



ELSEVIER

Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids 266–269 (2000) 859–866

JOURNAL OF
NON-CRYSTALLINE SOLIDS

www.elsevier.com/locate/jnoncrystal

Part II. Chalcogenide and organic semiconductors
Section 16. Growth and structural properties

Self-organization in network glasses

M.F. Thorpe^{a,*}, D.J. Jacobs^a, M.V. Chubynsky^a, J.C. Phillips^b

^a *Physics and Astronomy Department, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA*

^b *Bell Laboratories, Lucent Technologies, Murray Hill, NJ 07974, USA*

Abstract

The continuous random network model is widely used as a realistic description of the structure of covalent glasses and amorphous solids. We point out that in real glasses and amorphous materials, there are non-random structural elements that go beyond just simple chemical ordering. We propose that the network can self-organize at its formation or fictive temperature, and examine some of the possible consequences of such self-organization. We find that the absence of small rings can cause the mechanical threshold to change from a second order to a first order transition. We show that if stressed regions are inhibited in the network, then there are two-phase transitions and an intermediate phase that is rigid but stress-free. This intermediate phase is bounded by a second order transition on one side and a first order transition on the other. Recent experiments in chalcogenide glasses give evidence for this intermediate phase. © 2000 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The study of the structure of network glasses has progressed steadily since the initial work of Zachariasen [1] in 1932 that introduced the idea of the continuous random network (CRN). Zachariasen envisaged such networks maintaining local chemical order, but by incorporating small structural distortions, having a topology that is non-crystalline. This seminal idea has met some opposition over the years from proponents of various microcrystalline models, but today is widely accepted, mainly as a result of careful diffraction experiments from which the radial distribution function can be determined.

The CRN has been established as the basis for most modern discussions of covalent glasses, and this basis has occurred because of the interplay between diffraction experiments and model building. The early model building involved building networks with ~500 atoms from a seed with free boundaries in an approximately spherical shape [2]. Subsequent efforts have refined this approach and made it less subjective by using a computer to make the decisions and incorporating periodic boundary conditions. The best of these approaches was introduced by Wooten et al. [3] and consists of restructuring a crystalline lattice with a designated large unit supercell, until the supercell becomes amorphous. The large supercell contains typically ~5000 atoms. Both the hand built models and the Wooten et al. computer model are relaxed during the building process using a potential. The final structure is rather insensitive to the exact form of the potential and a Kirkwood [4] or Keating [5] potential is typically used.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1-517 355 9279; fax: +1-517 353 0690.

E-mail address: thorpe@pa.msu.edu (M.F. Thorpe).

Despite this success in understanding the structure, some concerns remain. Perhaps the most serious of these is that the network cannot be truly random. Even though glasses form at high temperatures where entropic effects are dominant, it is clearly not correct to ignore energy considerations that can favor particular local structural arrangements over others. A simple example of this is local chemical separation where for example bonding between like atoms is more probable than bonding between unlike atoms. This can lead to chemical thresholds as discussed later. A more subtle effect of interest to us here is how the structure itself can incorporate non-random features to minimize the free energy at the temperature of formation. This minimization is even more important in amorphous solids, which are usually formed at lower temperatures, and so energy considerations are relatively more important and we expect more non-random local structural arrangements. Such subtle structural correlations, to which we refer as *self-organization*, will almost certainly not be detected in diffraction experiments, but may have other manifestations. In this paper we consider the mechanical properties and critical mechanical thresholds, as these thresholds are where it is easiest to make theoretical progress at this time.

How can such an idea be developed theoretically? A proper procedure might be to use a very large supercell containing ~ 5000 atoms and use a first principles approach, such as that of Car and Parrinello [6] to form the glass at the appropriate temperature. It is not known if this would lead to any self-organization of the kind discussed above, but it might. However this result is unlikely, in the same way that the superconducting state would be hard to find from a brute force solution of the Schrödinger equation for a solid. We therefore need to look at other ways of generating self-organized networks. One promising approach is that of Barkema and Mousseau [7] who explore the energy landscape of a glass by moving over saddle points to try and find successively lower minima. In this paper, we look at even more simplified approaches that show what kinds of effects self-organization, and the resulting non-randomness produce.

