eq. (12) should be carried out over a range from 0 to $\infty$. We are interested in how the termination affects the PDF. In fact, the
derivation in this appendix may be applied in broader context of modeling finite data. In comparing theory and experiment, it is most convenient to incorporate the effects of truncation into the theory and then compare with the results obtained by Fourier transforming the experimental data. We substitute directly the theoretically calculated \( G(r) \) to give

\[
G_{
u}(r) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} G(r') \left[ \frac{\sin q_{\text{max}}(r-r')}{r-r'} - \frac{\sin q_{\text{max}}(r+r')}{r+r'} \right] dr'
\]  

(A6)

where \( G_{
u}(r) \) is the same quantity that is experimentally. The function in the bracket makes the ideal \( G(r) \) broader and produces ripples around the peaks as shown in the many of the figures in the text.
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