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AB$_2$O$_4$ normal spinels with a magnetic B site can host a variety of magnetic and orbital frustrations leading to spin-liquid phases and field-induced phase transitions. Here we report the first epitaxial growth of (111)-oriented MgCr$_2$O$_4$ thin films. By characterizing the structural and electronic properties of films grown along (001) and (111) directions, the influence of growth orientation has been studied. Despite distinctly different growth modes observed during deposition, the comprehensive characterization reveals no measurable disorder in the cation distribution nor multivalency issue for Cr ions in either orientation. Contrary to a naive expectation, the (111) stabilized films exhibit a smoother surface and a higher degree of crystallinity than (001)-oriented films. The preference in growth orientation is explained within the framework of heteroepitaxial stabilization in connection to a significantly lower (111) surface energy. These findings open broad opportunities in the fabrication of 2D kagome-triangular heterostructures with emergent magnetic behavior inaccessible in bulk crystals.

I. INTRODUCTION

Geometrically frustrated magnets have received considerable attention, and great efforts have been put forward to identify and characterize frustration-induced phenomena [1–4]. In two dimensions (2D), many antiferromagnetic materials with a triangular lattice motif can harbor frustrated interactions, making them excellent candidates for exotic behavior including quantized magnetization plateaus [3], charge frustration in mixed-valence spinels [6, 7], order by disorder [8], valence-bond ordering [9, 10], molecule-like spin clusters [11, 12], and potentially spin-liquid states [4, 13–17]. Despite a plethora of theoretical predictions, only a few highly-frustrated candidates have been investigated in detail so far [3, 4, 14, 17]. For instance, in three dimensions (3D), corner-sharing tetrahedral pyrochlores A$_2$B$_2$O$_7$ with spins coupled either ferromagnetically or antiferromagnetically have been proposed to host numerous interesting phenomena stemming from macroscopic ground state degeneracy [11, 18–24]. In close analogy to pyrochlores, spinels (AB$_2$O$_4$) represent another materials family that exhibits a corner-sharing tetrahedron network, with the B site ions forming a pyrochlore sublattice and A site ions organized into moderately frustrated diamond sublattice [23, 24]. Based on this observation, it is unsurprising that spinels also demonstrate many unusual low-temperature magnetic phenomena linked to the massive ground state degeneracy such as spin glass, spin ice, and spin liquid states [18, 27, 32].

In this work, we specifically focus on MgCr$_2$O$_4$ (MCO). MCO is a normal spinel that crystallizes into the cubic Fd$ar{3}$m space group with a = 8.33Å. [33, 34] In this spinel, the Cr$^{3+}$ (3d$^3$) ions are octahedrally coordinated by oxygen ions resulting in $S = 3/2$ high-spin state under the cubic crystal field. Due to the direct overlap between t$_{2g}$ orbitals, the antiferromagnetic exchange is dominant between nearest-neighbor Cr$^{3+}$ ions leading to the high Curie-Weiss temperature $\Theta_{CW} = -400$K. [33, 34] On the other hand, the corner-sharing tetrahedra sublattice of Cr$^{3+}$ ions remain paramagnetic down to the transition temperature $T_N = 12.5$K, yielding a moderate value of the frustration parameter $f = |\Theta_{CW}|/T_N \sim 32$. At $T_N$, the system undergoes a magneto-structural phase transition driven by the strong spin-lattice coupling. [33, 34, 36–38] Several neutron scattering experiments have elucidated the underlying frustrated behavior leading to the discovery of a highly-frustrated spin texture and ‘proximate’ spin liquid due to the short-range exchange interaction [39, 41].

In parallel to those developments, in pursuit of enhanced and tunable exchange interaction accompanied by strongly elevated magnetic frustration, a geometrical lattice engineering approach based on the synthesis of thin films of spinels along (111) becomes an increasingly popular direction. [30–32, 43, 45] To illustrate this approach, we note that along the (111) direction, Cr sublattice consists of alternating kagome and triangular atomic planes formed by magnetically active Cr$^{3+}$ ions (see Fig.1). Thus the expectation is that by growing MCO(111) thin films, one can lower the dimensionality and shift the energy balance to activate stronger exchange interactions to potentially reach new magnetic states with frustrated behavior unattainable in bulk. Despite the intriguing proposals linked to the (111) geometry, to our best knowledge, the growth of MCO thin films has not been demonstrated yet. It is also interesting to note that in bulk a wide variety of methods have been applied to synthesize MCO crystals, including ceramic synthesis, co-precipitation, sol-gel method, combustion, hydrothermal method, zone melting, and co-crystallization. [36–46] However, to date, the size of...
MCO crystals is still limited, which hinders the application of powerful experimental probes. [48–53]