The first of these approaches asks the question as to what would happen to the properties of a CRN if the small rings were to be eliminated as much as is possible. We show that network models can be built where the smallest ring is 10-membered, and we demonstrate that this elimination can alter some properties of the network. In particular the mechanical transition from a rigid to a floppy network that occurs as the mean coordination is reduced below 2.4, seems to become *first-order* rather than *second-order*. We also study a *self-organized* model of a random network in which configurations that are stressed are avoided if possible. This avoidance leads to two-phase transitions and an *intermediate phase* that is rigid but stress-free. Preliminary results show that the phase transition at the smallest mean coordination is second order and at the larger mean coordination is probably first order. There has been some recent evidence of a first order transition in chalcogenide glasses as the composition is varied and as observed in the Raman scattering [8–10], and also some evidence for the intermediate phase using differential scanning calorimetry [8–10].

In the next section we review ideas of rigidity percolation that lead to a mechanical threshold around a mean coordination of 2.4. In Sections 3 and 4, we examine the effect of the absence of rings and discuss the random bond model that contains no rings at all. In Section 5, we show how self-organization can lead to an intermediate phase that is rigid but stress-free. Finally we discuss how these ideas may lead to a better understanding of the glassy state, and compare with experimental results.

2. Rigidity percolation

We start by examining a large random covalent network that contains no dangling bonds, such as $\text{Ge}_x\text{As}_y\text{Se}_{1-x-y}$, where Ge stands for any four-fold coordinated atom, As for any three-fold coordinated atom and Se for any two-fold coordinated atom. The total number of atoms is N , there are n_r atoms with coordination r ($r = 2, 3$ or 4)

$$N = \sum_{r=2}^4 n_r \quad (1)$$

and we can define the mean coordination

$$\langle r \rangle = \frac{\sum_{r=2}^4 r n_r}{\sum_{r=2}^4 n_r} = 2 + 2x + y. \quad (2)$$

We note that $\langle r \rangle$ (where $2 < \langle r \rangle < 4$) gives a partial but very important description of the network.

In covalent networks such as $\text{Ge}_x\text{As}_y\text{Se}_{1-x-y}$, the bond lengths and angles are well defined. Small displacements from the equilibrium structure can be described by a Kirkwood [4] or Keating [5] potential, which we can write *schematically* as

$$V = \frac{\alpha}{2}(\Delta l)^2 + \frac{\beta}{2}(\Delta\theta)^2. \quad (3)$$

The mean bond length is l and Δl is the change in the bond length and $\Delta\theta$ is the change in the bond angle. The bond-bending force (β) is essential to the constraint counting approach for stability, in addition to the bond stretching term (α). The other terms in the potential are assumed to be much smaller and can be neglected at this stage. If floppy modes are present in the system, then these smaller terms in the potential will give the floppy modes a small finite frequency [11]. This division into *strong* and *weak* forces is essential to the constraint counting approach.

We will regard the solution of the eigenmodes of the potential of Eq. (3) as a problem in classical mechanics [11–13], where the dynamical matrix has a dimensionality of $3N$, corresponding to the $3N$ degrees of freedom in the system. The total number of zero frequency modes can be estimated by Maxwell counting [12], as was first done by Thorpe [11] following the work of Phillips [14,15] on optimal glass formation.

The constraint counting proceeds as follows. There is a single constraint associated with each bond. We assign $r/2$ constraints associated with each r -coordinated atom. In addition there are constraints associated with the angular forces in Eq. (3). For a two-fold coordinated atom there is a single angular constraint; for an r -fold coordinated atom there are a total of $2r - 3$ angular constraints. The total number of constraints is therefore

$$\sum_{r=2}^4 n_r [r/2 + (2r - 3)]. \quad (4)$$

The fraction, f , of zero-frequency modes is given by

$$f = \left[3N - \sum_{r=2}^4 n_r [r/2 + (2r - 3)] \right] / 3N. \quad (5)$$

This expression can be conveniently rewritten in the compact form

$$f = 2 - \frac{5}{6}\langle r \rangle, \quad (6)$$

where $\langle r \rangle$ is defined in Eq. (2). This result is shown in Fig. 1, where the transition at a mean coordination of 2.4 is indicated by an open square. Note that this result depends upon the combination $\langle r \rangle = 2x + y$, which is the only relevant variable.




Fig. 1. Showing the number of floppy modes plotted against the mean coordination for Maxwell counting (shown as a partly obscured dashed line) with the associated mean field transition shown by the open square at $\langle r \rangle = 2.4$, and for a randomly diluted diamond lattice using a dot-dash line, where the second order transition is indicated by the solid circle at $\langle r \rangle = 2.375$. The self-organized model described in Section 5, follows the Maxwell curve, and is shown by a solid line, and gives a second order transition at $\langle r \rangle = 2.375$, shown by an open circle, from a floppy to an unstressed rigid state and a first order transition at $\langle r \rangle = 2.392$, shown by an open triangle, to a stressed rigid state. The range of $\langle r \rangle$ over which the intermediate phase exists is indicated.

When $\langle r \rangle = 2$ (e.g., Se chains), then $f = 1/3$; that is one third of all the modes are floppy. As atoms with larger coordination than two are added to the network as cross-links, f decreases and goes to zero at $\langle r \rangle_c = 2.4$. The network becomes rigid, as it goes through a phase transition from *floppy* to *rigid*.

These ideas of Maxwell have been made rigorous by using an exact algorithm, the pebble game [16–18]. This algorithm is applied to a particular network which is then decomposed into the unstressed (isostatic) rigid regions, the stressed (overconstrained) rigid regions, with flexible joints between them. It is found that the Maxwell result (6) is a good guide, and for the randomly diluted diamond lattice, there is a transition at a mean coordination of 2.375, as shown in Fig. 1.

3. Random bond network

We have constructed networks for glasses like $\text{Ge}_x\text{As}_y\text{Se}_{1-x-y}$ by randomly positioning points in the plane as shown in Fig. 2. The main feature of these rather artificial random bond models (RBM) is that there are *no* loops or rings of bonds in the thermodynamic limit [18–20] and so they become equivalent to a Bethe lattice solution which has been recently discussed [19,20]. Thus they serve as a useful soluble guideline for what may be expected when there is a deficit of small rings. The




Fig. 2. The RBM where the squares are four-fold coordinated sites, the triangles are three-fold coordinated sites and the circles are two-fold coordinated sites.




Fig. 3. The derivative of the fraction of floppy modes f' for the RBM, normal diamond lattice and diamond lattice with six- and eight-fold rings removed ($n_{6,8}=0$), and then all subsequently randomly diluted.

bond lengths are quite unrealistic, but as rigidity is primarily a topological quantity, these lengths do not make a significant difference when compared to real networks that can be embedded in a three dimensional space. Of course it is three-dimensional rigidity that is examined as each vertex or atom has 3 degrees of freedom. The way rigidity is nucleated is rather interesting and a little different in the two cases. The rigidity transition is first order on these RBM networks, and in the Bethe lattice, rigidity nucleates from a rigid external busbar [18–20]. In the RBM shown in Fig. 2, there is no busbar and so rigidity must nucleate using the (few) large rings that are present on any finite RBM. The transition from rigid to floppy occurs at $\langle r \rangle_c = 2.3893$ in both the RBM and the Bethe lattice which are mathematically equivalent in the thermodynamic limit. The transition occurs in an *explosive-like* manner, when an infinite rigid cluster emerges all at once with the addition of a few constraints. In Fig. 3 we show the result for this first order transition in the RBM [18–20].

4. Rings

It is highly desirable to construct a more realistic network but with properties similar to the RBM. Real networks inevitably have rings, yet not

all of them are equally significant: isolated rings of size larger than six are floppy and can be a part of a rigid cluster only if they border other rings, and the larger the ring, the more bordering rings are needed. Therefore the smaller rings seem to be important for creating local rigid regions and can act as nucleating centers.