In this work, we describe the growth of MCO(111) and MCO(001) thin films created by way of epitaxial stabilization using pulsed-laser deposition (PLD) with in-situ reflection high-energy electron diffraction (RHEED). All the samples are characterized by X-ray reflectivity (XRR) and X-ray diffraction (XRD) using the Empyrean platform by Malvern Panalytical. X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) was performed in a K-alpha X-ray photoelectron spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Synchrotron-based X-ray absorption spectroscopy (XAS) was carried out on beamline 4.0.2 at the Advanced Light Source, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Based on the thorough analysis and contrary to the initial expectation, the results demonstrate that MCO growth on (111) surface is preferentially stabilized over the conventional (001) growth. This result was attributed to the significant difference in the orientation-dependent Gibbs energy during the initial phase of nucleation and growth. The successful stabilization of high-quality MCO(111) thin films expand the boundary of the materials phase space beyond bulk and potentially enable new magnetic states with frustrated behavior.

II. EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

A series of MCO films have been prepared on (100) and (111) oriented surfaces. All samples were grown by pulsed laser deposition with the same laser power of ~2 J/cm², pulse-rate of 4 Hz, and monitored by in-situ RHEED. During the deposition, the best growth condition occurs for the substrate temperature of 550 °C and 2 mTorr oxygen background pressure. After the growth, all films were annealed at the growth condition for 10 mins, and then cooled down to room temperature at 15 °C/min under the same oxygen pressure. Particularly, to create (111)-oriented films, we focused on two different substrates. One is MgAl₂O₄ spinel (MAO), which has the same structural morphology and a lattice mismatch ϵ = (αMAO - αMCO)/αMCO ~ -2.9% (compressive strain). As for the second choice, we selected α-Al₂O₃(AlO), whose oxygen sublattice is in close registry with MCO oxygen sublattice. Here we note, the in-plane averaged O-O distance of AlO is 2.75Å while the O-O distance on the (111) surface of MCO is 2.95 Å, resulting in the continuity of anion sublattice across the film/substrate interface albeit with a larger compressive strain of ~ -6.8%.

In order to grow MCO (001), we used MAO (001) as a substrate. As shown in Fig. 1b and 1c, after the deposition of MCO, sharp streaks in the RHEED pattern were observed with the vertical spacing matching the substrate (0,1) and (0,-1) reflections. This observation is typical for the films crystallized in the Stranski-Krastanov growth mode. However, after switching to the (111) surface of an otherwise identical MAO substrate, sharp RHEED streaks rapidly turn to diffuse streaks along the (1,-1) axis, as illustrated in Fig. 1d. This observation implies that after changing the substrate orientation from (111) to (001), the growth mode is switched to the Frank-van-der-Merve (3D island) mode. Surprisingly, despite the more substantial disparity in the crystal structure and larger strain, the MAO substrate serves as a better template for growing MCO(111). Figure 1h and 1f compares the RHEED patterns of AlO (0001) substrate with the MCO film. As clearly seen, the RHEED pattern of the substrate peaks (-1,-1) and (1,1) matches well with the (-1,1) and (1,1) RHEED reflections of the film. Since the in-plane lattice constant of MCO is twice of that of AlO, an extra pair of strong reflections appears almost immediately after the initial deposition [marked by (±1/2,±1/2) in Fig 1f]. A direct comparison to Fig. 1e reveals much smoother streaked features with an overall lower background observed after deposition on the AlO substrate, confirming the Frank-van-der-Merve growth mode. These findings signify the critical importance of matching the anion network over the magnitude of strain. One can speculate that a possible reason for the observed island growth on MAO (111) substrate is that the polar MAO (111) surface is compensated for the polar discontinuity with ordered oxygen vacancies leading to the reconstructed (6√3 × 6√3) a areas. As a result, the charge compensated surface will consist of a juxtaposition of the original oxygen-terminated MAO (111) domains disrupted by oxygen-deficient areas that impede the MCO crystallization. [54–55]

To further investigate the effect of oxygen pressure and temperature on the growth, a detailed analysis of the crystallinity of a series of samples was carried out by XRD and XRR. Figure 2a shows that no additional chemical phases were observed in any of the films regardless of the orientation or the growth mode. Moreover, for similar thicknesses, the MCO(111) on the MAO substrate demonstrates much weaker film peaks than the film grown on AlO, further confirming that AlO substrate with an oxygen-matched sublattice indeed markedly improves the crystallinity of the MCO films.