We study the effects of removing rings on a diamond lattice, which has even rings of sizes 6, 8, 10 and larger, using the pebble game algorithm [16–18]. Starting from the complete lattice, we first remove those bonds that maximally decrease the number of rings of each size of our choice. After the desirable number of rings of each size is reached, the bond dilution is continued in a random manner.

In determining the order of the transition here we use the number of floppy modes, F , in the network as a free-energy-like quantity [19,20], while $\langle r \rangle$ is the *temperature-like* quantity, with respect to which the derivatives of F are to be taken.

Fig. 4 shows the first derivatives of f with respect to the mean coordination $\langle r \rangle$ for diluted diamond lattices with different numbers of small rings left. We see that the curves sharpen up near the transition as six- and eight-fold rings are re-

moved. In Fig. 3, we show the result from Fig. 4 corresponding to the case when there are *no* six- and eight-fold rings, together with the result for the RBM and for the randomly diluted diamond lattice [18]. The former apparently has a jump comparable in size to that found in the RBM. Therefore the absence of small rings, where rigidity can be nucleated, drives the transition towards being first order [18].

5. Self-organizing networks

Within the present approach we have a rather unique opportunity to construct stress-free networks without a huge computational overhead. The basic idea is that we start with a smaller coordinated floppy network and add bonds. This addition leads to rigid regions being formed and as long as they are unstressed (isostatic) they are retained. By unstressed we mean that each bond length (angle) can have its natural length (angle) without being forced to change by the surrounding environment. Otherwise a bond is stressed. If adding a bond would result in that bond being redundant and hence create a stressed (overconstrained) region, then that move is abandoned.

If each bond corresponded to a single constraint (as in case of central-force networks), it would be possible to continue up to the point when the whole network is isostatic. Indeed, in this case each additional bond can either remove a floppy mode from the network, or put stress into it, but not both, so we can incorporate those bonds in the first category only until no more floppy modes remain. This is not quite the case in glass networks, where bonds also have angular (bond-bending) constraints associated with them, so it may happen that while one part of the set of constraints associated with a given bond removes floppy modes, the other part introduces strain. In our simulations about 0.6% of floppy modes are left when the strain becomes inevitable. At this point, which we will call the *stress transition*, a single additional bond causes a large stressed region which has a size $O(N)$ to appear, so the associated stress percolation transition is expected to be first order.




Fig. 4. The derivative of the fraction of floppy modes f' with respect to the mean coordination $\langle r \rangle$ for randomly diluted diamond lattices with different numbers of small rings. The total average number of six- and eight-fold rings going through a site at the transition in each case is shown. The curves with diamonds and triangles are blowups of respective curves in Fig. 3. The lines join the symbols and are for the guidance of the eye only.

A slight technical problem with this approach is that since we wish to model glasses having no atoms with coordination less than two, we must conduct the initial dilution in such a way that no such sites appear. It turns out to be impossible to completely remove all the redundant (stress causing) bonds. The final ratio of the number of redundant constraints to the total number of degrees of freedom is very small (typically about 0.05%) and does not increase when bonds are inserted (up to the stress transition), so it is largely irrelevant.

Before stress percolation occurs, the whole network is almost isostatic. This condition means that rigidity percolates through the network without any accompanying stress. This absence of stress is indeed the case, as is shown in Fig. 5, in which the dependence of the fraction of sites in the percolating rigid cluster on the coordination is shown. The isostatic transition is second order and occurs at $\langle r \rangle = 2.375 \pm 0.0015$. The critical exponent β for the size of the percolating cluster is estimated from the fit to $\beta = 0.185$. This β is equal (within the error bars) to that obtained for the case of unrestricted bond insertion, i.e., when redundant bonds are also added, where

$\beta = 0.175 \pm 0.02$. This agreement is probably not accidental. Indeed, a *central-force* network obtained by restricted bond insertion is obtainable from that with unrestricted bond insertion by removing from the latter all the bonds that were rejected while the former was built. Such a transformation does not change the cluster sizes and is smooth in $\langle r \rangle$, so the cluster size exponents are expected to be the same. Probably a similar argument applies when angular forces are present, though it is not as obvious.

Since restricted insertion requires the analysis of the rigidity of the network at each insertion attempt, this analysis is a very computationally intense procedure (especially when approaching the stress transition), so to get several realizations it is reasonable to do it only once to reach the stress transition and then use that network several times for further insertion. In particular, it is reasonable to insert a test bond in different random places in the network at the stress transition and then find the distribution of the percolating clusters. Before each new insertion the previous test bond is removed. It turns out that for the network sizes used (up to 125 000 atoms) the results are realization-dependent, but no noticeable size dependence was found. These results indicated that a stressed cluster of about 0.5 the network size appears after one or several bonds are inserted. We consider this as an indicator of a first order transition. This process we consider as an indication of the first order transition, with the percolating stressed cluster involving about 1/2 of the network sites after a few additional bonds are inserted at the stress transition.

Since there are no redundant constraints in the network below the stress transition, the number of floppy modes follows Maxwell counting *exactly* (which means it is perfectly linear in $\langle r \rangle$). This linearity means that the isostatic transition is not seen in the number of floppy modes, while the stress transition is accompanied with the change of the slope, as is expected for the first order transition (see Fig. 1).

6. Discussion

We have introduced the idea of a self-organized network as a model for covalent glasses. The self-




Fig. 5. Showing the fraction of sites P_∞ in the rigid and stressed percolating clusters. Circles are for the average over 4 networks with 64 000 sites, and triangles are the same for 5 networks with 125 000 sites. The thicker dashed lines are a power law before the stress transition, and for guidance of the eye after it. Note the break in slope of the dashed line at the first order transition at 2.392. The intermediate phase, which is rigid but unstressed exists for $2.375 < \langle r \rangle < 2.392$.

organization occurs because at the fictive temperature [21], which is where the glass is formed, the energy term in the free energy cannot be ignored when compared to the entropy term. This is particularly so for amorphous solids usually deposited at low temperatures. At the present time, it is not possible to examine all network structures and find those with the smallest free energy, and as this is an exponentially hard computer problem it probably will never be possible to do this analysis for sufficiently large systems. Therefore, we have constructed simple models and analyzed the effect of non-randomness, caused by self-organization, on mechanical properties. In one case this non-randomness was imposed, when the formation of small rings was inhibited. This randomness led to a first order transition. In another case, we avoided stressed regions and discovered the existence of an intermediate phase, which is rigid but unstressed.

It is possible, but far from proven, that this later situation with an intermediate phase has been observed experimentally by Boolchand et al. [8–10]. They studied the $\text{Ge}_x\text{X}_{1-x}$ glasses ($\text{X} = \text{S}$ or Se) by Raman scattering and found a jump in the composition dependence of the frequency of the mode corresponding to symmetric stretch of $\text{Ge}(\text{X}_{1/2})_4$ tetrahedra. For both S and Se this change occurs around the composition $x = 0.225$, which corresponds to a mean coordination $\langle r \rangle = 2.45$, and may correspond to the transition to the stressed state. It is also interesting to notice that there is some effect observed near $\langle r \rangle = 2.40$ in both cases, where the transition appears to begin, which may correspond to the isostatic second order transition. So the same sequence of two transitions was probably observed, which may correspond to the first observation of the *intermediate phase* discussed in this paper. Their experimental positions (from $\langle r \rangle = 2.40$ to 2.45) do not coincide with our results (from $\langle r \rangle = 2.375$ to 2.392), which is probably due to the simplicity of our model. Note that the lower transition is second order and the upper transition is first order in both experiment and theory. However the theory predicts that the intermediate phase is about three times narrower and shifted down from that observed experimentally. This shift may be significant and casts some doubt on making the equivalence

between experiment and theory, or more likely our theoretical model is just too simple to get all the details correct. Recent work [8–10] using differential scanning calorimetry also has evidence for an intermediate phase in $\text{Si}_x\text{Se}_{1-x}$ glasses.