In what follows, we focus on the AFM, XRR, and RSM results conducted on the MCO grown on AlO. The analysis of an XRD scan shown in Fig. 2a yields the out-of-plane lattice constant of 4.87 Å which under the assumption of a tetragonal distortion results in ~0.6% in-plane elongation which is in accord with the tensile in-plane strain. XRR data (Fig. 2b) confirm the presence of a very homogeneous film texture with a slow exponential intensity roll-off due to the surface roughness σ = 436 ± 3 pm. As illustrated in Fig. 2b, this low value of roughness was corroborated by the atomic force microscopy result (RMS roughness of ~171pm). Besides, the ω-scan measured around the (222) film Bragg reflection shows a very sharp single peak with FWHM of ~0.01° (see inset of Fig. 2c), further affirming the excellent film crystallinity. To verify the strain state, we measured reciprocal space map (RSM) around the off-symmetry (531) peak on a thicker sample of 80 nm (see Fig. 2c). By comparing the observed film peak position to the calculated bulk value marked by a white cross, it is clear that the film is compressed in-plane and stretched along the c-axis (i.e., tetragonally distorted). The estimated in-plane strain value is -0.5% which is in a good agreement with the value obtained from the 2θ - ω XRD data (-0.6%). Overall, these results confirm that imposed strain is robust and is only partially relaxed in the thick MCO(111)
film. In sharp contrast to the (111) oriented growth, for the MCO(100), the out-of-plane lattice constant remained practically unchanged after deposition, which is consistent with the Stranski-Krastanov growth mode initially revealed by in-situ RHEED.

In addition to the growth of MCO under the ideal growth condition, other growth conditions have been thoroughly explored. Here, we briefly discuss the film crystallinity dependence on substrate, temperature, and pressure on (111)-oriented MCO films. Figure 2 shows the MCO (222) Bragg reflection for three representative samples grown under different deposition conditions: S1 - 550 °C, 2 mTorr, S2 - 550 °C, 0.4 mTorr, and S3 - 450 °C, 2 mTorr. By zooming in to the (222) reflection, it is clear that there is a distinct oxygen pressure boundary at about 1 mTorr and a temperature threshold at ∼500 °C. Below these boundaries, the out-of-plane lattice constant estimated from the peak position becomes closer to the bulk value of 4.83 Å for S2 and 4.81 Å for S3. Besides that, the changes in temperature and oxygen pressure do not affect MCO’s growth mode along (001). Finally, all films become amorphous when grown under vacuum below 10⁻⁴ Torr, as evidenced by the absence of film peaks in XRD.

Next, we turn our attention to the electronic structure of the films. The electronic state and elemental composition were analyzed for MCO films grown in different orientations. First, since the X-ray absorption (XAS) can fingerprint the electronic configuration and spin state of MCO, we investigated the films by XAS at Cr L₂,₃-edge at room temperature. Figure 3 shows the absorption data taken on the MCO films in comparison to the well-known Cr²⁺ and Cr³⁺ reference compounds. As immediately seen, apart from some minor intensity variations, spectral features of MCO(111) largely mimic those of Cr₂O₃ (Cr³⁺) and are distinct from the Cr²⁺ spectral line shape. Additional evidence for expected Cr³⁺ was obtained from the XPS measurement showing the presence of a clear 2p doublet, and a pair of shake-up satellite peaks following the doublet at higher binding energy. Next, we fitted the chromium 2p₃/₂ peak following the Cr₂O₃ (Cr³⁺) references[57, 58]. As shown in Fig. 3, by comparing the MCO(111) peak distribution to the reference Cr³⁺ compounds CrO, Cr₂O₃, NiCr₂O₄ and FeCr₂O₄, we conclude that the peak positions and their relative intensity indeed closely follow the XPS results for the Cr³⁺ systems with analogous oxygen coordination. Interestingly, despite the 3D growth of MCO(100), the overall XPS core-state positions and the fine structure closely resemble the other chromium Cr³⁺ com-
FIG. 2. (a) Full-range XRD scans of MCO(001) film grown on MAO, MCO(111) film grown on AlO (orange), and MCO(111) film grown on MAO under the same deposition condition. (b) An atomic force microscopy image of MCO(111) grown on the AlO substrate. The averaged RMS roughness in the $1\mu m \times 1\mu m$ area is 171pm. (c) RSM of MCO (531) film peak measured on 80nm MCO (111) film. (d) XRR of the MCO(111) film, whose XRD is shown in (a), along with the fitting result. From the fitting, the film thickness is estimated to be around 23 nm. (e) Zoomed in XRD scan around (222) peak measured on films grown under various conditions. Inset is the $\omega$-scan of MCO (111) (550 $^\circ$C, 2mTorr) around (222) film peak; the estimated FWHM is 0.01$^\circ$.

III. DISCUSSION

During our search for an ideal growth condition for MCO (001), other substrates (e.g., MgO) and growth conditions ($O_2$ pressure varied from $10^{-5}$ Torr to 0.1 Torr, the temperature varied from 450$^\circ$C to 750$^\circ$C) have been explored. Despite these efforts, the MCO(001) films form in one of two ways: either develop 3D growth with high roughness, or exhibit poor micro-crystallinity though with a correct charge and chemical state. In sharp contrast, MCO(111) films can be grown in a layer-by-layer way, as seen in RHEED and XRD. Thus it is natural to ask: Why MCO(111) easier to stabilize than MCO(001)?

To address this question, we have made a Gibbs free energy comparison according to the model of heteroepitaxial stabilization [59]. The energy difference $\Delta E$ after the deposition can be primarily attributed to three parts: $\Delta E = \Delta G_v + \Delta G_{\text{strain}} + \Delta G_{\text{surface}}$ where $\Delta G_{\text{strain}} \propto \epsilon^2$ ($\epsilon$ is lattice mismatch), and $\Delta G_v$ is the specific volume Gibbs energy, which depends only on the initial and final chemical composition. For MCO, $\Delta G_v$ is approximately $-49200 (\pm 400)$ J at the growth temperature. [60] The negative value of $\Delta E$ means that the film growth is energetically favored. Now we can compare MCO (001) and MCO (111) growth based on the energy argument; first, experimentally we have determined that MCO (111) stabilizes easier than MCO (001), i.e., $\Delta E_{\text{111}} < \Delta E_{\text{001}}$. Secondly, the XPS result shows that the end composition for both orientations is a pure MCO spinel without secondary chemical phases, therefore $\Delta G_{\text{111}} = \Delta G_{\text{001}}$. Next, for the same substrate but under different orientations, we observed better growth on MAO (111) substrate than MAO (001). Last but not least, we take in to account the fact that AlO, as a substrate has a larger lattice mismatch $\epsilon$ than MAO (i.e. $\Delta G_{\text{strain}}^{\text{111}} > \Delta G_{\text{strain}}^{\text{001}}$). Finally, taking the above three points into consideration, one can conclude that indeed $\Delta G_{\text{111}}^{\text{surface}} < \Delta G_{\text{001}}^{\text{surface}}$.

This result is further corroborated by the data on spinel MAO and other spinel ferrites, showing that (111) surface has significantly lower surface energy than (001) surface. [61] More specifically, the specific surface energy can be written as $\nu = \lambda h^2/\pi^2 d$ where $\lambda$ is the elastic modulus normal to the plane under consideration, $d$ is the periodicity, and $h$ is the inter-layer spacing. For different orientations, $\lambda_{(001)} = C_{11}$ and $\lambda_{(111)} = (1/3)(C_{11} + 2C_{12} + 4C_{44})$. By adapting the elastic constants $C_{11}= 315.53$ GPa, $C_{12}= 206.73$ GPa, $C_{44}= 90.10$ GPa [62, 63] one can estimate the surface energy of MCO along the (001) and (111) direction to be $\sim 1664$ and 276 erg/cm$^2$, respectively. This large disparity in the surface
energy strongly influences the initial nucleation process lending strong support to the hypothesis that MCO should preferentially stabilize on the (111) surface, which overall agrees well with the data.

In conclusion, we have grown the first epitaxially stabilized MCO(111) films on the Al₂O₃ substrate. The MCO films deposited along (111) direction show excellent layer-by-layer growth while MCO films growth along (001) show Stranski-Krastanov (island-like) growth mode, albeit with correct morphology and chemical composition. The samples’ high crystallinity was evaluated by XRR and XRD, and the chemical composition and electronic structure confirmed by XPS and XAS. The high-quality growth along (111) is explained in the framework of heteroepitaxial stabilization and attributed primarily to the markedly lower surface energy of MCO(111) compared to (001). The presented methodology of growth of (111)-oriented spinel thin films based on the symmetry matching of anyon sublattices across the interface opens up rich research opportunities to probe spin dynamics in novel frustrated 2D systems.
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