We note that there is a quite separate chemical threshold at $x = 1/3$ in $\text{Ge}_x\text{X}_{1-x}$ glasses at which Ge–Ge bonds must first appear, as normally chemical alternation like Ge–X is favored. This chemical threshold is unlikely to lead to any first order effects and is located at a mean coordination of $\langle r \rangle = 2.67$ which is far from the region of interest here.

The notion of self-organized criticality [22] has been applied to many phenomena; the most familiar being avalanches in sandpiles, which appear to occur on all length scales. There are superficial connections with the work here that leads to the existence of the intermediate phase. However, much more work needs to be done – the lower isostatic transition is almost certainly of a conventional kind, and the precise properties of the upper transition to a stressed state are unknown at this time.

7. Conclusions

In this paper we have established that the rigidity transition can be first order if networks are not random. In the case when stressed regions were inhibited, there was also a second transition at a smaller mean coordination, and a resulting intermediate phase. At this time it is not known how robust this intermediate phase is, although the correspondence with experimental results is encouraging, and we suggest it may be quite robust. It is interesting to us to speculate that as a function of some yet unknown coordinate, the second order transition may go through a *tricritical* point and become first order and then subsequently split at a *triple* point to give the intermediate phase.

Acknowledgements

Some of the ideas in this paper concerning non-random networks and the fictive temperature were

developed in discussions between one of us (MFT) and the late Frank L. Galeener to whom this paper is dedicated. We acknowledge useful ongoing discussions with Punit Boolchand. This work was supported in part by NSF grants DMR-9632182 and CHE-9224102.

References

- [1] W.H. Zachariasen, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 54 (1932) 3841.
- [2] D.E. Polk, *J. Non-Cryst. Solids* 5 (1971) 365.
- [3] F. Wooten, K. Winer, D. Weaire, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 54 (1985) 1392.
- [4] J.G. Kirkwood, *J. Chem. Phys.* 7 (1939) 505.
- [5] P.N. Keating, *Phys. Rev.* 145 (1966) 637.
- [6] R. Car, M. Parrinello, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 55 (1985) 2471.
- [7] G.T. Barkema, N. Mousseau, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77 (1996) 4358.
- [8] X.W. Feng, W.J. Bresser, P. Boolchand, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 78 (1997) 4422.
- [9] P. Boolchand, X.W. Feng, D. Selvanathan, W.J. Bresser, in: *Rigidity Theory and Applications*, Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York, 1999.
- [10] D. Selvanathan, W.J. Bresser, P. Boolchand, B. Goodman, *Solid State Comm.* 111 (1999) 619.
- [11] M.F. Thorpe, *J. Non-Cryst. Solids* 57 (1983) 355.
- [12] J.C. Maxwell, *Philos. Mag.* 27 (1864) 294.
- [13] Y. Cai, M.F. Thorpe, *Phys. Rev. B* 40 (1989) 10535.
- [14] J.C. Phillips, *J. Non-Cryst. Solids* 34 (1979) 153.
- [15] J.C. Phillips, *J. Non-Cryst. Solids* 43 (1981) 37.
- [16] D.J. Jacobs, M.F. Thorpe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75 (1995) 4051.
- [17] D.J. Jacobs, M.F. Thorpe, *Phys. Rev.* 53 (1996) 3682.
- [18] M.F. Thorpe, D.J. Jacobs, N.V. Chubynsky, A.J. Rader, in: *Rigidity Theory and Applications*, Kluwer Academic/Plenum, New York, 1999.
- [19] D.J. Jacobs, M.F. Thorpe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 80 (1998) 5451.
- [20] P.M. Duxbury, D.J. Jacobs, M.F. Thorpe, C. Moukarzel, *Phys. Rev. E* 59 (1999) 2084.
- [21] F.L. Galeener, D.B. Kerwin, A.J. Miller, J.C. Mikkelsen Jr., *Phys. Rev. B* 47 (1993) 7760.
- [22] Per Bak, *How Nature Works: The Science of Self-Organized Criticality*, Copernicus, New York, 1996.